

I am submitting the following representation on behalf of the Tunbridge Wells Liberal Democrat Council Group. In formulating our proposals we have kept three objectives in mind: 1) saving council resources by reducing the number of polling districts where possible 2) making the task of officials in polling stations as straightforward as possible by reducing the number of polling places shared by multiple wards 3) recognising that rural areas as geographically dispersed and that polling places will often need to be provided in each village, even if small. All of our proposals are designed to achieve at least one of these three objectives.

We have also suggested alternative names for a few polling districts, which we feel better reflect the nature of the areas.

Cranbrook, Sissinghurst and Frittenden:

We agree with the proposals laid out in the report.

Culverden:

BA: must remain as is, given KCC Division Boundaries

BB, BC, BD: Could be combined into two polling districts, with the border running down Culverden Down and Molyneux Park Road. The BB polling place could remain as is for the westerly district and either the BC or BD polling place could serve for the easterly district.

BE, BF: Could be combined into a single polling district, as they are both part of the KCC TW South Division. Ideally this polling district would use the Linden Park CC Pavillion for its polling place.

The new polling districts formed out of BB, BC and BD should be renamed Culverden East and Culverden West

BE should be renamed Culverden South

Goudhurst, Lamberhurst and Horsmonden:

We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

Hawkhurst, Sandhurst and Benenden:

We feel that the polling districts should follow the Parish Council boundaries

DA, DB: Given the current close proximity of the polling places, we feel that these two polling districts could be merged. The Polling place would likely be in Beneden, which we believe is the larger of the two settlements.

DC, DD: Given the current close proximity of the polling places, we feel that these two polling districts could be merged. The polling place would likely be in Hawkhurst.

DE: We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

High Brooms:

We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

Paddock Wood:

We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

Pantiles:

GA: We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

GB, GC: We believe that these two polling districts are close enough together and of a reasonable size to be combined, perhaps with some of GC going into GD to create a clearer border and rebalance the sizes, possibly along Broadwater Lane and Broadwater Rise. The polling place for this revised polling district should be at Number One Community Centre

GD: Largely we think this should remain as proposed, perhaps with the alteration we have suggested above to the western border, which is currently very irregular

Park:

HA, HB, HC: We believe this area could be more effectively divided into two polling districts, with Calverley Road and Bayhall road marking the border between them. The northern most of these polling districts could use the Salvation Army as its polling place and the lower could use Claremont school.

HD: We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

Pembury and Capel

We believe that polling districts JC and JD could be combined into a single district, with the polling place somewhere central in Pembury. The other polling places should remain as is, given the rural nature of the rest of the ward and the changes to Paddock Wood.

A more appropriate polling place should be found for the JE polling district, long term.

JA polling district should be called Five Oak Green, as this is where the majority of the housing in this polling district is.

Rusthall and Speldhurst:

KA, KB: We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

KC, KD: We believe that these two polling districts could be combined, so that Rusthall parish is served by one PD, in the same way as the other two parishes in the ward are. The polling place could be at either of the two existing polling locations, given how close together they are to each other and the centre of the village.

Sherwood:

We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

Southborough and Bidborough:

We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report.

St James':

NA, NB: We agree with the proposals as laid out in the report, given that they sit in different KCC Divisions.

NC, ND: We believe that these two polling districts could be effectively combined. The polling place could be at the Hub (G&H park is generally accessible from most of the ward) or alternatively, if use can be obtained, the Sea Cadets Centre on Albion Road would be ideally placed for the whole of the proposed PD.

St John's:

We believe this ward could be covered by a single polling district, with the polling place at St Luke's Church Hall. As well as saving costs by reducing the number of polling stations, it would also avoid the complication of having two wards using the same polling place, as is currently the case at St John's Church.