

Councillors submissions to the Bexley Borough Council electoral review

This PDF document contains submissions from all councillors.

Some versions of Adobe allow the viewer to move quickly between bookmarks.



CllrBaileyL-2016-03-16



CllrFrancis-Bexley-2016-04-04



CllrMacDonald-Bexley-2016-04-04



CllrHuntJ-Bexley-2016-04-04



CllrHusband-Bexley-2016-03-23



CllrLeafD-Bexley-2016-04-04



CllrMarriner-RES_Bexley-2016-03-23



CllrMassey-Bexley-2016-03-22-part2



CllrRead-Bexley-2016-04-04



ErithCouncillors_BEXY_DR_emailre_views_2016-04-04



CllrWaters-Bexley-2016-03-23



CllrWilkinson-Bexley-2016-04-01

Dear Commissioner,

Having read the Commissions consultation document I would like to raise a suggestion regarding the proposed Crook Log Ward and Brampton Ward.

I've had the privilege of being one of the three Councillors representing Danson Park Ward since 2002 which at present contains the Crook Log Estate, as it known locally, the Regency style development centred on Regency Way and the Crook Log Leisure Centre in Brampton Road. To the South there is the Crook Log public house. Your proposal to make a new one member ward called Crook Log would split this local community into two separate wards and most of the Crook Log community would not be placed in the new ward.

I would ask the commission to consider joining the Crook Log Ward with Brampton and making it a three member ward which would neatly complement and mirror the proposed new Christchurch ward. By combining the two wards it would make the single ward closer to the Commissions target size of voters per Councillor to about 2.1/2% undersized and all of the Crook Log community in one ward.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Bailey

Cllr Linda Bailey
Danson Park Ward
Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Growth
London Borough of Bexley

Bexley London Borough

Personal Details:

Name: Daniel Francis

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Ward Councillor

Comment text:

I was very surprised to see the decision to split our community included in the draft recommendations. At the time of writing, I have lived in Belvedere for 39 years. In addition, I have had the privilege of representing Belvedere from 2000-2010 and again since 2014. During the last 20 years I have also been involved with a number of community groups including as a Board Member of the Belvedere Community Forum, as an officer of the Belvedere Community Centre Management Committee until it was merged with the Forum, as a Governor and volunteer at Lessness Heath Primary School and as a Governor at Woodside School. While a hill may separate the two schools, I have always seen them as being part of the same community. I was brought up in Barnfield Road in the heart of Belvedere Village but still used Belvedere Station as my local station, attended matches at Erith & Belvedere FC (now the B&Q/ASDA site) and the Belvedere Youth Centre (now Belvedere Community Centre). Yes there was a hill between the Village and these facilities, but I have always seen these as part of the same community. When the council took the decision to close the Picardy Street branch library, it cited the fact that there would remain a library in the same community in Woolwich Road. Yes there was a hill between the closed library and the remaining library, but the council saw this as the same community. In 2011, the Belvedere community become concerned regarding the future of Belvedere library. A campaign group was set up to save this library. The two people who led this campaign and led the deputation to council live in addresses in Upper Park Road and St Augustine's Road in the proposed Lower Belvedere ward while the library would be in the proposed Belvedere Village ward. This again demonstrates that our community considers itself to be one. When the Belvedere Community Forum was created, its agreed constitutional area of benefit covered parts of four wards. However this constitution and area of benefit was created by the London Borough of Bexley. Council officers wrote these documents but at their heart was the fact that Belvedere Village and the Station area were the two main focuses of the same community. For many years, the Belvedere community campaigned against the proposed incinerator and other odour nuisances. As a result, a campaign group was formed called Belvedere and District Against Incinerator Risk (BADAIR) to fight these issues although in theory it campaigned pre-dominantly across the Belvedere area. The main leaders of this campaign lived in Milton Road, Berkhamstead Road and Mitre Court, Picardy Road. Despite the properties of these people all being virtually due east of each other, these properties would now be split between two wards despite these activist having campaigned as part of one community. In 2013, the Belvedere Community become concerned regarding the future of Belvedere Community Centre due to the decision of the council for voluntary organisations to run community centres. The Belvedere Community Forum expressed an interest in running the Belvedere Community Centre and was supported from across the community. We were delighted that without requesting it, that All Saints Church and Belvedere Baptist Church both in Nuxley Road fundraised to assist us with legal costs towards the bid. We felt this demonstrated that we are one community with groups from Belvedere Village fundraising for their community representative group to run a facility in Mitchell Close. During the bid, the Belvedere Community Forum produced a video with community groups asking the council for the Centre to be managed by the Forum. This video included community groups based in Mitchell Close, a trader from Gilbert Road and representatives of All Saints Church and Belvedere Baptist Church both in Nuxley Road. This again demonstrated that residents and groups felt that the Village

was part of the same community as Mitchell Close. In 2014 and 2015, a campaign was run by the community to Save Belvedere Splash Park. The four most active residents in this campaign lived in Abbey Crescent, Kingswood Avenue, Raglan Road and Woolwich Road. Two of these addresses are in the proposed Lower Belvedere ward and two in the proposed Belvedere Village ward. Again this demonstrates that these residents feel their community to be the same not split in the middle. I can only presume that any proposal to split our community comes from individuals who have no idea about our community and its history. I would ask that common sense prevail and that the proposed Lower Belvedere and Belvedere Village wards be combined to create a three member Belvedere ward representing our community.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Owen, David

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2016 10:45 AM
To: Owen, David
Subject: FW: BEXLEY CONSULTATION - East Wickham Ward

From: Councillor Hunt, James [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 April 2016 20:24
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: BEXLEY CONSULTATION - East Wickham Ward

On behalf of my ward colleagues and myself we would like to thank you for the work done through the process so far. East Wickham has a brilliant and unique history and finally through the Councils submission and the work of the LGBCE the community will be reunited. If you were to only look at a map of the area it clearly prints the name East Wickham over the area that the new ward covers.

Obviously we would like to see the ward redesigned in line with our local work submitted to you by the council but we are very happy to support the most recent plan. Local residents we have spoken to and local groups, also see no problem with the suggested plans and all support it.

Cllr James Hunt
East Wickham Ward
London Borough of Bexley

Working for East Wickham all year round
twitter @eastwickham

This Email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of the email is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this email in error please notify London Borough of Bexley by telephone on +44 (0) 20 8303 7777.

Web Site: <http://www.bexley.gov.uk>

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense Inc. www.websense.com

Owen, David

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2016 10:24 AM
To: Owen, David
Subject: FW: Bexley boundaries review Belvedere

From: John Husband [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2016 16:02
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Bexley boundaries review Belvedere

Dear Sir,

I have been a resident of Belvedere for nearly thirty years. In 2002 part of Belvedere was sliced off to form part of a new ward-Lesnes Abbey. I am currently councillor for that ward.

I have found it extremely unsatisfactory because it has no heart or sense of community.

When I heard that you intended to put Belvedere back together again I was initially very pleased.

Now I learn that you plan to make the same mistake again with a new lower Belvedere ward with two councillors and Belvedere village as a separate single member ward.

Without the village and its amenities Belvedere becomes just a list of streets with a line drawn round them.

I am a founding committee member of the Belvedere Community Form which has helped develop a proper sense of community coinciding largely with the DA17 post code with the village at its very heart. Belvedere has a long history with the village at its heart. Its name denotes the "beautiful view" you could see from the village. So without the village its very name becomes a nonsense.

I urge you to think again and let us keep the village as the heart of the Belvedere community.

One final point. Single member wards have a major drawback as I learned following a major heart attack last autumn. As part of a three member ward there were fellow councillors to cover for me and keep me informed.

With one member wards you don't have the same backup when needed.

Kind regards

John Husband,

Belvedere resident, Belvedere Forum Committee member and Councillor for the Lesnes Abbey part of Belvedere.

Cllr David Leaf
Member for Longlands Ward
London Borough of Bexley

Mr David Owen
Review Officer (Bexley)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

reviews@lgbce.org.uk

4th April 2016

Dear Mr Owen,

Re: Response to the Draft Recommendations for the London Borough of Bexley

I write in broad support of the recommendations that have been published and to comment specifically on two geographical areas which I am most familiar as a resident and as a councillor. By way of background, I have lived in the Borough for over thirty years, spending over twenty years living in Belvedere (in the current Belvedere Ward) and about a decade living in the Sidcup area (in both the current Longlands Ward and Sidcup Ward). I represented Belvedere Ward between 2006 and 2010 and have represented Longlands Ward since May 2014.

I have been a member of various community groups and charities operating in the Borough in that time and a school governor.

Based on my experiences as a resident and as an elected local authority councillor, I submit the following comments for your consideration:

The proposed Longlands Ward:

The proposed ward delivers a strong level of electoral equality and has clear and distinctive boundaries bordering neighbouring local authorities to the west and to the south (the Royal Borough of Greenwich and the London Borough of Bromley) and to the north (railway line) and east (Station Road-Elm Road-Chislehurst Road).

The exception is the inclusion of the retail premises and restaurants on Elm Parade and Main Road; and the residential Hamilton Road and Stanhope Road, with Hamilton Road forming the ward boundary at this location. Given that this area is effectively an extension and integral part of the shopping, retail and leisure facilities provided on Sidcup High Street, it is logical for this part to fall within the proposed Sidcup Ward as has been proposed by the LGBCE.

With this in mind, I would suggest that the Main Road Car Park, where people park to use the High Street, is therefore transferred from the proposed Longlands Ward to the proposed Sidcup Ward. As there are no residential properties in this location it will have no impact on electoral numbers for either ward and is effectively a minor geographical change. This would also ensure continuity with the LGBCE's proposals of maintaining the facilities essential to Sidcup High Street within the proposed Sidcup Ward.

With the exception of this slight boundary change, the boundaries proposed for Longlands Ward reflect community and public transport links in a strong manner and should be implemented.

The proposed Belvedere Village Ward and Lower Belvedere Ward:

The proposals for these two wards are welcome as they support community identities and links in the area. Importantly, the geographic widening of the Lower Belvedere Ward to cover from Abbey Wood Railway Station, along the Abbey Road-Gilbert Road-Lower Road corridor to the Battle Road area reinforces the East-West links of this geographical area.

It brings together areas along this corridor with Belvedere addresses and DA17 postal codes into a single ward as opposed to the current arrangements where this corridor and the community that lives around it is divided into three wards (Erith Ward, Belvedere Ward, and Lesnes Abbey Ward). The main benefit is that it addresses an anomaly where residents feel that they are living in 'Belvedere' and in many cases 'Lower Belvedere' but have electoral ward arrangements that place them in Erith or Lesnes Abbey. This is particularly relevant to the areas from Mitchell Close to the Lower Road/Battle Road area and the area along Abbey Road and Elstree Gardens, which is where the current ward boundaries have been arbitrarily and somewhat illogically (from a community perspective) drawn.

It should also be noted that in recent years the community links and facilities centred around the Belvedere Railway Station area have been enhanced with the development of the ASDA superstore and B and Q. There is also a GP surgery and dentist in the immediate vicinity of the station, a public house and four schools (Belvedere Infant, Belvedere Junior School, St Augustine's Primary and Woodside) within a short walk on the southern side of the railway line; and a public house/restaurant and new development incorporating a petrol station and hotel on the Norman Park development to the north of the railway line. This has strengthened the station area in Belvedere as a focal point for Lower Belvedere and beyond and brings people into the area. It is the centre of the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward and along with the industrial and commercial sites to the north of the railway line serve as an area that provides jobs and employment.

There are therefore clear advantages to the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward of ensuring that the residential areas that follow the Abbey Road-Gilbert Road-Lower Road corridor are kept within a single ward, with the community facilities centred around Belvedere Railway Station and the employment and industrial areas to the immediate north of the railway line to the River Thames also being within that ward.

I would make one suggestion to enhance the community links within the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward and that would be to include in part or in full the Franks Park area. The main access to the playground in Franks Park is from Parkside Road, which is within the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward whereas Franks Park and the playground fall within the proposed North Heath Ward. Indeed, the southern ends of the roads from Poplar Mount to Stanmore Road have junctions with Parkside Road and are used by the community in Lower Belvedere and beyond to access Franks Park, the woods and the playground in particular, which is a community facility used by local residents. Under the proposals initially put forward by the Council, the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward southern boundary at this location ran along the Valley Road (Track). It would be logical and in the interests of community links for the LGBCE to use this as the Ward boundary or include the whole of the Franks Park area with the Avenue Road (Track) serving as the ward boundary. This would not affect any residential areas and would make no change to the electoral numbers for Lower Belvedere Ward.

Moreover, incorporating Franks Park into the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward ensures that the section of Green Chain Walk in woodland going from Erith to Abbey Wood is within a single ward. This change is therefore desirable and relevant.

The separate Belvedere Village Ward serves to reinforce the community and the identity of the area around Nuxley Road and Albert Road. As someone who grew up living in the vicinity of Belvedere Railway Station in the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward, there was always a sense that there was a 'Lower Belvedere' and an 'Upper Belvedere/Belvedere Village.' In particular, residents who lived in and around the Village area identified themselves in such a manner and during my term as a councillor covering this area residents living in the Village area commenting on planning applications and other matters frequently referred to the characteristics of the Village. As such, a single member ward for the Belvedere Village area is justifiable.

It has been suggested by some during the Boundary Review process that the LGBCE should merge these two wards into a single Belvedere Ward. It has also been suggested that this is due to: "residents to the north in the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward consider many facilities within Belvedere Village to be their community facilities." (Labour Party Submission to the Boundary Review) However, this claim does not reflect the fact that the Lower Belvedere area has had and will have significant growth, and that the predominant links in the Lower Belvedere area are East-West running from the Erith area through to Abbey Wood Railway Station along the Lower Road-Gilbert Road-Abbey Road corridor. Furthermore, the community facilities and services in the Belvedere Village area, such as the recreation grounds, Pop In Parlour, and Library on Woolwich Road are used by residents from a range of areas beyond the Belvedere Village area, including the proposed Bostall Ward and North Heath Ward and not just the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward. Therefore, the suggestion that use of facilities should qualify a merger of the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward, Erith Ward, and Belvedere Village Ward is not compelling when considering the wider areas where residents come from who use those facilities.

Moreover, while there is interaction between the Lower Belvedere area and the Belvedere Village area, there are also strong links that exist with other areas. For example, many

residents in the Belvedere Village area do not use Belvedere Railway Station and the public transport links in Lower Belvedere. They often use Bexleyheath Railway Station and the 422 and 99 bus routes. They also use the roads towards Bexleyheath, such as Bedonwell Road, and the roads towards Woolwich and Erith (Woolwich Road and Erith Road) to access services and facilities, such as supermarkets and retail stores. That is not to suggest that there are no links between the Belvedere Village area and Lower Belvedere area – some residents do use Belvedere Railway Station and the ASDA superstore. However, the Belvedere Village area is located in an area which provides access and connections to a wider area too and those are important and material points for consideration by the LGBCE, which reinforces the justification for there to be a separate single member Belvedere Village Ward.

Likewise, residents in the Lower Belvedere area (especially with the widening of the Lower Belvedere Ward to cover from Battle Road to Abbey Wood Railway Station), will use many services and facilities in the proposed Lower Belvedere Ward, as well as those in neighbouring areas, including facilities and services in the Abbey Wood and Thamesmead area (in the Royal Borough of Greenwich as well as in the London Borough of Bexley) and the Erith area. For instance, residents living along the eastern end of Lower Road may be more likely to use the library in Erith than in Belvedere Village at Woolwich Road; and those living near Abbey Wood Railway Station more likely to use the library in Thamesmead than in Belvedere Village.

The suggestion and insinuation that the facilities and services in the Belvedere Village area are integral to the Lower Belvedere area and should be within the same ward are therefore inaccurate and do not reflect the services and facilities that residents in Lower Belvedere access. That is not to suggest that there are no connections between the Lower Belvedere area and Belvedere Village area. However, with the Lower Belvedere Ward widened to cover the entire Lower Road-Gilbert Road-Abbey Road corridor, with the growth in the Lower Belvedere area, with the area around Belvedere Railway Station being a focal point, and the significant industrial and employment area to the north of the railway line it is logical and in the interests of convenient and effective local government, community links and identity, and the establishment of strong identifiable boundaries that there be two wards covering this area.

As with any proposal concerning electoral boundaries, there will always be some ambiguity over where community boundaries and identities covering particular areas begin and end. However, the LGBCE proposals for this area and the separate Lower Belvedere Ward and Belvedere Village Ward strike a fair and reasonable balance.

The proposed Erith and Slade Green Ward:

This proposed two member ward delivers a strong level of electoral equality and anticipates future growth in this area, such as at the new housing development granted permission for the Linpac site.

The boundary to the south with the railway line and the boundary to the north with the River Thames is clearly defined. The west boundary with Dartford Borough Council/Kent

County Council and the east boundary with the proposed Lower Belvedere Road at the junction of Bronze Age Way and Lower Belvedere is also clearly defined, which delivers convenient and effective governance.

The proposed ward links the main residential corridors leading into Erith Town Centre from the west along West Street and from the east along Manor Road into a single ward. This strip borders the River Thames and ensures that all residential and commercial properties along this stretch of the riverside are in a single ward, which helps deliver effective and convenient governance.

The communities along West Street and in Slade Green in the vicinity of the northern side of the railway line look towards Erith Town Centre for their main services and facilities, including retail shops, medical services, and library services.

The proposed ward is also set to have further housing growth along the corridor to Slade Green, which further links the communities in these areas and reinforces the justification for the proposed ward. Moreover, many addresses in Slade Green have Erith in their postal address so the link with Erith is already evident.

While I would not propose any changes to the geographical area of the proposed Erith and Slade Green Ward, I would suggest that consideration be given to changing the name to Erith Riverside and Slade Green Ward or to Erith Town and Slade Green Ward. Either of those alternative names empathises a key feature of the proposed ward (ie, the Riverside and the Town centre).

I trust that this feedback is helpful and informative.

Yours sincerely,

David

Cllr David Leaf
Member for Longlands Ward



Owen, David

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2016 10:44 AM
To: Owen, David
Subject: FW: Boundary review

-----Original Message-----

From: Councillor MacDonald, Gill [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 April 2016 22:06
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary review

As a resident of belvedere village and having lived in the village for over 47 years I am opposed to the splitting of the belvedere ward in to a village ward and lower belvedere ward.

It has taken many years to get away from the upper belvedere and lower belvedere culture and what you plan will start this all over again ,please to do do this leave it as a 3 member ward Yours faithfully Gillian Macdonald
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

----- This Email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of the email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify London Borough of Bexley by telephone on +44 (0) 20 8303 7777. Web Site: <http://www.bexley.gov.uk> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense Inc. www.websense.com >

Bexley London Borough

Personal Details:

Name: Howard Marriner

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I wish to make the following comments on your proposals in my personal capacity as a long-term resident of the London Borough of Bexley: 1. CRAYFORD WARD Whilst acknowledging and supporting the Commission's proposal to expand the present Crayford Ward boundaries by incorporating a large geographical tract of the present Barnehurst Ward including all of the roads bordering Barnehurst Golf Course, Mayplace Road East and roads to the south of Mayplace Road East (i.e. Stephen Road, Oakwood Drive, Inglewood Road and Woodside Road/Close) which have historically been considered as part of the community of Barnehurst, it is suggested that the proposed new Crayford Ward be redesignated as "CRAYFORD WITH BARNEHURST SOUTH" Ward to reflect the inclusion of Barnehurst Golf Course in the Ward bearing its name and the continued existence of Barnehurst as a separate Community adjacent to the historic town of Crayford. 2. BARNEHURST & NORTH END WARD TO BE SUB-DIVIDED TO FORM "BARNEHURST NORTH" & "NORTH END" WARDS. As a long-term resident of the London Borough of Bexley living on the border between Crayford and Barnehurst, I am aware that the communities of Barnehurst & North End are very different to each other having very little in common apart from being adjacent to one another. It is my considered opinion that it would be better to divide the proposed Barnehurst & North End Ward into two wards based on the different communities. I would respectfully suggest that you form a one-member ward to be styled "NORTH END" Ward comprising the area to the east of North End Road, plus the recently developed Erith Park area and the area on the west side of North End Road around Wessex Drive except Eversley Road. The remaining part of the Commission's proposed ward plus Randolph Close, Risedale Road and that part of Barnehurst Road which is presently in Christchurch Ward could then form a two-member ward styled "BARNEHURST NORTH" Ward as the residents of Barnehurst Road, Randolph Close & Risedale Road consider themselves as part of a wider "Barnehurst Community" instead of residing in Bexleyheath's Christchurch Ward. Your kind consideration of this submission is very much appreciated.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

The Review Officer (Bexley)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th floor, Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

22 March 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

London Borough of Bexley – Warding Pattern

I am writing concerning the Commission's draft proposals for the area I represent on Bexley Council, namely Cray Meadows Ward. The proposal is for this ward to become separated into two parts using the River Cray as a boundary, with the western part becoming part of Sidcup Ward and the eastern part becoming part of St Mary's & St James Ward.

I welcome these proposals as they recognise far better the ties of the communities within this area. Foots Cray, Royal Park and the eastern part of Sidcup are joined with the main part of Sidcup (including the shopping area), whilst North Cray becomes joined with Bexley village and Cold Blow.

I have represented Cray Meadows Ward for almost 10 years now and have always thought this ward was a strange amalgam, with many diverse areas almost randomly thrown together. By using the River Cray as a boundary the Commission's proposed warding pattern in this area accurately reflects how the communities have developed. The river is a significant barrier to transport locally, hence the very separate nature of the communities of Foots Cray and North Cray. Whilst they are close to each other in geographic distance, the local residents have separate shops, community facilities and very different types of housing.

Overall I feel the proposals put forward by the Commission for the area of the borough South of the A2 trunk road are very sensible and I support them.

Yours faithfully

Councillor Don Massey
Cray Meadows Ward

Bexley London Borough

Personal Details:

Name: Philip Read

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I have known Belvedere for a very long time going right back to being christened at All Saints Church in Belvedere village! Since then my connections to Belvedere have been strong and long lasting including attending the 4th Erith Cubs and Scouts at All Saints Church, spending my 3rd year at Bedonwell Junior School at its third year annex then located at Bedwell Road, Belvedere plus taking part in many impromptu games of football in the Belvedere recreation ground and later being married in All Saints Church. In addition, when I was first elected to Bexley Council in 1968 it was as Councillor for Belvedere ward and in later years I subsequently lived no more than one hundred yards from All Saints Church. Thus I can say with confidence, from both personal knowledge and experience, that Belvedere Village has always been seen as a separate entity from Lower Belvedere from which has always been differentiated by geography, tradition and custom. There has always been a locally accepted view that Belvedere was a village which has at its core All Saints Church, the Baptist church and the retail businesses in and close to Nuxley Road. People living within the proposed new ward would certainly see themselves as residents of a village the existence of which would be reaffirmed by the proposal giving back to them that community recognition removed from them in the past. Consequently I applaud the proposal for a Belvedere Village ward set out in the draft proposals and urge the commission to confirm this within their final decision.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Members Room



LONDON BOROUGH OF
BEXLEY

Civic Offices
2 Watling Street
Bexleyheath
Kent DA6 7AT
020 8303 7777
www.bexley.gov.uk

The Review Officer (Bexley)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th floor, Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP



Dear Sir/Madam

London Borough of Bexley - Wards

I would like to comment on the Commission's draft proposals for the area I represent on Bexley Council, currently Danson Park Ward.

The existing Danson Park ward becomes separated into two parts, with the western part joining Falconwood & Welling ward to give a unified ward covering central Welling. This is a big improvement in my opinion.

Crook Log Area

However, I am very concerned that the proposals for the eastern end of Danson Park ward unnecessarily split the Crook Log area in half – part to be in a new "Crook Log" ward, and half to be in a new "Brampton" ward. I feel that this area should be kept intact, which could easily be achieved by having a combined Crook Log/Brampton Ward with three councillors, rather than a Crook Log ward with one councillor and a Brampton ward with two councillors.

The district which local people know as "Crook Log" contains the area to the *south* of the road named Crook Log, which includes the Crook Log public house; and the area to the *north* of the road, which includes Crook Log Leisure Centre and the Crook Log Estate (the Regency style development built in the early 1970s and centred on Regency Way). It is illogical to split this local community into two separate wards, and the integrity and cohesion of the community would be better served by keeping it in one ward.

Both the proposed Brampton Ward and the proposed Crook Log Ward would deviate by about 5-6% from the target number of electors per councillor. A combined ward would be much closer to the target.

South Gipsy Road

Irrespective of your decision about merging the wards, the division in South Gipsy Road between Brampton Ward and Falconwood & Welling Ward is in the wrong place. It appears to be at about 56 South Gipsy Road, where the even numbers stop because of the presence

of a school. Slightly further north, at the junction with Westbrooke Road, there is a traffic management barrier which *physically* splits South Gipsy Road. You cannot travel north/south along South Gipsy Road past Westbrooke Road. It would therefore be more logical to place the division between Brampton Ward and Falconwood & Welling Ward at this point.

Yours faithfully



JOHN WATERS
Councillor, Danson Park Ward

Owen, David

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: Friday, April 1, 2016 2:34 PM
To: Owen, David
Subject: FW: Bexley Proposed Boundary Changes

Heather Fuller
Review Assistant
[LGBCE](#)
0330 500 1252

From: Councillor Wilkinson, John [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 April 2016 14:25
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Bexley Proposed Boundary Changes

Dear Sir/Madam,

The new boundary changes proposed for Bexley Borough suggest the formation of two single seat Wards. One is for Belvedere Village Ward which is entirely logical because the village and its immediate surroundings form a self contained village community with its own unique and distinctive identity and has always considered itself quite distinct from its neighbours.

The other proposal is for an area called Crook Log. This is an area which if the proposal should go ahead will leave a section of the community isolated and without true identity. In my opinion it would be more appropriate to combine this proposed one seat ward with the proposed two seat Brampton Ward. This new ward formed by the one seat Crook Log Ward combined with the proposed two seat Brampton Ward would make a very practical, logical and fully functional three seat Brampton Ward.

Cllr. John Wilkinson
London Borough of Bexley

This Email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of the email is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this email in error please notify London Borough of Bexley by telephone on +44 (0) 20 8303 7777.

Web Site: <http://www.bexley.gov.uk>

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense Inc. www.websense.com

Bexley Council
Civic Offices
2 Watling Street
Bexleyheath
DA6 7AT

Sent by email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
4 April 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's draft recommendations for Bexley

We are writing in our capacity as the ward councillors for the existing Erith ward. We have deep concerns about the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposal to merge Erith town centre and Slade Green into a 2-member ward.

Erith is a very different community to Slade Green, and should be split into two distinct wards. This is evidenced by them having separate local forums, separate rail stations, separate shops and local facilities.

It's important to note that the history of Erith and Slade Green is very different. Erith is a historic town which once had its own town council, in the 19th century it was Erith Urban Council which became the Municipal Borough of Erith in 1938. During that time Slade Green in the 19th century was part of Dartford Rural District then in 1920s joined Crayford District Council; although next door geographically it has never been the same community as Erith and has a different identity and has only been in the same borough since the creation of the London Borough of Bexley in 1965.

In your draft recommendations you stated that you believe that the "proposed Erith & Slade Green ward reflects the pattern of community interactions between Slade Green and Erith town centre". As local representatives of Erith Ward, we know that this is not correct. We are also concerned to see that historical parts of Erith have been placed outside of Erith and Slade Green Ward, which interact directly every day with the town centre through its shops, facilities, and transport links.

The draft recommendations assumes a hard boundary of the North Kent rail line. However, the railway line does not act as a hard boundary to either the community of Erith, which operate as communities across the railway lines, using local facilities, services and shops to form one community identity. The same applies to Slade Green and North End.

We note that the majority of Erith is not included in Erith and Slade Green Ward. Erith Station has been placed at the border. The historic Christ Church Erith, one of the focal points of the community, would not be in Erith and Slade Green Ward but in Northumberland Heath Ward. This Church is important to the community of Erith. The church organises the 'Erith Christmas Tree Festival' and Christmas concert every year for Erith residents to raise money for the Greenwich and Bexley Hospice. Secondly, the Church holds a big community lunch every

year for residents in Erith. We recently saw the opening of the new Age UK workshop at Christ Church for “men in sheds”, during which men came together to repair furniture and even make items for the local community. This is now an extremely popular and important part of community life.

The work that Christ Church does helps brings the bringing the community together in Erith. Therefore, it does not make sense placing this Church in Northumberland Heath ward as it would only have a relationship to a small part of the community it has been placed in.

Similarly, the defined parish of St John’s the Baptist Church Erith will see much of the parish fall outside of the ward and kept away from the community it seeks to serve.

Erith Town Forum, which covers all of Erith, is an active community group engaging residents from across the town. The Forum has different priorities and objectives to that of Slade Green’s Community Forum, which similarly comprises of active residents and focuses on Slade Green-related concerns.

Friends of Erith Riverside Gardens (FORGE) is run by Erith residents and is a non-party-political group that have been brought together by their desire to retain the Erith Riverside Gardens in their entirety. There are over 600 Erith residents that are members of the society.

We also have concerns that parts of Erith such as Park Crescent and its surrounding roads, will not be in Erith and Slade Green Ward but placed in Northumberland Heath Ward – a small community with which there are no links.

Alford Road and the roads surrounding it were terraced houses built for the workers of the factories in Erith – neither the industrial area on Fraser Road nor these associated houses would be included in the proposed Erith and Slade Green Ward. They owe their existence to Erith’s industrial heritage which is tied closely to the River Thames – which the community of Erith has always embraced. Yet these proposals see much of Erith in a different ward to the riverside.

The proposals will tear apart the existing strong community ties of Erith and state again that there is little historic, cultural or economic links between Erith and Slade Green, two distinct areas with different identity’s and concerns. We hope our comments help provide a different perspective aligned more closely with the local community in Erith.

Thank you for your consideration of our proposals.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Edward Boateng, Councillor Joe Ferreira and Councillor Abena Oppong-Asare
Erith Ward Councillors