

Flintshire Ward review – Analysis of LDBC Proposals

Green: Supported LDBC proposals or alternative proposals which have consensus amongst local Members, **Amber :** local proposals, **Red:** indicates where agreement has not been possible.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Argoed (1) 1:2,179			
New Brighton (1) 1:2,385	Argoed & New Brighton (2) 1:2,282, +24%		(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Aston (2) 1:1,287			
Hawarden (1) 1:1,578	Aston & Hawarden (2) 1:2,076 +13%		(G) Local Members continue to support their previous proposal for splitting the existing Hawarden ward between the current Aston and Mancot wards, which was part of the County Council submission in January 2019. They have provided evidence of proposed development on the former 'Poor Clare' monastery site. Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by the local Members.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Bagillt East (1) 1: 1,495			
Bagillt West (1) 1:1,706	Bagillt (2) 1:1,601, -13%		(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Broughton North East (1) 1:1,693	Broughton North East (1) 1:1,693 -8%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Broughton South (2) 1:1675	Broughton South (2) 1:1,675 -9%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Brynford (1) 1:1,777			
Halkyn (1) 1:1,396	Brynford & Halkyn (2) 1;1,587 -14%		(G) Concern that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as the current. ones. The Local members support status quo Flintshire recognises and supports this due to nature of these upland communities.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Buckley Bistre East (2) 1:1,311			
Buckley Bistre West (2) 1:1,615	Buckley Bistre (3) 1:1,950 +6%	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see paragraph 1.12 of the covering report)	(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the proposal which has been put forward by all seven Buckley Members and the Town Council, to adjust the current arrangements , so that: 641 electors are transferred from the Buckley Pentrobin Ward to the Bistre East Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly. 515 electors are transferred from the Buckley Mountain Ward to the Buckley Pentrobin Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly. No changes are proposed for Bistre West ward.
Buckley Mountain (1) 1:2,564			
Buckley Pentrobin (2) 1:2,095	Buckley Mountain & Pentrobin (3) 1:2,251 +23%	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see	(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the proposal which has been put forward by all seven Buckley Members and the Town Council, to adjust the current arrangements , so that: 641 electors are transferred from the Buckley Pentrobin Ward to the Bistre East Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly. 515 electors are transferred from the Buckley Mountain Ward to the Buckley Pentrobin Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly.

		paragraph 1.12 of the covering report)	No changes are proposed for Bistre West ward.
Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Caergwrle (1) 1:1,198	Caergwrle (1) 1:2,027 +10%	'New' Caergwrle ward to include the Cefn y Bedd and Cymau wards of Llanfynydd CC.	(G) Concern that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as current. Alternative proposals have been developed by local Members. Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by the local members for Caergwrle and Hope to be amalgamated as a two Member ward on the basis of locally well-known community ties between the two which has existed for hundreds of years. There is a local saying 'to live in Hope and die in Caergwrle' which illustrates the long standing inter-dependence between the two. The case has already been sent to LDBC. The local member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain. Flintshire recognises and supports the case for retention of Llanfynydd as a ward on the basis of the existing community ties and shared activities as illustrated in the case already sent to LDBC by the local Member.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Caerwys (1) 1:2,018	Caerwys (1) 1:2,018 +10%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Cilcain (1) 1:1,526	Cilcain (1) 1:1,526 -17%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Connah's Quay Central (2) 1:1,202	Connah's Quay Central (2) 1,1,755 -4%	Changed ward boundaries to provide 'balance' across the CQ county wards.	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Connah's Quay Golftyn (2) 1:1,977	Connah's Quay Golftyn (2) 1;1,858 +1%	Changed ward boundaries to provide 'balance' across the CQ county wards	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Connah's Quay South (2)	Connah's Quay South (2)	Changed ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.

1:2,291	1:1,857 +1%	boundaries to provide 'balance' across the CQ county wards	
Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Connah's Quay Wepre (1) 1:1,738	Connah's Quay Wepre (1) 1;1,738 -5%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Ewloe (2) 1:2,155	Ewloe (2) 1:2,155 +17%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Flint Castle (1) 1:1,464	Flint Castle (1) 1:1,772 -4%	Welsh version should be 'Castell Y Fflint' not 'Y Fflint Castell'	(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by local members for changes to the Flint Castle ward as submitted to the LDBC
Flint Coleshill (2) 1:1,529	Flint Coleshill (2) 1:1,529 -10.3%	Unchanged ward. Welsh should be Cynswllt y Fflint.	(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by local members for the retention of the current Coleshill ward with a minor change to the A548 boundary.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Flint Oakenholt (1) 1:2,390			
Flint Trelawny (2) 1:1,362	Flint Oakenholt and Trelawny (3) 1:1,602 -13%	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see paragraph 1.12 of the covering report).	(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by local Members for the retention of the current Oakenholt and Trelawny wards and number of representatives with adjustments to ward boundaries as submitted to the LDBC
Ffynnongroyw (1) 1:1,490			
Gronant (1) 1:1,248			
Trelawnyd & Gwaenysgor (1) 1:1,464	Llanasa & Trelawnyd (2) 1:2,101 +14%		(G) Local members are concerned that the proposals for a two Member ward are unlikely to adequately represent the interests of local people. They have cited topography, that the A roads tend to run east – west meaning that north –south journeys are on B and c roads which take longer; and that the communities are distinct, and self-contained , resulting in their being 9 community centres, that there are no community ties between

			<p>villages and that local transport connections do not encourage inter-communication. These are communities which have historically looked west towards Prestatyn and Rhyl for services and leisure, rather than to each other or to Holywell, or other Flintshire towns.</p> <p>Flintshire recognises and supports this due to nature of these dispersed, self-contained rural communities and the lack of community ties across the proposed ward.</p>
Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Greenfield (1) 1:2,014	Greenfield (1) 1:2,014 +10%	Unchanged ward	<p>(G) Some comments received and detailed below. However, Flintshire supports the LDBC proposal.</p> <p>(A) The Members for Holywell Central, East and West have put forward an alternative proposal for properties and electors to be transferred from Greenfield to Holywell East. They have also suggested that the ward be renamed Holywell Greenfield, citing consistency with other town wards across Flintshire.</p> <p>The Members for Greenfield and Whitford have said that their comments on the Greenfield Ward remain the same, and that they have responded to the Boundary Commission, on that basis.</p> <p>They have also suggested that Holywell West should remain the same as it fits the criteria, but renamed Holywell South, The remaining two wards be amalgamated, but as a two Councillor member Ward, named Holywell.</p>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Gwernaffield (1) 1:1,641			
Gwernymynydd (1) 1:1,389	Gwernaffield & Gwernymynydd (2) 1:1,515 -17%		(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Higher Kinnerton (1) 1:1,308			
Hope (1) 1: 2,055	Higher Kinnerton & Hope (2) 1:1,682 -8%		<p>(G) Concern that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as current. Alternative proposals have been developed by local Members. Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by the local members for Caergwrle and Hope to be amalgamated as a two Member ward on the basis of locally well-known community ties between the two which has existed for hundreds of years. There is a local saying 'to live in Hope and die in Caergwrle' which illustrates the long standing inter - dependence between the two. The case has already been sent to LDBC</p> <p>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case being made by the local Member for Higher Kinnerton that there are no ready community ties or links between Hope and Higher</p>

			Kinnerton. Higher Kinnerton has an unique character, with tithing community ties looking eastwards to its twin village of Lower Kinnerton on the English side of the border, with which it shares a cricket club. The ‘English nature’ of the village is confirmed by the decision to stay as part of the Church of England, and the Chester diocese in 1920 following disestablishment and the creation of the Church in Wales.
Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Holywell Central (1) 1:1,443			
Holywell East (1) 1:1,430			
Holywell West (1) 1: 1,761	Holywell (3) 1: 1,545 -16%	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see paragraph 1.12 of the covering report)	(G) The proposed ward ratio, is a -16% variance, which is very similar to- the existing variances across the current three Holywell wards;-15.4%, -16.1% and +3 effective representation. The three Member proposal is not considered to be in the best interests of the electors, who hitherto have been used to having one vote – one member. Three member wards are suited to larger urban areas, not to small rural towns. Three member wards tend to be in authorities where elections are by thirds, so that there is an element of continuity which will be lost with the LDBC proposal. Flintshire recognises and supports the case for status quo as the LDBC proposal doesn’t appear to be better for local residents. (A) The Members for Holywell Central, East and West have put forward an alternative proposal for properties and electors to be

			<p>transferred from Greenfield to Holywell East. They have also suggested that the ward be renamed Holywell Greenfield, citing consistency with other town wards across Flintshire.</p> <p>(A) The members for Greenfield and Whitford have said that their comments on the Greenfield Ward remain the same, and that they responded to the Boundary Commission, on that basis. They have also suggested that Holywell West should remain the same as it fits the criteria, but renamed Holywell South, The remaining two wards be amalgamated, but as a two Councillor member Ward, named Holywell.</p>
Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Leeswood (1) 1:1,620	Leeswood (1) 1:1,822 -1%	New ward to incorporate the Llanfynydd CC Pontybodkin ward	<p>(G) The Local member would prefer status quo, but recognises that if changes have to be made, incorporating Pontybodkin into the Leeswood ward is a 'least worse' compromise as there is evidence of community ties . Flintshire recognises and supports the case for status quo as the LDBC proposal doesn't appear to be better for local residents.</p> <p>The local member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community ties, cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain. Flintshire recognises and supports the case for retention of Llanfynydd as a ward on the basis of the existing community ties and shared activities as illustrated in the case already sent to LDBC by the local member.</p>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Llanfynydd (1) 1:1,505	The, proposal is for this ward to be disaggregated between the new Caergwrle, Leeswood and Treuddyn wards		(G) The local member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain. Flintshire recognises and supports the case for retention of Llanfynydd as a ward on the basis of the existing community ties and shared activities as illustrated in the case already sent to LDBC by the local member.
Mancot (2) 1:1,343			
Queensferry (1) 1;1,467	Mancot & Queensferry (2) 1;2,076 +13%		(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case put forward by the local members for Sealand and Queensferry for Sealand to become a two member ward, either on its own or by amalgamation with Queensferry. Whilst there is currently a +17% variance in Sealand, with proposed new development to 2023, this will increase to 51% A submission detailing the community ties and shared activities has already been sent by the local Members to the Boundary Commission (G) Flintshire supports the case for the current Mancot ward to be amalgamated with part of the existing Hawarden ward, with which there are close community ties. Parts of what is often thought of as Hawarden, are already within the Mancot Ward . Conversely, there is an absence of community ties with Queensferry, which tends to look towards Sealand.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Mold Broncoed (1) 1:2,096	Mold Broncoed (1) 1:2,096 +14%	Proposal to transfer electors from Broncoed to South	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Mold East (1) 1:1,547	Mold East (1) 1:2,018 +10%	Proposal to transfer electors from West to East.	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Mold South (1) 1;2,212	Mold South (1) 1:1,923 +5%	Proposal to transfer electors from South to West	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Mold West (1) 1:1,984	Mold West (1) 1:1,802 -2%	Proposal to transfer electors from West to east and from South to West	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Mostyn (1) 1;1,464	Mostyn (1) 1:1.464 -20%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Northop (1) 1:2,509			
Northop Hall (1) 1: 1,370	Northop & Northop Hall (2) 1:1,940 +6%		(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal. The Local member for Northop has put forward a proposal that as the largest settlement in the ward – Sychdyn is not mentioned in the proposed ward name, it should revert to the previous name for the two wards when combined between 1995 and 1999: 'Northop' .
Penyffordd (2) 1:1,760	Penyffordd (2) 1:1,760 -4%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Saltney Mold Junction (1) 1:1,041			
Saltney Stonebridge (1) 1;2,785	Saltney (2) 1:1,913 +4%		(R) No agreement reached, other than on need for 'Saltney Ferry' to be part of a new ward name. One local Member keen to pursue two single member wards. The other supports the LDBC proposal for amalgamation of the two wards. The need for the local members to encourage local people and organisations to make individual submissions to LDBC in support of preferences was emphasised.

			Corrections: The LDBC to be advised that FCC had not previously made a formal recommendation, contrary to page 63 and that the name of the brook is Balderton, rather than Boundary as mentioned in Appendix 5, page 20.
Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Sealand (1) 1:2,149	Sealand (1) 1:2,149 +17%	Unchanged ward	(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case put forward by the local Members for Sealand and Queensferry for Sealand to become a two member ward, either on its own or by amalgamation with Queensferry. Whilst there is currently a +17% variance in Sealand, with proposed new development to 2023, this will increase to 51% A submission detailing the community ties and shared activities has already been sent by the local Members to the Boundary Commission.
Shotton East (1) 1:1,390			
Shotton Higher (1) 1: 1,803	Shotton East & Higher (2) 1: 1,597 -13%		(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.
Shotton West (1) 1:1,600	Shotton West (1) 1:1,600 -13%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Treuddyn (1) 1:1,352	Treuddyn (1) 1:1,826	Incorporates Ffrith ward of Llanfynydd CC	<p>(A) There are concerns that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as current arrangements. An alternative proposal has been developed by the local Member, concentrating on known community ties.</p> <p>The local Member has indicated that if it should be necessary for Treuddyn to be amalgamated with any other community, thus should be with Nercwys because of existing church and school linkages. However, this would have an impact upon the proposals for Gwernymynydd and Gwernaffield.</p> <p>The local Member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community ties, cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain.</p>
Whitford (1) 1:1,919	Whitford (1) 1:1,919 +5%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.