

## CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY

I would like to make the below recommendation as an alternative community governance review proposal. This map is amendment to a proposal myself and Cllr Luke Wakeling of Weymouth council tried to come up with as a compromise. Sadly Weymouth council did not support the proposal. Therefor I would like to propose the below plan as alternative to their recommendation and also to Dorset council plan.

The numbers for all the wards are below. The variation in electors/seat is 1400-1900 (mean 1723) Just two wards with a var over 200.

Ward Name	No. of Councillors	Electorate	Electorate per Cllr
Broadway Upwey and Wey Valley	3	5202	1734
Littlemoor	2	3728	1864
Preston and Sutton Poyntz	3	4301	1433
Radipole	2	3747	1873
Lodmoor	2	3529	1764
Melcombe Regis	2	3970	1985
Westham West	3	5385	1795
Westham East	2	3316	1658
Rodwell	2	4221	2110
Chapplehay and Harbourside	2	3932	1966
Wyke Regis	2	3462	1731

Total Seats: 25

Average electors/seat: 1723

### **This alternative does key things**

- Cuts the number of Weymouth councillors from 29 to 25
- Keep Weymouth town council ward within the same Parliamentary boundary so no ward is stretched over two constituencies.
- Only breaks Dorset council ward boundaries twice (both times in order to keep within Parliamentary boundaries and to achieve good electoral equality and keep good community cohesion)
- Listens to the concerns of Littlemoor and Chickerell residents and delivers for them and doesn't split communities and therefor achieves cohesion
- Gives communities such as Sutton Poyntz and Southill name recognition
- Has better electoral equality than the Dorset council option one as seen below and eliminates anomalies like Nottingham ward.

## CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY

Dorset council ward options numbers. There are nine wards with a variance over 130 and six with a variance over 200.

n	seats	n/seat	var	name
3619	2	1809	60	Littlemoor
4515	2	2257	508	Preston
3848	2	1924	175	Upwey and Broadway
3513	2	1756	7	Melcombe Regis
176	1	176	-1572	Nottingham
3424	2	1712	-36	Lodmoor
4049	2	2024	275	Radipole
4249	2	2124	375	Rodwell
3231	2	1615	-133	Westham East
3670	2	1835	86	Westham West
2803	2	1401	-347	Wyke North
1005	1	1005	-743	Lanehouse
3852	2	1926	177	Wyke South

Total Seats: 24

Average electors/seat: 1748

### **Difference with Dorset council's proposal**

What this plan does as opposed to Dorset council's is moves the 500 houses North of Littlemoor and the area around Nightingale drive out of the parish of Winterbourne Faringdon into the Weymouth parish and into the ward of Upwey and Broadway as per the wishes of people in the consultation as they will share more similarities both in terms of community and representational circumstances. This gives Littlemoor good electoral equality as opposed to DC and Weymouth's plan. It also moves the Nottingham ward (which is the Chickerell DC ward) into the Upwey and Broadway ward to make a three member ward which would have far better electoral equality. It does cross DC border but keeps it in the same parliamentary boundary. It would keep Chickerell's border the same as DC recommends but move the Weymouth part of the Lanehouse ward into the Westham West ward. The rest of the plan largely keeps to Weymouth town councils wishes.

Electoral equality by variation from average number per councillor which is around 1725

## CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY

Ward	DC plan 24 Cllrs	My plan 25 Cllrs	WTC plan 1 24 Cllrs	WTC plan 2 24 Cllrs
Littlemoor	60	139	146	146
Preston	508	-292	-258	-258
Upwey	175	-9	289	289
Melcombe	7	148	32	32
Lodmoor	N/A	39	38	38
Radipole	275	148	93	93
Pye/Rodwell	-347	385	55	N/A
Rodwell/Nothe	375	241	70	70
Westham East	-133	70	158	-151
Westham West	86	-67	261	-6
Wyke regis	177	6	157	157
Nottingham	-1572	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lanehouse	-734	N/A	N/A	N/A
Highest var dif	2080	385	547	547

### **Difference with WTC proposal**

My submission is different from WTC's because it also put a focus on community cohesion which is ignored in their submission. My plan realises that while electoral equality is important so are natural boundaries, community boundaries, and cohesion of neighbourhoods. WTC's plan is designed for good equality but it doesn't even deliver that. It argues that the north side of Weymouth is over represented while the south side of Weymouth is under represented. But their plan would see Littlemoor and Upwey both area's that will see most of the future development under represented to offset overrepresentation in Preston which is an easily definable community that will grow. This is unfair as they are separate communities and should not just be lumped together. The difference in representation from wards in my plan is minimal the biggest difference is between Upwey with -264 and Lodmoor (which is central not Southern Weymouth or north by central or even East) which is 196 this is a difference of 460 which is small in the main scheme of things. Lodmoor is highly unlikely to expand while Upwey, Broadway, and Nottingham are likely to and already are. Weymouth's own plan has far worse differences between the largest and smaller variation from average. Weymouth's objection to the north of Weymouth being over represented by claiming that anything south of Upwey Broadway, Littlemoor and Preston is south Weymouth while ignoring their being a north south, east west and central area of the town. This would be like claiming that everything south of Newcastle is the south. While it is southern to Newcastle it is not the South of England there are midlands, west and Eastern areas. Weymouth's plan claims to include future developments and take them into consideration. However several developments in Littlemoor and Preston including a new housing estate have been missed and ignores the planned development in the Sutton Poyntz neighbourhood plan. I fear Weymouth's plan that will leave areas of Weymouth's northern side under represented (A fact they have tried to hide by offsetting this against Preston's

numbers) is part of further evidence that they have a negative attitude to this part of the town. Each ward should be looked at on its own merit.

**As said below it does cross Dorset council boundaries twice.**

1. It cuts the Winterbourne and Broadmayne ward and Upwey and Broadway ward by merging the Nightingale drive area and the development North of Littlemoor into the Upwey and Broadway town council ward. This area would still be split over two DC wards in the current DC proposal but would cut the same area by putting in the Littlemoor and Preston ward. This proposal though at least means that they share the same MP (As Upwey and Broadway is due to go into West Dorset), and town councillor as opposed to just a town councillor.
2. The second place is the Upwey and Broadway ward and Nottingham are by merging Nottingham (which is in the Chickerell DC ward) to the rest of the proposed Upwey and Broadway ward. This achieves far better electoral equality than the current proposal and also ensures that they are all within West Dorset.

**Community cohesion boundary's and names**

Weymouth unlike most towns in Dorset council but similar to Poole and Bournemouth is a collection of smaller communities, estates, villages, and suburbs. This means we must do what we can to keep those communities sovereign and separate but withing Weymouth councils area.

Historically certain smaller communities in Weymouth have been overlooked and swallowed up. Southill with is a growing suburb has been part of Westham North since 1979 despite the fact it is a separate community and has more in common with the Radipole area. Sutton Poyntz is a village which is on the north side of Preston and has always been in both borough and county council and now town and unitary wards part of the same ward as Preston. This makes sense but it would be beneficial to ensure its name is included in the ward name.

The North side of Weymouth has easily definable communities. Littlemoor, Upwey and Broadway and Preston and Sutton Poyntz with Radipole on the edges. These communities make up under half of Weymouths population but will be where most of the large scale development will come from. It is crucial that

1. These communities have separate representation to protect their interests and ensure they have a voice on issues
2. These communities aren't at the mercy at the rest of the town by ensuring it has fair community based representation.
3. As these communities spill out into other administrative and electoral domains (parliamentary, unitary wards and currently other parish's) they need to keep within the same domain
4. These communities are different. On the north side Littlemoor is the second most deprived area in Weymouth while Preston and Upwey and Broadway

## **CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY**

are the most affluent. It is key to ensure Littlemoor has separate representation.

### **Conclusion**

This plan delivers a plan that balances borders, numbers and communities. It cuts the number of councillors, achieves good electoral equality, keeps town council wards within Dorset council wards where it can and keeps them entirely within the same constituency. It listens to the voice of residents in ensuring that communities are protected are cohesive. I hope you look at this as an alternative when making your final decision.

### **My objections to Littlemoor being merged with the area to our north**

-The official government guidance on community governance review states in paragraph 163 that "no parish ward should be split by such a boundary" this proposal cuts the Littlemoor ward across the Winterbourne and Broadmayne ward and the Littlemoor and Preston ward. If you move these borders you will render my unitary ward name mute as I would instead be the councillor for "some of Littlemoor and Preston". This will add confusion to the already confusion borders that are not congruent with DC boundaries.

-While guidance has been stated that certain circumstances may warrant expectations I still have not been informed why an exception were made for Nottingham (which at the next election would have 1 Councillor elected by 177 and only increase to 498 in 5 years' time while Littlemoor would have 1864 per one 1 Councillor) but not the 500 houses north of Littlemoor and the existing area around Nightingale drive

-Issues have been raised around the viability of neighbouring parish council and of the importance of local borders. But if the Nightingale drive area is taken into Weymouth Winterbourne and Faringdon parish council W&FPC they claim they will become unviable. If the area of 500 houses is kept in their area they say they will become unviable surely the two answers would be to either bring in the area up to the natural border of the Ridgeway into Weymouth town council. Or W&FPC need to adapt to new housing in order to remain viable. Surely people cannot just pick and choose what they want and don't want. Littlemoor is arguing only to retain what it already has which is sovereign separate community representation at a town council level based on its historic identify and borders.

-Littlemoor has had separate representation on the lower tier authority since 2004. Prior to that it was part of the North central ward. This ward was split into Wey Valley and Littlemoor because it was felt that both given their differences should have separate representation. Merging Littlemoor with a housing development in another area would go against this

## **CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY**

-In paragraph 161 it says "In urban areas community identity tends to focus on a locality, whether this be a housing estate, a shopping centre or community facilities. Each locality is likely to have its own sense of identity. Again, principal councils should consider each case on its merits having regard to information and evidence generated during the review." This can easily be said of the Littlemoor. It is built around the community centre and shopping precinct at its middle and kept separate from Preston by fields to its East, a large nature reserve to its south, either the A354 relief road or main railway line depending on where you class Littlemoor. To its north it is separated by Winterbourne Faringdon by the A353 Littlemoor road.

-Paragraph 162. States "In reaching conclusions on the boundaries between parish wards the principal council should take account of community identity and interests in the area, and consider whether any particular ties or linkages might be broken by the drawing of particular ward boundaries. Principal councils should seek views on such matters during the course of a review. They will, however, be mindful that proposals which are intended to reflect community identity and local linkages should be justified in terms of sound and demonstrable evidence of those identities and linkages." Littlemoor residents through their own voice, the view of myself as one of their Dorset councillors, in their attendance at a public meeting where they unanimously agreed and through their community group and community safety group have shown they feel they are a distinct community separate from the area to their north. This is due to historic boundaries, differences in representation both and past and present and demographic.

-Paragraph 159 It states that "In considering whether or not a parish should be divided into wards, the 2007 Act requires that consideration be given to whether:

- a) the number, or distribution of the local government electors for the parish would make a single election of councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- b) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented"

As stated above these proposals create the ward of Nottingham in order to keep within Dorset council boundaries and to ensure the area/community of a parish is separately represented. Why can this not be done for the area north of us within Winterbourne and Farringdon?

-The rest of the guidance continually brings up the issue of cohesion 31 times in 54 pages, it also brings up identity 14 times, yet there seems to be little attention paid to the potential breaking of community and neighbourhood cohesion in regards to Littlemoor due to the feeling that the rules, guidance and attention paid to responses are not being treated fairly compared to other areas. Nor does it address concerns raised that Littlemoor's identity could be threatened.

-The arguments for or against various aspects of these proposals seem to be based on finance and precept monies. This is despite the guidance stating otherwise. The arguments against the Littlemoor ward gaining this new development seem to be the only ones being made based on the guidance and spirit of the rules and guidance not on money.

## **CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY**

-Littlemoor is semi-rural. It is largely housing with some community facilities and some shops. The area to the north will contain housing but also a hotel, car show room and large industrial units this will upset the balance and makeup of the area.

-While some groundwork has been done of this site the 500 homes have not yet been built. Cllr Flower did mention at a public meeting that petitions on specific areas could be brought forward at any time and the guidance does allow it surely it should make sense to keep the status quo and wait to see this development pan out and give the residents of that area a say on what area they live in? This approach is more in keeping with the spirit of the purpose of the community governance review.

-In the original submission of the community governance review Littlemoor's border remained unchanged. Why has this now been changed especially as it is changing the status quo and also breaking important guidelines against the wishes of the community.

-Littlemoor as it currently known sits in the ecclesiastical parish of Littlemoor serviced by St Francis church which for a modern congregation is a healthy number. The 500 houses sits in the ecclesiastical parish of Bincombe serviced by the village church at Holy Trinity which has a small congregation. Keeping these 500 houses linked to Bincombe may help bolster numbers here. The churches of Bincombe, Upwey and Brodaway share the same Vicar as well and are in the same grouping. The banner in St Nicholas church Broadway is emabnnered "Broadway cum Bincombe" showing a long term connection to the two communities.

-Littlemoor residents tend to socialise and congregate at Littlemoor community centre and the Top Club. There are no pubs or cafes on the estate so these venues along with the church tend to be more used for these activities. While residents in the Nightingale drive area tend to socialise at the Standard pub in Upwey and Broadway or the Reynolds institute in Upwey and Broadway. The community to the North will also have its own community centre.

-When discussing issues relating to our community Littlemoor residents use one of the buildings on the estate to hold their residents meetings at either the community centre, the church or the Top Club. The residents in the Nightingale drive area have always tended to use the Reynolds hall or the Memorial Hall in Upwey where their parish council also meets.

-The guidance around community governance talks a lot around cohesion and also brings up the fact reviews should not break up cohesive communities. The resentment against the development of 500 houses to our north and the impact that will have on our community and it's infrastructure is already fomenting. Forcibly merging the two area's against the settled area's will is likely to only increase this resentment.

CGR AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CLLR LOUIE O'LEARY

