

**Review of Electoral Arrangements in Cheshire West &
Chester**

**Comments on the
Draft Recommendations
made by
The Boundary Committee for
England**

Cheshire West & Chester Council

January 2010

Review of Electoral Arrangements – Comments on the Boundary Committee’s Draft Recommendation by Cheshire West & Chester Council

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Cheshire West & Chester Council acknowledges the preparation and publication of Draft Recommendations for New Electoral Arrangements for Cheshire West & Chester Council, by The Boundary Committee for England (hereafter referred to as the Boundary Committee).
- 1.2 The Council is pleased that these Draft Recommendations have been brought before the public in order that local people may consider them and respond to the Boundary Committee.
- 1.3 The Council is also pleased to take this opportunity itself to respond to the Boundary Committee on the Draft Recommendations. In doing so, the Council has had regard to the many representations made to the Boundary Committee by the Town and Parish Council, residents and local organisations whose submissions at Stage 1 of the review process appear on the Electoral Commission’s website. In addition, the Council published a draft response in December 2009 in order that local people may comment upon it. The Council considered reactions to that draft when resolving its formal response to the Boundary Committee at a meeting of the Council held on 26 January 2010.
- 1.4 It has been expressed to the Council that some representations were made to, and receipt acknowledged by, the Boundary Committee at Stage 1. The Council calls on the Boundary Committee forthwith to publish those submissions on the Electoral Commission’s website.

2.0 The Principles of Electoral Review

- 2.1 Cheshire West & Chester Council recognises the principles which underlie the review of electoral arrangements. For the benefit of readers of the Council’s response, they are reproduced below;

The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure ‘electoral equality’, which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors.

Our objective is to make recommendations that will achieve good electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

Our three main considerations.... are set out in legislation and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations.

- 2.2 The Council recognizes the attempt made by the Boundary Committee to equalise the number of electors each councillor represents and to reflect community identity. However, the Council believes that if the Boundary Committee has endeavoured to provide for effective and convenient local government, then it has neither made that endeavour evident nor struck the best balance when making Draft Recommendations.
- 2.3 This is an aspect of the Draft Recommendations which disappoints the Council and upon which the Council urges the Boundary Committee to reconsider.
- 2.4 The Council advanced the view that multi-member wards best provide electors with effective and convenient local government.
- 2.5 In re-affirming its view of the merits of multi-member Wards, the Council notes that a number of submissions were made at Stage 1 by those advocating the virtues of single-member wards. Most frequently, those advocating single-member wards indicate that their support for that form of representation is based on the perception that a simple, direct relationship between the ward councillor and the elector represents clarity and direct accountability. The Council understands why those advocating the virtues of single-member wards do so, but it also recognises that such a simplistic view of the democratic process will not necessarily represent the best interests of electors and the communities in which they live. There are some clear considerations.
- 2.6 In a single-member ward the absence of participation in Council business of an elected member who is ill, absent because of working commitments, personal/family commitments or holidays, represents a discontinuity of representation of electors in a single-member ward. This is not “effective local government”. Such absences will mean that the opportunities for members to contact or engage with their representative in a single member ward will be fewer than in a multi-member ward. This is not “convenient local government”.
- 2.7 A local Councillor who is required to serve on a planning committee is debarred from acting as an advocate on behalf of local people in respect of an application for planning permission, the determination of which falls to that planning committee. Similar considerations arise in respect of licensing. The absence of an advocate for an electorate is not “effective local government”.
- 2.8 In a multi-member ward, co-councillors can share expertise. A local Councillor serving in a single-member ward must be able to act authoritatively on behalf of all electors on all matters; often within the Council’s own organisation, often on “outside bodies”. We must, however, have expectations which are reasonable. In a single-member ward, it will be less likely that electors in such a ward will have a knowledgeable, authoritative representative on *all* matters. This is not “effective local government”.
- 2.9 In a multi-member ward, a newly-elected councillor is likely to receive support from more experienced co-councillors in the ward. In a single-member ward a “new” councilor may only draw support from councilors whose first

responsibility is to the electors of their own ward. This is not “effective local government”. The absence of direct support may also discourage candidacy.

- 2.10 In the previous two-tier authority system each resident had more than one representative councillor - a county councillor and between one and three district councillors. It has never before been the case, therefore, that a single elected councillor has been required to serve the electorate in respect of all aspects of the business of principal councils. In the new Council the councillor/elector ratio has been halved, which means that representation is much more thinly spread. Therefore some means are necessary to redress that balance unless communities are to be disadvantaged. In a three member ward each resident and each community has the opportunity to have three voices speaking for them in the Council instead of one. Those living in three member wards will therefore have an advantage over those in single member wards.
- 2.11 Many who advocate the direct relationship between elector and councillor in a single-member ward compare such a situation to that of a Member of Parliament. They don't, however, address in their argument, the underlying nature of local and national representation.
- 2.12 The Member of Parliament is salaried and pensioned as a full-time role, notwithstanding that some may have relatively undemanding additional paid employment. Local Councillors are not salaried in this way – many have full-time employment.
- 2.13 The Member of Parliament is able to employ at public expense, staff to support his/her work as an elected representative; local Councillors cannot engage personal support at public expense.
- 2.14 Comparisons between local government and parliamentary representatives are not therefore valid.
- 2.15 An oft-made comment is that *“Single-member wards give much greater accountability. If the council does not provide a service, we know exactly who to blame”*. This is far too simplistic a claim. No single-member can be accountable for every decision, every action, of the Council just as no single MP can be similarly accountable for a Government's actions (or inactions). Indeed, for the local resident who is seeking a particular action, then the direct representation by 3 Councillors out of 75 might be viewed as more powerful than of one out of 75.
- 2.16 However, advocates of single-member wards were countered by those such as Utkinton Parish Council which expressly referred to the merits of effectiveness in its advocacy of multi-member wards.
- 2.17 The Council notes the words of the Boundary Committee at paragraph 38 of the Draft Recommendations. Again, for the benefit of readers of this representation, those words are reproduced below;

Our proposals are for a pattern of 20 single-member wards, 17 two-member wards and seven three-member wards. We believe our proposals provide good electoral equality while seeking to reflect community identities and interests where we have received such evidence.

- 2.18 However, the obligation on the Boundary Committee, as shown in the earlier citation is to balance three considerations, not two. Missing from paragraph 38 is reference to the need to include in the balance of considerations, that of “effective and convenient local government”.
- 2.19 The Council would invite the Boundary Committee to address **all** of the matters to which it must have regard.

Electorate Forecasts

- 2.20 It is appropriate that the process of electoral review consider future changes in the number and distribution of electors. This necessitates the application of forecasting techniques and the Council is pleased that the Boundary Committee has accepted the forecasts which the Council has made. The Council believes its forecasts to be sound, reflecting an anticipated slowdown in the building of new homes during the economic recession. Because of uncertainty in the future performance of the national and local economy however, the Boundary Committee’s successor body, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, should reserve the right to revisit the electoral arrangements in advance of a Periodic Electoral Review. Those are reviews undertaken, in the word of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, “from time to time”. They normally follow a cyclical programme of national reviews as the arrangements of all principal councils are kept up-to-date.

3.0 Comments on Warding Arrangements presented in the Draft Recommendations.

- 3.1 Notwithstanding the view of the Council as expressed in the paragraphs above, the Council would comment on the recommended electoral arrangements. In having regard to the views of town and parish councils and of local people and organisations, the Council nevertheless acknowledges that it is not possible to present a response which would concur with all of those other local representations.
- 3.2 Several responses, whilst being very expressive in their portrayal of community identity, were unable to resolve that consideration with the need to secure electoral equality. Some acknowledged that inability.
- 3.3 The comments below are made having regard to the alphabetical order of the Boundary Committee’s recommended wards.

Blacon

- 3.4 The Council acknowledges the local submissions which advocate the inclusion of the entirety of the Blacon area in a single ward. Those submissions did not necessarily advocate the inclusion of areas outside of Blacon; however the Council recognises that in order to meet the requirements of electoral equality, there needs to be the addition of electors in the Sealand Road area to that, largely Blacon, ward.
- 3.5 The Council recognises that the recommended Blacon ward would be 7% below the average electoral ratio and that the adjoining recommended Garden Quarter ward would be 9% above the average electoral ratio. However, any attempt to equalise these ratios by modifying the recommended boundary between the two wards would be detrimental to the representation of community identity.
- 3.6 There is a particular matter which should be addressed. The Boundary Committee's mapping would include in the Blacon ward, Curzon Park Golf Course. The Golf Course is on the opposite bank of the River Dee from the residential areas of the recommended Blacon ward. The recommendation for the ward should be modified by the inclusion of the Golf Course with the Overleigh area and the utilisation of the course of the river as the boundary for the Blacon ward in this area.

Boughton

- 3.7 The Boundary Committee makes a recommendation for a single-member ward for Boughton, with an electoral ratio 7% above the average. The Boundary Committee also suggests that it should adjoin a single-member ward, Chester City. This ward would be 5% below the average. The Council believes that these recommended wards should be combined to create a two-member ward of Chester City and Boughton. This would have an electoral ratio which would be just 1% above the average in 2013. Desirable as this equalisation is, there are even more compelling reasons for making the amendment which the Council advocates.
- 3.8 Together, the City Centre and Boughton's western areas embrace the major part of Chester's commercial and entertainment areas. The Boundary Committee's recommendation would divide this functional commercial area and the business community which occupies it. In this combined area there arise particular demands upon elected Members who must address matters arising not only from the circumstances of resident electors, but also those arising from the nature of both the daytime and night-time economy. In particular, the need for engagement with the business community and with the emergency services places demands on elected representatives which are beyond those normally expected.

- 3.9 The first part of this electoral review process placed particular emphasis on, and resolved with particular care, the nature of the workload facing the elected representative. The need for that care should not be forgotten simply because the issue of Council size has been resolved.
- 3.10 The Council believes that in a two-member ward for this area, not only can the needs of the business community be addressed consistently, but also the impact on residential communities arising from, in particular, those who enjoy the amenities of the night-time economy.
- 3.11 Members in a two-member ward can support and sustain each other, and the work of the Council as a whole with regard to these matters, far more effectively than can members in adjoining single-member wards. The Council would therefore ask the Boundary Committee to avoid the creation of a circumstance which overburdened councillors for single-member wards for Chester City and Boughton to the detriment of those whom they represent.
- 3.12 The Council therefore proposes;

Chester City and Boughton			<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
	<i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>		<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>(2008)</i>
DC3		1114	1090		
DC1		868	890		
DC2		1274	1240		
DD3		98	90		
DU1		382	430		
Part of DF1		922	1030		
DF2		679	1260		
DF3		428	480		
DF4		355	360		
DF5 - Chester Castle		0	0		
		6120	6870	2	
				-8.66%	1.00%

Chester City

- 3.13 See paragraphs above regarding Boughton.

Chester Villages

- 3.14 The Council notes that the Boundary Committee has accepted its proposal in respect of this ward. The Council also notes that Parish Councils, together with some residents declared their favour with the Chester Villages proposal. The Council therefore would urge the Boundary Committee to confirm this proposal.

Dodleston & Huntington

- 3.15 The Council considers that the Boundary Committee's draft recommendation for Dodleston & Huntington represents, notwithstanding a relatively high degree of variance from the average electoral ratio, the most appropriate designation and boundary that could be obtained in any proposal for a single-member ward in this area. It is of concern to the Council however, that the River Dee presents a barrier to community interaction between Huntington and its "neighbouring" parishes to the west, and that community interaction between Huntington and those parishes to the west is limited.
- 3.16 Whilst the A55 crosses the ward, passing through Dodleston, Marlston-cum-Lache, Eccleston and Huntington parishes, this is a high-speed road with few, but grade-separated, junctions. There is a junction at Dodleston's boundary with Marlston-cum-Lache, but no other junction in the recommended ward.
- 3.17 The configuration of the ward, constructed for "mathematical" reasons of presenting an acceptable electoral ratio therefore embraces separate communities.
- 3.18 The Council recognises that the need for electoral equality will mean that a ward may include two or more distinct communities and that elected ward members can indeed serve more than one distinct community when this is necessary to satisfy the requirement for electoral equality. The Council would wish to minimise, however, the circumstances in which a ward containing a whole distinct community and a fraction of another is created.
- 3.19 Huntington's closest interactions are, in fact, with the contiguous built-up area of Great Boughton (where there is a junction of the local road network and A55). Huntington and Great Boughton (including Boughton Heath) have historically had much communality both areas having very similar demographics. This is very strong near the Caldby Valley Area (lower half of Great Boughton (Boughton Heath) and Huntington). Residents use the same schools (Huntington Community primary school in Huntington and The Bishops' Blue Coat Church of England High School in Great Boughton). They share churches and community centres, access is by direct roads and the existing parish and draft recommended Cheshire West ward boundaries run through Caldby Valley Nature Park (which is half in Huntington and half in Great Boughton).
- 3.20 It was because of these interactions that Cheshire West & Chester Council advocated a three-member ward to cover the area for which the Boundary Committee suggests the Dodleston & Huntington single-member ward and the Great Boughton two-member ward. The Cheshire West & Chester Council's view of the nature of the interactions between Huntington and Great Boughton is echoed by Huntington Parish Council.).
- 3.21 Given that the Boundary Committee recognises at least in part, that multi-member wards are valid, then one aspect of the resolution of the Review for this area is whether the more rural parishes in the west of the recommended

ward would be less well served in a ward which includes Huntington and Great Boughton than in a ward which includes Huntington alone, and if so, whether the advantage to those parishes outweighs the disadvantage to Huntington from its severance, in warding, from Great Boughton.

- 3.22 The Council, in concluding that its original proposal was sound, believes that the Boundary Committee should therefore be encouraged to conclude that the more rural parishes will be equally served in a ward in which they are included with Huntington as in a ward which includes both Huntington and Great Boughton. Meanwhile, Huntington and Great Boughton will be better served by a ward which includes them both. The Council's proposal is shown below;

Great Boughton & Dodleston <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
DD1 -Great Boughton (South Ward)	1359	1320			
DD2 -Great Boughton (South Ward)	1643	1590			
DI4 - Claverton	0	0			
DI5 - Dodleston	610	600			
DI6 - Eaton	40	40			
DI7 - Eccleston	146	140			
DI9 - Lower Kinnerton	105	100			
DI10 - Marlston-cum-Lache (part)	71	70			
DI11 - Poulton	74	90			
DI12 - Pulford	353	350			
DM1 - Huntington	1508	1580			
DN3 - Marlston-cum-Lache (part)	17	20			
DU2 - Great Boughton (north ward)	3847	3720			
DU3	198	190			
	9971	9810	3	-0.79%	-3.85%

- 3.23 Whilst this would result in a variance from the average electoral ratio in Great Boughton, where the Boundary Committee envisaged none (in 2013), this variance is not great. However, it is a marked improvement on the negative variance which the Boundary Committee envisaged for Huntington, Dodleston, and the other parishes in its recommended ward.
- 3.24 The ward includes a small part of the unparished area of the city of Chester, which would have been included in the Great Boughton ward recommended by the Boundary Committee. This represents a regard paid to the value of strong boundaries, with which the Council would concur.

- 3.25 The Council's proposal would largely retain the existing ward for which there is evidence of successful working and representation. It would appear hazardous to reject a tried-and-tested ward for an untried pattern in this area.

Eddisbury

- 3.26 The Boundary Committee recommends a three-member ward for the rural centre of Cheshire West & Chester, embracing the three large villages, Tarporley, Kelsall and Tarvin. Whilst the Council recognises that this produces a ward with a minimal electoral variance, it also believes that this recommendation would miss the opportunity to represent most appropriately, the relative strength of community ties which exist between larger and smaller villages in this part of Cheshire West & Chester.
- 3.27 In particular, the proposed ward misunderstands the relationship of Tarvin and Kelsall (which the Boundary Committee would include in the Eddisbury ward) to the parishes in the recommended Gowy ward, notably Barrow and Ashton Hayes. As explained in following paragraphs, the Council's proposal includes those large villages in its proposed Gowy ward.
- 3.28 The Council recognises the concern about the perceived communities which arise from differing perspectives in the different parts of this proposed ward. Beeston Parish Council recognises a connection with Tarporley, but not with Delamere whilst Delamere Parish Council identifies its own connection with Tarporley. Tarporley Parish Council, preferring a single-member ward identifies its connection with surrounding parishes but not one with Cuddington or Delamere. Oakmere Parish Council is content with the existing three-member ward. Utkinton Parish Council also favours a three-member ward.
- 3.29 It is clear from its examination of many different configurations that it is not possible to reconcile all the views represented above, particularly so because many of those approaches would have consequences for neighbouring wards, or potential wards, which in themselves would result in unsatisfactory breakages of community links.
- 3.30 Cuddington Parish Council's preference is for a single member ward but not one which separates Delamere Park from the main body of the parish. Cuddington Parish Council contends that there is not a community linkage between, for example, Cuddington and Tarporley. Tarporley Parish Council takes a similar view.
- 3.31 Cuddington Parish Council's preference cannot be accommodated within the realms of acceptable variances from average electoral ratio.
- 3.32 The Boundary Committee's recommendations exclude Cuddington parish from the Eddisbury ward, and would create a ward of Cuddington, Weaverham and Acton Bridge. The Council recognises the reasons for doing so, but finds the adverse consequences for parishes to the north and west of Weaverham to outweigh the positive attributes of that proposed Weaver & Cuddington ward.

Those adverse consequences are set out in paragraphs which comment on the proposed Gowy, Kingsley and Weaver & Cuddington wards.

- 3.33 Notwithstanding the parish council's preference for Delamere Park, Cheshire West & Chester Council's proposal is, therefore, that a new single-member ward for Cuddington and Sandiway be created, built from existing polling districts as shown below;

Cuddington & Sandiway	<i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
					<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
	EAA - Cuddington (part 1)	1811	1810			
	EAC - Sandiway	1665	1680			
		3476	3490	1	3.76%	2.62%

- 3.34 Delamere Park, whilst a part of the parish, is geographically a little detached from the contiguous villages of Cuddington and Sandiway. Undoubtedly its residents have social, community and service interactions with Cuddington, but then they also have strong interactions with Norley (especially its school) and Crowton; Delamere Park lies within Norley's ecclesiastical parish. For these reasons, this Council would prefer to include Delamere Park with a restored Weaver ward, than with Eddisbury. However, combination with Eddisbury offers "better" variances in electoral ratios and so the Council suggests to the Boundary Committee, a combination of Delamere Park and Eddisbury as an alternative to its preferred solution.
- 3.35 The Council has also responded to the case made by Darnhall Parish Council by recommending the inclusion of that parish in the Eddisbury ward instead of including Darnhall with South Winsford. The appropriate configuration of wards in this case rests on the nature of issues with which the principal and local councils must be concerned. In Darnhall Parish Council's view, it is the nature and economy of Darnhall as a rural area which presents issues to a greater extent than the position which the parish has on the fringe of Winsford's urban area. This means that they seek representatives who are experienced in addressing the needs of a rural, primarily agricultural, community and economy. Inclusion of the parish in Eddisbury will be more effective in securing that representation.
- 3.36 Beeston Parish Council and Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall Parish Council recognise the service and community connections which their residents have with Tarporley, but the Parish Councils appear to fear inclusion in a ward with Tarporley and Cuddington because of fears of over-dominance of those settlements. The Council's proposal for Cuddington deals in part with this fear.
- 3.37 However the Council also believes that inclusion of those parishes in a ward with Tarporley is better than including them with Tattenhall, with which functional relationships are less strong.

- 3.38 Whilst acknowledging that those parishes to the south of Tarporley have little sense of direct community involvement with those to the north of Tarporley, the Council recognises that it is the relationship of 'smaller' parishes to Tarporley as much as to each other, which matters here.
- 3.39 It is interesting to note that those smaller parishes which have experienced representation in a ward with Tarporley are encouraging the Boundary Committee to preserve that inclusion, rather than calling for change by recounting a history of Tarporley's over-dominance.
- 3.40 The Council therefore proposes a two-member ward configured in the way that Utkinton Parish Council also suggests, as follows;

Eddisbury <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
EAD - Oakmere	533	540			
EEA - Cotebrook	199	200			
EEB - Utkinton	363	370			
EEC - Delamere	915	920			
EFA - Darnhall	176	180			
EFB - Little Budworth	519	520			
EFC - Rushton	375	380			
EFD - Tarporley (part 1)	910	920			
EFE - Tarporley (part 2)	1255	1280			
FE3 - Clotton Hoofield	261	260			
FE9 - Iddinshall	30	60			
FF1 - Beeston	161	160			
FF10 - Tilstone Fearnall	93	90			
FF11 - Tiverton	335	320			
	6125	6200	2	-8.58%	-8.85%

- 3.41 The alternative configuration postulated in earlier paragraphs would provide for improved electoral ratios, but a lessened reflection of community interactions.

Alternative for Eddisbury				<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
Eddisbury <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>(2008) (2013)</i>	
				EAB - Cuddington (part 2) Delamere Park	926
EAD - Oakmere	533	540			
EEA - Cotebrook	199	200			
EEB - Utkinton	363	370			
EEC - Delamere	915	920			
EFA - Darnhall	176	180			
EFB - Little Budworth	519	520			

EFC - Rushton	375	380			
EFD - Tarporley (part 1)	910	920			
EFE - Tarporley (part 2)	1255	1280			
FE3 - Clotton Hoofield	261	260			
FE9 - Iddinshall	30	60			
FF1 - Beeston	161	160			
FF10 - Tilstone Fearnall	93	90			
FF11 - Tiverton	335	320			
	7051	7130	2	5.24%	4.82%

- 3.42 As described above, this is not Cuddington Parish Council's preference. However, it still leaves the parish of Cuddington with representation by three Cheshire West & Chester members in total, which Cuddington Parish Council recognises as acceptable.
- 3.43 The Council would discourage the further subdivision the proposed Eddisbury ward to create a single member ward centred on Tarporley. This is because, the remaining single-member ward, extending from Delamere to Darnhall, would lack a spatial focus. It is indeed, the presence of Tarporley which gives strength to the interaction of communities in this part of Cheshire West & Chester.

Ellesmere Port

- 3.44 The Boundary Committee reports that its draft recommendations for Ellesmere Port Town represent an endeavour to "secure wards that provide for good electoral equality and strong boundaries". It says that the Council's initial assertion of how the boundaries it proposed would support the representation of community identity lacked evidence. The draft recommendations did not however present an entirely consistent interpretation of features which might be said to form strong boundaries. For example in part of the town, the Boundary Committee saw the railway as a strong boundary, but in another it was not regarded as such a strong boundary. The Boundary Committee indirectly acknowledges that it has no evidence to demonstrate how its own proposal reflects community identity.
- 3.45 The Council would agree with the Boundaries which the Boundary Committee suggests for the Ellesmere Port ward to the south of the railway line but believes that the combination of housing area between the railway line and the motorway M53 with housing in the Rother Drive and Rossfield Road fails on two important counts. The Council identifies the housing area served by Station Road and Westminster Road as part of the community affected by and involved in the commercial life of the town centre and its peripheral retailing areas. Streetcare and traffic management issues mean that the bridge by Ellesmere Port station is a link between neighbouring housing areas, and not a barrier.

- 3.46 Secondly, the recommended warding, because of the need to ensure appropriate electoral variances across the whole area, eliminates the possibility of representation of the occupiers of housing in the recent and forthcoming Housing Growth Point developments together. This will dilute the opportunity for elected Members to develop the expertise and experience to address the particular requirements of new and emerging communities.
- 3.47 The Council's suggested warding satisfies the Boundary Committee's desire for strong, clear boundaries even more than does the Boundary Committee itself and a benefit of the Council's solution for the Ellesmere Port ward is a clearer, more appropriate representation of the Rossmore and Rivacre areas of the town. The evidence to support the Council's proposal is clear, it is the physical fabric of the town itself.
- 3.48 The Council's suggested Ellesmere Port is shown in the following table;

Ellesmere Port <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
NB	915	1010			
OA	2208	2140			
OC	1675	2350			
SA	1251	1210			
SB	1404	1470			
Part NA	1135	1042			
	8588	9222	3	-14.55%	-9.61%

- 3.49 Whilst the electoral ratio *is* relatively low, being almost 10% below the average, the Boundary Committee will recognise that here too, Members of the Council must, in addition to resident electors' concerns, turn their attention to the concerns of the business community and the issues which arise from representation of the commercial centre of the town.

Elton

- 3.50 The Boundary Committee recommends that Elton, Ince and parishes to the south of Ellesmere Port's urban area not be combined with the Ellesmere Port area of Whitby as proposed by the Council. Instead, it recommends the creation of a single-member ward formed by adding to those parishes, those of Lea-by-Backford, and the parishes served by Backford & District Parish Council; Backford, Chorlton-by-Backford and Caughall. This combination would result, in a ward which in 2013 would have an electoral ratio 6% above the average.
- 3.51 This solution appears to the Council, however, to be the result of incremental aggregation of parishes in order to achieve a satisfactory electoral ratio. The weakness of this approach with regard to this area is that it separates,

electorally, Lea-by-Backford and Backford & District from Saughall and Mollington. These are parishes to which they are more strongly linked in terms of community identity and engagement. The Council's view is substantiated by residents of Lea-by-Backford who have contacted the Council and by Backford & District Parish Council.

- 3.52 The Boundary Committee would view Saughall and Mollington as the focus of another single-member ward, one with an electoral ratio 3% above the average.
- 3.53 Whilst the Council recognises that those parishes the Boundary Committee would group in that ward share a community identity, it finds that the severance of the Backford grouping which similarly share that identity is avoidable.
- 3.54 The Council would propose therefore, a two-member ward, formed by the combination of the Boundary Committee's recommended Elton, and Saughall & Mollington wards. The Council's proposal would result in a ward with an electoral ratio 4.5% above the average in 2013. The Council proposes that this ward be named Elton & Saughall.
- 3.55 This solution does not represent a perfect "fit" with the submissions made by parish councils in the area at Stage 1 of the review. In those submissions, the desirability of retaining the link between Lea-by-Backford, Backford & District and Saughall and Mollington was recognised by Little Stanney & District, Lea-by-Backford and Mollington Parish Councils. Each of those parish councils also sees a connection between the parishes in this area and those in the area of the Council's proposed Chester Villages ward. The Council recognises however that within the area of that ward, there is broad consensus about the desirability of the its configuration: the Boundary Committee concurs.
- 3.56 The Council's proposed Elton & Saughall approach therefore represents a strong combination of elements present in the solutions preferred by parish councils in the area, which doesn't undermine the solutions for other parts of Cheshire West & Chester.
- 3.57 The configuration of the Council's proposal is presented in the following table.

Elton & Saughall	<i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
					<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
	DR1 - Puddington	303	290			
	DR3 - Shotwick	35	40			
	DR4 - Shotwick Park	26	30			
	DR5 - Woodbank	49	50			
	DO2 - Capenhurst	205	200			
	DO7 - Mollington	518	510			
	DO6 - Ledsham	98	90			
	DR2 - Saughall	2380	2300			
	DV1 - Croughton	21	20			
	DV2 - Little Stanney	161	160			

DV3 - Stoak	90	90			
DV4 - Wervin	108	100			
DO1 - Backford	85	80			
DO4 - Chorlton-by-Backford	77	70			
DO5 - Lea-by-Backford	150	150			
DO3 - Caughall	22	20			
OB	176	170			
EA1 - Elton	2632	2550			
EA2 - Thonton-le-Moors	194	190			
	7330	7110	2	9.40%	4.53%

Farndon & Aldford

- 3.58 The Boundary Committee recommends creation of a single-member ward for rural parishes in the Western edge of the Council's area. These are parishes which the Council proposed be included in a three-member ward, Broxton. The Council continues most strongly to propose this approach and therefore offers as preferential, a combination of this ward with those for both Tattenhall and Malpas.
- 3.59 In describing the benefits of this approach to Farndon & Aldford, much of the Council's evidence is equally applicable to the recommended Tattenhall and Malpas wards.
- 3.60 The view of parish Councils in the area is mixed. For example, Farndon Parish Council expresses the view that multi-member wards are preferable, citing advantages similar to those expressed by this Council. Aldford Parish Council favours single-member wards.
- 3.61 The Council would draw the Boundary Committee's attention to the fact that in the area of the current Broxton ward, the single-member wards presented in the draft recommendations display variances from the average electoral ratio which could be improved upon by treating those areas as part of a multi-member ward.
- 3.62 Whilst it is possible to satisfy the mathematics of electoral equality by dividing up the Broxton area, it is less easy to do it in ways which ensure that community interactions and the patterns of residents' activity are respected. For example, the parishes south of the A534, namely Shocklach, Tilston, Carden and Stretton, but not Crewe by Farndon, look more closely to Malpas than to Farndon for their shops, services and community facilities, because of the greater range of facilities there and because of the local bus service, which does not link to Farndon. The parishes to the East of Farndon, namely Barton, Coddington, Aldersey and Clutton look as much or more to Tattenhall for those facilities as to Farndon and Tilston. Aldford, Saughton, Buerton, Churton Heath and Lea Newbold look more to Tattenhall, Christleton, Boughton Heath and Huntington for those facilities, rather than to Farndon and Malpas. The Clutton

Primary School catchment area includes Broxton and Duckington, which are proposed to be in the Tattenhall ward. Shocklach Primary School catchment area includes Threapwood which is here proposed to be in the Malpas ward. Coddington Parish Room serves Handley Parish Council in the proposed Tattenhall ward. Tilston Day Nursery serves residents from the whole surrounding area, including from the proposed Malpas ward and Tattenhall ward. It is, therefore extremely difficult to divide the Broxton ward without dividing communities; a problem resolved by retaining the multi-member representation.

- 3.63 Broxton is based on the original Hundreds set out in the Domesday Book commissioned by William the Conqueror in 1085, and was known as the Broxton Hundred sometime in the 13th Century. The north part became a separate administration area of Chester, with Broxton as the area is now known as the area south of Chester down to as far as Whitchurch, broadly similar to the Broxton ward as we have at the present time.
- 3.64 Broxton is a large rural area focused on the main trade and transport route of the A41 from Chester to London (based on the Roman road called Watling Street) and between the trading towns of Wrexham and Nantwich along the West to East A534.
- 3.65 The 55 communities of small hamlets to the large villages are each individual in their character and identity. They are united, however, in the many issues they face such as loss/closure of services such as buses, shops, churches and schools. Issues of planning and development of housing creating similar tensions and retaining the individual characters of the villages is a common concern.
- 3.66 Strength has been found in working together in a co-operative way to enhance the influence of the villages with the district and County Councils, initially with the development of the Area Committee covering the Broxton ward.
- 3.67 The Broxton ward has traditionally been represented by one County Councillor and five District Councillors. They have been accessible and available and if one was away on holiday, ill, not able to be involved due to the requirement to declare interests or unavailable, it has always been possible to have some representation of our elected members.
- 3.68 This has been enhanced with the new Council with the Broxton Forum where the communities drive the agenda for the benefit of the communities. These meetings have been very well attended with nearly 200 at the most recent meeting. The key issues discussed are planning policy for the rural area, transport issues and the impact of isolation of the young and elderly in the rural area and the lack of activities available in the rural communities for the youth. It is clear these problems can not be solved by the communities in isolation, but some opportunities can be obtained by working together. The area is also represented for the Youth by the Broxton Youth Council covering the Broxton ward.

- 3.69 The Bishop Heber High School is the secondary school that covers the majority of the ward with the primary schools such as Huxley, Tattenhall, Farndon, Tilston, Malpas etc partner schools working closely with Bishop Heber High School through the Education Improvement Partnership and the long running partnership of the primary school network known as the Broxton Federation Group (BFG). This group was set up to foster greater co-operation between the schools, their staffs and their governing bodies. Furthermore the former LEA had set up a shared nursery service among these schools. These arrangements are going to be ever more vital in ensuring the survival of these schools in a more challenging financial environment.
- 3.70 The Fire and Rescue Service has a part-time fire tender based at Malpas, serving the rural area of Broxton, likewise the Police has a base at Dragon Hall Farm, Chowley, located on the A41 and the ambulance service having a unit based on the A41 at Milton Green, supported with the voluntary paramedics drawn from the Broxton area, based in Tattenhall. This shows how significant coverage of the Broxton ward by the public sector is best delivered in a balanced way throughout the ward.
- 3.71 The area is connected by the public transport system based on the A41 linking the villages such as Malpas, Tattenhall, Handley, Hargrave etc, providing a Broxton-wide service. Residents and communities are also served by the Community bus (dial a ride), serving the Broxton ward based in Malpas.
- 3.72 A number of the smaller villages and hamlets are now working together on developing their Parish Plans and Design Statements due to the similar nature of their issues and opportunities. There has been some good work carried out by working together on the responses to the consultations carried out by the new Council such as Gypsy and Travellers, Local Development Framework, Local Transport Plan etc.
- 3.73 There is a common rural economic agenda involving key landowners that cross the proposed single member wards such as the Bolesworth, Duke of Westminster, Barnston and Oulton Estates.
- 3.74 When considering making a change, it is useful to consider whether the present situation has faults to be addressed. Throughout the life of the Shadow Authority and since vesting day, the three local Members have worked together for the benefit of the communities, attending a number of Parish Councils, and supporting community projects via the Broxton community forum and the use of their personal budgets for key community projects. The elected members have demonstrated clear accountabilities and responsibilities in that they take away problems from meetings they attend individually and offer solutions, help and support on an individual basis, making things happen within the ward. It is clear that they are able to discuss issues and jointly support the community solutions to issues. They are clearly in touch with the communities they serve.
- 3.75 The Boundary Committee shows in its Draft Recommendations that the adjoining ward of Eddisbury would be a three member ward but is substantially the same in its geography, community make up and spread as Broxton

- 3.76 Broxton includes some of the most sparsely populated parts of Cheshire West and Chester; indeed parts of the current ward were included in the European Union's Leader+ programme for sparsely-populated areas. This does not wholly exempt the area from the requirement made of those conducting the review to achieve, as near as possible, electoral equality. The Council of course therefore accepts that the Broxton ward covers a large geographical area. The Boundary Committee's recommendation proposes wards of a smaller, not a small geographical area. The principle of representation depending on the mobility of Councillors is inextricable in this part of Cheshire West & Chester. The relatively low electoral ratio, 8.56% below the average will assist elected Members to discharge their responsibilities to the ward.
- 3.77 The Council's proposed Broxton ward is a well-defined geographical area bounded by the River Dee to the west and the Bickerton Hills to the East, bounded by the urban settlements of Chester, Wrexham and Whitchurch and centred on the major road links of the A41 and the A534.
- 3.78 The Council's proposal is described in the table below;

Broxton <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
DI1 - Alford	178	180			
DI2 - Buerton	24	20			
DI3 - Churton Heath	11	10			
DI8 - Lea Newbold	16	20			
DW1 - Saighton	145	140			
FB1 - Churton-by-Aldford	114	110			
FB2 - Churton-by-Farndon	120	120			
FB3 - Crewe-by-Farndon	17	20			
FB4 - Edgerley	3	0			
FB5 - Farndon	1272	1260			
FB6 - Kings Marsh	23	20			
FD1 - Agden	35	30			
FD10 - Macefen	73	70			
FD11 - Malpas	1391	1430			
FD12 - Newton-by-Malpas	8	10			
FD13 - Oldcastle	42	40			
FD14 - Overton	49	50			
FD15 - Stockton	13	10			
FD16 - Threapwood	240	230			
FD17 - Tushingham-cum-Grindley	130	130			
FD18 - Wigland	85	80			

FD19 - Wychough	3	0		
FD2 - Bickley	423	410		
FD3 - Bradley	49	50		
FD4 - Chidlow	6	10		
FD5 - Chorlton	44	40		
FD6 - Cuddington	154	150		
FD7 - Edge	159	170		
FD8 - Hampton	312	320		
FD9 - Larkton	32	30		
FE6 - Foulk Stapleford	140	140		
FE8 - Huxley	205	200		
FF2 - Burwardsley	144	140		
FF3 - Chowley	16	20		
FF4 - Golbourne Bellow	61	60		
FF5 - Golbourne David	47	50		
FF6 - Handley	129	130		
FF7 - Hatton	81	80		
FF8 - Newton-by- Tattenhall	98	100		
FF9 - Tattenhall	1680	1630		
FG1 - Aldersey	63	60		
FG10 - Grafton	3	0		
FG11 - Harthill	31	30		
FG12 - Horton-by- Malpas	55	50		
FG13 - Shocklach Oviatt	70	70		
FG14 - Stretton	40	80		
FG15 - Tilston	494	480		
FG2 - Barton	59	60		
FG3 - Broxton	342	330		
FG4 - Caldecott	28	30		
FG5 - Carden	47	50		
FG6 - Church Shocklach	85	80		
FG7 - Clutton	222	210		
FG8 - Coddington	52	50		
FG9 - Duckington	40	40		
	9403	9330	3	-6.44% -8.56%

Frodsham and Helsby

3.79 The Council welcomes the draft recommendation that the present Frodsham & Helsby ward be retained and note that this proposal attracted the support of Frodsham Parish Council.

Garden Quarter

- 3.80 The Council would propose that the boundary of the Garden Quarter ward recommended by the Boundary Committee be amended by the inclusion of the main University campus and properties fronting Parkgate Road. The Boundary Committee's calculation of the projected electorate at 2013 includes students of Chester University, many of whom reside on the campus and in the area which the Council suggests be included in the Garden Quarter ward.
- 3.81 Failure to adjust the extent of the ward in the way that the Council suggests will result in extreme actual variances from average electoral ratio in both the Garden Quarter ward and the Newton ward.
- 3.82 For clarity, the Council's proposed ward is shown in the following table.

Garden Quarter <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
Part of DG1	1437	1526			
Part of DG2	1166	2208			
	2603	3734	1	-22.30%	9.79%

Gowy

- 3.83 The Boundary Committee's draft recommendation for a single-member ward for Gowy fails to recognise the strength of community identity which links Kelsall and Tarvin with, in particular, Barrow and Ashton Hayes. Organisations which embrace these communities include Ash-worth Time Bank, Tarvin Educational Foundation, Good Companions Club. The Council would redress this by proposing that a two-member ward of Gowy be created by the re-affirmation of the existing community links in the area.
- 3.84 The Council's recommended configuration is shown in the table below. It retains, as sought by parish councils and recommended by the Boundary Committee, the connections between Hapsford, Dunham on the Hill and Mouldsworth with Great Barrow and with Ashton Hayes.

Gowy <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
EC1 - Dunham-on-Hill	397	390			
EC2 - Hapsford	62	70			
FA1 - Barrow	746	750			
FA2 - Horton-cum-Peel	26	30			
FA3 - Mouldsworth	234	230			

FC1 - Ashton	754	730			
FC2 - Kelsall	2139	2110			
FE10 - Prior's Heys	16	20			
FE11 - Tarvin (Outer Ward)	320	310			
FE12 - Tarvin (Village Ward)	1747	1690			
FE13 - Willington	73	70			
FE7 - Hockenhull	27	30			
	6541	6430	2	-2.37%	-5.47%

3.85 By doing this, the links between Alvanley, Manley, Norley and Kingsley can be restored as described in the Council's commentary on the recommended Kingsley ward.

Grange

3.86 The Council finds that whilst the Boundary Committee's proposed ward for the Grange area of Ellesmere Port is broadly acceptable, it proposes a modification which will facilitate significant improvement in the configuration of surrounding wards without diminishing the identity of the community in the Grange area.

Grange <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
RA	411	400			
RD	739	720			
RB	2049	1990			
	3199	3110	1	-4.51%	-8.56%

Great Boughton

3.87 See Comments on Dodleston & Huntington.

Handbridge Park

3.88 The Boundary Committee recommends that the present Overleigh ward be subdivided to create a two-member ward of Handbridge Park and a single-member Lache ward. Whilst the Council recognises that this solution retains the multi-member representation of the Queen's Park, Handbridge, Westminster Park and Curzon Park areas which the Council recommends, it leaves Lache with only one representative instead of three as advocated by the Council.

3.89 The Council avers that this subdivision would diminish the effectiveness of representation of the communities in this area.

- 3.90 Setting aside those representations which are motivated by a desire for single-member wards in principle, the Council understands the arguments which are made by those who would advocate single-member representation for Lache. However, the Council feels that these arguments embody a false representation of the Lache area as having a uniform character, one which is distinct from the remainder of the Overleigh ward which equally falsely, is presented as having a uniform character. It is coarsely often represented as a juxtaposition of affluence and deprivation, disregarding the presence of both in each area. Whilst such simplistic characterisation of areas can be useful when bidding for funding to address undoubted issues, it also leads to stigmatisation. Not necessarily intentionally, it is reinforced by many of the arguments offered by those who express favour for a single-member Lache ward. Separating Lache Park from the Overleigh community threatens the progress made so far in building an integrated community. Overleigh ward should continue to be a three member ward.
- 3.91 Issues which are common throughout the Overleigh ward area include those of accessibility to the city area and the transport network and services, the provision of a comprehensive range of local services and amenities within the Overleigh area and the contribution of West Cheshire College to the communities to the south of the river.
- 3.92 For these reasons, the Council returns to its preference for the retention of the present Overleigh ward as a three-member ward as shown below.

Overleigh <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
DH1	1426	1430			
DH2	1942	1880			
DJ1	620	600			
DJ2	2523	2440			
DN1	1181	1150			
DN2	3115	3030			
	10807	10530	3	7.53%	3.20%

- 3.93 Should the Boundary Committee be minded to adhere to its Draft Recommendation for this area, then the Council would propose that the existing ward name *Overleigh* be adopted for the ward which is represented as Handbridge Park in the Draft Recommendations.

Hartford

- 3.94 The Boundary Committee recommends that a two-member ward be created by combining two polling districts (WJA, WJC) of Northwich Town's Castle ward with the three polling districts which make up the parish of Hartford.
- 3.95 The Borough Council would like to improve upon this, and on the adjoining Over & Verdin and Winnington Bridge wards by;

- i) adding the parish of Whitegate & Marton to the Hartford ward, and
 - ii) adding part of polling district WJA to the Winnington Bridge ward (see comments about the ward name in following paragraphs).
- 3.96 Until 1988, Whitegate was part of Winsford. The 1998 parishing review, conducted by the Boundary Committee's predecessors, agreed with the residents of Whitegate, and of Winsford that Whitegate's rural community was distinct from that of the town. In implementation of that review, Whitegate was added to the then existing parish of Marton. This expanded parish of Whitegate & Marton was then warded with Cuddington in the Vale Royal district ward of Cuddington and Marton until the 1998 review of Vale Royal Borough Council's electoral arrangements and the creation of the Hartford & Whitegate ward.
- 3.97 From that point, Hartford and Whitegate & Marton was effectively represented as a district council ward. The Council detects no appetite amongst Whitegate & Marton residents to break this representative and community connection.
- 3.98 The Council initially advocated that the Greenbank neighbourhood of Northwich be represented along with Hartford and would not disagree with the Boundary Committee's suggestion that the area known as *The Pippins* similarly be included within Hartford's ward. However, the Council would suggest that it is inappropriate to include the whole of polling district WJA as the Moss Road/Cromwell Road part of that polling district would be better represented along with Winnington (polling district WKA) which also includes properties on Moss Road and Cromwell Road. Properties on Alderley Road are also divided by the polling district boundary.
- 3.99 The locally known "Iron Bridge" which crosses Chester Road would still mark the extent of wards whilst the Moss Farm recreation area provides clear physical boundaries to the Council's proposed "extension" of the Winnington Bridge ward.
- 3.100 The Council's configuration of this ward would be, therefore;

Hartford	<i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
					<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
	ECA - Whitegate & Marton	933	930			
	WDA - Hartford (part 1)	1505	1510			
	WDB - Hartford (part 2)	1498	1530			
	WDC - Hartford (part 3)	1427	1430			
	Part of WJA - Northwich Castle (part 1)	1189	1200			
	WJC - Northwich Castle (part 3)	644	640			
		7196	7240	2	7.42%	6.44%

Heath

- 3.101 The Boundary Committee would modify the existing Sutton & Manor ward by excluding the area to the west of A41 Chester Road and parts of the Pooltown Road area. This would be offset in part by the addition of an area of housing to the south of Hope Farm Road “taken” from the present Groves & Whitby ward. The result of this would be a two-member ward.
- 3.102 The Council can agree with the creation of a two-member ward but would modify the Boundary Committee’s recommended ward.
- 3.103 The Council would, as the Boundary Committee recommends, exclude the areas to the west of the A41 from the existing Sutton & Manor ward. In addition it would exclude the area of properties fronting, and accessed fro, Chester Road: this is the area around the Ellesmere Port Hospital and contained presently in polling district VB. The further changes to the northern boundary of the Sutton & Manor ward which the Boundary Committee recommends are unnecessary and would surrender a reasonably strong boundary, Sutton Way, for some weaker, less distinct ones. The Council advocates therefore, retention of Sutton Way as a clear boundary. Further, in achieving this, the Council would propose the retention of the present linkage of the Tennyson Road area with the remainder of polling district VA.
- 3.104 The effect of the Council’s proposal would be a reduction of the present three-member Sutton & Manor ward to a two-member ward which should be called *Sutton*, thereby retaining both the geographical and electoral identity of an established community.
- 3.105 The configuration of the Council’s proposal is shown in the following table.

Sutton <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
UA	994	960			
UB	1184	1150			
UC	2204	2140			
VA	2427	2350			
	6809	6600	2	1.63%	-2.97%

- 3.106 Configuring the Sutton ward in this way is also consistent with the aim of securing representation of community identity and strong and clear boundaries in adjoining areas.

Hoole

- 3.107 The Boundary Committee accepted the Council’s proposal for a two-member Hoole ward which would constitute an established community and have strong,

clear boundaries. The Council would therefore wish to see the draft recommendation for this ward confirmed.

Kingsley

- 3.108 In recommending a single-member ward for Kingsley and some adjoining parishes, the Boundary Committee has formulated a ward which was not sought by any of the respondents submitting proposals at an earlier stage. There are several reasons why local people and organisations wouldn't propose this ward. The recommended warding arrangement disregards the historic and current relationship which Crowton, Norley and Kingsley have with Alvanley and Manley. For example, the five parishes took part in an assessment of rural housing issues. The area of these parishes was seen as a clear social housing community and the provision of affordable housing for both the parishes at the former Crossley Hospital site was identified as the appropriate reflection of the interaction of the residents of these parishes.
- 3.109 The role of the churches of the area in the social and cultural life of the community, as well as its spiritual well-being is important. The documents presented in Appendix 4 include an illustration of the interaction of communities in the joint parish magazine of Crowton, Kingsley and Norley, the three parishes being linked in a united benefice. The magazine contains news and information about the Kingsley, Norley and Crowton Mothers' Union and the Three Parishes Ladies' Fellowship. It should be re-iterated here that Delamere Park forms part of Norley's ecclesiastical parish.
- 3.110 The recommended ward also disregards the linear nature of the action programme for the Weaver Valley in which Acton Bridge and Weaverham parish councils also play a significant part.
- 3.111 The recommendation also disjoins Aston and Sutton from the parishes of Kingsley, Norley and Crowton; an unbridged section of the River Weaver passes through the ward. By road, Sutton is a minimum of 2 miles from the parish of Kingsley, via Frodsham, and Crowton is 5 miles from Aston via Acton Bridge, Little Leigh, Dutton and part of Runcorn.
- 3.112 The Council would not necessarily argue that all parts of a ward should necessarily be connected by road, but these distances seem extreme. For example, the Council would disagree with the Boundary Commission's conclusion that Dutton should be severed from its more natural community and related parishes of Aston and Sutton because "it does not have a transport connection to the west". However, it does seem contradictory then to suggest that Crowton should be indirectly connected with Aston, and that access by road via Dutton would be acceptable.
- 3.113 In order better to reflect the communities of the locality, Dutton should be warded with existing Weaver ward parishes. The Parish Council says that "The Parish [of Dutton] has very close links with the River Weaver and the Weaver Valley, the nearest shopping village is Weaverham and Weaverham High School is also the feeder school for the children in the parish".

- 3.114 The Council recognises that the Kingsley proposal is a consequence of the Boundary Committee's endeavour to accommodate requests for a ward containing Weaverham and Cuddington and understands why it should want to respond to requests to do so. The consequence of that endeavour is a warding solution in the lower Weaver Valley which does not all reflect the interconnections of communities and even, whilst recognising the connections between Acton Bridge/Weaverham and Cuddington/Sandiway, does not reflect the links which Acton Bridge and Weaverham have with Crowton, Dutton, Kingsley and Norley, etc.
- 3.115 Reflecting on all of these issues, and especially the lack of a "case" for the recommended Kingsley ward and its severances, the Council is confident that its initial proposal for a Weaver ward presented in overall terms, a stronger representation of community connections and identities.
- 3.116 As described earlier, the Council would propose that Delamere Park be added to this ward, in order to facilitate the creation of a single-member ward for Cuddington & Sandiway and to reflect the community connections with Norley and Crowton.

Weaver <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
EAB - Cuddington (part 2) Delamere Park	926	930			
WAC - Norley	965	970			
WFA - Kingsley	1684	1690			
WHA - Acton Bridge	519	520			
WHB - Aston	85	90			
WHC - Crowton	377	380			
WHD - Dutton	346	360			
WHE - Sutton	388	390			
WNA - Church	1650	1660			
WNB - Gorstage	1626	1630			
WNC - Owley Wood	1724	1730			
WAA - Alvanley	373	380			
WAB - Manley	472	600			
	11135	11330	3	10.80%	11.05%

- 3.117 This represents quite a high degree of variance from average electoral ratio. If the Boundary Committee were to consider this variance too great, and that community identity was of secondary importance, then the Council can suggest as an alternative, and reflecting the alternative proposal for Eddisbury, the following;

Alternative for Weaver

Weaver

Variance from average electoral ratio

<i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
WAC - Norley	965	970			
WFA - Kingsley	1684	1690			
WHA - Acton Bridge	519	520			
WHB - Aston	85	90			
WHC - Crowton	377	380			
WHD - Dutton	346	360			
WHE - Sutton	388	390			
WNA - Church	1650	1660			
WNB - Gorstage	1626	1630			
WNC - Owley Wood	1724	1730			
WAA - Alvanley	373	380			
WAB - Manley	472	600			
	10209	10400	3	1.58%	1.93%

Lache

3.118 See Comments on Handbridge Park.

Little Neston & Burton

3.119 The Boundary Committee's draft recommendation would modify the Council's initial proposal for a three-member ward for Little Neston & Willaston, by establishing a two-member Little Neston & Burton ward which would constitute a distinct group of communities and have strong, clear boundaries. A further single-member ward for Willaston and Thornton, again clearly distinct and with appropriate boundaries would be created. The Council recognises the approach taken by the Boundary Committee and would therefore wish to see the draft recommendation for the configuration of this ward confirmed.

3.120 The residents of Ness are keen to ensure that the identity of their community remains distinct and have asked their Councillors to press the view that the ward be named Little Neston, Burton & Ness. Cheshire West & Chester Council is happy to support that community in their endeavour and so would urge the Boundary Committee to accede to the community's wish.

Malpas

3.121 The Council has commented extensively on the risks to community representation posed by the creation of single-member wards in the present Broxton area (see comments on Farndon & Aldford). The Boundary Committee's draft recommendation for Malpas presents an element of the Council's concern.

3.122 If, however, the Boundary Committee wishes to confirm a single-member ward in this part of Cheshire West & Chester, then the recommended grouping of parishes for Malpas is appropriate.

Marbury

3.123 The Council notes that the Boundary Committee would amend the Council's proposal for the Marbury ward at the north-eastern edge of the Council's area. The Boundary Committee would add the parish of Dutton from the present Weaver ward. The Boundary Committee's view is that the parish of Dutton has no transport links to the west. This is not strictly true. Dutton connects with the Weaver ward parishes of Aston and Sutton, with which it is associated and shares both common interests and concerns, and community identity by roads at the very boundary or just outside the boundary of Cheshire West and Chester. Dutton also is served in its connections with the Weaver ward parishes by A49 and the rural road network on the western side of the River Weaver.

3.124 This means that the separation of the Dutton community from those of Sutton and Aston, with which there are long and active links, is based on a misrepresentation of transport links. The nature of this is illustrated by the Boundary Committee's proposal for the Weaver ward in which the parishes of Norley, Kingsley and Crowton are most easily connected with Aston and Sutton by road journeys passing through Dutton.

3.125 Most telling is the view of Dutton Parish Council which has illustrated its wish to be included in the Weaver ward with its neighbouring Weaver parishes.

3.126 The Council therefore asks the Boundary Committee to conclude, with Dutton Parish Council that the appropriate association for that parish is with its westerly neighbours and not its easterly ones. The Council's proposal presents, for Marbury, an electoral ratio closer to the average than does the Boundary Committee's draft recommendation and is shown below.

Marbury <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
TCB - Wincham	1773	1950			
TEC - Marston	448	450			
TEA - Antrobus	644	650			
TEB - Great Budworth	303	300			
TAA - Barnton (part 1)	1428	1590			
TAB - Barnton (part 2)	1402	1400			
TAC - Barnton (part 3)	1568	1630			
TBA - Anderton with Marbury	470	470			
TBB - Comberbach	805	810			
TBC - Little Leigh	472	470			

TED - Whitley	433	440			
	9746	10160	3	-3.02%	-0.42%

Mere Heath & Leftwich

- 3.127 The Boundary Committee's draft recommendation would create a three-Member ward covering Leftwich, Davenham, Moulton and Bostock. This includes the area which will form the new Kingsmead parish in 2011. This recommended ward represents part of the solution which would see the separation of that part of the present three-member Abbey ward which lies to the west of the river Weaver from that part lying to the east of the River.
- 3.128 The Borough Council broadly accepts this proposal but would vary it by the inclusion of Stanthorne and Wimboldsley as proposed by Moulton Parish Council.
- 3.129 The Council notes the preference of Moulton Parish Council for the creation of a ward which uses the A556 as its northern boundary, but recognises that this would not be possible in a warding solution which retains electoral variances within the range currently represented by the Boundary Committee's draft recommendations.
- 3.130 The Council recognises that the Boundary Committee's proposed name for the ward includes a reference to Mere Heath, a local name represented on Ordnance Survey mapping of the area. Mere Heath is a very localised area however and represents well neither the community of Davenham nor that of Moulton, where the parish council does not see value in the reference to Mere Heath. Cheshire West & Chester Council therefore proposes that the ward be named Davenham & Leftwich.
- 3.131 The Council therefore proposes a Davenham & Leftwich ward that is configured in the terms set out in the following table.

Davenham & Leftwich	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
<i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>					
EBA - Bostock	198	210			
EBB - Davenham Village	2170	2170			
EBC - Davenham					
Whatcroft	56	60			
EBD - Moulton	1877	1880			
WGA - Northwich					
Leftwich (part 1)	1569	1620			
WGB - Northwich					
Leftwich (part 2)	1636	1640			
EDA - Davenham					
Kingsmead	2881	2880			

EBE - Stanthorne	114	110			
EBF - Wimboldsley	134	130			
	10635	10700	3	5.82%	4.87%

Neston

- 3.132 The Boundary Committee proposes a single-member ward, to be named Neston, for a part of the area and community of Neston. The remainder of the electorate of Neston would, in the Boundary Committee's draft recommendations live in a "Parkgate" ward, although would outnumber the electorate of the Parkgate area. The Borough Council's concern for the people in this part of the Borough is that such an arrangement would weaken the ability of the Council to address matters which affect residents of Neston as a whole, without adding significantly to its ability to represent the interests of Parkgate residents.
- 3.133 In particular, the Boundary Committee's recommendation would fragment representation and consideration of issues relating to the Neston Town centre and the strategic consideration of local education provision.
- 3.134 The Council therefore proposes that its initial proposal for a two-member ward for Neston & Parkgate be adopted.

Neston & Parkgate <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
Part CE	178	162			
CH	1437	1390			
CJ	1691	1680			
CF	3070	3050			
	6376	6282	2	-4.84%	-7.64%

Netherpool

- 3.135 The Boundary Committee has not, in its draft recommendation is for warding the northern part of Ellesmere Port town, accepted any of the locally derived proposals put before it. The recommended Netherpool ward is part of this approach. However, the Boundary Committee's approach would divide some community areas and inappropriately combine others. The Boundary Committee's approach would result in some moderate electoral variances.
- 3.136 In the Council's view, it is better to reflect the character of the area, the interests of current and emerging communities and to strive for electoral equality, than to support the draft recommendations.

- 3.137 The area represents a mix of established communities, new residents and the formation of communities by the occupation of recently-completed housing, and modern industrial areas, most dominant of which is the Vauxhall Motors plant.
- 3.138 That the area is subject to change can be seen in the designation of this area as the site of much housing development to take place under the Housing Growth Point initiative –reflected in the electoral forecasts both for Netherpool and the Boundary Committee’s recommended Rossmore ward.
- 3.139 The Council proposed to the Boundary Committee, a two-member ward to include the area of the Boundary Committee’s recommended Netherpool ward, the area which is, essentially that comprised of recent and proposed new housing in its recommended Rossmore ward, and the northern part of its recommended St Paul’s Sutton ward which is separated from the southern part by the town’s railway line.
- 3.140 The Council finds that the Boundary Committee’s conclusion that the railway at Little Sutton does not provide a meaningful ward boundary, whilst at Station Road it does do so is flawed.
- 3.141 Whilst, as in all parts of the Borough, it is important to ensure proper representation of the established communities, elected members need to dedicate particular energies and skills in engaging with emerging communities, of areas of rapid housing growth. The occupiers of houses in such new-build areas will, by definition be new neighbours to their fellows; they may be newly-forming householders and/or may be geographic migrants to the area. There will be questions relating to the establishment and provision of new public services and the rights of access to services.
- 3.142 The Boundary Committee’s approach would fragment representation on these matters; the Council’s approach would ensure that the issue of settlement of a new and growing community would be comprehensively represented.
- 3.143 For this reason, the Council’s preference is for the adoption of its initial proposal for a two-member ward, to be called Rossmore & Rivacre. This name more accurately represents the identity of the established communities than does the Boundary Committee’s proposed “Netherpool”.

Rossmore & Rivacre <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
MA	2020	2040			
MB	1139	1100			
MC	1029	1000			
MD	391	380			
NC	517	1980			
Part NA	142	198			
Part PA	261	231			
	5499	6929	2	-17.93%	1.87%

3.144 The Council can contemplate ways of sub-dividing its preferred ward by the creation of separate wards for Rossmore and for Rivacre. It finds, however, that to do so, increases the variance from average electoral ratio for any reasonably defined single-member ward, but does not add any representational advantage.

Newton

3.145 The Boundary Committee’s draft recommendation broadly reflects the Council’s proposal. However, it differs in one significant effect. The Boundary Committee would include the major part of the University of Chester campus in the Newton ward. This is shown on the Boundary Committee’s mapping, but it is not reflected in its forecasts of future electorate. The definition of ward boundaries as depicted in the Boundary Committee’s mapping would increase electoral imbalances. This point is addressed in the Council’s commentary on the recommended Garden Quarter ward.

3.146 The Boundary Committee’s reasoning for its recommended inclusion of the Campus in the Newton ward is that it seeks stronger ward boundaries at the western edge of the Newton ward, being satisfied with the Council’s proposed boundary in every other respect. The Council would suggest that the effect of the change does not produce such a strong improvement in ward boundaries as to warrant excessive electoral imbalance.

3.147 The Council would therefore advocate the adoption of its initial proposal for the Newton ward as described in the following table;

Newton <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
Part of DF1	285	380			
Part of DG2	388	442			
DP1	1976	1910			
DQ1	2009	1940			
DQ2	139	130			
DQ3	523	510			
DS6	1820	1770			
	7140	7082	2	6.57%	4.12%

Over & Verdin

3.148 The Boundary Committee recommends a ward comprised of the northern and western parts of Winsford with the parish of Whitegate and Marton. However, it would be possible to combine Whitegate & Marton with Hartford, in which direction community ties are stronger. The result would be an Over & Verdin ward with a greater focus, particularly on addressing the needs of an area in which national indicators describe severe and concentrated deprivation.

3.149 Excluding Whitegate & Marton results in a ward with quite a high variance from the average in its electoral ratio. Nevertheless, as at Blacon, the issues affecting this ward are of such a nature that a lower than average electoral will enable elected Members to give them due regard.

3.150 The Council's proposed configuration is shown below;

Over & Verdin <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
EJA - Winsford Over (part 1)	2361	2360			
EJB - Winsford Over (part 2)	548	550			
EJC - Winsford Over (part 3)	1103	1200			
ELA - Winsford Verdin (part 1)	135	140			
ELB - Winsford Verdin (part 2)	1958	1990			
ELC - Winsford Verdin (part 3)	2746	2750			
	8851	8990	3	-11.93%	-11.89%

Parkgate

3.151 See comments on Neston.

Rossmore

3.152 See comments on Netherpool.

Saughall and Mollington.

3.153 See comments regarding Elton.

Shakerley

3.154 The Boundary Committee recommends a single-member ward for Shakerley. The Council may, however wish to recreate a former Borough Council ward of Rudheath & Shakerley as part of facilitation of a more appropriate solution for Northwich than that proposed by the Boundary Committee and described in following paragraphs.

3.155 This approach would reflect the similar issues which occur in both Rudheath and Lostock Gralam as substantial communities on the edge of Northwich Town whilst similarly connecting the rural King Street area of Rudheath with the adjacent Lach Dennis.

3.156 This would result in a ward composed in the manner shown below;

Rudheath & Shakerley <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
TCA - Lostock Gralam Village	1480	1490			
TDA - Rudheath (part 1)	1487	1490			
TDB - Rudheath (part 2)	1406	1460			
TFA - Allostock	623	630			
TFB - Byley	162	160			
TFC - Lach Dennis	212	210			
TFD - Lostock Green	288	290			
TFE - Nether Peover	349	350			
TFF - Sproston	176	180			
WMA - Northwich South					
Witton	698	700			
	6881	6960	2	2.70%	2.32%

South Winsford

3.157 The Boundary Committee recommends a two-member ward which includes the former Borough Council wards of Swanlow and Dene, and the parish of Darnhall. A strong case for Darnhall's inclusion in Eddisbury has been made by the Parish Council and this Council may wish to encourage the Boundary Committee to accede to it. Reflecting this change, the Council would suggest however, that the ward now be called *Swanlow & Dene*. This would be consistent with the retention of the Town Council wards and names.

South Winsford <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
EGA - Winsford Dene (part 1)	2011	2020			
EGB - Winsford Dene (part 2)	1434	1700			
EKA - Winsford Swanlow (part 1)	1731	1760			
EKB - Winsford Swanlow (part 2)	1637	1640			
	6813	7120	2	1.69%	4.68%

St Paul's Sutton

- 3.158 Warding solutions in Ellesmere Port's built-up areas must, in particular, reflect the communities and neighbourhoods, often quite localised which make up the town as a whole.
- 3.159 In particular, the Boundary Committee's approach would fragment Rossmore. The Boundary Committee's proposal for a two-member St Paul's Sutton ward appears to be predicated on a notion that the presence of the railway line and Little Sutton station are the basis of a community identity shared by people living on both sides of the railway (in a way that the Boundary Committee considers inappropriate elsewhere). The Council challenges this view.
- 3.160 Earlier paragraphs relating to Rossmore & Rivacre describe a more appropriate solution for the communities to the north of the railway whilst to the south of it, a single member ward named *Great Sutton Village* would provide for a more clear representation of the community in that part of Ellesmere Port. The composition of the Council's proposed Rossmore and Rivacre ward has been presented with explanations given above. For Great Sutton Village, however, the Council proposes a single-member ward.

Great Sutton Village <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
RC	911	880			
QA	728	710			
QB	856	830			
QC	1404	1360			
	3899	3780	1	16.39%	11.14%

Strawberry

- 3.161 The Boundary Committee recommend warding which in essence, is a subdivision of the present Groves and Whitby ward to create a single-member Strawberry ward and a two-member Whitby ward. Further adjustments would be made in the Hope Farm Road area to accommodate the creation of the Heath ward described in preceding paragraphs and Chester Road area to facilitate the West Sutton ward described in later paragraphs. The Council has, however, suggested improvements to that proposal which would render the adjustments in the Hope Farm Road area unnecessary.
- 3.162 The Council may understand the apparent attractiveness of this subdivision to the Boundary Committee. The Strawberry ward comprises, however, almost entirely of housing, with the local services upon which residents depend

situated in the adjoining Whitby ward. The Council may consider that a restoration of the Groves & Whitby ward will enable better representation of people in the Boundary Committee's recommended Strawberry ward, by virtue of the combining of the consideration of residents with the services on which they depend.

3.163 The Council therefore proposes the reconciliation of this area with the Whitby area in the following configuration;

Groves & Whitby <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
WA	1017	990			
VB	530	510			
WB	1896	1840			
XB	873	850			
YA	1105	1070			
YB	1451	1410			
XA	1861	1800			
YC	2216	2150			
	10949	10620	3	8.95%	4.09%

Tattenhall

3.164 The Boundary Committee recommends a single-member ward for Tattenhall. This would include the parishes of Beeston, Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall. The Council remains convinced, however, that the interests of residents are that their electoral arrangements should lie with the patterns of their interactions with Tarporley, which the parish councils for those areas recognise.

3.165 Cheshire West & Chester Council, in addressing matters to the north of its proposed Eddisbury ward has proposed a resolution of the concerns which those parish councils have regarding their inclusion in a ward with Cuddington and it has been seen that parishes. Councils such as that at Utkinton would allay their concerns regarding Tarporley.

3.166 The Council has also made comment on the impact of the Boundary Committee's proposal on the Broxton area as a whole in its addressing of the proposal for Farndon & Aldford.

3.167 Tattenhall Parish Council concurs with the Cheshire West & Chester Council that the considerations lead it to conclude that the advantage to residents lies in the configuration of a three-member ward for the Broxton area.

Upton

- 3.168 The Boundary Committee recommends the formation of a two-member *Upton* ward which includes Moston parish. This would be, in effect a part of the three-member ward proposed by the Council at an earlier stage of the review. The Council would agree that the Boundary Committee's proposal would provide for satisfactory representation.

Weaver & Cuddington

- 3.169 See comments regarding Eddisbury, Kingsley, & Marbury.
- 3.170 It is clear to the Council that the Boundary Committee's recommendation of a Weaver & Cuddington ward would meet the requests made at Stage 1 by the Weaverham Trust and perhaps Weaverham Parish Council. It would appear, however, that the recommendation would answer the wishes of Cuddington Parish Council only to the extent that the parish would not be included in a ward with Tarporley.
- 3.171 The Council believes that the assertions of integration between the communities are exaggerated. At Appendix 4, editions of the Weaverham Trust's newsletter and circular to residents, and of the Round Tower a newsletter for Cuddington & Sandiway display a lack of representation of issues which identify any community connection between Cuddington and Weaverham; this despite the Round Tower's front-page feature on electoral review.
- 3.172 Meanwhile, the recommendation fails to meet the interests of residents of parishes around Weaverham. This was illustrated at a public meeting in Acton Bridge, when the fragmentation of the present Weaver ward was heavily criticised by residents of that area. The Council's proposals in response to the draft recommendation address the community interests of all parts of the area.

West Sutton

- 3.173 The Boundary Committee broadly accepts the Council's proposal for Ledsham and Manor, although would apply the name West Sutton. However, the Boundary Committee would vary that proposal by excluding an area of housing to the west of Chester Road. Doing this supports electoral ratios for other wards proposed by the Boundary Committee which are, nevertheless, inappropriate, and produces a ward of a better "shape" when seen on the map. The experience of councillors is that this question of shape is less important than that of the most clear identification of communities and what works well in practice.

3.174 The Council may also conclude that the name *Ledsham & Manor* is sufficiently meaningful to people living in the area than would be a name which doesn't directly relate to the communities as the Council, and people in them, understand exist now.

3.175 The Council therefore proposes;

Ledsham & Manor <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
Part PA	1516	1489			
PB	2885	2900			
ZA	1485	1440			
ZB	1525	1480			
	7411	7309	2	10.61%	7.45%

Wharton

3.176 The Boundary Committee recommends acceptance of the Council's Stage 1 proposal for Wharton. However, the Council has been impressed by representations by Moulton Parish Council, which envisages Stanthorne and Wimboldsley in "its" ward and by Darnhall Parish Council which describes at length, the prevalence of rural issues over urban fringe issues in that parish on the edge of Winsford. The Council therefore now proposes a Wharton ward consisting entirely of Winsford Town polling districts as shown below.

Wharton <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
EHA - Winsford Gravel (part 1)	1531	1530			
EHB - Winsford Gravel (part 2)	1679	1680			
EMA - Winsford Wharton (part 1)	1223	1220			
EMB - Winsford Wharton (part 2)	2327	2340			
	6760	6770	2	0.90%	-0.47%

Whitby

3.177 See comments on Strawberry

Willaston & Thornton

3.178 The Council recognises that the creation of a single-member ward for Willaston & Thornton would also allow the creation of the two-member ward for Little

Neston & Burton. As described above, the Council would conclude that this is an appropriate alternative to the Council's initial proposal for a three-member ward.

Winnington Bridge

3.179 The Boundary Committee proposes a two-member ward which consists of the Winnington area of Northwich, part of the Castle area, and part of the Witton area.

3.180 The Council recognises that this approach necessarily involves the combination of quite distinct neighbourhoods and communities. In particular, the Witton area would, in some respects be “out on a limb” from the western part of the proposed ward. The Council believes that this can be satisfactorily overcome by a ward which consolidates the Witton area. In particular, this approach would be much more relevant to those living in the Carlton Road area of Northwich. The result would be a three-member Northwich ward which more adequately represented the composition of the town and its neighbourhoods. It would also give greater strength to the economic, social and environmental regeneration programmes in place for East Northwich.

3.181 This would be as shown below;

Northwich <i>Composition with reference to polling districts</i>	<i>Electorate (2008)</i>	<i>Electorate (2013)</i>	<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from average electoral ratio</i>	
				<i>(2008)</i>	<i>(2013)</i>
Part of WJA - Northwich Castle (part 1)	331	330			
WJB - Northwich Castle (part 2)	2545	2590			
WKA - Northwich Winnington	2028	2080			
WLA - Northwich Witton (part 1)	428	430			
WLB - Northwich Witton (part 2)	1239	1240			
WLC - Northwich Witton (part 3)	1203	1320			
WLD - Northwich Witton (part 4)	1673	1960			
WLE - Northwich Witton (part 5)	676	830			
	10123	10780	3	0.73%	5.66%

Witton & Rudheath

- 3.182 The creation of a Northwich ward facilitates the re-creation of the former Rudheath and Shakerley ward as described in earlier paragraphs.

4.0 Town & Parish Councils

- 4.1 Cheshire West & Chester Council's proposed improvements to the Draft Recommendations would imply no requirement to alter the electoral arrangements of most parish councils. Most are not warded. Cuddington is warded however, with a Cuddington & Delamere Park parish ward and a Sandiway parish ward. The creation of a single-member Cuddington & Sandiway ward in Cheshire West and Chester Council's electoral arrangements would require creation of a Cuddington parish ward and a Delamere Park parish ward; this should be done using the present polling district boundaries.
- 4.2 Of the Town Councils, Frodsham, Neston and Winsford would be unaffected. Northwich would require a change however, reflecting either the Boundary Committee's proposed recommendation or Cheshire West & Chester's Council's proposed amendment of it, including the proposal to alter the boundaries of two existing polling districts. However, a change in existing parish warding has already been set in train by the 2008 Community Governance Review, undertaken by Vale Royal Borough Council, which has determined that a new parish, *Kingsmead*, be created, consisting of the Davenham Kingsmead parish ward and part of the Northwich Leftwich ward. The new parish would lie wholly within the Mere Heath & Leftwich ward recommended by the Boundary Committee or the Davenham & Leftwich parish suggested by Cheshire West & Chester Council.
- 4.3 In setting Northwich town's electoral arrangements, the Boundary Committee should have regard to that Community Governance Review.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 This review of electoral arrangements for Cheshire West & Chester has reached a critical stage – the final opportunity for the residents of the area and their local representatives to have direct influence. It is clear to the Council that local communities have a strong concern for the well-being of their future democratic arrangements.
- 5.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council has taken this opportunity to impress upon the Boundary Committee, the importance of community identity to the arrangements by which people choose their representatives, and the importance of effectiveness with which their representatives serve them.
- 5.3 The wards proposed in Appendix 2 present a range of variances from the average electoral ratio. The greatest positive variance is for a ward recommended by the Boundary Committee whilst the greatest negative variance is less than that for a ward recommended by the Boundary

Committee. It may reasonably be surmised that for all of the wards proposed in Appendix 2, the electoral ratio forecast at 2013 is acceptable.

- 5.4 The summation of the Council's comments on the Draft Recommendations equates to a proposal for Cheshire West & Chester's electoral arrangements is indicated below;

	Council Response	Draft Recommendations
Single-Member Wards	5	20
Two-Member Wards	17	17
Three-Member Wards	12	7

Appendix 1. Draft Recommendations for New Electoral Arrangements for Cheshire West & Chester Council

<i>Ward Proposed in Boundary Committee Draft Recommendations</i>	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>Number of Councillors</i>	<i>Variance from Average Electoral Ratio</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
Blacon	9494	9464	3	-5.53%	-7.24%
Boughton	3639	3643	1	8.63%	7.12%
Chester City	2481	3227	1	-25.94%	-5.12%
Chester Villages	6721	6520	2	0.31%	-4.15%
Dodleston & Huntington	2924	2990	1	-12.72%	-12.08%
Eddisbury	10185	10160	3	1.34%	-0.42%
Ellesmere Port	6538	7170	2	-2.42%	5.41%
Elton	3716	3600	1	10.93%	5.85%
Farndon & Aldford	3141	3120	1	-6.24%	-8.26%
Frodsham and Helsby	11122	11390	3	10.67%	11.63%
Garden Quarter	2583	3714	1	-22.90%	9.20%
Goway	3064	3180	1	-8.54%	-6.50%
Grange	3563	3485	1	6.36%	2.47%
Great Boughton	7047	6820	2	5.18%	0.26%
Handbridge Park	7055	6888	2	5.30%	1.26%
Hartford	6594	6640	2	-1.58%	-2.38%
Heath	7654	7373	2	14.24%	8.39%
Hoole	6705	6490	2	0.07%	-4.59%
Kingsley	3499	3520	1	4.45%	3.50%
Lache	3752	3642	1	12.00%	7.09%
Little Neston & Burton	6770	6578	2	1.04%	-3.29%
Malpas	3248	3260	1	-3.04%	-4.15%
Marbury	10092	10520	3	0.42%	3.11%
Mere Heath & Leftwich	10387	10460	3	3.35%	2.52%
Neston	3248	3212	1	-3.04%	-5.56%
Netherpool	2451	3184	1	-26.84%	-6.38%
Newton	7160	7102	2	6.87%	4.41%
Over & Verdin	9784	9920	3	-2.65%	-2.77%
Parkgate	3128	3070	1	-6.63%	-9.73%
Rossmore	2426	3146	1	-27.58%	-7.50%
Saughall & Mollington	3614	3510	1	7.88%	3.20%
Shakerley	3290	3310	1	-1.79%	-2.68%
South Winsford	6989	7300	2	4.31%	7.32%
St Paul's Sutton	6982	6731	2	4.21%	-1.04%
Strawberry	3414	3313	1	1.91%	-2.59%
Tattenhall	3603	3520	1	7.55%	3.50%
Upton	6333	6450	2	-5.48%	-5.17%
Weaver & Cuddington	9921	9960	3	-1.28%	-2.38%
West Sutton	6597	6640	2	-1.54%	-2.38%
Wharton	7008	7010	2	4.60%	3.06%
Whitby	6729	6528	2	0.43%	-4.03%
Willaston & Thornton	3236	3210	1	-3.40%	-5.62%
Winnington Bridge	6880	7250	2	2.69%	6.59%
Witton & Rudheath	6503	6850	2	-2.94%	0.71%
	251270	255070	75		

Appendix 2. Council Alternative to Draft Recommendations

Response to Draft Recommendations: Alternative Warding Pattern for Cheshire West & Chester:

Blacon	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
DA1	2724	2650			
DA2	1272	1240			
DA3	1479	1430			
DB1	854	830			
DB3	1399	1350			
DB2	1277	1470			
Part of DG1	489	494			
	9494	9464	3	-5.53%	-7.24%

Broxton	<i>Electorate</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
DI1 - Alford	178	180
DI2 - Buerton	24	20
DI3 - Churton Heath	11	10
DI8 - Lea Newbold	16	20
DW1 - Saighton	145	140
FB1 - Churton-by-Aldford	114	110
FB2 - Churton-by-Farndon	120	120
FB3 - Crewe-by-Farndon	17	20
FB4 - Edgerley	3	0
FB5 - Farndon	1272	1260
FB6 - Kings Marsh	23	20
FD1 - Agden	35	30
FD10 - Macefen	73	70
FD11 - Malpas	1391	1430
FD12 - Newton-by-Malpas	8	10
FD13 - Oldcastle	42	40
FD14 - Overton	49	50
FD15 - Stockton	13	10
FD16 - Threapwood	240	230
FD17 - Tushingam-cum-Grindley	130	130
FD18 - Wigland	85	80
FD19 - Wychough	3	0
FD2 - Bickley	423	410
FD3 - Bradley	49	50
FD4 - Chidlow	6	10
FD5 - Chorlton	44	40
FD6 - Cuddington	154	150
FD7 - Edge	159	170
FD8 - Hampton	312	320
FD9 - Larkton	32	30
FE6 - Foulk Stapleford	140	140
FE8 - Huxley	205	200
FF2 - Burwardsley	144	140

FF3 - Chowley	16	20			
FF4 - Golbourne Bellow	61	60			
FF5 - Golbourne David	47	50			
FF6 - Handley	129	130			
FF7 - Hatton	81	80			
FF8 - Newton-by-Tattenhall	98	100			
FF9 - Tattenhall	1680	1630			
FG1 - Aldersey	63	60			
FG10 - Grafton	3	0			
FG11 - Harthill	31	30			
FG12 - Horton-by-Malpas	55	50			
FG13 - Shocklach Oviatt	70	70			
FG14 - Stretton	40	80			
FG15 - Tilston	494	480			
FG2 - Barton	59	60			
FG3 - Broxton	342	330			
FG4 - Caldecott	28	30			
FG5 - Carden	47	50			
FG6 - Church Shocklach	85	80			
FG7 - Clutton	222	210			
FG8 - Coddington	52	50	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
FG9 - Duckington	40	40	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	9403	9330	3	-6.44%	-8.56%

Chester City & Boughton	<i>Electorate Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
DC1	868	890			
DC2	1274	1240			
Part of DC3	1114	1090			
DD3	98	90			
Part of DF1	922	1030			
DF2	679	1260			
DF3	428	480			
DF4	355	360			
DF5 - Chester Castle	0	0	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
DU1	382	430	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	6120	6870	2	-8.66%	1.00%

Chester Villages	<i>Electorate Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
DE1 - Christleton	1626	1580			
DE2 - Littleton	493	480			
DX1 - Rowton	379	370			
FH2 - Waverton	1271	1230			
EB4 - Picton	46	40			
EB5 - Wimbolds Trafford	89	90			
EB1 - Bridge Trafford	21	20			
DE3 - Guilden Sutton	1131	1100			
EB3 - Mickle Trafford	1449	1400			
EB2 - Hoole Village	185	180			
FH1 - Cotton Abbots	7	10	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>

FE4 - Cotton Edmunds	24	20	<i>Members</i>	2008	2013
	6721	6520	2	0.31%	-4.15%

Cuddington & Sandiway	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	2008	2013			
EAA - Cuddington (part 1)	1811	1810	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
EAC - Sandiway	1665	1680	<i>Members</i>	2008	2013
	3476	3490	1	3.76%	2.62%

Davenham & Leftwich	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	2008	2013			
EBA - Bostock	198	210			
EBB - Davenham Village	2170	2170			
EBC - Davenham Whatcroft	56	60			
EBD - Moulton	1877	1880			
WGA - Northwich Leftwich (part 1)	1569	1620			
WGB - Northwich Leftwich (part 2)	1636	1640			
EDA - Davenham Kingsmead	2881	2880			
EBE - Stanthorne	114	110	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
EBF - Wimboldsley	134	130	<i>Members</i>	2008	2013
	10635	10700	3	5.82%	4.87%

Eddisbury	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	2008	2013			
EAD - Oakmere	533	540			
EEA - Cotebrook	199	200			
EEB - Utkinton	363	370			
EEC - Delamere	915	920			
EFA - Darnhall	176	180			
EFB - Little Budworth	519	520			
EFC - Rushton	375	380			
EFD - Tarporley (part 1)	910	920			
EFE - Tarporley (part 2)	1255	1280			
FE3 - Clotton Hoofield	261	260			
FE9 - Iddinshall	30	60			
FF1 - Beeston	161	160			
FF10 - Tilstone Fearnall	93	90	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
FF11 - Tiverton	335	320	<i>Members</i>	2008	2013
	6125	6200	2	-8.58%	-8.85%

Alternative for Eddisbury					
Eddisbury	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	2008	2013			
EAB - Cuddington (part 2) Delamere Park	926	930			
EAD - Oakmere	533	540			
EEA - Cotebrook	199	200			
EEB - Utkinton	363	370			
EEC - Delamere	915	920			
EFA - Darnhall	176	180			
EFB - Little Budworth	519	520			
EFC - Rushton	375	380			

EFD - Tarporley (part 1)	910	920			
EFE - Tarporley (part 2)	1255	1280			
FE3 - Clotton Hoofield	261	260			
FE9 - Iddinshall	30	60			
FF1 - Beeston	161	160			
FF10 - Tilstone Fearnall	93	90	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
FF11 - Tiverton	335	320	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	7051	7130	2	5.24%	4.82%

Ellesmere Port	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
NB	915	1010			
OA	2208	2140			
OC	1675	2350			
SA	1251	1210			
SB	1404	1470	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
Part NA	1135	1042	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	8588	9222	3	-14.55%	-9.61%

Elton & Saughall	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
DR1 - Puddington	303	290			
DR3 - Shotwick	35	40			
DR4 - Shotwick Park	26	30			
DR5 - Woodbank	49	50			
DO2 - Capenhurst	205	200			
DO7 - Mollington	518	510			
DO6 - Ledsham	98	90			
DR2 - Saughall	2380	2300			
DV1 - Croughton	21	20			
DV2 - Little Stanney	161	160			
DV3 - Stoak	90	90			
DV4 - Wervin	108	100			
DO1 - Backford	85	80			
DO4 - Chorlton-by-Backford	77	70			
DO5 - Lea-by-Backford	150	150			
DO3 - Caughall	22	20			
OB	176	170			
EA1 - Elton	2632	2550	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
EA2 - Thonton-le-Moors	194	190	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	7330	7110	2	9.40%	4.53%

Frodsham & Helsby	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
WBA - Frodsham East	1935	1940			
WBB - Frodsham North	2414	2540			
WBC - Frodsham West	1187	1280			
WCA - Frodsham South	1754	1760			
WEA - Helsby Central	1436	1440			
WEB - Helsby North	1342	1350	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
WEC - Helsby South	1054	1080	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>

	11122	11390	3	10.67%	11.63%
--	--------------	--------------	----------	---------------	---------------

Garden Quarter	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
Part of DG1	1437	1526			
Part of DG2	1166	2208			
	2603	3734	1	-22.30%	9.79%

Gowy	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
EC1 - Dunham-on-Hill	397	390			
EC2 - Hapsford	62	70			
FA1 - Barrow	746	750			
FA2 - Horton-cum-Peel	26	30			
FA3 - Mouldsworth	234	230			
FC1 - Ashton	754	730			
FC2 - Kelsall	2139	2110			
FE1 - Bruen Stapleford	66	60			
FE10 - Prior's Heys	16	20			
FE11 - Tarvin (Outer Ward)	320	310			
FE12 - Tarvin (Village Ward)	1747	1690			
FE13 - Willington	73	70			
FE7 - Hockenhull	27	30			
FE2 - Burton-by-Tarvin	43	40			
FE5 - Duddon	394	380			
	7044	6910	2	5.13%	1.59%

Grange	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
RA	411	400			
RD	739	720			
RB	2049	1990			
	3199	3110	1	-4.51%	-8.56%

Great Boughton & Dodleston	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
DD1 -Great Boughton (South Ward)	1359	1320			
DD2 -Great Boughton (South Ward)	1643	1590			
DI4 - Claverton	0	0			
DI5 - Dodleston	610	600			
DI6 - Eaton	40	40			
DI7 - Eccleston	146	140			
DI9 - Lower Kinnerton	105	100			
DI10 - Marlston-cum-Lache (part)	71	70			
DI11 - Poulton	74	90			
DI12 - Pulford	353	350			
DM1 - Huntington	1508	1580			
DN3 - Marlston-cum-Lache (part)	17	20			
DU2 - Great Boughton (north ward)	3847	3720			
DU3	198	190			
	9971	9810	3	-0.79%	-3.85%

Great Sutton Village	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
RC	911	880			
QA	728	710			
QB	856	830			
QC	1404	1360	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
	3899	3780	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
			1	16.39%	11.14%

Groves & Whitby	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
WA	1017	990			
VB	530	510			
WB	1896	1840			
XB	873	850			
YA	1105	1070			
YB	1451	1410			
XA	1861	1800	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
YC	2216	2150	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	10949	10620	3	8.95%	4.09%

Hartford	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
ECA - Whitegate & Marton	933	930			
WDA - Hartford (part 1)	1505	1510			
WDB - Hartford (part 2)	1498	1530			
WDC - Hartford (part 3)	1427	1430			
Part of WJA - Northwich Castle (part 1)	1189	1200	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
WJC - Northwich Castle (part 3)	644	640	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	7196	7240	2	7.42%	6.44%

Hoole	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
DK1	1255	1210			
DK2	1214	1170			
DL1	1321	1280			
DL2	1423	1380			
DL3	358	350		<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
DP2	1134	1100	<i>No. of</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	6705	6490	<i>Members</i>	2	0.07%
					-4.59%

Ledsham & Manor	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
Part PA	1516	1489			
PB	2885	2900			
ZA	1485	1440	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
ZB	1525	1480	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	7411	7309	2	10.61%	7.45%

Little Neston, Burton and Ness	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
Part CE	904	888			
CC	2870	2780			
CD	1652	1600			
CA	585	570	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
CB	759	740			
	6770	6578	2	1.04%	-3.29%

Marbury	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
TCB - Wincham	1773	1950			
TEC - Marston	448	450			
TEA - Antrobus	644	650			
TEB - Great Budworth	303	300			
TAA - Barnton (part 1)	1428	1590			
TAB - Barnton (part 2)	1402	1400			
TAC - Barnton (part 3)	1568	1630			
TBA - Anderton with Marbury	470	470			
TBB - Comberbach	805	810			
TBC - Little Leigh	472	470	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
TED - Whitley	433	440			
	9746	10160	3	-3.02%	-0.42%

Neston & Parkgate	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
Part CE	178	162			
CH	1437	1390			
CJ	1691	1680	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
CF	3070	3050			
	6376	6282	2	-4.84%	-7.64%

Newton	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
Part of DF1	285	380			
Part of DG2	388	442			
DP1	1976	1910			
DQ1	2009	1940			
DQ2	139	130			
DQ3	523	510	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
DS6	1820	1770			
	7140	7082	2	6.57%	4.12%

Northwich	<i>Electorate</i>				
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
Part of WJA - Northwich Castle (part 1)	331	330			
WJB - Northwich Castle (part 2)	2545	2590			
WKA - Northwich Winnington	2028	2080			
WLA - Northwich Witton (part 1)	428	430			
WLB - Northwich Witton (part 2)	1239	1240			
WLC - Northwich Witton (part 3)	1203	1320			

WLD - Northwich Witton (part 4)	1673	1960	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
WLE - Northwich Witton (part 5)	676	830			
	10123	10780	3	0.73%	5.66%

Over & Verdin	<i>Electorate 2008</i>	<i>Electorate 2013</i>			
EJA - Winsford Over (part 1)	2361	2360	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
EJB - Winsford Over (part 2)	548	550			
EJC - Winsford Over (part 3)	1103	1200			
ELA - Winsford Verdin (part 1)	135	140			
ELB - Winsford Verdin (part 2)	1958	1990			
ELC - Winsford Verdin (part 3)	2746	2750			
	8851	8990			

Overleigh	<i>Electorate 2008</i>	<i>Electorate 2013</i>						
DH1	1426	1430	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>			
DH2	1942	1880						
DJ1	620	600						
DJ2	2523	2440						
DN1	1181	1150						
DN2	3115	3030						
	10807	10530				3	7.53%	3.20%

Rossmore & Rivacre	<i>Electorate 2008</i>	<i>Electorate 2013</i>			
MA	2020	2040	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>
MB	1139	1100			
MC	1029	1000			
MD	391	380			
NC	517	1980			
Part NA	142	198			
Part PA	261	231			
	5499	6929			

Rudheath & Shakerley	<i>Electorate 2008</i>	<i>Electorate 2013</i>						
TCA - Lostock Gramam Village	1480	1490	<i>No. of Members</i>	<i>Variance 2008</i>	<i>Variance 2013</i>			
TDA - Rudheath (part 1)	1487	1490						
TDB - Rudheath (part 2)	1406	1460						
TFA - Allostock	623	630						
TFB - Byley	162	160						
TFC - Lach Dennis	212	210						
TFD - Lostock Green	288	290						
TFE - Nether Peover	349	350						
TFF - Sproston	176	180						
WMA - Northwich South Witton	698	700						
	6881	6960				2	2.70%	2.32%

Sutton	<i>Electorate 2008</i>	<i>Electorate 2013</i>			

UA	994	960			
UB	1184	1150			
UC	2204	2140	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
VA	2427	2350	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	6809	6600	2	1.63%	-2.97%

Swanlow & Dene	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
EGA - Winsford Dene (part 1)	2011	2020			
EGB - Winsford Dene (part 2)	1434	1700			
EKA - Winsford Swanlow (part 1)	1731	1760	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
EKB - Winsford Swanlow (part 2)	1637	1640	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	6813	7120	2	1.69%	4.68%

Upton	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
DS1 - Upton-by-Chester (Upton Grange)	947	920			
DS2 - Upton-by-Chester (Upton Grange)	931	900			
DS3 - Upton-by-Chester (Upton Grange)	440	430			
DS4 - Upton-by-Chester (Upton Park)	697	670			
DS5 - Bache	125	440			
DS7	2	0			
DT1 - Upton-by-Chester (Upton Heath)	3010	2920	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
DO8 - Moston	181	170	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	6333	6450	2	-5.48%	-5.17%

Weaver	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
EAB - Cuddington (part 2) Delamere Park	926	930			
WAC - Norley	965	970			
WFA - Kingsley	1684	1690			
WHA - Acton Bridge	519	520			
WHB - Aston	85	90			
WHC - Crowton	377	380			
WHD - Dutton	346	360			
WHE - Sutton	388	390			
WNA - Church	1650	1660			
WNB - Gorstage	1626	1630			
WNC - Owley Wood	1724	1730			
WAA - Alvanley	373	380	<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Variance</i>
WAB - Manley	472	600	<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>
	11135	11330	3	10.80%	11.05%

Alternative for Weaver

Weaver	<i>Electorate</i>	<i>Electorate</i>			
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>			
WAC - Norley	965	970			
WFA - Kingsley	1684	1690			
WHA - Acton Bridge	519	520			
WHB - Aston	85	90			

WHC - Crowton	377	380			
WHD - Dutton	346	360			
WHE - Sutton	388	390			
WNA - Church	1650	1660			
WNB - Gorstage	1626	1630			
WNC - Owley Wood	1724	1730			
WAA - Alvanley	373	380			
WAB - Manley	472	600			
	10209	10400	3	1.58%	1.93%

Wharton	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>
EHA - Winsford Gravel (part 1)	1531	1530			
EHB - Winsford Gravel (part 2)	1679	1680			
EMA - Winsford Wharton (part 1)	1223	1220			
EMB - Winsford Wharton (part 2)	2327	2340			
	6760	6770	2	0.90%	-0.47%

Willaston & Thornton	<i>Electorate</i>		<i>No. of</i>	<i>Variance</i>	
	<i>2008</i>	<i>2013</i>		<i>Members</i>	<i>2008</i>
CK	2293	2250			
LA	943	960			
	3236	3210	1	-3.40%	-5.62%

	Electorate 2008	Electorate 2013		Variance 2008	Variance 2013
Blacon	9494	9464	3	-5.53%	-7.24%
Broxton	9403	9330	3	-6.44%	-8.56%
Chester City & Boughton	6120	6870	2	-8.66%	1.00%
Chester Villages	6721	6520	2	0.31%	-4.15%
Cuddington & Sandiway	3476	3490	1	3.76%	2.62%
Davenham & Leftwich	10635	10700	3	5.82%	4.87%
Eddisbury	6125	6200	2	-8.58%	-8.85%
Ellesmere Port	8588	9222	3	-14.55%	-9.61%
Elton & Saughall	7330	7110	2	9.40%	4.53%
Frodsham & Helsby	11122	11390	3	10.67%	11.63%
Garden Quarter	2603	3734	1	-22.30%	9.79%
Gowy	7044	6910	2	5.13%	1.59%
Grange	3199	3110	1	-4.51%	-8.56%
Great Boughton & Dodleston	9971	9810	3	-0.79%	-3.85%
Great Sutton Village	3899	3780	1	16.39%	11.14%
Groves & Whitby	10949	10620	3	8.95%	4.09%
Hartford	7196	7240	2	7.42%	6.44%
Hoole	6705	6490	2	0.07%	-4.59%
Ledsham & Manor	7411	7309	2	10.61%	7.45%
Little Neston, Burton & Ness	6770	6578	2	1.04%	-3.29%
Marbury	9746	10160	3	-3.02%	-0.42%
Neston & Parkgate	6376	6282	2	-4.84%	-7.64%
Newton	7140	7082	2	6.57%	4.12%
Northwich	10123	10780	3	0.73%	5.66%
Over & Verdin	8851	8990	3	-11.93%	-11.89%
Overleigh	10807	10530	3	7.53%	3.20%
Rossmore & Rivacre	5499	6929	2	-17.93%	1.87%
Rudheath & Shakerley	6881	6960	2	2.70%	2.32%
Swanlow & Dene	6813	7120	2	1.69%	4.68%
Sutton	6809	6600	2	1.63%	-2.97%
Upton	6333	6450	2	-5.48%	-5.17%
Weaver	11135	11330	3	10.80%	11.05%
Wharton	6760	6770	2	0.90%	-0.47%
Willaston & Thornton	3236	3210	1	-3.40%	-5.62%
	251270	255070	75		

Appendix 3

Cheshire West & Chester Electoral Review Responses of Parish Councils to the Boundary Committee's Draft Recommendations

The responses presented below have been sent by parish councillors and clerks on behalf of their councils to the Policy Manager, Cheshire West & Chester Council

Backford & District Parish Council

As a parish council we have discussed and voted on this issue. We are strongly opposed to being linked to Elton. We would wish to remain with Mollington and Lea by Backford, in the Mollington and Saughall Ward.

Our community is rural, comprising dairy, sheep and arable farms. Our community enjoy horse riding, shooting, walking, cycling, jogging and other rural pursuits. In comparison Elton has housing estates, and light and heavy industry.

The parish forms part of the Green Belt dividing Chester from Ellesmere port. This is a conservation responsibility we take very seriously. The local geography is firmly divided by the M53 to the east (separating the industrialisation of Stanlow) and the A5117 to the North (separating the suburbs of Ellesmere Port). Our natural affinity is with the districts to the West who share our values and rural aspects.

The Parishes of Backford, Lea by Backford & Mollington share the Village Hall in the Backford Parish. This is one of three focal points of community life. The hall supports the Womens Institute, Toddler Group, Brownies, Historical Society, Church Fellowship, Art Classes, French Classes, Belly Dancing, Yoga and the Village Pantomime. The village does not have a pub, so the village hall runs regular "last drop Inns". All these events are publicised in, and attended by, the residents of the Mollington, Lea by Backford and Backford Parishes.

The Parish Councils of Backford, Lea by Backford and Mollington financially support the Village Hall by annual funding and support of their fundraising activities such as Plant Sales, Quizes, Theatre Productions etc

Another focal point of community life is St Oswald's School (in Mollington). The local school in Backford was closed down on the understanding that we remained linked to Mollington for the educational needs of the Parish.

The last significant focal point is St Oswalds Church (in Backford). This church is attended by residents from Mollington, Lea by Backford, Backford and Chorlton by Backford. This maintains a spiritual and socially supportive community link.

The communities are linked by the bus transport systems which link to Chester on the A41.

We understand the need to balance numbers in the interest of electoral fairness. However, due to the low population density of the rural areas, we feel the variance should be minor.

Darnhall PC

Darnhall Parish Council strongly objects to the Boundary Commission's draft recommendations placing the rural Darnhall with the urban wards of Swanlow and Dene in Winsford, to be called South Winsford.

However, the Council is very pleased to support C W A C Council's proposal to include Darnhall in the Eddisbury Ward, along with Tarporley and the surrounding rural parishes.

Over the years Darnhall has formed strong links with the Eddisbury Ward parishes through its major industry which is dairy and beef farming. The farmers are naturally orientated to Beeston Cattle Market where they sell their stock as calves or finished beef cattle. Beeston also has a weekly stall holders market which is very popular with the residents in Darnhall. The residents also frequent the rural pubs, farm shops, butchers, garden centres, etc. of the Eddisbury ward.

A good number of the residents also use the educational, medical and dental facilities in Tarporley, Bunbury, Eaton and Calveley. Particularly of great use is the Tarporley Memorial Hospital for radiotherapy, small operations, and recuperation.

As mentioned the main employers in the parish are the farms together with approximately three other small businesses. The biggest of these is John Bownes Ltd which supplies agricultural machinery and is a major national factor. One of the other small business was started by a retired dairy farmer who has created a cottage industry making cakes and fruit pies and supplying farm shops, village cafes, and the Tarporley delicatessen, all in the rural areas of Eddisbury.

The boundary maps of Darnhall make it clear that we are a rural parish because part of the boundary is formed along the Wettenhall Brook and Ash Brook which meet and flow into the Winsford Flashes. And the longest boundary of the parish is with East Cheshire (Wettenhall, Lea Green and Church Minshull) all of which are agriculture and rural areas. Only a very small part of the parish boundary is with Winsford and that boundary is mainly rural. The remaining boundary within Cheshire West and Chester is with Little Budworth and Rushton and Eaton and once again this is an agricultural area.

There are two main areas of housing in Darnhall - one is a new development adjoining the Winsford boundary and the other approximately one mile away along a country lane near the recently refurbished Village Hall. There have been cottages in this area for hundreds of years, and the small holding

adjoining one of the cottages is the home of a farrier who shoes anything from small ponies to shire horses both on and off site.

A large portion of the property and land in the parish is owned by the Verdin Estate and joins onto their lands in Wettenhall.

An area of land next to Darnhall Village Hall marks the Centre of Cheshire. The Hall itself has recently been refurbished and rejuvenated thanks to over £100 thousand in grants from rural funds. It is regularly used by the local community and is home to the Darnhall & Wettenhall Women's Institute, Darnhall Brownies and Guides, Darnhall Dancers, as well as many private functions. Many of the participants come from the local rural villages in the Eddisbury Ward.

The events in the Hall are often shown in the local glossy magazine, Tarporley Talk, where there is a strong sense of the local community. This sense is not often shared by the Winsford newspapers who are too 'urbanised' to bother with their surrounding villages.

During the last four years we have had a very good working relationship with the three Eddisbury Councillors. They have represented us well in council, and have given good advice when needed. Also they have acquired grants for us to continue with our refurbishment. Long may this continue that Darnhall is regarded as a separate and worthwhile entity of its own, and not just another 'suburb' of Winsford to be casually subsumed into a greater whole for the sake of a few population statistics.

The councillors feel that the best interests of the residents of the parish would be served by continuing to be in a rural cluster. The problems of urban areas are in many ways different from those where there is no rural transport and very few services, and a rural based cluster would have a better comprehension of our problems.

Dutton PC

The Members, having been told that there was a possibility that Dutton may move Wards, wish to make it clear that they wish to remain in the Weaver Ward and support the Councils proposal to retain the existing Ward as is.

The Parish has very close links with the River Weaver and the Weaver Valley, the nearest shopping village is Weaverham and Weaverham High School is also the feeder school for the children in the parish.

Fouk Stapleford PC

Fouk Stapleford Parish Councillors would like to express their satisfaction with the inclusion of the parish into the proposed electoral ward of Tattenhall.

Guilden Sutton PC

Guilden Sutton support Chester Villages.

Huntington PC

Huntington Parish Council voted unanimously at the 16th November meeting 2009 to agree (extract from minutes):

"09/042 resolved:

It was agreed that the council should make the following observations to the boundary committee, that it did not support the proposed ward and recommend the continuation of a three member ward including Great Boughton which is part of the same community as Huntington. It was felt that Huntington had no communality with the villages in the proposed ward emphasized by the fact that there are not direct road links to these villages."

Huxley PC

Huxley Parish Council support the proposal that the parish be part of the Tattenhall Ward and represented on CW&C by a single councillor.

Moulton PC

The map showing the area is incorrect in that it fails to recognise that Davenham Parish boundary will change in May 2011 and a new Parish Council of Kingsmead will come into existence. This Parish will consist of the present area of Davenham Parish north of the A556 and part of Northwich Town Council up to Sir John Deane's College. This is set out in detail in the Parishing Changes approved by Vale Royal Borough Council in February 2009.

This completes a series of boundary changes to the old Cheshire County Council Warding, Vale Royal Borough Council Warding, the Parliamentary Constituency Boundary and the Boundary between Davenham 'Village' and 'Kingsmead Wards' of Davenham Parish Council. The co-terminus Boundary resulting from these changes is the A556 trunk road.

We believe that the community is less concerned with the number of electors in each ward than that wards should encompass identifiable communities. The present warding recommendation bears no relation to a coherent community as understood locally. This was part of the consideration in creating a new Kingsmead Parish north of the A556. The boundary of the old 'Davenham and Moulton' and 'Kingsmead and Leftwich' wards of Vale Royal Borough Council was also amended to the A556 as their boundary. This boundary was of course retained when creating the current Unitary Council Wards.

The Boundary Committee proposal to change the Unitary Council Ward Boundaries will again create the confusion of different boundaries for the local authority wards and the parliamentary constituencies.

Moulton Parish Council strongly recommends that the A556, a more robust boundary line than any of the meandering brooks and arbitrary lines across agricultural land, be retained as the ward boundary.

Section 159 of The Boundary Committee's recommendations notes correctly that, '.... Hartford has very little in common with Moulton and Davenham'. The Council wishes to record that, however it may appear on a map, Leftwich has even less in common with Moulton or Davenham.

Section 160, having accepted that a two member ward including Davenham would provide good electoral quality, concludes without demonstrating any justification that '..... but would produce a weak ward boundary which divides

residential streets! As Davenham Parish will, after May 2011, not extend north of the A556, what streets are referred to?

Moulton Parish Council would, in conclusion urge you to reconsider your recommendations and to recognise:

- 1 That the A556 is a robust boundary between the very different communities of Kingsmead [largely a new housing development] and Leftwich [a semi rural housing area] north of the A556 and the old rural villages of Davenham, Moulton and Bostock south of the A556.
- 2 That the ward south of the A556 to include the smaller villages of Stanthorne and Wimboldsley in addition to Bostock and Whatcroft and be called 'Davenham and Moulton' [as it was prior to the new unitary authority].
- 3 That each ward then have two elected members. The Kingsmead/ Leftwich ward would have approximately 6140 electors and Davenham/Moulton 4552 electors. In noting that most wards are already proposed as 'two member' the Council considers that this should be the optimum. Whilst the two wards would increase the total number of councillors from 75 to 76 it seems a small concession to balance against community benefit.
- 4 The Council believes that whilst the number of electors in 'Davenham/Moulton' ward would be below the target figures this is, we would contend, less important in 'local' government than losing the importance of strong, identifiable communities.
- 5 There is considerable resistance to naming the proposed Ward 'Mere Heath and Leftwich'. Mere Heath is a small geographical area within Davenham, rarely referred to locally. Again even the OS mapping is no substitute for knowing the community on the ground. Our proposal above enables more recognisable Ward names.

Tarporley PC

Tarporley Parish Council has considered the options available to it for the composition of a new electoral ward of which its parish would be part. It has been very aware of the sensibilities of adjacent parishes and has taken this into consideration by contacting the various Clerks and Chairmen, however due to the tight timescale consultation has been limited and without final consensus.

In 1973 Tarporley became part of Vale Royal Borough Council, with one councillor representing it. More recently there was a boundary change and Tarporley, together with Rushton, Little Budworth, and Darnall, became the Tarporley and Oulton ward, represented by two councillors. This arrangement worked well with one councillor concentrating on Tarporley and the other, the remaining smaller parishes.

With regard to the Cheshire County Council, Tarporley was included in the Eddisbury Ward that extended from Cuddington in the north to Tilston Fearnall in the south and was represented by one councillor. This constituted an

unsatisfactorily large geographical spread with the majority of the population living in the Cuddington area.

Tarporley Community Identity

Tarporley is the centre for commerce, social, educational and service provision over a wide area in this part of Cheshire West and Chester (CW&C) bounded by Tarvin in the north, Little Budworth in the east, Alpraham (in Cheshire East) in the south and Bunbury (also in Cheshire East) in the west. Therefore it is reasonable to say that these parishes constitute the wider Tarporley community. Each of these villages does not have the full range of facilities and service provision available in Tarporley and people, living in these areas, both currently and historically, look to Tarporley for the facilities and services not available in their own village.

For example, Tarporley High Street has a large number of commercial premises both retail and office. There are two banks, a Post Office, two large supermarket style convenience stores, one having a filling station, five estate agents, a hotel, three public houses, ladies and gentlemen's hairdressers, butcher, delicatessen, white goods shop, jeweller, dry cleaners, restaurants, confectioners etc. These service a population from the wide rural area who would otherwise need to travel to Nantwich or Chester, each some twelve miles distant.

Also Tarporley has a number of health services, which serve this wider Tarporley community. Tarporley's Health Centre is home to two general practises, housing eight general practitioners together with associated health professionals and administrative staff. One of the practice's patient catchments is an area that includes Tarvin and Waverton and the villages in between. Doctors from the Tarporley Health Centre, the GP practices in Kelsall, Tarvin, Bunbury, Tattenhall have admission rights and look after patients in the Tarporley War Memorial Hospital, funded to a significant extent by local contributions. Fund raising takes place for the hospital within these communities. The hospital provides recuperative and respite care for patients discharged from the hospitals in Chester and occasionally from the hospital in Crewe. It has a physiotherapy department and consulting rooms for visiting consultants. There are two dental practices in Nantwich Road and a chiropody practice in Forest Road with patients come from the wider Tarporley community.

Tarporley has a Country Market held on the first Saturday of the month in the High Street. It is a great success with thirty or so stalls and attracts customers from a wide area.

The ecclesiastical parish of St. Helen's with its ancient church forming part of the High Street scene encompasses the villages of Eaton, in the civil parish of Rushton, Cotebrook and Utkinton in the civil parish of Utkinton.

The number 84 is the only regular bus service running through the village, connecting it via the A51 with Nantwich and Chester. There is no bus service connecting Tarporley with Cuddington, Delamere and Sandiway.

The Tarporley High School and Sixth Form College has a catchment area extending from Calvely in Cheshire East to Delamere, Bunbury also in Cheshire East, to Little Budworth, with the exception of Huxley. Tarporley C of E Primary School and the Done Room pre-school attract children from the wider Tarporley area.

Tarporley is the focus for a number of sporting organisations. Tarporley Vics have two adult football teams, the Tarporley Wanderers five youth football teams, the Tarporley Cricket Club, the Tarporley Tennis Club and four crown green bowling teams all of whom draw their membership from the wider Tarporley community.

Therefore for the above reasons Tarporley Parish Council has taken note of what it considers to be the wider Tarporley community in considering its proposals to the Boundary Commission

Proposal

Tarporley Parish Council is in favour of a single councillor ward serving the community identified above that consists of Tarporley and immediately adjacent smaller rural villages. There would then be only one point of contact, no confusion as to who might be the responsible councillor and direct accountability to the local electorate. While it has, proved difficult to construct a single councillor ward that complies with the numerical criteria the Boundary Committee favours, it is still the Parish Council's preferred option.

Tarporley Parish Council does not favour the proposition for the three-member ward likely to be proposed by Cheshire West and Chester Council. The wider Tarporley community has no affinity with Cuddington, Sandiway and Delamere, a grouping that has links with Hartford and Northwich. These areas are adjacent, and have transport links to the urban area of Northwich, where residents access health, social, leisure, financial and other facilities and services. Such a ward would also have in excess of fifty percent of the electorate living in the Cuddington, Sandiway and Delamere area, thus possibly diluting the councillors' attention to be paid to the Tarporley area. It should be noted that the current Cheshire West and Chester Local Development Framework Core Strategy Topic Paper - Winsford and Rural East reinforces the above as it states "*3.5 ... Tarporley is a large village in the south of the area, surrounded by open countryside and close to the border with Cheshire East. Settlements in the north of the area, including Cuddington, Davenham and Lostock Gralam have strong connections with Northwich.*

Tarporley Parish Council submits the following proposals for wards that include Tarporley and associated parishes.

1. A Single Councillor Ward. The Strongly Preferred Option

Little Budworth, 560; Tarporley, 2200; Rushton, 380; Utkinton, 570; Tiverton & Tilston Fearnall, 428; Iddinshall, 50.
Total electorate 4188

Although strongly favouring a single councillor ward Tarporley Parish Council accepts that the debate may well extend to two and three councillor wards. In

such a case the following are presented for consideration as offering a more homogeneous aggregation than the CW&C proposal.

2. A Two-Councillor Ward.

As above plus.

Fouk Stapleford, 140; Huxley, 200; Beeston, 160; Duddon, 380; Clotton Hoofield, 260; Willington, 100; Hockenhull, 30; Bruen Stapleford, 60; Burton by Tarvin, 50, Darnhall 180.

(The figure for the final three parishes is an estimate as only population figures for October 2008 were available.)

Total electorate 5748

3. A Three-Councillor Ward

As above plus

Tarvin, 2000; Kelsall, 2110,

Total electorate 9858

(Please note the 42% of the electorate will live in the two parishes of Tarvin and Kelsall)

Tattenhall PC

Tattenhall have this evening [21 January 2010]comprehensively agreed to support the 3 member option, which with Farndon cover 2 of the 3 main settlements in the Broxton Ward.

Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall PC

Background.

At the Parish Council meeting of 12th January the Boundary Committee's proposals were discussed at length. This followed extensive discussions between various parish councillors in response to CWaC's request, received just before Christmas, for comments on the Boundary Committee's November 2009 Report. Our Chairman, Janice Farrall, asked David Owen of CWaC for an extension of their deadline for parish comments, so the matter could be more fully discussed at our Parish Council meeting on 12th, to which he agreed.

First, the Council wish to register our view, in the strongest possible terms, that there was a serious lack of clarity in the Boundary Committee's proposals regarding Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall Parish. The text of the report was confusing and apparently contradictory in places, there was no detailed listing of parishes for the proposed wards, the relevant maps could not be downloaded from the web-site and the content of our earlier submission seemed to have been mis-read altogether. I requested clarification from both the Boundary Committee and CWaC by e-mail but received only a standard acknowledgement from the BC rather than an informative reply. CWaC did provide the relevant information. We also consulted our neighbours in Beeston Parish and they confirmed that they had had similar difficulties making sense of the proposals.

In our original submission we did not reject CWaC's proposals for a three-councillor ward of Eddisbury, but, rather, saw some merit in it, since there is strong orientation towards our close neighbour, Tarporley. A view was expressed, however, that the parish traditionally had closer links with Tattenhall and certainly the most northerly of the 50-odd rural parishes in the Broxton ward. Above all we stressed, and still do so, that the new ward structure must allow the issues and concerns of Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall, as rural parishes in South West Cheshire, to be properly represented. We do not want our interests to be swamped either by the more urban concerns of Tarporley or the rather different issues again of the Northwich-oriented parishes in the north of the proposed Eddisbury ward.

Our Current Position

The Parish Council are still most concerned about appropriate representation; that the issues of concern to Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall should not be "lost" in the large three-councillor ward of Eddisbury, as proposed by CWaC. The northern part of the proposed ward, containing the likes of Cuddington, Sandiway and Delamere, was seen as being quite different in character from the southern rural parishes. The point about the differences between ourselves and Tarporley has already been discussed. The Council was particularly concerned that local representation would not be as close or as effective in a three-councillor ward as in a single-councillor ward. Neil Ritchie, council member of CWaC, was in attendance and put CWaC's case for three-councillor wards very strongly and cogently, but the Parish Council on balance preferred the single councillor, smaller ward, model.

On balance, therefore, the Council's unanimous decision was in favour of Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall being included in the proposed new Tattenhall ward. Our neighbouring parish of Beeston was also represented at the meeting by Councillor Doug Hayne who contributed strongly to the discussion. Beeston also prefer to join the Tattenhall ward, for very similar reasons.

Utkinton PC

The Council is submitting its representations relating to Eddisbury (paras. 116-124 of the Boundary Committee's recommendations).

It notes that there are a number of options for this large rural area but that the main factor must be an identifiable community; one that is identifiable to the community.

Eddisbury contains a number of small rural villages with broadly similar needs and these have an identifiable link to Tarporley in particular with its retail, business and secondary school facilities which are accessible. Utkinton Parish Council considers that these villages should be combined to create a 2-member ward. This would enable elected members to represent an identifiable community and for the various communities to be best served.

The Council's proposal is therefore a 2-member ward for Beeston, Cotebrook, Clotton Hoofield, Darnhall, Delamere, Iddinshall, Little Budworth, Oakmere, Rushton, Tarporley, Tilstone Fearnall, Tiverton and Utkinton. This gives a total of 6125 electors in 2008 and a projected total of 6200 in 2013.

The Council acknowledges its proposal results in Cuddington and Sandiway not being in its proposed ward but views that they are large villages with no obvious community or location links to the rest of the proposed ward and could become a single member ward.

Appendix 4

Documents Referenced With regard to the Weaver Ward

(These documents do not appear in 'electronic' versions of the Council's response)

Appendix 5

Maps showing the boundaries of Wards represented in the Council's Response to the Draft Recommendations.

(These maps do not appear in 'electronic' versions of the Council's response)