

## **TAMESIDE ELECTORAL REVIEW**

### **TAMESIDE COUNCIL RESPONSE TO LGBCE DRAFT PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

In June 2019 the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) informed Tameside Council they would be undertaking an electoral review of Tameside. The last such review was concluded in 2004.

At stage one of the review which concluded in January 2021 the LGBCE proposed 57 councillors for Tameside. At the first part of stage 2 a full borough wide ward patterns and ward names proposal was submitted to the LGBCE by Tameside Council. The LGBCE published their draft ward patterns and ward names proposal on 1 June 2021 which triggered ten weeks of public consultation (closing on 9 August 2021).

This report is the Tameside Council response to the LGBCE ward patterns and ward names proposal published on 1 June 2021.

The report is structured as below:

1. Executive summary
2. Approach
3. Denton, Audenshaw and Droylsden (West)
4. Ashton-under-Lyne (North)
5. Dukinfield, Mossley and Stalybridge (East)
6. Hyde and Longdendale (South)
7. Appendix

#### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 Tameside Council notes that the LGBCE ward pattern and names proposal is based in the greater part on the Tameside Council submission. As such Tameside Council broadly supports the proposal outlined by the LGBCE but with some areas of difference where amendments are suggested.

1.2 Tameside Council **supports in full** the LGBCE proposal for the wards listed below.

- Droylsden West
- Denton North East
- Denton South
- Ashton Hurst
- Ashton St. Michael's
- Dukinfield
- Dukinfield Stalybridge
- Mossley
- Longdendale

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

---

1.3 Tameside Council **supports but with minor amendment** as outlined in this report the LGBCE proposal for the wards listed below.

- Droylsden East – with an amendment so the boundary with Audenshaw runs along Williams Lane to the junction with Ashton Hill Lane and does not go round the back of Willow Fold, Fitzroy Street and King Street as proposed by the LGBCE.
- Audenshaw – with an amendment so the boundary with Denton West is drawn through the middle of Audenshaw reservoir as per the Tameside Council submission. The amendment ensures that Denton railway station remains within Denton wards. In addition, an amendment so the boundary with Droylsden East runs along Williams Lane to the junction with Ashton Hill Lane and does not go round the back of Willow Fold, Fitzroy Street and King Street as proposed by the LGBCE.
- Denton West – with an amendment so the boundary with Audenshaw is drawn through the middle of Audenshaw reservoir as per the Tameside Council submission. The amendment ensures that Denton railway station remains within Denton wards. In addition that the name is not changed to ‘Denton West & Dane Bank’, but remains as ‘Denton West’.
- Stalybridge South – with an amendment to the boundary so that St. Raphael’s primary school remains in Stalybridge South and not Stalybridge North as proposed by the LGBCE.
- Stalybridge North – with an amendment to the boundary so that St. Raphael’s primary school remains in Stalybridge South and not Stalybridge North as proposed by the LGBCE.

1.4 Tameside Council **supports but with more substantial amendment** the LGBCE proposal for the following wards and re-iterates the original submission from the council for these areas which provides a better balance of electoral equality, community identity and convenient local government. Further detail is provided in the relevant sections of this report.

- St. Peter’s
- Ashton Waterloo
- Hyde Newton
- Hyde Godley
- Hyde Werneth

1.5 The response from Tameside Council outlined in this report is **supported by both the controlling group (the Labour Party) and the opposition group (the Conservative Party)**.

## **2. APPROACH**

2.1 Tameside Council welcomes the LGBCE proposals in the greater part as they are based significantly on the Tameside Council submission. This response report reviews the differences between the Tameside council submission and the LGBCE proposals and in doing so it notes which of the differences the council supports, and which it does not. Where the council does not support parts of the LGBCE proposals then the original

## ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021

---

Tameside Council submission is re-iterated as the most appropriate approach in those specific areas.

- 2.2 Where Tameside Council doesn't agree with parts of the LGBCE proposal that objection is not a criticism, rather it is an attempt to inform a final plan based on the extensive and detailed on the ground local knowledge the council brings to the process.
- 2.3 It is notable that of the three more substantial areas of difference between the Tameside Council submission and the LGBCE proposal (and where the council asks for amendment) two are on the periphery of town centres – Hyde and Ashton. Community boundaries are often more complex in town centres and areas where communities gather whether that be for employment, retail, health, leisure or public transport to name a few. A task made more difficult in the coronavirus pandemic which prevented the LGBCE making on the ground visits to see the environment and speak to the community, but having to rely on a virtual tour.
- 2.4 The areas where the Tameside Council response asks for an amendment to the LGBCE proposals are based on a genuine belief that they provide a better balance between community identity and electoral equality. In cases where community identity on the ground isn't particularly strong then electoral equality has been prioritised, and vice versa. Electoral forecasts are challenging given it is unclear what the potential impact of the coronavirus pandemic will be on the economy and housing growth. With that in mind Tameside council's approach has been to try to avoid electoral equality greater than +/- 5% (without being at the expense of community identity) to provide some flexibility and future proofing.
- 2.5 Tameside Council's response as outlined in this report has been developed in consultation with all elected members and is supported by both the controlling group (the Labour Party) and the opposition group (the Conservative Party).
- 2.6 Tameside Council's response to the LGBCE proposals is summarised at **Appendix 1** and explained in detail in the following sections.

### **3. DENTON, AUDENSHAW AND DROYLSDEN (WEST)**

- 3.1 Tameside Council supports the proposals for the wards in the west area of the borough with two minor amendments. A boundary amendment regarding Audenshaw reservoir and Denton railway station and the name of the Denton West ward.

#### **Droylsden West**

- 3.2 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Droylsden West ward.

#### **Droylsden East**

- 3.3 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Droylsden East ward with a minor amendment to the boundary. An amendment so the boundary with Audenshaw runs along Williams Lane to the junction with Ashton Hill

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – RESPONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

---

Lane and does not go round the back of Willow Fold, Fitzroy Street and King Street as proposed by the LGBCE. North of the canal, Ashton Hill Lane and Williams Lane is the locally recognised and understood boundary between the towns of Droylsden and Audenshaw.

**Audenshaw**

- 3.4 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Audenshaw ward with two relatively minor exceptions regarding the boundary. The proposed boundary with Denton North East runs the full length of the reservoir along the railway line and then round the bottom of the reservoir site along Manchester Road where it forms the boundary with Denton West. The proposed boundary splits Denton railway station between the Audenshaw ward and the Denton North East ward. Tameside Council would amend the boundary so it is drawn through the middle of the reservoir as per the council submission. The amendment would ensure that Denton railway station is within Denton wards. In addition, an amendment so the boundary with Droylsden East runs along Williams Lane to the junction with Ashton Hill Lane and does not go round the back of Willow Fold, Fitzroy Street and King Street as proposed by the LGBCE. North of the canal, Ashton Hill Lane and Williams Lane is the locally recognised and understood boundary between the towns of Droylsden and Audenshaw.

**Denton North East**

- 3.5 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Denton North East ward.

**Denton South**

- 3.6 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Denton South ward.

**Denton West**

- 3.7 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary proposal for the Denton West ward with a minor amendment. Tameside Council would amend the boundary with the Audenshaw ward so it is drawn through the middle of the reservoir as per the council submission. The amendment would ensure that Denton railway station is within Denton wards.
- 3.8 In addition, the council does not support the proposal to change the name to 'Denton West and Dane Bank', and believes the name should remain as 'Denton West'. While Dane Bank does form a distinct community within the wider ward so do other areas such as the Thornley Park and Shirley Park communities. To highlight one area in the ward name but not others actively prioritises one but excludes the rest whereas a more generic name such as Denton West is more inclusive by its nature.

**4. ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE (NORTH)**

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

4.1 Tameside Council supports the proposals for the wards in the north area but with some more substantial amendments affecting the boundaries of the St. Peter’s ward and the Ashton Waterloo ward. The amendments relate to the ‘St. Peter’s thumb’ area north of the main Manchester to Leeds railway line and currently in the St. Peter’s ward. Tameside Council believes the council submission which split this area between the St. Peter’s ward and the Ashton Waterloo ward provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality. The table below shows the differences in electoral equality between the current wards, the Tameside Council submission and the LGBCE proposal (all at 2026). Electoral equality of +/-9% for both the Ashton Waterloo ward and the St. Peter’s do not make sense given there is no justifying or strong community identity argument. Nor do changes of +7% to -9% (St. Peter’s ward) and -5% to +9% (Ashton Waterloo ward) between the current ward arrangements and the LGBCE proposal (both at 2026). Again, the community identity factors that are used to explain these significant swings from the current position and the poorer electoral equality compared to the Tameside Council submission are not strong.

**Table 1: Comparison of electoral equality in Ashton on 2026**

Ward	Current wards (2026)	Proposed wards (2026)	
		TMBC	LGBCE
St. Peter’s	+7%	-2%	-9%
Ashton Waterloo	-5%	+2%	+9%
Ashton Hurst	-1%	-1%	-3%
Ashton St. Michael’s	-3%	-1%	+1%

4.2 While not making a formal proposal the LGBCE report seeks views on the most appropriate ward for the Alt Hill / Park Bridge area. Currently this area is in the Ashton Waterloo ward in that part of the ward which runs around the north of the Ashton Hurst ward. Neither the Tameside Council submission nor the LGBCE proposal suggests a change to this arrangement. Tameside Council included Alt Hill / Park Bridge in the Ashton Waterloo ward on the basis of community identity. The area is part of the wider Medlock Valley that encompasses Daisy Nook to the west and Park Bridge to the east all of which runs across the north of the Ashton Waterloo ward. Elector numbers are small so electoral equality is not a factor here.

**St. Peter’s**

4.3 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the St. Peter’s ward with an amendment to the area to the north of Ashton town centre (and the Manchester-Leeds railway) which is currently in St. Peter’s. The LGBCE proposal moves this area – aka the ‘St. Peter’s thumb’ - in its entirety into the Ashton Waterloo ward. The submission from Tameside Council only moved part of this area into the Ashton Waterloo ward with the other part remaining in the St. Peter’s ward. Tameside Council would re-iterate this split approach as an amendment to the LGBCE proposal. The current LGBCE proposal for this area and its impact on both the Ashton Waterloo ward and the St. Peter’s ward does not speak well to either community identity or electoral equality.

4.4 On a map the Manchester to Leeds railway line is a distinct physical feature, but to assume this translates into a clear community boundary on the ground is a misread of

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

---

the situation. A line running from the south west to the north east from the Charlestown industrial area to King George V playing fields is a stronger community boundary than the railway line. The area to the north west of that line identifies more with the Ashton Waterloo area. Residents from this primarily residential area access services and networks in the direction of Oldham Road (to the west and part of the Ashton Waterloo ward currently). The more mixed residential and services area to the south east of that line is connected to the town centre via the southern end of Henrietta Street (one of the primary routes over the railway line). In addition to the housing in this area to the south east there also some services such as shops, garages and cafes which form the outer edge of the town centre which is in the St. Peter's ward. As such Tameside Council would amend the LGBCE proposal by keeping the area to the south east in St. Peter's.

- 4.5 Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission for the St. Peter's ward as it provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality whereas the LGBCE proposal is weaker on both counts.

**Ashton Waterloo**

- 4.6 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Ashton Waterloo ward with an amendment to the area to the north of Ashton town centre (and the Manchester-Leeds railway) which is currently in St. Peter's. The LGBCE proposal moves this area – aka the 'St. Peter's thumb' – in its entirety into the Ashton Waterloo ward. The submission from Tameside Council only moved part of this area into the Ashton Waterloo ward with the other part remaining in the St. Peter's ward. Tameside Council would re-iterate this split approach as an amendment to the LGBCE proposal. The current LGBCE proposal for this area and its impact on both the Ashton Waterloo ward and the St. Peter's ward does not speak well to either community identity or electoral equality.

- 4.7 On a map the Manchester to Leeds railway line is a distinct physical feature, but to assume this translates into a clear community boundary on the ground is a misread of the situation. A line running from the south west to the north east from the Charlestown industrial area to King George V playing fields is a stronger community boundary than the railway line. The area to the north west of that line identities more with the Ashton Waterloo area. Residents from this primarily residential area access services and networks in the direction of Oldham Road (to the west and part of the Ashton Waterloo ward currently). The more mixed residential and services area to the south east of that line is connected to the town centre via the southern end of Henrietta Street (one of the primary routes over the railway line). In addition to the housing in this area to the south east there also some services such as shops, garages and cafes which form the outer edge of the town centre which is in the St. Peter's ward. As such Tameside Council would amend the LGBCE proposal by placing the area to the north west in the Ashton Waterloo ward, but not the area to the south east.

- 4.8 Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission for the Ashton Waterloo ward as it provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality whereas the LGBCE proposal is weaker on both counts.

**Ashton St. Michael's**

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

---

- 4.9 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Ashton St. Michael's ward.

**Ashton Hurst**

- 4.10 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Ashton Hurst ward.

**5. DUKINFIELD, MOSSLEY AND STALYBRIDGE (EAST)**

- 5.1 Tameside Council supports the proposals for the wards in the east area of the borough with one minor amendment regarding St. Raphael's primary school.

**Dukinfield**

- 5.2 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Dukinfield ward.

**Dukinfield Stalybridge**

- 5.3 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Dukinfield Stalybridge ward.

**Mossley**

- 5.4 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Mossley ward.

**Stalybridge North**

- 5.5 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Stalybridge North ward with one minor exception regarding the boundary. The proposed boundary places St. Raphael's primary school in Stalybridge North, along with Millbrook primary school on the neighbouring site. Currently, St. Raphael's primary school is in Stalybridge South and Millbrook primary school is in Stalybridge North, an arrangement that works well. Both schools draw pupils from both wards albeit with Millbrook primary school having more pupils from the Stalybridge North ward than St. Raphael's primary school. The pupil roll for St. Raphael's comes from a much wider area than Millbrook primary school, as would be expected with a faith school. Given both schools have links with both wards and communities; relationships are well established between local elected members and the schools; and the existing arrangement works well, Tameside Council does not see a case for change. Tameside Council would prefer the boundary is draw in such a way that St. Raphael's primary school remains in Stalybridge South.

**Stalybridge South**

- 5.6 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Stalybridge South ward with one minor exception regarding the boundary. The proposed boundary places St. Raphael's primary school in Stalybridge North, along

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

with Millbrook primary school on the neighbouring site. Currently, St. Raphael’s primary school is in Stalybridge South and Millbrook primary school is in Stalybridge North, an arrangement that works well. Both schools draw pupils from both wards albeit with Millbrook primary school having more pupils from the Stalybridge North ward than St. Raphael’s primary school. The pupil roll for St. Raphael’s comes from a much wider area than Millbrook primary school, as would be expected with a faith school. Given both schools have links with both wards and communities; relationships are well established between local elected members and the schools; and the existing arrangement works well, Tameside Council does not see a case for change. Tameside Council would prefer the boundary is draw in such a way that St. Raphael’s primary school remains in Stalybridge South.

**6. HYDE AND LONGDENDALE (SOUTH)**

6.1 Tameside Council supports the proposals for the wards in the south area but with some more substantial amendments affecting the boundaries of the three Hyde wards. The amendments relate to the Kingston area and Christy site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews). Tameside Council believes the council submission which placed both these areas in Hyde Godley provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality. The table below shows the differences between the current wards, the Tameside Council submission and the LGBCE proposal (all at 2026). The LGBCE proposal has poorer electoral equality (particularly for Hyde Godley) based on a misunderstanding of community identity. The Tameside Council proposal provided better electoral equality with a greater understanding of community identity. While the identity in one of the areas is not particularly strong in any direction it makes sense then to prioritise equality.

**Table 2: Comparison of electoral equality in Hyde in 2026**

Ward	Current wards (2026)	Proposed wards (2026)	
		TMBC	LGBCE
Hyde Newton	+20%	-2%	+3%
Hyde Godley	+3%	+1%	-9%
Hyde Werneth	-2%	-3%	+3%

6.2 While not making a formal proposal re name changes the LGBCE report seeks views on a change for the Longdendale ward to Hattersley and the Hyde Newton ward, the Hyde Godley ward and the Hyde Werneth ward to Hyde North, Hyde Central and Hyde South respectively. Tameside Council does not support any names changes of this kind.

6.3 While Hattersley has one of the strongest community identities in the borough, and makes up the greater part of the Longdendale ward, a name change is not appropriate. The Longdendale ward also includes the distinct village communities of Mottram, Hollingworth and Broadbottom. A change of ward name to Hattersley would be seen to exclude those villages, whereas the more generic area name of Longdendale is more inclusive and generally understood to include all the communities of the wider



## ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021

---

area. The Hattersley estate as well as the villages of Mottram, Hollingworth and Broadbottom.

- 6.4 The LGBCE proposal report asks for views as to whether the Newton, Godley and Werneth locality suffixes for the Hyde wards adequately reflect the nature of the communities, and in doing so notes a suggestion from a resident for a potential change to North, Central and South. Tameside Council is of the strong view that Newton, Godley and Werneth are the most appropriate names. They are well understood in the community and provide a geographic hook as to the locality of the ward within the wider town of Hyde. Any change to North, Central and South would lack clarity and cause unnecessary and unhelpful confusion in the community.

### **Longdendale**

- 6.5 Tameside Council supports in full the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Longdendale ward. Although the LGBCE report does not propose a name change it does seek views. The council does not support any name change for the reasons outlined in paragraph 6.3 above.

### **Hyde Newton**

- 6.6 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Hyde Newton ward with an amendment to the boundary regarding the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews).
- 6.7 The Tameside Council submission proposed moving three areas alongside the M67 – collectively called the Godley Brook north community – from the Hyde Newton ward to the Hyde Godley ward. Those areas are Christy's (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews); Clarendon and Danby. The LGBCE proposal moves the latter two but keeps the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) within the Hyde Newton ward. Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission which moved all three from the Hyde Newton ward to the Hyde Godley ward on the basis of better community identity and improved electoral equality across the three Hyde wards.
- 6.8 The LGBCE report argues that the M67 and an 'industrial area either side of Clark Way' provides a strong boundary meaning those residents on the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) will identify more with the Hyde Newton ward – i.e. it divides them from the town centre and the Hyde Godley ward. The area either side of Clark Way is relatively small in size and is mixed rather than industrial. It includes car service garages, a restaurant, two small greens and the Grafton Centre one of the largest, if not the largest, community group in Hyde. The area is also the through route to the two access points over the M67 to the bus station and wider town centre. It is the area through which all the Godley Brook north community access the town centre and services such as the bus station, railway station, retail, health and the library. As such it is more a point of interaction rather than division between communities. The current housing on the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) was built quite recently with new units being constructed now. The housing is marketed to the younger age range with families, and in part on the basis of access to the motorway and Hyde town centre. As such these new residents have a focus to the south (Godley) towards services rather than north (Newton) towards existing established residential communities.

## ELECTORAL REVIEW – RESPONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021

---

- 6.9 Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission for the Hyde Newton ward as it provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality (across all the Hyde wards) whereas the LGBCE proposal is weaker on both counts.

### **Hyde Godley**

- 6.10 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Hyde Godley ward with an amendment to the boundary regarding the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) and the Kingston area.
- 6.11 The Tameside Council submission proposed moving three areas alongside the M67 – collectively called the Godley Brook north community – from the Hyde Newton ward to the Hyde Godley ward. Those areas are Christy's (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews); Clarendon and Danby. The LGBCE proposal moves the latter two but keeps the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) within the Hyde Newton ward. Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission which moved all three from the Hyde Newton ward into the Hyde Godley ward on the basis of better community identity and improved electoral equality across the three Hyde wards.
- 6.12 The LGBCE report argues that the M67 and an 'industrial area either side of Clark Way' provides a strong boundary meaning those residents on the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) will identify more with the Hyde Newton ward – i.e. it divides them from the town centre and the Hyde Godley ward. The area either side of Clark Way is relatively small in size and is mixed rather than industrial. It includes car service garages, a restaurant, two small greens and the Grafton Centre one of the largest, if not the largest, community group in Hyde. The area is also the through route to the two access points over the M67 to the bus station and wider town centre. It is the area through which all the Godley Brook north community access the town centre and services such as the bus station, railway station, retail, health and the library. As such it is more a point of interaction rather than division between communities. The current housing on the Christy's site (Carrfield, Bayleyfield and Zorbit Mews) was built quite recently with new units being constructed now. The housing is marketed to the younger age range with families, and in part on the basis of access to the motorway and Hyde town centre. As such these new residents have a focus to the south (Godley) towards services rather than north (Newton) towards existing established residential communities.
- 6.13 With regards to the Kingston area the LGBCE report argues it is better placed in the Hyde Werneth ward due to the presence of a 'particularly strong' potential boundary along the M67. While this is a strong physical boundary it doesn't by consequence give the area of Kingston any particular connection with the Hyde Werneth ward. The M67 is to the north of the Kingston area, whereas the Hyde Werneth ward is the east. The Kingston area has strong physical boundaries on all sides. The M67 to the north, the River Tame and the Tame Valley to both the west and south, and the Peak Forest Canal and the Rosehill to Manchester railway line to the east. It is these physical boundaries on all sides that means while Kingston is considered part of Hyde, it isn't associated specifically with any particular part of Hyde (Newton, Godley or Werneth). With this in mind it makes sense to place Kingston in the most appropriate place that meets the broad community identity of Hyde and provides for better electoral equality. That place being in the Hyde Godley ward.

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

- 6.14 Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission for Hyde Godley as it provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality (across all the Hyde wards) whereas the LGBCE proposal is weaker on both counts.

**Hyde Werneth**

- 6.15 Tameside Council supports the LGBCE boundary and name proposal for the Hyde Werneth ward with an amendment to the boundary regarding the Kingston area.
- 6.16 The LGBCE report argues the Kingston area is better placed in Hyde Werneth due to the presence of a ‘particularly strong’ potential boundary along the M67. The Tameside Council submission kept Kingston in the Hyde Godley where it is currently. While the M67 is a strong physical boundary it doesn’t by consequence give the area of Kingston any particular connection with the Hyde Werneth ward. The M67 is to the north of the Kingston area, whereas the Hyde Werneth ward is the east. The Kingston area has strong physical boundaries on all sides. The M67 to the north, the River Tame and the Tame Valley to both the west and south, and the Peak Forest Canal and the Rosehill to Manchester railway line to the east. It is these physical boundaries on all sides that means while Kingston is considered part of Hyde, it isn’t associated specifically with any particular part of Hyde (Newton, Godley or Werneth). With this in mind it makes sense to place Kingston in the most appropriate place that meets the broad community identity of Hyde and provides for better electoral equality. That place being in the Hyde Godley ward.
- 6.17 Tameside Council re-iterates the council submission for Hyde Werneth as it provides a better balance of community identity and electoral equality (across all the Hyde wards) whereas the LGBCE proposal is weaker on both counts.

**7. APPENDIX**

- 7.1 Summary of the Tameside Council response to the LGBCE proposals.

Ward	Name	Boundary	Notes
Droylsden West	Yes	Yes	-
Droylsden East	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend re Willow Fold, Fitzroy Street and King Street as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).
Audenshaw	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend re Audenshaw Reservoir and Denton Railway station as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021). Boundary: Amend re Willow Fold, Fitzroy Street and King Street as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).
Denton West	No	Amend	Boundary: Amend re Audenshaw Reservoir and Denton Railway station as

**ELECTORAL REVIEW – REPSONSE TO LGBCE PROPOSAL – JULY 2021**

			per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021). Name: Remain as Denton West. Do not add Dane Bank.
Denton South	Yes	Yes	-
Denton North East	Yes	Yes	-
St. Peter's	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend re 'St. Peter's thumb' as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).
Ashton Waterloo	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend re 'St. Peter's thumb' as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).
Ashton Hurst	Yes	Yes	-
Ashton St. Michael's	Yes	Yes	-
Mossley	Yes	Yes	-
Stalybridge North	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend so St. Raphael's primary school is in Stalybridge South.
Stalybridge South	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend so St. Raphael's primary school is in Stalybridge South.
Dukinfield	Yes	Yes	-
Dukinfield Stalybridge	Yes	Yes	-
Longdendale	Yes	Yes	Name: Although a name change is not proposed in the LGBCE report it does seek views. Tameside Council does not support any name change (see paragraph 6.3).
Hyde Newton	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend so the 'Christy' site is in Hyde Godley as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).
Hyde Godley	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend so the 'Christy' site and the 'Kingston' area are both in Hyde Godley as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).
Hyde Werneth	Yes	Amend	Boundary: Amend so the 'Kingston' area is in Hyde Godley as per Tameside Council submission (1 April 2021).