The Review Officer (West Berkshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

10 July 2017

Electoral Review of West Berkshire District Council

Reference:
A. LGBCE letter to Chief Executive West Berkshire Council 13 June 2017
B. West Berkshire Council report to Full Council meeting 4 July 2017
C. Statement by Cllr Graham Jones, Leader West Berkshire Council 4 July 2017
D. Newbury & West Berkshire Liberal Democrats submission to LGBCE April 2017

This is the response of the Liberal Democrat Party to the latest consultation on the Review, announced in Reference A. It takes account of the Council’s own report on the matter (Reference B) and remarks by its Leader (Reference C) at the meeting where their response was approved, although draft minutes are not yet available.

The author attended part of the Full Council discussion on 4 July and has since been briefed by the Liberal Democrat Opposition Group Leader who attended the whole of it. However the Newbury & West Berkshire Local Party area does not include the whole of West Berkshire District and this response does not necessarily represent the views of the Opposition Group on the Council or the Liberal Democrats in the Wokingham Constituency part of the District.

In addition to this letter (to be uploaded via the consultation website) we have used the mapping tool on the BCE website to graphically show our proposals. However we reached the site’s limits on map points before we could depict the three Thatcham wards.

General Points

We have not changed our view greatly about how we believe the Electoral Review should best achieve its aims. See points ‘a’ to ‘f’ on page 5 of Reference D.

We strongly believe that the existing parish and polling districts (PDs) with current boundaries are not now necessarily the best ‘building blocks’ for making coherent communities, which was the view expressed with some emphasis in Reference C (counter to our points ‘e’ and ‘f’). We therefore continue to suggest that other natural and manmade features be used in the instances
described in Reference D. We add a few more in this revised District-wide proposal and highlight in Appendix 1 all the new splits in parish and PDs which we now propose.

In a number of respects, parish boundaries in and near several growing settlements are overdue a review.

However we agree with the Council that, contrary to ‘a’, a single three-member ward for Hungerford and Kintbury might be an acceptable solution for that part of the district (although we have a slight difference of opinion as to how the Kintbury Ward be made up).

**Voter Numbers**

We are still unconvinced that the forecast elector numbers for all PDs are sound (e.g. for GB1 & GB2). Where we believe that a PD needs to be divided in order to achieve the best outcome in terms of elector numbers as well as ‘community identity’, we need to know where within each divided PD - and when - the increase is expected. For some PDs, where there is no anticipated new development, we can predict the numbers in each part fairly accurately. For others, we first need to see the Council’s detailed assumptions on progress within each housing development, including offices converting to flats.

Meanwhile we believe that all but three of our proposed wards¹ are within the +/-10% tolerance of the 3100 per councillor target, taking account of where we express specific doubts about the Council’s numbers. Where we have split a PD, we have used our party’s electoral data (obtained from the Council and used within a GIS) as the basis for estimates of numbers in each part of the split PDs: the data is accurate down to household level.

**The Council’s New Proposals**

We have the following main objections to the Council’s proposals and offer reasons why we believe our own to be better.

**Newbury settlement area.**

The Liberal Democrats sought a Community Governance Review (CGR) for the Newbury settlement area in 2012 and again in 2015 but on both occasions were told it was not a suitable time in the electoral cycle. On the second occasion we were advised by the Council that a CGR could be undertaken after this Electoral Review. However this seems to be putting the two reviews in the wrong order: many of the changes we propose here to District wards are predicated upon suggested new parish boundaries which we have been unable to offer to the communities affected but which we believe are needed to create a sense of “community identity” at parish level where none seems to exist. We identified some of these in Reference D and most of these remain in our revised District Ward proposals, with a small number added.

1. **Greenham (Racecourse / Sandleford).** The Council ignores the fact that the parish boundary between Greenham and Newbury splits part of the Racecourse development and will split Sandleford Park. Creating either a two-member ward or two one-member wards for Greenham does not help create clearly identifiable communities. Our proposals keep the whole Racecourse development together in one ward and also the whole Sandleford Park development together with the rest of Wash Common, with which it has much better links than it does with Greenham east of the A339. If the parish

---

¹ Pangbourne, Aldermaston and Mortimer, none of them more than 12% from target size.
boundary is used as the ward boundary within Sandleford, almost half of the proposed development will be in Newbury (split between the Council’s Falkland and St Johns wards) and the rest will be within Greenham.

GB2’s revised estimated electorate seems far too small, bearing in mind the visible progress on site and the fact the Racecourse development is due completion within the period of this review. We believe it will easily reach 1200 by 2022.

2. **Wash Common.** There are significant parts of Enborne parish east of the A34 bypass that have much better links with Wash Common than with Kintbury, some of which are within the Newbury settlement area. The Council does nothing to address this, because it treats the existing parish boundaries as though they reflect modern life pre-bypass. Our proposals include all of Enborne east of the A34 and south of the railway line (Wash Water and Skinners Green) as part of a one-member Wash Common Ward. This would include both sides of Essex Street and all of Sandleford Park up to Monks Lane in the north and A339 in the east.

GB1’s increase is presumably largely attributable to Sandleford but must also include some of the other recently consented housing east of A339. We would need to know the split to be able to estimate numbers in our Wash Common, Greenham and Newbury SE wards. We have taken only 10% of GB1 in Wash Common, with all the remaining increase of GB1 remaining in Greenham. We do not know whether any of Sandleford’s future electorate has been included in the Council’s figures for NB12 or NB14.

3. **Clay Hill.** Although our proposal here is very similar to the Council’s, we note that the newly consented development off Stoney Lane, although it abuts Manor Park Estate and is in Newbury settlement area, is included by the Council in its very strangely shaped Castle Ward. In our proposal, it follows the precedent of Manor Park and is included in Clay Hill ward. With about 150 electors, it brings this ward closer to the target size.

4. **Speen & Shaw.** The Council treats these parishes as though they are coherent communities, although they are split by the bypass. The handful of houses in Speen parish south of the canal in Bone Mill Lane are also cut off from the rest of the parish by the pedestrianised Newbury town centre. We have included them with our Northcroft Ward. We have also included all of Speen west of the A34 with Chieveley Ward, while joining the parts of Speen within Newbury settlement area with most of Shaw-cum-Donnington and the consented ‘North Newbury’ development. The Council’s inclusion of Shaw-cum-Donnington within Castle Ward, which extends for nine miles north east beyond Yattenden, is extremely unsatisfactory in our view.

5. Our more purely urban Shaw with Speen Ward (with almost all Shaw-cum-Donnington) is one-member and 7.4% above target electorate.

6. **Newbury Town Central.** The Council takes the easy solution for Newbury, using existing polling districts as building blocks. We have first considered the above anomalies and having resolved them we have found a different solution for Newbury, which we believe works well according to the required criteria. With Clay Hill in the north east and Wash Common in the far south, there are three other two-member wards meeting roughly in the town centre: Northcroft in the north-west, bounded as now by the railway to the south; St Barts / South West, bounded by Essex Street and Monks Lane to the south and Newtown Road to the east; South East / St Johns bounded by the river to the north (see Reference D).
Thatcham
The Council’s Dunstan Ward, Henwick Ward and Kennet & Crookham Ward are simply made up of existing PDs, without any consideration of how convenient they are for electors or their representatives. Both west and east of the town centre, the Council combines parts of the town either side of the A4. Yet the Council uses the less busy traffic-calmed Station Road as a ward boundary.

Our proposal in Reference D was for six one-member wards none of which combined areas north of the A4 with areas south of the A4. If BCE are minded to instead create three two-member wards, we believe that our six one-member wards make better building blocks for these. Crookham should be combined with those parts of south-east Thatcham that are nearest to the level crossing, producing a larger Thatcham South & Crookham ward that takes in much of the town centre. Thatcham North ward would combine our Whitelands and North East wards, all north of A4. The only ward crossing A4 would be Thatcham West. The inner boundaries of the three wards running north-south should not go down the middle of residential roads and should keep the elector numbers as equal as possible. Thatcham is not expecting major growth in population overall.

Rural Areas
We have touched on Castle Ward, which we believe to be a very unsatisfactory feature of the Council’s process that merely uses parishes as building blocks throughout. Our solution avoids such an artificial ward. The distance from Donnington village to Burnt Hill Yattenden is nearly nine miles and there is nothing in common between Yattendon Estates and Shaw Estate within Newbury settlement area.

By keeping Welford with Kintbury (but taking parts of Enborne in with our Wash Common ward), we start to reconfigure the whole of the rest of the rural area with what we believe to be a more satisfactory combination of parishes. This is broadly the same as our proposals in Reference D. We give our estimate of variance from target number of electors per councillor for each below.

- Beedon remains part of Downlands Ward (-0.08%);
- Chieveley Ward with Winterbourne, Boxford and those parts of Speen west of bypass (+1.7%);
- Hampstead Norreys and Ashampstead – but not Streatley – are in Ridgeway Ward (+2.3%);
- Basildon and Bradfield are combined with Pangbourne as a two-member ward (+11.4%);
- Bucklebury Ward undergoes less change taking most of Castle Ward but losing Woolhampton back to Aldermaston Ward (+0.6%);
- Aldermaston Ward loses Ufton Nervet and those parts of Padworth south of River Kennet to Mortimer Ward but retains Woolhampton (+11.9%);
- Mortimer Ward retains Ufton Nervet and Padworth (parts south of River Kennet), as well as Beech Hill. It also takes in Wokefield (from Burghfield) and part of
Sulhamstead (YSG2) adjacent to Wokefield Common\(^2\) and becomes a two-member ward\(^3\) (-11.5%);  
- Burghfield takes in Englefield, which does not fit well with Theale (-3.2%).

**Theale & Reading West**

We have considered including Englefield (currently part of Wokingham Constituency) with Theale (Reading West). However we have been advised that there is no problem having a ward that has parts in different constituencies. Similarly our Pangbourne Ward includes Basildon, Streatley and Bradfield (all currently Newbury Constituency) as well as parishes in Reading West constituency.

In the concurrent Parliamentary Boundary Review, Liberal Democrats have proposed a very different solution which would result in all of West Berkshire District not in Newbury constituency being in a much changed Reading West constituency. Englefield and Theale would both be in Newbury.

We propose Purley be a one-member ward and we concur with the Council’s proposals for Tilehurst.

**Conclusion**

We do not have any more proposed changes to our scheme in Reference D at this stage. Changes that we have made are summarised in Appendix 1. However we intend to make a full response to BCE’s draft recommendations when these are issued late August.

Yours sincerely

Tony Vickers, Chair, Newbury & West Berkshire Liberal Democrats

---

\(^2\) Three Firs Way estate and the west side of Reading Road between Goring Lane and Hollybush Lane.  
\(^3\) We are not entirely satisfied with our proposals for the south east of the District. The revised Council forecast electorates have meant that Theale does not need the addition of Englefield to be a viable one-member Ward but Englefield’s only ‘local centre’ is Theale. Burghfield is above the 10% tolerance under the Council’s proposal but only with Beech Hill and Wokefield. Beech Hill is as poorly connected to Burghfield as Englefield but its obvious local centre is Mortimer.
Appendix 1 – List of Polling Districts that would need amending or creating

EC – part retained with Kintbury Ward, part east of A34 (with Wash Common)
SB2 – split by A34 (west part in Chieveley; east and north of R Kennet in Speen; east but south of R Kennet in Northcroft)
CD1 & 2 – re-draw split (moving about 150 more electors from CD1 to CD2) to put Stoney Lane development into Clay Hill
NB10 & 6 – extend NB10 to include all of NB6 south of river and west of Bartholomew Street
NB12 – split in two places: along Newtown Road (west part in St Barts Ward, east part in St Johns); along centre of Monks Lane (new homes in Sandleford Park development within 50m of Monks Lane are in Newbury but should be in Wash Common Ward)
NB13 & 14 – redraw boundary to put all properties on north side of Essex Street (including Falkland Garth) with NB14 in Wash Common
NB5 – split extreme east part which is Racecourse development in Greenham Ward
GB1 – split along A339, putting west part in Wash Common Ward
TH4, 5 & 6 – all Thatcham Central Wards will be re-divided to be shared between the three Thatcham Wards. TH6 will be partly in Thatcham West and partly in Thatcham North; most of TH5 will also be in Thatcham West; most of TH6 will be in Thatcham South & Crookham.
YPA – split Padworth along River Kennet, to unite the whole of Aldermaston Wharf in one Ward
YSG2 – put all properties that access Reading Road into same Ward (Mortimer) as Wokefield, leaving remainder with Burghfield Ward
Appendix 2 – Changes in Liberal Democrat proposals since April

**Thatcham** – three two-member wards instead of six one-member ones

**Speen Ward**: in error, we made it a two-member ward when it should only be a one-member ward. We now call it “Shaw with Speen Ward”

**Midgham parish**: moved from Aldermaston Ward into Bucklebury Ward

**Englefield parish**: moved from Theale Ward into Burghfield Ward

**Ufton Nervet and Wokefield parishes**: moved from Burghfield Ward to Mortimer Ward

**Padworth parish**: the part south of River Kennet moved from Burghfield to Mortimer

**Sulhamstead parish**: part of YSG2 (was in Burghfield Ward) moved into Mortimer Ward

**Mortimer Ward** – now two members, not one
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Summary

The Liberal Democrats have produced a set of alternative proposals for Wards across the whole of West Berkshire District. We have sought input to these proposals from our members in all parts of the District, both urban and rural.

As far as possible we have followed the Council’s proposals but we have tried to comply more rigorously with the statutory guidelines in terms of reflecting local communities. In particular, we have noted the divisive impact of major natural and man-made barriers and the fact that parts of several largely rural parishes are now – or soon will be – within adjacent towns: Newbury and Thatcham.

Our proposals therefore involve creation of several new polling districts and the adjustment of many more polling districts than in the Council’s proposals. However, we have the same seven wards for Lambourn, Hungerford, Mortimer and Tilehurst (ten councillors).

These proposals are heavily caveated by the lack of robustness in the baseline electoral figures that we have had to work with. We urge the Commission to carry out an independent analysis that takes account of the virtual collapse of the Council’s Development Plan evidenced by the successful planning appeal in North Newbury earlier this year and the stalemate of the Sandleford Park strategic housing site.
Introduction

The Newbury and West Berkshire Liberal Democrats are an active political party within West Berkshire with Councillors serving on the Parishes, Towns and District Council. On West Berkshire Council, the Liberal Democrats are the Official Opposition Party.

The final warding arrangements whilst having a political impact will have more of an impact upon our residents and their sense of place.

To help shape the future sense of place in West Berkshire the Executive Committee of the Newbury and West Berkshire Liberal Democrats resolved at a meeting held on Thursday, 26 January 2017 to respond to the consultation exercise.

A working party was formed to draw up our response consisting of members from across West Berkshire from our rural communities to our larger towns.

A draft submission was approved by our Executive Committee at a meeting held on Wednesday 8th March 2017. However, it was delegated to a sub-group of members to refine our proposals after studying the Council’s own submission. This document reflects that review.

Our submission is broken down into the following sections:

- General Points of Principal
- Voter numbers
- Detailed warding patterns for Newbury Parish
- Detailed warding patterns for Thatcham Parish
- Detailed warding patterns for areas outside Newbury & Thatcham (warded town councils)

Our submission works on the basis of the cross-party response of the number of Councillors being reduced from 54 to 42 (plus or minus one) which we support.

Our response also takes the following into account;

- Each councillor should represent roughly the same number of electors;
- “The pattern of wards should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities”, which we have taken to mean that ‘communities’ ought not to be split.

In the case of West Berkshire District, the additional factors are:

- We have a mixture of very rural areas and urban areas;
- We have some warded town councils (Newbury & Thatcham);
- The number of councillors reduces from 52 to 42 (+/-1), which means that each 1-member ward must have about 3000 electors, which is nearly 30% more than at present. Two-member wards must have about 6000 electors; 3-member wards about 9000;
- We also note that the District boundaries are fixed and that it is unlikely that rural parishes will be split unless it is necessary to meet the equal representation criteria.
General Points of Principle

In working out our detailed warding patterns we felt that it would be prudent to set out some general points of principle which we request the LGBCE take note of.

These are:

a. Keep wards to one or two members per ward;

b. Group a smaller parish without facilities (e.g. Fawley) with a parish to which it looks for facilities such as primary school, local shop, pub;

c. Rural parishes should be in one-member wards unless that involves splitting a community within a parish, to keep geographic size as small as possible;

d. Urban wards should normally be multi-member, to avoid splitting natural communities (e.g. West Fields in Newbury or Moors Estate in Thatcham);

e. Notwithstanding ‘a’, do not combine areas separated by a railway line, canal, major river or motorway unless these barriers are frequently crossed by the communities either side. If rural parishes must be split, use these natural geographic barriers as ward boundaries. (e.g. about 10 houses in Speen parish, south of the canal, have a 2-mile journey through Newbury to reach the rest of Speen parish, in which Ward they currently sit / vote);

f. Where a part of a parish is within the settlement area of a neighbouring town which has most of the facilities needed, it should be in the same Ward as the adjacent town community to which it effectively belongs (e.g. part of Manor Park estate in Clay Hill Ward is Cold Ash parish, and part of Enborne parish (Wash Water) is effectively Wash Common community (Falkland Ward) but currently in Kintbury Ward, with which it has no affinity.

g. Ward boundaries should not run along the centre of residential roads.

Voter Numbers

Our submission would like to ask the Commission to review the elector numbers that its calculation for Ward sizes are based on. To highlight why we have concerns on voter numbers we would like to draw out the following points and questions.

To instigate the boundary review, WBC sent two documents, which are available on the LGBCE website:

- Public Document Pack (the Council Report);
- WBC data of current electorates by ward and predictions for 2022.

There is a significant discrepancy between the two documents, and some anomalies in the excel spreadsheet provided by the Council.

The discrepancy between the two documents is explained in more detail below:
The document pack contains a forecast of the electorate in 2022: “The forecast of the number of people eligible to vote by 2022 shows a cumulative projected increase of 3.2% on the 2016 figures to 125,877." The corresponding number in the Excel spreadsheet is the total of the numbers in cells I20 to I134 of the Electoral Data sheet. This total is 124,492.

Anomalies in the excel spreadsheet:

- The Excel spreadsheet includes estimates of the number of electors in each polling district for 2022. Most of these rise by a few percent, in line with the estimated increase across the district. A few rise by a larger amount, reflecting planned development. However, one (NB6, Victoria Waterside) almost doubles (note that this polling district does not include any of the Faraday Road development), and some others drop by a significant amount, for unexplained reasons.

Whilst the above draws concern over the base line numbers and draws some generalised questions over a lack of narrative in number variations which would have been helpful, we consider the following to be worthy of even more attention from the Commission:

The following polling districts have reductions in number of voters which we find surprising and would ask the Commission to carry out their own assessment of voter numbers rather than rely on the figures produced by the Council.

- NB1 (Clay Hill): from 2736 to 2537
- NB8 (Northcroft): from 1091 to 1015
- NB12 (St Johns): from 3380 to 3177
- NB13 (Falkland): from 2470 to 2141
- NB14 (Falkland): from 2493 to 2071
- TH 1 (Thatcham West): from 2255 to 2157
- TH 3 (Thatcham West): from 452 to 405

The other final concern on voter numbers that we would like to draw attention to is that during the last 6 months of 2016 there were over 400 conversions from offices to residential dwellings granted, mostly in Victoria Ward. Moreover, the trend continues: a further 130 residential units (permitted development from offices) were submitted for approval last month in Newbury.

This could potentially be another 800-1000 voters in the Newbury wards. We do not think that these have been included in West Berkshire Councils figures and would like the Commission to note the very significant local increase in voter numbers that these conversions would lead to.

It is our belief that most of these will likely be occupied by May 2019; it does not take long to do conversion works, compared with demolition and new build (as in Market Street development which is in the Council figures), or with green field development requiring full planning permission and new infrastructure (e.g. Sandleford Park).

**For these reasons, our proposals for new wards are provisional only.** Until we see more robust predictions of electorate, we cannot be confident that any set of new wards will maintain the required range of numbers through the period until 2023 local elections are
approaching. Detailed comments below on the Council’s proposals, which we use to justify our own alternatives, take account of the above.

Note on the maps: The maps in the following sections were generated using software in the Liberal Democrat Party’s own system. The dots represent households with voters, based on electoral registrations as at January 2017¹. The ward boundaries themselves are not shown.

¹ Because of the method of production of these maps, a few isolated rural properties with one or two voters may not be shown.
Detailed warding patterns for Newbury Parish

Proposed new Clay Hill Ward – 2 members

This ward is similar to the Council’s proposal (Ward 13). Note that it retains a portion of Cold Ash parish, which is an integral part of the Manor Park Estate. We would suggest that the Stoney Lane development immediately to the north of Manor Park, also wholly within Cold Ash, is included in the same polling district and in Clay Hill Ward, rather in a primarily rural ward encompassing most of Cold Ash and other parishes to the north.

Church Rd, Shaw (together with Well Meadow and Sherrardmead), currently in Speen Ward, have a stronger affinity with Clay Hill than with Speen, and LGBCE might consider including them within the new Clay Hill ward.

Proposed new Northcroft Ward – 2 members

Whereas the Council retains Victoria Ward and reduces Northcroft Ward to a 1-member ward, we absorb Victoria Ward into Clay Hill, Northcroft, and other wards. Northcroft Ward now includes Brummell Grove town council ward (currently part of Speen Ward) and also NB6 – all of Victoria north of the river and south of the A4. It retains NB10 and now includes the whole of West Fields Estate, which is currently divided along Kennet Road.

We also believe that the few households in Speen parish that are south of the river, off Bone Mill Lane, ought to be part of Northcroft Ward. They have absolutely no links with the rest of Speen.

---

2 These roads are not included in the maps for the proposed new Clay Hill or Speen wards in this submission.
Proposed new South East Ward – 2 members

This ward takes all of Victoria Ward south of the river (except the bit of West Fields Estate added to Northcroft) and adds it to most of St Johns Ward. We suggest dividing NB12 north/south, so that this Ward includes all of Newtown Road and everything to the east, plus NB15 which is currently in Greenham Ward.

The small part of Racecourse Estate which is in Newbury (not Greenham) could be added to Greenham Ward. However, we do not think Boundary Road should be used as the Ward or parish boundary but rather the new Estate should all be in the same Ward, with Boundary Rd east staying in Newbury South East ward.

Proposed new Wash Common Ward – 1 member

Here we propose a new Ward to comprise all of Wash Common south of (but including both sides of) Essex Street, plus the whole of Sandleford Park Estate and all of Enborne parish east of the Newbury bypass, which acts as a natural barrier.

It would start with one councillor, but this could be expanded to two as Sandleford is built out without other changes to the warding pattern. Sandleford has much more in common with Wash Common than with the Racecourse Estate or Greenham east of the A339.

Proposed new South West Ward – 2 members

This Ward includes all of Newbury south of the railway, west of Newtown Road and north of Monks Lane & Essex Street.

An alternative name might be St Barts Ward
Detailed warding patterns for Thatcham Parish

We believe that Thatcham Parish should have seven councillors. It is not possible to define a warding pattern for six councillors that does not either break up communities or combine communities with nothing in common together. These wards should include all of Thatcham parish, plus adjacent developments that have extended the settlement boundary of Thatcham town beyond the parish boundary.

**Proposed new Thatcham West Ward – 2 members**

This Ward includes all of the current Thatcham West Ward, but extending further to the east and adding Florence Gardens and the north side of Bowling Green Road from Cold Ash Ward.

To the east, it should include the eastern side of Northfield Road, the whole length of Lower Way, Glebelands and Bath Road as far east as Beverley Close.

**Proposed new Thatcham North Ward – 2 members**

This Ward includes all of Thatcham to the east of Northfield Road and north of the A4 (Chapel St and Bath Road), plus Billington Way, Grindle Close and Maynard Close from Cold Ash ward. These roads are accessed from Heath Lane (the relief road), and are therefore connected with Thatcham.

Thatcham parish includes a number of properties to the north and east of Floral Way (the relief road)\(^3\). Our preference is for these to be part of this ward. However, this does result in this ward being significantly larger than the proposed Thatcham

---

\(^3\) These properties are not shown on this map.
South ward. If LGBCE feels it important to achieve roughly equal size, we would accept these properties being included in Thatcham South ward (apart from the development adjacent to the Floral Way/Harts Hill Road roundabout, which should remain part of Thatcham North).

**Proposed new Thatcham Centre Ward – 1 member**

This Ward includes the town centre of Thatcham (the area around the High Street, the Broadway and St Mary's church) and The Moors estate to the south.

Note that the only road access to this estate is from the north (via The Moors, the 'U' shaped road on the map), so it has no connection to the parts of Thatcham to the south east.

**Proposed new Thatcham South & Crookham Ward – 2 members**

This Ward is essentially identical to the current ward of Thatcham South and Crookham (Crookham and the other rural parts of the ward to the south of the River Kennet are not shown on the map). A few properties further west along Chapel Street have been added, to increase numbers.

We recognise that this ward would be significantly below the target. If this is important to LGBCE, we would accept adding the rural area to the north of the A4 and east of Floral Way. This is preferable to dividing the town centre of The Moors between wards, or to combining Crookham and The Moors in a single ward.
Detailed warding patterns for areas outside Newbury & Thatcham (warded town councils)

**Proposed new Speen Ward – 1 member**

The Newbury bypass forms a distinct barrier separating parts of Speen parish west of it from Newbury. We therefore propose including only those parts of Speen and Shaw-cum-Donnington east of the bypass in this Ward.

Church Rd, Shaw (together with Well Meadow and Sherrardmead), currently in Speen Ward, have a stronger affinity with Clay Hill than with Speen, and LGBCE might consider including them within the new Clay Hill ward.

In March 2017, a planning appeal allowed the development of 400 homes within Speen Ward, which we expect to be occupied by 2022. This has not been taken into account in the excel spreadsheet on the LGBCE website.

**Proposed new Lambourn Ward – 1 member**

We agree with the Council’s proposal that this ward consists just of Lambourn parish.

**Proposed new Hungerford Ward – 2 members**

We agree with the Council’s proposal. There is no other way to create a 2-member ward including Hungerford.

**Proposed new Kintbury Ward – 1 member**

We suggest including Welford with Kintbury, Hamstead Marshall and Enborne parishes. Welford does not fit well with Downlands in the Council’s proposal, which stretches from the railway south of the A4 at Halfway all the way to the Oxfordshire border.

However, having taken Wash Water and all of Enborne east of the bypass into our Wash Common Ward, our Kintbury Ward is still well within its size quota.

**Proposed new Downlands Ward – 1 member**

This ward would be similar to the Council’s proposal, minus Welford but plus Beedon.

**Proposed new Ridgeway Ward – 1 member**

This ward is somewhat different to the Council’s proposal of the same name. It does not include Streatley but it does include Hamstead Norreys and Ashampstead, which are well connected to Compton. Streatley is much better connected to Reading and Basildon than to villages along the Ridgeway to the west.
Proposed new Pangbourne & Basildon Ward – 2 members

We believe Pangbourne and Basildon look towards Reading more than towards Newbury and to some extent Bradfield does as well. We have therefore combined these two existing one-member wards with Bradfield. We have also included Tidmarsh and Sulham, which link better with Pangbourne than with either Purley (as now) or Theale.

Proposed new Bucklebury Ward – 2 members

This new ward would be similar to the current Bucklebury Ward but without Bradfield and with Cold Ash and Yattenden added in. Parts of Cold Ash (existing and planned) which are adjacent to Newbury & Thatcham and urban in nature would be ‘lost’ to wards in these towns (see above).

Proposed new Chieveley Ward – 1 member

Our new Chieveley ward includes Boxford, Winterbourne and those rural parts of Speen parish west of the bypass.

Proposed Greenham Ward – 2 members

This is similar to the Council’s proposal: just Greenham parish. However, we think that Sandleford Park development ought to be all in one Ward: Wash Common (see above) and with the planned development in the rest of Greenham it still merits two councillors.

We do not think the Racecourse development should be a separate one-member ward. Splitting the ward would need to include much of GB1 to merit a ‘Racecourse’ District ward.

Proposed new Aldermaston Ward – 1 member

Our proposal adds to the existing Aldermaston Ward the whole parish of Beenham and just that part of Padworth north of the River Kennet, including along the A4 (Lower Padworth). This unites the settlement of Aldermaston Wharf in one District Ward.

Proposed new Burghfield Ward – 2 members

Our proposal adds Ufton Nervet and Wokefield to the current Burghfield Ward but takes away Beenham and Englefield. Only those parts of Sulhamstead and Padworth south of the river would be included: the rest we propose including with Theale and Aldermaston respectively.

Proposed new Mortimer Ward – 1 member

We agree with the Council’s proposal.

Proposed new Theale Ward – 1 member

Our proposal for Theale ward is similar to that submitted separately by the current Ward Member, Cllr Alan Macro. We agree with him that this Ward should not extend north of the M4. It should include all of Englefield parish, which is bounded by the M4 to the north, also that part of Sulhamstead north of the river.
Proposals for Purley and Tilehurst – 7 members

We propose a one member Purley Ward but the Council’s proposals for Tilehurst are acceptable to us.