

New Electoral Arrangements for Lichfield District Council – Draft Recommendations Response

WARD NUMBER	AREAS	WARD	COMMENTS
01	Rural North	Alrewas & Fradley	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
02	Rural North	Armitage With Handsacre	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
03	Lichfield City	Boley Park	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
04	Burntwood	Boney Hay & Central	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
05	Rural South	Bourne Vale	The proposal to move Shenstone Wood End and Little Hay to Bourne Vale will create confusion and disruption with member representation as it will bring another District Member from an otherwise remote area to the existing Parish community interest.
06	Lichfield City	Chadsmead	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
07	Burntwood	Chase Terrace	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
08	Burntwood	Chasetown	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
09	Rural North	Colton & The Ridwares	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
10	Lichfield City	Curborough	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
11	Rural South	Fazeley	Lichfield District Council agree the benefit of taking the part of Drayton Bassett Parish Council that sits in Fazeley back into Bourne Vale ward.
12	Rural South	Hammerwich With Wall	<p>The Council observes that the proposed combination of Wall and Hammerwich crosses Parliamentary boundaries; Wall being in Tamworth and Hammerwich in Lichfield and conflicts with the Commissions previous advice.</p> <p>The Council view is that the two communities of Wall and Hammerwich share neither commonalities nor community infrastructure. The Council believes that the Commissions proposals to merge these two distinct communities together is neither in the interests of the communities themselves nor the District Ward councillors in achieving fair and proportionate representation of the two communities, Hammerwich and Wall</p>
13	Burntwood	Highfield	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
14	Lichfield City	Leomansley	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward

15	Rural South	Little Aston & Stonnall	<p>Point 81 on page16 of the draft recommends combining Little Aston and Stonnall Parishes into one Parish Ward with eight members, thus abolishing their individual status and goes on to create a new parish ward of Shenstone Wood End (although unmentioned it is suspected that this would include the hamlet of Little Hay) with one member.</p> <p>The proposal to move Shenstone Wood End and Little Hay to Bourne Vale will also create confusion and disruption with member representation as it will bring another District Member from an otherwise remote area to the existing parish community interest. This also conflicts with the Government funded Neighbourhood Plans emerging for each of the three distinctive Shenstone Parish Wards</p> <p>Paragraph. 73. 74.75. We find these recommendations somewhat at odds with the Boundary Commission guidelines in so much as Wall is divided from Hammerwich by the Walsall Road with only possibly the few properties that face across the main road having any affinity with Stonnall and Wall as Hammerwich village and the Triangle Ward are some significant distance apart.</p> <p>Wall has a boundary, which stretches mainly across the top of Stonnall and Shenstone, and there is significant community cohesion across the community. It is therefore difficult to justify combining Hammerwich with Wall when the District Council's proposal offers a better solution. The combination of Little Aston and Stonnall may meet the criteria of numbers but it does not recognise the strong individuality of the two communities and their very significant social and economic differences. The recommendations also fail to recognise the emerging Neighbourhood Plans that are being produced to identify the specific need of the communities.</p> <p>The Council notes that the Boundary Commissioner has segmented the Blake Street community. Blake Street is an integral part of the Little Aston community and not Bourne Vale. Segmenting this community serves no purpose other than to divide a currently united community into two. The Council requests that the Commissioner reconsiders this division and returns this area of Blake Street back into the Little Aston Ward.</p> <p>The Boundary Commission should note that the three Parish Council Wards are well advanced in preparing under the Localism Act 2011 individual Neighbourhood Plans. The parish proposal has been part of a major consultation with over 3000 households. Should the drastic changes being proposed by the Boundary Commission occur it will undoubtedly have a major consequence on the ultimate implementation of these well-advanced plans.</p>
16	Rural North	Longdon	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
17	Rural South	Mease Valley	<p>Paragraph. 52 Mease Valley ward. Since the Councils proposals there have been significant changes that affect this Ward which make the proposal no longer practical. The Planning Committee of the District Council have now approved a detailed application, (14/00018/OUTM), for 165 new homes in Wigginton Parish which equates to an increase in the electorate of 413, increasing the Ward to an electorate of 2388 ie.30% oversize.</p> <p>Lichfield District Council have had extensive discussions with the developer for planning application</p>

			<p>14/00018/OUTM whom informs us that subject to the signing of a Section 106 planning agreement they intend to commence development at the earliest possible date and no later than March 2015. This is not speculative but an actual development that will start before the next District and Parish elections. On the basis, that the intention of the Boundary Review is to address imbalances it is the Councils view that this should be addressed.</p> <p>Paragraph. 59 Taking into consideration the points made in this section regarding the electoral imbalance the Council would accept this view if the Boundary Commission takes into account that the variations have now changed to an unacceptable level as detailed above.</p>
18	Rural South	Shenstone	<p>The standing District Council’s proposals which, importantly to our community, retained the existing outer boundary line of the three Wards that comprise our joint interest, changing only the Division lines within the area to correctly balance the represented electoral numbers to within your requirements for the 2019 projection. Although there would be a reduction of one District Member for the whole area (from 5 to 4), the overall long-standing relationship, and cohesion of the area and its residents would be maintained.</p> <p>Paragraph. 72 This statement is incorrect, the residents of Lynn Lane are split in two by a significant area of green belt, and it is inaccurate to suggest that the residents at the Lynn end of the Lane see themselves as anything other than residents of the combined community of Lynn and Stonnall. The Council requests that the Commission ensure that the community of Lynn Lane are kept together within Stonnall. This could be achieved by moving the boundary from the current proposed demarcation of Thorneyhurst Lane to Raikes Lane, with the boundary following alongside Owlett Hall Farm.</p> <p>We assume that the boundary between Lower Stonnall and Fotherley remains the same as Fotherley is already in Shenstone Ward. The Boundary Commission’s documentation clarifying its powers and limitations clearly stated that “it cannot create or abolish Parish Councils” yet the published recommendation has done both within our Wards</p> <p>Lichfield District Council requests that the Boundary Commission reconsider its proposal. The Commission should revert to the original submission made by for this area, which was formulated over a lengthy period, by and with, residents, Parish, District, and County members and based on very significant local knowledge and the importance of the structure and sense of identity of the whole of our community.</p> <p>The Boundary Commission should note that the three Parish Council Wards are well advanced in preparing under the Localism Act 2011 individual Neighbourhood Plans. The Parish proposal has been part of a major consultation with over 3000 households. Should the drastic changes being proposed by the Boundary Commission occur it will undoubtedly have a major consequence on the ultimate implementation of these well-advanced plans.</p>
19	Lichfield City	St Johns	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
20	Lichfield City	Stowe	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward
21	Burntwood	Summerfield &	Lichfield District Council has no further comments in relation to the proposals for this Ward

		All Saints	
22	Rural South	Whittington & Streethay	<p>Paragraph. 69. We question, based on local knowledge, if this statement is correct, and request the Commissioner to further justify this statement along with sufficient evidence.</p> <p>Paragraph.71. We note that you have decided to move Swinfen and Packington in to Whittington Ward and this will place it incorrectly into the Lichfield Constituency and we agree the benefit of taking the part of Drayton Bassett Parish Council that sits in Fazeley back together into Bourne Vale Ward.</p> <p>What does not work is the separation of Shenstone Wood End away from Little Aston where it shares a boundary into a new Shenstone Parish Council Parish Ward but separating it from location within its adjoining community and placing it in another ward that is outside its district membership family.</p>

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate - 2019	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Alrewas & Fradley	3	5,653	1,884	0%
Armitage with Handsacre	3	6,220	2,073	10%
Boley Park	2	3,681	1,841	-2%
Boney Hay & Central	3	5,365	1,788	-5%
Bourne Vale	1	1,871	1,871	0%
Chadsmead	2	3,631	1,816	-3%
Chase Terrace	2	3,894	1,947	4%
Chasetown	2	3,722	1,861	-1%
Colton & the Ridwares	1	1,849	1,849	-2%
Curborough	2	3,568	1,784	-5%
Fazeley	2	4,113	2,057	9%
Hammerwich	1	1,980	1,980	5%
Highfield	2	3,891	1,946	3%
Leomansley	3	5,572	1,857	-1%
Little Aston	2	3,870	1,935	3%
Stonnall & Wall	1	2,001	2,001	6%
Longdon	1	1,813	1,813	-4%
Mease Valley	1	1,984	2,397	6%
Shenstone	1	1,890	1,999	0%
St John's	3	5,739	1,913	2%
Stowe	3	5,364	1,788	-5%
Summerfield & All Saints	3	5,438	1,813	-4%
Whittington & Streethay	3	5,261	1,992	-6%
Total Number of councillors / electorate	47	88,370		