

[REDACTED]

From: Josh Newbury (Cllr) <joshnewbury@cannockchasedc.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 February 2023 00:13
To: reviews
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission to Cannock Chase draft recommendations consultation - Cannock Chase CLP and Labour Group
Attachments: Cannock Chase Constituency Labour Party and Labour District Councillors response to the Cannock Chase boundary review - 06.02.2023.pdf; Brereton and Ravenhill parish.kmz; Rugeley parish.kmz; Heath Hayes and Wimblebury parish.kmz

Good evening,

Please find attached a joint submission to the draft recommendations consultation of the Cannock Chase electoral review from the Cannock Chase Constituency Labour Party and the Labour group of councillors on Cannock Chase District Council.

I have also attached three .kmz shape files which detail our proposals for [parish-level wards](#) which are explained towards the end of our submission. Where we refer to wards in our submission to the initial consultation, those district-level wards can be viewed [here](#).

Please let me know if you have any queries regarding our submission or if you have any trouble with the files or links to our maps. We look forward to seeing the final recommendations later this year and to participating in the ongoing review of Staffordshire County Council's divisions.

Many thanks,

Councillor Josh Newbury



Josh Newbury | Councillor For Norton Canes Ward
Cannock Chase Council | 16 Lambourne Way | Norton Canes | Cannock | WS11 9FA
07884 111382 | joshnewbury@cannockchasedc.gov.uk | www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk

Information you supply to us via email will be dealt with in line with data protection legislation. We will use your information to enable us to fulfil our duties in relation to your enquiry. To that end, where the law allows, your information may be shared with relevant departments within the council, and with other authorities and organisations where required. Cannock Chase Council is the data controller for any personal information you provide. For more information on your data protection rights relating to the service to which your email relates, please visit www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/privacynotice

Website: www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk
Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/cannockchasedc
Find us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/cannockchasedc

This e-mail and any attachment(s), is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the recipient, the use of the information by

disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient please inform the sender immediately and destroy the e-mail, any attachment(s) and any copies.

All liability for viruses is excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law. It is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachment(s).

Unless otherwise stated:

(i) views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender

(ii) no contract may be construed by this e-mail.

Emails may be stored and monitored and you are taken to consent to these actions.



Cannock Chase Constituency Labour Party and Cannock Chase District Council Labour Group

Joint submission to the consultation on draft recommendations for Cannock Chase

Monday 6th February 2023

Introduction

This submission to the boundary review of the Cannock Chase District is made jointly by the Cannock Chase Constituency Labour Party ('the CLP') and the group of Labour and Labour and Co-operative councillors on Cannock Chase District Council ('the group'). As with our submission to the initial consultation, our response reflects the views of CLP members and group councillors.

We are not supplying a new map of district ward proposals with this submission as we are primarily either in agreement with the draft recommendations, or we wish to restate our proposals from the initial consultation. As with the initial consultation period, we welcome the high degree of agreement between different political groups in the District and the many similarities between the District Council's submission and the Commission's draft recommendations.

We welcome the pattern of 12 three-member wards as we believe this will provide uniformity across the District, something that we do not have currently, and enable the continuation of the 'by thirds' electoral system. We also welcome the fact that the draft recommendations minimise the crossing of what most residents would consider clear community boundaries between local towns and villages. This has not been possible in every case, and we do feel that some of the Commission's proposals do not place enough emphasis on this, but broadly speaking the draft recommendations do represent community lines which most residents would recognise.

We agree in full with the Commission's draft recommendations for the Hednesford area, the Rugeley and Brereton area, and for Norton Canes. We wish to make further representations around the Cannock and Heath Hayes areas, and around the proposals for parish and town council wards, some of which we disagree with strongly.

As we did with our previous submission, we will begin at the southern end of the district and move northwards.

District ward comments

Norton Canes

Boundary

We fully agree with the Commission's proposal to retain the current boundaries for Norton Canes. There would be no logical way of splitting Norton Canes, so we welcome the strong cross-party support for keeping its district council boundaries coterminous with the parish boundary.

Ward name

We support retaining the existing ward name for Norton Canes.

Commentary

As we stated previously, Norton Canes has a strong, separate community identity from the rest of the District, particularly given the fact that it is geographically separate from the main urban area. We welcome the Commission's recognition of this and the strong electoral equality that the current ward boundary would provide.

Heath Hayes and Wimblebury

Boundary

We would like to resubmit the same proposed boundary for this ward as we did to the initial consultation last year. This differs from the Commission's draft recommendations in that we propose that the area contained in the proposed 'Gorsemoor' parish ward (labelled C) should be kept in the Hawks Green ward and also that all homes on Meadow Way and Kensington Place, and some homes (numbers 90 to 100 and 241 to 257) on Gorsemoor Road, also be included in the Hawks Green ward.

Ward name

We welcome the Commission's agreement that the name 'Heath Hayes and Wimblebury' best reflects the communities included in the ward. However, we would point out that the name becomes slightly more problematic if a part of the Hawks Green area is included within this ward for the reasons outlined below.

Commentary

We welcome the fact that the Commission has largely agreed with our submission, and the submission from the District Council, in respect of the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward. Namely, that the southern boundary should remain as it is currently, that the eastern boundary should take in much of the rural unparished area and that the estates off of Keys Park Road and Brickworks Road should be added to this ward. We feel that these changes address the current illogical boundary, futureproof the ward with regards to new housing developments, and provide good electoral equality.

However, we object to the Commission's proposal to include the Badgers Way estate in this ward on the grounds of both community identity and electoral equality.

In terms of community identity, Heath Hayes is generally regarded as one village with an identity distinct from nearby communities, even though it has effectively become joined on to the Cannock / Hednesford urban area. However, the Hawks Green area also has a somewhat separate identity due to its status as a planned community which built up rapidly much later than most of the remainder of Heath Hayes which grew organically over a longer period as a former mining village. Made up of multiple estates built up around the main roads of Heath Way, Hayes Way and Hemlock Way, the Hawks Green area developed quickly, primarily during the 1980s, as a large urban extension. The Badgers Way estate was amongst the first areas of Hawks Green to be developed. The community was built with its own local infrastructure which is centred around the 'Hawks Green district centre' at the junction of Heath Way and Hayes Way. Due to this, Hawks

Green residents tend to use the same services e.g. shops in the district centre, GP surgery, primary schools, etc. Hawks Green also has its own community centre, the Hayes Green Community Centre, which acts as a central point for the surrounding estate, as demonstrated by the fact that it serves as the polling station for the whole current Hawks Green ward.

Given that the area was planned as a 'garden suburb', the estates are linked together with many green footpaths which promotes linkages between them despite the fact that from a vehicular perspective they may seem separate. This is the case for the Badgers Way estate and the Meadow Way estate which feed onto footpaths that link with Hayes Way and the Gorsemoor Road play area. Unusually for Hawks Green, these two estates also share a road link: Thistledown Drive. The Commission's draft recommendations therefore cut Thistledown Drive, a small residential side road, in half which would be confusing for those residents and does not promote good governance. We would argue that given that these are arguably the two most connected of the Hawks Green estates, they should be kept together in the same ward. The neighbouring areas of Heath Hayes to the east are generally much older and focused around the local high street of Hednesford Road. We would therefore propose that for reasons for common community identity, shared infrastructure and physical links, the Badgers Way area should be kept within the Hawks Green ward for both district council and parish council elections.

In terms of electoral equality, we note that by 2028, the proposed Hawks Green ward would have one of the lowest numbers of electors per councillor, leaving it close to the 10% variance. Meanwhile, the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward would be slightly larger than the average ward, meaning its variance is 9% higher than Hawks Green's. We believe this would be a large variance between two neighbouring wards which are primarily within the same parish and without a solid community identity reason for that variance. Therefore, keeping the Badgers Way estate within Hawks Green would provide a more even variance between Heath Hayes and Wimblebury and Hawks Green. It should also be noted that there are no prospects of substantial development within the Hawks Green ward, due to the fact that urban development already covers its whole area. Within the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward, on the other hand, there are prospects of significant development on 'safeguarded' land to the east of Wimblebury Road and possibly also in the fields to the east of John Street and south of Littleworth Road. Therefore, if the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward is already significantly larger than the Hawks Green ward, the disparity between the two could grow even larger in the coming years. We therefore feel that it would be appropriate for the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward to be slightly smaller than proposed in the draft recommendations, allowing room for future growth, and the Hawks Green ward slightly larger, in acknowledgement of the fact that it will not grow significantly before the next review.

In terms of the minor change we proposed for Gorsemoor Road and Kensington Place, we would like to again request that this alteration is made. The houses at the end of Gorsemoor Road (numbers 90 to 100 and 241 to 257) and along Meadow Way and Kensington Place were all built at the same time as part of the Meadow Way development within Hawks Green. For the reasons stated above regarding Hawks Green's somewhat separate identity, we feel that these houses should be included within the Hawks Green ward. The current boundary, which the Commission has proposed to retain, is unnecessarily confusing and we found the Commission's justification for its retention in the full report on the draft recommendations equally confusing. In point 52, it is stated that it would not be possible to remove these homes from the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward "without creating an unviable parish ward". If the remainder of the Meadow Way estate was located in a different parish to these houses, we would understand that argument,

however they are not. All of Gorsemoor Road and the houses on Meadow Way and Kensington Place are all contained within the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury Parish. Therefore, the homes in question could simply be transferred to the Hawks Green ward for both district council and parish council purposes. If the Commission felt that splitting Gorsemoor Road near to its junction with Meadow Way would be confusing, we would accept the whole of Gorsemoor Road remaining in the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward whilst all homes on Meadow Way and Kensington Place are included in the Hawks Green ward. However, we would point out that there are many proposals to split roads elsewhere in the district, for example most homes on nearby Hill Street will be included in Heath Hayes and Wimblebury whilst others will be included in the Hednesford Hills and Rawsley ward.

Hawks Green

Boundary

As with the previous neighbouring ward, we propose the same boundary for Hawks Green that we submitted in our response to the previous consultation; this is also the same as the District Council's response to the initial consultation. Therefore, our submission differs from the draft recommendations in the boundary with the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury ward explained above, and also in that the Rumer Hill area of Cannock (south of Lichfield Road) would not be transferred to the Hawks Green ward.

Ward name

In our response to the initial consultation, we proposed the name 'Cannock Pebble Mill and Hawks Green' for this ward. This was in response to feedback from some residents in the area of Cannock east of Old Hednesford Road that they do not identify with Hawks Green name and consider themselves firmly part of Cannock. However, this name was seen as overly long and not reflective of the fact that the Hawks Green area makes up the vast majority of this ward (even more so if the Badgers Way estate is kept within Hawks Green). For this submission, we therefore agree with the draft recommendations and the District Council's submission that the name 'Hawks Green' should be used for this ward.

Commentary

As we stated in our submission to the initial consultation and in the section above on the neighbouring ward, we feel that the estates which make up the Hawks Green area have strong links with one another and should therefore be kept together. We feel that a Hawks Green ward with a significant chunk of what is regarded locally as the Hawks Green area missing does not make sense on a community identity basis.

We very much welcome the correction of the boundary around Sapphire Drive as this will be much more logical and contribute to good governance.

However, we strongly object to the inclusion of the Rumer Hill estate within the proposed Hawks Green ward on community identity grounds. We can appreciate why this change may have been proposed from an electoral equality perspective, albeit that shifting the Badgers Way estate out of this ward significantly undermines that. We feel that retaining the Badgers Way estate in Hawks Green would enable the Rumer Hill estate to remain within the neighbouring ward, which the Commission has called 'Cannock South' and we have named 'Cannock Longford and Bridgtown'. Although the Rumer Hill area is fairly close in proximity to Hawks Green, its residents very much

feel part of Cannock and do not identify with Hawks Green at all. This is underlined by the fact that Rumer Hill residents would not travel into Hawks Green, or Heath Hayes, to access local services or amenities but would instead look to Cannock town centre. Rumer Hill residents would also use schools in Cannock as opposed to the schools much further away in Heath Hayes. The draft recommendations would split Rumer Hill Road which is illogical to residents in the area, particularly given that the railway line is not the physical barrier it would appear to be on a map. Rumer Hill has a long association with Cannock so we therefore argue that this change should not be made and that the strong cross-party consensus in submissions to the initial consultation should be heeded.

Cannock Longford and Bridgtown

Boundary

Once again, we propose the suggested boundary which we submitted to the initial consultation last year, albeit with a minor change around the town centre proposed in the District Council's submission. This differs from the draft recommendations in that, as detailed above, the Rumer Hill area south of Lichfield Road remains in this ward and that Bideford Way, Dorchester Road, Exeter Road, Burnham Green, Barnswood Close, Meriden Close and Poplar Lane are *not* added to this ward.

Ward name

Our suggested name for this ward is, as before, 'Cannock Longford and Bridgtown'. We reiterate the fact that Bridgtown is a parish and small community in its own right and should therefore be recognised in the ward name. Residents in the southern part of Cannock also identify with the 'Longford' name to refer to the area around Longford Road and the 'Longford estate'. We welcome the fact that the District Council's submission includes this ward name, and we hope that the Commission will recognise the need for Cannock ward names which reflect the different areas of the town, as opposed to generic 'points on a compass' names which do not.

Commentary

As previously stated, we object to the Rumer Hill estate being removed from this ward due to the community identity of the residents who live there. Although in our initial consultation submission we did not propose any changes to the boundary between the current Cannock South and Cannock West wards, aside from moving the St. James estate from the latter to the former, we accept the Commission's proposal to also move Victoria Street, Queen Street, Newhall Street, Danilo Road and Manor Avenue into this ward. This would make for a more logical boundary in this part of the town which currently has a somewhat confusing boundary. However, in discussions of the Boundary Review Working Group, it was felt that the draft recommendations resulted in a jagged, somewhat confusing boundary around the town centre. We therefore agree with the proposal in the District Council's submission to move the boundary northwards to Park Road; this would not affect many properties but would provide a simpler, cleaner boundary.

Cannock Park and Old Fallow

Boundary

Our proposal for the boundary of this ward matches the draft recommendations, aside from the minor amendment around the town centre as proposed in the District Council's submission. Our initial proposal for the boundary between this ward and the ward to the north included part of

Cannock Road and one side of Burns Street in this ward. However, we accept the Commission's proposal for a tighter boundary around the Sankey Road, Hardie Green and Smilie Place estate.

We would also like to draw the Commission's attention to one minor difference between the draft recommendations and our previous submission along Stafford Road (the A34). Near to the District boundary with the South Staffordshire District, there are a row of flats north of the White Lion pub and the junction with Cemetery Road, on the eastern side of Stafford Road. In the Commission's draft recommendations, these flats are drawn in the Cannock North ward due to the boundary going along Cemetery Road and then up Stafford Road as far as the District boundary. We argue that it does not make sense for all of Stafford Road to be included in this ward, aside from a small row of flats at its end. We therefore suggest that all properties on Stafford Road are included in this ward.

Ward name

In our initial submission, we proposed the name 'Cannock Shoal Hill and Old Fallow' for this ward, to reflect local names for the western and eastern parts of this ward respectively. However, in discussions with the Boundary Review Working Group, there were some concerns raised over the 'Shoal Hill' name, mostly due to the fact that Shoal Hill itself and the Shoal Hill Tavern are located outside of the District. It was also felt that the name was too long.

Following discussions at the Working Group, we therefore support the District Council's submission of 'Cannock Park and Old Fallow' for this ward. The 'Park' part of the name would refer to Cannock Park which is situated roughly in the middle of the ward and is something of a unifying feature. This was the reason for a previous ward which straddles the current Cannock North and Cannock West wards being named 'Parkside'. As stated in our previous submission, 'Old Fallow' has long been associated with the area around Old Fallow Road and would be recognisable by residents in that part of Cannock. We therefore feel that 'Cannock Park and Old Fallow' provides a good balance between the western and eastern sides of the ward and reflects the communities it covers.

Commentary

Whilst this ward may not be the strongest in terms of community identity, we feel that it strikes the best balance possible between keeping coherent communities within Cannock together and maintaining good electoral equality.

Chadsmoor

Boundary

We welcome the Commission's draft recommendations for this ward and we do not have any suggested amendments to its boundary. We accept the Commission's comments around the fact that it is not possible to move Apollo Close from the Hednesford Green Heath ward into this ward due to the need to create an unviable parish ward; we will instead seek to have this anomaly addressed through a Community Governance Review. We welcome the proposal to move Festival Mews out of this ward and into Hednesford Green Heath.

Ward name

We were very disappointed to see that both the Conservative group's response to the initial consultation and the Commission's draft recommendations retained the Cannock North name for

this ward as opposed to 'Chadsmoor' which is a clearly identifiable name for the area the ward covers. Most residents in this ward feel that Chadsmoor has a distinct identity, having developed separately to Cannock and having its own high street with local amenities. As we stated in our previous submission, the Chadsmoor name can be seen in a local primary school and a nursery school within this ward, as well as numerous local businesses. It is also the name of a county council division which covers a similar, albeit slightly larger, area. We therefore welcome the fact that the District Council's submission proposes 'Chadsmoor' as the name of this ward and we strongly urge the Commission to adopt this name.

Commentary

We believe that this ward is strong from both a community identity perspective and from an electoral equality perspective.

The Hednesford wards

There appears to be a high level of agreement over the boundaries and names of the three wards which cover the Hednesford and Rawsley area. We do not propose any changes to the draft recommendations for Hednesford Green Heath, Hednesford Pye Green or Hednesford Hills and Rawsley and we would encourage the Commission to continue with its draft recommendations.

Brereton and Ravenhill

Boundary

We welcome the adoption of our proposed boundaries for this ward and we do not propose any amendments to the draft recommendations.

Ward name

Welcome the retention of the 'Brereton and Ravenhill' ward name as we feel this will best reflect the new ward boundary, despite the addition of the Pear Tree estate from the existing Hagley ward.

Commentary

As we stated in our submission to the previous consultation, we believe on balance that the new community which will be developed on the former Rugeley Power Station site would fit better with a ward containing Rugeley town centre due to the planned road and pedestrian / cycling linkages. We feel that the addition of the Pear Tree estate would be cohesive from a community identity perspective as there are footpath links between that estate and the existing Brereton and Ravenhill ward, and it was built at a similar time.

Western Springs

Boundary

As with the previous ward, we welcome the draft recommendations and do not propose any amendments. We particularly welcome the inclusion of the three cul-de-sacs off of Wolseley Road as this is much more logical than the current boundary which includes them in the existing Etching Hill and the Heath ward.

Ward name

We welcome the retention of the Western Springs ward name as this has many local connections.

Commentary

We restate our belief that Hednesford Road is a key unifying road in the town whilst Western Springs Road is a dividing road due to the limited number of junctions along it. We very much welcome the fact that the Commission has drawn the draft recommendations based on this and we hope that the proposed boundary is carried through to the final recommendations. We do not believe that any other configuration, such as combining the western side of the existing Hagley ward with the Etching Hill area, would make sense from a community cohesion perspective.

Etching Hill and the Heath

Boundary

Again, we welcome the draft recommendations and do not propose any amendments.

Ward name

We agree that retaining the current ward name is the best approach as this would still represent the proposed ward well, even with the additions from the existing Western Springs ward.

Commentary

We welcome the usage of Western Springs Road as a clear delineation between this ward and the proposed Western Springs ward. We feel that this makes sense from a community identity perspective and provides a clear, identifiable boundary for the two Rugeley wards. We also note that our proposal, and therefore the draft recommendations, only divide one proposed ward (Western Springs) between Rugeley's two county council divisions whereas the Conservative group's initial proposals also divided this ward between the two divisions, a situation which would cause confusion for residents.

Comments on parish ward proposals

For the most part, we welcome the Commission's proposals for parish and town council ward boundaries. However, we feel that there have been oversights or misunderstandings in some areas as well as missed opportunities to create parish wards which are more reflective of smaller communities within proposed district wards.

Hednesford parish

We welcome the proposals for the Hednesford parish. The 'Green Heath', 'Pye Green' and 'Hednesford Hills' wards will make sense as they are coterminous with the proposed district council wards. Whilst we believe the 'Hawks Green' and 'Keys Park' wards are illogical on their own merits, we acknowledge that this is down to the out-of-date parish boundary which can be rectified through a Community Governance Review ahead of the first parish elections at which they would be contested (2027).

Brereton and Ravenhill parish

Again, we support the two proposed parish wards and their names. A better name than 'Power Station' may emerge as the development of the power station site commences but, again, this could be updated via a future Community Governance Review.

Rugeley parish

As we stated in our response to the initial consultation, we believe that a parish the size of Rugeley should be divided into more wards than just the three required by the proposed district council boundaries. We also believe that more than four parish wards are needed and therefore, with one exception, we cannot support the Commission's draft recommendations.

We would urge the Commission to look again at our initial proposals for six parish wards for the Rugeley parish which we believe would provide boundaries and ward names which better reflect the community identities within Rugeley.

We do support the *boundaries* of the proposed 'Hagley East' parish ward, which is clearly necessitated by this area's inclusion in the Brereton and Ravenhill district ward. As we stated previously, the Pear Tree estate has its own identity and is geographically discrete, with just one access point along the Queensway. However, we object to the 'Hagley East' ward name as we do not believe this reflects the area or the estate's identity. 'Hagley' was chosen as the name of the existing district ward which covers this area as there was a historical link between the western side of the ward and the name 'Hagley Park'; this can be seen in the road name Hagley Park Gardens and the former Hagley Park Academy (which opened as Hagley Park Secondary Modern). However, the Hagley Park Academy has since become a site of The Hart School, so the Hagley Park name has been lost. If asked where they live, residents in the area would not state that they live in 'Hagley', they are likely to consider their area as simply part of Rugeley. Many residents on the Pear Tree estate would state that they live "on the Pear Tree" as the estate has its own identity which can be seen on the signage at the estate's entrance. We would therefore ask that the Commission renames this parish ward to either 'Pear Tree Estate' or 'Pear Tree'.

We do not support the proposed 'Western Springs South and Hagley West' ward as we believe that Western Springs Road provides a natural delineation for the purposes of parish warding. We believe that the long, and somewhat clunky, ward name underlines the fact that this ward is seeking to combine two areas which it would make more sense to have in separate parish wards. The character of the town centre area is very different to the Hednesford Road / Burnthill Lane area and we would therefore once again propose the initial suggestions we submitted in our previous response. This would mean that the existing Hagley district council ward, minus the area outlined above which will go into the Brereton and Ravenhill district ward, would form a parish ward named 'Hagley'.

Following on from this, we propose that the remainder of the Rugeley parish within the proposed Western Springs district council ward would form a separate parish ward simply called 'Western Springs'. This ward would be bounded by Western Springs Road to the west, the railway line to the southeast and the District boundary to the east. We believe that this is a clearly delineated area which would avoid an arbitrary boundary along Church Street and Station Road.

We feel that a single, very large parish ward covering the Rugeley parish portion of the Etching Hill and the Heath district ward would be unwieldy, out of step with the three other smaller

proposed Rugeley parish wards, and would not reflect the community identities within this part of Rugeley. We therefore cannot support the Commission's proposed 'Etchinghill' parish ward and instead propose, as we did previously, that the area be divided into three parish wards: 'Springfields', 'Etching Hill' and 'Green Lane with Slitting Mill'.

Our proposed 'Springfields' parish ward at the northern end of the ward would primarily comprise the area which locals refer to as the 'Springfields estate' i.e. the cul-de-sacs ringed by Springfields Road, Crabtree Way, Jennie Lee Way, School Road and Plovers Rise. This estate was built in one phase, has developed an identity of its own and a small parade of shops on Byron Close. This proposed ward would also include the Forest Hills Primary School and some other estates in the immediate vicinity of the Springfields estate. We would urge the Commission to recognise that the Springfields estate has its own identity separate to that of the Etching Hill area which lies at the other end of the district ward, and that a parish ward is needed for this area.

In terms of the Etching Hill area itself, we suggest that the hill, off of Mount Road, and the area around it is included in a separate parish ward. The feedback we received when formulating our response to the initial consultation was that the roads we have drawn into this ward have a lot in common as many of them predate the large, sprawling development which makes up much of the Etching Hill and the Heath ward. This is a historical part of Rugeley and the association with the 'Etching Hill' name goes back very far. We therefore believe that it would make a strong parish ward, of similar size to our proposed 'Pear Tree Estate' and 'Springfields' wards.

We propose that the remainder of the proposed Etching Hill and the Heath district ward would form a parish ward called 'Green Lane with Slitting Mill'. The main roads linking estates within this ward together are Plovers Rise, Crabtree Way, Green Lane and Woodcock Road. 'Green Lane' is suggested for the ward name as it is the main road through this area. We feel that 'Slitting Mill' should also be featured in the ward name as it is a discrete village with its own history and separate identity. As we argued in our previous response, we feel that any parish ward containing Slitting Mill should also contain Hagley Road as this is the main road in and out of Rugeley for the village's residents.

Below is a table which shows the estimated figures for our proposed Rugeley parish wards:

Proposed Rugeley Town Council wards				
<i>District council ward</i>	<i>Town council ward</i>	<i>Approximate (current) electors</i>	<i>Number of town councillors</i>	<i>Electors per town councillor</i>
Etching Hill and the Heath	Etching Hill	1,461	2	731
	Springfields	1,557	2	779
	Green Lane with Slitting Mill	3,879	5	776
Western Springs	Western Springs	3,251	5	650
	Hagley	2,008	3	670
Brereton and Ravenhill	Pear Tree Estate	1,307	2	654

Heath Hayes and Wimblebury parish

In our response to the initial consultation, we did not make any proposals for parish wards within the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury parish as we assumed that the existing parish ward boundaries would be retained. However, they have not been retained in the draft recommendations and we

object to the Commission's proposals, particularly the 'Wimblebury' parish ward (labelled E) which covers a much wider area than the area generally regarded as Wimblebury. Wimblebury is a village at the northern end of the wider parish which has a separate, proud identity and we therefore feel that, as it does currently, it should have its own parish ward. The boundary between Heath Hayes and Wimblebury is generally regarded as the point where Wimblebury Road becomes John Street. Therefore, the current Wimblebury parish ward includes Claygate Road and its offshoots but does not include the estate immediately to the south (Brisbane Way and its offshoots). We therefore propose that this continues to be used as the boundary for the Wimblebury parish ward.

The remainder of our proposed Heath Hayes and Wimblebury district ward which is located in this parish would then form a larger parish ward simple called 'Heath Hayes'. This boundary would include the older, original part of Heath Hayes village, as well as some newer additions such as the Brisbane Way estate and Fremantle Drive.

In terms of the Hawks Green area, we would propose that it be split into two parish wards, as it is currently, as one parish ward covering the whole area would be too large compared to the Heath Hayes and Wimblebury parish wards. We suggest that the most recognisable and clear boundary within Hawks Green is the Hayes Way district road, so we propose that this road be used to split the area into 'Hawks Green North' and 'Hawks Green South' parish wards. We propose that the boundary deviates north, away from Hayes Way towards its western end in order to avoid splitting Wrens Croft and Robins Croft, two roads which were built at the same time and form part of the newest section of the Hawks Green area.

In order to illustrate our proposals for the Brereton and Ravenhill, Rugeley and Heath Hayes and Wimblebury parishes, we have created a map which can be viewed [here](#).