West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Tim Ansell

E-mail: 

Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

The splitting of the wards into equal population sized areas is a sensible and logical idea and I think will be best for the whole population. The problem I have is why West Berkshire should continue to exist? It is a poorly run area without the scale to do anything well for the population as a whole. Consequently it focusses all attention on the population of Newbury and the surrounding area does nothing (other than damage) to eastern part of West Berkshire. These proposed changes are not radical enough and will continue see the wasting of valuable resources on an inefficiently run area. Significant money is wasted on making sure that the resources of West Berks, Reading and Hampshire are not shared across boundaries leaving all the populations on the edges of the areas receiving poor service. It would be much more sensible if West Berkshire no longer existed and the area were divided up between Oxfordshire, Reading and Hampshire, or alternatively have one Berkshire created again that wold have the scale to provide the services the community so desperately needs.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Steve Ardagh-Walter
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: West Berkshire and Thatcham Town Councils

Comment text:

I strongly believe that your current proposals, including several very large three member wards, are wrong for West Berkshire. These wards have no logical single community, and would make effective representation nearly impossible. The three-member Thatcham South and Crookham ward, if adopted, would involve the election of no less than eight councillors for Thatcham Town Council (where matching West Berkshire wards is a logistical necessity). Will voters be able to make a meaningful choice with such a large ballot sheet? Please adopt the amendments which West Berkshire and Thatcham Town Councils have proposed.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Chris Austin
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

The proposed boundary changes are not something I agree with. The new boundary sees Bucklebury moved away from Newbury, and more towards West Reading. The current way in which Bucklebury is aligned to Newbury works well, our local MP adequately represents our views and needs. A move towards being represented by the MP for West Reading would see our rural setting being represented by someone in a more suburban location, it's not something I agree with.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: David Bathe
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name:

Comment text:

There is no explanation why you are doing this, a bit of context will help because at the moment it looks like you'll be making our Local Government more expensive.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**West Berkshire**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Anthony Billington  
**E-mail:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I strongly support the proposed revisions as outlined by the West Berkshire Conservative Association.

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Alison Bragg
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Dear LGBC for England team, I would like to take the opportunity to register my support for your latest proposal in relation to the areas of Burghfield & Mortimer and Aldermaston & Bucklebury. The recommendation to subsume Sulhamstead into the new areas of Burghfield/Mortimer and Aldermaston/Bucklebury delivers an efficient and effective model. In particular, I am pleased to note how LGBC has identified the importance of community cohesion as one the main priorities of the review. The boundary adjustments are pragmatic and places the need of the community at the centre of the proposal. Whilst the population of Burghfield and Mortimer are scheduled to increase in the future, which places councillor / resident ratio near the maximum, it has to be acknowledged that combining Burghfield & Mortimer into one area will greatly benefit the whole community by encouraging dialogue and action across the parishes and hamlets which will further strengthen this wonderful rural community. Congratulations LGBC for placing the needs of communities at the centre of your review and challenging us all to think outside box. I wish you success in implementing the recommendations referenced in your proposal. Best regards,

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
As a resident for the last 28 years of the village of Frilsham I strongly object to becoming part of the Reading West constituency. Our village is much closer geographically to Newbury which we regard as our local town and the centre of our community. As a rural parish we should fall within a representative constituency reflecting the nature of our community and this would not be served by our incorporation into Reading West. please reconsider.

None Uploaded
## West Berkshire

### Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Andrew Button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Name</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment text:

I support the proposals.

### Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Hilary Cairns
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Why do the Aldermaston and Bucklebury ward have to be one? Cannot the A4 divide this proposed hugely increased area into two?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

**Name:** Nicola Clifford

**E-mail:**

**Postcode:**

**Organisation Name:** Mrs.

Comment text:

I strongly believe as per your proposal that given the size and population of Theale combined with the extensive building, which is planned, Theale is best represented by one Councillor covering Theale village. I really appreciate your insight into this decision.

Best wishes Nicky

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Leslie COOPER
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

The aim of the review, although obviously needed for a reduction in the number of District councillors has a built in flaw from the very beginning. The number of voters for each councillor can undoubtedly be achieved relative to one, two or three councillor wards. The problem arises when there are 'by' elections. (There has already been four or five since 2015). In a theoretical example, given the new boundaries, if there was a by election for a District councillor in the ‘one councillor’ ward of Lambourn then the projected number of electorate per councillor would be 3,225. If there was a by election in the 'three councillor' ward of Hungerford and Kintbury to replace a single councillor then the projected number of the electorate rises to 9,136. Clearly, this is an anomaly where 3,225 voters can elect one councillor in Lambourn but it requires 9,136 to elect one councillor in Hungerford and Kintbury. Even though this is the current state of affairs with the existing boundaries there is no reason why the aim of having similar numbers of voters to elect a single councillor still cannot be the primary aim. Of course the only way to do this is to split the 2 and 3 councillor wards into defined smaller areas within the larger one. Since the brief is to reduce the number of councillors from 52 down to 43 and not as I understand it to necessarily reduce the number of wards or sub-wards, it seems illogical to me that the fairness of voting numbers per councillor is alright for the full council elections but is totally ignored (and it could be argued is biased) when it comes to 'by' elections. I really don't see why there cannot be sub-divisions in the 2 and 3 councillor wards so that an elected single councillor has a particular 'patch' to represent. It would also stop any political voting bias that could (and probably does) occur when an overwhelming voting pattern in one suburb of a ward dominates the outcome for the whole of the ward. So, by having single councillor wards or sub-wards the problem of variance of voting numbers in 'by' elections would disappear along with the inbuilt domination of suburbs dictating outcomes for the whole ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Jonathan Fanti
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Some of these wards are far too large, Aldermaston & Bucklebury in particular is vast area and even with 3 councillors I don't see how the issues of somebody living rural Frilsham have the same issues as somebody living in the semi-rural Aldermaston Wharf area and how those councillors could be accessible for such a huge area. I have the same concerns for the Hungerford and Kintbury ward. Why not split the district into 43 1 councillor wards? Each ward would be small enough for people living in ward to know their councillor and, more importantly, for the councillor of that small ward to understand all of the local issues very well.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Wendy Ferris
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

We live in Upper Bucklebury, we are very happy with how the boundaries lay and see no logical reason for the changes proposed, other than politics. We strongly object to the changes being made.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I live in Bucklebury and I am opposed to the current proposal. 3 district councillors will cover 14 parishes, each of which is very rural and sparsely populated. This makes the proposed ward very large and district councillors would not have the detailed knowledge the parish councils currently find so valuable nor be able to represent them as robustly as they do now.. If each councillor came to each monthly parish council meeting, as they do now, they would attend 168 annually plus the Annual Assemblies Some of the parishes are on major transport road and rail routes along the Kennet valley and therefore have different problems to those covered by more rural roads. The parishes to the south of the A4 are different to those north of the A4 with different problems caused by their geography. I believe this proposal would be unsatisfactory for all concerned..
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Mark Hawkesworth
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: N/A

Comment text:

There is much commonality through linking the parishes along the Pang Valley. This would broadly combine the existing wards of Bucklebury and Compton (plus East and West Ilsley. The Pang is a rare chalk stream which flows through the AONB. The parishes work together through the Pang Valley Flood Forum and have much in common in terms of village communities, rural businesses and agriculture. Rural parishes are increasingly having to fend for themselves as local authority budgets are cut, and increasingly parishes will have to share resources and take more of the burden of local government.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Gerald Jones
E-mail: [omitted]
Postcode: [omitted]
Organisation Name: [omitted]

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: West Ilsley

Comment text:
West Ilsley is on same side of A54 as Downlands Ward, and would make sense it was included within, in my opinion.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
West Berkshire

Personal Details:

Name: Anne King
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I think we should get rid of "Tilehurst & Purley Ward", "Theale Ward" and "Burghfield and Mortimer Ward" - and give it to Reading.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Mishka Meyers

FER in West Berkshire Council’s (WBC) future size, to be 43 members …!

My sincere thanks for the breadth & depth of analysis in the Commission’s Draft recommendation for a 43-member Council in the future for the WBC. The Commission’s revision, of its original mindfulness’s forty-two councillors, allows a better balance, resolving of the electoral equality criteria: it is very welcome.

Naming of the unitary district’s wards should assist identity. There are three (3) urban locations. There is need for clarity of identity. If you’re a councillor representing a ward on the rural fringe eg Lambourn or Hungerford. Speen is known because of ‘the Speenhamland system’ before ‘the Poor Law’ until 1948. All wards that have a constituent parish unit within the town of Newbury need clarity: Thatcham and Tilehurst are suburbs of Newbury and Reading respectively: and they are best identified using ‘compass point’ aspect.

It is note-worthy that WBC’s initial scheme used the town of Newbury’s name as prefix for those urban wards: clear identity comprehension by rural fringes.

Naming of new wards was discussed with WBC’s officer team at each stage.

Respectfully suggest ‘fine-tuned’ names for clearer identity: clearer identity it would greatly help this unitary district’s efficient Local Governance purposes.

County Down with the delightful Mountains of Mourne is in the island of Ireland. In east & south England are chalk uplands known as ‘the Downs’. Along ‘the Downs’ is the Ridgeway – an ancient public highway – which spans the North Wessex AONB: in WBC its original name is Berkshire Downs. Down-lands (sic) a name created by the former district of Newbury: a deprecated usage that has depreciated these chalk uplands known as ‘the Downs’. Ridgeway ward, rather than parishes, is a geographic name with ancient links thru >10k years.

The electoral equality criteria was resolved by the Commission’s breadth & depth of analysis and revising its original mindfulness – 42 members – with their Draft recommendation of a 43 (forty-three) member Council, in the future, that is due to commence in 2019: my sincere thanks.

Yours sincerely

< e-Mail >

Peter Kingswood