

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.356

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Nicholas Morrison KCB

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Mr R R Thornton CB DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

To the Rt Hon William Whitelaw CH MC MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE
DISTRICT OF REDDITCH IN THE COUNTY OF HEREFORD AND
WORCESTER

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the District of Redditch in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements of that District.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 31 December 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Redditch District Council, copies of which were circulated to Hereford and Worcester County Council, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.
3. Redditch District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council have exercised an option for a system of elections by thirds.

5. The Council presented their draft scheme of representation on 23 May 1975. It provided for 11 wards, each returning 3 members and one ward returning 2 members to give a total Council of 35 members.

6. We also received, from a local political association, an alternative scheme providing for 9 wards returning 3 members each and one ward returning 2 members, to give a total Council of 29.

7. We found both schemes provided an uneven standard of representation.

We therefore invited the Council to submit revised proposals.

8. On 8 November 1976 Redditch District Council presented their revised draft scheme. They proposed to divide the area of the district into 7 wards each returning 3 members and 4 wards each returning 2 members to form a council of 29, four more than at present.

9. The District Council received no comments in response to the publication of their revised draft scheme. A local political group submitted to us an alternative scheme which provided for the division of the district into 10 wards each returning 3 members and 2 wards each returning 2 members to give a council of 34 members. This alternative scheme did not appear to offer any advantage over the draft scheme submitted by Redditch District Council.

10. We decided therefore that the District Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements for the district in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines.

Subject to minor adjustments recommended by Ordnance Survey to the alignments of some of the boundaries to secure boundary lines which were more easily identifiable on the ground, we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

11. On 3 May 1977 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the District Council's draft scheme. The District Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that comments should reach us by 18 July 1977.

12. Redditch District Council informed us that they approved of our draft proposals.

13. Hereford and Worcester County Council drew attention to the possible difficulties of dividing the proposed 11 wards among the 9 county electoral divisions which they envisaged.

14. The political group previously referred to in paragraph 9 submitted a modified version of their earlier alternative scheme for 10 wards.

15. A local political party wrote to suggest that the draft proposals should be amended so as to alter the boundaries between the proposed Crabbs Cross and Feckenham wards; between the proposed Central and West wards; and between the proposed Winyates and Matchborough wards.

16. In view of these comments we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request Mr D B F P Leigh was appointed an Assistant Commissioner. He was asked to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

17. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting at Redditch on 22 March 1979. He made an inspection of the areas discussed at the meeting. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1.

18. In the light of the evidence submitted at the meeting and of his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be adopted as final proposals, subject to a boundary amendment between Abbey and Church Hill wards.

19. We have reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments we received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We noted that the Assistant Commissioner concluded that both the draft proposals and the modified alternative scheme referred to in paragraph 14 offered a standard of equality of representation that was satisfactory. After careful consideration we decided that the boundaries put forward by the District Council and included in our draft proposals as modified by the Assistant Commissioner were better than those in the modified alternative scheme. We therefore decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals, subject to the boundary amendment recommended by the Assistant Commissioner.

20. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the map, is set out in Schedule 3. Schedule 4 shows our proposals for the order of retirement of councillors.

PUBLICATION

21. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to the

Redditch District Council and will be available for inspection at the District Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without the map) are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed:

NICHOLAS MORRISON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

R R THORNTON

LESLIE GRIMSHAW (Secretary)

26 July 1979

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS
DISTRICT OF REDDITCH

REPORT OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

Assistant Commissioner:

Mr D.B.F.P Leigh

Date of Meeting:

22nd March 1979

File No.:

LGBC/D/18/3

1.1 Having been appointed an Assistant Commissioner by the Home Secretary, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, I was asked by the Commission to hold a public meeting to hear representations and local views on their draft proposals for the electoral arrangements for the District of Redditch. I was advised that the meeting was part of the process of local consultation and should be run on lines as informal as possible so as to encourage a full exchange of views but consistent with the need to ensure a fair hearing

1.2 The meeting was held at the Council House Redditch on the 22nd March 1979. A list showing the names and address of those attending and the interests they represented is attached. On the same day I visited areas discussed at the meeting.

THE COMMISSION'S DRAFT PROPOSALS

2.1 The Commission's draft proposals, which are described in detail in their letter of the 3rd May 1977 to the District Council, provide for the following 11 wards:

	<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>No. of Councillors</u>
1	ABBEY	2
2	BATCHLEY	3
3	CENTRAL	3
4	CHURCH HILL	2
5	CRABBS CROSS	2
6	FECKENHAM	2
7	GREENLANDS	3
8	LODGE PARK	3
9	MATCHBOROUGH	3
10	WEST	3
11	WINYATES	3

The Council would consist of 29 Councillors and would be elected by thirds.

LABOUR GROUP ALTERNATIVE SCHEME

2.2 The District Council Labour Group's alternative Scheme, as amended by their letters to the Commission dated 19th June and 11th November 1977, provides for the following 12 wards:

	<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>No. of Councillors</u>
1	BATCHLEY	3
2	NORTH	3
3	NORTH-EAST	3
4	CENTRAL	3
5	HOLLOWAY	3
6	WINYATES	3
7	WEST	3
8	GREENLANDS	3
9	MATCHBOROUGH	3
10	CRABBS CROSS	3
11	WOODROW	2
12	FECKENHAM	2

The Council would consist of 34 Councillors and would be elected by thirds.

REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Mr W.J.Strang representing the Labour Group on the District Council drew attention to two important features of the rapid development of Redditch. The first was the increase in the population which was still growing and whose future size was difficult to forecast accurately. Secondly, the new road pattern included in the Master Plan created new natural boundaries between communities.
- 3.2 As to the size of the Council, he referred to paragraph 12 of the Commission's letter to the Council, dated 31st December 1974 which stated categorically "For non- metropolitan district councils the range is 30 - 60 Councillors. Your Council's draft Scheme should, therefore, provide for a number of Councillors within this range;" The Commission's proposal for a council of 29 members fell outside the terms of this instruction whereas the Labour Group's alternative, providing for 34 Councillors, did not and should, therefore, be preferred.
- 3.3 With regard to numerical equality, he referred to paragraph 4 of the Commission's letter to the Council, dated 7th May 1976, which rejected both schemes originally submitted by the Council and the then Conservative minority group on the grounds that they did not satisfy the requirement laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 that having regard to any change in the number or distribution of local government electors of a district likely to take place within the next 5 years, the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of

Councillors elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district. The Schedules accompanying the letter had been understood to mean that the maximum tolerance or departure from numerical equality in entitlement for Councillors should be 10%. The Labour Group's Scheme was the only one that fulfilled these requirements for each of the proposed wards on 1981 figures. The Commission's proposals did not satisfy this criterion.

3.4 He observed also that paragraph 14 of the Commission's letter of 31st December 1974 informed the Council that where the option to have elections by thirds had been chosen "it will usually be convenient to divide the area into 3-member wards" although an exception was made for rural areas in an otherwise urban district. The Labour Group Scheme followed this advice by making the rural Feckenham Ward a 2-member Ward. In Woodrow Ward which was the only other 2-member Ward a substantial area of land was likely to be developed after 1981 when it would be a simple matter to upgrade the ward to 3-member status. On the other hand the Commission's proposals envisaged 4 2-member Wards and would undermine the concept of election by thirds.

3.5

Dealing with other features of the Commission's proposals Mr Strang pointed out that the Labour Group Scheme paid maximum attention to the rules set out in paragraphs 7 - 10 of the Commission's letter of the 31st December 1974, particularly as to fixing easily identifiable boundaries and taking account of existing local ties insofar as was consistent with numerical equality. Special attention had been paid to the natural boundaries created by the new road pattern. By contrast the Commission's proposals provided a poor boundary between Abbey and Church Hill Wards which followed field boundaries and cut estate roads. That between Winyates and Matchborough was inexplicable on both community and numerical grounds. The boundary between Peckenham and Crabbs Cross ignored local community ties and traffic patterns. Finally the boundaries of Central, West and Crabbs Cross Wards split up Headless Cross into 3 wards in an indefensible hotchpotch.

4.1

Mr G. Millichamp, Secretary and Agent, Bromsgrove and Redditch Conservative Association said that he had been concerned with the preparation of a Scheme for the electoral arrangements in Redditch since 1975 and he agreed that there were special problems. With regard to the number of 2-member Wards in the Commission's proposals, he expected that future growth of population would soon justify an additional councillor in each of the Abbey, Church Hill and Crabbs Cross Wards.

4.2 The Council's Scheme, upon which the Commission's proposals had been based, took account of new roads and natural boundaries. As to particular boundaries proposed by the Commission he observed that although the boundary between Abbey and Church Hill Wards was not ideal if Alvechurch Highway and Coventry Highway were adopted as the boundary roads it would upset the balance of numbers and would create a ward which would be entitled to 4 members. As to the Winyates and Matchborough Wards boundary he agreed that the estate at Winyates Green was an identifiable community which should be included in one ward. He did not object to its inclusion in Matchborough Ward but would be agreeable to its inclusion in Winyates Ward if equality of representation permitted this to be done. The boundary between Feckenham and Crabbs Cross was not entirely satisfactory and Windmill Drive would make a better boundary but equality of numbers was again the problem. The most difficult boundaries were those between Central, West and Crabbs Cross Wards which affected the Headless Cross area but the Commission's proposals gave effect to the community of interest amongst those living along the Evesham Road. He supported the Commission's proposals.

5.1 Mr A. Wharrad representing the Redditch District Labour Party said that the criteria originally adopted placed principal emphasis upon the importance of conserving local communities and selecting natural boundaries. After the submission of a Scheme by the then Labour controlled Council the emphasis had shifted towards the importance of numerical equality.

5.2 He wished first to discuss the boundary between Feckenham and Crabbs Cross Wards. The Commission's proposals had the effect of putting the largest single estate in Crabbs Cross into Feckenham with which it had hardly any connection. Some 780 electors lived in the rough square bounded by Crabbs Cross Lane to the north, Evesham Road to the East, Weavers Hill - Dagtail Lane to the south and Enfield Road to the West. The new road system was designed to feed them in a northerly direction towards the centre of Crabbs Cross where were situated the shops, post office, public houses, Junior School, clinic and the site for a projected community centre. The footpaths were similarly directed. To the south and south-west lay some 3 miles of open country before Feckenham was reached. Between Crabbs Cross and Astwood Bank lay fields, a wood and a disused sewerage plant. There existed an association called The Hunt End and Crabbs Cross Community Association. The school, Church and Chapel were in Crabbs Cross as was the new polling station at St. Augustine's High School and the playing fields. This community, the bulk of whom were born and bred in Crabbs Cross or Hunt End, should be in Crabbs Cross and not in Feckenham Ward. The boundary should follow Windmill Drive. As a corollary to this proposal

Mr Wharrad put forward a new suggestion whereby, in order to for the electors transferred to Crabbs Cross Ward, compensate Feckenham Ward/ an area of roughly rectangular shape at the southwest of West Ward would be put into Feckenham Ward. The numbers of electors added to Feckenham Ward resulting from this boundary change was said to be 180 on current figures and was not expected to rise by 1981.

5.3 Secondly he referred to the boot shaped area of Headless Cross at the southern end of the proposed Central Ward. If approved the boundary would cut in half the Vaynor Estate, the largest private estate in this part of Redditch bounded ~~the~~ ^{by} Meadway to the north, Evesham Road to the east, Jubilee Avenue to the South and Feckenham Road to the west. This area had its own shops and provided most of the members of the Headless Cross Residents Association. It should be left intact and the northern boundary of this area should run along the line created by The Rough, across Evesham Road to Highfield Avenue to join the eastern boundary of the proposed Central Ward from a point where The Meadway joins Chapel Street i.e. the existing ward boundary. This would retain the unity of most of Headless Cross.

5.4 Thirdly, Mr Wharrad raised the issue of the proposed Matchborough and Winyates Wards. He submitted a plan to illustrate the District Labour Party's revised proposal that the boundary should proceed to the district boundary to the east via Warwick Highway with no diversion in Winyates Green. Both the Winyates and Matchborough areas were bounded by major dual

carriageways to the north and the south, by the County boundary to the east and by the River Arrow to the west. Both Matchborough and Winyates had Residents' Associations. Matchborough had a shopping centre, Church centre and community buildings. Winyates had a shopping centre, Health Centre, Craft Centre, community rooms and a Church Centre in course of construction. It would be indefensible to take a mile long corridor from the north and east of Winyates and include it in Matchborough. The Labour Party suggestion would not produce unacceptable inequality of representation. The District Labour Party would prefer that the Labour Group's Scheme should be adopted. If the Commission's proposals were retained the ward boundaries should be amended as he had indicated.

6. Mr C.T. Wareing, Secretary of the Bromsgrove and Redditch Conservative Association agreed on the importance of community ties. It was, however, significant that the Headless Cross Community Association, formed 6 or 7 years ago, was not represented at the meeting and clearly did not feel strongly about the proposed boundaries of Central, West and Crabbs Cross Wards which were eminently sensible. The Labour Party proposal would divide the Headless Cross area in half. He supported the submission made by Mr Millichamp and considered that the Commission's proposals were impartial and should be confirmed.

7. Mr. G.P. Hartles, Independent District Councillor supported the Labour Group's proposals.

Mr P.E.J. Reynolds, Chairman, South Branch Labour Party supported the Labour Party proposals with regard to Crabbs Cross and Hunt End which should not be split.

8.1 Mr F. Woodrow, Chief Planning Officer, Redditch District Council drew attention to the hierarchy and nomenclature of roads in the Master Plan. District Distributors (Drives) were strong dividers. Local Distributors (Lanes) might or might not be regarded as dividers.

8.2 With regard to the number of councillors he pointed out that it was a compact district. It was moreover still growing and it would be undesirable if, by reason of future additions to its membership, the Council were to become too large. An unusually high proportion of councillors were familiar with parts of the district other than those they represented.

8.3 Dealing with the boundary between Crabbs Cross and Feckenham Wards, Mr Woodrow agreed that the community of Crabbs Cross was separate from Feckenham but in order to preserve equality of representation it had been necessary to include more electors in Feckenham Ward and he regarded the Commission's proposed boundary as a sensible compromise. If it were feasible to re-draw the boundary of Crabbs Cross so as to follow Windmill Drive the effect, on both 1980 and 1981 projections, would be to

transfer 300 electors into the ward from Feckenham.
He appreciated the problems of the Headless Cross area.
The Commission's proposals included the land on the ridge to the north of Jubilee Avenue in Central Ward. This division corresponded with the feelings of the residents on the ridge who looked upon themselves as natives of Headless Cross.
As to the boundary between Matchborough and Winyates Ward he agreed that Winyates Green should be considered as a whole.
There were 2 possible dividers, Alders Drive, a district distributor and Warwick Highway, which was to be a dual-carriageway. Preferably the area should be in Winyates Ward but the difficulty was to attain numerical equality.

ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 The District of Redditch is relatively compact in size but is unusual in the extent and rate of its projected population growth. The present electoral scheme consisting of 8 Wards returning a Council of 25, no less than 7 of whom are elected for the Greenlands Ward, is clearly inadequate and both the Commission's proposals and the Labour Group Scheme provide for a substantial increase in the number of wards and the size of the Council. It is not possible to introduce changes of this order without some interference with the links that bind local communities, as was recognised by those who had tried to work out a new scheme, while at the same time observing the rules laid down in the Local Government Act, 1972. It seems to me, having had the advantage of hearing at the meeting the views of those concerned in the preparation of the Council's Scheme, which formed the basis of the Commission's proposals, and of the Labour Group's alternative Scheme, that they had all made conscientious and thorough attempts to overcome the difficulties inherent in the situation and I would draw no distinction between them in this respect.

Size of Council

9.2 The 1972 Act itself contains no provisions as to the size of Councils. Mr Strang, on behalf of the Labour Group, is however right in saying that the advice given by the Commission contemplates a range of 30 - 60 Councillors in non-metropolitan district councils and that by this standard there is a shortfall of 1 councillor in the Commission's proposals. The lower figure of 30 is not, however, an immutable standard and the Commission in paragraph 12 of their letter to the Council of the 31st December 1974 also recognise that a smaller number may be appropriate in some circumstances. The right test, it is suggested, is whether the size of the Council is sufficient to enable it to discharge its functions effectively. No evidence was put before me to show that a Council of 29 members would be at a disadvantage in this respect and I conclude that a Council of this size could operate efficiently. In view of the expected further growth of the population of the District it seems likely that in the years after 1981 there may be justification for an increase in its size and that a Council of 29 would be a suitable base on which to build. Having regard also to the compact nature of the District I consider that the Commission's proposals are satisfactory with regard to the number of members of the Council.

Equality of Representation

9.3 Equality of representation is of vital importance in considering electoral arrangements. The projections available for the future size of the electorate are for the years 1980 and 1981 and it is necessary to compare the entitlements under both the Commission's proposals and the Labour Group's Scheme.

9.4 The following table shows entitlements under the Commission's proposals (1981 figures taken from the Council's table dated 26th April 1977)

	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>1980 Entitlement</u>	<u>1981 Entitlement</u>
1	BATCHLEY	3	3.08	3.00
2	ABBEY	2	1.95	2.06
3	CHURCH HILL	2	2.27	2.26
4	WEST	3	2.75	2.72
5	CENTRAL	3	3.21	3.13
6	WINYATES	3	2.87	2.80
7	MATCHBOROUGH	3	3.11	3.00
8	LODGE PARK	3	3.00	2.90
9	GREENLANDS	3	3.17	3.09
10	CRABBS CROSS	2	1.87	2.27
11	FECKENHAM	2	1.71	1.71
	Total electorate:		48010	49280
	Average electors for Councillor:		1656	1699

9.5 The following table shows entitlements under the Labour Group's Scheme:

	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>1980 entitlement</u>	<u>1981 entitlement</u>
1	BATCHLEY	3	3.13	3.05
2	NORTH	3	3.16	3.08
3	NORTH-EAST	3	2.57	2.74
4	CENTRAL	3	2.77	2.70
5	HOLLOWAY	3	3.21	3.13
6	WINYATES	3	3.15	3.07
7	WEST	3	3.28	3.24
8	GREENLANDS	3	2.96	2.98
9	MATCHBOROUGH	3	3.07	3.00
10	CRABBS CROSS	3	2.82	3.01
11	WOODROW	2	2.04	1.99
12	FECKENHAM	2	1.78	2.00
Total electorate:			48010	49280
Average electors per Councillor:			1412	1449

9.6 On a careful consideration of these tables I conclude that both Schemes afford a standard of equality of representation that is satisfactory.

Election by Thirds

9.7 An advantage claimed for the Labour Group's Scheme is that in only 2 wards (Feckenham and Woodrow) is the number of councillors to be elected 2. Moreover Woodrow Ward was likely to grow after 1981 so as to justify a third councillor. The other 10 wards return 3 councillors each. Under the Commission's proposals 4 wards (Abbey, Church Hill, Crabbs Cross and Feckenham) return 2 councillors each and the remaining 7 return 3 councillors each. Mr Strang suggested that so high a proportion of 2-member wards would undermine the concept of election by thirds.

9.8 Where a system of election by thirds is adopted in a district it is tidier and probably more convenient to divide the area into 3-member wards although this is not an essential requirement. The Commission's proposals provide for the councillors representing the 2-member wards to retire in rotation so that one third, as nearly as may be, of the whole council is re-elected in each district election year. This arrangement is, in my view, quite acceptable and I do not attach great importance to the criticism made of the Commission's proposals in this respect.

Ward Boundaries

9.9 Abbey and Church Hill Wards

The boundary proposed by the Commission between Abbey and Church Hill Wards appears to follow ordnance survey field boundaries. It was suggested to me that a much better boundary would be formed by following the new road pattern and that the numbers of electors in the two wards would not thereby be changed materially. I agree and

I RECOMMEND

that the boundary between Abbey and Church Hill Wards should follow a line southwards along Icknield Street and Tanhouse Lane to its junction with Church Hill Way thence westwards along Church Hill Way to its junction with Paper Mill Drive thence southeastwards along Paper Mill Drive to its junction with Coventry Highway.

Matchborough and Winyates Wards

9.10 The representatives of the Conservative and Labour organisations were generally in agreement that Winyates Green constituted a community which should preferably be placed in its entirety in one ward. Mr Wharred felt that it rightly belonged to Winyates Ward. Mr Millichamp did not think it very important whether it was in Matchborough or Winyates Ward. The number of electors in Winyates Green was 841 on the current register and was not expected to rise by 1981. It was apparent that if it were to be included in Winyates Ward there would be an increase of 841 in the number of electors for that ward because no compensatory adjustment of its boundary would be practicable.

9.11 By extending the boundary between the two wards eastwards along Warwick Highway to the district boundary the whole of Winyates Green would be placed in Winyates Ward. The effect of this change numerically would be as follows:

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No. of Councillors</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>1980</u> <u>Entitlement</u>
Matchborough	3	4312 (5153)	2.60 (3.11)
Winyates	3	5588 (4747)	3.37 (2.87)

(Figures for Commission's proposals shown in brackets)

Unfortunately the entitlements are significantly worse under this arrangement and for this reason I do not feel able to endorse it. Mr Wharred put forward at the meeting a further revised proposal for a lesser revision of the boundary so as to transfer some 220 electors from Matchborough to Winyates. The benefits conferred by this suggestion would, in my view, be marginal and the effect on equality of representation, though slight, would be adverse. On balance I do not recommend it.

Crabbs Cross, Feckenham and West Wards

9.12 It was suggested by the Redditch District Labour Party that the boundary between Crabbs Cross and Feckenham Wards should follow the line of Windmile Drive so as to keep the coherent communities of Crabbs Cross and Hunt End within Crabbs Cross Ward. My impression was that all parties agreed that the Crabbs Cross/Feckenham boundary was a difficult one, in that Crabbs Cross was a more natural centre for the houses at the northeastern extremity of Feckenham Ward than was Feckenham which was separated from them by a large area of open land. Moreover the road pattern recognised this.

9.13 The difficulty arises from the need to achieve parity of representation. The change proposed would have the following result:

<u>Wards</u>	<u>No. of Councillors</u>	<u>Electors</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Crabbs Cross	2	3525 (3101)	2.13	(1.87)
Feckenham	2	2405 (2829)	1.45	(1.71)

(Figures for Commission's proposals shown in brackets)

9.14 At the meeting Mr Wharrad put forward a new proposal, designed to improve the Feckenham entitlement, whereby an area at the southwest of West Ward, said to contain ^{some} 180 electors, would be transferred to Feckenham Ward. On a comparable basis to the above numerical table the effect of this would be:

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No. of Councillors</u>	<u>Electors</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Crabbs Cross	2	3525 (3101)	2.13	(1.87)
Feckenham	2	2585 (2829)	1.56	(1.71)
West	3	4376 (4556)	2.64	(2.75)

(Figures for Commission's proposals shown in brackets)

The entitlements which would result from the alteration proposed, even if the further modification to the boundary of Feckenham and Crabbs Cross Wards were effected, are markedly worse than those under the Commission's proposals. In particular Feckenham would be over-represented. In view of the priority to be attached to equal representation, it is with some regret that I am unable to accept the amendments proposed. I agree with Mr Woodrow's view that given the need to attain a reasonable number of electors in Feckenham Ward the Commission's proposals represent a sensible compromise.

Central, Crabbs Cross and West Wards

9.14

All those who addressed me at the meeting were in agreement about the difficulty of incorporating the Headless Cross area within a ward pattern, given the need to achieve a numerically satisfactory standard of representation. None of the proposals advanced succeeded in retaining this community within a single ward. The Commission's proposals were criticised for splitting the area into three wards but on the other hand it was said that they recognised the community of interest between those living along the Evesham Road. Judging by the lack of any representations from the Headless Cross Community Association and from members of the public the precise division of this area, granted that all the proposals made accept the need for it to be divided in some way, does not seem to be a matter of great concern to the local residents. On 1980 figures the Commission's proposals appear to offer a somewhat better standard of equality than those under the District Labour Party's alternative, particularly in Central Ward (3.21 as against 2.62) and in West Ward (2.75 as against 3.35) and on balance seem to me preferable.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

10. I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals be adopted as the final proposals for the electoral arrangements in the District of Redditch, subject to the re-drawing of the boundary between Abbey and Church Hill Wards as indicated in paragraph 9.9 of this report.

Signed

David Leiper

Dated

18th May 1979

Local Government Boundary Commission

Review of Electoral Arrangements

Public Meeting - 22nd March, 1979

Council House, Redditch

ATTENDANCE LIST

Name	Address	Organisation Represented
W J Strain	1069, Evesham Road	Council Labour Group
A G Wharrell	205, Fobstock Close, Redditch.	Redditch Labour Party.
R. H. L. L.	174 Worcester Road	Bromsgrove & Redditch Liberal Party
C. J. Waring.	33, Downsell Road, Webheath, REDDITCH.	Bromsgrove & Redditch Conservative Association
G. M. LICHANP.	49 SUTTON CLOSE WINTERS REDDITCH Wals'	SELESTON & AGENT BROMSGROVE & REDDITCH Conservative Association
F. A. NEWBOULD	OLD YARR PECKENHAM.	Bromsgrove & Redditch Conservative Assoc.
M. Lodge.	Arrow C. Ward. Redditch Assn.	
Cllr G P Hatters.	72 Sillins Avenue ^{Redditch}	Independent Group
Mitchell Clue.	Hemel's Road	Bham Evening Mail
Graeme Thompson	Edgeworth Close, Church Hill.	Redditch Independent
I. E. J. Roy D/S.	1 Beoley Croft, Redditch	South Branch Labour Party
F. J. Doolan	178 Alcester Road Shady	Redditch District Council
R. Baker	95 CROPTHORNS CLOSE, REDDITCH	Redditch District Council
M. Marshall	45 South Street, Redditch	Redditch District Council

REDDITCH DISTRICT : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
Abbey	2
Batchley	3
Central	3
Church Hill	2
Crabbs Cross	2
Feckenham	2
Greenlands	3
Lodge Park	3
Matchborough	3
West	3
Winyates	3

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES - DISTRICT OF REDDITCH

Note: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature, it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

FECKENHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of the District meets the southwestern boundary of parcel No 2177 as

shown on OS 1:2500 plan SP 00-0165 Edition of 1973, thence southeastwards, southwestwards and southeastwards along said southwestern boundary to Norgrove Lane, thence northeastwards along said lane to a point opposite the north-eastern boundary of parcel no 2052, thence southeastwards to and along said northeastern boundary and southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of said parcel to the eastern boundary of parcel no 2323, thence southeastwards along said eastern boundary to the unnamed stream that flows southwestwards from Green Lane, thence generally northeastwards along said stream to Green Lane, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said lane to a point opposite the path that leads from Green Lane to Feckenham Road, thence southeastwards to and northeastwards along said path to the eastern boundary of parcel no 2419 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SP 02-0365 Edition of 1973, thence southwestwards along said eastern boundary, the eastern boundary of parcel no 2700 and 2700 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SP 02-0364 Edition of 1973 and southwards along the eastern boundaries of parcel nos 1600 and 2779 to Callow Hill Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to a point opposite the western boundary of the property known as Whitmore Cottage, thence southeastwards to and generally southwards along said western boundary to its junction with the southern boundary of said property and the northwestern boundary of parcel no 4663, thence southeastwards in a straight line from said point to the western most point of parcel no 5658, thence southeastwards along the southwestern boundary of said parcel to the

road known as Love Lane, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of parcel no 8942, thence northeastwards to and along said boundary and the northwestern boundaries of parcel nos 0749 and 3529 to northeastern boundary of the last mentioned parcel, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the northeastern boundary of parcel no 5245 to the stream known as The Wharrage, thence generally southeastwards and southwards along said stream to the southwestern boundary of No 124 Enfield Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Enfield Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Crabbs Cross Lane, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along said lane to its end, thence due south to and northeastwards along Windmill Drive to the roundabout junction with Evesham Road, thence southwards along said road to a point opposite the northern boundary of parcel no 2700 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SP 04-0564 Edition of 1972, thence eastwards to and along said boundary and the northern boundary of parcel no 3000 to the eastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwards along said District boundary and generally westwards along the southern boundary and generally northwards along the western boundary of the District to the point of commencement.

CRABBS CROSS WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of the District meets the northeastern boundary of Feckenham Ward, thence generally northwestwards and northwards along said northeastern boundary to the footpath that leads from Green Lane to Feckenham Road, thence eastwards along said footpath to Feckenham Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the path leading from Feckenham Road to Tennyson Road, thence southeastwards to and southeastwards and northeastwards along said path to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of parcel no 4620 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SP 02-0365 Edition of 1973, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 74 Jubilee Avenue, thence northeastwards along said boundary and generally northeastwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 72-10 Jubilee Avenue to the northern boundary of No 126 Malvern Road, thence northeastwards along said boundary, crossing Malvern Road in a straight line to the northern boundary of No 109 Malvern Road, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 4 and 2 Jubilee Avenue to the

northern boundary of No 284 Evesham Road, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Evesham Road, thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of No 239 Evesham Road, thence northeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the northwestern boundary of parcel no 0041, thence northeastwards along said boundary and continuing northeastwards along said field boundary as shown on OS 1:1250 plan SP 0465 SW and its prolongation to Coldfield Drive, thence generally southeastwards along said drive to Rough Hill Drive, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along said drive to a point opposite the rear boundaries of Nos 23-61 The Slough, thence southeastwards to and along said rear boundaries to the track southeast of the last mentioned property, thence southeastwards along the northern end of said track and the rear boundary of No 65 The Slough to the southwestern boundary of parcel no 8450 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SP 04-0564 Edition of 1972, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the District, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said District boundary to the point of WEST WARD commencement.

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Feckenham Ward meets the western boundary of the District, thence generally northeastwards and northwestwards along said District boundary to the road known as Bromsgrove Highway, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite Plymouth Road South, thence southwestwards to and along said road and crossing Rectory Road to Birchfield Road, thence southeastwards along said road to Chapel Street, thence southwestwards along said street to the road known as The Meadway, thence southeastwards along said road to Mason Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 43 Mason Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 45-63 Mason Road to the rear boundary of No 18 Byron Road, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundary of No 20 Byron Road to the southwestern boundary

of said property, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Byron Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the access road to the rear of Nos 81-91 Mason Road, thence southeastwards along said access road and in prolongation thereof to the northern boundary of No 93 Mason Road, thence eastwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southeastwards along said boundary and generally southeastwards and southwestwards along the rear boundaries of Nos 95-111 Mason Road to the southwestern boundary of last mentioned property, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the rear boundary of No 113 Mason Road, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 115 and 117 Mason Road to the northeastern boundary of No 119 Mason Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary and southwestwards along the rear boundary of said property and the rear boundary of No 121 Mason Road to the southwestern boundary of No 151 Mason Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Mason Road, then northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of No 192 Mason Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the northwestern boundary of Crabbs Cross Ward, thence southwestwards, northwestwards and again southwestwards along said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Feckenham Ward, thence generally southwestwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

BATCHLEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of West Ward meets the western boundary of the District, thence generally northeastwards along said District boundary and southeastwards along the northern boundary of the District to Birmingham Road, thence southwards along said road to the road known as Alvechurch Highway, thence southeastwards along said road to the road known as Coventry Highway, thence southwestwards along said road and the road known as Redditch Ringway

to Alcester Street, thence northwestwards along said street, Market Place and the road known as Unicorn Hill to a road known as Bates Hill, thence northwestwards along said road and the subway to Windsor Street, thence southwards along said street to the footbridge over the Redditch-Alvechurch railway line, thence westwards along said footbridge to the access road from Bridge Street to Clive Works, thence northwards and westwards along said access road to Bridge Street, thence westwards along said street to the footpath leading from Bridge Street to the access road to Valley Stadium, thence southwestwards along said footpath to said access road, thence northwestwards along said access road to the southeastern boundary of Valley Stadium, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the southeastern and southwestern boundaries of said Stadium to the southeastern boundary of Bridley Moor High School Playing Fields, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the southeastern boundary of the Cricket Ground to the western boundary of No 164 Bromsgrove Road, thence, southeastwards along said boundary to Bromsgrove Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 205 Bromsgrove Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said rear boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 207-287 Bromsgrove Road to the southwestern corner of the last mentioned property, thence due southwestwards from said corner to the northeastern boundary of West Ward, thence northwestwards along said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

CENTRAL WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of West Ward meets the southeastern boundary of Batchley Ward, thence generally northeastwards, southeastwards and northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to a point opposite Other Road on the Redditch Ringway - Coventry Highway Roundabout, thence southeastwards to and along said road to Ipsley Street, thence southwestwards along said street to Holloway Lane, thence southeastwards along said lane to Holloway Drive, thence

southwestwards and southeastwards along said drive to the road known as Alvechurch Highway, thence southwestwards along said road to a point being due east of NG Reference SP 04491 66432 thence due west to said NG Reference being in Coldfield Drive, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said drive to the northern boundary of Crabbs Cross Ward, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of West Ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary and northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said ward to the point of commencement.

ABBEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Batchley Ward meets the northern boundary of the District, thence generally eastwards and southwards along said District Boundary to a point due north of the junction of Ravensbank Road and Tanhouse Lane thence due south to and generally southeastwards along Tanhouse Lane to a road known as Church Hill Way, thence southwestwards along said road to Paper Mill Drive, thence generally southeastwards along said drive to the road known as Coventry Highway, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said road to the northeastern boundary of Batchley Ward, thence northwestwards and northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

CHURCH HILL WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Abbey Ward meets the northern boundary of the District, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along the said northern and eastern boundary of the District to the road known as Coventry Highway, thence generally westwards

along said road to the eastern boundary of Abbey Ward, thence northwestwards, northeastwards and northwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

WINYATES WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Abbey Ward meets the southern boundary of Church Hill Ward, thence generally eastwards along said boundary to Alders Drive, thence southwestwards, southeastwards and southwards along said drive to the road known as Warwick Highway, thence northwestwards along said road, crossing the Warwick Highway-Henley Highway Roundabout in a straight line to the southern carriageway of the road known as Henley Highway, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said road to the River Arrow as realigned, thence northwestwards along said river to the path at NG Reference SP 0579767479, thence northeastwards along said path to and northwestwards, northeastwards and southeastwards along the path leading to the unnamed road between Arrow Valley Lake and Marlfield Lane, thence northwestwards along said unnamed road to a point opposite the western boundary of parcel no 8781 on OS 1:2500 plan SP 04-0567 Edition of 1968, thence northwestwards to said boundary, thence northeastwards along the southern boundary, northwards along the eastern boundary and northwestwards along the northern boundary of said parcel to the eastern boundary of parcel no 8200, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Abbey Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

MATCHBOROUGH WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Church Hill Ward meets the northeastern boundary of the District, thence southeastwards along said District Boundary and generally southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of the District to the River Arrow, thence generally northwestwards along said river and following its realigned alignment to the southern

boundary of Winyates Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of said ward, thence generally northwards, northwestwards and northeastwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Church Hill Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

LODGE PARK WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Abbey Ward meets the western boundary of Winyates Ward, thence southeastwards, southwestwards and southeastwards along said western boundary to and generally southeastwards along the western boundary of Matchborough Ward to Broadground Ditch, thence generally northwestwards along said ditch to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of the Engineering Works of British Aluminium Ltd, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to Studley Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Oakenshaw Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of No 3 Oakenshaw Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of said property, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 5-9 Oakenshaw Road, crossing Greenlands Avenue in a straight line to the rear boundary of No 11 Oakenshaw Road, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 13-17 and 21-85 Oakenshaw Road, crossing the path leading from Oakenshaw Road to Greenlands Avenue, to the rear boundary of No 87 Oakenshaw Road, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 89-107 Oakenshaw Road and in prolongation thereof to Granhill Close, thence southeastwards along said close to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of No 1 Granhill Close, thence northeastwards to and along said boundary to the footpath to the northeast of Nos 1-13 Granhill Close, thence southeastwards along said footpath to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 13 Granhill Close, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to Granhill Close, thence southeastwards along said

close to a point due north of the northeastern corner of No 48 Granhill Close, thence due south to and southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of said property to the footpath leading to Wishaw Close, thence southwestwards along said footpath to the footpath to the north of Nos 110-126 and Nos 131-123 Wishaw Close, thence generally westwards along said footpath and southwestwards and southeastwards along the continuation of said footpath being to the west of Nos 123-13 Wishaw Close to its junction with the footpath to the north of the Sports and Social Club, thence northwestwards and generally southwestwards along said path to Greenlands Drive, thence southeastwards along said drive to Rough Hill Drive, thence southwestwards and southeastwards along said drive to the northeastern boundary of Crabbs Cross Ward, thence generally northwestwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of Central Ward, thence generally northwestwards, northeastwards and northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Batchley Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the southeastern boundary of Abbey Ward to the point of commencement.

GREENLANDS WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Matchborough Ward meets the southeastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwestwards and northwestwards along said District Boundary to the southeastern boundary of Crabbs Cross Ward, thence northwestwards and northeastwards along said boundary and northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said ward to the southeastern boundary of Lodge Park Ward, thence generally northeastwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the southwestern boundary of Matchborough Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

SCHEDULE 4

DISTRICT OF REDDITCH

ELECTION BY THIRDS : ORDER OF RETIREMENT

NAME OF WARD	NO. OF COUNCILLORS REPRESENTING WARD	ORDER OF RETIREMENT		
		FIRST YEAR	SECOND YEAR	THIRD YEAR
Abbey	2	-	1	1
Batchley	3	1	1	1
Central	3	1	1	1
Church Hill	2	1	-	1
Crabbs Cross	2	-	1	1
Feckenham	2	1	1	-
Greenlands	3	1	1	1
Lodge Park	3	1	1	1
Matchborough	3	1	1	1
West	3	1	1	1
Winyates	3	1	1	1
	29	9	10	10

