



To the Local Government Boundary Commission for England
RE: Liverpool Liberal Democrat submission to the Liverpool City Boundary review

Wednesday 8th June 2022

Dear Sirs,

Please find attached our response to the draft recommendations for Liverpool City Council. This Liberal Democrat submission is made on behalf of both the Liverpool Council Group and the Local Party, which are two separate organisations.

The following pages contain an introduction outlining our ongoing concerns with both the baseline data that has been used to produce these wards, and the projected electoral figures for 2027.

The second part contains our response to each of the proposed wards, and how they can be improved to better reflect the communities they intend to serve.

We would be pleased to answer any questions that you might have to assist with your understanding of these issues.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr Richard Kemp CBE
Leader
Liverpool Liberal Democrats

Rob McCallister-Bell
Chair
Liverpool Liberal Democrats

Liverpool Liberal Democrats – response to Local Government Boundary Review

Technical considerations

We are concerned that the proposed boundaries create a significant disparity between the suburban neighbourhoods, particularly in the south of the city which will be under-represented and the city centre / inner core wards which will be over represented.

Many of the proposed city centre and surrounding wards are being justified by dubious electoral forecasts that are highly optimistic, and based on speculative apartment developments. Many of these are unlikely to come to fruition, particularly as a result of the large number of high profile failed city centre investment schemes, some of which are subject to criminal investigations.

In many cases the current “estimated electorate” which Liverpool City Council used as the baseline for their projections are unrealistically out of sync with the numbers actually present on the electoral register.

As evidenced in our previous submission, we are highly dubious about the quality of the data supplied by Liverpool City Council, and how it was calculated. This makes assumptions of significant population decline in stable suburban owner-occupied housing areas, which are somehow expected to lose up to 13% of their electorate by 2027

We note from the commission’s draft report that they also identified inaccuracies in the council’s figures. As the table below shows, several wards that the council believed were within electoral tolerance were found to be significantly incorrect.

Ward	Liverpool City Council projection	LGBCE projection
Walton on the Hill	-10%	-16%
Everton West	-10%	-14%
Orrell Park	-9%	-11%
Walton Hall	+10%	+17%
Walton Vale	-10%	-17%
Tuebrook Edinburgh Park	+7%	+11%

We are grateful that the commission has corrected these miscalculations, but it adds weight to our believe that the baseline projections for 2027 are inaccurate.

Overall, we found the council’s work on this review to be rushed, which was not Liverpool City Council’s fault, but it was also significantly under-resourced and given a low priority by

the authority's senior officers. No dedicated staffing was allocated to this task, and it was left to a member of Committee Services staff to compile and write the city's submission in addition to his full time duties.

The supply of poor quality data from Liverpool City Council made it extremely challenging to draw up counter proposals.

For example, Liverpool City Council estimated that the Central Ward polling district CEB would have 2,261 electors in 2020. The actual register shows 1,120 electors.

Polling district CEE is estimated by the council to have 2,638 electors. The actual figure is 853.

At the other end of the scale, Greenbank Polling District GRF has been estimated to currently have 390 electors, whereas the actual register shows 819. That is a 110% variance.

Whilst these are extreme examples, the general trend within the council's data appears to overestimate the current and future populations of wards in and around the city centre, to the disadvantage of suburban wards.

We suspect it is unlikely at this stage of the process that the commission will be willing to reassess the quality of the data which this review is based on. However, we wish to again place on record our concerns, and our belief that that the city centre will remain severely over-represented with councillors in 2027, and for many years afterwards, while suburban areas will be under-represented.

Apart from creating a disparity in the workload of councillors in different parts of the city, this is also likely to unfairly impact the political balance of the authority.

Liverpool Liberal Democrat response to the draft boundary proposals for Liverpool City Council

Ward 1. Aigburth

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However, having heard evidence from Sudley Area Residents' Association (SARA), we would support their strong argument for merging Aigburth and Mossley Hill wards to create a two member ward.

SARA has a significant presence within the current Mossley Hill Ward, having been established in 1977 and registered as a charity in 1979 as a focus for the Aigburth area.

This would address the issue of the part of the Aigburth community that have been included within Mossley Hill Ward to minimise the electoral variance. These are the areas between Elmswood Road and Rosemont Road, and the area between North Sudley Road and Aigburth Road.

We would suggest calling the new ward Aigburth and Mossley Hill.

Ward 2. Aintree

We support the commission's proposal for this ward, however we feel that the proposed name does not adequately describe it and is guaranteed to result in confusion with Aintree in the borough of Sefton.

We assume that this name was chosen due to the prominence of Aintree Hospital within this ward, however residents of this community would consider themselves to be living in Fazakerley. Indeed, it should be noted that this hospital site was actually called Fazakerley Hospital until its merger with Aintree Hospital in 1999. To this day it is still widely referred to as such.

To add to confusion, ward 26 Fazakerley West sits adjacent to both Aintree Racecourse and Aintree Railway Station. A modern housing estate in the middle of ward 26 also sits on the site of the former Aintree Racecourse Railway Station. We do not advocate that ward 26 should be called Aintree, however it would have a more valid claim to this title than ward 2.

We suggest that Fazakerley South would be a more appropriate name for this ward.

Ward 3. Anfield

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 4. Arundel

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However, on reflection we feel that this could be further improved by incorporating Grove Park and Croxteth Grove from Princes Park Ward.

This would create a simple and easily recognisable boundary of Smithdown Road, Lodge Lane, Croxteth Road and Ullet Road.

We further note that the electoral variances show Arundel as -10% and Princes Park as +19%. This transfer would assist in redressing this electoral imbalance.

Ward 5. Belle Vale

We remain of the view that Belle Vale and Netherley are two distinct communities. Indeed, each of these communities were in their own 3 member wards until 2004 (Netherley Ward and Valley Ward).

Netherley itself comprises of 3 sub-communities, Netherley, Lee Park and Woodlands. Their isolation from the rest of the city frequently fosters a belief that they are forgotten about, and this has been exacerbated by being subsumed within Belle Vale since 2004.

Retaining Netherley as a separate ward would go some way towards protecting their identity and ensuring that their concerns are not overlooked.

Ward 6. Broadgreen

We agree that commission's proposals for this ward define a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 7. Brownlow Hill

We agree that commission's proposals for this ward define a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We are however seriously concerned at the undersized electorate for this ward with 2,026 electors. We feel that the forecast electorate increase to 8,034 is highly optimistic, and based on speculative apartment and student developments, many of which are unlikely to come to fruition.

Brownlow Hill should be a single member ward.

Ward 8. Calderstones

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We would however suggest minor alterations to include properties at 4-18 Calderstones Road, Calder Lodge and Harthill Lodge within the same ward.

We would not be opposed to the commission's suggestion that this ward could be merged with Ward 37. Menlove Ward, to form a two-member ward. If this option is selected, we would suggest that this ward should be called Calderstones Ward.

Ward 9. Childwall

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We are however concerned at the size of this ward's electorate, which is actually closer to justifying a 3-member ward.

By reducing the proposed number of city centre councillors by 1 (in areas that are set to be significantly over-represented) it would be possible to create an additional ward to alleviate the oversized Childwall and Belle Vale Wards.

Ideally the area of Childwall east of the loop line former railway, known as the Chelwood Estate should be combined with the northern section of Belle Vale to create a new ward.

Barnham Drive

We would also suggest that the 10 houses on Barnham Drive, Barnside Court, and Givenchy Close, currently sited in Childwall Ward, are transferred to Gateacre Ward.

From our conversations with residents and the current councillors for the two wards, this blurred boundary has often been the source of confusion and serves no purpose. Changing this would have the added benefit of creating a clearer, more distinct boundary between these communities.

Ward 10. Church

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 11. City Centre North

As with the other proposed city centre wards, we are concerned at the undersized electorate for this ward and feel that the forecast electorate increase is highly optimistic, and based on speculative apartment developments, many of which are unlikely to come to fruition.

We disagree with the commission's proposals for ward 11 and believe that "City Centre North" does not form a recognisable community to justify its existence as a two-member ward.

The southern half of the proposed ward is clearly based around the heart of the city centre and based around loft living. The northern half is clearly on the periphery of the city centre, and consists of a mix of new build apartments and an older community of mostly social housing.

We propose two single member wards for this area, with Dale Street or Tithbarn Street forming a logical dividing line between these areas.

The northern ward should either be called "Moorfields" or restore the Exchange Ward that existed from 1880 until 1952 based around Liverpool Exchange Railway Station.

The southern ward should be named Central or Whitechapel.

Ward 12. City Centre South

As with the other proposed city centre wards, we are concerned at the undersized electorate for this ward and feel that the forecast electorate increase is highly optimistic,

and based on speculative apartment developments, many of which are unlikely to come to fruition.

We disagree with the commission's proposals for ward 12 and believe that "City Centre South" does not form a recognisable community to justify its existence as a two-member ward.

The proposed name of "City Centre South" is a poor description, and lead to many residents in the proposed Ropewalks, Paddington and Waterfront South wards incorrectly assuming that they live in Ward 12. St James would be a far more logical name for this ward, reflecting the inclusion of St James's Gardens, St James's Mount, St James Street, and the former St James station within this ward.

An alternative name would be "Baltic" to reflect the up and coming Baltic Quarter within this area, and the new Baltic Railway Station that is to be constructed at the junction of Parliament Street and Great George Street.

Ward 13. Clubmoor East

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 14. Clubmoor West

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 15. County

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 16. Croxteth

We largely support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Given the very different natures of Croxteth and Croxteth Country Park, we consider that it is beneficial for these to exist as separate wards.

However, given the electoral variance between these two wards, we would argue that the Abbeyfield Drive area, which sits in isolation between the communities of Croxteth and Croxteth Country Park, should instead be included within the Croxteth Ward.

Ward 17. Croxteth Country Park

We largely support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We are seriously concerned at the way electoral forecasts were calculated for this ward, and find the estimated reduction in population to be implausible given the nature of this popular modern housing estate.

Given this, and the electoral variance between these two wards, we would argue that the Abbeyfield Drive area, which sits in isolation between the communities of Croxteth and Croxteth Country Park, should instead be included within the Croxteth Ward.

Ward 18. Dingle North

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 19. Dingle South

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

While we understand the numerical logic of including South Hill Road, Ruby Street, Emerald Street, Bosnia Street, and Dingle Lane within ward 27 Festival Gardens it is clear that these form part of the Dingle community and have no relationship with the Festival Gardens or waterfront communities.

Ward 20. Dovecot North

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a

recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 21. Dovecot South

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 22. Edge Hill

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 23. Everton North

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 24. Everton South

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 25. Fazakerley East

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We would suggest Fazakerley Hall as an alternative name, incorporating both Fazakerley Hall Recreation Ground (the principal open space within ward 25) and the New Hall model village that is also within the ward.

Ward 26. Fazakerley West

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities. However, given its location, we would suggest that Fazakerley North is a more appropriate title.

Ward 27. Festival Gardens

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

While we understand the numerical logic of including South Hill Road, Ruby Street, Emerald Street, Bosnia Street, and Dingle Lane within ward 19 Dingle South it is clear that these form part of the Dingle community and have no relationship with the Festival Gardens or waterfront communities.

Ward 28. Garston North

Whitehedge Road became an artificial boundary as a result of the 2004 boundary review, however this is not a logical boundary between Grassendale and Garston. Instead, Garston Old Road forms a more logical demarcation line, and would have the added benefit on creating a more numerically balanced electorate in these two wards.

The 16 properties at Mersey Cottages on the southern side of Speke Road are isolated from the rest of ward 29 and should be transferred to ward 28.

We feel that Garston Village would be a more appropriate name for this ward.

Ward 29. Garston South and Cressington

The name Garston South and Cressington is ungainly, and it has been suggested to us by local residents that the name St Mary's would be more appropriate. This would resurrect the pre 2004 ward name which had been in place since 1953.

The 16 properties at Mersey Cottages on the southern side of Speke Road are isolated from the rest of ward 29 and should be transferred to ward 28.

Ward 30. Gateacre

We retain the view that Gateacre and Woolton Park should be a two member ward, forming the historic parish of Little Woolton.

Area east of the “Loop Line”

Regardless of whether or not these wards are merged, we are concerned that the “Loop Line” former railway forms a significant and obvious boundary point between Gateacre and Belle Vale.

We understand the numerical argument for having the proposed Gateacre Ward crossing this boundary, as the new Belle Vale Ward would otherwise be above the 10% threshold. However, crossing this boundary is far from ideal and will result in this community being very poorly served, and residents will face a significant walk (including entering the Belle Vale Ward) to reach the site of Gateacre’s polling station at the Gateacre Institute.

This is particularly true of Herdman Close, Bedford Road and Oakwood Road which are particularly cut off from the rest of Gateacre, and have a far more obvious affinity with Belle Vale.

We would request that these 3 roads (170 electors) are placed in Belle Vale Ward, This can be easily accommodated within the existing electoral tolerance.

Barnham Drive

We would also suggest that the 10 houses on Barnham Drive, Barnside Court, and Givenchy Close, currently sited in Childwall Ward, are transferred to Gateacre Ward.

From our conversations with residents and the current councillors for the two wards, this blurred boundary has often been the source of confusion and serves no purpose. Changing this would have the added benefit of creating a clearer, more distinct boundary between these communities.

Ward 31. Grassendale

Whitehedge Road became an artificial boundary as a result of the 2004 boundary review, however this is not a logical boundary between Grassendale and Garston. Instead, Garston Old Road forms a more logical demarcation line, and would have the added benefit on creating a more numerically balanced electorate in these two wards.

Ward 32. Greenbank

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However, we do believe that Sefton Park Community Centre should logically be situated within Sefton Park Ward., as should Sefton Park Cricket Club and the tower blocks adjacent to Croxteth Park Gate that overlook Sefton Park.

Logically, Greenbank Drive should form the boundary between Greenbank and Sefton Park wards.

We do note the commissions concern at the electoral variance that would result from this, however we would point out that the 2027 assumptions do not adequately reflect the likelihood of future development within this ward.

The Carnatic Halls of residence on Elmswood Road were one of the largest student housing sites in the city. These closed in 2019, and this substantial site is currently being offered for sale to prospective housing developers. <https://www.placenorthwest.co.uk/university-puts-mossley-hill-site-up-for-sale/>

The development of this 22 acre site in a highly sought after part of the city will significantly tilt the electoral variance of the new Greenbank Ward, resulting in the electoral variance rising substantially above the threshold.

While we appreciate that this review cannot include this prospective development within its electoral calculations, we do feel that the likelihood of such a substantial development in the near future does constitute justification for accepting proposals that are, on paper at least, below the 10% threshold.

Ward 33. Kensington & Fairfield

We recognise and accept the argument that North and South Kensington will be better served as a combined ward, however we would question the commission's proposal to combine this community with Fairfield to make a 3 member ward.

We feel that the commission's justification for this is weak. While it was our preference to retain all Liverpool wards as 3 member wards, we feel that it is unreasonable to single out one area to retain a 3 member ward while the rest of the city has predominantly single member wards imposed upon it.

Fairfield is a distinct community with its own identity. The Fairfield Ward was created in the 1895 review and existed as its own ward until the 1980 boundary review when population decline resulted in it being unable to sustain its own 3 member ward.

As such, we feel that a two member Kensington and single member Fairfield Ward would be more appropriate, and consistent with the commission's recommendations for other parts of the city.

Ward 34. Kirkdale

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 35. Knotty Ash

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 36. Melrose

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 37. Menlove

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

The overwhelming majority of this ward is within the L18 community, and correctly transfers several L18 streets from the current Woolton Ward. However it also includes a small number of streets located in L25, whose residents would consider themselves to be part of Woolton.

It is therefore suggested that Dunsdon Road, Dunsdon Close, Aldbourne Avenue, Aldbourne Close, and Smalley Avenue are retained within Woolton Park Ward to better reflect recognised communities.

We would further suggest minor alterations to include properties at 4-18 Calderstones Road, Calder Lodge and Harthill Lodge within the same ward.

We note the 35% electoral variance for this ward, and consider the assumption that this popular and prosperous area will lose over 1000 electors by 2027 as highly questionable.

We would not be opposed to the commission's suggestion that this ward could be merged with Ward 8. Calderstones to form a two member ward.

Ward 38. Mossley Hill

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However, having heard evidence from local residents association, we agree that there is a strong argument for merging Aigburth and Mossley Hill wards to create a two member ward.

This would address the issue of the area between Aigburth Vale and Dundonald Road having been included within Aigburth Ward to minimise the electoral variance.

Ward 39. Much Woolton and Hunts Cross

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities. We feel that a two member ward was the correct decision for this community.

Ward 40. Norris Green East

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However after speaking to local residents we feel that the boundary of the Carr Lane East area is incorrectly situated.

By transferring Carr Lane East and Carr Close from the proposed West Derby Muirhead into Norris Green East Ward it will create a clearer easier to define boundary for both wards.

We support the proposal for a single member ward in this area.

Ward 41. Norris Green North

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 42. Norris Green West

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 43. Old Swan East

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 44. Old Swan West

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 45. Orrell Park

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

The distinct nature of this community makes it ideally served by a single member ward.

Ward 46. Paddington

As with the other proposed city centre wards, we are concerned at the undersized electorate for this ward and feel that the forecast electorate increase is highly optimistic, and based on speculative apartment developments, many of which are unlikely to come to fruition.

That said, we recognise these boundaries as forming a logical community.

Ward 47. Penny Lane

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

The distinct nature of this community makes it ideally served by a single member ward.

Ward 48. Princes Park

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However on reflection we feel that this could be further improved by transferring Grove Park and Croxteth Grove into Arundel Ward.

This would help simplify the boundaries of Princes Park Ward, and make them more recognisable.

We further note that the electoral variances show Arundel as -10% and Princes Park as +19%. This transfer would assist in redressing this electoral imbalance.

Ward 49. Ropewalks

We agree that commission's proposals for this ward define a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We are however seriously concerned at the undersized electorate for this ward with 1,484 electors. We feel that the forecast electorate increase to 4,707 is highly optimistic, and based on speculative apartment developments, many of which are unlikely to come to fruition.

Ward 50. Sandfield Park

We agree that commission's proposals for this ward define a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 51. Scotland Road

We agree that commission's proposals for this ward define a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We are however seriously concerned at the undersized electorate for this ward with 5,921 electors for a two member area. We feel that the forecast electorate increase to 7,837 is optimistic, but even this is significantly out of proportion with wards in the south of the city such as Childwall.

Ward 52. Sefton Park

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 53. Smithdown

We support the commission's proposals for this two member ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 54. Speke

While Speke might appear to be one community from a cursory glance at a map, there is a significant divide between eastern Speke which is made up of ex council housing stock constructed during the inter-war and post-war period and the western side of Speke, largely consists of 21st Century private housing. From our consultations with local residents, the significant distinction between these communities risks seeing the interests of electors in the newer estates overwhelmed by the needs of those in eastern Speke.

Prior to the 2004 boundary review, Speke formed a 3 member ward covering the area east of Conleach Road. Meanwhile west Speke sat within the St Mary's Ward. We suggest a return to this traditional dividing line by creating two single member wards with a boundary between the parallel roads of Conleach Road and Ganworth Road. These wards could be called East Speke and West Speke.

Ward 55. Springwood

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 57. Stoneycroft

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 58. Toxteth

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 59. Tuebrook Edinburgh Park

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We do however disagree with the choice of name for this ward, as residents of the majority of this area would describe themselves as living within the Anfield Community rather than Tuebrook.

This is evidenced by a simple Google search of individual streets within this proposed ward, where you will only find these streets described as being in Anfield by estate agents.

While an imperfect description, Edinburgh Park serves as a clear central point within this ward that residents will be able to recognise.

Ward 60. Tuebrook Larkhill

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 61. Vauxhall

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Ward 62. Walton Hall

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We do not feel that merger with Walton Vale Ward would be beneficial, as Rice Lane provides an effective boundary between these two communities.

Ward 63. Walton Vale

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We do not feel that merger with Walton Hall Ward would be beneficial, as Rice Lane provides an effective boundary between these two communities.

Ward 64. Waterfront North

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We remain concerned at the highly speculative electoral forecasts for this area, and consider it highly unlikely that the proposed number of developments will proceed.

The area of docklands on either side of the city centre have traditionally always been referred to as the North Docks and South Docks. Obviously, these have not been home to communities until recently, but they have traditionally been major centres of employment and their description has important historical significance.

As such we feel that North Docks would be a far more descriptive and recognisable name for this ward.

Ward 65. Waterfront South

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We remain concerned at the highly speculative electoral forecasts for this area, and consider it highly unlikely that the proposed number of developments will proceed.

The area of docklands on either side of the city centre have traditionally always been referred to as the North Docks and South Docks. Obviously, these have not been home to communities until recently, but they have traditionally been major centres of employment and their description has important historical significance.

As such we feel that South Docks would be a far more descriptive and recognisable name for this ward.

Ward 66. Wavertree Garden Suburb

We support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

Incorporating the area north of the railway line is not ideal, however this area is equally isolated from Broadgreen Ward by Edge Lane Drive. Its inclusion within Wavertree Garden Suburb does ensure that the new ward is within the electoral variance.

Ward 67. Wavertree Village

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We believe that Wavertree Village is a distinct community, with very different issues from the neighbouring Wavertree Garden Suburb and Church Wards, and the proposed single member ward will be beneficial to ensuring there is a focus on these concerns.

Ward 68. West Derby Daysbrook

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that it defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We support the proposal for a single member ward in this area with clear lines of accountability.

Ward 69. West Derby Layfield

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that it defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

We support the proposal for a single member ward in this area.

Ward 70. West Derby Muirhead

We strongly support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that it generally defines a recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

However after speaking to local residents we feel that the boundary of the Carr Lane East area is incorrectly situated.

By transferring Carr Lane East and Carr Close into Norris Green East Ward it will create a clearer easier to define boundary for both wards.

We support the proposal for a single member ward in this area.

Ward 71. Woolton Park

We generally support the commission's proposals for this ward and feel that defines a fairly recognisable community with common interests and amenities.

L18 parts of Woolton Ward

The overwhelming majority of this ward is within the L25 community, which is recognised as being Woolton. As such it is suggested that Dunsdon Road, Dunsdon Close, Aldbourne Avenue, Aldbourne Close, and Smalley Avenue are retained within Woolton Park Ward to better reflect recognised communities, rather than being incorporated within the L18 community of Menlove.

Ward name

We feel that the name Woolton Park offers a poor description of this community and is likely to result in confusion. Woolton Village would be a more appropriate name, reflecting the historic nature of this community that existed outside of the boundaries of Liverpool until its incorporation in 1913.