Submission from BELMONT WARD Councillors concerning the on-going boundary review in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

As Belmont councillors, we recognise and appreciate the need for the Local Government Boundary Commission to ensure electoral equality in the on-going boundary review in the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. We also note the need to ensure that the pattern of wards reflects the interests and identities of local communities, and broadly agree with the proposals the Commission have put forward for the Borough.

However we are proposing there are some slight modifications to the area linking the Belmont/Riverside/St Marys Wards which will not only still maintain electoral equality, but are also in the interest of local community interests and identities.

We have included two maps as appendixes. Option 1 is the Commission’s proposals, and Option 2 is our proposals.

We have added a red line in the Belmont Ward which shows the present two Polling Districts BA and BB.

Belmont Ward has the main A4 as a boundary to the south and the very busy B4447 to the east. Belmont has two Polling Stations presently splitting the Ward evenly west to east. However under Option 1, the BB District now becomes very wide west to east and is divided by the main B4447 road. It is also not helped by the large Industrial estate that would now be in the middle of the new proposed BB area.

North Town is a community to the east of the B4447 from Laggan Road in the north down to Ray Mill Road West and beyond. A major factor is that except for Ellington Park, west of the B4447 is a large industrial estate which represents a buffer to any sense of community attachment to the Belmont/Riverside residents.

Major roads, railways and rivers do act as ward boundaries, and when looking to the east of the B4447 in Option 1, from Laggan Road down to the dual-carriageway Saint Cloud Way, there are three Wards proposed – Belmont, Riverside and St. Mary’s dividing up this community.
Under Option 2, there are only two – Riverside and St. Mary’s which would seem to be more compatible and less of a divisive issue. The fact that Riverside Primary School under Option 2 remains in the Riverside Ward is also a good point, whereas in Option 1, it would then be in the Belmont Ward and the name logically changed to Belmont Primary School. Again, confusing and unnecessary.

The final point to make is there would be far less disruption to the boundaries and consequently the communities identity of Riverside and Belmont, which is beneficial to both our Maidenhead residents and Councillors if Option 2 is adopted, and this must surely be a consideration.

We have listed below the variance/electors per councillor under the Commission’s proposals against our own, and you will see that both Options 1 and 2 fall within the 10% variance, and are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission’s proposals</th>
<th><strong>OPTION 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>OPTION 2</strong></th>
<th>Our proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td>6,141 +9%</td>
<td>5,194 -8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>5,727 +1%</td>
<td>6,109 +8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. MARY’S</td>
<td>5,204 -8%</td>
<td>5,769 +2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based as being two member wards, and were provided by Officers which included the Electoral Services Manager.

We therefore hope that the evidence we have supplied presents a compelling case to retain North Town in Riverside in the interests of preserving communities’ identities, and as these slight modifications will also maintain electoral equality and similar Councillors per ward, you will be minded to endorse the revised warding pattern for Belmont, Riverside and St Mary’s.

Councillor Philip Love
Councillor Marion Mills