

Date of issue: 23rd September 2011

MEETING:	COUNCIL
	To All Members of Slough Borough Council
DATE AND TIME:	THURSDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 2011 AT 7.00 PM
VENUE:	COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, BATH ROAD, SLOUGH
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER: (for all enquiries)	CATHERINE MEEK 01753 875011

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

The following Papers have been added to the agenda for the above meeting:-

Item 6 – Appendix A – Slough Borough Council Submission on Warding Arrangements - was not available for publication with the rest of the agenda.

PART 1

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>REPORT TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>WARD</u>
6.	Electoral Matters - Local Government Boundary Commission Electoral Review, Polling District and Polling Place Review and Parliamentary Constituency Boundary Review	1 - 20	All;

This page is intentionally left blank

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SLOUGH

**SLOUGH BOROUGH
COUNCIL SUBMISSION
ON WARDING
ARRANGEMENTS**

SEPTEMBER 2011

INTRODUCTION

Electoral Review

- 1 The Council was advised at its meeting on the 21st February 2011 that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) intended to carry out an electoral review of Slough Borough.
- 2 The aim of the review, which is based on statutory criteria, is to provide for good, or improved, levels of electoral representation across the Borough. This means ensuring that, as nearly as possible, each Councillor within a specific local authority ward represents the same number of electors as his or her colleagues. The LGBCE had identified Slough as having a high number of wards (36%) with electorates more than 10% from the mean size.
- 3 This aim is balanced with the need to reflect community identity and provide for convenient and effective local government.

Council Size

- 4 The Council size (number of Members) is the starting point in any electoral review as it determines the average number of electors per councillor to be achieved across all wards. The Council established a working group comprising the Group Leaders supported by key officers to consider the review criteria and make recommendations to the Council in April 2011 on proposals for Council size.
- 5 At its meeting on 19th April 2011 the Council agreed a Submission to the LGBCE recommending a Council size of 42 elected members.
- 6 The Commission considered the Submission and informed the Council that it had agreed to recommend a Council size of 42 members for Slough. In reaching this decision the Commission

'noted that the representational pressures created by Slough's increasingly complex communities were significant and were satisfied that any reduction in Council size would be detrimental to the council's ability to meet the expectations of the diverse communities it represented. Given this, and to reflect the fact that the Council elects by thirds, 42 Councillors is considered the most appropriate size for the Council'
- 7 The next stage of the Review commenced formally on 4th July 2011 with an invitation from the LGBCE to all interested parties to submit proposals for new wards based on a Council size of 42 members. The consultation runs until 4th October 2011.
- 8 The Council at its meeting on 26th July established a cross party working group to develop warding arrangements for the Borough and make recommendations to the Council at its meeting on 29th September.

- 9 This submission sets out proposals for warding arrangements based on the Commission's proposed council size of 42 elected members.

Warding Arrangements

Statutory Criteria

- 10 The three statutory criteria to be considered when developing Warding arrangements are:

Equality of representation

- The optimum number of electors per councillor is determined once the council size has been reached (see above).
- The LGBCE will then seek to ensure that each councillor in the authority represents as close as possible to the same number of electors, by setting the boundaries of wards or by changing the number of councillors in any ward. The Council's recommendations to the LGBCE should therefore seek to make warding proposals that give a ratio as close to this optimum level as possible.
- The LGBCE will only recommend wards that do not provide a good level of electoral representation if they are satisfied, based on good evidence provided during the review, that such recommendations present the most effective way of meeting the other statutory criteria.

Reflecting community identities and interests

- Community identity is hard to define as it means different things to different people. It is therefore essential that if the case is made on the basis of 'community identity', that the LGBCE are told what and where the community is and, more importantly, what defines it and marks it out as a separately identifiable community.
- For some, community identity could be defined by the location of public facilities such as doctors' surgeries, hospitals, residents' associations, libraries or schools.
- An area's history and tradition may be the basis of its sense of community identity. However, communities are constantly evolving over time and historical considerations may not have such importance in areas which have been subject to recent development or population dispersal.
- Major roads could be seen to be the focus of an area if they are the location of shops or community facilities which people visit regularly. Alternatively, major roads, rivers or railway lines could be seen as physical barriers marking the boundary between different communities.

Providing for convenient and effective local government

- This is the fundamental consideration at the start of the review when the decision is made about council size, but is often overlooked as a consideration when making proposals on warding arrangements.

- The impact of proposals on individual councillors needs to be considered, as a ward may be so large in terms of area or electorate that it prevents a councillor from effectively representing the ward.

Developing Warding Arrangements for Slough Borough Council

- 11 The Working Group has met on several occasions and has considered a number of differing warding proposals. Working Group members have sought to reach a solution that accords to the Commission's statutory criteria and has the support of the majority of the Council Members.
- 12 When gathering and considering information the Working Group has had regard to the Commission's 'technical guidance' and the statutory criteria detailed above with an overall aim in establishing a pattern of wards that achieves good electoral equality, reflects community identity and interests and provides for effective and convenient local government. The working group has also sought to use easily-identifiable boundaries when deciding where ward boundaries should be drawn and to ensure that the pattern of wards means that everyone's vote in Slough is of equal value regardless of where they live.
- 13 The Working Party approached the review with an objective to seek cross party support for the proposals and, whilst having regard to the Statutory criteria to retain as many of the existing ward boundaries as possible. The working group identified natural barriers such as major roads that acted as boundaries between communities and, using their knowledge of the communities within the town, proposed warding arrangements that would deliver electoral equality and reflect the community identities and interests of the town. Given the overriding requirement of electoral equality and the aim for all electors to have the same opportunity to vote for local councillors the Working Group have developed a scheme of 14 Wards each with three Councillors. With a projected electorate in 2017 of 95382 and with a Council size of 42 this gives a target of 6813 voters per ward with each councillor representing 2271 voters.
- 14 The attached table provides an explanation for how these warding arrangements have been developed. It also provides the evidence and rationale for how the proposed warding arrangements reflect community identities and interests, by highlighting local amenities and facilities that may be either a focal point or natural break between communities, the history and tradition of individual areas which may be the basis of their sense of community identity and any natural or man-made physical barriers that mark the boundary between different communities.
- 15 A map of the proposed new ward boundaries map is attached at Appendix A. This map shows the total electorate per ward and the percentage variance refers to the forecast electorate for 2017.

Ward Name	Number of Councillors	Forecast electorate 2017	% Electoral Variance in 2017	Evidence and Rationale that the proposals meet the three statutory criteria
Haymill	3	6615	-3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Northborough estate is a distinct area of Haymill, located at its extreme west, and having a greater association with Britwell than the community west of the Haymill valley ('the Millie'). The proposed boundary change moves this estate from Haymill to Britwell. • A small estate of new flats and houses - in a defined area of Bath Road and a new road called Eaton Avenue, both west of the slip road to the M4 at Junction 7 – join the ward from Cippenham Green. In design style and location these properties have more in common with the Haymill flats north of Bath Road than they do with the Cippenham settlement to the east. The M4 slip road is such a physical divide that these properties are effectively 'detached' from Cippenham. This change also 'unites' Huntercombe Lane North with the small section of Huntercombe Lane South to the south of the A4 Bath Road. • A group of roads isolated from the rest of Britwell by the Lynch Hill Valley also join the ward. This change 'unites' Haymill Road and Whittaker Road, and takes in properties whose focus is more towards Burnham Lane and Burnham than to Britwell. All the properties south of long Furlong Drive included in this change are also not within the Britwell Parish area, making them further distinct from much of the rest of Britwell.
Britwell and Northborough	3	6918	+1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On its current boundaries, Britwell ward is 'too small' by several hundred electors. The proposed new boundaries almost completely keep intact the original 1950s London County Council-built estate, leaving the vast bulk of the Britwell ward unchanged. • One clearly-defined housing estate, the Northborough estate, is added in its entirety. This estate abuts Kennedy Park and Northborough residents use many of Britwell's shops and facilities as their closest

				<p>amenities. The Park is also the site of a planned new shopping parade in a regeneration scheme designed to link Britwell and Northborough. The Northborough Housing is also separate in style and design, and to a degree, geography, from the rest of Haymill ward – and this boundary change simply consolidates the Northborough estate’s existing associations with Britwell.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lynch Hill Valley isolates a small group of roads in the extreme west of Britwell from the rest of the ‘Britwell estate’. Most of these roads sit outside the Parish Council area as well. These residents look as much towards Burnham for their shopping facilities and amenities (like much of the existing Haymill ward) as they do Britwell. The properties facing on to Lynch Hill Lane are left in Britwell, to keep Lynch Hill Lane itself ‘unified’ and because the incline of the Hill detaches Lynch Hill itself from the roads to the rear – Newport Road and Stratford Close whose main entrance is from Long Furlong Drive, after the Lynch Hill Valley. This boundary does not follow that of the Parish, which has no obvious boundary as it currently divides roads in this area. The proposed new boundary also unites Haymill Road and Whittaker Road, which are roads arbitrarily ‘split’ across the two wards on the existing boundary for purely numeric reasons.
Farnham	3	6788	-0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The residential properties in Farnham ward remain virtually unchanged on the new boundaries as the ward has the right sized population. • One minor ‘tweak’ moves/restores 20 properties in Oatlands Drive into Baylis and Stoke ward, to ‘unite’ this road, by using the back gardens of Oatlands Drive properties as the proposed boundary, rather than the road frontage. These properties were placed in Farnham ward in 2004, as a consequence of a change designed to ‘unite’ Belfast Avenue into Farnham. But the entrance to Oatlands Drive effectively ‘marks’ the boundary between Farnham ward and Baylis & Stoke, so it is more logical that the boundary runs along their rear gardens than the frontage.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farnham ward is extended to include the arterial routes of the trading estate into the ward in full; creating tidier boundaries with the Britwell & Northborough and Haymill wards, but no residential properties are involved in this change.
Baylis and Stoke	3	6686	-1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baylis and Stoke has approximately 1,000 electors 'too many' on the current boundaries. The proposed change keeps Baylis and Stoke ward largely intact, simply detaching a group of roads that are geographically separated from the rest of the ward by Baylis Park, and which 'front on' to Stoke Poges Lane, as far as the junction with Elliman Avenue. The proposal joins them with the properties on the other side of Elliman Avenue in the proposed new 'Elliman' ward, as Stoke Poges Lane is a stronger focus for this group of roads than the rest of Baylis and Stoke to the North and west. Baylis Landmarks like the Park itself, and Baylis House, all remain in Baylis and Stoke ward
Elliman	3	6861	+0.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the wards in central Slough have populations substantially above the size of Slough's remaining wards (Chalvey, Central, Wexham, Baylis & Stoke). The new Elliman ward groups together a settled community of electors from central Slough coming from adjacent Polling Districts in these wards. The Polling Districts of CA and CB from the existing Central ward are joined with the Borderside area (NC) immediately to the north (an area that was in Central ward until 2004). The group of roads fronting Stoke Poges Lane in Baylis & Stoke's AB Polling District are united with the roads of Polling District CA that are their immediate neighbours to the east and which also front Stoke Poges Lane. The group of roads from the extreme north of the current Chalvey ward (a self-contained section of DC polling district) – sandwiched between Stoke Poges Lane to the west and the arc of the railway line to the east

				<p>also join the ward, as they also front Stoke Poges Lane and are detached from the rest of Chalvey by Salt Hill Park and the A4 road, as well as being separated from Chalvey by large commercial/office buildings fostering a greater identity with residential dwelling on the northern side of the railway, accessed by the Stoke Poges Lane railway crossing bridge, to which these residential properties are adjacent. Hence why this area is proposed to straddle the mainline due to these special circumstances, something which has been avoided elsewhere. This area only became part of Chalvey in the 2004 boundary changes and prior to that was in the same ward as the roads to the north. This community has no real identification with Chalvey – and would not naturally describe themselves as living there, as they are firmly on the edge of the town centre, like much of the rest of the Elliman community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elliman Avenue and James Elliman school are landmarks in the centre of this new ward (Elliman Avenue being the arterial road through the middle of the ward), and James Elliman was a substantial benefactor to Slough – leaving bequests of land in central Slough for public use; hence the proposed name of the new ward. • Littledown Road and some of the properties fronting Stoke Road north of the railway are drawn out of the ward on the proposed new boundaries, as their ‘face’, focus and identification is more to the Stoke Road and the properties opposite to the east, than it is to the roads to the rear in the west. This change keeps the new ward’s population closer to the electoral average for Slough’s new wards.
Wexham Lea	3	6840	+0.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the current boundaries Wexham Lea ward’s population is too large. • The proposed new boundary removes Polling District NC - Borderside and the group of roads off it (as well as a small number of properties fronting the western side of Wexham Road). These roads are already physically detached from the rest of the ward, as the middle of Wexham Road is the western boundary line below and above this group of streets.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Borderside area only became part of Wexham Lea ward in the 2004 boundary changes and these roads are outside the parished area of Wexham Court Parish to the east. • The rest of the ward remains on its current boundaries
Langley St Mary's	3	6868	+0.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Langley St Mary's current Polling Districts of K,KA, and KB are all preserved intact (except some minor change to the western boundary of 'K' to more strongly assert the rear of the St Mary's houses at Gilmore Close and Locke Gardens and the start of Langley Road as the 'entrance' to Langley St Mary's. This affects no residential property, but moves the land for an expected small residential development off Dolphin Road into Upton, as it can only be accessed from Dolphin Road if/when it occurs). • The 1930s housing along most of Langley Road is in design and style like that of St Mary's and Upton, and distinct from the Trelawney London County Council estate to the rear. The proposed Change draws Langley Road's southern side into Langley St Mary's from the western edge of the Trelawney estate, to the end of the road. This has the virtue of 'reuniting' more of Langley Road into one ward, and marks out the boundary two distinct neighbourhoods (the Trelawney estate and the 1930s 'St Mary's area of Langley) more effectively. • The southern side of Willoughby Road is reunited into St Mary's with the northern half of the road already within it on the current boundary – as this rather arbitrary split only occurred in 2004. Willoughby Road is older and much narrower than Burroway and Kennet Road (where the boundary is also the middle of the Road) – so it is more logical to keep both sides of Willoughby road together as the physical boundary of the 'middle of the street' is far less strong here. • The road immediately below Willoughby Road, Elmhurst Road is - like Willoughby - an older 1880s/1890s road historically part of the 'Langley village'. It is more logical to reunite this with Willoughby Road into St Mary's ward than to put it into the Langley South ward, which consists

				<p>almost exclusively of 1950s and 1960 residential expansion. Including Elmhurst Road into St Mary's also creates a more linear boundary, extending from the rear gardens of properties at Langley Road eastwards through the open space at Langley Memorial Ground and behind the rear gardens of Elmhurst Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The changes to St Mary's ward are minimal, drawing back into the ward areas that were within it until 2004 and reuniting full roads that were divided along their centre line only by previous boundary changes.
Colnbrook and Langley East	3	6597	-3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing Colnbrook with Poyle wards 3 polling districts remain intact, however having been SBC's only two member ward, requires additional electors to bring the size closer to other wards in the town. The distinct self-contained community of the new Langley Woods residential development and Ditton Road, physically isolated from the rest of Langley by Ditton Park and the physical divide of the London Road A4, join the ward from Foxborough. The 'Blunden Drive' estate is also a self-contained development (on the old IVECO plant site), accessed only from Sutton Lane (the southern section of which is already in Colnbrook) and as there is a strong physical divide between this and the rest of Langley, this area also joins the ward from Foxborough, joining together all the communities 'fronting' Sutton lane. The roads of Foxborough's GC Polling District that do not front Langley High Street, but are accessed off Parlaunt Road to the south, also join the ward. This is a self-contained development of chalet bungalows/houses, somewhat separated from the community around Langley High Street to which they back on; and which is accessed from Parlaunt Road to the south. This change keeps the residential community around Parlaunt Road together and brings the Colnbrook and Langley East ward up to the required electorate size.
Langley South	3	7140	+4.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The changes here keep the entire London County Council 'Trelawney' estate preserved in a single ward.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trelawney estate is united with the two residential estates of Foxborough that are accessed from Langley High Street, which is the main focus of this ward in terms of amenities. • If asked, residents of this entire area would claim to live in 'Langley', whilst knowing they do not live in 'St Mary's' – so the new ward has the virtue of joining up this population in a recognisable and defined area. • Excluded from the ward are the JC Polling District of the old Kedermister ward, and the group of roads around Langley Broom, not within the London County Council and which can only be accessed from London Road to the South, making them physically divided from the residential estate above them. • The roads to the west of Trelawney Avenue (Lynwood Avenue, Hempson Avenue, Rambler Lane etc); the western tip of the old JB Polling District, identify as much with Upton as with Langley – as they are distinct from the red-brick 1950s housing of the Trelawney estate to their east, and were (in the main) built at the same time as the roads of Upton to the South). Their focus and access is also from London Road, on the opposite side to the properties of Upton which they face directly - these roads leave the old Kedermister ward to join Upton. • Although this ward is sized at the top of the tolerance at +4.8%, housing figures to 2017 indicate that the number of electors in this area will reduce over time, bringing it closer to the target number of electors.
Upton	3	6577	-3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upton's M, MC, MD polling districts are retained intact. • Polling District JC joins them from Kedermister, reuniting Marlborough Road and linking up the settled community of 1930s housing that identifies itself with Upton into the ward. • The similar-style 1930s housing from JB Polling District, also facing and accessed from London Road (and in the main indentifying itself as Upton) also joins the ward, along with roads like Kaywood Close that can only be accessed from London Road at this location. • Amanda Court and a small number of houses on the southern side of

				<p>Langley Road join the ward from Kedermister, as all the area geographically to the south joins Upton. The eastern end of Amanda Court is a clear physical divide on Langley Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Langley Broom, Fieldhurst, The Briars and Haynes Close are isolated from the residential community to the north and are accessed only from London Road at the easterly tip of Upton. They join Upton ward on the proposed boundary. • These changes join up the communities either side of London Road, which runs the length of the ward – and now includes in Upton more electors who already perceive that that is where they live. • The parts of MA and MB located within the ‘town centre’ leave Upton to join Central – as the double-width roads of Yew Tree Road and Uxbridge Road are a very strong physical/geographical boundary here, between central Slough and the residential suburb of Upton/Castleview. • The Myrke remains in Upton ward, as it is physically detached from the rest of MA Polling District and strongly identifies with the Upton suburban area as its nearest tie of community. • The northern side of Sussex Place joins Upton, uniting it with the Southern side which is in the ward already. Dolphin Road and Hawtrey Close are separated from Central to the north by the railway and from the town centre by the double-width of Uxbridge Road. These roads also join the ward as their identification is with their neighbours to the south in Sussex Place and the westerly section of London Road. • Upton ward remains slightly below the average electorate size, because of the imminence with which later phases of new residential development at Castleview are expected to join the ward (beyond the modest housing calculation already included), adding approximately 200-300 further electors to the ward when the development is completed.
Central	3	6809	-0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central ward’s population is the largest in Slough and nearly 1,500 electors too large on the current boundaries. Changes across the Langley wards, which are nearly all ‘too small’ also make Central the

				<p>focus for quite extensive revision as this is where the town grows in 'depth' north to south.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC and CD Polling Districts remain intact within the new ward, along with the densely populated Goodman Park housing estate. • The Polling Districts of CA (except Littledown Rd and some houses physically on the Stoke Rd) and CB move into the new Elliman ward to the north and east – to return 'Central' to covering the area identifiable as the town centre. • The western edge of the town centre bounded by the arc of the Windsor railway line joins the ward from Chalvey; as the railway and A4 physically and geographically divide this area from the rest of Chalvey on the ground. This mixed site of residential, retail and the current site of the University of West London is associated more closely with the Heart of Slough regeneration sector than with the residential areas of Chalvey. Electors here identify themselves with the town centre primarily. • The town centre sections of MA (everything except The Myrke, which is located on a quite isolated section of the Datchet Road) and MB (all roads west of Yew Tree and Uxbridge Road, which are a strong physical divide here) Polling Districts join the ward from Upton, to unite the entire community around the town centre and its amenities into one ward. • Due to the solidity of the physical boundary as the 'edge' of the town centre at Uxbridge Road below the railway, Dolphin Road and Hawtrey Close (which are the 'gateway' to Langley/Upton here) leave Central to join with Upton ward, this change unites Sussex Place into one ward; the division of which was an anomaly of earlier boundary changes. • Much new housing is expected in the 'Heart of Slough' development over the coming years. These boundary changes contain most of this within Central ward, but precise numbers are hard to predict as none of the residential phase of the Heart of Slough has detailed planning permission and development is likely to be market-dependent.
--	--	--	--	--

Chalvey	3	6804	-0.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chalvey ward's population is too large on the current boundaries. • Two areas of the current DC polling district are removed, as this is a somewhat artificial construct, divided in two as it is by Salt Hill Park and being separated from the rest of Chalvey by commercial/office buildings and from surrounding areas by the A4 and railway link. The self-contained group of roads at Salt Hill (all fronting on to Farnham Road but divided from the area further north by the railway bridge) join with Cippenham Meadows immediately to their south. The area around Lansdowne Avenue, contained by Stoke Poges Lane and the railway line moves to the new Elliman ward, as many of its roads front Stoke Poges Lane also. • The large, recent, residential development at Windmill Road, and the area of Salt Hill Park, itself remain in Chalvey as they 'face it' immediately to the south, whereas the raised area of mainline railway to the north is a strong physical divide at this location, leaving these roads separated from the community to the north. • Chalvey's D, DA and DB Polling Districts remain entirely intact, but Chalvey Grove (part of the historic Chalvey settlement of the 1880s) and the roads accessible from it move from Cippenham Meadows to Chalvey. This area was built prior to the Windsor Meadows estate, and is distinct from it, and is more connected to Chalvey High Street (its primary access point, as the A355 is elevated above the roads and pedestrian ways here) than to the Windsor Meadows estate to its west.
Cippenham Meadows	3	7082	+3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cippenham Meadows has too large a population on its current boundaries. • The boundary changes keep the entire 'Harvest Meadows/Eton Fields' estate intact within the ward. The community around Weekes Drive, Keel Drive and Cranbourne Road are also preserved in full within the ward, along with the southern phase of the Windsor Meadows estate east of the Asda store, around Telford Drive.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ward loses to Chalvey ward, the large road of Chalvey Grove and all the roads which enter onto it. Chalvey Grove was part of the original Chalvey Village and it and all the roads onto it were in Chalvey ward until the 2004 boundary changes. They are all accessed from Chalvey High Street, where it joins Keel Drive, and therefore this group of roads are geographically somewhat detached from the rest of Cippenham Meadows community. • The stream north of Concorde Way and Griffin Close is a physical boundary, and is used to form the new boundary between Cippenham Meadows and Chalvey. This stream also separates the group of roads moving to Cippenham Green – as described in the Cippenham Green notes. • Cippenham Meadows gains from Chalvey the area of ‘Salt Hill’ – a group of four large roads between the A4 and the railway line, all fronting on to Farnham Road before the road rises up over the railway line at its bridge. The area also includes Thirkelby Close, off the Bath Road; the last road before a large section of trading estate to the west. This community is quite distinct – it does not identify itself as ‘Chalvey’; being far more of a gateway between Chalvey, Cippenham and the Farnham area over the bridge. It is logical to include these roads in Cippenham Meadows, as they are connected to Cranbourne Road and Cranbourne Close, which they face, in Cippenham Meadows to the south.
Cippenham Green	3	6809	-0.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cippenham Green’s population is ‘too small’ on its current boundaries. The boundary between Cippenham Village and the large new ‘Harvest Meadows/Eton Fields’ housing estate to the south of Cippenham Village Green is very distinct – so this boundary has been left entirely intact. • The stream crossing Richards Way is the current physical boundary here, and is distinct on the ground, so the proposed change follows the course of stream eastwards south of Gladstone Way and across Telford

				<p>Drive to take in the group of roads to the north from the older 1980s-built 'Windsor Meadows' estate. These properties surround the two historic barns and Cippenham Lodge, all of which are landmarks of Cippenham Village more than being connected to the dormitory housing southwards. The boundary runs northwards behind Adam Close, Telford drive and Bruce Close to return to Cippenham Lane. Hardy Close, Gladstone Way, Wade Drive, Bennetts Close, Raleigh Close and this section of Telford Drive were all also in the original Cippenham ward prior to the 2004 boundary review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backing onto Westgate School, Oakfield Avenue and Twinches Lane are isolated from the rest of the Cippenham Meadows community to the south and the Twinches Lane retail park is a clearer physical divide on the ground than the current Westgate playing Field (as Westgate school is effectively a 'Cippenham Green' place maker. As a result these roads are drawn into Cippenham Green. • A small estate of new flats and houses - in a defined area of Bath Road and a new road called Eaton Avenue, both west of the slip road to the M4 at Junction 7 – leave Cippenham Green to join Haymill ward. In design style and location these properties have more in common with the Haymill flats north of Bath Road than they do with the Cippenham settlement to the east. The M4 slip road is such a physical divide that these properties are effectively 'detached' from Cippenham. This change also 'unites' Huntercombe Lane North with the small section of Huntercombe Lane South to the south of the A4 Bath Road. • The northern Boundary of Cippenham Green is moved north, from being the A4 to becoming the railway line, from Dover Road to Cippenham Green's eastern tip. This change simply 'joins up' the area of Slough Trading Estate south of the railway. It is designed to 'tidy' the boundary of Cippenham Green with Haymill and Farnham wards, and spread any future developable areas more evenly between Slough's wards, as a small proportion of this land may come forward for future residential or mixed development in later years.
--	--	--	--	---

Consultation


- 16 The Working Group has shared its proposals with the wider Council membership. Once the Working Group had decided on its first draft set of proposals it consulted via political groups, so that Councillors who were not on the Working Group were able to comment on the proposals first-hand, leading to a number of revisions over a period of weeks. This exercise received a favourable response from most councillors, comments from which were used to facilitate further deliberations by the Working Group. Publicity has been given to the Electoral Review via the Council's website
- 17 Throughout the process there has been a significant measure of cross-party support for the approach within the Council and Members and Officers have worked collectively to secure a practical and acceptable solution.

Conclusion

- 18 This submission has been prepared following consideration of the Commission's statutory criteria. The principles and guidance on these criteria have been extensively reviewed and considered by the Working Group with supportive reasoning and evidence contained within this submission. There has been regard to sense of community when considering ward names and the names suggested have tried to reflect the locality of the ward and the associated history and strong ties that exist within the community. This submission presents the case for the recommended Warding arrangements for Slough Borough Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Map showing Revised Working Group Proposal for Wards



Legend

Slough Borough Boundary

Recommended Ward Boundary

6597 Forecast Electorate 2017

Department of Resources and Regeneration
 St. Martins Place,
 51, Bath Road,
 Slough, SL1 3UF

Slough Borough Council

www.slough.gov.uk

Scale mts
 plot date 21.09.2011

Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown Copyright and database right 2011. Ordnance Survey Licence No. 100019446.

This page is intentionally left blank