

**From:** [reviews](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Alexandra](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Bracknell Forest Boundary Review  
**Date:** 08 September 2020 09:33:00

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 September 2020 12:55  
**To:** reviews <[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)>  
**Subject:** Bracknell Forest Boundary Review

Dear Sir,

I am writing as a member of the public, living in Bracknell, regarding the boundary review that is ongoing. I have a few comments relating to the changes proposed by Bracknell Forrester Borough Council (BFBC), and one or two other proposals.

1) My first concern relates to Quelm Park – the LGBCE proposes merging Quelm Park (QP) with Priestwood and Garth (P&G). QP shares very little identity with P&G. P&G was one of the earliest areas developed in Bracknell New Town, whereas QP was built many years later. P&G has a generally older and more established population, QP has a generally younger population. People in QP tend to look towards the Northern parishes, sending children to Warfield and Whitegrove primary schools and also shopping in Tesco North Bracknell and Binfield. Indeed there are no direct road links between QP and P&G. I would, therefore support the proposal in the BFBC Final Submission (page 5) to merge QP with the Binfield and Warfield parishes. I do not see a problem in splitting QP for electoral balance and QP relates well to both Binfield and Warfield.

2) I understand that there is another proposal for QP involving creating a 3 councillor, predominantly rural ward (Binfield North and Warfield), and an urban (Whitegrove) ward with two councillors. The suggested mechanics are:

*If (Polling District WQ) Quelm were taken from (BP / BG) Priestwood & Garth and given back to Warfield, Priestwood and Garth would need another 723 electors. These could come from the bits of (BE) Bullbrook (the Elms, Lynwood and Priory) which are being proposed as moved to Warfield East. In other words, a swap and the bits that were Warfield stay Warfield and the bits that were Bracknell Town stay that way!*

*If (WP) Warfield Park / (WN) Warfield Park North and (West WQ) Quelm are added into (BA) Binfield and (WM) Warfield St Michael's there are an extra 2,586 electors. This would create a 'rural B3034 corridor' and would warrant 3 councillors. This would be Binfield North and Warfield.*

*This would leave (WG / WE) Whitegrove and (East WQ) Quelm to create a 2 councillor urban ward.*

I would support this variant over the BFBC proposal for QP, but would still support the BFBC proposal should this alternative not be acceptable.

3) Central Bracknell – the LGBCE proposal is for a single councillor. This is a concern as a single councillor ward has the possibility that it can leave a ward unrepresented should the councillor be taken ill or otherwise prevented from carrying out their duties. The BFBC response is that there should not be any single councillor wards and that there should be adjustments to the Central Bracknell wards and the Bullbrook & The Parks wards to give two 2 councillor wards (BFBC response pages 3-4, and page 8) – I support the BFBC proposal for two 2 councillor wards and attendant ward changes.

4) South Hill Park and surroundings – I also support Cllr Mary Temperton's views regarding the redrawing of the boundary for Hanworth (<https://www.bracknellnews.co.uk/news/18699051.south-hill->

[park-lake-caught-bracknell-forest-map-saga/](#)) and agree that whilst the houses identified as 'North Lake' should be included in Hanworth the recreational area should remain in Easthampstead.

