

Worcestershire

Personal Details:

Name: Liam Carroll

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Wyre Forest Constituency Labour Party (Representative of a local organisation)

Comment text:

To whom it may concern,

We, as a local Constituency Labour Party, have considered the latest proposals by the Local Government Boundary Commission at length and our comments are below. We have commented on the proposals for Kidderminster and Stourport but not for those relating to Bewdley.

Kidderminster

We understand that there is a proposal to change the current wards from 6 each represented by 3 councillors to 10 with varying numbers of councillors. This seems to us to be an unnecessary and complicated change which would confuse the voters.

The current situation is that the Kidderminster Town Council wards are that same as those for the District Council, so the voters know which ward they are in and who to contact if there is a problem. It is an arrangement which works reasonably well.

The proposed changes fly in the face of common sense – if it is not broke don't try to fix it.

we ask that the commission does not implement the proposals and leaves things as they are.

Stourport

We understand that the Commission is seeking to ensure that each County division serves a similar number of electors. However, achieving this aim means that there is a likelihood that it will fail in another aim; that of adhering to already established District Ward boundaries.

This is the case in respect of Stourport where it is proposed to divide the Lickhill District in half in order to create two new County Divisions. On

balance we accept that this may be necessary, if potentially confusing, outcome. Therefore, we concur with the proposal to have two County Divisions each with one councillor.

Regarding the name of each Division, we would suggest that you revert to the previous names used prior to the last boundary review: Mitton Division and Severn Division.

Stourport on Severn Town Council

Whilst we accept need to divide Lickhill Ward for County Council elections we do not see that this is necessary for Town Council purposes. Electors, who have faced changes to District Ward boundaries alongside constantly changing voting venues, find it very confusing and frustrating. We recommend that Lickhill Parish Ward should remain coterminous with the District Boundary. However, as it is the smallest Ward, we do not object to a reduction in number of councillors to 2.

Regarding Areley Kings East and Areley Kings West, we do not understand why you propose to reduce the number of councillors representing AKE and giving an extra one to AKW. It feels a lot like political engineering/gerrymandering! The voters in AKE have already lost the ability to cast their vote within the Ward boundaries making it more difficult to participate in the democratic process. AKE is also the more deprived Ward which produces considerably more work for local councillors.

If you deem it necessary to increase the number of Ward councillors in AKW this could be done by reallocating the 1 seat from Lickhill Ward rather than increasing North Ward to 5 councillors. We oppose the reduction of the number of councillors to 2 in Areley Kings East Parish Ward.

As a political Party we have had to cope with many changes to the electoral arrangements in Stourport. When District and Town Councils have elections on the same day it is very confusing if the wards are not coterminous. It makes it more difficult to manage when trying to keep in touch with electors via direct mailing or knocking on doors when face with such complexities.

Surely if our aim is to get more people engaged with the democratic process, we want it to be as simple and straightforward as possible?

Thank you for taking the time to consider our comments on the latest proposals. We are happy to answer any queries you may have from this letter by emailing us at labourwyreforest@gmail.com

Yours Sincerely,
Wyre Forest Constituency Labour Party

Attached Documents:

None attached