

Cheshire East

Personal Details:

Name: Mr Kenneth Edwards

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Cheshire East Councillor Bollington Ward (Representative of parish/town council)

Comment text:

Related subject: Proposed Bollington and Rainow Ward and the area of Macclesfield

Current Borough Councillors of Bollington Ward strongly support the Boundary Commission's proposals for the new ward of Bollington and Rainow as part of the complex rewarding of the Macclesfield Area as opposed to the proposals of Cheshire East. We support Bollington Town Council's position because the LGBS's proposal for the new Ward includes the whole of Bollington Town Council's administrative area with those of Pott Shrigley and Rainow as well as supporting through the loss of the Parish of Higher Hurdsfield the rewarding of Macclesfield proposed by the Commission.

Attached Documents:

- local-government-boundary-commission-2024-submission-(5.docx

Local Government Boundary Commission

Review of Cheshire East Ward Boundaries November 2024

Review Response from Borough Councillors for the Bollington Ward Cheshire East Council.

Cllrs. Ken Edwards and John Place

Introduction

Consideration of the Local Government Boundary Commission recommendation for the new Ward of Bollington and Rainow in preparation for the elections to Cheshire East Council in 2027

The Boundary Commission recommends the current Bollington Ward which includes the Parishes of Bollington and Higher Hurdsfield should lose Higher Hurdsfield Parish to Macclesfield Hurdsfield Ward and be configured to include the adjacent Parishes of Rainow and Pott Shrigley. The name of the new Ward is proposed as Bollington and Rainow reflecting the larger populations of those two Wards.

Main Request: Please ensure whatever arrangements are finally decided on, the Civil Parish of Bollington, governed locally by Bollington Town Council is wholly contained within the Bollington and Rainow Ward to ensure effective and understandable governance for all the residents of Bollington Civil Parish.

If the Bollington and Rainow Ward is to be created as a Ward of Cheshire East Council then all three lower tier authorities within that Ward, Bollington Town, Rainow Parish and the Parish of Pott Shrigley in their entirety should be in that Ward.

The current proposals of the Local Boundary Commission fulfil that request and are therefore strongly supported.

The current Borough Councillors representing the Bollington Ward accept the logic of this position. Bollington is designated as a Local Service Centre in the Cheshire East Local Plan. Nevertheless, a variety of stores, restaurants, pubs, and medical, dental, leisure and cultural services plus household repair services are available to local communities near Bollington like Pott Shrigley and Rainow, as well as clubs and societies and cultural activities organised by the Bollington Arts Centre.

All these services are conveniently available to Bollington Parish residents to the south of the Silk road.

Links with proposed Parishes Rainow and Pott Shrigley

Pott Shrigley has very good road connections with Bollington whereas Rainow's connections are solely on rural roads.

We understand Rainow Parish Council has opposed the new warding. However, there is a former history of local government links with the previous Cheshire County Council Warding and a strong natural geographical connection through the shared valley of the River Dean and its tributaries. The Dean valley was the cradle of the industrial revolution in this area from the 1780's and the shared responsibility for Kerridge Ridge and the iconic monument of White Nancy, visible throughout the new Ward gives a natural unity to the Ward belied by the transport system.

We also note the strong social and economic connection of the area through walkers in this part of the Peak District. The new ward will be a walkers paradise stretching from Kerridge to Shining Tor.

The current Borough Councillors therefore believe that there are more than sufficient natural, economic and social links within the three separate communities to ensure coherent governance from the point of view of Cheshire East.

We understand that Rainow Parish wishes to remain within a rural Ward. We can only say that a significant part of the Bollington Settlement Area is already in Rainow Parish so we share significant concerns over housing development, particularly in Ingersley Vale where we have a joint interest in the redevelopment of a significant brown field site with planning permission for 66 houses. Those houses, if built, will rely on Bollington for all their services as their only exit and access to the A523 which connects Bollington with Macclesfield and rail to London and Manchester Airport will be on to Church Street in the heart of the Bollington Conservation Area, and out through Bollington on the B5090.

We refer to the recent Community Governance Review of 2021/22 when BTC wrote to Rainow Parish Council.

‘We write to you regarding the Review being carried out currently into Community Governance by Cheshire East Borough Council.

We would like to propose extending the border of Bollington Administrative Parish to recognise the extended Settlement Area of our Town into Ingersley Vale along recognised boundaries to be agreed that exist on the ground.

The basic reason is that all dwellings in Ingersley Vale will, of necessity, use Bollington’s services. The only vehicle access and egress is through the length of Bollington so all the impact of resident’s use of roads and local facilities, leisure facilities, medical facilities and schools will be with our community.’

Rainow Parish Council refused to consider the proposal but could not deny that the connections of the lower Dean Valley with Bollington were much stronger than with Rainow Village.

We have cooperated recently very positively over establishing Mill Lane as a scheduled by way, providing all the information necessary for the designation to be made. The Bollington Civic society collected the necessary information regarding use of this lane on the border between the two Parishes and processed the results to get the Lane designated.

Rainow has a proud industrial history, as has Bollington. We are sure we can build very positive relationships with Rainow Parish Council and our successors will be very happy in representing their interests. There may well be residents in Rainow interested in standing for election to Cheshire East in 2027.

Similarly with Pott Shrigley Parish. Virtually all traffic exiting Pott Shrigley goes through Bollington. The small Pott Shrigley School is sustained by pupils from Bollington and in the past has been federated with St. Johns C of E Primary School in Bollington. Pott Shrigley’s famous film shows, ‘Flix in the Sticks,’ are strongly supported both organisationally, and in terms of audience attendance from Bollington.

The Bollington Ward Borough councillors therefore strongly support the creation of the three Parish Ward noting that large areas of Bollington Parish are rural in nature and are farmed locally and the South Manchester Green Belt that sweeps over parts of Rainow and Pott Shrigley tightly binds the urban area of the Bollington Parish.

The south western border: Bollington and the Macclesfield Tytherington Wards

It is this Parish Border that has become contentious due to the Borough of Cheshire East , presumably for its own convenience rather than any direct interest in the Parish of Bollington, wishing to move it north to the Silk Road thus dividing Bollington into two sections contrary to the decision in the recent Community Governance Review in 2021-22.

Borough Councillors checked with residents at the time whether they saw themselves as part of Bollington or Macclesfield and the overwhelming majority that expressed a preference wanted to stay in Bollington.

The LGBC has recommended that a section of the very large Parish of Macclesfield governed locally by Macclesfield Town Council, an additional portion of the Springwood Estate, is included as a transfer from the Tytherington Macclesfield Ward into the proposed Bollington and Rainow Ward.

Although Bollington Ward Borough Councillors would prefer the new Ward Boundary to follow the current Parish Border we understand clearly that for electoral equality purposes the LGBC regards including the whole of the Springwood Estate within the new Ward Boundary achieves two important aims of Bollington Town Council as well as improving electoral equality.

1. First and foremost, the whole of the current Bollington Parish is within the new Bollington Ward and Neighbourhood Plan Area and
2. Secondly there would be an opportunity to consider in a later Community Governance Review the possibility of a small adjustment from the current Parish Border to the border proposed by the LGBC.

The building of the Tytherington Business Park and associated Housing took no account of Parish Boundaries or the needs of local government and built over the Bollington Parish Boundary in a small number of places.

During the recent Community Governance Review Bollington Town Council suggested a very limited border modification to correct these anomalies but Cheshire East Borough Council refused to consider these minor changes.

Frankly BTC believes they left the anomalies in order to have an argument for cutting back the Bollington Parish Boundary to the Silk Road as part of the LGBC CE ward boundary Review as in fact they have done in their proposal.

Comments on the overall LGBC's proposals for Macclesfield Warding

It is clear from the Boundary Commission's description of the electoral warding pattern proposed for Macclesfield that what is required is for the Parish of Higher Hurdsfield to be transferred from the current Bollington Ward to join with Macclesfield Hurdsfield Ward. That significant transfer changing the nature of Bollington Ward is an integral part of the complex considerations surrounding warding within Macclesfield.

Para 125 of the LGBC Review states: Bollington & Rainow, Gawsorth and Sutton

'To conclude, we are recommending the Bollington and Rainow Ward as proposed by the Council and the Liberal Democrats, with a modification as a result of warding arrangements in north-east Macclesfield which we addressed in the Macclesfield Tytherington section.'

The current Bollington Ward Borough councillors note that the loss of Higher Hurdsfield to be transferred into Macclesfield Hurdsfield Ward from Bollington Ward would on its own produce a Ward incapable of electoral equality. Macclesfield Hurdsfield means that the arrangements in

Macclesfield propose to change the representation for the Tytherington Ward from 2 Councillors to 1. This change arises from the need to readjust the size of the Tytherington Ward as sections of the Ward in Macclesfield (Bollinbrook) are more strongly linked from a community point of view to Broken Cross and Upton Ward. Paras 106 and 107 describe the LGBC's thinking.

We agree strongly with the proposal that the northern part of the current Tytherington Ward (the Springwood Estate should be included in the Bollington Ward. This will help to reduce the electoral inequality experienced in the Tytherington Ward and will also produce a better match for electoral equality for the Bollington and Rainow Ward of -3% by 2030.

Moreover, in the longer term the resolution of the anomalies in Bollington's Border with Macclesfield Town Boundary can be overcome by a further Community Governance Review settling the Parish Boundary between Macclesfield and Bollington along the proposed Cheshire East Ward line. This is a more natural based line recognising the integrity of the current Bollington Neighbourhood Plan Area accepted by Cheshire East Council when the plan was created in 2018 and in its recently presented review of 2024. We understand neither Tytherington as a ward, or Macclesfield as a Town Council, has a Neighbourhood Plan therefore such a change would not affect their future administrative and planning objectives in the same way that dividing Bollington Parish would as Cheshire East Council seems to want to do.

We realise that this proposal does create a small area of the Springwood Estate that will remain in the Parish of Macclesfield yet be in the Bollington and Rainow Ward. But since this arrangement preserves the whole community and Neighbourhood Plan Area of Bollington within the Bollington and Rainow Ward we strongly support the Boundary Commission proposal. As we note above this can be adjusted in the future through a Community Governance Review.

We refer back to the Community Governance Review of 2021-22 when Cheshire East proposed that the Parish of Bollington border should be the Silk Road.

Bollington Town Council argued three reasons why this would be inappropriate.

1. Community cohesion. Referenced by the Local Government Boundary Commission.
2. The Silk road was a means of access to Macclesfield and Manchester for Bollington Residents on either side of the road and NOT a barrier. Indeed given that the dual carriageway stops at Bollington it could be said the road was built to provide necessary improved access for Bollington residents who live on both sides of the road to Macclesfield and the railway station.
3. The Silk Road was clearly not a barrier as there was a daily bus route across it, there was a roundabout for ease of vehicle access, there was a pedestrian controlled crossing with a refuge to allow all to cross safely and there was a raised footway across it carrying the Middlewood Way. And finally during every school day young people of secondary school age use these crossings to walk to their secondary school in Tytherington.

During intense discussions resulting from the recent Community Governance Review in 2021 Cheshire East Council accepted this situation as described and changed their proposals for the Bollington Parish border to retain the integrity of the Parish.

It has been a great disappointment to the Borough Councillors that Cheshire East Council has produced Warding proposals that fail to recognise the integrity of the Bollington Town Neighbourhood Plan and Administrative area that they represent and once again propose the Silk

Road as a border for the Cheshire East Ward ignoring the Bollington Parish Boundary and proposing to divide Bollington Parish once again.

This would mean that part of Bollington Parish would be represented by the Borough Councillors from Tytherington.

There is a perception of basic unfairness when two rural parishes are included in their entirety in a newly created Ward called Bollington and Rainow yet the main core parish is proposed to be split in two for no good reason.

We note that the broad submission from the Macclesfield Labour Party that is supported by the Local Government Boundary Commission relating to Warding in Macclesfield is also supportive of this Ward Boundary on the northern Border of the Tytherington Ward recognising the whole of the Springwood Estate being in Bollington and Rainow Ward.

We accept that the political management of this area is a little complicated. And would ask the Boundary Commission to consider creating the Springwood Estate area of the proposed Bollington and Rainow Ward as a polling district.

The Springwood Estate would sit comfortably electorally within the West Ward of Bollington Town Council. This situation can only be settled by a Community Governance Review.

With the proposals before us. The Springwood Estate sits with its northern portion in Bollington Parish and with its southern half within Macclesfield Parish.

Therefore, we would suggest a polling district for the Springwood Estate should be created to manage a single electoral register for Cheshire East elections and a double register for Town/ Parish elections.

Though we accept the suggestion of the Local Government Boundary Commission that to simplify electoral arrangements the Springwood Ward for Macclesfield Town would be created and be represented for Cheshire East purposes as part of the Bollington and Rainow Ward by the two Councillors elected for that Ward.

Conclusion

So on the grounds of basic electoral equality, community cohesion, and good governance the Borough Councillors currently representing Bollington strongly support the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposals for the Bollington and Rainow Ward to be introduced for the proposed rewording in Bollington Ward in 2027.

Further critical comments on Cheshire East Council narrative

1. Cheshire East Council writes:

A key limitation with each of these three potential boundary lines – the Commission's recommended one, the local Labour Party's and the Council's submitted proposal – is that they require the creation of a new parish ward with very few electors. This is because each one would split an existing parish ward (Bollington West in the case of the Council's proposal, and Macclesfield Tytherington in the case of the Boundary Commission's proposals.

Cheshire East Council quotes a limitation on the Boundary Commission's powers set out in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act of 2009 .

“Borough wards have to consist of whole parishes or parish wards” the affected current parish ward would have to be subdivided along the new Borough ward boundary line Tytherington in the case of the others) between two Borough wards.”

This restriction does exist in Schedule 2 of the Act but only in relation to County and District Councils not in relation to Unitary Authorities and Parishes/Towns.

Therefore Bollington Ward Councillors dispute this analysis with regard to the Commission’s proposals.

1. If the current Bollington and Rainow Ward boundary is extended to include the whole of the Springwood Estate Then the Boundary Commission could recommend the Tytherington Town ward is reduced in size and West Ward in Bollington is extended to include the whole of the Springwood Estate. Any variation of electors that are out of step within the three Bollington Wards can be adjusted at the next Community Governance Review as they were at the last one.
2. The Macclesfield Tytherington Town Ward would remain the same as the Commission’s proposals elsewhere along the Macclesfield Tytherington Ward Boundary propose change.
3. The Boundary Commission could recommend a change in the Town Boundaries between Macclesfield and Bollington in the interests of good governance or recommend such changes to a future Local Governance Review.
4. The Local Government And Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 Chap 1 6A appears to give power to the Boundary Commission to recommend Parish/Town boundary changes to the Secretary of State(see later please?)
5. Otherwise electors in the area of the Springwood Estate not currently in the Bollington Parish would be represented by the Town councillor for Tytherington on Macclesfield Town Council

Relevant Figures of Electors (taken from CE’s submitted papers to Committee)

Electors for the Bollington and Rainow Ward if the boundary between those Wards is as per the Council’s submission(the Silk road) but the other boundaries of their Wards follow the Commissions show the poorest electoral variations for a Tytherington Councillor. Recommendations and therefore the Commissions recommendations need to be followed.

	Seats(S)	Electors(E) 2023	Ratio E/C	Electors 2030	RationE/C
Bollington and Rainow Ward	2	7447	3724	7596	3798
Macclesfield/Tytherington Ward	1	5002	5002	4966	4966

Now the key Ratios here are the variations from the Cheshire East Average per ward of electors to Councillors. Cheshire East’s own figures show that the variations in 2023 and 2030 for the Bollington and Rainow Ward are -3% and -8%. These are within the Commissions parameters of +or- 10%.

But the variations for Macclesfield Tytherington Ward are +30% and +21% and these are way outside the parameters acceptable to the Boundary Commission.

These figures clearly illustrate that if the carefully worked out Warding Macclesfield set out by the Boundary Commission is applied as is supported by this submission then the Silk Road boundary for the Bollington and Rainow Ward does not only split the Bollington Parish but comes nowhere near satisfying the Commission requirements for electoral variation.

Equality of representation for electors is one of the prime motivations for Ward boundary review.

Therefore in order to maintain electoral equality adjustments need to be made.

The Macclesfield Labour Party's proposals improve proportions somewhat:

Macclesfield Tytherington's come down to 2023 +27% and in 2030 +13%

The Boundary Commissions proposals improve the situation again:

Macclesfield Tytherington's come down to 2023 +21% and 2030 +12%

With these proposals Bollington and Rainow Wards variations are:

2023 +2% and 2030 -3% and well within the Boundary Commissions parameters.

Justification for support of the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposals

Bollington Ward Borough Councillors recognise the difficulties of reconciling a large positive variation of electors to Councillors in the Tytherington Ward.

But would make the following points:

1. The ward is very homogenous in terms of housing, income and education as the ward profile shows with lower than average unemployment and lower than average 3 bedroomed house because the residents enjoy much higher than average 4 bedroomed houses. There is well below average deprivation.
2. The Ward covers a relatively small area. Residents are close together compared to many Cheshire East Rural Wards.

Therefore, although in theory there is more work for a Councillor to do given the number of electors, the problems that are likely to face residents are much more limited and the time taken covering the Ward area much less than many other wards.

Conclusion

Taking an overall view therefore which means taking a view that includes the solution proposed by the Commission to Macclesfield's need to reduce Councillors from 12 to 11 we strongly support the Boundary Commission's proposals and accept that the Boundary between Macclesfield Tytherington Ward and the Bollington and Rainow Ward should be agreed as proposed to include the whole of the Southwood Estate as the Boundary Commission recommends.

We regard this as beneficial to the Bollington and Rainow Ward through including all three current parishes within one ward, Bollington. Rainow and Pott Shrigley.

A border for the Ward has been described which follows a clearly defined highway.

The electoral ratios have been organised reasonably with little variation from the average in Bollington and Rainow's case and a larger than normal ratio in Tytherington's case but given the nature of the Ward we believe the representational duties will be more than sustainable because of the very homogenous nature of the Ward. There are no Parish councils within it for example. Unlike the Bollington and Rainow Ward where three

communities live with populations of 8000. 1250 and 220, all with their challenges and strong sense of identity plus relations with the Peak Park Authority and the Canal and Rivers Trust to consider, as we have in the Bollington and Rainow Ward.

Finally, the electors residing in the Springwood Estate will be in the Bollington and Rainow Ward for Borough Council Elections.

For Parish Electors residents in the Springwood Estate will partly be in Bollington West Ward as they are at present and can vote in the Community Centre in Bollington if they do not have a postal vote. We are sure most will be persuaded in that direction as it is generally convenient.

For Parish electors in the Macclesfield Tytherington Ward their arrangements do not need to change. They can vote with other Macclesfield Tytherington voters or take advantage of postal voting.

It will need a little ingenuity possibly on the part of Cheshire East to manage that for electors.

Cheshire East Council has referred in a note to supposed legislative restrictions but the restrictions apply in the case of County Councils and Districts there is no reference we could find in relation to Unitary Authorities. Therefore, the restriction is null and void and the local government Boundary Commission is not bound by reference to this legislation which is copied below. Schedule 2 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009

The relevant legislation is:

65 Electoral changes consequential on boundary change in England

(1)Chapter 1 of Part 1 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (structural and boundary change) is amended as follows.

(2)In section 8 (review of local government areas) after subsection (6) insert—

“(6A)Where under subsection (2) the Local Government Boundary Commission recommend that a boundary change should be made in relation to any local government area, the Commission must recommend to the Secretary of State whether, in consequence, a change should be made to—

(a)the electoral arrangements of the area of a local authority;

(b)the electoral arrangements of the area of a parish council.

(6B)In subsection (6A)(a) “electoral arrangements”, in relation to the area of a local authority means—

(a)the total number of members of the local authority (“councillors”);

(b)the number and boundaries of electoral areas for the purposes of the election of councillors;

- (c) the number of councillors to be returned by any electoral area in that area; and
- (d) the name of any electoral area.

The legislation has been modified by:

6D) Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 applies in relation to the making of recommendations under subsection (6A).

Modifications etc. (not altering text)

C1 Sch. 2 applied by 2007 c. 28, s. 8(6D) (as inserted (1.4.2010) by [Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 \(c. 20\)](#), ss. 65(2), 148(3)(b); S.I. 2009/3318, art. 4(l))

County councils

1(1) This paragraph applies where the Local Government Boundary Commission for England makes recommendations under section 56 in relation to the electoral arrangements for the area of a county council.

(2) The recommendations must secure the following results—

- (a) an electoral area of the county council must not fall partly inside and partly outside any district,
- (b) every ward of a parish having a parish council (whether separate or common) must lie wholly within a single electoral area of the county council, and
- (c) every parish which is not divided into parish wards must lie wholly within a single electoral area of the county council.

(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (2), in making the recommendations the Local Government Boundary Commission for England must have regard to—

- (a) the need to secure that the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of members of the county council to be elected is, as nearly as possible, the same in every electoral area of the council,
- (b) the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities and in particular—
 - (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable, and
 - (ii) the desirability of not breaking local ties when fixing boundaries,
- (c) the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and

(d)the boundaries of the electoral areas of any district council whose area is within the area of the county council.

(4)For the purpose of sub-paragraph (3)(a) the Local Government Boundary Commission for England must have regard to any change in the number or distribution of local government electors in the area of the county council which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the making of the recommendations.

Commencement Information

11Sch. 2 para. 1 in force at 1.4.2010 by [S.I. 2009/3318](#), art. 4(ee)

Prepared by Cllr. Ken Edwards

Cheshire East Councillor

Bollington Ward

Checked and agreed by:

John Place

Cheshire East Councillor

Bollington Ward

Date 08/12/24