

Eleanor Gregory

From: Eleanor Gregory
Sent: 09 February 2010 09:50
To: Richard Buck
Subject: FW: Cheshire East electoral review
Attachments: Parish Councillor Hogben response to BC draft proposals.doc

From: Steve Hogben [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2010 18:10
To: Reviews@
Subject: Cheshire East electoral review

To:

The Review Officer (Cheshire East)
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW.

Dear Sir,

As one of the two parish councillors for the Gresty Brook Ward in the Shavington-cum-Gresty parish, I attach my comments on your draft proposals for new warding arrangements in Cheshire East.

I trust that you will be able to take account of this response when you prepare your final recommendations.

Yours faithfully,

Steven Hogben
Parish Councillor



Response to draft recommendations of the Boundary Committee

Crewe South and Shavington

In general, the Boundary Committee proposals have sought to separate parished areas from those parts of urban Crewe that are not parished. This is an approach that I welcome. The creation of a Town Council for the unparished parts of Crewe must be a serious possibility in the foreseeable future, given the community governance reviews that Cheshire East Council is undertaking in several parts of the borough.

Within the Boundary Committee proposals, however, there is one exception to this approach, which I believe should be rectified in the interests of consistency, as well as recognising the established local (i.e. parish) council arrangements that exist on all sides of the town.

As one of the two parish councillors for the area in question, I firmly believe that the current Polling District 1GM2 (Shavington Parish – Gresty Brook ward) should be removed from Crewe South Ward and be included in the proposed Shavington Ward, along with the rest of the Shavington-cum-Gresty parish. It is forecast that in 2013 this area will include 550 electors. While it might be argued that this area does not itself include a direct road link with the rest of the parish, the same can be said of the “College Fields” estate lying within polling district 1FG2 (Christchurch Avenue, College Fields, Harrow Close, Magdalen Court, Sandhurst Avenue, Trinity Close). This latter estate lies within the current Wistaston Green parish ward of Wistaston parish, and it has been included within the proposed two-member Wistaston Ward.

In fact the Gresty Brook parish ward and the “College Fields” estate both have regularly used pedestrian access to the remainder of their respective parishes (across the Gresty Brook and Wistaston Brook respectively, both of which are sections of the same historic watercourse that marked the boundary of the erstwhile Nantwich Rural District). Consistency alone surely must require that these two parished areas be dealt with in the same manner.

In addition, the Shavington-cum-Gresty parish council is established as both a convenient and effective unit of local government. The parish council itself favours a single member unitary ward based upon the parish council boundaries, and was planning to respond to the Boundary Committee to that effect, following a unanimous decision taken in public at the meeting held on Wednesday 3rd December 2009. Local residents in the parish want clear lines of accountability to the parish council by the unitary council. At present no such clarity exists, especially as six unitary councillors from three different political parties can be involved in any local matter.

It makes sense to recognise the value of a single-member ward for the whole of Shavington-cum-Gresty parish, as is the case for Leighton parish, which the Boundary Committee has already proposed should be a single-member unitary ward.

The effect of this change would be to increase the electorate of the proposed Shavington Ward to 3,800 in 2013 (+7.0%), and it would reduce the electorate of the proposed two-member Crewe South Ward to 6,562 in 2013 (-7.6%).