

RECEIVED

11 JAN 2016



Local Government Boundary Commission for England,  
Layden House,  
76/78 Turnmill Street,  
London EC1 5LG  
(By Recorded Delivery).

6<sup>th</sup> January 2016

Dear Sirs,

**RE: Boundary Review South Lakeland District  
Council  
Response By Conservative Group on Warding  
Pattern**

I am writing on behalf of the above Group with our alternative response on warding pattern to that proposed by South Lakeland District Council.

I attach our proposals and confirm that I have been authorised to sign this letter as confirmation that these proposals have been agreed by the entire Conservative Group of Councillors namely:

J. and C. Airey, B. Berry, R. Bingham, A. Butcher, B. Cooper, A. Hall, T. Harvey, J. Holmes, H. Irving, J. Jenkinson, K. Lancaster, M. Mackie, A. Rigg, and myself.

You



**Cllr.David.L.Williams**  
**Group Leader Conservatives SLDC.**

## **Conservative Group Recommendations to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England on new Warding Arrangements for the District of South Lakeland**

As the Conservative Group we initially considered that all out elections, with single member wards, were preferable to election by thirds and three member wards. However, since The Council voted to continue with three member wards we consider that wards should be represented by three members wherever possible.

In presenting our submissions we have focused on the following points:

- Three member wards to reflect the electoral cycle of The Council.
- Keeping communities together by merging existing wards and looking at County Council Divisions, reflecting community interests and identities.
- Using the Council's 2021 electorate forecast to ensure each proposed ward comes to within a 5% variance of the optimum, to ensure convenient local government.

Below are our proposed warding arrangements. Please forgive us for not suggesting ward names at this time:

### **Whinfell, Staveley (Westmorland) and Burneside**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5209 (being inside a 5% variance) and being the existing County Division.

### **Windermere Bowness South, Lyth Valley and Staveley Cartmel**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5236 (being inside a 5% variance) and being most of the existing County Division.

### **Windermere Appletwhaithe and Troutbeck, Windermere Bowness North, Windermere Town**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5130 (being inside a 5% variance) and being the existing County Division with the addition of Troutbeck polling station. Please note that removing Troutbeck polling district from this proposed ward reduces the electorate to below the 5% variance we aimed for.

### **Broughton, Hawkshead and Coniston Crake**

We recognise that with 4805 residents this ward does not meet our optimum electorate number. However given the amount of small parishes and the vast nature of this ward we feel keeping this rural community together as a three member ward outweighs the small downside in electorate.

### **Ulverston East, Ulverston Central and Ulverston Town**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5231 (being inside a 5% variance) and being the existing County Division.

**Ulverston West, South and North**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5390 (being inside a 5% variance) and being the existing County Division.

**Arnside and Beetham, Milnthorpe**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5624 (being inside a 5% variance), being most of the existing County Division and having strong local connections between these communities.

**Burton and Holme, Crooklands**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5548 (being inside a 5% variance) and being most of the existing County Division.

**Sedbergh and Kirkby Lonsdale**

This is already a three member ward with an electorate of 5307 (being inside a 5% variance) and the existing County Division.

**Grange West, Grange North, Grange South**

We accept that this proposed three member ward would have an excess of electorate by the 2021 forecast (6004 residents). However, considering the strong local connections and with 2015 electorate numbers (5035) we strongly believe this ward should be considered.

**Mid Furness and Low Furness**

This meets all three criteria by means of being a three member ward, with an electorate of 5136 (being inside a 5% variance) and being the existing County Division.

**Kendal and Levens**

Five three member wards can be made in Kendal, including Levens, within the tolerances of electorate numbers. We defer to the Local Government Boundary Commission to look closely at this area and decide what is best.

Having proposed these wards and strictly followed our guidelines we are left with two communities which will be left as distinct rural communities and existing district wards namely:

**Holker with one member and Ambleside and Grasmere represented by two members.**