

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2021 12:08
To: reviews
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Trafford ward boundary consultation
Attachments: Trafford ward boundary review Green Party 190821.docx
Categories: Submissions [REDACTED]

Dear Boundary Commission

I am attaching a submission to the consultation on ward boundaries for Trafford Borough, on behalf of Trafford Green Party.

My profound apologies for the lateness of this submission, for which we take full responsibility; should that mean that it cannot now be used then we accept that.

Your sincerely

Brian Candeland, Chair, Trafford Green Party

Geraldine Coggins, Leader, Green Group, Trafford Borough Council.

--

This email has been checked for viruses by AVG.
<https://www.avg.com>

The ward proposals from TMBC are, in our opinion, broadly sensible and appropriate.

We outline here some specific criticisms, observations and suggestions for alterations.

We have not sought to give exact demographic numbers for these suggestions, but ask that the commission give the reasoning and the suggestions serious consideration alongside the council's proposals.

One particular focus has been that we consider the railway/Metrolink lines in the borough, and the Bridgewater Canal, to be more significant natural boundaries than arterial roads. These have fewer crossing points and it is less likely that the nature of these boundaries will be altered in future.

NORTH

1.

The proposed **Gorse Hill and Park** ward broadly makes sense, bringing new developments along the ship canal together. The one issue that we highlight is the area around Trafford Park railway station.

The Bridgewater Canal forms a strong natural boundary when it runs north-westerly from the A56 to the junction with its Stretford & Leigh branch. This is perceived locally as the border between Gorse Hill north-east and Stretford to the south-west. Inclusion into **Gorse Hill and Park** of the area around Trafford Park station, therefore, is not ideal.

We suggest that this area be included in **Stretford and Humphrey Park** ward instead. This would have the benefit of slightly reducing the comparatively large variance of the proposed **Gorse Hill and Park** ward.

2.

The proposed boundary between **Stretford and Humphrey Park** and **Lostock** includes an awkward divide of the area to the south of the Liverpool to Manchester railway line. Our suggestion is that the railway line forms a much more significant natural boundary than roads such as Bradfield Road, and that the full area to the south of the railway (bounded by the motorway, Bradfield Road, Lyndhurst Road and Park Road) should be placed in **Stretford and Humphrey Park**.

If this is not possible due to variance of **Stretford and Humphrey Park**, the less preferable suggestion is that Bradfield Road be used as the boundary and the whole of the area in question be placed in **Lostock** (with obvious consequences for ward names, Humphrey Park station being fully within **Lostock**).

3.

We regard the suggested **Urmston, Flixton** and **Davyhulme** wards to be sensible.

4.

We consider Option A, **Carrington and Partington**, to be preferable to Option B, **Bucklow St Martin's**.

The inclusion of the St Martin's portion of the Ashton-on-Mersey to create the existing Bucklow St Martin's ward was a less-than-ideal compromise in a previous boundary review, and we welcome the opportunity to reverse it.

Our suggestion is that the parishes of Warburton and Dunham be moved from **Bowdon** into this ward. These two communities do not have particularly strong connections to the Bowdon area, with Warburton in particular mostly looking out-of-borough for local services and amenities.

All four of these communities have the same challenges due to being remote (in comparison to the rest of the borough), such as skeletal public transport provision and car-dependency.

This would also reduce the variance of the new ward slightly.

The name of this suggested ward would need amending.

CENTRAL

5.

Our main observation with these proposals is that, as with the existing wards in this part of the borough, the A56 is used as a natural boundary throughout. Our suggestion is that the Bridgewater Canal should be favoured as a natural north-south boundary.

The canal has very few crossing points for any kind of traffic or movement, with no new ones likely to be constructed in the near future. The A56, however, has more existing crossing points, and there is a focus at the GMCA level to tackle severance points created by major signal-controlled junctions, reducing the 'boundary' nature of the road.

It is our view, therefore, that wards which span the A56 will give greater ownership to ward members of issues such as these.

We do not have specific suggestions, but we ask the commission to consider revising the council's proposals for this part of the borough, with the starting-point of the canal as the dominant natural boundary. It may be that it is impossible to have three wards on one side and two on the other within acceptable variances, in which case we would suggest that the point at which the boundary deviates away from the canal should be around Sale town centre.

SOUTH

6.

We note that the suggested **Timperley North** and **Timperley South** wards use the railway line as a natural boundary. We approve of this approach where possible: railway lines (as with canals, see above) being among the most permanent and impermeable of natural boundaries.

7.

To this end, we suggest that (if possible within variances) the boundary should continue to follow the disused railway alignment from Skelton Junction to the bridge across the Bridgewater Canal at Canal Road.

Note that this alignment, the route which ran via West Timperley and Partington stations and crossing the ship canal to reach Glazebrook, is disused but not formally closed. Its presence as a natural boundary, regarding the construction of new crossing-points etc., is as significant as for a live railway line.

8.

Due to the above, we note that in the council's description of its proposals for **Broadheath**, this railway line as 'now open space', whereas it is legally an open railway line.

9.

The suggested boundaries for **Hale Barns** include an expanded area to the north of the green belt area and Timperley Brook. We regard this as less than ideal, being part of a wider community towards Timperley with little association with Hale Barns itself.

If possible, we would suggest that this be avoided, by reallocating from **Hale** the area around the western part of Grove Lane, bounded by Bancroft Road, Westminster Road, Hale Road and Delahays Road.

However, we acknowledge that variances are tight in this part of the proposals and that this may not be possible.

10.

The suggestion that Warburton and Dunham parishes be moved from **Bowdon** to **Carrington and Partington** has been mentioned earlier.

11.

The proposals placing Urban Drive and Urban Avenue into **Hale** divide a cohesive community around Urban Road and including St James' Court. We suggest that this boundary instead continue along Moss Lane to Welman Way, retaining all of the Urban streets in **Altrincham**, and then north towards King George V Pool.