

Malvern Hills District Council

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Whatley

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Malvern Hills District Council Independent & Green Councillors

Comment text:

Attached are proposals (a zipped file containing a detailed document, plus two maps) agreed by the Independent and Green councillors on Malvern Hills District Council. We believe that these match the objectives and constraints laid down by the Boundary Commission at their initial meetings with MHDC, conform to known elector preferences and provide an equitable and logical basis on which to proceed.

Uploaded Documents:

[Download \(https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1629364714_MHDC+Independent+%26+Green+Councillors+submission.zip\)](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1629364714_MHDC+Independent+%26+Green+Councillors+submission.zip)

Malvern Hills District Council – Boundary Commission Review 2021

Independent Councillors' Submission

Introduction & Principles

We are pleased to submit our proposals for re-ordering MHDC's wards. The following core principles have been used:

- A distinction is maintained between Malvern's urban wards and the rural wards, with one exception (Newland)
- Major rivers (Severn & Teme) form ward boundaries, except where there is a road bridge
- Parishes are not split between new wards, though one might be considered (Knightwick)
- Two member wards have been preferred as a standard across the District

These principles have been used to create 17 wards, 6 in Malvern Town (as now) and 11 in the rural parts of MHDC. The number of councillors splits 12 to Malvern Town and 19 to rural wards, very closely aligned to the split of electors between the two, as projected for 2027. The exact split would be 11.98 against 19.02, assuming Newland is deemed part of the Malvern Town area.

Any questions about this submission should be directed to Councillor Peter Whatley using the contact details available on MHDC's website.

Malvern Town area

We propose that six wards are maintained, each with two ward councillors. Other than the Malvern Hills themselves, there are no obvious boundary markers within the urban area. The railway line is currently used in part as a boundary, but it is a highly permeable barrier for most of its length.

Newland rural parish is proposed for incorporation into Malvern's urban area. This reflects both difficulty in placing it in a nearby rural area without causing an imbalance and the known proposals for extensive development in the parish that will, inevitably, cause it to become physically and logically part of the urban area.

For Malvern's urban area, the following changes are proposed:

<u>Ward Name</u>	<u>Changes</u>
Chase 2 councillors 4736 electors +5% variance	Yields properties to Priory Ward on: Avenue Road between current boundary and Barnards Green roundabout Beacon Grange (all) Cameron Close (all) Chestnut Court (all) Christ Church Road (all) Clarence Close (all) Court Gardens (all) Court Road (from No.7 to junction with St Andrews/ Thirlstaine Roads) Fraser Close (all) Manby Road (all) Percy Walton Close (all) Spencer Drive (all) St Andrews Close (all) St Andrews Road (No.1 to No 50/50a/50b)

	<p>Thorngrove Road (all)</p> <p>Woodshears Road (between current boundary and Court Road)</p>
<p>Dyson Perrins</p> <p>2 councillors</p> <p>4326 electors</p> <p>-4% variance</p>	<p>Gains properties from Link Ward as described below</p>
<p>Link</p> <p>2 councillors</p> <p>4736 electors</p> <p>+5% variance</p>	<p>Gains Newland parish from Powick</p> <p>Yields properties as follows:</p> <p>Dyson Perrins Ward:</p> <p>Albert Park Road (all between Somers Park Avenue and Queen's Road/ Quest Hills Road)</p> <p>Church Road (all west of railway line)</p> <p>Frederick Road (all)</p> <p>Howsell Road (Nos 40-56 & 39(exc)-61)</p> <p>Lower Quest Hills Road (all)</p> <p>Quest Hills Road (all)</p> <p>Priory:</p> <p>62/64 Moorlands Road. These properties are an electoral oddity, currently isolated from the rest of the road by the electoral boundary along the railway line.</p> <p>West:</p> <p>Alexandra Lane (all)</p> <p>Alexandra Mews (all)</p> <p>Alexandra Road (all)</p> <p>Albert Park Road (from Worcester Road to junction with Queen's Road/ Quest Hills Road)</p> <p>Albert Park Mews (all)</p> <p>Carlton Road (all)</p> <p>Highfield Road (No.1 only)</p> <p>Jenny Lind Grove (all)</p> <p>Laburnum Walk (all)</p> <p>Worcester Road (Nos 101-Morgan Court)</p>
<p>Pickersleigh</p> <p>2 councillors</p> <p>4798 electors</p> <p>+6% variance</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Priory</p> <p>2 councillors</p> <p>4280 electors</p> <p>-5% variance</p>	<p>Gains properties from Chase Ward as described above, plus</p> <p>62/64 Moorlands Road from Link Ward as above</p>
<p>West</p> <p>2 councillors</p> <p>4166 electors</p> <p>-8% variance</p>	<p>Gains properties from Link Ward as described above</p>

Rural Wards

We propose 11 wards as tabled below. A more detailed description of the new wards and underlying logic in their creation follows the table:

Name of Ward	Cllrs	Electorate 2027	Variance 2027	Parish/ Town Council(s)
Baldwin	1	2195	-3%	Astley; Holt; Shrawley; Little Witley
Broadheath & Hallow	2	4447	-1%	Broadwas & Cotheridge; Grimley; Hallow; Lower Broadheath
Kempsey	2	4751	5%	Kempsey; Severn Stoke & Croome D'Abitot
Leigh & Rushwick	2	4780	6%	Alfrick & Lulsley; Leigh & Bransford; Rushwick; Suckley
Lindridge	1	2259	0%	Bayton; Knighton-on-Teme; Lindridge; Mamble; Pensax; Stockton-on-Teme
Longdon	1	2096	-7%	Berrow; Birtsmorton; Bushley; Eldersfield; Longdon, Queenhill & Holdfast; Pendock
Martley & Teme Valley	2	4647	3%	Abberley; Clifton-Upon-Teme; Great Witley & Hillhampton; Kenswick & Wichenford; Knightwick & Doddenham (but see Exceptional Case section below); Lower Sapey; Martley; The Shelsleys
Powick & Hanley	2	4719	5%	Guarlford; Hanley Castle; Madresfield; Powick
Tenbury	2	4182	-7%	Eastham; Hanley; Rochford; Stanford with Orleton; Stoke Bliss, Kyre & Bockleton; Tenbury
Upton & Ripple	2	4306	-5%	Earls Croome; Hill Croome; Ripple; Ripple (HG); Upton upon Severn
Wells & Morton	2	4520	0%	Castlemorton; Malvern Wells; Welland

- Baldwin – the current ward plus Little Witley
- Broadheath & Hallow – existing Broadheath and Hallow wards combined, minus Rushwick.
- Kempsey – unchanged
- Leigh & Rushwick – The current Alfrick & Leigh ward, minus Knightwick & Doddenham parish, but plus Rushwick. The current ward is cross-Teme at Knightwick bridge: the proposed one at Bransford bridge. The new ward would better reflect the main local travel corridor for both car traffic and the limited bus service within the ward.
- Lindridge – the current ward, plus Pensax parish, the Teme forming the southern boundary
- Longdon – the current ward, plus Birtsmorton parish
- Martley & Teme Valley – Formed from the existing Martley ward, plus a majority of Woodbury ward and the eastern half of Teme Valley ward. The combined parish of Knightwick and Doddenham is also included from the current Alfrick & Leigh ward. Doddenham is a good fit, being north of the River Teme and resolving a complex ward

boundary that today splits the community at the summit of Ankerdine Hill. Knightwick is a debatable fit as outlined under the Exceptional Cases section. Although the new ward has a large geographic extent, the electorate is concentrated in a more limited area and the ward shape reflects main traffic arteries. There are two bridges across the Teme, connecting Martley directly to parishes south of the river.

- Powick & Hanley – the existing Powick ward, plus Hanley Castle parish, but minus Newland parish
- Tenbury – the existing ward, plus the western half of today's Teme Valley ward, the Teme forming the northern boundary.
- Upton & Ripple – the current Ripple ward, linked to the urban part of Upton-upon-Severn, a major crossing point of the Severn. There is an obvious linkage between communities either side of the Severn, with all major shopping and commercial facilities in Upton.
- Wells & Morton – the current Wells and Morton wards combined, but minus Birtsmorton.

Exceptional Case

Knightwick may be considered a potential exception to the core principles described.

Knightwick lies south of the River Teme and has a small population (2027 = 93 or 29% of the combined parish of Knightwick & Doddenham) that mainly lives close to the boundary with Suckley. The parish is considered by local councillors to be more closely aligned with Suckley for most purposes (shopping, worship, schooling) than parishes north of the Teme. Were Knightwick to form part of the new Leigh & Rushwick ward, that ward and the proposed Martley & Teme Valley ward would have the following characteristics:

Name of Ward	Cllrs	Electorate 2027	Variance 2027
Martley & Teme Valley (without Knightwick)	2	4554	1%
Leigh & Rushwick (with Knightwick)	2	4873	8%



