

Bradford

Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: N/A (Member of the public)

Comment text:

Related subject: Division of Bingley ward

I oppose the proposal. Having read the Baildon Council document on which this proposal is based, it has clearly successfully and emotively argued that Baildon is fine as they are, thanks ("a self-contained community"), but their proposal has also drawn a Sykes-Picot line that splits the town of Bingley in half.

The rejection of the first draft hangs on placement of the village of Eldwick, which it is argued 'has no community of interest' with Baildon, and is geographically separated from Baildon ("over a mile of a single narrow moorland road").

Well, as one of the ~2,000 residents of Bingley that would be electorally divided from the rest of the town under the new proposal, I also would point out that I have no community of interest with the villages of Harden, Wilsden, Cullingworth &c, from which I am also separated by at least a mile of single narrow road (it's steep too).

The currently convenient ward title of 'Bingley Rural' belies the fact that most of this area is not Bingley at all. The proposed ward of Bingley West seems to use that category mistake to justify placing a number of Bingley town residents in a predominantly rural ward with very different concerns and interests from their own.

This proposal might satisfy the first of its three statutory criteria ("secure equality of representation"), but it certainly does satisfy the latter two: the identity and interests of Bingley town residents are being disregarded; whilst dividing the town of Bingley this way cannot be sensibly considered a

"strong and long-standing" solution.

I should hope that the LGBCE reconsiders this avoidable mistake.

Attached Documents:

None attached