

Cheshire East

Personal Details:

Name: Mr Arndt Pedersen

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Macclesfield Civic Society (Representative of a local organisation)

Comment text:

Related subject: Macclesfield

LGBCE Boundaries review Cheshire East, Macclesfield

Comments on behalf of Macclesfield Civic Society

The Committee of Macclesfield Civic Society have reviewed the proposals and feel it is important to draw attention to anomalies they perceive in the realignment of boundaries.

Historically Macclesfield has experienced a number of changes in status without significant changes in ward boundaries. On establishment of Cheshire East Council the previous Macclesfield Borough Council was dissolved but its ward boundaries were maintained. The previous Borough encompassed both the urban core of the town and its rural surroundings. The urban growth of the pre and post 39/45 war periods had encroached into the surrounding rural parishes but as the Borough Council was the lowest tier of functional local government the retention of the historical parish boundaries had little direct consequence. On creation of Cheshire East Macclesfield became an unparished area with the Cheshire East unitary authority having jurisdiction over all local government functions. Macclesfield was re-parished in 2011 with Town Council Wards mirroring Cheshire East Council Wards in both geography and representation. Thus in comparison with other near equivalent towns residents of Macclesfield are under represented at the lowest tier of Local Government. This decision may have been seen as a pragmatic decision at the time but on reflection the Civic Society feels that drawing a clearer separation between the two tiers of local government would have been a better option. The ward representation at both CE and TC level incorporate both single and multiple councillor representation. We

believe a clearer distinction between the tiers could be achieved by retaining the current Ward Boundaries at CE level but adopting single representation at TC level with the division of multi councillor wards into new TC wards based on electoral district codes.

As an exceptionally large Parish level council Macclesfield TC has the resources to deliver services that are outside the reach of typical rural parishes but the corollary is that residents lose out on the localism enjoyed by these smaller communities. Perhaps this is most noticeable in the sphere of planning with many of the parishes in Cheshire East having formulated Neighbourhood plans that form an integral part of the national planning framework. The Town Council regard the task of developing a neighbourhood plan for a community of approaching 60,000 as being too large an undertaking but are not supportive of delegation to smaller communities in the town, say based on Ward Boundaries to give expression to residents' wishes to have a formal say in the development of their communities.

Since the last review of local government boundaries Cheshire East has developed, gained approval and adopted its Local Development Plan in which Macclesfield, along with Crewe, is presented as location for significant population growth with areas removed from the surrounding greenbelt as sites for development or as land safeguarded for future development. Thus there has been significant reshaping of the definition of the urban area.

This review presents an opportunity to reflect the new reality by a redefinition of the town's award boundaries. Exploration of perceptions of the distinction between the urban and rural was a key factor in the examination of the plan by the Planning Inspector. For example on Macclesfield's western boundary pre/post war ribbon development stretches along the A537 towards the village of Henbury, the inspector probed views on where Macclesfield ended and Henbury began, the consensus that emerged settled on the Cock public house as appropriate demarcation point. The site allocated to the expansion of Macclesfield's urban area to the north of the A537 appears on the LGBCE as Polling District 4GET within Gawsworth Ward but Macclesfield Town Council. The site is clearly allocated as an extension of the town but allocates it to a rural parish for representation at CE level.

Polling Areas 4GDT and 4CCT are also areas fully or partially allocated as strategic sites for extension of the urban areas that remain assigned to rural the rural parishes of Gawsworth and Sutton for both Cheshire East and Macclesfield Town Council whereas the Local Development plan presents them as an integral element of the Macclesfield Town urban area. Allocating these to Macclesfield Wards would recognise the reality of the town's future boundary and remove the historical inconsistencies arising from earlier incremental extension of the town.

Polling District 4FC1 Higher Hurdsfield Parish is an urban extension of Macclesfield, predominantly Victorian development stretching along the B5470 and '60/70s development in the Roe Wood Lane area, it is essentially a part of Macclesfield separated from the town by the Macclesfield Canal just as sections of Macclesfield East and South wards. There is a significant rural gap between Higher Hurdsfield and Bollington. Amalgamation with Macclesfield for both Cheshire East and Parish matters is a logical proposal.

There are anomalies within existing town ward boundaries, polling district 4AE1 currently forms part of the two member Tytherington ward

although geographically it is separated from the bulk of that Ward by the Bollin River. Significant post census development in the adjacent 4AC1 district and Ward boundary adjustments at the North of Tytherington ward might allow for boundaries more consistent with community identities if representation at TC level were based on single councillor wards.

These observations are presented as the reflections of a group with longstanding interests in the development of the town's physical and community structures. Our motto is “ working for a town to be proud of” , our comments are offered in that spirit.

Macclesfield Civic Society

Attached Documents:

None attached

Cheshire East

Personal Details:

Name: Keith Williams

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Macclesfield Civic Society (Representative of a local organisation)

Comment text:

I have attached comments on the proposed local government boundary changes to the wards for Macclesfield in Cheshire East. They represent the views emerging in a review of the proposals undertaken by the committee of Macclesfield Civic Society.
I trust the points raised will be considered in the post consultation review

Attached Documents:

- lgbce-boundaries-macclesfield-macclesfield-civic-society.docx

LGBCE Boundaries review Cheshire East, Macclesfield

Comments on behalf of Macclesfield Civic Society

The Committee of Macclesfield Civic Society have reviewed the proposals and feel it is important to draw attention to anomalies they perceive in the realignment of boundaries and other broader aspects of the review

Historically Macclesfield has experienced a number of changes in status without significant changes in ward boundaries. On establishment of Cheshire East Council the previous Macclesfield Borough Council was dissolved but its ward boundaries were maintained. The previous Borough encompassed both the urban core of the town and its rural surroundings. The urban growth of the pre and post 39/45 war periods had encroached into the surrounding rural parishes but as the Borough Council was the lowest tier of functional local government the retention of the historical parish boundaries had little direct consequence. On creation of Cheshire East Macclesfield became an unparished area with the Cheshire East unitary authority having jurisdiction over all local government functions. Macclesfield was re-parished in 2011 with Town Council Wards mirroring Cheshire East Council Wards in both geography and representation. Thus in comparison with other near equivalent towns residents of Macclesfield are under represented at the lowest tier of Local Government. This decision may have been seen as a pragmatic decision at the time but on reflection the Civic Society feels that drawing a clearer separation between the two tiers of local government would have been a better option. The ward representation at both CE and TC level incorporate both single and multiple councillor representation. **We believe a clearer distinction between the tiers of local government could be achieved by retaining the current Ward Boundaries at CE level but adopting single representation at TC level with the division of multi councillor wards into new TC wards based on electoral district codes or other community defining boundaries.**

As an exceptionally large Parish level council Macclesfield TC has the resources to deliver services that are outside the reach of typical rural parishes but the corollary is that residents lose out on the localism enjoyed by these smaller communities. Perhaps this is most noticeable in the sphere of planning with the many of the parishes in Cheshire East having formulated Neighbourhood plans that form an integral part of the national planning framework. The Town Council regard the task of developing a neighbourhood plan for a community of approaching 60,000 as being too large an undertaking but are not supportive of delegation to smaller communities in the town, say based on Ward Boundaries, to give expression to residents' wishes to have a formal say in the development of their communities.

Since the last review of local government boundaries Cheshire East has developed, gained approval for and adopted its Local Development Plan in which Macclesfield, along with Crewe, is presented as location for significant population growth with areas removed from the surrounding greenbelt as strategic sites for development or as land safeguarded for future development. Thus there has been a significant reshaping of the definition of the urban area.

This boundary review presents an opportunity to reflect the new reality by a redefinition of the town's ward boundaries. Exploration of perceptions of the distinction between the urban and rural was a key factor in the examination of the plan by the Planning Inspector. For example on Macclesfield's western boundary pre/post war ribbon development stretches along the A537 towards the village of Henbury, the inspector probed views on where Macclesfield ended and Henbury began, the consensus that emerged settled on the Cock public house as appropriate

demarcation point. The site allocated to the expansion of Macclesfield's urban area to the north of the A537 appears on the LGBCE map as Polling District 4GET within Gawsworth Ward for Cheshire East representation but Macclesfield Parish for Town Council. The site is clearly allocated as an extension of the town but allocates it to a rural parish for representation at CE level. This is clearly an anomaly that should be corrected.

Polling Areas 4GDT and 4CCT are also areas fully or partially allocated as strategic sites for extension of the urban areas that remain assigned to the rural parishes of Gawsworth and Sutton for both Cheshire East and Parish level whereas the Local Development plan presents them as an integral element of the Macclesfield Town urban area. Allocating these to Macclesfield Wards would recognise the reality of the town's future boundary and remove the historical inconsistencies arising from earlier incremental extension of the town.

Polling District 4FC1 Higher Hurdsfield Parish is an urban extension of Macclesfield, predominantly Victorian development stretching along the B5470 and '60/70s development in the Roe Wood Lane area, it is essentially a part of Macclesfield separated from the town by the Macclesfield Canal just as sections of Macclesfield East and South wards. There is a significant rural gap between the more densely populated areas of Higher Hurdsfield and Bollington. Amalgamation with Macclesfield for both Cheshire East and Parish matters is a logical proposal.

There are anomalies within existing town ward boundaries, polling district 4AE1 currently forms part of the two member Tytherington ward although geographically it is separated from the bulk of that Ward by the Bollin River. Significant post census development in the adjacent 4AC1 district and Ward boundary adjustments at the North of Tytherington ward might allow for boundaries more consistent with community identities if representation at TC level were based on single councillor wards. The River Bollin would provide a clear boundary between a Tytherington only ward to the north and east of the river and a new ward focussed on Westminster Road and Beech Lane to the south and west.

These observations are presented as the reflections of a group with longstanding interests in the development of the town's physical and community structures. Our motto is " working for a town to be proud of" , our comments are offered in that spirit.

Submitted by

Keith Williams (Acting Chair, Macclesfield Civic Society)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]