

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No.138

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 138

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr P B Young, CBE.

To The Rt Hon Roy Jenkins, MP  
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LICHFIELD  
DISTRICT OF THE COUNTY OF STAFFORDSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of Lichfield in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements of that district.

2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 3 June 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Lichfield District Council, copies of which were circulated to Staffordshire County Council, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings in the district, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and to the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.

3. Lichfield District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council have exercised an option for a system of whole council elections.
5. On 6 November 1974 the District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the district into 27 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a council of 56.
6. When formulating their draft scheme, the District Council had taken into account the comments which they had received. Following their publication of this scheme, they received a number of comments, all of which dealt with the names of one or other of two of their proposed wards. Comments were also sent directly to us from a town council and three parish councils each of whom expressed a desire for retaining the present electoral arrangements.
7. We studied the draft scheme and, in a number of instances, we considered whether there were modifications which could be made to secure a more even standard of representation. However, because of the pattern of the parishes and parish wards in the district, we concluded that any changes which might be made to improve the standard of representation of the district wards, would be likely to break local ties.
8. We noted that in the parish of Burntwood the District Council proposed 7 district wards. These proposed arrangements had attracted comment from Burntwood Town Council who wished to retain their existing 3 wards, 2 of which would return 6 members each. This was contrary to the guidelines in our Report No 6 that only in the most exceptional circumstances should it be necessary for the number of councillors for a ward to be other than one, two or three. We considered the arguments for retaining the existing 6 member wards of Burntwood and Chase Town but decided that the circumstances were not so exceptional as to require the retention of these large wards and we concluded the District Council's proposals should not be altered.

9. We considered the proposals from the Mavesyn Ridware, Hamstall Ridware and Colton parish councils to alter the proposed arrangements so that the parish of Colton ; the parishes of Mavesyn Ridware and Hamstall Ridware; and the parishes of King's Bromley and Curborough and Elmhurst; should form 3 separate single-member wards. All 3 proposed wards would be over-represented when compared with the average elector/councillor ratio for the district and we accordingly resolved that these proposals should be rejected.

10. We considered a second and alternative proposal, put forward by the Hamstall Ridware and Mavesyn Ridware Parish Councils, for them to be grouped in a ward with the Parish of Colton. We decided that the proposed arrangements would be improved by the reorganisation of the proposed 3 single-member wards of Beaudesert, King's Bromley, and Mavesyn Ridware and Colton into 2 wards so as to create a single-member ward, to be known as "Colton and Ridware", comprising the parishes of Colton, Mavesyn Ridware and Hamstall Ridware; and a 2-member ward, to be known as "Beaudesert", comprising the parishes of Longdon, King's Bromley, Curborough and Elmhurst and Farewell and Chorley.

11. We considered a number of other proposals which had been made to the District Council during the period when their scheme was being prepared but which they had not felt able to adopt and incorporate in their draft scheme. We concluded in every case that the District Council's decision had been appropriate.

12. In relation to the names of the wards we noted that in some instances where parishes or parish wards had been joined to form district wards, the Council had used both the names. The result was cumbersome and we decided to propose that the names be abbreviated by using the name of the parish or parish ward with the largest electorate in the proposed ward. We decided also to propose the adoption of the name "Bourne Vale" for the proposed Watling Street ward and "Mease Valley" for the proposed Mease ward.

13. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 10 and 12 above, and to some minor alterations recommended by the Ordnance Survey in the interests of better boundaries, we decided that the District Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements for the district in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

14. On 12 June 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals and the accompanying maps, which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 8 August 1975.

15. The District Council responded to the draft proposals by suggesting that the proposed Beaudesert ward be divided so that the parish of Longdon become a single-member ward, and the parishes of King's Bromley, Curborough and Elmhurst, and Farewell and Chorley be combined in a single-member ward to be called King's Bromley. This was supported by Longdon Parish Council. The District Council suggested also that the proposed Colton and Ridware ward be named "Colton and Ridwares" and that the names of the proposed Alrewas, Whittington, Wigginton and Shenstone wards should be as originally proposed by the Council.

16. Comments were received from Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council and Hamstall Ridware Parish Council which suggested that Colton parish by itself should constitute a single-member ward and that Hamstall Ridware and Mavesyn Ridware parishes be combined in a single-member ward. It was suggested, alternatively, that the number of councillors assigned to the proposed Colton and Ridware ward should be increased from one to two.

17. We heard also from Colton Parish Council who suggested that the parishes comprising the proposed 2-member Beaudesert ward and single-member Colton and Ridware ward should be re-arranged to form a 3-member ward comprising the parishes of Curborough and Elmhurst, King's Bromley, Hamstall Ridware, Mavesyn Ridware, and Colton; and that Farewell and Chorley, and Longdon parishes should be combined to form a two-member ward. The two additional councillors would be obtained by increasing the size of the council or by withdrawing a councillor from each of the Burntwood and Lichfield areas.

18. A member of the public wrote to request an adjustment to a parish boundary so that the whole of his property would be within one ward. Finally we heard from a private person who objected to the proposed wards in Burntwood.

19. In view of these comments, we considered that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, you appointed Mr R A Pearson as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

20. Prior to the meeting, the District Council sent us a revised ward description for the proposed parish wards in Burntwood in order to clarify the ward boundaries. Burntwood Town Council wrote expressing concern at the timing of the meeting and reiterating their earlier views that the present district wards in the town should be retained. We heard also from a district councillor opposing the suggestions from Colton Parish Council that the area in the north-west of the district should be allocated two extra councillors who would be withdrawn from Burntwood and Lichfield. Copies of these letters were forwarded to the Assistant Commissioner.

21. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at the Council Chamber, Lichfield on 10 October 1975 and visited the areas which were the subject of dispute. A copy of his report to us of the meeting (without enclosures) is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

22. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be modified in the following manner:-

- a. that the proposed Wigginton and Colton and Ridware wards should be renamed "Tame" and "Colton and Ridwares" respectively;
- b. that the proposed Beaudesert ward be divided into two single wards to be known as "Longdon" and "King's Bromley". The Longdon ward would comprise the parish of Longdon only. The other parishes would be grouped in the proposed King's Bromley ward; and
- c. that the boundaries between the proposed Summerfield and Chasetown and the proposed Boney Hay and Redslade wards of Burntwood be modified as indicated on a map which the Assistant Commissioner supplied to us.

In addition, he recommended that the Ordnance Survey should discuss with the District Council its recommended alterations to the wards in Lichfield. These discussions have since taken place and agreement has been reached.

23. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's Report. We decided to adopt the modifications agreed between the Ordnance Survey and the District Council. We concluded that the alterations recommended by the Assistant Commissioner and identified at paragraph 22 (a) & (b) above should be adopted. The changes relating to the proposed Summerfield and Chasetown and Boney Hay and Redslade wards had been recommended in order to secure more readily identifiable boundaries. There seemed to be no doubt about this but the changes had been challenged by the Town Council on the grounds that they would disturb local ties. We noted that, in the case of the Boney Hay and Redslade wards, the changes would also produce a less even standard of representation, and concluded that we should not accept either of these proposals.

24. We decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals, subject to the modifications mentioned at paragraph 23 above.

25. Details of these final proposals are set out in schedule 2 to this report and on the attached maps. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the maps.

26. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the maps are being sent to Lichfield District Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the maps, is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

ANDREW WHEATLEY

DAVID R SMITH (Secretary)

18 December 1975

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 SECTION 60ELECTORAL REVIEW - LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION'S  
DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR THE LICHFIELD DISTRICTREPORT of Mr. R.A. Pearson, Assistant Commissioner

I was appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Office to hold a meeting to hear representations relative to the proposed future electoral arrangements for the Lichfield District at the Council Chamber, Lichfield on the 1st October, 1975. A list of the persons attending the meeting is attached (Appendix 'A').

PREAMBLE

The Lichfield District Council has an electorate of 58,058 and at the present time has 24 Wards with 56 Councillors. Three of these Wards have more than three Councillors, viz. the Burntwood and Chase Terrace Wards of the Parish of Burntwood with six each and the Ward comprising the Parishes of Shenstone and Wall with five Councillors.

The Lichfield District Council have submitted their draft Scheme of representation to the Boundary Commission providing for 27 Wards with 56 Councillors, the maximum suggested number of Councillors for any Ward being three.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England, after considering the draft Scheme of representation submitted by the Lichfield District Council, have accepted the District Council's Scheme as their draft Scheme with the following amendments :-

(a) Wards The substitution of a single member Ward, to be known as "Colton and Ridware", comprising the Parishes of Colton, Mavesyn Ridware and Hamstall Ridware, and a two member Ward, to be known as "Beaudesert", comprising the Parishes of Longdon, Kings Bromley, Elmshurst and Curborough and Farewell and Chorley, in place of the Council's proposed three single member Wards designated as the Beaudesert, Kings Bromley and Mavesyn Ridware and Colton Wards

(b) Change of Name of proposed Wards The adoption of the name "Bourne Vale" for the proposed "Watling Street" Ward, and "Mease Valley" for the proposed "Mease" Ward

(c) Abbreviation of Ward Names The abbreviation of the names of the following Wards :-

| <u>Proposed Name</u>       | <u>Abbreviated Name</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Alrewas and Streethay      | Alrewas                 |
| Fisherwick and Whittington | Whittington             |
| Wigginton and Elford       | Wigginton               |
| Shenstone and Wall         | Shenstone               |

(d) Minor boundary changes A number of minor boundary adjustments were proposed by the Ordnance Survey Office within the former Lichfield Borough area to secure boundaries which were considered technically better.

(e) Boundary Commission's Proposals A statement of the Boundary Commission's proposals in their draft Scheme is annexed as Appendix 'B' together with detailed statistics. This draft Scheme is shown on two Maps which, for ease of reference and convenience, have been marked as Maps 3 and 4, covering the following areas :-

Map No. 3 - Lichfield Town area

Map No. 4 - Remainder of District

2.

### OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

Objections and representations to the Commission's proposals, with details of alternative proposals, where applicable, were made in writing by the following :-

(a) Lichfield District Council

(i) That the proposed Colton and Ridware Ward be named "Colton and Ridwares"

(ii) That the proposed Beaudesert Ward be divided into two single member Wards comprising the Parish of Longdon, to be named "Longdon", and the Parishes of King's Bromley, Curborough and Elmhurst, and Farewell and Chorley, to be named "Kings Bromley", and

(iii) That the names of the proposed Alrewas, Whittington, Wigginton, and Shenstone Wards should be as originally proposed by the District Council

(b) Longdon Parish Council

The Parish Council feel that the proposed Ward of Beaudesert, comprising Longdon, King's Bromley, Curborough with Elmhurst and Farewell and Chorley, with two Councillors, is too large an area, and that the Parish of Longdon with an electorate of 1215 should be a separate Ward with one Councillor.

(c) Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council

The Parish Council object to the proposed Colton and Ridware Ward, comprising the Parishes of Colton, Mavesyn Ridware and Hamstall Ridware, on the grounds that the electorate would receive inadequate representation, and the large area of the three Parishes. They suggest that one Councillor should represent the Ridwares and one Councillor for Colton.

(d) Hamstall Ridware Parish Council

The Parish Council object to the proposed Colton and Ridware Ward, and suggest that there should either be two Councillors for the proposed Ward, or that it should be divided to form two Wards, one for Colton, and one for the Ridwares.

(e) Colton Parish Council

The Parish Council object to the proposed warding, urging that additional Councillors should be allocated to the rural areas in the

north-west of the District. They suggest that the proposed Beaudesert and Colton and Ridware Wards should be re-drawn to provide for one Ward for the Parishes of Farewell and Chorley and Longdon, with two Councillors, and another Ward comprising the Parishes of King's Bromley, Hamstall Ridware, Mavesyn Ridware, Colton and Curborough and Elmhurst, with three Councillors. They consider that this addition of two Councillors should be either achieved by an increase in the number of District Councillors from 56 to 58, or that the representation in the Lichfield and Burntwood areas be reduced by one in each case. Their grounds for these proposals are, firstly they consider the greater areas of the rural parishes should be a determining factor, in conjunction with electorate, for the allocation of Wards, secondly the difficult task of Councillors in looking after large rural areas, and lastly where one Parish in an electoral area has a much larger electorate than the others it is likely that representation on the District Council will always emanate from that Parish leading to apathy in the smaller Parishes.

(f) Mr. F.H. Armour-Brown

Mr. Armour-Brown drew attention to an anomaly due to part of his property being in Lichfield and part in Burntwood Parish, and asked that the boundaries of the Parishes should be altered. This was not a matter for the review of district electoral arrangements but could be considered when the review of parish boundaries is undertaken in the future.

(g) Dr. M.R. Ashburner

Dr. Ashburner objected to the proposed Wards for Burntwood on the grounds that they would be divisive in their effect at this stage of the development of the parish in community terms. He urged that the three village centres of the Parish should be retained, which would involve the provision of Wards with more than three Councillors each, but no specific proposals were put forward.

(h) Burntwood Town Council

The Town Council, having originally recommended that the Parish should be divided into three Wards, two of which would have had substantially more than three Councillors, had under protest submitted proposals for seven Wards. They felt, however, that Burntwood had exceptional circumstances due to the influx of a very considerable increase in electorate in recent years, and that by splitting the village into seven Wards the problem of integration would be aggravated.

(i) Coun. R.J. Wingrove

Councillor Wingrove supported the District Council's comments and representations, and objected to the proposal that the number of District Councillors for Lichfield City should be reduced in order to provide additional Councillors for the proposed Wards in the rural north-western portion of the Lichfield District.

## THE INQUIRY

A communication had been received from the Burntwood Town Council expressing concern that a day-time meeting gave no opportunity to working electors to attend the hearing, and suggested that time might be made available for an evening meeting for the purpose. It was felt, however, that since the Town Council were represented by their Clerk as well as a number of District and Town Councillors, and that several residents were present, their views could be adequately put forward without the necessity for an evening meeting. The meeting was informed that the Assistant Commissioner's report would not be submitted to the Commission for two weeks to give interested persons who could not be present an opportunity of writing to him with their views.

### (a) Naming of Wards

The Lichfield District Council, represented by Mr. K.D. Brownlow, Director of Administration, put forward the representations of the District Council that the proposed Alrewas, Whittington, Wigginton and Shenstone Wards should be designated the Alrewas and Streethay; Fisherwick and Whittington; Wigginton and Elford; and Shenstone and Wall Wards respectively. They also felt that the proposed Colton and Ridware Ward should be named Colton and Ridwares, being indicative of the fact that the Parishes of Hamstall Ridware and Mavesyn Ridware were both included in the Ward. The Elford Parish representative, with the full support of the Wigginton Parish Council, suggested that the proposed Wigginton Ward should be designated as the "Tame" Ward, as the River Tame ran through the major portion of the proposed Ward, and this suggested naming was accepted by the District Council. General agreement was expressed by the representatives of Colton, Hamstall Ridware, and Mavesyn Ridware to the District Council's recommendation that the Ward be named Colton and Ridwares.

Three members of the District Council supported the Commission's proposals to abbreviate the names of the remaining three Wards. The meeting as a whole were asked if anyone had any objection to the views expressed by these three District Councillors, but no comment was forthcoming.

### (b) Colton and Ridwares and Beaudesert Wards

Mr. K.D. Brownlow on behalf of the District Council, intimated that they had hoped that their proposals submitted to the Boundary Commission had produced a reasonably balanced Scheme, which had been achieved by having regard to the rules contained in the 11th Schedule to the Local Government Act 1972 and following certain principles. These were - that the number of Councillors should be approximately the same as at present, viz. 56 members, with a maximum of three Councillors per Ward with each Councillor representing, as nearly as possible, current electorates of 1,000 and projected electorates of approximately 1,250. Generally this Scheme had met with approval, except in the north-western area where the Council had proposed three single-member Wards, namely the Beaudesert Ward comprising the Parishes of Longdon and Farewell and Chorley, the King's Bromley Ward comprising the Parishes of Hamstall Ridware, King's Bromley and Curborough and Elmhurst, and the Mavesyn Ridware and Colton Ward comprising the Parishes of Mavesyn Ridware and Colton. The Boundary Commission's proposals reduced these three Wards to two, namely the Beaudesert Ward with two members, comprising the Parishes of Longdon, Farewell and Chorley, King's Bromley and Curborough and Elmhurst, and the Colton and Ridwares Ward, comprising the Parishes of Colton, Mavesyn Ridware and Hamstall Ridware with one Member.

The District Council raised no objection to the proposed Colton and Ridwares Ward, having regard to the close association between the two Ridwares, even though the present electorate would be somewhat above the average per Ward for the District. They did, however, feel that in the truly rural areas single member Wards were preferable, and, being of the opinion that there was no community of interest whatsoever between the Parishes of King's Bromley and Longdon, represented that Longdon should comprise a separate Ward, with one member, and that the remaining Parishes in the proposed Beaudesert Ward should form the King's Bromley Ward. The effect of this would give Longdon a current electorate of 1215 and a projected electorate of 1374, and the suggested King's Bromley Ward would have a current electorate of 838 and a projected electorate of 1126. The somewhat lower electorate of the suggested King's Bromley Ward would have been raised more nearly to the average had Hamstall Ridware been included, when it would give a current electorate of 1052 and a projected electorate of 1374.

Dealing with the Colton and Ridwares Ward, Mr. Brownlow referred to the representations from the Ridwares that an additional Councillor should be allocated, and from Colton that two additional Councillors be allocated to the north-western area, the latter being either achieved by increasing the number of Councillors from 56 to 58 or by a reduction of one in each of the Burntwood and Lichfield areas. The effect of this would be to decrease the electorate per Councillor for the north-western area, and substantially increase the electorate per Councillor in the Burntwood and Lichfield areas, which appeared to be contrary to the statute that the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of Councillors to be elected should be as near as may be the same in every Ward whether rural or urban. Alternatively, the application of the electorate/Councillor ratio to the rest of the District should the north-western area be allocated two extra Councillors would result in a Council of at least 75 members, which could not possibly be justified.

Mr. D. Sanders on behalf of the Colton Parish Council referred to the detailed representations made by that Council, making specific reference to difficulties of communication with Councillors by the public, particularly in the rural areas, and urging that Colton should have separate representation as at present.

Mr. J.C. Price District and Parish Councillor, referred to the problems in grouping parishes to form electorates of 1,000, the divergent interests between the Ridwares and Colton, and the real danger of conflict of interests. He further stressed the probability of a Councillor only representing the dominant area of a Ward

Mr. F.E. Masser District Councillor and Clerk to the Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council, urged that in view of the physical difficulties for one Councillor to represent the proposed Ward, the extensive area, and the higher than average electorate both current and projected of the proposed Ward, one Councillor should be allocated to the Ridwares and one to Colton. He was supported by Mrs. D. Griffiths, a member of the Parish Council.

Councillor J.E. Riley of King's Bromley, County Councillor for the area, supported the representation that Colton and the Ridwares should be divided and have separate representation.

Mr. E.C. Behague Vice-Chairman of the Hamstall Ridware Parish Council opposed the proposed grouping of Colton and the Ridwares on the grounds that the proposed Ward would have the highest projected electorate, and one District Councillor would have great difficulty in covering the area and deal with the needs of the electorate. He stated that the structure plan for Colton envisaged an ultimate extension to 4,000. The Parish Council was, however, opposed to the splitting of the two Ridwares.

With regard to the proposed Beaudesert Ward -

Mr. J.E. Riley County Councillor for the area and Chairman of the King's Bromley Parish Council intimated that whilst the Parish Council were not diametrically opposed to the District Council's representation that Longdon should be a separate Ward and the remainder of the proposed Ward should form another Ward with one Councillor, they felt that Farewell and Chorley Parish was a long way from the major centre of population, and referred to the real difficulties of communication in vast rural areas between the electorate and their elected representatives.

Mr. T.D. Brown District Councillor for Longdon and Farewell and Chorley representing the Longdon Parish Council and the District Councillor for King's Bromley, Curborough and Elmhurst (Coun. Cliffe) stated that there was no affinity between Longdon and the remainder of the proposed Ward, and supported the District Council's representation that Longdon should be a separate Ward. So far as Farewell and Chorley was concerned, the Parish Council for that Parish had expressed a preference to remain with Longdon, but despite geographical difficulties, Councillor Brown did not think that there would be any major objection should the Parish be grouped with King's Bromley and Curborough and Elmhurst.

Coun. R.J. Wingrove Vice-Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee of the Lichfield District Council, explained the District Council's approach to their scheme of representation. The Council were opposed to any increased representation in the north-western area, as it would necessarily reflect throughout the area to maintain the ratio of near equality in electorate per Councillor in the Wards, and could result in a large increase in the number of Councillors.

Coun. W.J. Wilson County and District Councillor, in support of the District Council's representations, pointed out that as all the Parishes concerned had Parish Councils, a District Councillor could rely upon them for assistance in keeping him informed of local problems.

(c) Burntwood

Mr. G. Colley Clerk to the Burntwood Town Council contended that the existing three Wards should be retained because the District Council's Scheme would mean fragmentation and dismemberment of established communities. Mr. Colley forcefully maintained that the circumstances of the Burntwood area were very exceptional and that there were sufficient grounds to justify the retention of more than three Councillors per Ward. He stated that Burntwood consisted of three distinct parts, Chasetown, Chase Terrace and Burntwood, each with its own shops and amenities, and although they were becoming joined by reason of very substantial development in recent years, there was no central shopping or cultural centre serving the whole area. When the District Council prepared its draft Scheme, the Town Council drew up the proposals for seven Wards under protest, but they still wished to have three Wards.

Dr. M.R. Ashburner District Councillor, supported the representations of the Burntwood Town Council. He drew attention to the problems occasioned by the increase in population over the last 20 years due to unprecedented development, contending that the existing three Wards should be retained since the proposed seven Wards would result in fragmentation and cause disunity. He traced the growth of Burntwood from a rural village with normal growth from 1801 to 1851. The advent of coal mining resulted in the development of Chasetown and Chase Terrace as mining communities, its population rising from 780 to 6400 in 30 years. Despite the closure of the mines in the 1920's the population continued to expand. This increase was caused by an influx of population from the West Midlands conurbation, so that the Parish was now mainly a dormitory area. The Town Council's case was further supported by Councillor H.B. Lymer.

The possibility of the adjustment of the boundaries of the proposed Boney Hay and Redslade Wards, and the Summerfield and Chasetown Wards, to give clearer definition, was discussed. The District Council's Director of Administration agreed that the suggested amendments seemed to be desirable on the grounds of clarity. The Town Council representatives, however, stated that their lines had been selected for the preservation of community of interest, and that the suggested amended lines would have the effect of cutting off some people from their existing community.

#### Lichfield District Council

Details of the Committee structure, functions, etc. of the Lichfield District Council were given as follows :-

- Standing Committees - Six, five with memberships between 21 and 29 Members meeting every 8 weeks, one (Planning Applications) comprising the whole Council, meeting every three weeks.
- Sub-Committees - Two with memberships of 23 and 38, meeting every eight weeks.
- Joint Committees etc. - Eight, with memberships (District Council) ranging from 16 to 3, meeting quarterly or less or as required.
- Delegations There is a substantial degree of delegation to the standing Committees of the Council, and to Chief Officers in respect of administrative and non-controversial day to day matters.

It would appear that the size of the Council is adequate for the proper performance of their duties.

#### 4. ACCOUNT OF INSPECTIONS MADE BY ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

Your Assistant Commissioner made a tour of the whole area in an attempt to assess the relation of the urban and rural parts of the District, in particular the north-western portion and Burntwood, where the objections and representations had been made. He gave particular attention to the somewhat vague boundaries proposed between the Boney Hay and Redslade Wards and the Summerfield and Chasetown Wards as clearly defined boundaries appeared to be available

ADVANCED AT THE HEARING

(a) Naming of Wards

The District Council recommended that their original naming of the four Wards should stand. However, three persons, viz. Coun. W.J. Wilson, County and District Councillor, Coun. R. Aldridge, District Councillor and Mr. V. Hunt supported the Commission's proposals. No other persons present expressed views to the contrary. In the case of the proposed Wigginton Ward, comprising the Parishes of Wigginton and Elford, the Parish Councils concerned had amicably arrived at a compromise name for the Ward, that of Tame, which the District Council representatives were prepared to support. So far as the Colton and Ridware Ward is concerned, the District Council's recommendation that this should be named 'Colton and Ridwares' appeared to be logical, reasonable, and acceptable to all concerned.

(b) Colton and Ridwares and Beaudesert Wards

(i) Colton Parish Council - The suggestion that area should be a major factor in the allocation of wards is, of course, contrary to the guide lines laid down in the 11th Schedule to the Act of 1972. There would seem to be little justification for an increase in the number of District Councillors from 56 to 58 to give two extra Councillors for the north-west area, as if this were done further Councillors would have to be allocated to the remainder of the area to preserve the electorate/Councillor ratio.

A three-member Ward for the area, less Longdon and Farewell and Chorley, where a two-member Ward was suggested by Colton, would only appear to be of advantage to them inasmuch as it would make them the second largest parish in the group. However, as the current electorate/Councillor ratio would only give just under two Councillors, a third Councillor could not be justified. On the same basis, Longdon with Farewell and Chorley could hardly warrant two Councillors.

Colton do not favour being grouped with the two Ridwares, with their close links and their joint electorate of 791 as against Colton's 541. Their contention that the area is too large for one Councillor does not stand close inspection, as it would seem that the proposed Mease Valley and Bourne Vale Wards are larger than that proposed, whilst the Alrewas Ward does not appear to be very much smaller in area.

It is, perhaps, somewhat unfortunate that when the Ward boundaries were first fixed for the first elections of District Councillors, there could not have been greater compliance with the Councillor/electorate ratio rule. Colton were originally allocated a District Councillor, when their electorate gave them a theoretical 'entitlement' of fractionally over one-half.

(ii) Mavesyn Ridware Parish Council - Neither alternative appears feasible. Neither Colton nor Mavesyn Ridware, on their own, qualify for a District Councillor, so the two must be together. The two Ridwares wish to be together, and to give effect to this, leaves a larger Councillor/electorate ratio than the average. Without Hamstall Ridware, the electorate of Colton and Mavesyn Ridware would be 1118 compared with the average of 1035. The individual electorates of the two parishes are 541 and 577 respectively, a very delicate balance.

(iii) Hamstall Ridware Parish Council - The Parish Council want things as they are, with separate Councillors for Colton and the Ridwares. They do not wish to be separated from Mavesyn Ridware.

(iv) Longdon Parish Council - The Parish Council's request that there should be a separate Ward for Longdon is, apparently, made in the full knowledge that their electorate is 60% of that for the proposed two-member Ward, and, with the support of Farewell and Chorley, would make some 70% so that, if they wished, they could have complete control over both seats. The Parish is, however, satisfied with being a Ward on its own, which would leave as a single-member Ward the Parishes of King's Bromley, Curborough and Elmhurst, and Farewell and Chorley, with an electorate of 838, somewhat lower than the average, but not the lowest.

(v) King's Bromley Parish Council - Should Longdon be a Ward on its own, King's Bromley would be the largest Parish in the remainder of the proposed Beaudesert Ward, the need for a compromise name would no longer remain, and it would be appropriate for it to be named King's Bromley.

(vi) Burntwood Town Council - Whilst one can appreciate the wishes of the Town Council to retain the three village settlements comprising the Parish, it seems quite clear that for a parish with an electorate in excess of 16,000 to be divided into only three Wards would not be to the benefit of the electorate or be conducive to good administration. The proposed Ward boundaries ought to ensure proper representation for the various parts of the Parish, and at the same time make the electoral areas compact in what is undoubtedly an urban area. There seemed to be a strong case for the adjustment of the boundaries between the Boney Hay and Redslade Wards and the Summerfield and Chasetown Wards to secure a clearer definition of the Ward boundaries, which could readily be achieved.

(vii) Lichfield District Council - From the details given, it would appear that the District Council membership is adequate for the performance of their functions, and there would be no necessity for the total number to be increased.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER(a) Naming of Wards

(i) That the proposed Wigginton Ward, comprising the Parishes of Wigginton and Elford, be named the Tame Ward.

(ii) That the proposed Colton and Ridware Ward be named the Colton and Ridwares Ward.

(iii) That no amendments be made to the naming of the proposed Alrewas, Shenstone and Whittington Wards.

(b) Colton and Ridwares and Beaudesert Wards

(i) That no amendment be made to the area of the proposed Colton and Ridwares Ward

(ii) That the proposed Beaudesert Ward be divided into two single-member Wards, viz. The Longdon Ward, comprising the Parish of Longdon, and the King's Bromley Ward, comprising the Parishes of King's Bromley, Curborough and Elmhurst and Farewell and Chorley.

(c) Burntwood Parish

(i) That the boundary between the proposed Summerfield and Chasetown Wards be amended to read "thence south-westerly along Queen Street to its junction with Lawnswood Avenue, thence in a southerly direction along the centre of Lawnswood Avenue to the southern boundary of the Parish of Burntwood" instead of "thence south-westerly along Queen Street to a point 30 yards on the western side of its junction with Meadway Street, thence southerly along the eastern side boundary of No. 124 Queen Street to a point where it joins the northern rear boundary of No. 4 Newgate Street, thence in a westerly direction along the southern rear boundaries of properties on the southern side of Queen Street from No. 124 Queen Street to the eastern boundary of The Cottage of Content Public House, thence in a southerly direction along the eastern rear boundary of the Queen Street Industrial Estate to the southern boundary of the Parish of Burntwood".

(ii) That the boundary between the proposed Boney Hay and Redslade Wards be amended to read "thence westerly along Slade Avenue and Redwood Drive to its junction with Rugeley Road, thence northerly along the boundary with Chase Terrace Ward to the point of commencement" instead of "thence westerly along Slade Avenue across its junction with Parkhill Road and Redwood Drive on the north side of the boundary of No. 95 Redwood Drive etc., ... .. thence northerly along the boundary with Chase Terrace Ward to the point of commencement"

(iii) That no amendment be made to the area of the proposed Highfield, All Saints and Chase Terrace Wards of the Parish of Burntwood.

A statement of the Wards, as recommended, with appropriate statistical details, is attached (Appendix 'c').

A Street Plan of Burntwood, with the proposed Wards indicated by red lines, and the suggested amendments shown by blue lines, is attached (Map 5)

LICHFIELD - Minor adjustments as recommended by Ordnance Survey Office

A number of members of the District Council expressed the view that on the face of it certain of the recommendations of the Ordnance Survey Office could create difficulties, mainly due to proposed development or matters of local detail which would not readily be apparent without local knowledge. The District Council's representatives asked whether it would be possible for the Ordnance Survey Office to discuss this matter with them in detail before any final line was settled. Your Assistant Commissioner agreed to defer the matter and raise the whole question with the Department.

Some adjustment of the statistics in Appendix 'C' may be necessary as a result of amendment to Map 3.

DISTRICT OF LICHFIELD: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND  
NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

| <u>NAME OF WARD</u>     | <u>NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS</u> |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| ALL SAINTS              | 2                            |
| ALREWAS                 | 3                            |
| ARMITAGE-WITH-HANDSACRE | 3                            |
| BONEY HAY               | 2                            |
| BOURNE VALE             | 1                            |
| CENTRAL                 | 2                            |
| CHADSMEAD               | 2                            |
| CHASE TERRACE           | 3                            |
| CHASETOWN               | 3                            |
| COLTON & RIDWARES       | 1                            |
| CURBOROUGH              | 3                            |
| FAZELEY,                | 3                            |
| HAMMERWICH              | 3                            |
| HIGHFIELD               | 2                            |
| KING'S BROMLEY          | 1                            |
| LONGDON                 | 1                            |
| LEOMANSLEY              | 2                            |
| LITTLE ASTON            | 2                            |
| MEASE VALLEY            | 1                            |
| REDSLADE                | 2                            |
| ST JOHN'S               | 3                            |
| SHENSTONE               | 2                            |
| STONNALL                | 1                            |
| STOWE                   | 3                            |
| SUMMERFIELD             | 2                            |
| TAME                    | 1                            |
| WHITTINGTON             | 2                            |

## LICHFIELD DISTRICT: DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

NOTE: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature, it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

## LEOMANSLEY WARD

Commencing at a point where the Lichfield to Birmingham railway meets the northeastern boundary of Wall CP, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the eastern boundary of Burntwood CP, thence northwards and following said boundary and the eastern boundary of Farewell and Chorley CP to the southern boundary of Curborough and Elmhurst CP, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to Grange Lane, thence southeastwards along said Lane to Wheel Lane, thence southwestwards along said lane to Beacon Street, thence southeastwards along said street to Shaw Lane, thence southwestwards and following said lane to the path from said Lane to Leomansley Brook, thence southwestwards along said path to said Brook thence westwards and following said Brook and continuing along the southern boundary of the pond situated to the north of the Pavilion in Beacon Park, thence westwards and following the Leomansley Brook to the A51 Road, thence southeastwards along said Road to Walsall Road, thence southwestwards along said Road to a point opposite the rear boundary of the property known as Waterworks Cottage, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the northwestern boundary of the Swimming Baths thence southwestwards and following said boundary and the rear and southeastern boundaries of said Swimming Baths to the eastern boundary of Parcel No 1100 on Ordnance Survey Plan Nos SK 10/1109 edition of 1966 and SK 10/1108 edition of 1965 thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 20 and 22 Friary Road thence eastwards, southeastwards and in prolongation thereof to the rear boundary of Victoria Hospital, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of parcel No 2084 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SK 10-1108 edn of 1965 thence southwestwards and northwestwards along the southern and western boundaries of the said parcel to the prolongation northeastwards of the northwestern boundary of

Maxstock Grange, thence southwestwards along said prolongation and boundary to the rear of said Grange, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along the rear and southeastern boundaries of said Grange to the path leading from said Grange to Chesterfield Road, thence southeastwards along said path to said Road, thence southwards along said Road to the Lichfield to Birmingham Railway, thence southwestwards along said Railway to the point of commencement.

#### CHADSMEAD WARD

Commencing at a point where Anson Avenue meets the eastern boundary of Leomansley Ward, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of Curborough and Elmhurst CP, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the Lane known as The Dimbles, thence southwestwards and following said lane and Dimbles Lane to Anson Avenue, thence southwestwards along said Avenue to the point of commencement.

#### CURBOROUGH WARD

Commencing at a point where Gaia Lane meets the eastern boundary of Leomansley Ward thence northwestwards along said boundary to the southeastern boundary of Chadsmead Ward, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of Curborough and Elmhurst CP, thence eastwards and following said boundary to Watery Lane thence southwestwards along the said lane to Eastern Avenue thence southeastwards and following said Avenue to the road known as Netherstowe, thence southwestwards along said road, to the prolongation southeastwards of the path to the northeast of No 10 Walkers Croft, thence northwestwards along said prolongation and path to Curborough Brook, thence southwestwards and following said Brook and the western boundary of St Chad's Church to St Chad's Road, thence westwards along said Road to the prolongation

northeastwards of the path on the northwestern side of Stowe Pool, thence southwestwards along said prolongation to said path, thence southwestwards and northwestwards along said path to Gaia Lane, thence southwestwards along said Lane to the point of commencement.

#### ST JOHNS WARD

Commencing at a point where the northeastern boundary of Wall CP meets the southern boundary of Leomansley Ward thence northeastwards along said boundary and the Lichfield to Birmingham railway, to a point opposite the western boundary of parcel No 1400 on OS Plan SK 12/1309 edition of 1966, thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the northern boundary of parcel No 8513 on said plan, thence westwards along said boundary to Boley Lane, thence southeastwards and following said Lane to a point opposite the western boundary of Boley Cottage, thence northeastwards, southeastwards and southwestwards along the western, rear and eastern boundaries of said cottage, to Boley Lane, thence southeastwards along said Lane and Darnford Lane to the northwestern boundary of Whittington CP, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northwestern boundary of Swinfen and Packington CP, thence westwards and following said boundary to the northeastern boundary of Wall CP, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### CENTRAL WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Leomansley Ward meets the northwestern boundary of St John's Ward, thence northwards and following said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Curborough Ward, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the southern perimeter path of Stowe Pool thence southeastwards and following said path to a point due northwest of the northernmost corner of No 4 Lombard Gardens, thence southeastwards to said corner and continuing southeastwards along the

northeastern boundary of No 4 Lombard Gardens and the northeastern boundary of No 39 Lombard Street to the southeastern boundary of said property, thence northeastwards in a straight line to Stowe Road, thence southeastwards along said Road and Stowe Street to the southeastern boundary of No 2 Stowe Street thence northeastwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 2 to 8 Stowe Street, thence northwestwards and following said boundaries to the southern boundary of Nos 12 and 14 Stowe Street, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the southwestern boundary of No 25 Smithfield Rise thence southeastwards along said boundary and in prolongation thereof to the southwestern boundary of No 24 Smithfield Rise, thence southeastwards and northeastwards along the southwestern and rear boundaries of said property thence continuing northeastwards and southeastwards along the northwestern and northern boundaries of the Builders Yard to the northeastern boundary of the unnamed property northeast of the Engineering Works on St Michael Road thence northeastwards and southeastwards along the northwestern and northeastern boundaries of said property to St Michael Road, thence southeastwards along said Road to the southeastern boundary of No 97 St Michael Road, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 97 to 79 St Michael Road thence northwestwards and following said boundaries to the southwestern boundary of No 77 St Michael Road, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Stowe CE (C) Primary School to the path from the road known as Paradise Row to Rocklands School thence northwestwards along said path to the southeastern boundary of Rocklands School thence northeastwards and following said boundary to Wissage Road thence southeastwards along said Road to the rear access road of Nos 23 to 65 Trent Valley Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the western boundary of No 67 Trent Valley Road, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundary of the said property, thence northeastwards along the said boundary and the rear boundaries of No's 69 and 73 Trent Valley Road and continuing in a straight line to the rear boundaries of Nos 74

to 66 Valley Lane, thence northeastwards along said boundaries and continuing northeastwards in a straight line to the rear boundary of No 28 Valley Lane thence northeastwards along the boundaries of Nos 28 to 2 Valley Lane to the northeastern boundary of No 2 Valley Lane, thence northwestwards along said boundary to Valley Lane, thence eastwards and following said Lane to Eastern Avenue, thence northwestwards along said Avenue to Vulcan Road, thence northeastwards along said Road and in prolongation thereof to the western boundary of Streethay CP, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the eastern boundary of Whittington CP, thence southwestwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of St John's Ward, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### STOWE WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Central Ward meets the eastern boundary of Curborough Ward, thence northeastwards along said eastern boundary to the western boundary of Streethay CP, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Central Ward, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

## COLTON AND RIDWARES WARD

The parishes of Colton, Hamstall Ridware and Mavesyn Ridware.

## ARMITAGE-WITH-HANDSACRE WARD

The parish of Armitage with Handsacre.

## LONGDON WARD

The parish of Longdon.

## KING'S BROMLEY WARD

The parishes of King's Bromley, Elmhurst and Curborough, and Farewell and Chorley.

## ALREWAS WARD

The parishes of Alrewas and Streethay.

## MEASE VALLEY WARD

The parishes of Edingale, Harlaston, Clifton Campville and Thorpe Constantine.

## HAMMERWICH WARD

The parish of Hammerwich

## STONNALL WARD

The Stonnall Ward of the parish of Shenstone.

## LITTLE ASTON WARD

The Little Aston Ward of the parish of Shenstone.

## SHENSTONE WARD

The Shenstone Ward of the parish of Shenstone, and the parish of Wall.

## BOURNE VALE WARD

The parishes of Swinfen and Packington, Weeford, Hints and Drayton Bassett.

## WHITTINGTON WARD

The parishes of Fisherwick and Whittington

## TAME WARD

The parishes of Elford and Wigginton

## FAZELEY WARD

The parish of Fazeley

## ALL SAINTS WARD

The All Saints ward of the parish of Burntwood

## BONEY HAY WARD

The Boney Hay ward of the parish of Burntwood

## CHASE TERRACE WARD

The Chase Terrace ward of the parish of Burntwood

## CHASETOWN WARD

The Chasetown ward of the parish of Burntwood

## HIGHFIELD WARD

The Highfield ward of the parish of Burntwood

REDSLADDE WARD

The Redslade ward of the parish of Burntwood

SUMMERFIELD WARD

The Summerfield ward of the parish of Burntwood