

Cheshire East

Personal Details:

Name: Mrs Elizabeth Braithwaite
Email: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: (District or county councillor)

Comment text:

Related subject: Macclesfield Central Ward

See attached file

Attached Documents:

- ward-boundary-review-macclesfield-central.docx

Boundary Commission Submission Macclesfield Central Ward

Introduction

As an elected councillor for, and a resident of, Macclesfield Central Ward I fully support the submissions made on behalf of the Macclesfield Labour Councillors and Macclesfield Constituency Labour Party.

I feel compelled to provide an additional submission after reading the recent Macclesfield Conservatives' submission with regard to Macclesfield Central.

Comments on Macclesfield Conservatives 'Response to consultation on proposed ward boundary changes for Cheshire East Council', with regard to Macclesfield Central Ward:

- The proposal to chop the ward at the edges and artificially compress it around the town centre so that a single councillor could 'adequately' and 'appropriately' focus on ASB, county lines crime, vacant commercial properties etc. does not reflect the warding arrangements in other Cheshire East towns; nor does it acknowledge that most of the concerns listed are under the jurisdiction of the police and other outside bodies. The Macclesfield town council employs a town centre manager, and also works on projects with CEC and all Macclesfield CEC councillors. It is true that there are challenges in the ward, but these would not be addressed by changing its governance arrangements and breaking down long-standing community connections.
- The proposed boundaries would bisect the following streets:
 - Brough Street West
 - Hobson Street
 - Bread Street
 - Mill Lane
- It's not clear whether the proposed Park Lane boundary would run down the middle of the road. If not, it would mean that many of the streets in Central would not be connected in a cohesive way along Park Lane; properties on Park Lane could be sharing a yard/access with properties in a different ward. If so, the boundary would separate those properties on Park Lane between the Crompton Road and Oxford Road junctions

from the rest of Park Lane. Similar concerns apply to the proposed Crompton Road boundary.

- The proposed Silk Road/Cross Street boundary is also unclear – the Silk Road joins Mill Lane which then becomes Cross Street past Mill Green. The same question on where the boundary would lie applies. The proposed boundary would isolate a number of smaller streets between Mill Lane and the railway/river.
- Hibel Road alone is not a boundary road. It joins Cumberland Street at the Churchill Way roundabout. It is not clear whether the proposed boundary is along the middle of the road. If not, the boundary would bisect Cumberland Street (the section off Jordangate).
- The references to air pollution within Central Ward are irrelevant to this consultation. Nonetheless, they are not accurate, the CEC Air Quality Management Areas information pages show that the areas in question are located between Central and two other wards (Tytherington and South). All council members are committed to reducing pollution and it is disingenuous to suggest that this falls more heavily on some rather than others. An AQMA was recently removed from Park Lane.
- Crompton Road and Crompton Street are used interchangeably (it's Crompton Road); as is Chester Road and Chester Street (it's Chester Road). This demonstrates a lack of familiarity with the area.

Additional comments

The communities and connectivity within the current Central ward are well-established. This also applies to the roads and properties around Station Street and Coare Street, many of which date from the 19th century in common with areas in the town centre. The connections to the town can be seen on maps of the area pre-Hibel Road extension. This has been recognised by the commission in its draft proposals. The commission has also commented that its draft proposals for Macclesfield Central and South wards show a good balance of statutory criteria.

In summary, this submission is intended to support the draft recommendation for a 2-member Central Ward, and to ask that only accurate and relevant information is considered going forward.