
Boundary Review - Response to the LGBCs Draft Proposals - Supporting Information

1. Introduction/Background


- 1.1 To set out the Council's proposed response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposed changes to the Council's warding patterns from the 2019/20 District Council Elections.
- 1.2 On 29 August 2017 the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) published a set of draft recommendations for changes to the Council's warding patterns with effect from 2019/20 District Council elections. These recommendations proposed:
- (i) 43 Councillors, nine fewer than there are now.
 - (ii) 20 wards, 10 fewer than there are now.
 - (iii) The boundaries of one ward staying the same.
- 2.2 The original consultation period was 29 August to 6 November 2017 (10 weeks). However, an error was identified in the LGBC's calculations for the proposed new Wash Common ward, and in order to correct these figures, the consultation period has been extended to 13 November.

2. Options for Consideration

- 2.1 The Boundary Review Steering Group met on 12 October 2017 to look at a number of the LGBC's warding pattern proposals. The Steering Group focussed on the following areas:
- (i) Bucklebury and Aldermaston Ward
 - (ii) Hungerford and Kintbury
 - (iii) Basildon and Compton
 - (iv) Wash Common, Newbury Central and Greenham
 - (v) Thatcham Central and Crookham
 - (vi) Purley and Tilehurst
- 2.2 The average number of electors based on 43 Councillors is 3028.

3. Proposals

- 3.1 The map below details the counter proposals which the Council is recommended is forwarded to the LGBC in response to their proposed warding patterns for the district from the 2019/20 District Council elections.



Bucklebury and Aldermaston

- 3.2 Council is asked to recommend to the LGBC that the new Bucklebury and Aldermaston ward be divided into three one member wards as set out below. It is also recommended that the new wards be named, Bucklebury, Bradfield and Aldermaston. These changes would better reflect the different communities associated with the three areas. These proposals would also ensure that the area of Aldermaston Wharf, which straddles three Parishes, will be in one ward.
- 3.3 As well as containing some 15 parishes, the LGBC's proposed three member ward contains some 10 primary school catchment areas. Whilst members appreciate the LGBC's comments that members should be productive rather than just 'busy', this wide geographical spread of different interests and service use will make it more difficult for members to remain closely engaged with their communities. This could be particularly detrimental to the smaller parishes, such as Wasing with 31 electors, where their voices might become lost in such a large ward.
- 3.4 In terms of churches, Aldermaston and Bucklebury are very clearly looked to by the smaller parishes contained in the Council's proposed new one member wards. Bucklebury's parish church forms part of a cluster with Stanford Dingley's church.


The churches of Midgham and Woolhampton are also closely aligned with each other. The Aldermaston benefice comprises not only Aldermaston St Mary's but the parish churches in Wasing, Brimpton and Beenham.

3.5 The parishes of Bucklebury, Frilsham, Stanford Dingley and Woolhampton look to Midgham for their train services to the postal towns of Newbury and Reading as well as further afield to London. Indeed, Midgham Rail Station is actually located in Woolhampton, which demonstrates the geographical and communal proximity of the two parishes. Similarly, the parishes of Brimpton, Wasing, Beenham and Padworth look to Aldermaston for their rail links, with commuters into London using the station there; whilst the parishes of Englefield and Bradfield to the north eastern corner of the LGBCE's proposed ward look to Theale for their rail service.

3.6 The parishes after which the three wards proposed by the Council are named also contain Post Offices. The post offices therefore serve as community hubs for the smaller neighbouring parishes, who rely on them for a broad range of essential services.

Proposed New Bucklebury Ward


PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
FC	Frilsham	249	
BI1/2	Bucklebury	1806	
SC	Stanford Dingley	168	
MA	Midgham	262	
WG	Woolhampton	758	
			3243 (7%)



Proposed Bucklebury Ward

Proposed New Bradfield Ward


PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
BF1/2	Bradfield	1324	
YED	Englefield	223	
YSG1/2	Sulhampstead	1286	
YUA	Ufton Nervet	260	
			3093 (2%)



Proposed Bradfield Ward

Proposed New Aldermaston Ward

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
YBD	Beenham	1020	
YPA	Padworth	738	
AA1/2	Aldermaston	892	
WA	Wasing	31	
BH	Brimpton	457	
			3138 (3%)




Proposed Aldermaston Ward

Hungerford and Kintbury

- 3.7 Council is recommended to ask the LGBC to remove Enborne (652 electors) from the proposed new Hungerford and Kintbury Ward and to incorporate these electors into a new Wash Common Ward. This would mean that the adjusted electorate for the new Hungerford and Kintbury Ward would be 8907 (-2%), which would provide slightly better electoral equality than that proposed by the LGBC.

Proposed New Hungerford and Kintbury Ward

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
HB	Hampstead Marshall	231	
WD	West Woodhay	87	
CE	Combe	28	
IA	Inkpen	670	
KT	Kintbury	2268	
HD1/2/3	Hungerford	4758	
WB	Welford	428	
BE	Boxford	437	
			8907 (-2%)




Proposed Hungerford & Kintbury Ward

Basildon and Compton

- 3.8 The eastern and western communities of this ward have very little in common with each other. Council is therefore asked to recommend to the LGBC that the ward be split, roughly down the centre, to create 2 one member wards. These should be named Basildon and Ridgeway Wards.

Proposed New Basildon Ward


PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
BA	Basildon	1536	
SE	Streatley	901	
AC	Ashampstead	308	
AB	Aldworth	259	
			3004 (- 1%)



Proposed Basildon Ward

Proposed New Ridgeway Ward

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
WC	West Ilsley	269	
EB	East Ilsley	460	
CF	Compton	1261	
HA	Hampstead Norreys	636	
YA	Yattendon	297	
			2923 (4%)



Proposed Ridgeway Ward


Wash Common, Newbury Central and Greenham

- 3.9 The proposed new wards of Wash Common, Newbury Central and Greenham are not supported. It is recommended that Council asks the LGBC to consider making the following changes to their proposals for Wash Common, Greenham and Newbury Central Wards.
- 3.10 The LGBCs proposals for a three member Greenham Ward to include the 825 electors in the St John's Road, Newtown Rd, A339 triangle will split established communities. The catchment schools for this area are St John's and St Bart's, whereas for those living east of the A339 the catchment schools are The Willows and Park House. The catchment area boundaries are drawn using distinct groups of communities who look to the same areas for local services. Council feels that it would be wrong for a small number of electors to be moved into a different ward where the majority of residents use services based in a different area. The proposal to redraw the Greenham ward and to create a new Newbury St John's ward is therefore Council's preferred option.
- 3.11 This area is also an established and historic part of Newbury in which various almshouses, the Newbury bombing memorial and the Commonwealth War Graves are located. It is distinctly part of the old town centre and is different in character to the area to the east, which is in Greenham parish and consists of newer buildings and settlements.
- 3.12 The East Fields part of Newbury parish is an established community that, being adjacent to the train station and the town centre shops, contains residents identifying themselves as living in the town centre. As such, the Council is

proposing that this area be removed from the Greenham ward and a new ward known as Newbury Wash Common created.

Proposed new Newbury Wash Common Ward

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
EC	Enborne	652	
NB14	Newbury	2528	
			3180 (5%)




Proposed Newbury Wash Common Ward

3.13 Area J, with a new northern boundary of Essex Street along with the parish of Enborne, be created as a one member ward and named Newbury Wash Common (3,180 (5%) electorate). This is a distinct area away from Newbury Town. Local people identify as living in Wash Common as a separate entity from Newbury.

Proposed Newbury St Johns Ward

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
NB12/13	Newbury	6093	
			6093 (0.6%)



Proposed Newbury St. Johns Ward

- 3.14 A two member ward be created for the area to the left of H, with an eastern boundary of the A339 (currently included in Greenham) and a western boundary of Enborne, using the northern part of area J from Essex Street towards the town centre. This new ward should be named Newbury St Johns. The total electorate for this new ward would be 6093 (-1%)
- 3.15 This proposal would result in the town centre moving from the proposed Greenham Ward into the new ward of Newbury St/Johns. The A339 will also be used as a boundary to this new ward incorporating other historic features such as Alms Houses and the old cemetery, all associated with Newbury.
- 3.16 In addition to the above proposals Council is also asked to recommend to the LGBC that the wards of Clay Hill and Speen be renamed Newbury Clay Hill and Newbury Speen. This would provide some consistency with the approach taken in Thatcham and Tilehurst.


Proposed Greenham Ward (revised)

(A)

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
GB1/2	Greenham	5790	
Part NB4/5	Newbury	1571	
Part B12/15	Newbury	1780	
			9141 (0.6%)

(B) Greenham


PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
GB1/2	Greenham	5790	
			5790 (-4%)



Proposed Greenham Ward

(C) East Fields

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
NB4/5	Newbury	1571	
Part NB12/15	Newbury	1780	
			3351 (11%)




Proposed East Fields Ward

- 3.17 There are two proposals for the Greenham Ward. One proposal retains a three member ward (A) and one creates two wards, a two member ward and a one member ward (B) and (C).
- 3.18 It is recommended that the three member ward be named Newbury South and Greenham. This area would comprise areas E and F. This would provide an electorate of 9147. Area F was previously in Wash Common, but is actually in the Parish of Greenham.
- 3.19 The second proposal for the Greenham Ward would provide for a smaller two member ward (B) which uses the boundary of Greenham Parish (electorate 5,796 (-5%)). Although the elector variance is -5%, this would provide opportunities for growth should part of the Sandleford development be built out earlier than is expected.
- 3.20 A smaller one member (C) ward could then be created in the East Fields area which would include part of area H, made up of the Nightingales Estate and the East Fields area of Newbury south of the Kennet & Avon canal. This area would have an electorate of 3,351 (10%). This could be named Newbury East Fields ward.
- 3.21 With regards to parish warding, we feel that the proportion of councillors assigned to (E) and (F) should be readdressed to recognise the large number of residents in the completed Racecourse development in E, the established housing area of Pyle Hill, and the rural area surrounding the former Greenham Common Airbase.

Thatcham Central and Crookham

Thacham Central


PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
TH4 (part)/5/12/13	Thatcham	5453	
			5453 (-10%)



Proposed Thatcham Central Ward

Thatcham Colthrop and Crookham

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
TH10/11	Thatcham	2768	
			2768 (-9%)




Proposed Thatcham Colthrop and Crookham Ward

- 3.22 Council is asked to recommend to the LGBC two options for the Thatcham Central and Crookham Ward. The first proposal and the Council’s preferred option is to divide the large three member ward of Thatcham Central and Crookham into a two member ward named Thatcham Central (electorate 5453 (-10%)) and a one member ward named Thatcham Colthrop and Crookham (electorate 2768 (-9%)). The electorate numbers are low but it is understood there is a reduced level of registration of the Kennet Heath estate due to the high number of rental properties.
- 3.23 The above proposal would provide better representation as the majority of the residents are in the existing town centre. Thatcham Town Council which currently has a large number of members representing a very large ward would also benefit from these proposals.
- 3.24 The second, less favoured option would be to retain the current proposal of one three member ward proposed by the LGBC.
- 3.25 The number of Thatcham Town Councillors representing Thatcham Central and Colthrop/Crookham should be adjusted from 8 to match the new split ward, should the split be adopted.

Purley and Tilehurst North

Purley


PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
ZPD	Purley on Thames	3676	
ZTL2	Tilehurst	2234	
			5910 (-2%)



Proposed Purley Ward

Tilehurst North

PS Code	Polling Station	Electorate	Total
ZTL3	Tilehurst	1466	
ZTL1	Tilehurst	1514	
			2980 (-2%)



Proposed Tilehurst North Ward

3.26 Council is asked to recommend to the LGBC that the proposed three member ward for Purley and Tilehurst be amended to one two member ward for Purley (electorate 5910 (+2%)) and a one member ward for Tilehurst (electorate 2980 (-2%)). This would better reflect the local communities.

3.27 Purley-on-Thames and Tilehurst are separate communities, evidenced by the fact that they are represented by separate parish councils. Purley and the northern part of Tilehurst experience different problems and pressures:

- The lower part of Purley-on Thames is frequently flooded
- The proposed “North Tilehurst” ward has experienced pressures caused by extensive housing development in the last few years. These pressures will be increased by the large housing sites that have been allocated in the area by the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

3.28 Purley is served by shops in Purley village, Knowsley Road and Overdown Road. Inhabitants of northern Tilehurst look to the shopping areas in The Triangle (in Reading) and City Road, in addition to the shopping area in Overdown Road.

3.29 Purley is covered by the catchment areas of Purley Church of England, Long Lane and Westwood Farm primary schools whereas north Tilehurst is in the catchment area of Downsway Primary School.

3.30 In addition to the above proposals, Council is asked to recommend to the LGBC that Florence Gardens stay in Cold Ash as it is at present. This would remove the need for an additional Parish Councillor based on one road.

4. Conclusion

4.1 The Boundary Review Steering Group has reviewed a number of the LGBCs proposals warding patterns and has made several counter proposals mainly based on 3 member wards. The Council’s counter proposals have focused on electoral equality or community identity. Council is asked to approve these new proposals.

Background Papers:

Previous Reports to Full Council.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: No: X

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval X

Wards affected:

All

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

X MEC – Become an even more effective Council

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority:

X MEC1 – Become an even more effective Council

Officer details:

Name: Andy Day
Job Title: Head of Strategic Support
Tel No: 01635 519459
E-mail Address: andy.day@westberks.gov.uk
