

Community of Trellech United

Trellech United Community Council

Ann Davison – Trellech United Community Council Clerk

At its meeting on 18th February the Community Council discussed its current ward boundaries and representation.

1. The council felt that the level of representation is about right, and did not want to either increase or decrease the number of councillors.

2. They had two suggestions for changes to ward boundaries, although felt that this really depended on the views of electors living within the two areas.

(a) Trellech Grange (as its name suggests) "belongs" with Trellech rather than with Tintern, and the suggestion is to move the boundary of the Llanishen ward to run from Whitelye Common and below The Fountain Inn . The parishes of Llanishen and Trellech Grange have always been linked, the primary school catchment is to Trellech school, and The Fountain is the "local" for Catbrook within TUCC.

(b) Far Hill, which is currently within the Llanishen ward, lies more naturally within Trellech Town. There is no direct road link between Far Hill and Llanishen. When residents of Far Hill wish to vote at an election they need to drive straight past the polling station in Trellech, in order to reach Llanishen. For the same reason other community links and activities tend naturally towards Trellech rather than Llanishen.

Trellech United Community Council

George Weston – Community Councillor Llanishen Ward

Introduction:

The following considerations are personal to me and do not necessarily represent those held by TUCC, of which I am an elected member. However, they were presented as such to TUCC at their meeting on 18th February and received no objection from the members present.

I approached the exercise on the basis of "community of interest" or, if you will, "sense of place", rather than as an exercise in load-balancing. However, it can be seen that my recommendations, if adopted, would result in the Llanishen Ward of TUCC having the exact county average of 150 electors per community councillor.

1. Trellech Grange:

Trellech Grange is clearly historically linked to the Trellech area by its name but is currently – inexplicably - part of Tintern community. Trellech Grange is also one of the three linked historic parishes of Llanishen, Trellech Grange and Llanfihangel-tor-

y-Mynydd; the local priest-in-charge is responsible for all three churches. Trellech Grange's strong links with Llanishen are also reflected in the Trust Deed of the charity which owns and operates Llanishen village hall; the deed states that the "area of benefit" of the charity consists of those three historic parishes.

(It should be noted at this stage that whilst Llanfihangel-tor-y-Mynydd is also linked in this way, its ties with Llanishen are perhaps not so strong, as that settlement tends to identify more closely with its proximity to Llansoy and Devauden Community. Moreover, as far as the Post Office is concerned, Llanfihangel-tor-y-Mynydd is part of Llansoy. I have therefore not considered any changes which would involve Llanfihangel-tor-y-Mynydd or Devauden Community.)

Returning to Trellech Grange, I also note that many addresses in that historic parish have NP16 6Q* postcodes and Llanishen postal addresses. Many residents of Trellech Grange therefore have a strong natural "community of interest" with Llanishen and consider themselves to be part of the Llanishen community. The boundary of Trellech Grange with Llanishen is also very close to the village centre of Llanishen. However, Trellech Grange is currently a Ward of Tintern Community, notwithstanding the fact that Tintern is anything up to 4 miles away and is directly accessible only via a narrow road through the Angidy valley (this road is currently closed owing to a landslip). Trellech Grange's "community of interest" with Tintern is therefore as not as strong as it is with Llanishen. There are 36 properties in Tintern Community's Trellech Grange Ward and 72 electors.

For the above reasons I therefore propose that consideration be given to transferring the Trellech Grange Ward of Tintern Community to TUCC and incorporating it into TUCC's Llanishen Ward.

2. Far Hill:

Far Hill is currently part of the Llanishen Ward of TUCC. However, it is relatively isolated from "Llanishen proper". The preferred access to and from Far Hill is via Trellech, where a good, direct minor road leading off the B4293 (R76/C45-7) links the two settlements. Access to Far Hill from Llanishen is possible but via a long, convoluted route of narrow lanes leading off the road that leads out into the countryside towards Llangovan. The residents of Far Hill therefore naturally have a much greater "community of interest" with Trellech than they do with Llanishen. There are 25 properties listed in the electoral register as being in in Far Hill with 55 electors. However, I note that 3 of those properties, Glyn Farm, Glyn Farm Barn and Lower Glyn Farm are incorrectly listed as being in Far Hill; they are actually in Llanishen. The natural boundary between Llanishen and Far Hill is the Penarth Brook, which I have shown as a red line on the accompanying map (Far Hill to the north, Llanishen to the south).

I therefore propose that consideration be given to transferring the properties to the

north of the Penarth Brook which lie currently within the Llanishen Ward of Tucc to the Trellech Town Ward of that Council. The properties transferred would be those served by the following highways: R76/C45-7, C46-1, C46-2, C46-3 and C46-4. The 3 properties to the south of the line which are mentioned above as being erroneously shown on the electoral register as being in Far Hill should remain in Llanishen Ward of Tucc.

Statistics:

(a) Current arrangements:

Tucc, Llanishen Ward: 141 properties, 274 electors

Tucc, Trellech Town Ward: 168 properties, 327 electors

Tucc, Far Hill settlement (part of Llanishen Ward): 25 properties, 55 electors

Tintern CC, Trellech Grange Ward: 36 properties, 72 electors

(b) After proposed changes:

Tucc Llanishen Ward: 155 properties, 300 electors

(net gain = 14 properties, 26 electors)

Tucc Trellech Town Ward: 193 properties, 382 electors

(net gain = 22 properties, 46 electors)

(c) Resultant community losses and gains

Tintern Community would lose 36 properties and 72 Electors

Trellech United Community would gain those 36 properties and 72 electors

Llanishen Ward, Trellech United Community Council

A resident of Far Hill

I would like to add my support to the proposal that Farhill be part of Trellech Town ward instead of Llanishen ward. This fits far better with the local geography, and most Farhill residents see Trellech as their local community focus rather than Llanishen

By road Trellech is much closer, and indeed it is usual to go through Trellech to get to Llanishen from Farhill

Llanishen Ward, Trellech United Community Council

A resident of Far Hill

I would like to add my support to the proposal that Far Hill be part of Trellech Town ward instead of Llanishen ward. I would suggest that Penarth Brook forms an appropriate boundary.

Most Far Hill residents see Trellech as their local community focus rather than Llanishen. By

road Trellech is much closer, and indeed it is usual to go through Trellech to get to Llanishen from Far Hill.

Llanishen Ward, Trellech United Community Council

A resident of Far Hill

With regard to the above we are writing to confirm that we support the proposal that Far Hill be included in the Trellech Town Parish and be removed from Llanishen Parish. We have lived at Ty Newydd, Farhill for the past 10 years.

Llanishen Ward, Trellech United Community Council

A resident of Far Hill

This is to state that as a resident of Far Hill I very much support moving the boundaries of Trellech Town to include Far Hill.

It makes far more sense for us to be represented by Trellech than Llanishen. We all drive to Trellech to get off the hill and on our way to Monmouth or Chepstow, we go to the doctor there, the pub and the church. We all feel part of Trellech, not Llanishen and would very much appreciate being represented by the Trellech councillors.

Llanishen Ward, Trellech United Community Council

A resident of Far Hill

We understand that it's being considered whether Far Hill remains in Llanishen Parish or becomes part of Trellech Town Parish. If so, we would prefer to be linked with Trellech since it's logical - this village is much closer to us and is our social hub.

Additional Representation Submitted by Community Councillor George Weston, Llanishen Ward

I have received and read the initial representations document with interest.

Of particular concern to me is the comment from County Councillor Ann Webb (MCC St. Arvans Division) with regard to my submissions regarding proposals affecting the Llanishen Ward of Trellech United Community Council (TUCC), which have been endorsed by TUCC.

County Councillor Webb's comment reads as follows:

"Just a note to say that I as the local member for Trellech Grange would strongly oppose this being included into the Trellech United Ward. There are historical reasons for this being within St Arvans Division. If you would like we could discuss this in more detail, but firstly I wanted to make sure you knew my feelings!!"

I would make two points in response to this statement:

1. County Councillor Webb is not "the local member for Trellech Grange". That post on Tintern Community Council is held by Mr Stephen Pocock. County Councillor Webb's County Ward of St. Arvans does include the Trellech Grange Ward of Tintern Community Council –

indeed, she resides in Trellech Grange. However, she is not a member of Tintern Community Council and has not indicated that her comments have been endorsed by that Community Council. I note further that Tintern Community Council have not submitted any representations themselves.

2. County Councillor Webb mentions that she would *“strongly oppose this being included into the Trellech United Ward. There are historical reasons for this being within the St. Arvans Division...”* However, she does not give these reasons in her submission or provide any statistics or cogent arguments to support her views. Additionally, her comments would seem to suggest that the reasons for her opposition could be discussed between her and you, presumably in private. I would submit that any such discussions might be outside the terms of reference of your consultation and might perhaps be anti-democratic. Moreover, the consultation does not concern itself with County Council Divisions/Wards but Community Councils and their own Wards. I note that no other County Councillor has submitted any comments and I therefore consider County Councillor Webb’s comments to be *ultra vires*.

I trust that you will take my comments on board prior to engaging in any discussions with County Councillor Webb.