

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 August 2014 10:24
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of Local Government Boundaries in Peterborough

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 August 2014 09:54
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Review of Local Government Boundaries in Peterborough

From: JACKSON, Stewart [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2014 11:33
To: Reviews@
Subject: Review of Local Government Boundaries in Peterborough

Dear Sir/Madam

I write in response to your draft recommendations published on 14th July 2014.

For the record, I have been the Member of Parliament for the Peterborough constituency since May 2005 and followed the previous local government boundary review for the city in 2002 with close interest too.

For the avoidance of doubt, I broadly SUPPORT these draft proposals and the plans for 20 3-member wards across the City Council area giving a total membership of the City Council of 60 elected members.

I will generally confine my remarks to those proposals most closely linked to the existing wards I currently represent, i.e. the north of the Unitary Authority area, with the exception of the proposed Fletton and Woodston ward, which does impact upon the current West ward.

I support the need to have strong natural boundaries as logical and easily understood ward boundaries - such as the East Coast Mainline and the river. I also believe that the proposed ward boundaries should be based not merely on electoral numbers but on well understood districts, locales and communities.

As such, I strongly OBJECT to the decision to cross the River Nene and move residential streets on the north bank of the river (broadly the Thorpe Meadows area e.g Vermont Grove) into a *southern* city ward (Fletton and Woodston). This is perverse, goes against recent policy (the last 2002 review ended the historic anomaly in the old West ward of a cross river ward taking in parts of Orton Longueville) and has no support from local residents, who have no affinity or community links with Woodston residents. In addition, by retaining the streets in question in the new West ward, you will improve electoral equality between these two wards, especially as the proposed West ward variance is currently estimated to be -7% and this will be eliminated by retaining these streets in the new (and existing) West ward, with little serious knock on for Fletton and Woodston.

I SUPPORT the new **Ravensthorpe** ward proposals and in particular the logical inclusion of the Netherton residential area (in the south of the new ward) but would suggest that as the Ravensthorpe estate is merely one discrete part of the ward, it would be better named as "Ravensthorpe and Netherton" ward.

I **OBJECT** to the new **Park** ward boundaries in so far as Gilpin Street, Allen Road and part of Rock and St. Paul's Roads respectively are added. The Commission should seek to change boundaries for only the most compelling reasons and should avoid unnecessary disruption. These streets should be placed in the proposed North ward, not least because to do so would not just minimise disruption but would improve electoral equality between Park and North wards respectively. As such Park ward should be left with its existing boundaries which are longstanding and well understood.

Whilst I broadly support the new **West** ward, the decision to move many established properties in a fine residential area around the old Peterborough District Hospital site and adjacent to Thorpe Road into a Peterborough Central ward will attract much opposition and is unprecedented, not least because it disregards the natural boundaries of the A15 and the East Coast Mainline.

I **SUPPORT** the plans for the new **Bretton, East, Paston and Walton, Dogsthorpe, Eye, Thorney and Newborough, Gunthorpe** and **Werrington** wards respectively

I think that there is a case to be made to move the **Central** ward further east and to retain the railway line as a strong natural boundary; as the area west of the railway line has very little in common with the area to the east in the current Central ward.

Notwithstanding my comments regarding the boundary between the proposed North and Park Wards, I support the new **North** ward but believe its name is redundant and illogical. It is no longer "north" of either the urban area or the Unitary Authority as a whole, the name being an historical anomaly. I believe therefore that it should be renamed "Millfield and New England" ward to better reflect the local residential districts of which it will be composed.

I should be most grateful if you would take my comments into account in preparing your final boundary proposals.

Yours Sincerely

Stewart Jackson
MP for Peterborough

Telephone: 0207 219 5046

Email: stewart.jackson.mp@parliament.uk

Write: House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

Website: www.stewartjackson.org.uk

Twitter: @SJacksonMP

A strong and independent voice for Peterborough

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.