

## Malvern Hills District Council

### Personal Details:

**Name:**

[REDACTED]

**E-mail:**

[REDACTED]

**Postcode:**

[REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:**

### Comment text:

The revised draft of proposed wards is better than V1 in rural areas, with two clear exceptions, but vastly worse in the Malvern urban area. I believe single person wards are preferable for all parties. The electorate has an identifiable local councillor and a councillor has a small enough community to maintain real contact with. That said, some 2-councillor wards appear inevitable, especially in rural areas with few people and multiple parish boundaries. Tenbury and Upton are obvious examples. On the other hand, the proposed Alfrick/ Leigh/ Rushwick and Longdon wards are nonsenses. Each contains widely diverse populations that have little or nothing in common with each other. Longdon should be split into two with the suburban area around Welland and Malvern Wells separated from Longdon and Castlemorton. Rushwick has no links whatsoever with Bransford. If anything, it should be split, with all areas east of the A4440 and north of the A44 incorporated into the city of Worcester. Even then, Rushwick is today suburbia and will become steadily more so over the next decade. By 2030, it will be large enough to justify more than one councillor in its own right. The proposed link to the completely different rural communities across the River Teme – an obvious natural boundary – is plain wrong. In urban Malvern, the V2 proposals fail the basic tests of representation and accountability. Each of the existing 3-person wards in Malvern are notable for the poor representation and attendance records of at least one councillor. Creating four wards in which the electorate's size is little different from a county Division is asking for trouble. In all four wards, it should be possible with a little imagination to create multiple single-person wards that far better represent local interests on the ground. There is nothing that links Pickersleigh with Great Malvern, nor has the area of Cedar/ Willow/ Meadow Roads anything in common with the terraced housing of central Malvern Link, a short, but mentally important distance away across Link Common. The same can be said for the Dysons Perrins area being forced into a shotgun marriage with West Malvern. Please, revisit the proposals again, if necessary by being bold. For example changing from 31 councillors to a number that works better for voters, or consciously having greater variation in electors between rural and urban wards. Whatever the Commission decides, it MUST revisit the proposals for Malvern's urban area and eradicate 3-person wards to avoid voters becoming even more distant from and cynical about the contribution of local councillors.

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded