CREWE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO STAGE 3 CONSULTATION

18 Holly Mount
Basford
CREWE
CW2 5AZ
27 June 2012

Democratic Services
Cheshire East Council
Westfields
Sandbach
CW11 1HZ

CREWE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this stage of the Governance Review.

By way of background I have lived in the Crewe area since 1966. In 1983 I was elected as a Borough Councillor for the Delamere Ward of Crewe, a position I held until the abolition of the authority in 2009. For several years I was Chairman of the Authority's Community Scrutiny Committee. In 2009 I was accorded the honour of Honorary Alderman in recognition of my service.

I fully support the creation of a Town Council for Crewe. However, I cannot support the warding arrangements proposed by Cheshire East Council as they would lead to significant variations in electoral representation. As an alternative I would propose the creation of ten two-member wards as follows:

Crewe Central, Crewe North & Crewe St Barnabas would remain as proposed by Cheshire East.

Crewe South and Crewe West would each be divided into two two-member wards [in the case of Crewe South the first ward could be based on the newer property in the western part of the Ward, the second on the older property north of Nantwich Road and in the south-eastern part of the ward; Crewe West could be easily divided between the communities around Queens Park, and the community based on the Ruskin Park area].

Crewe East Ward would be divided into three two-member wards [probably based on a) the Maw Green area; b) the Sydney area; c) the Earle Street – Hungerford Road area].

The creation of these relatively smaller wards would create stronger community links between town councillors and those they represent, and create a more varied – and representative – council by making it more practical for independent and others outside the party machinery to achieve election.

Yours sincerely,

Gwyn Griffiths

2.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From: captainhastings@orange.net
Sent: 30 June 2012 11:29
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: crewe town council

Dear Sir/Ms,

I am in favour of 16 councillors and strongly opposed to any greater number.

D P Hughes

3.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From: TIMPSON, Edward [TIMPSONE@parliament.uk]
Sent: 28 June 2012 15:10
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Crewe Community Governance Review

Crewe finds itself in an interesting predicament following a lengthy period of rather cumbersome consultation from Cheshire East Council, the outcome of which will, I am sure, be a new town council for Crewe.

In the first referendum of Crewe taxpayers on the issue, some people found the questions overly complex, but on the other hand proper information was provided to voters about what a town council is, what it will do, and how much it might cost.

Conversely, in the second referendum, a simpler question was, quite rightly, put - yes or no. However the educational material explaining what people were voting for was not sent out.

The difference is that when taxpayers were told what it might cost, they voted against. When taxpayers were not told, they voted for.

So my concern is this: will this town council help make Crewe a better place to live and work, and will it provide value for money?

This is not to suggest that it won't - I very much hope it does. And that is the challenge to those 16 people who are elected in April.

But if it doesn't deliver for the people of Crewe, and address the key problems the town is facing, then they will have the people of Crewe to answer to.

Some of those who have shown interest in standing for the town council are always very quick to criticise Cheshire East Council. Some are Cheshire East councillors themselves, and want a second job.

But very soon, the boot will be on the other foot. They too must be prepared to be held to account for their actions and how they spend our residents' money.

I am not currently convinced that they have properly thought this through, but I hope that in the end they do it wisely.

Edward Timpson
MP for Crewe and Nantwich

UK Parliament Disclaimer:
This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

4.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From: Linda Davenport [lindadavenport@chalc.org.uk]
Sent: 21 June 2012 11:48
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Response to Lindsey Parton's email of 12 June - final stage consultation re. Crewe CGR
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Good morning Lindsey

Thanks for sending over the two documents. I note from the Stakeholder briefing note that elections are planned for April 2013, but thereafter "synchronised with the ordinary date of elections" so I'm assuming the 2013 councillors will serve for two years only then have to stand for re-election in 2015. Please let me know if I have misunderstood Cheshire East's intentions.

You may recall that ChALC, both directly and via Mike Flynn, was involved with the implementation of the Order creating Wilmslow, Styal & Handforth local councils, eg. advising on elements of expenditure to be included in the first precept, supporting candidates with information about the practicalities, powers and duties of being a local councillor and drafting agendas/ providing model documents for the new council's first meeting, and we are equally as happy to provide a service to Crewe if this would assist Cheshire East Council's aims for its new local council.

With best regards, Linda

Linda Davenport
Development Officer
Cheshire Association of Local Councils (ChALC)
Blue Bache Barn
Burleydam
Whitchurch
SY13 4AW
Tel: 01948 871314

5.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From:	peterakent@tiscali.co.uk
Sent:	18 June 2012 00:20
To:	COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc:	GRAVES, Rachel
Subject:	RE: Crewe Community Governance Review
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Red
Attachments:	2012-06 submission to CEC.doc

Thank you for your invitation to comment on the final stage of the review. Please find attached the response from the "A Voice for Crewe" campaign.

Peter Kent

From: GRAVES, Rachel [mailto:Rachel.Graves@cheshireeast.gov.uk]
Sent: 12 June 2012 08:13
To: 'peterakent@tiscali.co.uk'
Subject: Crewe Community Governance Review

Dear Sir/Madam

The review of Community Governance Arrangements in Crewe is now entering the final stage.

I am contacting you as the Council would welcome your views on this important issue which will be taken into account in reaching any decisions.

Please find attached a letter and a briefing note which provide information about the final stage of the Review. Further information can be found on the Cheshire East website at www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/crewegovreview

You can respond by email to communitygovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk *or* by post to The Registration Service and Business Manager, Democratic Services, Cheshire East Council, Westfields, Sandbach, Cheshire, CW11 1HZ. **Please respond by Monday 2 July 2012.**

Kind regards

Lindsey Parton
Registration Service and Business Manager
Cheshire East Council
Westfields, Sandbach

Tel: 01270 686477

A VOICE FOR CREWE

What's NEW?

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the final stage of the review of Community Governance Arrangements in Crewe.

There remains really just one point of contention and that is the number of councillors and warding arrangements. The campaign has always argued in favour of 20 members (see our submission in September 2009), based on the existing Borough wards, and with two town councillors for each Borough councillor. In the event of further borough ward boundary changes as populations and electorates change, this is a robust principle that can be maintained, with the least possible administrative cost falling on your council.

Democratic equality

The wards in Crewe are of different sizes and the numbers of Borough councillors have been adjusted appropriately, so that there is broad equality of representation throughout the town.

However, the current proposal of 16 town councillors is achieved by simply adding on 1 for every Borough councillor and this destroys that principle of equality. To be precise, if there are 16 members along the lines of the current suggestion, the number of electors per councillor would be:

- Central 1862 20% below the average, so over-represented
- East 2715 17% above the average, so under-represented
- North 1842 21% below
- St Barnabas 1929 17% below
- South 2458 6% above
- West 2579 11% above

The average number of voters is 2327 and, as you can see, the variation is considerable.

But if there are 20 members, then the figures are:

- Central 1862 Exactly matching the average
- East 1810 3% below
- North 1842 1% below
- St Barnabas 1929 4% above
- South 1844 1% below
- West 1935 4% above

Here the average is 1862 per councillor. And given the Boundary Commission's usual advice of there being no more than 5% deviation from the norm, it fits nicely, as one would expect.

These figures are based on the current electorate as supplied by your own council. The figure for Crewe South excludes that part of the ward lying in Shavington parish. The figures also exclude the 403 residing in the currently unparished area of Leighton, since its future depends on the ballot currently being undertaken. If it were to be

included in the St Barnabas ward for town council purposes, this is clearly an area that would be examined in the next boundary review.

Effectiveness

Our proposal gives a reasonable number of councillors overall, in comparison with other parts of the Borough. Examples abound on this, but the most relevant is probably the one from the most recent review elsewhere in the Borough. Only last year, Cheshire East set up new town councils in Wilmslow, Handforth and in Styal. Wilmslow Town Council has an electorate of 19,088 and 15 council seats – this gives an average of 1272 electors per member. The numbers are lower for Handforth and Styal. Of course, there is a maximum practicable size so if we had the same ratio as Wilmslow it might be thought to be unworkable (though there were 32 on the old Crewe Borough Council). But whilst 15 for Wilmslow is reasonable, 16 for a town almost twice the size is not. We would also draw your attention to the recent decision of Sandbach Town Council, representing 14600 electors, to increase its numbers to 20 because of the workload falling on its members.

Most of these points were advanced at a recent Council meeting and the only point that was raised against was that if you have too many councillors it impedes progress. However, there was no response to the logical response that other councils like Wilmslow, for instance, should therefore look to a reduction in their numbers. I do hope that your members are not so firmly wedded to the idea of 16 members that they will not be prepared to give reasonable consideration to the case for 20.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Kent

PETER KENT
Co-ordinator, Campaign for "A Voice for Crewe"

6.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From: D CANNON [cannon380@btinternet.com]
Sent: 27 June 2012 20:01
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: CREWE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Attachments: CrewWard.pdf; TownCoun2.doc

Lindsey Parton,
Registration Service and Business Manager.

Dear Lindsey,

The two files which are attached to this message together contain the submission by the Liberal Democrats Crewe & Nantwich constituency party to the final stage of public consultation in the Crewe Community Governance Review.

The main text is in "TownCoun2". "CrewWard" is an appendix which suggests how the existing polling districts in Crewe could be grouped to make smaller wards for the proposed Town Council.

Yours sincerely,

David Cannon
for Crewe & Nantwich Liberal Democrats

PROPOSED TOWN COUNCIL FOR CREWE

The Executive Committee of Crewe & Nantwich Liberal Democrats discussed the recommendations from the review of community governance in Crewe at our May meeting.

Members welcome the prospect of a Town Council for Crewe, which we supported in our submission to the earlier stage of public consultation.

One reason for supporting a Town Council was our concern at the size of the job taken on by a Cheshire East councillor representing a Crewe ward. They must be willing to take a strategic view of issues that affect the whole of Cheshire East but also engage with the minutiae of issues that affect only their ward. We also expressed the hope that a Town Council in Crewe would make it easier for people to stand for election for the first time, and thus increase the number of people actively involved in local democracy.

The present proposals for a Town Council only partly address our original hopes and concerns. If the Council is restricted to 16 members, then each councillor will represent many more electors than is the case with existing town and parish councils in Cheshire East. The effect is made worse by the use of multi-member wards based on those used for Cheshire East elections at present. Anyone considering standing for election for the first time faces the daunting prospect of seeking support from a large area, maybe beyond the part of the town for which they have an affinity. Another objection is the variable size of the Cheshire East wards. Voters face the potential confusion of having differing numbers of votes depending on where they live. "First Past the Post" elections, are also often in practice "Winner Takes All" elections when multi-member wards are used. When wards vary in size the party with the most support gains disproportionately.

Liberal Democrats advocate a Town Council of 20 members, so that in effect, each representative of Crewe on Cheshire East Council would be supported by two town councillors. We wish to see the multi-member Cheshire East wards subdivided for the purpose of Town Council elections, to create ten equal sized, two member wards. These wards would correspond more closely with localities that are recognised within the town. The appendix shows how this could be done, using the existing Polling Districts. It is no less feasible to create smaller, equal sized wards for Town Council elections, based on the 16 member council that is proposed in the consultation documents.

APPENDIX

The purpose of this appendix is to show that for Town Council purposes, Crewe may be divided into ten wards, each electing two councillors, using existing polling districts. This requires that the Cheshire East wards of Crewe South and Crewe West be split into two parts, and that Crewe East be split into three parts. These wards could be divided in other ways. Liberal Democrats are not advocating this division more strongly than any alternative: our purpose is to show that splitting the wards is feasible. Numbers of electors are taken from the 2011 register.

CREWE POLLING DISTRICTS

Division of CREWE EAST into three Town Council wards:

Brierley Street area	1AC1	855	
Lea Ave est + part Poets est	1DF1	2114	
Crewe Road estate	1DG1	307	
University	1DG2	60	
"Waldron" Total			3336
Lower Middlewich St	1AD1	1014	
Broughton Rd/ Stoneley Rd	1CC1	412	
Upper Middlewich St	1CD1	1602	
Trees estate west	1CF1	1226	
"Maw Green" Total			4254
Trees estate east	1CE1	1075	
Sydney + part Poets estate	1DF2	2155	
"Sydney" Total			3230
Crewe East	Total		10820

Division of CREWE SOUTH into two Town Council wards:

Bedford St/ Gresty Rd	1DA1	1864	
Brookhouse Dr/ Collinbrook Av	1DB1	1555	
Claughton Ave	1DC1	537	
"Alexandra" Total			3956
Edleston Road area	1DE1	2097	
Rosehill estate	1BD2	416	
Ruskin Park	1BD3	793	
"St John's" Total			3306
Shavington Parish (excluded)	1GM2		
Crewe South	Total		7262

Division of CREWE WEST into two Town Council wards:

Wistaston Green estate	1BA1	1948	
Queens Park Gardens	1BB1	253	
Marshfield estate	1BF1	1223	
Victoria Avenue estate	1BB2	575	
"Queen's Park" Total			3999
Alton Street west	1BC1	1659	
Danebank Avenue	1BD1	1226	
Alton Street east	1DD1	907	
"Valley" Total			3792
Crewe West	Total		7791
CREWE CENTRAL	Total		2999
CREWE NORTH	Total		3592
ST BARNABAS	Total		3788

7.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From: PAM MINSHALL [pam.minshall@btinternet.com]
Sent: 13 June 2012 15:25
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Crewe Town Council
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

We are pleased that at last, the wish for a town council, expressed several years ago by the residents of Crewe, is going to be fulfilled. We agree that the existing wards are the obvious structure, and with the suggestion for the minor anomolies. However, the proposal for 16 councillors seems perplexing and arbitrary since it means that the number of electors per councillor varies considerably while the boundary Commission advises no more than 5% deviation from the norm. We believe that it would be much simpler and fairer to give the new Crewe Council 20 councillors, two for each of the existing Borough Councillors. This would even out the number of electors per councillor, be easy to maintain as boundaries changed and would be more appropriate in comparison with other parish councils in Cheshire East where there are much smaller electorates than will be the case in Crewe, while not being so large as to impede progress.

Pam Minshall

Crewe Historical Society
Valley Community Action Project.

8.

MOUNTFORD, Paul

From: Helen Birtles [helen@birtles6000.freeserve.co.uk]
Sent: 12 June 2012 21:34
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Local Governance review
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Dear Rachel

Further to your email, I am writing to confirm that on behalf of the members of Union Street Baptist Church we shall be pleased to see the formation of a Town Council for Crewe. Your plans seem very suitable and we look forward to
seeing the results of the election. Thank you for including us.

Helen Birtles

Church Secretary.