

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 August 2022 17:05
To: reviews
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Local electoral Boundary Changes proposals

Categories: [REDACTED]

Re: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England

New electoral arrangements for Malvern Hills District Council – Further draft recommendations

June 2022

Comments on the proposed changes affecting Upper Welland

Dear Sirs

I have read your Further Draft Recommendations and wish to object to the proposed electoral boundary change for Upper Welland in the strongest terms. I note the three statutory criteria that must be taken into account and do not consider that these have been met in any way. My comments are as follows:

1. I am a resident of Upper Welland, having moved here specifically because of the proximity to the Malvern Hills. I have always considered Upper Welland to be affiliated with Malvern Wells due to the strong community links that bind us together. The same cannot be said of Welland or Longdon. Residents of Upper Welland rely on Malvern Wells to satisfy its every day needs, which include shops and a garage, which I use regularly. The village hall is situated in Malvern Wells and the annual Malvern Wells village fete is held on the village green in Upper Welland. Our church is in Malvern Wells and although I have no resident children, I am aware of many neighbours in Upper Welland whose children attend the Malvern Wells CofE Primary School. The nature reserve also provides local recreational needs for Upper Welland and Malvern Wells. My view therefore is that Upper Welland is linked to Malvern Wells through community interests and should be one entity, sharing the same Councillors.
2. Upper Welland lies within the AONB, which also covers Malvern Wells. As such it lies within the jurisdiction of the Malvern Hills Trust. One of the benefits of this is that we are eligible to purchase a parking permit which provides access to all the car parks on the Malvern Hills. As a dog owner, we walk on the Malvern Hills daily, sometimes more than once and although there is a levy in our rates towards this benefit, we are happy to pay this for the usage we make of it. However at a time of rising inflation and ever higher costs, if we were to lose the permit, we would have to look elsewhere for dog walking. If we were to pay £4.85 for each visit, our annual costs would rise by over £1,500. I am aware that many other dog owning residents of Upper Welland use the Hills for exercising their pets and would be faced with the same decision if the proposed boundary change were agreed. It means that the Hills would be used mainly by tourists and visitors from outside the AONB

area. Upper Welland residents would have to make more use of the Reserve, which is already crowded and not really satisfactory for a large number of dogs.

3. I do not consider that Upper Welland has any community links with Welland and does not identify with Welland in any way. I am even more appalled at the proposal to join Upper Welland with Longdon, which has no association with Upper Welland at all and is more local to Tewkesbury. I have no idea what amenities Longdon provides but it certainly has no shared community interests and has its own identity, separate from Upper Welland. It is too remote from Upper Welland for any communal identity, being more than 6.8 miles away from here. If anything, I would think it should be associated with Upton, which is much closer. I cannot see how it can provide for effective and convenient local government when the communities are so disparate.

For the reasons set out above, I strongly object to the proposed new electoral arrangements for Upper Welland and I cannot see how these proposal meet the statutory criteria.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5th August 2022