

Dear Mr Ashby,

Re: New electoral arrangements for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

As election Agent for Windsor Constituency Labour Party (CLP), I write on their behalf to offer our contribution to the Local Government Boundary Commission's review of local ward boundaries in Windsor and Maidenhead. It is understood that the Commission recommends that the number of councillors for the whole of Windsor and Maidenhead be reduced from 57 to 42. We propose a final scheme of 41 councillors overall, this being 19 in Windsor and 22 in Maidenhead. This differs from the proposal of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM), which assumes 42 councillors in total.

We share the three main considerations of the Commission, namely to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

We do not agree that a pattern consisting exclusively of two and three-member wards should be "*favoured over a pattern including one-member wards to promote effective local government.*" (RBWM submission, para 4.2) Local government is most effective where there is a clear identification of the councillors with a well-defined community, sharing common interests and identity – whether it be in one, two or three-member wards.

The Commission's draft for Ascot and Windsor proposes 8 wards; our recommendation is for 11 wards. Two of the eight recommendations we accept unaltered, namely, **Clewer East** and **Datchet, Horton and Wraybury**. These fulfil the requirements vis a vis equivalence, efficiency and community identity, set out above.

Windsor CLP recommends that:

Eton Wick with Eton could stand alone as a single member ward, it being clearly bounded by the River Thames to its south.

Clewer North and **Clewer South** have enjoyed a "natural" boundary since 1920, in the shape of the B3024. Nonetheless, to improve electoral equality, polling district JA could be transferred, in its entirety, from Clewer South to Clewer North.

Thereupon, in each of these three wards above, equivalence would be good; Local Government efficiencies are then optimised, the same pattern of polling districts being largely preserved, and extant community identities are hence recognised and respected (for instance, Dedworth is respected as it will be no longer tied to Clewer Village, with which it has relatively little affinity).

Old Windsor ward has poor equivalence at present and will require an additional 1650 electors to remedy this. We recommend it is combined with the polling district VD (Park East) from **Park Ward**, to be renamed **Old Windsor and Park**; community identities are similar, and this ward, though seemingly large in area, is sparsely populated, thus satisfying the electoral equivalence requirement.

Ascot area, presently served by three wards would see great improvements in the reflection of community identity, and near perfect electoral equality if it moved to four wards, namely: **Ascot Heath**; **Ascot with Sunninghill**; **South Ascot**; **Sunningdale & Cheapside**. Each of these four areas enjoys its own individual amenities, in the form of schools and shops and community events, often centred on the schools.

To conclude, in the following summary of the council members we recommend for each of our 11 preferred wards, we can demonstrate that optimum electoral equality is achieved.....

	Councillors	Electors 2023
Datchet, Horton and Wraysbury:	3	8,481
Eton Wick with Eton:	1	3,206
Castle:	2	5,944
Clewer East:	2	5,452
Clewer North & Dedworth:	2	5,886
Clewer South:	2	5,717
Old Windsor and Park:	2	5,793
Ascot Heath:	1	2,859
Ascot with Sunninghill:	1	2,958
South Ascot:	1	2,752
Sunningdale and Cheapside:	2	5,882

Regards,

Lesley Hunter, Election Agent, Windsor Constituency Labour Party
May 6th, 2018