

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No. 164

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 164

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.

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

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CITY OF  
GLOUCESTER IN THE COUNTY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the City of Gloucester 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 for that City.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 21 April 1975 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Gloucester City Council, copies of which were circulated to the Gloucestershire County Council, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of 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. Gloucester City 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 asked also 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)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council have exercised an option for a system of elections by thirds.

5. On 29 October 1975 the Gloucester City Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area into 11 wards each returning 3 members to form a council of 33 members.

6. We considered the draft scheme together with alternative proposals which had been submitted to us by a local political party. The alternative scheme, which superseded proposals which the party had previously submitted to the City Council for their consideration, also provided for the division of the City into eleven 3 member wards but in most parts of the City the boundaries were substantially different. The alternative scheme had obviously been prepared with care but we could not find advantages in the proposals sufficient, in our view, to justify their adoption in place of the City Council's draft scheme which had likewise been drawn to a high standard in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines. We decided to adopt the City Council's draft scheme as our draft proposals although we incorporated a minor modification which had been recommended by the Ordnance Survey to secure a technically better boundary between two of the proposed wards.

7. On 9 December 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or who had commented on the Council's draft scheme. 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 13 February 1976.

8. The City Council raised a number of queries concerning the description of the ward boundaries which had been included with our draft proposals. We noted that these queries had been discussed with the Ordnance Survey and with officers of the City Council and that a revised description had been prepared.

9. The local political party which had previously made representations reiterated its support for its alternative scheme.

10. In view of this comment, 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 T Foord as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

11. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at Guildhall, Gloucester on 18 May 1976. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this Report.

12. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should remain unaltered subject to any alterations which might be made on the advice of the Ordnance Survey in the interests of good boundaries.

13. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's Report. Having noted that the Ordnance Survey were satisfied with our proposed

boundaries we concluded that our draft proposals should be confirmed and we formulated our final proposals accordingly.

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

#### PUBLICATION

15. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Gloucester City 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 map, 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

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

1 July 1976

**THOMAS FOORD**  
 LL.B (HONS.), F.C.I.B., L.M.B., T.P.I.  
 SOLICITOR

—  
 WORTHING 200766

75 FIRST AVENUE,  
 WORTHING,  
 SUSSEX,  
 BN14 9NP

27th May 1976.

Your ref: LGBC/D/16/3

D.R. Smith Esq.,  
 Secretary,  
 Local Government Boundary  
 Commission for England,  
 20 Albert Embankment,  
 London, SE1 7TJ.

Dear Sir,

REVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR  
THE CITY OF GLOUCESTER

I have pleasure in submitting my report on the local meeting held at the Guildhall, Gloucester, on the 18th May 1976, to consider the future electoral arrangements for the City of Gloucester following the representations which had been made on the draft proposals for the City published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. I enclose an attendance list giving the names and addresses of the persons who attended the meeting and the interests they represented.

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals provide for the future division of the City into 11 wards returning a total of 33 councillors, as follows:

<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>
BARNWOOD	3	LONGLEVENS	3
BARTON	3	MATSON	3
EASTGATE	3	PODSMEAD	3
HUCCLECOTE	3	TUFFLEY	3
KINGSHOLM	3	WESTGATE	3
LINDEN	3		

The draft proposals and the boundaries of the several wards substantially follow the draft scheme submitted by Gloucester City Council.

After publication of the Council's draft scheme and before its formal submission to the Boundary Commission, the Gloucester Liberal Party produced an alternative scheme for the warding of the City (Scheme "A") which provides for the division of the City into eight wards, two returning three councillors each, two returning four councillors each, and four returning 5 councillors each, a total of 34 councillors.

The Gloucester Liberal Party subsequently withdrew Scheme "A" and submitted an alternative Scheme "B", which, like the City Council's scheme, provides for eleven wards each returning three councillors. The names of the proposed wards followed the City Council's nomenclature but the ward boundaries and the electorate contained therein, apart from Matson ward, were substantially different. Prior to the local meeting I made a general inspection of the area and the alternative ward boundaries suggested.

At the beginning of the Meeting the representatives of the Gloucester Liberal Party confirmed that they did not wish their original Scheme "A" to be considered, but they wished to press their objection to the City Council's scheme embodied in the Boundary Commission's draft proposals and to pursue their alternative Scheme "B". I asked the persons present at the meeting whether there were any other objectors to the Commission's draft proposals, and learned that there were not. Those who wished to speak indicated that they agreed with the City Council's scheme and supported the Boundary Commission's proposals. It was decided, therefore, that the best method of procedure would be for Mr. Halford and Mr. Warner, representing the Gloucester Liberal Party, to put forward their case for the several wards proposed by them, and for the Council representatives and others present at the Meeting to comment as they thought fit.

In opening Mr. Halford stated that their approach and proposals differed considerably from the City Council's. They felt that more emphasis should be placed on natural communities, and that the Council's proposals did not use natural physical boundaries between most of the wards. He accepted that there was difficulty in getting wards of the same size but natural communities do not necessarily fit easily into laid down criteria. He and Mr. Warner then dealt with the individual wards.

### Barton Ward

Mr. Warner stated that the Council proposed to take the All Saints area out and add in White City area, which is isolated by the railway line. The Liberals considered that it would be preferable to add in the area north of the existing ward. They felt that Ryecroft Street does not form a natural boundary and that the White City does not form part of the existing neighbourhood unit. They also felt that the Barton Street and Ryecroft Street area was part of the existing Tredworth/Barton neighbourhood unit.

Mr. Shackleton, the Chief Executive of Gloucester City Council, pointed out that the Liberals' proposals created a ward considerably above the electorate average. The Council had achieved a good boundary by using Barton Street, Upton Street, Ryecroft Street and Goodyere Street. The Council had to increase the electorate in the ward because of the peripheral development. Mr. Woollorton, representing Barton, felt that the City Council's recommendations must be right. Mr. Hyett stated that while he was now a Councillor for the Barnwood ward he was born in the Barton ward. He supported the City Council's view entirely and felt that the proposed ward fitted in with the community and shopping interests of the people in the area.

### Longlevens Ward

Mr. Halford and Mr. Warner said that here again they had tried to look at the neighbourhood area. They considered Estcourt Road to be a natural boundary. It was part of the by-pass, with a 40 mile an hour speed limit. They also felt that Cheltenham Road was a preferable ward boundary. They felt that Oxstalls Lane and Little Normans areas should be united with the rest of Longlevens because they were geographically isolated from Kingsholm. Mr. Slackleton said that the Council had used Oxstalls Lane and Insworth Lane as a ward boundary in preference to Cheltenham Road. The Council felt that the use of Cheltenham Road would cut the area commonly thought of as Longlevens in two. The proposed northern by-pass road to relieve Estcourt Road of a considerable amount of traffic had been taken into account. The Longlevens/Kingsholm area had only been incorporated in the City in 1967, when the present wards were formed, and he felt that another major revision, as proposed by the Liberals, was not justified at the present time.

Mr. Lattimer supported the City Council's views. He felt that the Liberal Party's proposals involved shifting too many electors about. In his opinion Oxstalls Lane was a perfectly adequate and identifiable boundary between

Kingsholm and Longlevens wards. Councillor Hyett also supported the City Council's scheme, and referred to the siting of schools on opposite sides of Estcourt Road.

#### Eastgate Ward

Mr. Halford felt that the use of Grafton Road, Riversley Road and in the Council's proposal also Elmbridge Road and Barnwood Road, as the northern boundary divides an old established residential area. He felt that the ward should possibly be called Elmbridge Ward. So far as the southern boundary was concerned he reiterated views he had expressed on Barton Ward.

Mr. Shackleton pointed out that it was a fundamental change and that the Council had tried to use existing roads as boundaries. One had to look at Kingsholm, Longlevens and Eastgate wards together, and the Liberal Party proposals provided for a major alteration of boundaries and a re-distribution of electorate between these three wards.

The Council's proposals gave two wards within the range of plus or minus of 200 of the average ward, and were better than the alternative proposals. Mr. Lattimer and Mr. Hyett both preferred the City Council's scheme to that of the Liberal Party.

#### Kingsholm Ward

Mr. Halford detailed the boundaries which the Liberal Party proposed for the ward. He pointed out that the City Council's proposals for Kingsholm included the Longford area that is part of the Longlevens neighbourhood. The Liberal Party felt that the Hospital and Station areas should be included in the ward and that Estcourt Road formed a natural northern boundary. Mr. Warner emphasised that their proposals fitted in with the natural northern City centre community. Kingsholm Rugby Ground would be brought in together with Denmark Road area. Under the Council's proposals Kingsholm Square was in the Westgate Ward, whereas he felt that it should be in the Kingsholm Ward.

For the Council Mr. Shackleton reiterated that the three wards must be considered together and that the Council had put the whole of the City centre into their proposed Westgate Ward.

Mr. Lattimer supported the City Council's proposals. He emphasised that the alternative proposals of the Liberal Party involved large movements of electorate from the existing wards. He felt that the Council's boundaries for

the Kingsholm Ward were clearly identifiable and suitable. The movement of people shopping was towards the town centre.

#### Westgate Ward

Mr. Halford outlined the boundaries which the Liberal Party proposed for the Westgate Ward. He pointed out that in the City Council's proposals the Ward stretched from the northern to the southern City boundaries, whereas the Liberal Party proposals limited the geographical spread of the Ward.

Mr. Shackleton said that in considering this Ward one was faced with the problems of the flood plains. The Council's Westgate Ward takes in the whole of the City centre. The Liberals proposals would cut the existing Linden community in two.

Mr. Warner accepted totally that the Westgate/Linden boundary proposed was a poor boundary but so was the existing proposal.

Mr. Lattimer did not agree with the Liberal view. He thought that the people living on either side of Tewkesbury Road were better served by being joined to wards south of them (i.e. Westgate and Kingsholm) rather than being joined to the electorate east of them in the proposed Longlevens Ward. He felt that the Liberals were proposing a tortuous boundary to the south with Linden Ward dividing a homogeneous group of people in the Bristol Road area. The Council's proposals were preferable.

Miss Sylvia Coppen-Gardner, representing Westgate Ward, supported the Council's proposals. She laid great emphasis on the neighbourhood community, which would be broken up under the Liberal proposals.

#### Podsmead Ward

Mr. Halford stated that he was one of the Councillors for Podsmead Ward. He felt that the eastern boundary of the City Council's proposals divided the existing community. The Liberal Party proposed that the main railway line should be used as a boundary instead of Grange Road and Epnay Road. If Cole Avenue were used as a northern boundary one obtained a compact triangular area forming a natural community. The Liberal Party felt that the present warding arrangements and the City Council's proposed boundary are unnatural.

For the Council Mr. Shackleton accepted that Cole Avenue and the railway would be good boundaries, but resulted in a ward below the electoral average (minus 360) and the effect of taking the area of Lower Tuffley out of Tuffley Ward gives the Liberals' Tuffley Ward an electorate 617 below average. The City Council's proposals gives an electorate to Podsmead Ward of minus 200 and a Tuffley Ward of minus 108. The Council's proposals did not affect the present ward.

Mrs. West stated that she lived in Podsmead Ward. She pointed out that children go to school on both sides of Cole Avenue. She supported the Council's proposals and did not like the Liberal split.

Councillor Hyett stated that he was originally a Councillor for this area and was instrumental in forming the Tuffley Community Association. He felt that Cole Avenue was no barrier whatever, and he supported the City Council's scheme.

Mr. Lattimer once again referred to the major shift of the electorate which would be involved in the acceptance of the Liberal Party proposals. Alterations to improve the Podsmead Ward could only be made at the expense of the other wards.

Mr. Wooltorton also supported the Council's proposals. He too did not feel that Cole Avenue should be a boundary, and emphasised the number of people regularly crossing it. He did not feel that it was a natural boundary.

#### Tuffley Ward

Mr. Halford considered that the railway line formed a natural boundary here. The Liberal Party felt that the Podsmead Road/Tuffley Avenue area is part of the Linden neighbourhood unit, separated from Tuffley by the railway and the by-pass.

For the Council Mr. Shackleton pointed out that their proposals used the existing ward boundary except that it included the area in the north west corner where development is taking place. The ward proposed by the Liberal Party was well below the average electorate. He did not feel that there was a natural affinity with the Marlborough Road area, which the Liberals had included in their Tuffley Ward.

Councillor Hyett considered that the Liberal Party's proposals for this ward were ludicrous. From the community point of view the Council's proposals were absolutely right.

Mr. Lattimer supported the City Council's boundaries. He pointed out that the Liberal Party even by adding in areas to the north could not make the electorate up to the right figure.

#### Matson Ward

There was no dispute over this ward.

#### Linden Ward

Mr. Halford outlined the Liberal Party's proposed boundaries for the Linden Ward, which he felt were more natural boundaries than the existing arrangements and the City Council's proposals. He accepted that they were not too happy about the northern boundary but that this arose out of the requirement of electoral equality.

For the City Council Mr. Shackleton felt that the published proposals have a better northern boundary and referred to his comments with regard to Westgate Ward.

#### Hucclecote Ward and Barnwood Ward

Mr. Halford and Mr. Warner stated that what the Liberal Party were proposing was only a slight change from the existing boundaries. They asked why the Council's proposed boundary should run along Barnwood Road.

For the Council Mr. Shackleton accepted that the Liberal Party's proposals for the Barnwood and Hucclecote Wards did not differ radically from the Council's. He pointed out that the existing boundaries were based on the old parishes in part which were added to the City in 1967. The boundaries had created difficulties and had to be rationalised. Residential development can take place in this area and indeed Barnwood Ward is the area where the major development is likely to take place in the next five years. The existing boundaries go right through the middle of housing estates. The Council felt that Upton Lane was a much better boundary than Church Lane and an undefined line across fields. The Council have previously considered the use of Welveland Lane as a boundary, but preferred Barnwood Road and the railway.

Mr. Hyett, who is a Councillor for Barnwood Ward,

said that he spoke also for the other Councillors in the Ward in supporting the Council's proposals. He accepted that a change was necessary because of the impending development.

This concluded the detailed arguments on the alternative Ward boundaries.

Summing up for the Liberal Party Mr. Halford said that they had attempted to give the greatest consideration to natural communities and natural boundaries. They felt that their proposals were better than those of the City Council.

Mr. Lattimer then stated that when the Conservative Association first saw the recommended Ward boundary changes they looked for the likely political consequences of the proposals. However, after a careful scrutiny they came to the conclusion that whilst they accepted the necessity for boundary changes, those proposed were likely to be of equal advantage or disadvantage to all parties. He felt that this indicated that the proposals were administratively sound and essentially unbiased. Given that changes were necessary it followed that any new plan should cause minimum disturbance to the existing scheme of things provided that the pre-requisite of the fairest possible equality of representation was met. These two criteria; minimal disturbance and equality of representation appear to be satisfied in the Boundary Commission's proposals.

He also pointed out that all parties in Gloucester have vigorous Branch organisations established in each of the Wards. Those Branches depended for their success upon the goodwill, friendship and co-operation of supporters living in the Ward. The well being of such Ward organisations would suffer if they were the victims of unnecessary major surgery. Old ties would have to be disturbed, new Ward organisations slowly developed out of mutilated remains of the previous structure and new councillor/elector relationships establishes. This must be bad for the democratic process.

There was also a need to take a City-wide view of the Ward boundary problem. It is all too easy to achieve near perfection in an isolated case by falling woefully short of the requirements of the 1972 Act in the remainder of the area under review. The problem really must be looked at in the round, and this he believed the Council had successfully done whilst the Liberal counter-proposals did not.

The Liberal counter-proposals succeeded in involving about half the electors of Gloucester in a wholly unnecessary game of electoral musical chairs. This would confuse the electorate, damage all three voluntary political organisations, and councillor/elector relations. The Liberal Party's proposals were demonstrably less equitable than the Chief Executive's proposals adopted by the Council with an admitted electoral variation between Wards twice as big as that initially put forward.

In winding up for the City Council the Chief Executive, Mr. Shackleton, said that the aim of the Council had been to produce wards, if possible, within plus or minus 200 of the average electorate. Of the 11 wards proposed 7 were within this norm and 1 was minus 206. The remaining 3 wards were also within acceptable limits. The Council had also been mindful of the need to preserve as many of the existing electoral arrangements as possible.

The Liberal Party's proposals had no apparent advantages over the Council's proposals, and in a number of ways they were less satisfactory.

Mr. Shackleton handed in a letter from Councillor H. Layton, the leader of the City Council Labour group, saying that at the last moment he had been prevented from attending the local meeting and confirming that the Labour group on the City Council was quite happy with the proposals published by the Boundary Commission.

A further letter was handed in from the County Clerk of Gloucester County Council, saying that it did not seem to be necessary for the County Council to be represented at the meeting and notifying me that there were no comments on the draft proposals.

The Meeting was then closed, and I made a further inspection of the area to examine the detailed ward boundary matters, community features, and other points to which my attention had been drawn during the meeting.

### Conclusions

It is clear that the City Council's scheme and the Gloucester Liberal Party's scheme must be considered as alternatives. Both are good schemes and the Chief Executive and Gloucester City Council on the one hand and the Gloucester Liberal Party Policy Committee on the other are to be congratulated on the care and thought put into the preparation of their respective schemes. The ward

boundaries proposed are so different, however, that it would not be possible to adjust them between the two schemes without consequent "shunt" effects which would produce unacceptable electoral inequalities.

The City Council's scheme as embodied in the Boundary Commission's draft proposals offers a very even standard of equality of representation and causes minimum disturbance to the existing electoral arrangements for the City. Apart from the objection by the Gloucester Liberal Party, no other objections were received to these proposals, and they were supported by those who spoke at the local meeting. The scheme commands the support of the Conservative and the Labour groups on the Council, and the Council, after considering the alternative proposals advanced by the Liberal Party, re-affirmed their preference for the Commission's draft proposals. The ward sizes vary between 6,504 (Barnwood) and 5,823 (Linden), eight of the wards being close to the average of about 6,100.

The Gloucester Liberal Party's scheme offers a generally viable alternative. The standard of equality of representation is not quite so good as that in the Commission's draft proposals, but is largely acceptable. The size of wards vary from 6,716 (Barton) to 5,564 (Tuffley).

If the electoral arrangements for the city were being prepared de novo it would be difficult to choose between the two schemes, although on balance the Council's scheme gives a better equality of representation. But immediately one considers the existing electoral arrangements it is clear that the Council's scheme has a paramount advantage because it causes the least disturbance to the electorate, given that certain major changes have to be made. The Council's proposals lead to some 4,700 of the electorate being in different wards, whereas the Liberal Party's scheme involves some 16,500 electors, about one in four of the total electorate.

For these reasons I am satisfied that the City Council's scheme is preferable.

#### Recommendation

I recommend that the draft proposals of the Boundary Commission be confirmed, subject to any alterations which may be made on the advice of the Ordnance Survey in the interests of good boundaries.

I am most grateful to all those who attended the local meeting and assisted me in my consideration of the alternative schemes.

I return herewith the relevant maps and documents.

Yours sincerely,

*James Ford*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION MEETING

18TH MAY, 1976

ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
H. R. T. SHACKLETON	Chief Executive Officer, Guildhall, GLOUCESTER.	GLOUCESTER CITY
S. S. CLARKSON	Asstant E.R.O.	" "
MISS SYLVIA COPPEN- GARDNER	19 COLLEGE GREEN, GLOUCESTER GL1 2LR	WESTGATE WARD
PATRICIA MOREFIELD	1, GARNALLS ROAD, MATSON, GLOUCESTER.	MATSON WARD
DAVID HALFORD	8, IVORY CLOSE, PODSMEAD, GLOUCESTER	GLOUCESTER LIBERAL PARTY
ALAN WARNER	25, HIGH VIEW, HEMPSTED, GLOUCESTER	" "
LESLEY PRESSEY	34, CALTON ROAD, GLOUCESTER	LINDEN WARD
M.J. WOOLTORTON	51, SPENCER CLOSE, HUCCLECOTE	BARTON
R. E. GARDINER	4, HEATHFIELD ROAD, STROUD	'THE CITIZEN'
M. S. WEST	45 EMERALD CLOSE	PODSMEAD
LESLEY A. MOUNTJOY	58 WINDSOR DRIVE	"
ARTHUR G. FOOTE	8, COWLEY ROAD	TUFFLEY WARD
FRED HARMAN	46 FAIRMILE GARDENS, GLOUCESTER	KINGSHOLM WARD
KEN. HYETT	36 MORPETH STREET, GLOUCESTER	BARNWOOD
P. J. LATTIMER	CONSTITUTION HOUSE, GLOUCESTER	GLOS. CONS. ASSN.
F. DAVENPORT	3, OLD PAINSWICK CLOSE, GLOUCESTER	GLOS. LABOUR PARTY
A.V.M. YOUNG	82 GILPIN AVENUE, HUCCLECOTE	GLOS. CONS. ASSN.
J. C. PORTER	22 ENNERDALE AVENUE	LONGLEVENS WARD
ELIZABETH M. WARNER	25 HIGH VIEW, HEMPSTED	WESTGATE
R. H. PULLAN	GREENACRES, PAINSWICK ROAD, BROCKWORTH	
K. W. DURBIN	EASTGATE SHOPPING CENTRE.	EASTGATE SHOPPING CENTRE.
PETER M. ROBINS.	GUILDHALL - MAYOR.	

## SCHEDULE 2

## CITY OF GLOUCESTER: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO OF COUNCILLORS</u>
BARNWOOD	3
BARTON	3
EASTGATE	3
HUCCLECOTE	3
KINGSHOLM	3
LINDEN	3
LONGLEVENS	3
MATSON	3
PODSMEAD	3
TUFFLEY	3
WESTGATE	3

## CITY OF GLOUCESTER      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.

## WESTGATE WARD

Commencing at the point where the Gloucester and Sharpness Canal meets the western boundary of the District, thence northwestwards and following said boundary and eastwards and following the northern boundary of the District to Tewkesbury Road, thence southwestwards and southwards along said road, Kingsholm Road and Worcester Street to Alvin Street, thence southeastwards along said street to London Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Great Western Road, thence southeastwards along said road to the path and subway from said road to Central Station, thence southwestwards along said path and subway and continuing southwestwards along the road known as Station Approach to Bruton Way, thence southwards along said way to Station Road, thence southeastwards and following said road to Barton Street, thence southeastwards along said street to the railway, thence southwestwards and following said railway to Tredworth Road, thence northwestwards along said road and Stroud Road to Bristol Road, thence northwards along said road and Southgate Street to Baker Street, thence northwestwards along said street and in prolongation thereof to the Gloucester and Sharpness Canal, thence southwestwards and following said canal to the point of commencement.

## KINGSHOLM WARD

Commencing at the point where Asylum Lane meets the eastern boundary of Westgate Ward, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the northern boundary of the District, thence southeastwards and following said northern boundary to Innsworth Lane, thence southwards and southwestwards along said Lane and Oxstalls Lane to Cheltenham Road, thence generally southwestwards along said road to London Road, thence northwestwards and southwestwards along said road to Hyde Lane, thence southwards along said lane to Asylum Lane, thence generally southwestwards along said lane to the point of commencement.

### LONGLEVENS WARD

Commencing at the point where the Cheltenham to Gloucester railway meets Barnwood Road, thence northwestwards along said road to Elmbridge Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Riversley Road, thence northwestwards and following said road to Grafton Road thence northwards along said road to the eastern boundary of Kingsholm Ward, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the northern boundary of the District, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the Cheltenham to Gloucester railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

---

### EASTGATE WARD

Commencing at the point where Tredworth Road (formerly known as Cottesford Road) meets the Gloucester to Stroud railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to Barton Street at Chequers Bridge, thence northwestwards along said street and continuing northwestwards along Upton Street and Ryecroft Street to Victoria Street, thence northwards along said Victoria Street to Goodyere Street, thence northwestwards along said street and in prolongation thereof to the eastern boundary of Westgate Ward, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of Kingsholme Ward, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Longlevens Ward, thence southwards and following said boundary and continuing southeastwards along Barnwood Road to Eastern Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Tredworth Road, thence northwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.

---

### BARNWOOD WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of the District meets Painswick Road (B4073), thence northwestwards along said road to the southeastern boundary of Eastgate Ward, thence generally northeastwards along said boundary to Barnwood Road, thence southeastwards along said road to

Upton Lane, thence southwards and following said Lane (as altered) to the southeastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwestwards along said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### HUCCLECOTE WARD

Commencing at the point where the southeastern boundary of the District meets the eastern boundary of Barnwood Ward, thence northwards and following said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Eastgate Ward to the southeastern boundary of Longlevens Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the District, thence southwards and following said boundary and the southeastern boundary of the District to the point of commencement.

#### PODSMEAD WARD

Commencing at the point where the Gloucester to Stroud railway meets the southern boundary of the District, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the eastern boundary of Westgate Ward, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to a point opposite the southern boundary of the Steel Depot centred at national grid reference SO 8227416948, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary to Bristol Road, thence southwestwards along said road to Tuffley Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to Podsmead Road, thence southwestwards and southwards along said road to Cole Avenue, thence westwards along said avenue to Epney Road, thence southwards and following said road and Grange Road to the Gloucester to Stroud railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

#### LINDEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the Gloucester to Stroud railway meets Stroud Road, thence northwards along said road to Tuffley Avenue, thence northwestwards along said road and the northern boundary of Podsmead Ward, to the

eastern boundary of Westgate Ward, thence northeastwards and southeastwards along said boundary to the railway, thence generally southwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

#### BARTON WARD

Commencing at the point where Finlay Road meets Selwyn Road, thence northwestwards along said Selwyn Road to Northfield Road, thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of numbers 24 to 17 Northfield Square, thence northwestwards to and along said boundaries and in prolongation thereof to the dismantled railway, thence southwestwards along said dismantled railway to the eastern boundary of Linden Ward, thence generally northwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Westgate Ward to the southern boundary of Eastgate Ward, thence generally southeastwards along said boundary to Finlay Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.

#### TUFFLEY WARD

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the District meets the eastern boundary of Podsmead Ward, thence northeastwards and following said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Linden Ward, thence southeastwards and following said boundary and the southern boundary of Barton Ward and continuing southeastwards along Selwyn Road to Reservoir Road, thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of number 99 Reservoir Road, thence southwards to and along said boundary, the eastern boundary of number 101 in said road and the rear boundaries of numbers 10 to 13 Ashmore Road to the southern boundary of number 13 in said road, thence southeastwards in a straight line to a point at National Grid reference SO 8402615835, thence due south to the southern boundary of the District, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

**MATSON WARD**

Commencing at the point where the southern boundary of the District meets the eastern boundary of Tuffley Ward, thence due northwards and following said eastern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Barton Ward, thence north-eastwards along said boundary and continuing northeastwards along the eastern boundary of Eastgate Ward to the western boundary of Barnwood Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of the District, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

