

Eleanor Gregory

From: SILVESTER, Brian (Councillor) [Brian.Silvester@cheshireeast.gov.uk]
Sent: 12 February 2010 22:31
To: Reviews@
Subject: Ward Boundaries.Cheshire East
Attachments: BC Final Submission.doc

Dear sir,

I write to fully support the submission by the Cheshire East Council on electoral arrangements in the Borough. (attached below) I would draw your attention to the fact that all the Parish councils in the Rope Ward have written to you to broadly support the views expressed by the Cheshire East Council in relation to this Ward and in opposition to your recommendations. I hope you will give due weight to the elected Parish and Borough representatives in the Rope Ward when you make your final recommendations.

Yours faithfully,



**Cllr Brian Silvester
Rope Ward**

Note: This E-Mail is intended for the addressee only and may include confidential information.

Unauthorised recipients are requested to please advise the sender immediately by telephone and then delete the message without copying or storing it or disclosing its contents to any other person.

We have taken all reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are transmitted from the Authority to any third party. Copyright in this e-mail and attachments created by us unless stated to the contrary belongs to the

Any liability (in negligence or otherwise) arising from any party acting, or refraining from acting on any information contained in this e mail is hereby excluded.

Should you communicate with anyone at the Council by e-mail, you consent to us monitoring and reading any such correspondence.

Printing this email? Please think environmentally and only print when essential!

**CHESHIRE EAST BOROUGH COUNCIL
UNITARY AUTHORITY ELECTORAL REVIEW 2009/2010**

Submission to the Boundary Committee on Electoral Arrangements

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Electoral Review of Cheshire East Council commenced on 24th February 2009, and has previously involved two stages of public consultation on (1) Council size and (2) the warding arrangements for the Authority. Cheshire East Council made detailed submissions at both of these earlier stages, taking into account, wherever possible, the views of Town and Parish Councils and other interested bodies. The Boundary Committee (BC) has indicated that it is minded to adopt a Council size of 82 Members (in line with the Council's proposals), and has now published Draft Recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for the Council.

2. TIMETABLE

- 2.1. The Draft Recommendations were published by the BC on 10th November 2009, for a ten weeks period of public consultation. However, due to the need for a number of numerical and mapping errors to be corrected, the deadline for responses was extended to 15th February 2010. The Recommendations make provision for six 3 Member Wards, eighteen 2 Member Wards, and twenty-eight single Member Wards (52 Wards in total). Interested parties are now invited to comment on any aspects of these electoral proposals, including the proposed Ward boundaries, the number of Councillors, Ward names, and consequential Parish and Town Council electoral arrangements.
- 2.2. The final stage of the Review will follow the consultation deadline of 15th February, when the BC will review these draft Recommendations in the light of representations received, and decide whether or not they should be altered. Final Proposals will be published by the BC in May 2010. They will then be subject to Parliamentary process, and formally brought into force by Statutory Order.

3. THE COUNCIL'S SUBMISSION

- 3.1. As at previous stages of the Review, the Council's response has been guided by an all-Party Members Task Group. The Group has given careful consideration to the Draft Recommendations, and has overseen the production of this submission, which sets out the Authority's response as approved by the full Council on 25th January 2010. The views and responses of other interested parties have been taken into consideration where known, recognising that they may make their own comments directly to the BC as part of the public consultation process.

3.2. Whilst the BC's recommendations on the number of Wards and the number of Councillors for each vary to a degree from the Council's earlier submission, the Council is minded broadly to support the BC's proposals, including the general thrust of the Ward and member configurations identified above. However, there are a number of areas where the Council disagrees with the proposals and wishes to make further representations as set out in this document. The areas and Wards concerned are dealt with in detail in the following sections, but may be summarised as:-

- (a) Wilmslow – Dean Row and Handforth
- (b) Poynton – relating to Adlington, Lyme Handley and Kettleshulme
- (c) Crewe Town
- (d) Willaston, Rope and Wistaston
- (e) Nantwich and Wybunbury
- (f) Haslington and Sandbach
- (g) Macclesfield Town
- (h) Ward names in the Congleton area

3.3. Reference was made in the Council's last submission to the requirement to conduct a Community Governance Review (CGR) of the un-parished area of Crewe Town. The CGR has now been completed, following two stages of public consultation locally. At the Special meeting on 25 January 2010, the Council resolved:

"Having taken into account all consultation responses made during the second stage of consultation, and having regard to the need to ensure that Community Governance within the area reflects the identities and interests of the Community, and is effective and convenient, that the draft recommendation of the Council of 15 October 2009 be reaffirmed, i.e. 'To accept the vote from the people of Crewe and to reject the notion of a Town Council for Crewe at this time'."

Accordingly, there are no implications for the Electoral Review of Cheshire East Council arising from the Crewe CGR.

4. WILMSLOW – DEAN ROW AND HANDFORTH

4.1. The Council's original proposal for this area was for a single Wilmslow North Ward, covering the communities of Dean Row and Handforth, represented by three Councillors, which achieved good electoral equality of +0.1% from the average.

4.2. The difficulty with this area in electoral equality terms is that both communities have similar electorates of 5000 – 5500, which indicates that they should each be represented by 1.5 Councillors. The BC proposal seeks to address this problem by transferring a substantial number of electors from one community to the other (in this case Dean Row to Handforth) in order to create one, 2-Member Ward and one single-Member ward and thereby achieve electoral equality. The Council believes that this would be at the expense of the community identities in the area.

- 4.3. Whichever way around the transfer of electors is carried out, it will be harmful to one of the communities. The Council's submission is that it is better to reflect the local community identities and avoid artificial boundaries by approving a single, 3-Member Ward for the whole area, which would also bring with it good electoral equality. This proposal is made on the following basis:
- (a) The natural boundary between the two communities is well recognised locally as the river Dean. To the north of the river lies Handforth, and to the south is Wilmslow, of which Dean Row is part. This is evidenced by the fact that main road names change as they cross the river, i.e. Wilmslow Road in Handforth (former A34) becomes Manchester Road in Dean Row; and Dean Road (Handforth) becomes Handforth Road in Dean Row (B5358) at this point.
 - (b) The BC proposal places the Colshaw Farm and Finney Green areas of Wilmslow (Dean Row), all of which are located south of the river Dean, into Handforth to the north. This means that Wilmslow's cemetery, the Dean Row Community Centre and the local Dean Row Shopping Centre (Summerfields) would be located out of the town and in the Handforth Ward, which is not consistent with local community identities. It would mean that representation of Dean Row residents would lie in the hands of Handforth Councillors.
 - (c) To achieve the BC's proposal requires the transfer of the whole of Polling District 8EE1 (1291 electors) and the major part of PD 8EA (595 electors), a total of 1886 electors, from Wilmslow (Dean Row) to Handforth in order to arrive at electoral equality within the tolerance. This would continue the decision made in the 2001 Macclesfield Borough Review when PD 8EE1 was moved to Handforth. This outcome generated a good deal of local opposition in the community. Many regard it as having been an error and there is now the opportunity to correct the position in line with the community's preferences.
 - (d) There is a large degree of affinity between these distinct but linked communities, evidenced by:-
 - The excellent major road and rail links between Wilmslow and Handforth
 - Secondary school transfer by Handforth pupils is normally to Wilmslow High School
 - Both Dean Row (Colshaw Farm) and Handforth (Spath Lane) contain substantial Manchester "overspill" housing from the 1950s
 - The major "out of town" shopping centre serving the area is named "Handforth Dean"
 - (e) The Council's proposal for a single, 3-Member Ward would render irrelevant and overcome the difficult issue of the transfer of a part of

Dean Row to Handforth. It would achieve good electoral equality for the Ward of 3400 electors per Councillor in 2013.

- (f) A Petition has been received requiring a Community Governance Review of Wilmslow and Handforth. Although the outcome cannot be anticipated, should there be a decision to create Parish or Town Councils in the area, the Polling Districts within both Dean Row and Handforth would lend themselves well to forming Parish Wards, without any need for further Ward boundary changes. There could, for example, readily be Parish Wards based on Colshaw Farm and Spath Lane housing estates, which would further enhance local governance and community identities in the area.

4.4. Accordingly, the Council remains strongly of the view that a single, 3-Member Ward for the Handforth and Dean Row areas is the solution which best reflects local community wishes, avoids causing damage to any of these community identities and achieves very good electoral equality. The Council would also now propose that the 3 Member Ward is named "Dean Row and Handforth" rather than "Wilmslow North" as previously suggested. The proposed Ward boundaries are shown on Map 1 attached.

4.5. The Council also proposes that the Wilmslow Lacey Green Ward should be named "Wilmslow Lacey Green and Styal Ward" as this better reflects the local community identities in the area.

5. POYNTON AREA

5.1. The Council's proposal for this area was for two, 2-Member Wards, namely Poynton West and Poynton East and Adlington. Whilst the BC has accepted the principle of two Poynton Wards, each returning two Councillors and requiring some linkage with adjoining communities, their preference is for Adlington to be joined with Poynton West, citing better transport links and accessibility as the main reasons. The Council would wish to make further submissions in support of the initial proposal that Adlington should be warded with Poynton East. The Council understands that this is also the strong view of Poynton with Worth Town Council. Cheshire East is also aware that Adlington Parish Council (bearing in mind their expressed preference to be warded with Prestbury and Mottram St Andrew) would rather be warded with Poynton East should they have to be joined with Poynton at all.

5.2. It would appear that the BC has accepted the general evidence of economic, transport, educational and other links between Poynton and Adlington. It is also the case that Poynton and Adlington formed a single Cheshire County Council electoral division between 1974 and 2001, so the association is well understood by the local communities. However, the Council feels that, in particular, local transport links most used by the community are the rural buses linking Adlington more with Poynton East. The bus services connect up the small hamlets within Adlington, and give access to the eastern and more rural part of Poynton, which

has more affinity with the rural character of Adlington. The Council also accepts that Pott Shrigley should be included with Poynton East and Adlington, which would reinforce the generally rural character of the whole area. These links are more relevant to the local communities than to the more commuter-orientated road and rail connections through Adlington and Poynton West.

- 5.3. Although the Poynton Business Park lies within Adlington (which also has its own Business Park), the workforce and customers found at both of these Parks came from both Poynton and Adlington (and beyond) so any direct link with Poynton West is not critical. Many Poynton residents use Adlington businesses on Wood Lane and Moggie Lane, both of which are nearer to Poynton East.
- 5.4. With regard to the boundary line between Poynton East and West Wards, the Council supports the proposed change advocated by the Town Council, that the centre line of Dickens Lane provides the strongest and most locally identifiable boundary between the two Wards, with all of Vernon Road and Spring Road being in Poynton West. This line also follows Polling District boundaries and avoids the need for any split Polling Districts.
- 5.5. Looking a little further afield, the Council is unable to understand the BC's proposed inclusion of Kettlethulme in Poynton East, as it is several miles from the town and the road links are poor. The better road links are with Rainow, which is also well served by the local buses. The Council would therefore want to argue again for its initial submission that Kettlethulme has much greater affinity with Rainow, and that it should therefore be in the Sutton Ward together with Rainow Parish. Should the proposal below concerning Lyme Handley be accepted, there would in fact be no link at all between Kettlethulme and Poynton.
- 5.6. The Council would wish to press again for its initial proposal for Lyme Handley to be included in the Disley Ward, which is also supported by Disley Parish Council. Lyme Handley has no direct connection by road with Poynton, the only access being by footpath, and Lyme Handley's only road link is with Disley. Previously, Lyme Handley and Disley formed a single ward for Macclesfield Borough Council and all of the polling places for Lyme Handley are in Disley. There are strong historic links between the Lord Newton family of Lyme Hall and Disley. Lord Newton is patron of Disley Parish Church. The deceased of Lyme Handley are buried in Disley Parish Church's graveyard and children from Lyme Handley attend school in Disley. Accordingly, the community of Lyme Handley is much more closely identified with Disley than Poynton.
- 5.7. The effect of these proposals overall would be for Poynton West Ward to have an electorate of 6389 with Poynton East & Adlington Ward containing 6801. This figure reflects the removal of the 278 electors from Kettlethulme to Sutton which becomes 3892 electors as a result of this change, and 122 from Lyme Handley to Disley, which would then have an electorate of 3726. However, should the Council's proposal to transfer Lyme Green (552 electors) from Sutton to Macclesfield Moss be accepted (see 10.1 below), the Sutton Ward electorate would reduce to 3340. It should also be noted that the planned development of

an Extra Care Residential Home in Poynton East at the former Vernon Infants School site in Bulkeley Road has now been approved, thereby increasing the Ward electorate by up to 130 in the near future. Taken overall, therefore, these proposals would result in good electoral equality across all of the Wards concerned.

5.8. In summary, the Council is making representations as shown on Map 2 attached on the basis of:-

- A Poynton West Ward.
- A Poynton East and Adlington Ward (including Pott Shrigley but not including Kettlethulme or Lyme Handley which should be in Sutton and Disley Wards respectively).
- Adjustment to the boundary between the East and West Wards of Poynton in the Dickens Lane area, as proposed by the Town Council.

6. CREWE TOWN

- 6.1. The Council recognises the virtue of having clear and distinct boundaries formed by the railway lines in the urban part of Crewe. With regard to the proposed Crewe East Ward, the Council reluctantly accepts the difficulty of splitting the area into individual wards and therefore does not propose any change to the draft recommendations.
- 6.2. The BC Draft Recommendations split the North Western Area of Crewe into four single member wards: Central; North; Leighton and St Barnabas. The Council proposes only one small change to this arrangement. This involves a redrawing of the line between the Leighton and St Barnabas Wards so that James Atkinson Way and a number of small Closes off the way are fully included in the Leighton Ward. This area forms a small estate which is currently split by the Draft Recommendation; a proposal which would involve two separate Councillors being involved in any problems or consultations involving this small community. The revised boundary as shown on Map 3 would run to the rear of Skylark Close and join the BC's recommended boundary adjacent to the top of Wheelman Road. The change would not split the parish of Leighton nor would it involve splitting the PD FJ4. There is a strong measure of community support for this proposal, as a petition containing 185 signatures strongly objecting to the proposal of the BC and asking that the whole of the estate remain within the Leighton Ward has been submitted to the Council.
- 6.3. If approved, this proposal would result in 334 electors moving from St Barnabas Ward into Leighton Ward, giving new electorates of 3297 and 3926 respectively. Although in Leighton this exceeds the normal tolerance on electoral equality, the community identity arguments and the strength of feeling among local residents make this an exceptional case.
- 6.4. The BC draft recommendations split the South Western Area of Crewe into two, 2-Member Wards – West and South. The Council proposes several changes to this arrangement:

- 6.5. Firstly, the Council believes there is a better line that can be drawn between the two Wards. It proposes two changes to the line: at the south end the small polling district BD2 should move into the West Ward, where it has traditionally been, moving the boundary line to Nantwich Road, making it a stronger and much more simple line. This is the current boundary line between the existing Crewe West and South Wards. At the north end of the line, the current proposal cuts diagonally west to east in a series of steps. A better line would be the west extremity of PD DD1 which would run along Franklin Avenue (to the rear of the houses) and then along Jubilee Avenue and Stewart Street to the railway. DD1 is currently in the existing South Ward and mainly consists of terraced housing very similar to the rest of the ward.
- 6.6. Secondly, the Council believes that polling district GM2 (Gresty Brook Parish Ward of Shavington-cum-Gresty Parish Council, containing 558 electors) has little in common with the rest of Crewe South Ward and should, instead, be incorporated into Shavington Ward. Although there is no direct road link between Gresty Brook and the remainder of the Parish, there is good pedestrian access across Gresty Brook itself. This would have the added advantage of creating a single ward fully co-terminous with the local Parish of Shavington-cum-Gresty, making the area a convenient and effective unit of local government. The effect of these changes to the three Wards involved would result in an evening-up of the variances in the West and South Wards and a similar absolute variance in Shavington (but positive instead of negative).
- 6.7. Thirdly, dependent on the foregoing changes being made in Crewe West, the Council believes there is a further opportunity to create two, single-member Wards in the area (rather than the one, 2-member Ward proposed by the BC). One Ward would comprise the area to the north of Queen's Park (Hughes Drive area), the former Hospital site to the north-east, and the housing estate on the south side. This would continue as the West Ward comprising PD's BF1, BB1 and BA1. The remaining PD's namely BC1, BD1, BD2 and BB2 together with part of PD FG2 (Flixton Drive) covering the area to the north of Gainsborough Infants School would form a new King's Grove Ward. These arrangements would be well understood by the local communities, as they are based on the former Crewe & Nantwich Borough Ward of Ruskin Park. Good electoral equality would be retained in the two, single-member Wards, as Crewe West would have 3312 electors (-5%) and Kings Grove 3823 (+9%).
- 6.8. All of these proposed changes for the South Western Area of Crewe are shown on Map 4.

7. WILLASTON, ROPE AND WISTASTON

- 7.1. Currently called Rope Ward, the draft recommendations split the area with three wards: one, 2-member Wistaston Ward; one, single-member Willaston and Rope Ward and one, single-member Shavington Ward.

- 7.2. Subject to the addition of Gresty Brook Parish Ward (PD GM2) to the Shavington Ward as detailed in the Crewe Area changes (paragraph 6.6, above), the Council is happy with the Shavington Ward proposal. The Council also accepts the changes proposed which extend the Wistaston Ward into the Wistaston Green area thus enabling a common Ward and Civil Parish boundary. This means the whole of Wistaston Parish is now within the same Council Ward. The Council is however most unhappy about the thoroughly artificial Willaston and Rope Ward. These two parishes have no significant community links (indeed they are completely separate communities) and the only road link (Eastern Road) is an inadequate country lane which is mainly used as a rat-run to access the Shavington Bypass. The Council also notes that Willaston Parish is split into two parts by the proposals with the northern part of the Parish in the Wistaston Ward.
- 7.3. The Council believes a better solution would be to combine the proposed Wistaston and Willaston and Rope Wards into a 3-member single Ward (retaining the name Rope) as shown on Map 5. This Ward would then neatly and totally encompass the full parishes of Wistaston, Willaston and Rope. It is a good example of how a single, 3-member Ward would be better understood and supported by the communities concerned, and would better reflect convenient local governance with the Ward and Parish arrangements being clearly defined with each other. The proposed single ward would have an electorate of 11420 (11520 by 2013) and, therefore, a variation of +9% in 2008 and +8% in 2013. This compares favourably with +11% and +10% for Willaston and Rope and +8% and +7% for Wistaston Ward in the draft recommendations.

8. NANTWICH AND WYBUNBURY

- 8.1. With regard to the recommendations on a future Wybunbury Ward, the Council has reviewed the position further and, in the light of local representations, would now contend that Stapeley Rural (including Batherton) is not part of Nantwich and has much more in common with the conjoining Parishes of Wybunbury and Hatherton & Walgherton (all in the Wybunbury Ward). Whilst this could see the division of Stapeley Parish Council, we strongly believe that these areas are rural: the housing is ribbon development on Wybunbury Lane, London Road and Broad Lane and not part of Nantwich. The ribbon housing on these roads is no more part of the Nantwich community than Hatherton & Walgtherton, Hough, Shavington or Wybunbury. For example, most young children go to Wybunbury Sir John Delves and Stapeley Broad Lane Primary Schools and not primary schools in Nantwich. The boundary between the Nantwich South and Wybunbury Wards would run along Peter Destapleigh Way.
- 8.2. If the BC accepts the Council's proposals to include Stapeley Rural and Batherton in Wybunbury Ward, and the relocation of Wychwood Village from Wybunbury to Haslington Ward (see paragraph 8.5, below), there would be a neutral effect on the electorate figure for Wybunbury, which remains at 3765, giving excellent electoral quality. However, it does result in the loss of the 322 electors in Stapeley Rural and Batherton from Nantwich South Ward, thereby

creating the need to review the boundary line between Nantwich South Ward and Nantwich North & West Ward, in order to achieve a reasonable electoral balance between these two Wards. The revised boundary could run along Beam Street and Millstone Lane (rather than South Crofts) both of which are main roads, providing a strong boundary line in the town centre. This would result in electorates of 6726 in Nantwich South and 6272 in Nantwich North & West, only just in line with the electoral equality tolerance.

- 8.3. However, better electoral equality would be achieved if an alternative boundary were to be drawn around the residential area bounded by St Lawrence Court and South Crofts (area "A" marked on Map 6 attached). This would result in 6467 electors in Nantwich South and 6531 electors in Nantwich North & West, both clearly within the tolerance and giving a good balance between the two Wards.
- 8.4. The Council is pleased that the BC has accepted that the whole of the gated community of Wychwood Park should be in Wybunbury Ward. Over two thirds of the housing has been part of Chorlton (which forms with Hough a first class Parish Council) since it was built and it makes total sense that the remaining two small enclaves should be included in the Ward. Furthermore, the inclusion of the Hotel and the Golf Course gives Hough and Chorlton Parish the basis of some infrastructure which it has been sorely missing to date. Wychwood Park is included in the Nantwich Area Partnership and is policed from Nantwich as is the rest of the Wybunbury Ward.
- 8.5. The Council contends that Wychwood Village, which is normal housing development unlike the very different, gated, Wychwood Park community, should remain part of Weston Village and hence in the recommended Haslington Ward. Wychwood Village which is still under construction has since its inception had a close affinity with Weston and has been totally within Weston's parish boundaries. It is close to Englesea Brook (part of Weston's bailiwick) and is most definitely a separate community to the self-contained Wychwood Park. Wychwood Village has its own amenities which are important to Weston: a golf course and a major community centre. The latter is vitally significant to Weston as it has only a very small and dilapidated facility of its own. Wychwood Village is included in the Crewe Local Area Partnership and is policed from Crewe as is the rest of the Haslington Ward. Accordingly, the revised boundary between the Wybunbury and Haslington Wards in this area would follow the A531 Newcastle Road rather than along Snape Lane and across country, as shown on Map 7.
- 8.6. The inclusion of Wychwood Village with Haslington would mean that the Ward electorate would increase by 322. Taken with the minor boundary adjustment proposed in paragraph 9.2 below (82 electors), the Haslington electorate would total 7017, giving excellent electoral equality in this 2-Member Ward.

9. HASLINGTON AND SANDBACH

- 9.1. Both Cheshire East Council and Haslington Parish Council are strongly in favour of the whole of Wheelock Heath and Winterley being included in the Haslington Ward and not in Sandbach. Paragraph 121 of the Draft Recommendations incorrectly attributes the contrary view to the Parish Council. Since the opening of the Haslington/Wheelock Bypasses, the natural division of Haslington and the Wheelock area of Sandbach is, without doubt, the Bypass roundabout at the end of the village. The current arrangement is an unnatural division of the Community which has traditionally looked towards Haslington for its focus and identity as it is isolated from Wheelock/Sandbach.
- 9.2. The entire area north of the Holly Bush Inn, up to the Haslington/Wheelock Bypasses, shares a common settlement boundary and has strong Community links with the rest of the Haslington Ward. Examples of this include common education provision and the use of local facilities, including shops and public houses. Residents in this area also tend to contact Haslington Parish Council should they have any concerns, for example on planning matters. Everyone, both residents and visitors, regard this area as logically being within the Haslington Ward and there is now the opportunity to correct this anomaly of the Community being unnaturally divided. Accordingly, the BC's proposal is endorsed by this Council, subject to a minor adjustment to the proposed boundary line north of Elton Lane, so that the boundary runs along Crewe Road, as shown on Map 8 attached. This would include a further 82 electors in the Haslington Ward and leaves Sandbach Ettiley Heath & Wheelock Ward with 3404 electors, which continues to represent good electoral quality.
- 9.3. The Council also proposes an adjustment to the boundary line between Sandbach Town Ward and the Sandbach Elworth Ward. The Sandbach Town Ward's boundary line on Middlewich Road needs a slight adjustment to move the line closer to the Elworth village sign ['Elworth'] on Middlewich Road, which is located on the footway in front of house number 206, just past Grange Way, heading towards Middlewich. However, to relocate the boundary line to just beyond Grange Way would probably be difficult to achieve, as it would result in the division of houses on the estates/developments off Grange Way. Consequently, it is proposed that the boundary line is relocated to align with, and to incorporate, Rowan Close, off Middlewich Road, as shown on Map 9. It should be noted that Elworth Village does not have a boundary, it is considered to be a locality and also only about 24 houses would be affected by this proposed adjustment.

10. MACCLESFIELD TOWN

- 10.1. The Council proposes that the Lyme Green area (PD 4CC1) should not be part of the Sutton Ward, as recommended by the BC, but that it should be in the proposed Macclesfield Moss Ward. There is no green space between Lyme Green and Macclesfield. The entry road signs for Macclesfield Town and the former Macclesfield Highways Depot are located in Lyme Green and the Lyme Green Business Park is adjacent within the Town. People in Lyme Green fulfill

their hospital, social and spiritual needs in Macclesfield and children from the town attend the Nursery School in Lyme Green. The Lyme Green ex-service Settlement provides valued community facilities for Macclesfield residents. The PD has been located in the existing Macclesfield South Ward since 1999 and, therefore, the ties between Lyme Green and the urban approaches to Macclesfield are much stronger than to the predominantly rural Sutton area. The proposed new boundary between Macclesfield Moss and Sutton Wards is shown on Map 10.

- 10.2. The proposal would also improve electoral equality, particularly if Kettleshulme is included in Sutton (as recommended in paragraph 5.5, above), given that Sutton is currently +3% without Kettleshulme, and Macclesfield Moss is -7%. If the 552 electors in Lyme Green were added to Macclesfield Moss (6540), this would result in a Ward of 7092 electors. The effect of these changes would result in good electoral equality of -4% for Sutton Ward and +1% for Macclesfield Moss.
- 10.3. The Council also submits that the proposed Ward name of Macclesfield Moss is not appropriate, as the “Moss” concerns only one part of the area, which also includes “Ryles” and “Ivy” within its boundaries. The Council proposes the Ward name “Macclesfield South”, which is more representative of the character of the area, was the name of the former Macclesfield Borough Ward and will be more readily understood by local communities.
- 10.4. The Council recommends that the Broken Cross and Upton Priory Ward should be named simply “Broken Cross and Upton”. Upton is the more historical name for this area, (it may have been an historical parish), which extends well beyond the Upton Priory housing estate.
- 10.5. It is also proposed that Macclesfield Weston and Ivy Ward should be named Macclesfield West and Ivy, as Weston is a housing estate which is only one feature of a much wider area.

11. WARD NAMES IN THE CONGLETON AREA

- 11.1. The Council proposes that the Brereton Ward should be named “Brereton Rural” Ward, which better reflects the diverse rural nature of the area and the fact that it covers a number of other parish communities.
- 11.2. The Council would also wish to reaffirm its previous submission that the Holmes Chapel Ward should be named “Dane Valley” Ward, which better reflects the fact that the Ward includes three other Parish Councils in addition to Holmes Chapel. A generic, but well-recognised, local name, such as Dane Valley, would be more representative of these collective but distinct Parish areas.

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1. As previously indicated, the Council is minded broadly to support the majority of the BC's proposals for the Cheshire East area. However, the Council is of the view that the arrangements can be improved in the areas covered by these further representations, by more effectively reflecting local community identities and, in many instances, improving electoral equality. The Council's proposals would result in eight 3-Member Wards; fifteen 2-Member Wards; and twenty-eight Single-Member Wards (in this case, the same number as the BC's own recommendations) - 51 Wards in total. Even in the case of multi-member Wards, these proposals do not depart significantly from the BC's scheme, as summarised in paragraph 2.1, above.
- 12.2. Appendix A summarises the electorate information (2008 and 2013 figures) and the impact on electoral equality for each Ward relating to the Council's proposals.. Appendix B provides more detailed electorate and Polling District information for the Wards concerned. Also attached are the Maps which illustrate the Council's proposals, as follows:
1. Wilmslow Dean Row and Handforth
 2. Poynton Area
 3. Crewe Leighton and St. Barnabas
 - 4 Crewe South Western Area
 5. Willaston, Rope and Wistaston
 6. Nantwich
 7. Haslington – Wychwood Village
 8. Haslington – Wheelock Heath and Winterley
 9. Sandbach Town and Elworth Wards Boundary
 10. Macclesfield Lyme Green