

# Bradford

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Matt Edwards  
**Email:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** Green Party Group (Political groups)

## Comment text:

Please find attached to this email Bradford District Green Party's submission to the additional consultation.

## Attached Documents:

- green-submission---local-government-boundary-commission---further-consultation---bradford.pdf

# Local Government Boundary Commission for England review of Bradford District

## **GREEN PARTY SUBMISSION**

1. Throughout this submission, we have sought to review 'Further Draft Recommendations - July 2024' put forward by Local Government Boundary Commission.
2. We have assessed the proposals against the considerations outlined in paragraph 4 of that draft.
  - Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.
  - Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.
  - Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.
3. In each section, we have scored the proposals by the three statutory objectives of the boundary review.

## Baildon, Bingley and Shipley

Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.	Partial
Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.	No
Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.	No

4. We feel that the proposals for Baildon, Bingley and in the 'Further Draft Recommendations' provide a significantly worse reflection of community identity.
5. The most contentious aspect of this proposal stems from the adaptation of Baildon Town Council's recommendation that Lower Baildon be moved from Shipley into Baildon Ward.
6. Lower Baildon has been in the current Shipley Ward since the previous Local Government Boundary review. There have been very few complaints about this (and with Baildon Town Council itself being the principal source of these).
7. Lower Baildon is well connected to Saltaire via footways and roads and that area contains part of the Saltaire World Heritage Site. In many respects, Lower Baildon actually has closer community links with Saltaire and Shipley than it does with Baildon Town Centre itself.

8. Whilst moving the boundary to the River Aire may very slightly better reflect the community identify – it has resulted in proposals that not only fail to reflect community identity elsewhere (particularly in Bingley).
9. As such the decision to make an (arguably minor) improvement to the representation of Lower Baildon has resulted in a significant worse proposal for the towns of Shipley and Bingley.
10. The worst consequence of moving Lower Baildon into Baildon Ward has meant that part (the South and Central areas) of Cottingley will sit in Shipley Ward. The northernmost areas of Cottingley would sit within Bingley West. As with our comments regarding splitting Bierley in the first consultation, we strongly oppose this arbitrary division a settlement when an alternative arrangement is viable.
11. There are very few community links between Cottingley and the Shipley settlement. Cottingley is much more closely linked to Bingley and sits within the area served by Bingley Town Council.
12. In addition to this, the effective splitting of Bingley Town Centre between two wards will mean some residents of Bingley will not be represented by the same councillors that represent their town centre.
13. We acknowledge the opposition of moving Eldwick into Baildon, but we are slightly confused by the inconsistency of some of this opposition. On one hand, comments refer to close community links

to Bingley but on the other, there are suggestions (including by the Conservatives who once again propose an unworkable proposal to move Eldwick to Wharfedale) that involve moving Eldwick.

14. The reality of needing to improve electoral equality and equalising the number of electors whom each councillor represents means a change is needed. Whilst there is disagreement as to where Eldwick could move to, this is the area for which there is broad agreement on that would be easiest to move whilst retaining the community identity.
15. Eldwick is a homogeneous community and would remain undivided within one ward. There are indeed strong links between Eldwick and the rest of Bingley Ward, but the same could be said for Cottingley. If one area needs to be moved, then moving the entirety of Eldwick into Baildon ward does less harm – particularly to preserving community links – than moving part of Cottingley.
16. We acknowledge the attempt to balance the proposals against the Commission's three statutory criteria, but we feel the proposals in Further Draft Recommendations do much less to meet the three criteria than the original proposals. As such, we urge the boundary commission to stick with their initial proposals for the Baildon, Bingley and Shipley area.

## Southeast and southwest of Bradford city centre

Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.	Partial
Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.	Yes
Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.	Yes

17. We welcome the analysis of our submission to the first consultation and the acknowledgement that we provided a viable alternative that LGBCE has used as the basis for the second proposal.

18. Whilst we do acknowledge that the proposal isn't perfect, especially in the sense that Bowling & Barkerend Ward is 10% over the variance and the new Wyke Ward is 10% under. However, we feel this is the best possible outcome in balancing the three objectives.

19. The retention of the existing Bowling and Barkerend Ward and the borders of the renamed Tong Street Ward ensure the best balance of Improving electoral equality whilst maintaining community identity.

20. We welcome the acknowledgement of the prominence of the M606 as a border both physically and from a community perspective between Bierley in the East and Wyke in the West.

21. In paragraph 36 of your report, you ask for evidence regarding the viability of moving the Swain Green / Laiserdyke area into Tong Street Ward (whilst also retaining all of Bierley). We strongly oppose this as there is no reasoning within the goals of this review that would justify this.
22. There are very few community ties between the communities South East and North West of the A6177 (Dick Lane / Cutler Heights Lane). This is evidence by the existence of two community centres (The Sutton Centre and The Vine) within relatively close proximity, on either side of the road, servicing their respective communities.
23. Bradford Council's justification for this proposal puts the organisational decision to align its 'Areas' to Westminster Parliamentary Constituencies before the needs of the community and the local identities that exist. The Council could very easily decide to align its areas to the new council ward arrangements (i.e. each area is made up of six wards).
24. In addition to this, the Tong Street Ward is already a ward with high levels of deprivation. The Council's proposal would result in another area with significant challenges from Bowling and Barkerend into Tong Ward. This would make effective local governance even more challenging.
25. We welcome the LGBCE's rejection of the Council's proposal as they fail to address any of the statutory objectives of this review. We hope you decided that the borders between these two wards remains as is proposed.

26. In relation to the boundary between the Royds Ward and the new Wibsey and Odsal ward put forward by LGBCE in paragraph 38, we feel this proposal is an improvement on our proposal. Given the character of Glendale Drive, we welcome a proposal that sees both sides of the road within the same ward as it will better satisfy the objectives of this review.

27. We fully support the LGBCE's proposals for Southeast and southwest of Bradford city centre as put forward in the 'Further Draft Recommendations' document



## Conclusion

28. With regards to the Baildon, Bingley and Shipley area, we have put forward evidence to support the original proposal and argue that the further proposal is less successful in balancing the three statutory objectives.

29. With regards to southeast and southwest of Bradford city centre we strongly support the second proposal (based on our submission to the first proposal).

30. We thank the LGBCE for their thorough review of the ward boundaries and the willingness to take on board feedback.