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Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Louise Bennett
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

Comments on the new proposal to include Great Alne in Studley I understand that money needs to be saved somewhere along the line but I would rather Great Alne stayed linked to Alcester, as I believe there are natural community links between the two. It is the closest for schooling and health links, as well as transport links and it would just feel wrong to be included in Studley area. There is no natural link between here and Studley, and to separate Great Alne from Alcester would not be a sensible way forward. When we moved here from Stratford, because we were moving in to a B postcode area from a CV37 area, our insurance premiums increased. If we were linked with Studley, as it is effectively closer to Birmingham, would that have a bearing on insurance as well? Would this also have a bearing in property values? Would residents have to go into Studley to vote or would they still be able to use Great Alne? As far as I’m concerned it makes no sense to fix something which doesn't appear to be broken! There must be a better way...
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Personal Details:

Name: Peter Bostock
E-mail: [masked]
Postcode: [masked]
Organisation Name: [masked]

Comment text:

I oppose the link of Great Alne to Studley as people in Great Alne use the facilities in Alcester not Studley which is 5 miles away as opposed to 2 miles away for Alcester. We Great Alne PC has very close links with Alcester TC so it makes sense for us to be part of Alcester. Alcester is part of my postal address not Studley.
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Hello I have some very major concerns about section 6 of the community governance review of moving East Whitnash to Sydenham and Leamington. This area of land is very much a part of the town of Whitnash and contains the historic parts of the town, including the Whitnash Brook, the Brook Valley, the Holy Well and the Mill Dam Fields. It was populated as far back as the Ancient Britons, and its earliest origins can be traced back to pre-Roman occupation, so it is one of the most historically important areas in the area if not the whole of Warwickshire. This area is of historical significance to the town, and should not be lost to another neighbouring area. -Would you move Kenilworth Castle to Coventry; no you would not because it is historically important to Kenilworth and it is the thing which means the most to the people of Kenilworth. -Would you move Warwick Castle to Bishop's Tachbrook; no you would not because it is historically important to Warwick and it is the thing which means the most to the people of Warwick. -Would you move the Jephson Gardens to Radford Semele; no you would not because it is historically important to Leamington and it is the thing which means the most to the people of Leamington. So why do you seem hell bent of moving the most historically important area of Whitnash and the area of Whitnash which means the most to the people of Whitnash to Sydenham and Leamington? This is a very serious threat to the very existence of Whitnash as it is just leading the way for Whitnash is just be absorbed into Leamington and for Whitnash to be surrounded by housing estates on all sides. Who would of thought Whitnash in living memory was a small rural village with no proper road connecting it the outside world? Section 6 is just leading the way for the destruction of Whitnash to continue. If you want a fight from the people of Whitnash you will get one. We will do all we can to protect our town from further persecution from Warwick District Council.
Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Damon Brown
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: none

Comment text:

As a Bedworth resident for more than 25 years including a four year period serving as Borough Councillor for Bedworth Heath Ward, Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council, I believe I possess an excellent knowledge of the various communities and neighbourhoods within the town of Bedworth. The proposed changes to the Electoral Division boundaries within Bedworth contain a number of changes that make no sense in that they link areas that have little in common with each other and also split existing established communities across a number of divisions. I have detailed specific areas of concern below (1) The removal of the Francis Crescent, Margaret Avenue and part of Arbury Avenue from Bedworth North to the Bedworth West Electoral Division. Not only does this split the small road of Arbury Avenue across two electoral divisions but it also links these roads with the Bedworth Heath area. In my experience (as a resident of Bedworth North division and former Councillor for Bedworth Heath) I would observe that the Bedworth Heath area is largely a distinct community with its own sense of place and neighbourhood whereas the Margaret Avenue area residents traditionally view themselves as being part of Bedworth as opposed to Bedworth Heath. (2) Splitting the Mavor Drive area of Bedworth Heath so that part of the area becomes contained within the Bedworth North division. The Mavor Drive area is a central part of a large estate at Bedworth Heath, which retains its own identity and character. This is markedly different from that of Bedworth North as exemplified by, say, the Woodlands area around Silver Birch Drive or the neighbourhoods surrounding Newdigate Road or Sutherland Drive. The Mavor Drive area should remain as part of Bedworth West. (3) Smorrall Lane should be contained within a single electoral division - I would suggest the whole of this road is contained within Bedworth North division and forms the Southern boundary of the division. Attached is a plan showing by orange edging the above.
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Annotation 1: Change the name of this division from "Nuneaton" to "Stockingford"

Annotation 2: Change the name of this division from "Nuneaton"

Comment text:
Annotation 1: The entire area of this particular division is what is commonly referred to as "Stockingford", therefore that name would be appropriate for here rather than the generic "Nuneaton West". Annotation 2: The one thing that unites this area is Eastboro way, its main connection and core of the division. It'd be easily recognisable and less generic than "Nuneaton East"
Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Crichton
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

2: Change the name of this division from "Nuneaton East" to "Eastbord"

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Change the name of this division from "Nuneaton"
Annotation 2: Change the name of this division from "Nuneaton"

Comment text:

Annotation 1: The entire area of this particular division is what is commonly referred to as "Stockingford", therefore that name would be appropriate for here rather than the generic "Nuneaton West". Annotation 2: The one thing that unites this area is Eastbord way, its main connection and core of the division. It'd be easily recognisable and less generic than "Nuneaton East"
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Hi David,

Please see submission below for Warwickshire.

Regards,
Helen

---

Sir or Madam

With reference to the consultation on County Council representative boundaries, may I, as a long-serving Parish Council member for Warton express my strong disapproval of the proposal to put Warton with Baddesly, Dordon and Grendon. Warton has no affinity to those villages. Your guidance notes to your decision make three requirements, your decision fails on two of them, that is the 2nd and 3rd.

I know that on numbers it fits, but in reality it does not work. The current councillor lives in Dordon, I believe, but we see little of him. Warton is in the same church parish as the other villages here; Austrey, Newton Regis etc. We work together, do not just put us out as a convenient get out.

Robert Critchley
I write as the Liberal Democrat Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for the constituency of Kenilworth and Southam in response to your recommendations for this area.

I fully support the submission made by Warwickshire County Council as agreed at its meeting on the 28th October 2014, and also that made by the Liberal Democrat Group of members of Warwickshire County Council.

The principal reasons for supporting the counter proposals are:

1. **To provide a less confusing boundary:** the residents of the old historic centre of the town, where a famous siege took place nearly 750 years ago to defend the honour of good government and which is currently in the Kenilworth Abbey county division, would be confused and upset to find themselves part of a large, diverse mostly rural division such as the Lapworth & West Kenilworth division as you have recommended.

2. **To provide total co-terminosity:** within the boundaries of Kenilworth Town Council between town, district and county boundaries. This has already been partially achieved by the LGBCE review of Warwick District ward boundaries and the Warwick District Community Governance Review, and would be completed by the County Council’s proposals. It would be illogical to move the University parish ward (KWD) out of Kenilworth Abbey into Park Hill, when the Warwick District boundary review has only just moved it from Stoneleigh into Abbey Ward.

3. **To achieve best fit with surrounding village communities:** Kenilworth is the third largest town within Warwick District. It is surrounded by a number of rural villages, all of which have strong linkages with the town. Crucially, however, these villages do not extend as far as across to Lapworth. The proposal by the County Council for three new Kenilworth divisions, each based on an appropriate “slice” of the town together with its immediate neighbouring rural area, would represent an outstanding “fit” both electorally and in terms of community links and cohesion.

It is noted that your final recommendations will be issued on 3rd February 2015. In the meantime kindly acknowledge receipt of this email by return.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Dickson
Liberal Democrat Prospective Parliamentary Candidate
Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: ray dupree
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I agree with making the council smaller and having each councillor having a similar number of constituents
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Dear Heather,
Comments are in relation to the Warwickshire Council proposal to reduce the number of councillors.
Regards
John

Dear Mr and Mrs Furnival,

Thank you for your email. Could you please clarify which electoral review you are commenting on?

Kind regards

Heather Fuller
We would like to register our support for the recommendations to reduce the number of councillors hence hopefully reducing costs and freeing up funds for front line services.

Yours faithfully

John Furnival

Celia Furnival
Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Trevor Honychurch
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The proposal for Stratford Town seems crazy if the area South of the river is to be included with Clopton—there are no river crossings and no natural connections—far better to include parts of Old Town which connect with the area South of the river via road crossings.
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Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: val ingram

E-mail: [redacted]

Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

We have not had a county councillor visit our parish council for over two years now and have worked perfectly well without one, I think you should consider reducing the number of councillors even further and when we do have some they should sit an aptitude test before being allowed to represent us. the calibre of councillor and leadership at Warwickshire falls far short of what should be expected. Why not bring in the county elections to fall in with district and parish elections next year and save us some more money?
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Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Maiden
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I live in Cubbington. We have nothing to do with Kenilworth or Leek Wootton. And, in a general election, we have nothing to do with Southam. We should be grouped with Warwick and Leamington

Uploaded Documents:
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Having previously worked for Warwickshire County Council and being a resident I am fully supportive of this proposal, but believe the lack of effort by the elected members in dealing with their electorate means these cuts are not deep enough. The elected members are neither delivering value or leadership to the Warwickshire electorate so I would like to see much deeper cuts to this expensive and ineffective group. Let's see some proposals for true reform and radical change rather than this token effort.
Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: K Phillips
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Firstly I must say your web site is VERY misleading. There is a postcode searcher which indicates that our address and that of my business both do not fall into 'the area' but it is not clear what exactly that means - useless, distracting facility! Looking at the map there is clearly the intention to take a significant chunk of Kenilworth and bundle it in with places which are as much as 12 or more miles away by road which seems odd, but then putting Kenilworth with Southam on a national Government level also seems odd. Why not split Kenilworth into 2 wards not 3? Both Warwick and Leamington are tightly knit communities and their boundaries do not extend very far at all beyond the built up areas. Make Kenilworth the same so that it comprises the dense patches of the small town it is. The smaller villages and countryside areas around Lapworth will tend to have more in common with each other in terms of issues they want addressing, just as issues of concern in Kenilworth are of little interest to anyone who is as far over as Hockely Heath (where I drove just the other day as it happens - it is a long way!) Travel forms a large part of Councillors expenses and this too should be a factor? Abbey Ward in Kenilworth is the old and original part of Kenilworth so why is it being watered down so much?
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Personal Details:

Name: Rosemary Ratcliffe
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I am concerned that the proposals for Stratford East involve areas both north and south of the river Avon. There are really no natural links between Tiddington and Alveston, south of the river and Welcombe and Clopton to the north. The crowded Clopton Bridge and the gyratory make strong disincentives to journey either way unnecessarily. Very few people use surgeries, pharmacies, primary schools, churches on the opposite side. I used to manage the Home Care Service for Stratford before I retired and many people in Alveston and Tiddington at that time preferred to shop and use the surgery and pharmacy in Wellesbourne rather than cross the river into Stratford. Since that time Waitrose has opened south of the river, so they would now go there, but in general the traffic over the bridge has increased, making the crossing even less desirable. On the other hand Stratford West has more sensible connections with the Old Town area of Stratford via Waterside on foot or bicycle or by the new bridge. The north of Stratford has reasonable links between the Birmingham, Alcester and Evesham roads. Rosemary Ratcliffe
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Warwickshire County

Personal Details:

Name: Sam Sexton
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

The proposal to create Lapworth & West Kenilworth is frankly ridiculous - Kenilworth is expanding and it would be better to rearrange the Kenilworth wards than expand one of them to a vast area which does not share the same issues as Kenilworth Abbey. Please review this bizarre decision.
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Fuller, Heather

From: Fuller, Heather  
Sent: 03 November 2014 15:09  
To: Owen, David  
Subject: FW: Draft recommendations for Warwickshire County Council Divisions

The current proposals (as I understand them) for Stratford-upon-Avon present 3 divisions -

Stratford East

Stratford South

Stratford West

As a local resident and voter, I am concerned by both the use of:

a) Words

ie Stratford South: The proposed boundaries cross the river & as such 'contradict' the commonly held view that anything 'north' of the river is North & anything 'south' of the river is South. So, to us, the general public, residents & voters - we would naturally think that when you use the 'words' 'Stratford South' you mean South of the river - but this is not the case - you mean South & North of the river. This is confusing & disingenuous - which in turn will not help the representation of the division or the elected councillor.

ie Stratford East: Likewise as the proposed division crosses the river into what is commonly understood to be Stratford South. As above this will have a confusing effect both to the residents and to elected representatives (as well I believe to officers)

Stratford West - is what it says.

b) Boundary 'division'

The crossing & re-crossing of the river - which in itself would seem to be a natural boundary - seems to be both illogical and unnecessary

Proposal

Stratford East: To be renamed Stratford North & East with it's natural boundary being the river and to include any of the presently proposed area included in Stratford South which is 'north' of the river & adjacent to Stratford West.

Stratford South: To 'take in' the area presently proposed as that part of Stratford East which crosses south of the river. This would seem to be fairer, more logical, more easily understood & more cohesive.
Stratford West: to remain as presently proposed.

Please feel free to contact me directly if you feel my proposal need further explanation or to feedback.

Richard Vos
Dear Sir,

I should like to object to the proposal contained in Paragraph 90 of the Recommendations.

Whilst I appreciate the objective of creating divisions with approximately equal electorates, I cannot see any logic in lopping off the Northwest quarter of Kenilworth simply as a makeweight to create a largely (by area) rural division of Lapworth and West Kenilworth.

The other parts of Kenilworth are logically catered for in two urban divisions with what should be largely common interests. By contrast, it would be extremely difficult for the councillor for the proposed Lapworth and West Kenilworth division to adequately represent the inevitably divergent interests of his/her rural and urban constituents.

Please modify your proposals to retain the coherence of representation of the residents of the town of Kenilworth.

Yours faithfully,
T R Walmesley
Ref: Proposed boundary changes to Kenilworth Abbey ward to Kenilworth and Lapworth.

Dear Sir,

I would like to comment on the above proposal as I am opposed to it for the following reasons:

1. We have only just achieved coterminosity as the District and County boundaries now match and then you deem it necessary to remove this.

2. I ask whether the boundary commission has included in the Warwickshire Boundary changes the proposed 10,000 plus new homes that are supposed to be being built in the area. In the particular area I am commenting on there will be in excess of 700 new homes. Surely it would be more beneficial to keep the changes to within Kenilworth. Again I ask if the new changes to 2 of Kenilworth’s wards have been included?

3. The proposed Abbey/Lapworth ward makes little sense and doesn’t conform to your guide lines for the following reasons
   a) Lapworth is a rural area Kenilworth is an urban area and there is a conflict of interest. For example the people of Kenilworth have long been involved in Stop HS2 but this does not affect Lapworth.
   b) There are no travel links between the two places.
   c) It is also quite likely that the people work in different areas ie Lapworth they may well look to Stratford and Solihull and Kenilworth to Coventry and Warwick University.
   d) There are natural boundaries one such is the M40.

4. The Boundary Commission continually targets this region. In the Electoral reforms over the years we have been
   a) Kenilworth Warwick and Leamington Spa
   then we became
   b) Kenilworth and Rugby
   then we became
   c) Kenilworth and Southam.

In the last electoral changes you proposed we were to become Kenilworth and Knowle in the West Midlands! (This I also opposed) We have a detached Electoral system between Kenilworth and Southam due to the idea that all boundaries have to be the same size.

Why can the Boundary Commission not realize that not every ward in England can be the same size due to local historical issues and if WCC has to lose councillors why 5 why not 4 or 6? it was enforcing such boundaries in 1919 that lead to the 2nd World War.

Is it too much to ask that the people of Kenilworth could elect local councillors who actually live in the area and know the needs of the town to represent them rather than have one ward divided because it has to represent an entirely different area? Or is that one of the hidden agendas to this consultation?
Yours sincerely
Trudi Wheat,