

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

To: [REDACTED] reviews

Subject: Lancaster City Council further draft recommendations

Categories: [REDACTED]

Dear LGBCE,

Please find below a submission to the above review from two local residents.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

-

We are very pleased to see these further draft recommendations. The decisions to maintain a University ward and to create a Bowerham ward, following the suggestion made by ourselves and the local Labour Party, are very welcome.

As displayed in the overwhelming evidence provided following the initial draft recommendations, the university site and its surroundings have unique requirements, and boundaries in this area have particularly significant effects. While the electoral variance is not ideal, the idea to have a ward solely composed of the Lancaster University campus, with Scotforth Rural moved to the similarly rural Ellet and Scotforth East represented separately, is without doubt the correct one to balance the needs of local communities.

As residents of Bowerham, we are grateful for the addition of a dedicated ward for this cohesive community, which was previously divided across three wards, with John O'Gaunt in particular having little in common across its various parts. Bowerham ward will help local people connect to politics and ensure the needs of the area are represented holistically, and will address other issues such as keeping the users of Barton Road Community Centre and Palatine Recreation Ground together in Scotforth East, as raised in some of the other submissions.

The only minor downside to these proposals is that John O'Gaunt ward remains a slightly odd conception that covers very different communities, divided by a large park, only traversable around its very edges. The ideal solution would have been a ward that covers the new build estates on the eastern part of both Bulk and John O'Gaunt (Nightingale Hall Road and eastwards), which we believe has been suggested by others. These areas have far more in common with each other than with the rest of their respective wards - they are largely made up of relatively expensive, car-dependent new build family housing on the outskirts of town, heavily contrasting with the Ridge council estate in Bulk, for example, or the student-dominated terraces of Primrose and Moorlands - and use common facilities such as the Co-op shop on Quernmore Road. However they have limited representation because (until very recently) their councillors have all lived in the urban core of Lancaster, and they are seen to be minor attachments to large wards with existing needs.

A single member ward to the east of Lancaster would, for example, allow Freehold to join the existing 2 member John O'Gaunt ward, and the rest of Bulk to continue as a 2 member ward. We appreciate, however, the issues with electoral variance this poses. These could be mitigated somewhat by including the Pottery Gardens estate in the single member ward, which is a self-contained community served by the farm shop and other facilities at Lancaster Leisure Park (which is also used by many people in the developments east of Lancaster), particularly noting that the area in between, either side of Grab Lane, is set to be filled by housing in the coming years.

Even if the above is not possible, the further draft proposals are a highly positive solution and they balance the views expressed in the submissions well.

