

---

**From:** barbara studholme [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 June 2016 13:58  
**To:** reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
**Subject:** Review Officer (South Lakeland)

Dear sir/madam,

I attach a response to the current review of the wards in South Lakeland District Council.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Studholme  
Chair of the Kendal branch of the Liberal Democrats

Kendal Branch  
Westmorland & Lonsdale Liberal Democrats



23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016

Review Officer (South Lakeland)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir/Madam,

Response to the Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Lakeland District Council May 2016.

I am writing to object to the proposals for the new electoral areas for both the Kendal Town Council and the South Lakeland District Council. Kendal is the principal town in South Lakeland. It has a designated parish boundary and has mayoral status. We have a very rural constituency covering most of the South Lakeland District Council. One of our present wards is 8 miles across.

Draft recommendations for Kendal Town Council.

We object to the draft proposals. The variety of councillors proposed from one to five for each electoral area is not acceptable. It means that some members will clearly identify with their area and others will find their area too large. The present arrangement of two councillors per ward and just two single member wards was agreed only a few years ago and we need to continue with this arrangement. They are also co-terminus with the District and County electoral areas.

Draft recommendations for South Lakeland District Council

As we are a rural constituency we object to the proposal of 17 three member wards. They are far too large. Our towns and villages have their own clear identities and so are better represented by more local people. The existing single member representative for a community should be retained. The proposal dilutes democracy, the inhabitants will not know who their representative is and the councillor will fail to identify with his ward .

The proposed movement of the Stonecross ward/area into the Levens and Natland area is not acceptable. The Stonecross ward is within the Kendal parish and so should be part of the parish voting area. It is also not acceptable as it means that the River Kent divides the new ward.

Equally the proposed Kendal North area means that the River Kent is a natural dividing area. There is only one road bridge linking the area and this was closed for two months in the floods this year.

It would appear that the proposals are not co-terminus with the present County Council divisions. The current situation is far easier for the public to understand.

We ask that the present arrangement be retained of single member wards. In order to address the variance in electoral equality, ward boundaries can be adjusted slightly.

Yours faithfully,

Barbara M Studholme  
Chairperson