

TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND'S DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

This submission sets out Tendring District Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's draft recommendations on a new scheme of district council wards for Tendring.

The Council has no further comment to make on the following proposed wards:-

- Harwich and Kingsway – 1 Member
- Dovercourt Bay – 1 Member
- Dovercourt Tollgate – 1 Member
- Dovercourt All Saints – 2 Members
- Frinton – 2 Members
- Kirby-Le-Soken and Hamford – 1 Member
- Kirby Cross – 1 Member
- Homelands – 1 Member
- Walton – 1 Member
- Brightlingsea – 3 Members
- Thorpe, Beaumont and Great Holland – 1 Member
- Stour Valley – 1 Member
- The Oakleys and Wix – 1 Member

With regard to the other proposed wards the Council's comments are as follows:-

Parkeston

As almost half of this proposed ward is in Dovercourt the Council believes that simply calling the ward 'Parkeston' will be misleading and will create confusion. As over 200 of the properties located in the Dovercourt part of the ward are on what is known as the 'Vines Estate' the Council suggests the name of Dovercourt Vines and Parkeston for this ward. The boundary and number of members would be as proposed in the LGBCE draft recommendations.

Central and West Tendring

The Council does not support the following proposed wards for the reasons given:-

- *St Osyth and Little Clacton* - there are no community links between St Osyth and Point Clear and Little Clacton. These settlements are not in close proximity and there is no direct road joining them which makes communication between them difficult.
- *Ardleigh, Alresford and Elmstead* - The Council considers that the ward of Great Bromley, Thorrington, Frating, Alresford, Ardleigh and Elmstead is too big and does not fit well together as a community. Ardleigh in village terms is far from Alresford and Thorrington. Elected district councillors often attend all parish meetings in their ward and it would be onerous for any councillor to attend meetings of six parishes. The Council believes that smaller wards would better reflect the local communities.
- *The Bentleys and Weeley* - Weeley does not fit with Great Bentley and these villages have no community ties to each other apart from reasonable proximity. Both are large independent centres with their own facilities.

- *Lawford, Manningtree and Mistley* - the Council is mostly supportive of this ward except that we do not agree with including Little Bromley in this ward. Little Bromley is a rural parish and the Council believes that its community identity would be lost by joining it with the larger settlements of Lawford, Manningtree and Mistley.

The Council's alternative proposals are as follows:-

St Osyth (2 Members -10% variance)

The LGBCE draft recommendations include that part of St Johns Road should be included in the St Osyth ward. In the Council's original submission, reference was made to additional housing that had been agreed in St Osyth following a planning enquiry. The number of new homes is 90 which were not included in the Council's forecast. These would therefore increase the forecast population of St Osyth by 146 electors. This, together with the increased electorate from the inclusion of St Johns Road would mean that St Osyth and Point Clear can stand alone as a separate two member ward in terms of electoral equality. There is also a much stronger community argument for St Osyth and Point Clear remaining as a single ward without the inclusion of Little Clacton.

Little Clacton (1 Member 0% variance)

Little Clacton meets electoral equality as a single ward on its own and the Council believes that this should be a separate ward of one member.

Alresford, Thorrington, Great Bromley and Elmstead

The Council's original submission included a proposed single member ward of Alresford and Thorrington. The Council recognises that this proposed ward exceeded the tolerance on electoral equality however the Council strongly believes that for this one ward only the community argument is the stronger criteria to be considered. Not only in that the close proximity and relationship of Alresford and Thorrington make this best warding arrangement for these two parishes but that it also then allows other wards proposed by the Council to be implemented. We strongly believe that the warding arrangement proposed by the Council is the optimum for this west area of Tendring.

In particular this would allow a ward of Elmstead and Great Bromley to be implemented. These two parishes fit well together, are near each other and have been connected for years with people in Great Bromley using the shop, post office and garage in Elmstead.

Therefore our strongly preferred option is:-

Alresford and Thorrington – 1 Member variance 16%
Elmstead and Great Bromley – 1 Member variance 3%

However, if the LGBCE is not minded to place the community criteria above the electoral equality criteria in this one ward then the Council submits a proposal of a 2 member ward of Alresford and Elmstead (variance 9%). We do not support the ward of six parishes proposed by the LGBCE.

The Bentleys and Frating (1 Member 3% variance)

This is the ward as originally proposed by the Council. It allows Great and Little Bentley to remain together but the Council believes better reflects the community as there is not the mismatch of including Great Bentley and Weeley, two sizeable independent settlements, in the same ward.

Weeley and Tendring (1 Member -2% variance)

The ward of The Bentleys and Frating allows Weeley to essentially remain as a ward on its own. Weeley is a sizeable independent settlement. This proposed ward includes Tendring.

Ardleigh and Little Bromley (1 Member -9% variance)

As set out above the Council does not support the inclusion of Little Bromley with Lawford, Manningtree and Mistley. We are proposing the ward of Ardleigh and Little Bromley. This is the existing ward which we believe works well.

Lawford, Manningtree and Mistley (3 Members -4% variance)

Apart from the removal of Little Bromley, the Council has no further comments on this proposed ward. The three towns do have close community links with each other and we believe this would work as a three member ward.

Clacton

In relation to Clacton, the Council has the following comments on the draft recommendations:-

- Subject to one or two amendments set out below, the Council wishes to resubmit its original scheme of single member wards for further consideration. The Council believes that this is the best scheme for Clacton which delivers the Council's desire for single member wards. It is the Council's strong belief that single member wards provide much greater clarity for the public in that it provides consistency across wards and avoids any confusion for voters around their second or third vote at elections.
- The LGBCE has proposed a three member ward of Pier. The Council does not support the inclusion of the area to the east of Clacton Pier as this is very distinct in character and demographics from the rest of this proposed ward. This area is distinct from the west of this proposed ward which is residential and has its own doctor's surgery, church, convenience store and pub. The Council suggests that there should be a two member ward of St James and a single member ward of Pier. The St James Ward would be equivalent to the Council's originally proposed Martello and The Royals and West Cliff Wards with a separate Pier Ward also as originally proposed. Pier Ward is one of the most deprived wards in the Country, with low life expectancy and high crime. It therefore has particular needs and we believe, should stand as a separate ward as its particular needs require individual and separate Member representation.
- The Council does not support the proposed Southcliff Ward. The Council proposes that the single Member Eastcliff Ward should remain. A large part of the Eastcliff Ward is part of or linked to Holland-on-Sea. The school and playing field in Eastcliff are used by some Holland residents and residents living in the east part of Eastcliff naturally gravitate to Holland-on-Sea as their shopping centre and children in the West of Holland attend Holland Park school. Keeping Eastcliff as a separate single member ward would mean that St Pauls would also need to be maintained as a single member ward.
- The Council would prefer to see its proposed single Member wards of St Bartholomews and Haven implemented instead of the suggested ward of Holland Haven but recognises that a two Member ward would work as long as this included only the community of Holland-on-Sea. However, if the LGBCE is minded to recommend a two member ward here then we suggest the whole two member ward should be called St Bartholomews. The area of the Haven is around the country park at the far east of Holland and it would not be appropriate to apply this name to the whole of the Holland-on-Sea area. Also part of Holland –on-Sea would still extend into the next western ward (what we are calling Eastcliff) so neither would it be appropriate to include the name of Holland just in the eastern ward(s).
- The Council supports the proposed West Clacton and Jaywick Sands Ward including the boundary change to lie south of St Johns Road and West of Jaywick Lane.
- The Council does not support the proposed Burrsville Park Ward. We consider this is too big and destroys the separate village community of Burrsville which has its own post office, pub and village hall. It is separated from Castle Hill by Thorpe Road. Burrsville has a residential / industrial character distinct from Castle Hill which is mixed residential commercial with Brook Retail Park and a large supermarket in Centenary Way. We resubmit our original single member wards of Burrsville and Castle Hill. If the LGBCE is minded to pursue a two member ward here then we believe it should just be called Burrsville rather than Burrsville Park as that is how the area is widely known.

- The Council does not support the proposed ward of St Johns. The area of St Johns centres around Great Clacton which is a separate identifiable community. Local road signs identify it as a separate place. It has its own school, shopping centre, pubs, doctors, opticians and church. For this reason the Council resubmits its original single member wards of St Johns and Old Road. These two wards are separated by St Johns Road.
- The Council has no specific comments to make on the proposed Coppins, Bluehouse and Cann Hall wards. The Council feels strongly that there is a robust community argument for the single member wards suggested above and it would be our preference to see single member wards across Clacton apart from West Clacton and Jaywick Sands and St James. However, the Council recognises that this central area of Clacton is harder to distinguish in terms of communities and therefore, given the submissions above, submits its single member scheme for these wards (Coppins, Bluehouse and Cann Hall) on the basis of achieving electoral equality. If the LG BCE are minded to accept the Council's single member wards then with regard to Bockings Elm the boundary would be slightly changed from our original submission to accommodate the move of the north of St Johns Road into St Osyth and, to achieve electoral equality to include the move of the eastern boundary to follow the footpath that runs north of Woodrows Lane.

In summary the Council proposals, having considered the LGBCE draft recommendations, as are follows:-

Ward	Members	Variance from Electoral Equality
Alton Park	1	1%
Lake	1	5%
Bockings Elm	1	-2%
Rush Green	1	-6%
Cann Hall	1	-10%
Peter Bruff	1	2%
Burrsville	1	10%
Castle Hill	1	-5%
West Clacton and Jaywick Sands	2	-4%
Haven	1	3%
St Bartholomews	1	0%
Pier	1	-6%
St James	2	6%
St Johns	1	1%
Old Road	1	7%
Eastcliff	1	-1%
St Pauls	1	-2%
Harwich and Kingsway	1	5%
Dovercourt Bay	1	-9%
Dovercourt Tollgate	1	5%
Dovercourt All Saints	2	6%
Dovercourt Vines and Parkeston	1	-7%
Frinton	2	4%
Kirby-le-Soken and Hamford	1	6%
Kirby Cross	1	6%
Homelands	1	6%
Walton	1	8%
Brightlingsea	3	-8%
Thorpe, Beaumont and Great Holland	1	9%
Stour Valley	1	6%
The Oakleys and Wix	1	-3%
St Osyth	2	-10%
Little Clacton	1	0%
Alresford and Thorrington	1	16%
Elmstead and Great Bromley	1	3%
The Bentleys and Frating	1	3%
Weeley and Tendring	1	2%
Ardleigh and Little Bromley	1	-9%
Lawford, Manningtree and Mistley	3	-4%