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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 We the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales (the Commission) are undertaking a review of community boundaries in the City and County of Swansea as directed by the Minister for Social Justice and Local Government in his Direction to us dated 19 December 2007 (Appendix 1).

1.2 The purpose of the review is to consider whether, in the interests of effective and convenient local government, the Commission should propose changes to the present community boundaries. The review is being conducted under the provisions of Section 56(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 (the Act).

1.3 Section 60 of the Act lays down procedural guidelines, which are to be followed in carrying out a review. In line with that guidance we wrote on 9 January 2008 to all of the Community Councils in the City and County of Swansea, the Member of Parliament for the local constituency, the Assembly Members for the area and other interested parties to inform them of our intention to conduct the review and to request their preliminary views by 14 March 2008.

1.4 In response to our initial invitation we received a number of representations which were considered carefully before publishing our Draft Proposals on 30 September 2008. We asked interested parties to submit their comments on our Draft Proposals by 5 December 2008.

1.5 In response to our Draft Proposals we received a number of representations that made suggestions for changes to community boundaries which were not considered at Draft Proposals stage. As we considered that some of these suggested changes had merit and as they had not been included in our Draft Proposals report, we considered it appropriate to issue this further report so as to allow interested parties an opportunity to comment on these proposals.

1.6 In this Further Draft Proposals report we only make reference to those representations we have received in respect of our Draft Proposals report that have either suggested changes to boundaries between communities not previously considered. All other representations we received in response to our Draft Proposals will be considered along with the representations made in response to this report when we consider our Final Proposals.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 We propose that:

- the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard be realigned to follow the green line as shown on the maps at Appendices 4 and 5; and
- the boundary between the Communities of Castle and Landore be realigned to follow the green line as shown on the map at Appendix 5.

3. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

3.1 In respect of new suggestions for boundary changes we received representations from Swansea City and County Council; Clydach Community Council; Mawr Community Council; and Councillor Keith Marsh (Bishopston Electoral Division,
Swansea City and County Council. We considered all of these representations carefully before we formulated our proposals. Details of all of these representations can be found at Appendix 2.

4. ASSESSMENT

4.1 We have considered suggested changes to community and community ward boundaries in the following areas: Birchgrove, Bishopston, Castle, Clydach, Landore, Llangyfelach, Mawr, Mumbles, Pennard and Pontardulais.

Bishopston and Mumbles

4.2 Councillor Marsh suggested a change to the boundary between the Community of Mumbles and the Community of Bishopston such that the whole of Caswell Bay is transferred into Bishopston. This would effectively include three shops on the sea front and the concrete bus shelter within Bishopston. A possible amendment to the boundary was investigated (map at Appendix 3) but in parts was found not to follow clearly topographical features and was not an improvement, in these terms, to the existing boundary. We noted that the suggested change does not involve the transfer of electors. We are of the view, from the information that we have, that such a realignment of the boundary would not be desirable in terms of the interests of effective and convenient local government and consider that the existing boundary should be retained.

Bishopston and Pennard

4.3 Councillor Marsh suggested a change to move a property together with adjoining buildings from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston. He suggests that this area has a community of interest with Bishopston rather than Pennard and that access to the properties is through Bishopston. We undertook a site visit to the area and found that the proposed boundary was clearly defined and confirmed that access to the properties involved was through the Community of Bishopston. We consider therefore a change to the boundary between the Bishopston ward of the Community of Bishopston and the Kittle ward of the Community of Pennard to be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government and propose the change shown on the map at Appendix 4.

4.4 Councillor Marsh also suggested a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard so as to include two residences on the beach within the Community of Bishopston as he considered access to the properties is through that community. Although Councillor Marsh mentioned Cliff Cottage from what we are able to determine the two cottages that can be considered to be ‘on the beach’ at Pwlldu Bay are Ship Cottage and Beaufort House. Having investigated the area it appears to us that road access to these properties is via Bishopston although this is not clearly seen on the map (Appendix 5). We consider the access issue indicates that the area including the two properties has greater ties with the Community of Bishopston than the Community of Pennard. The nature of the topography in the area has proved difficult in respect of defining an alternative boundary that includes the two properties within Bishopston. Following a site visit to the area, we have defined a boundary that, as far as possible, follows identifiable features but we would welcome any suggestions for improvement. We consider the change to the boundary between the Bishopston ward of the Community of Bishopston and the Southgate ward of the Community of Pennard to be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government and propose the change shown on the map at Appendix 5.
Castle and Landore

4.5 Swansea City and County Council suggested a transfer a number of properties at Pentre from the Community of Castle into the Community of Landore. We undertook a site visit to the area and found that the proposed boundary was clearly defined and was an improvement in terms of access to the properties involved which was mainly through the Community of Landore. We consider therefore that a change to the boundary between the Communities of Castle and Landore to be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government and propose the change shown on the map at Appendix 6.

Clydach

4.6 Clydach Community Council suggested that the area of Baran Carnllechart, Gellionnen be transferred into their Community. We had difficulty in locating this area from the description given. We suspect that Baran Carnllechart, Gellionnen is within the County Borough of Neath Port Talbot and any change in this area would require a review of the boundary between the City and County of Swansea and the County Borough of Neath Port which is outside the remit of this current review. It is open to Clydach Community Council to provide more particulars by way of representations on this draft proposals report, if they wish to consider the matter further.

Mawr and Llangyfelach

4.7 Mawr Community Council suggested the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach be realigned along the M4 / Llangyfelach Road as shown on the map at Appendix 7. The Council consider that the M4 acts as a boundary between the areas to the north and south of it. We have noted however that there are good road links between the two areas crossing either below or above the motorway. We considered that such a change to the boundary would involve the transfer of a substantial area of the Community of Llangyfelach into the Community of Mawr and that the area in involved was of a similar nature to areas in the Community of Llangyfelach to the south of the motorway. It does not appear to us that the residents of the area to the north of the motorway have closer ties with the Community of Mawr than they do with the remainder of the Community of Llangyfelach. We do not consider that the suggested change would be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore make no proposals at this stage for a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach.

Mawr and Pontardulais

4.8 Mawr Community Council also suggested that the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Pontardulais be realigned to transfer the area of Cwm Dulais from the Community of Pontardulais into the Community of Mawr. The Community Council did not provide us with an alternative boundary and we were unable to determine from their representation the area they thought should be transferred. A map showing the Cwm Dulais area is at Appendix 8. It appears to us that the area of Cwm Dulais is of a similar rural nature to adjacent areas of Pontardulais to the north and south. Cwm Dulais is also closer to settlements in Pontardulais than any similar area in Mawr. From a detailed study of maps of the area it appears to us that the properties in the Cwm Dulais area that are currently within the Community of Pontardulais are all accessed through Pontardulais. Having considered the evidence available to us we do not consider that the suggested
change would be desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore make no proposals at this stage for a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Pontardulais.

5. PROPOSALS

5.1 Having considered the evidence available to us at this stage of our review we propose that the boundaries of the Communities of Bishopston, Castle, Landore and Pennard should be realigned to follow the boundaries shown in green on the maps at Appendices 4, 5 and 6.

5.2 Detailed maps to a larger scale showing the proposed new boundaries can be inspected at the offices of Swansea City and County Council and at the office of the Commission in Cardiff.

5.3 This report details our draft proposals for change to the community boundaries in the City and County of Swansea and we would welcome comments on the proposals.

6. CONSEQUENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 In considering the various changes to the community boundaries it was also necessary for us to take account of the consequential effects on the electoral arrangements for community councils and the principal authority, which would result from these changes. This section of our report details our proposals for consequential changes to the electoral arrangements. We would also welcome comments on this aspect of our report. The electoral statistics used in this report were provided by Swansea City and County Council.

Community Council Electoral Arrangements

6.2 The Communities of Castle and Landore do not have a community council. There are therefore no consequential changes to be considered as a result of our proposals in respect of these Communities.

6.3 The Community of Bishopston is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Bishopston and Murton. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>E/C*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishopston</td>
<td>Bishopston</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murton</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E/C – electors per councillor

6.4 Under our proposals the Bishopston Ward will increase by 5 to 1,623 electors (4 from the Kittle ward of Pennard and 1 from the Southgate ward of Pennard. We do not consider that the proposed increase in electors would require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>E/C*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishopston</td>
<td>Bishopston</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murton</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E/C – electors per councillor
6.5 The Community of Pennard is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Kittle and Southgate. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>E/C*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennard</td>
<td>Kittle</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E/C – electors per councillor

6.6 Under our proposals the Kittle Ward will decrease by 4 electors to 550 and the Southgate Ward will decrease by 1 elector to 1,738. We do not consider that the proposed increase in electors would require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>E/C*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennard</td>
<td>Kittle</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E/C – electors per councillor

County Borough Council Electoral Arrangements

6.14 The Bishopston electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Bishopston currently, has 2,787 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Bishopston would see an increase in the number of electors in the Bishopston electoral division to 2,792.

6.15 The Castle electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Castle currently, has 10,875 electors represented by 4 councillors. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Castle would see a fall in the number of electors in the Castle electoral division to 10,748.

6.16 The Landore electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Landore currently has 4,731 electors represented by 2 councillors. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Landore would see a rise in the number of electors in the Landore electoral division to 4,858.

6.17 The Pennard electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Pennard currently, has 2,293 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Pennard would see a fall in the number of electors in the Pennard electoral division to 2,288.

6.18 We are of the view that for all of the above electoral divisions the changes to the number of electors as a consequence of the proposed boundary changes are not so significant as, at this time, to require either an increase or a decrease in the number of councillors representing each electoral division. We noted that within the next few years we are due to conduct a review of the electoral arrangements for all of principal councils in Wales and at that time we will look in detail at the electoral arrangements for the City and County of Swansea Council and will take into account any changes that arise from these proposed changes to community boundaries.
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

7.1 We wish to express our gratitude Swansea City and County Council and the Community Councils for their assistance and to all persons and bodies who made representations to us.

8. RESPONSES TO THIS REPORT

8.1 All observations on this draft report should be sent to:

   The Secretary
   Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales
   Caradog House
   1-6 St Andrews Place
   Cardiff  CF10 3BE

not later than 4 September 2009.

9. THE NEXT STEPS

9.1 When we have considered the comments made to us in response to this draft report we shall submit our recommendations to the Welsh Assembly Government in the form of a report and proposals. It will then fall to the Welsh Assembly Government, if it thinks fit, to implement our recommendations either with or without modifications.
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MR J BADER (Member)
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THE WELSH MINISTERS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 PART IV

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES
(REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES) (CITY AND COUNTY OF
SWANSEA) DIRECTION 2007

The Welsh Ministers give the following Direction to the Local
Government Boundary Commission for Wales in exercise of the powers
conferred upon the Secretary of State by section 56 of the Local
Government Act 1972 (1) which powers are now exercisable by the Welsh
Ministers (2):

1. In this Direction:

"the Act" ("y Ddoddf") means the Local Government Act 1972;

"the Commission" ("y Comisiwn") means the Local Government
Boundary Commission for Wales.

2. Pursuant to section 56(1) of the Act, the Welsh Ministers direct
the Commission to conduct a review of the community
boundaries in the City and County of Swansea for the purpose of
considering whether or not to make such proposals in relation to
the areas reviewed as are authorised by section 54 of the Act and
what proposals, if any, to make; and the Commission must, if they
think fit, formulate such proposals accordingly.

Dr Brian Gibbons

Minister for Social Justice and Local Government

Date: 19/12/2007

(1) 1972 c.70; section 56 was amended by the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994

(2) See the National Assembly for Wales (Transfer of Functions) Order 1999 (S.I. 1999/672)
which transferred the functions of the Secretary of State to the National Assembly for Wales.
The functions of the Assembly were subsequently transferred to the Welsh Ministers by
Summary of Representations Received in Response to the Draft Proposals

Please note that these representations are those that have either suggested changes to boundaries between communities not previously considered or that make suggestions for substantial amendments to a previously considered proposal. The remaining representations we received in response to our Draft Proposals will be summarised in our Final Proposals report.

The City and County of Swansea Council proposed that the properties 189 – 195 and 209 – 215 Llangyfelach Road, 1 – 10 Hafod Park, 39 – 75 Pentremawr Road, 1 – 10 St. John’s House and 43 – 64 Odo Street be transferred from the Community of Castle into the Community of Landore.

Clydach Community Council considered that the area of Baran Carnllechart, Gellionnen should be transferred into their Community as their footpath policy would benefit this area.

Mawr Community Council considered that the area to the north of the M4 at Llangyfelach Road should be included within the Community of Mawr as the M4 acted as a natural boundary. The Council considers that the area only includes a few farms the residents of which have a feeling of rootlessness in respect of community representation. In respect of the Cwm Dulais area the Council argues that the few farms and residencies in that area are accessed from the highway leading from Felindre to Garnswllt and should be included in the Community of Mawr. They are of the view that those residents use the school in Felindre and attend functions in Felindre and Garnswllt and have more in common both geographically and culturally with Mawr.

Cllr Keith Marsh (Bishopston Electoral Division, Swansea City and County Council) made three proposals for minor changes to the boundary of the Community of Bishopston. These were:

- The boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard be moved westwards so as to include two residences on the beach (Cliff Cottage) within the Community of Bishopston as access to the properties is through that Community;
- The boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard be moved so as to include the kennels at Barlands Common within the Community of Bishopston as access to the kennels is through that Community; and
- The boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Mumbles be moved so as to include the whole of Caswell Bay including the 3 shops within the Community of Bishopston.