

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2022 16:34
To: reviews
Subject: Review of Boundaries which will affect where we live

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sunday 31st July 2022

The Boundary Commission
Derby City Council

Dear Sir/Madam

We have been made aware of the proposed changes to the boundaries in our area (Alvaston) and wish to make our objections to these proposals known.

We are very well represented by our local councillors. We have lived in Alvaston for many years and been very comfortable being part of the Alvaston Ward. We really object to this ward being changed over to being Crewton, Wilmorton and Osmaston.

The Area from Harvey Road and up to Ascot Drive is known and has always been referred to locally as Alvaston. To change this to Wilmorton seems to be an unnecessary change and a change for changes sake. It will tend to divide rather than bring the community together. In the same vein, the area being referred to as "Crewton" is simply viewed by the locals and Royal Mail as Alvaston as well! A change to the ward in the way proposed will bring confusion to an area that has been settled for a long time. No one locally refers to this area being called "Crewton" (or for that matter the area being proposed to be called "Alvaston Village" even a cursory poll taken locally would be sufficient to establish this fact.

The area currently north at the north part of Alvaston, including Pride Parkway, Derwent Parade, etc, are largely factory estates and have very little housing.

In the report (paragraph 45) say a resident considers that the ward was geographically large. As stated above, a large part of the ward is a very large business park and has mostly industrial buildings; Derby County Football Ground; Derby Velodrome; factory units and shopping zones (including Costco, Sainsburys, and Halfords, etc.). In effect, this very large geographical part of the ward. could easily be part of ANY Ward. And this would not make any material difference to the numbers of electors as part of the percentage calculations of Number of councillors vs the electorate.

These facts, will not easily be noticed by a boundary commission if it doesn't know the local area well. The way that the proposed changes (proposed by the Labour party) are laid out, doesn't give the correct impression to a commission, largely (with one visit excepted), naïve in the local area.

The arguments proposed by the "labour plan" citing "Wilmorton area is much closer to the town centre and disconnected by the canal path" has as much argument as saying that the industrial areas of the current Alvaston Ward are disconnected from the electorate because they are mostly all industrial areas!

Indeed, the area to the west of Ascot Drive, the roundabout (centred by, and called Wilmorton on the map), London road running to the west and Pride Parkway are almost all exclusively industrial areas. In fact, the argument that the canal split Wilmorton from Alvaston, is, and can be countered by the industrial units separate Wilmorton from the town centre.

Regarding the area north of Osmaston Park Road, this is (culturally) more in keeping with Sinfin than "Wilmorton" and "Crewton" and therefore the comment made by the Labour scheme that (Osmaston) "did not associate with Sinfin at all" ludicrous, as if what they say is correct, that people who live in Osmaston work at Alstom and Rolls Royce, then those employers are based more in Sinfin than Alvaston!

These proposals, and the explanations given with them, seem to be clutching at straws and are seemingly wanting to change the boundaries for changes sake, or, given the cultural communities and the demographic makeup, are wanting to split up previously settled communities and make fundamental changes to their settled wards.

Given that we are told that there was broad agreement from all the parties to make very little change to the make-up of the wards, then we fail to see what the Labour proposals will achieve other than to favour the labour vote and give the labour party a greater chance of returning labour councillors in these Wards. This seems to be to be a highly partisan manoeuvre by the labour party at the expense of rival political candidates and this seems to us to be entirely unacceptable.

We would encourage the Boundary Commission to revert back to the council proposal, as was broadly agreed before by many of the parties in a non-partisan proposal, and keep the status quo

Yours faithfully

