

# Cumberland

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Mr Keith Fitton

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Postcode:** [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:** West Cumberland Green Party Chair (Representative of a local organisation)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** West Cumberland

The Green group broadly agrees with the proposals set out by the LGBCE. In particular we strongly agree with the one councillor one ward model, believing this facilitates clearer lines of responsibility and a more even footing between parties and independents in the resources required to run for an individual seat of 3,900 voters than a double ward of 7,800. There are a number of places in the report where comment is encouraged on the possible combining of wards. The Green Group prefers the single ward model over the combined wards model in these cases and for all 55 wards. Despite our broad agreement there are some specific areas where we note our particular concerns or support.

### North East

Boundaries in the North East of Cumberland appear to be those best to meet the needs of the local populations and the statutory requirements to which the LGBCE must work.

We note particular support for the boundaries of Brampton and its designation as a single ward that matches the boundaries of Brampton Town agreeing this “would facilitate effective and convenient local government in Brampton”

### Carlisle

Boundaries here see significant change and we would encourage further work in promoting the consultation to ensure all local residents are

aware of them in time to submit comments. The proposals seem to collect together identifiable communities.

The naming of these wards may not be as locally identifiable as desirable. Whilst we do not have specific name suggestions we encourage the LGBCE to seriously consider any resident submissions for ward names that match the communities they will serve.

#### Fells and Solway

Boundaries in Fells and Solway appear to be those best to meet the needs of the local populations and the statutory requirements to which the LGBCE must work.

#### Abbeytown & Solway Firth and Silloth & Allonby Bay

We support these boundaries and the way they match the communities they will serve. We agree that Abbeytown & Solway Firth ward combines the Solway Firth communities with their shared identity. The Silloth and Allonby bay is very well suited to the community it will serve and, though larger in electors than recommended, shows the best boundaries to reunite these communities in a single ward.

#### Midwest and Central Cumberland and Maryport

Cockermouth North and South The Green Group strongly supports the one councillor one ward model adopted here and is opposed to any plan to make cockermouth a single ward with two councillors. We are of the view that any two councillor ward reduces voter choice and locks in seats for large parties due to few voters split balloting. We would be comfortable with slight alterations to the proposed boundaries if deemed necessary to maintain the two separate wards.

#### Mellbreak & The Marron / Buttermere, Bassenthwaite & Caldbeck

We express concern about the separation of Loweswater and Blindbothel parishes into a separate ward from Lorton and Buttermere. These four parishes combine into the Melbreak communities, cooperating on a number of facilities. We strongly recommend further consideration of the ties between these communities and if this border has been drawn for the convenience of other wards in Cumberland rather than in the best interests of the communities of these Melbreak parishes.

The inclusion of the 'West to Workington looking' Great (and to a lesser extent Little) Clifton with the 'East to the Lake District Authority' looking Blindbothel and Loweswater risks creating a 'ward of two parts/halves' we would encourage the consideration of the connections between these communities and if those connections outweigh the differences and consideration of if this border has been drawn for the convenience of other wards in Cumberland rather than in the best interests of the parishes placed in it.

## Workington and Seaton

The names of the Workington Central and South assume Workington can be defined as just that section of this conurbation when the Town Council covers a much larger area to which this compass direction language is not well matched. The 'South' ward is more central and the 'Central & Stainburn' more north. Naming should be 'Workington North & Stainburn' and 'Workington Central' or similar.

Naming a ward containing two parishes of Seaton and Camerton just 'Seaton' risks confusion between parish and ward and the exclusion of the, admittedly smaller, Camerton. For these reasons 'Seaton & Camerton' is a preferable name.

## Whitehaven and Surrounding Parishes

We express broad agreement with the boundaries drawn in this area with a few considerations.

The golf course, an area of likely planning permission requests for facilities, is split into two separate wards; this does not appear to be for the benefit of either ward or the course and we would expect the Golf Course to be drawn into a single ward as in the pre-proposal wards to mitigate these issues. We have no preference for which ward it goes into.

## Bransty & Lowca / Morresby

Use of the Parish boundaries here creates an issue at the junction of A595 and Bransty Road/Briscoe Crescent. This border should be clarified to avoid creating a Ward where you have to leave it and re enter it, splitting the southern and Parton sections of the ward.

## Attached Documents:

*None attached*