

Fareham Borough Council

Personal Details:

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

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Dear Sir/Madam I write with regard to your draft recommendations for new ward boundaries for Fareham Borough Council, and in particular to how your proposals impact upon my own neighbourhood. I shall begin by stating that I understand the desire to create wards that serve broadly similar population numbers, and appreciate this is no easy task. However, I firmly believe that such changes should not be contrived to the point that new boundaries leave a group of residents isolated from the community that surrounds them, or representation from ward councillors and decisions that materially affect them. But this is clearly the case with respect to residents of circa 76 properties that you propose to include in the new Titchfield Common ward rather than the Locks Heath ward. The properties I refer to are those on the South side of Church Road, Locks Heath, between its junctions with Locks Road (to the West) and St John's Road (to the East), together with those in The Chimes, Woodpecker Copse, Kingfisher Copse, Nightingale Mews, and on the West side of St John's Road between its junctions with Church Road and Woodpecker Copse. This group of properties is physically separated from the bulk of the proposed new ward to which you have attached them - by the green spaces of St John's Park, St John's Road Cemetery and the adjacent wooded copse - and my fear is that they will be 'outliers' of little relevance to ward representatives. Furthermore, this 'finger' of outliers is far more likely to be affected by decisions that will be the concern of ward councillors representing the proposed new Locks Heath and Park Gate wards, than Titchfield Common. Indeed, your proposal seems to contradict your own arguments for the opposite side of Church Road (in paragraph 70), opposing FBC's proposal that the boundary should run to the rear of properties on the north side of Church Road (rather than the centre thereof), as "we consider that this amendment to the Council's proposals will provide for a clearer and more identifiable boundary." And yet, you have proposed exactly the opposite of this with regard to the South side of this section of Church Road. I have attached a marked copy of your proposed map, showing a blue line following the path/stream that you propose as the boundary to the rear of properties in St Tristan Close, The Vale, etc. on to its junction with Woodpecker Copse and then to the junction of St John's Road and Church Road. My proposed amendment would then include those 76 properties to the North and West of that blue line in the Locks Heath ward. I hope you will agree that this is a sensible amendment that, for only a marginal change in numbers, not merely provides a much more acceptable boundary by removing the concerns I have outlined above, but rectifies the contradiction in your own reasoning. [REDACTED]

Uploaded Documents:

[Download \(https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1667924938 Westbrook+Proposal.png\)](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1667924938%20Westbrook+Proposal.png)

