Liverpool City Council

Personal Details:

Name: Kim Johnson

E-mail: kim.johnson.mp@parliament.uk

Postcode: L8 1TH

Organisation Name: Member of Parliament

Comment text:

I am writing to support the proposal to make Dingle North and Dingle South a single ward, with two councillors. The proposed dividing line of Park Street between proposed Dingle North and Dingle South is an arbitrary one that takes no account of the current and historic community identify of Dingle. The community has long been identified as a single community, being a catchment area for local schools, sharing community organisations along the length of Mill Street and having a single GP surgery. My experience of community resilience during the pandemic has shown organisations like The Florrie, Riverview Development Trust, South Liverpool Community Transport, Wheel Meet Again and churches such as St Gabriel's and St Cleopas working collaboratively across the whole of Dingle, both sides of the proposed new ward divide. That community cohesion made a significant impact on ensuring the well-being of Dingle residents and I fear this may be damaged by the unnatural divide into two distinct communities that the proposals may create. This Dingle community is one of the more deprived areas of my constituency of Liverpool Riverside, and they are in need of consistent and continued access to councillor support. Having two councillors to be able to share the workload, covering for holidays and sicknesses, will significantly benefit – and reassure – Dingle constituents. As the LGBCE themselves suggest, by 2027, the two Dingle wards combined will meet a 0% variance in the constituent numbers being proposed and, as such, I would argue that combining Dingle North and Dingle South into one two-person ward will not compromise the ward number calculations but will indeed benefit a long-identified community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Liverpool City Council

Personal Details:

Name: Kim Johnson

E-mail: kim.johnson.mp@parliament.uk

Postcode: L8 1TH

Organisation Name: Member of Parliament

Comment text:

I would like to propose merging City Centre South and Ropewalks into a new three-member ward, City Centre South. My objection to a single-member Ropewalks ward is that it would not accurately reflect community identities and not provide effective and convenient local government. Ropewalks is a widely recognised community within the south end of the City Centre. It is recognised as such in the Liverpool Local Plan as a distinct character areas and is covered by its own planning policy (CC15). It includes residential areas like south of Duke Street, like Campbell Street, Argyle Street, Henry Street, York Street, Madison Square and Tradewind Square and residential areas in Chinatown like Cornwallis Street, Bailey Street, Grenwille Street South, Nelson Street and Hardy Street. None of these areas, though integral parts of Ropewalks, are included within the proposed Ropewalks ward in the draft recommendations. Conversely, areas north of Wood Street with significant numbers of residents, like Bold Street, Oldham Street, Benson Street and Mount Pleasant are included within the proposed Ropewalks ward. This does not reflect natural communities. This is illustrated on the map attached. I believe that the community of interest of those living in the proposed Ropewalks ward would be better reflected as part of an expanded three-member City Centre South ward. This would include existing community ties like local schools (such as LIPA Primary School and St Vincent de Paul Catholic Primary School), shops, including supermarkets, open spaces and other local amenities.

Uploaded Documents:

Download (https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1653824328_City+Centre+South.Ropewalks.jpg)

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2027)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Draft recommendations							
City Centre South	2	3,542	1,771	-54%	8,457	4,229	-2%
Ropewalks	1	1,484	1,484	-61%	4,707	4,707	9%
Counter proposal							
City Centre South	3	5,026	1,675	-56%	13,164	4,388	2%

Key

Ropewalks ward – draft recommendations

Area covered by Ropewalks Policy CC15 Liverpool Local Plan