

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 January 2016 10:03  
**To:** reviews  
**Subject:** Consultation Response  
**Attachments:** Boundaries Paper Dec.2015 (2)(3)(4) letter.docx; SUBMISSION 2016.doc; Boundary Commission 2016.odt

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached my submission to the Review of Boundary Changes of South Lakeland District Council.

Best Wishes,

Cllr. Janette Jenkinson  
Town and District Councillor for Ulverston West Ward

## **PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARY CHANGES; ULVERSTON; (SOUTH LAKELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL)**

**Boundary Commission,**

**Dear Sirs**

**Appended to this letter is a copy of the report from Ulverston Town Council, which was agreed unanimously by the Town Council at its January Meeting. Since then, the District Council has debated its own response to the Commission with which we profoundly disagree.**

### **The main points of concern with the SLDC proposals are:**

- 1. We do believe that three-member wards are wrong in principle, tend to weaken democracy & efficiency, create distance between councillor and elector and are particularly unsuited to Ulverston.**
- 2. We do not believe that there is any necessary causal link between members being elected in thirds and the creation of three member wards. If election by thirds were decided upon, it is quite straight-forward to keep single-members wards, linking contiguous wards to decide the order in which councillors are up for re-election. Where there is disparity in numbers of electors, it is a simple matter to use percentage of electorate or percentage of total votes cast.**
- 3. However, we believe that yearly elections lead to voter "fatigue" and more importantly to short-termism amongst councillors, who will be in permanent election mode, seeking headlines, raising campaign funds etc. It is inimical to proper planning & strategy, particularly over the most serious matters – like flooding - and inimical to cross-Party collaboration, which is not uncommon in local government matters.**

**The Agenda paper presented to the District Councillors repeated the statement that "regarding the impact on Parishes, the Group was advised that currently, their elections were by thirds". This is simply not true, and what's more the Council was informed of the error several weeks before the agenda paper was written. It exemplifies the mistaken assumptions on which some of the SLDC's decisions were made. Ulverston has had elections every four years for most of the past forty years, interrupted by shorter and isolated examples of two member wards, which were not always popular. Although the changes do not, on the surface, affect Town/Parish councils, the coterminous nature of elections in Ulverston is well-understood, has a positive history, and need not be removed. No imperative in the Boundary Commission's brief demands that.**

**It is important that the main priority in changes – the equalisation as far as possible of the size of electorates – is pretty-well achieved by the projected increase in the electorates of Ulverston wards by 2020. Those figures are clear in the Commission's website. The transfer of segments of the community between wards would be needed to create balance between wards in Ulverston. That presents no mathematical difficulties, and**

would be needed in any case between the two three-member wards, should they be decided upon.

Colin Pickthall,  
Town Councillor,  
Ulverston North Ward.  
7.1.2016.

## **ULVERSTON TOWN COUNCIL.**

**Draft response to SLDC's draft proposals to the LGBCE review of S.Lakes:  
(6.1.2016)**

- **and proposed submission by UTC to the LGBCE (11<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016)**

- 1. Ulverston Town Council recognises and respects the Boundary Commission's three criteria for consideration:**
  - (i) To deliver electoral equality where each district councillor represents roughly the same number of electors:**
  - (ii) That the pattern of divisions should, as far as possible reflect the interests and identities of local communities**
  - (iii) That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.**
  
- 2. The objections and proposals we make below are fully cognisant of those three criteria, with which we, of course, agree.**

**We note that none of them posits a uniformity of structure for a District, (which in the case of SLDC would be irrational). An area as diverse in population densities as South Lakeland must inevitably encompass a variety of structures, whilst complying with criterion (i).**
  
- 3. We note with dismay that proposals going forward to SLDC councillors include two three-councillor wards for Ulverston and election/re-election by thirds.**

**We strongly remind officers and councillors that Ulverston Town and District Councillors have been elected all-out every 4 years for the past 40 years. We also point out that Ulverston has had single member District Wards for most of the same period, with a couple of examples of two-member wards.**

**This structure has been well-received and well-respected by the electorate and the various political groupings, and has been productive**

of good democratic representation. Our proposal is that it should be retained for the reasons that follow and that no sensible argument has been adduced as to why it should change.

4.1. “Electoral equality”. To create two 3-member wards along the lines by SLDC, would create an electoral imbalance of 667, between the proposed new East & West wards, and therefore inevitably an imbalance with other wards in the District. This in itself would demand a further review.

4.2 SLDC figures for the Ulverston Wards are as follows:

	Present.	2020
Central:	1540	1867
East:	1606	1835
North:	1561	1613
South:	1508	1781
Town:	1480	1529
West:	1524	1996
Average:	1536	1770

The current average for South Lakeland as a whole, is 1,632, rising to 1,746 by 2020. So by the elections in 2020, Ulverston’s 6 wards, on their current boundaries, will be very close to the District average.

While the disparity at present between the Ulverston Wards with the highest (East) and the lowest (Town) is 126 by 2020, the disparity between the highest (West) and the lowest (Town) will be 467. That will of course have to be addressed by minor boundary change. The disparity between the proposed new 3 member West and East wards in 2020 would be 340.

The reason for the increase in, particularly, West and South Wards is the projected number of new homes to be built on the rural fringes of the Town. The figures show a need for a change to the boundaries of the six Ulverston Wards by the 2020 elections, depending on refinement of the projections in the light of actual builds. They do not show the need for a change into 2 three- member wards now, or indeed, at all.

It is hard to detect in the proposals before SLDC, any recognition of the impact of the new homes.

**4.3. The present ward structure in Ulverston means that one District Councillor directly represents, on average, over 1536 electors. Such a ratio is enough to allow a councillor to get to know a large proportion of his or her electors and certainly all his or her ward's needs problems and strengths, at the micro level required of District Councillors. A new Ulverston Ward of some 5000 electors makes that level and quality of representation unlikely. Individual councillors in that context could well end up representing no-one, but leaving it to ward colleagues. One member, one ward is, in Ulverston anyway at District Level, is the cleanest, simplest, most efficient and most democratic way of representing the electorate.**

**4.4. It is important to bear in mind that Ulverston is not a rural parish. It is a small urban market centre, second in size only to Kendal in the South Lakeland District, with an electorate of over 9000 and a population of about 12,000. This population lives in a town no more than one and a half miles from edge to edge. It is not surprising that it is not represented at District or parish level by "independents" but by vigorously active political parties. If the proposed 2 three-member wards were to come about, "the interests and identities of local communities" could be seriously compromised.**

**The proposed new West Ward is most likely to be permanently represented by Conservatives. The proposed new East ward is most likely to be permanently represented by Labour, (other parties and Independents hardly figure in Ulverston). At present, the single member ward enables an outstanding, popular or hard-working candidate to win against the political tide. In three member wards in Ulverston, that seems most improbable. With the two three-member wards proposed, it is likely that the Town would be unpleasantly divided in half.**

**In addition, the new West Ward would be overwhelmingly residential, while the new East Ward would have almost all the Town Centre, and the vast majority of the Town's Commerce, Industrial and entertainment life.**

**4.5 Elections Frequency, is a separate matter. Since 1974, Ulverston has had all-out elections every 4 years for both District and Town Council elections, on the same day. This has been found to be totally satisfactory. There have been periodic changes in political control, which is healthy in a local democracy.**

**Each successive Town Council and District councillor has had that period of time to develop policies and campaigns without annual distraction of**

**elections, the required money raising and the point scoring and short termism that annual elections unavoidably mean.**

**Moreover annual elections involve both the Councils concerned and the political groups and individuals much more expense simply dealing with the mechanics.**

#### **CONCLUSION.**

**While recognising that there will be a need for boundary adjustments within Ulverston to meet the LGBCE's first criterion, we can see no reason whatever why the single member District Wards and the all-out four yearly elections need to be changed.**

**Ulverston Town Council**

**2.1.2016**

Cllr. Janette Jenkinson,

Barne House, Broad Dale, Pennington Lane, Ulverston, Cumbria, LA12 7SE.

9th January, 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**Boundary Changes for South Lakeland District Council**

I am writing regarding the potential boundary changes to South Lakeland District Council.

**I fully support the responses from the Conservative Group on SLDC and Ulverston Town Councils.** I find SLDC's response objectionable in many ways.

I have represented Ulverston West Ward on SLDC and Ulverston Town Council since 1991 and have stood and fought in many elections since then. Having lived in the area all my life and devoting it to serving my community, I feel I have a very good knowledge of what works well and community needs.

I have been Mayor of Ulverston twice and Chairman of SLDC, I am on many committees, outside bodies and Chairman of Low Furness and Ulverston Local Area Partnership. I still find the role of councillor exciting, invigorating and challenging particular at this time of Localism and Partnership Working.

If we have to have three member wards in Ulverston they should be the County Divisions of Ulverston West, North and South and Ulverston East, Town and Central. The community are aware of these divisions and they work well. District and County Councillors in these areas work together on issues. I also believe yearly elections open up all sorts of problems.

I do hope you will look favourably on both these submissions.

Regards,

Cllr. Janette Jenkinson

SLDC and Ulverston Town Councillor Ulverston West Ward.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Ulverston West, South and North**

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

### **Arnside and Beetham, Milnthorpe**

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

### **Burton and Holme, Crooklands**

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

### **Sedbergh and Kirkby Lonsdale**

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

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

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

### **Mid Furness and Low Furness**

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

### **Kendal and Levens**

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

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

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