South Ribble Labour Group's response to the Boundary Commission consultation on new ward boundaries for 2015 onwards. The South Ribble Labour Group welcomes the consultation document (15/10/2013) outlining the Boundary Commission's proposals for new ward boundaries to take effect as from the local elections in 2015. We are satisfied that the Boundary Commission has completed a thorough examination of the communities within our Borough and believe that, in general, the wards proposed are equitable, easily defined and will be recognised by local communities. We are pleased to note that there are no proposals for single member wards and reiterate our view that such arrangements have a potential to detrimentally affect the representation of a community. In recognising the unusual status of the community of Buckshaw Village, on the periphery of Leyland, we acknowledge that splitting the Worden and Buckshaw ward into two one member wards might have some benefits. On balance however, we believe the current suggested ward is more preferable. There remain one or two anomalies that we feel could easily be rectified along the boundary between Leyland and Farington. • If the whole of Lever House Lane is to be incorporated into Farington East ward, then the small cul-de-sac of Convent Close should be also. • The boundary between Farington East and Bannister Brook wards ought to allow the whole of Parish Gardens to be in Bannister Brook ward. There also seem to be some anomalies in terms of elector numbers between Bamber Bridge East ward and Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward. We understand that South Ribble Borough Council will be suggesting a new boundary line which would run along Brindle Road rather than the M6. The South Ribble Labour Group accepts, and supports, this suggestion. Other than these minor changes, the South Ribble Labour Group accepts the ward boundaries as shown on the maps issued as a part of the current consultation. We do, however, differ from the Boundary Commissions' ideas about some of the proposed ward names. We believe our local knowledge, not just of the geography of the wards, but of the communities and people that live within those wards give the following comments some weight. • We suggest that the proposed Wade Hall ward be named 'Seven Stars'. The housing estate known as Wade Hall is well defined and will account for less than one third of the area covered by the new ward. Residents living in areas such as West Paddock, Victoria Park Avenue or Slater Lane will have very strong views as to whether they live in 'Wade Hall'. The area known locally as 'Seven Stars' covers the junction of Fox Lane, Mill Lane and Leyland Lane and surroundings. We believe this name would be well recognised and a more accurate and acceptable name for the ward. • In our original submission we suggested that the 'Earnshaw Bridge' ward be named 'Earnshaw Bridge and Lostock'. The area known locally as Earnshaw Bridge is centred on the road junction between Golden Hill Lane, Leyland Lane and Longmeanygate. This area is at the extreme northern end of a ward which runs north to south along Leyland Lane, Schleswig Way and Moss Side Way. We would argue that residents living at the far southern end of this ward, in streets such as Northlands or Alder Close, would have great difficulty in understanding why 'their' ward was named Earnshaw Bridge. As the river Lostock flows through this ward, in a north to south direction, we would now suggest calling the ward 'Lostock Ward'. • The suggested name of 'Bannister Brook' for the ward which covers the town centre of Leyland is, perhaps, the one we find most difficult to understand. We believe that the ward name of 'Leyland Central' is already well established and is clearly identifiable. If anything, the changes to the ward boundaries make the name of
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Leyland Central a more accurate description of the new ward than it was for the former one. The geographic feature of Bannister Brook does indeed flow through the northerly part of the ward, but we would contend that most residents of the ward would have great difficulty identifying where it was or why ‘their’ ward carried this name. If anything, Bannister Brook is more locally associated with the area of Broadfield than it is with the town centre. We believe that our original suggestion of ‘Leyland Central’ should stand. • In the east of the Borough, we note that the Boundary Commission has changed the name of the former ‘Bamber Bridge North’ ward to ‘Walton le Dale East’ even though the ward boundaries have had minimal changes. Whilst we accept that the ward does straddle the two communities of Bamber Bridge and Walton le Dale, we would argue that the majority of residents would recognise that they live in Bamber Bridge. Also, as the name ‘Bamber Bridge North’ is already established and recognised, we see little merit in changing for changes sake. • In Penwortham, we are disappointed to note the demise of the name of Kingsfold. Our original suggestion was for the ‘Middleforth’ ward to be named ‘Middleforth and Kingsfold’ and we believe that suggestion still holds some merit. Perhaps a more accurate solution in terms of geography would be to for the proposed ‘Middleforth’ ward to become ‘Middleforth and Kingsfold North’ and the proposed ‘Charnock’ ward to become ‘Charnock and Kingsfold South’. We would like to thank the Boundary Commission for the hard work which has gone into the production of the proposed new ward boundaries for the borough and for the opportunity to contribute to their further development. We look forward to the final plans being published early in 2014.