

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES



Comisiwn Ffiniau
Llywodraeth Leol
i Gymru



Local Government
Boundary Commission
for Wales

**REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES IN THE
CITY AND COUNTY OF SWANSEA**

REPORT AND PROPOSALS

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES

**REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES IN THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SWANSEA**

REPORT AND PROPOSALS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS
3. SCOPE AND OBJECT OF THE REVIEW
4. DRAFT PROPOSALS
5. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE
DRAFT PROPOSALS
6. FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS
7. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE
FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS
8. ASSESSMENT
9. PROPOSALS
10. CONSEQUENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS
11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
12. THE NEXT STEPS

The Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales

*Caradog House
1-6 St Andrews Place
CARDIFF
CF10 3BE*

Tel Number: (029) 2039 5031

Fax Number: (029) 2039 5250

E-mail: lgbc.wales@wales.gsi.gov.uk

www.lgbc-wales.gov.uk



1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 We the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales (the Commission) have completed the review of the City and County of Swansea as directed by you in your Direction to us dated 19 December 2007 (Appendix 1).

2. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 2.1 We propose that:

- the boundary between the Communities Birchgrove, Bishopston, Bonymaen, Castle, Clydach, Cockett, Cwmbwrla, Dunvant, Gorseinon, Grovesend and Waungron, Landore, Llangyfelach, Llanrhidian Higher, Llansamlet, Llwchwr, Morriston, Mynyddbach, Penderry, Penllergaer, Pennard, Pontlliw and Tircoed, Townhill and Upper Killay should be realigned to follow the boundaries shown in green on the maps at Appendices 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

3. SCOPE AND OBJECT OF THE REVIEW

- 3.1 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 55 of the Local Government Act 1972 (the Act).

Procedure

- 3.2 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 Town and Community Councils in the City and County of Swansea, the Member of Parliament for the local constituencies, 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. We also publicised our intention to conduct the review in local newspapers circulating in the area and asked the Councils to display public notices. Notification of the start of the review and the closing date for representations to be made (14 March 2008) was given on the Commission's web site.

4. DRAFT PROPOSALS

- 4.1 In response to our initial invitation, we received representations from Swansea City and County Council; Clydach Community Council; Gorseinon Town Council, Gowerton Community Council; Grovesend and Waungron Community Council,

Ilston Community Council; Killay Community Council; Llangyfelach Community Council; Llanrhidian Higher Community Council; Llŵchwr Town Council; Mawr Community Council; Penllergaer Community Council, Pontlliw and Tircoed Community Council; Rhossili Community Council; Upper Killay Community Council; The Penlegare Trust, Independents@Swansea and two local councillors. In our Draft Proposals published on 30 September 2008, we considered the issues raised in the representations.

- 4.2 Proposals for change to community boundaries were made in the following areas: Birchgrove, Bonymaen, Castle, Clydach, Cockett, Cwmbwrla, Dunvant, Gorseinon, Grovesend and Waungron, Landore, Llangyfelach, Llansamlet, Llŵchwr, Morriston, Mynyddbach, Penderry, Penllergaer, Pontlliw and Tircoed, Townhill and Upper Killay.

Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed

- 4.3 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact the existing boundary between the communities of Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed divided the settlement of Tircoed. In addition to this both Pontlliw and Tircoed and Llangyfelach Community Councils suggested that the boundary in this area be realigned so as to include the whole of the Tircoed settlement within the Community of Pontlliw and Tircoed. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Llangyfelach and the Community of Pontlliw and Tircoed.

Llangyfelach and Mynyddbach

- 4.4 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact that the existing boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Mynyddbach divided the Bryn Hedydd Estate cutting through two properties. Llangyfelach Community Council also pointed out this anomaly in their boundary and suggested an alternative realignment. We considered that, as access to the Bryn Hedydd Estate was through the Community of Llangyfelach, the whole of the Bryn Hedydd Estate should be included within the Community of Llangyfelach. However, we did not concur with Llangyfelach Community Council's suggestion that four properties on Llangyfelach Road to the south of Bryn Hedydd should be included in the area to be transferred into Llangyfelach as we considered that these properties were readily accessible through the Community of Mynyddbach. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Llangyfelach and the Community of Mynyddbach.

Cockett and Townhill

- 4.5 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact that the existing boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Townhill divided a small business area at Webbons's Way and Meadow Street. We considered that this anomaly could be addressed by realigning the boundary to follow the line of Heol-y-Gors to the south of the business area thereby transferring the whole of the business area into the Community of Cockett. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Cockett and the Community of Townhill.

Cockett and Penderry

- 4.6 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact that the existing boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry no longer followed a clearly defined line in the area of Llwyn Teg and the Pontardulais Road and Fforestfach Retail Parks. We considered that the area of Llwyn Teg was a continuation of an adjacent residential area in the Community of Cockett and that the Pontardulais Road and Fforestfach Retail Parks also appeared to belong within the Community of Cockett. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Cockett and the Community of Penderry to include the area of Llwyn Teg and the whole of the Pontardulais Road and Fforestfach Retail Parks within the Community of Cockett.
- 4.7 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact that the existing boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry no longer followed a clearly defined line in the area of Courtlands Way. We noted that the residential area at Courtlands Way and the adjoining roads could only be accessed through the Community of Cockett. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Cockett and the Community of Penderry to include the area of Courtlands Way and adjoining areas of Beaufort Court, Richmond Way, Cranmer Court and Chantry Court within the Community of Cockett.

Landore and Morrison

- 4.8 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact that the existing boundary between the Communities of Landore and Morrison divided the Plasmarl Industrial Estate. We considered that the whole of the Plasmarl Industrial Estate should be included within the Community of Morrison. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Landore and the Community of Morrison.

Bonymaen and Llansamlet

- 4.9 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to the fact that the existing boundary between the Communities of Bonymaen and Llansamlet divided the Llansamlet and Winch Wen Industrial Estates. We considered that both of these areas appeared to be continuations of similar areas within the Community of Llansamlet and that the whole of both the industrial estates should be included within that community. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Bonymaen and the Community of Llansamlet.

Penllergaer and Llŵchwr

- 4.10 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to a suggestion that they had received from Penllergaer Community Council and a local councillor for a change to the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llŵchwr to transfer Garngoch Hospital and surrounding area from the Community of Llŵchwr into the Community of Penllergaer. In addition to this Councillor Wendy Fitzgerald also submitted a representation suggesting the same realignment of the boundary. We considered that the suggested boundary had the advantage of following the more

clearly defined line of the A484 road. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Community of Penllergaer and the Community of Llchwyr.

Birchgrove and Clydach

- 4.11 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to a suggestion that they had received from Clydach Community Council for a realignment to the boundary between the Community of Birchgrove and the Community of Clydach to include the whole of the Glais village within the Community of Clydach. Clydach Community Council also submitted a representation to the Commission suggesting the same realignment of the boundary. We noted, however, that the existing boundary included the greater part of the Glais village within the Community of Birchgrove. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Birchgrove and Clydach so as to include the whole of the Glais village within the Community of Birchgrove.

Dunvant and Upper Killay

- 4.12 Upper Killay Community Council suggested that three properties at Ddol Lane in the Community of Upper Killay should be transferred into the Community of Dunvant. We noted that access to these properties was only through the Community of Dunvant. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Upper Killay and Dunvant to transfer the three properties at Ddol Lane from the Community of Upper Killay into the Community of Dunvant.

Clydach and Morriston

- 4.13 Clydach Community Council suggested that the Caermawr and Pen-y-Rhedyn area of the Community of Morriston should be transferred to their Community. We noted that the area of Caermawr appeared to be a continuation of a similar adjacent built-up area in the Community of Clydach. We also noted that the area of Pen-y-Rhedyn appeared to be of a similar rural nature to other adjacent areas in the Community of Morriston and had access through that Community. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Clydach and Morriston to transfer the area of Caermawr from the Community of Morriston into the Community of Clydach. However, we considered that the area of Pen-y-Rhedyn should remain within the Community of Morriston.

Llangyfelach and Morriston

- 4.14 Llangyfelach Community Council suggested that the area to the west of Pant Lasau Road in the Community of Morriston should be transferred into the Community of Llangyfelach. It appeared to us that this area had more in common with the adjoining rural areas of Llangyfelach than the more urban area of Morriston. We also considered the Pant Lasau and Mynydd Gelliwastad Roads constituted a clearly defined boundary between the two communities. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Morriston to transfer the area to the west of Pant Lasau Road and Mynydd Gelliwastad Road from the Community of Morriston into the Community of Llangyfelach.

Townhill and Castle

- 4.15 In the course of the review we noted that properties in Nicander Place in the Community of Castle were only accessible through the Community of Townhill and were detached from similar adjacent areas in the Community of Castle. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Townhill and Castle to transfer Nicander Place from the Community of Castle into the Community of Townhill.

Cwmbwrla and Penderry

- 4.16 In the course of the review we noted that properties in Brenig Road in the Community of Cwmbwrla were only accessible through the Community of Penderry. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Cwmbwrla and Penderry to transfer Brenig Road from the Community of Cwmbwrla into the Community of Penderry.

Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron

- 4.17 In the course of the review we noted that three properties at Bryn Car, Rose Cottage and Gors-fawr in the Community of Gorseinon were only accessible through the Community of Grovesend and Waungron. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron to transfer these properties from the Community of Gorseinon into the Community of Grovesend and Waungron.

Gorseinon and Llchwyr

- 4.18 In the course of the review we noted that the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr appeared anomalous as it divided a residential area in the vicinity of Clos y Nant, Heol Pant y Dwr and Heol Pen y Cae and that all the properties in this area were accessed through the Community of Gorseinon. We also received a representation regarding this area from Councillor Gillian Evans who considered that the Upper Loughor Ward of the Community of Llchwyr extended north into an area which was locally considered to be part of Gorseinon. We noted Councillor Evans' suggested realignment of the boundary in this area but considered that it transferred too much of the Community of Llchwyr into the Community of Gorseinon, including properties which were not affected by the boundary anomaly described above. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr to transfer those properties with access through the Community of Gorseinon from the Community of Llchwyr into the Community of Gorseinon.
- 4.19 Councillor Gillian Evans suggested that the boundary between the Gorseinon East Ward of the Community of Gorseinon and the Kingsbridge and Garden Village Wards of the Community of Llchwyr which extended south to encompass the area of the former Bryngwyn steel works was somewhat artificial. We noted that the area was designated for housing development and Councillor Evans' suggestion that this housing development could either remain in Gorseinon East or be incorporated into the Community of Llchwyr. We noted in Swansea City and County Council's Unitary Development Plan that this area is designated to be

developed for mixed use (i.e. for housing and for employment) and that the area could extend north into an adjacent built-up area of Gorseinon East and to the south towards the built up area of Kingsbridge. It appeared to us that once the development of the area is completed any realignment of the existing boundary could become an artificial division within a continuous built up area which would be more conveniently included within the same community. We noted, however that the line of the River Lliw appeared to present a natural boundary between the Communities of Llŵchwr and Gorseinon and that the areas to the north and south east of the former Bryngwyn steelworks to the east of the River Lliw did not appear to be included in the development currently being undertaken to the west of the River. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llŵchwr to transfer the area to the east of the River Lliw from the Community of Gorseinon into the Community of Llŵchwr.

Gorseinon and Penllergaer

- 4.20 In the course of the review we noted that the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Penllergaer appeared to be anomalous in that it divide a building belonging to a property at the end of Windsor Terrace, Gorseinon. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Penllergaer to transfer this building from the Community of Penllergaer into the Community of Gorseinon.

Llanrhidian Higher

- 4.21 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to a suggestion they had received from Llanrhidian Higher Community Council that the Three Crosses Ward should be removed from the Community of Llanrhidian Higher to form a new Community by itself. We also received correspondence from Llanrhidian Higher Community Council suggesting this change as they considered that inland area Three Crosses had little affinity with the other two Wards of Llanrhidian Higher, Penclawdd and Llanmorlais, which are coastal areas. Swansea City and County Council suggested that an alternative would be for the Three Crosses Ward to be transferred into the Community of Upper Killay. We considered both of these suggestions but from the information provided to us we were unable to determine whether either of these changes would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore made no proposals in respect of Llanrhidian Higher Community but invited further representations.
- 4.22 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to a suggestion that they had received from Llanrhidian Higher Community Council that the boundary between the Penclawdd and Llanmorlais Wards of the Community of Llanrhidian Higher was anomalous as it divided the upper part of Station Road leaving several properties in the Penclawdd Ward which could only be accessed through the Llanmorlais Ward. This meant that the residents of these properties had to travel through Llanmorlais in order to vote in Penclawdd. We also received correspondence from Llanrhidian Higher Community Council suggesting this change to the Ward boundary. We considered that this suggestion had merit in view of the reasons put forward but we were unable to propose this change as we were not proposing any change to the

community boundary of Llanrhidian Higher which would justify such a consequential change to the electoral arrangements for that Community. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore made no proposals for change to the boundary between the Llanrhidian Higher Community Wards of Penclawdd and Llanmorlais.

Penllergaer and Llangyfelach

4.23 Councillor Wendy Fitzgerald and The Penllergare Trust both suggested that the whole of Penllergaer Valley Woods and area of the former Penllergaer Estate should be transferred from the Community of Llangyfelach into the Community of Penllergaer. Swansea City and County Council also drew our attention to a similar suggestion that they had received. It appeared to us that this proposed change to the boundary involved few electors and was being put forward for largely historical reasons rather than to improve effective and convenient local government. We also noted that the existing boundary follows the clearly defined line of the Afon Llan and there was some difficulty in identifying an alternative realignment which would also be clearly identifiable. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore made no proposals for change to the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llangyfelach.

Dunvant and Upper Killay

4.24 Swansea City and County Council drew our attention to a suggestion that they had received from Upper Killay Community Council that the Dunvant Rugby Club should be transferred from their Community into the Community of Dunvant. We noted, however, that access to the Duvant Rugby Club was through the Community of Killay and that its location in respect of the boundary between the Communities of Dunvant and Upper Killay made it difficult to identify an appropriate realignment of the boundary. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore made no proposals for change to the boundary between the Communities of Dunvant and Upper Killay in the area of Dunvant Rugby Club.

Townhill

4.25 The Independents @ Swansea suggested that the Community of Townhill be abolished and two new communities called Townhill and Mayhill be established in its place. It appeared to us that this suggestion may have some merit. However we considered that such a change would require considerable support. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore made no proposals for change to the Community of Townhill but invited further representations.

Gorseinon and Llchwyr

4.26 Councillor Gillian Evans suggested that the boundary between the Community of Gorseinon and the Community of Llchwyr in the area of West Street should be realigned to transfer the properties along West Street from the Community of Llchwyr into the Community of Gorseinon. However, we were not satisfied that the existing boundary presented a significant anomaly in terms of effective and convenient local government. In our Draft Proposals Report we therefore made no proposals for change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr in the area of West Street.

- 4.27 We made no proposals for changes to the remaining community areas within the City and County of Swansea.

5. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

- 5.1 In response to our Draft Proposals report we received representations from Swansea City and County Council, Clydach Community Council, Gorseinon Town Council, Llanrhidian Higher Community Council, Llŵchwr Town Council, Mawr Community Council, The Rt. Hon. Alan Williams MP, Edwina Hart AM, Andrew Davies AM, Penderry Ward Labour Party, Townhill Ward Swansea West Labour Party, 13 local councillors, 8 local residents including a petition of 198 signatures in respect of Townhill Community, a petition of 78 signatures in respect of Glais Village and a petition of 402 signatures in respect of Llanrhidian Higher Community. A summary of these representations can be found at Appendix 2.

6. FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS

- 6.1 In response to our Draft Proposals Report we received representations from Swansea City and County Council and Councillor Keith Marsh suggesting changes which we had not previously considered as part of the review process. We also gave further consideration to suggestions received from Clydach and Mawr Community Councils for which we had been previously unable to clearly identify the areas involved. In our Further Draft Proposals published on 3 July 2009, we considered the issues raised in these representations.

Landore and Castle

- 6.2 Swansea City and County Council suggested that a number of properties at Llangyfelach Road, Hafod Park, Pentremawr Road and Odo Street in the Community of Castle should be transferred into the Community of Landore. We noted that these properties were more accessible from the Community of Landore and appeared to be linked to a similar adjacent area in that Community. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Castle to transfer these properties at Llangyfelach Road, Hafod Park, Pentremawr Road and Odo Street from the Community of Castle into the Community of Landore.

Bishopston and Mumbles

- 6.3 Councillor Marsh suggested a change to the boundary between the Community of Mumbles and the Community of Bishopston to include the whole of Caswell Bay within the Community of Bishopston. We noted that the suggested change does not involve the transfer of electors and was not a significant improvement on the existing boundary. In view of this we were not convinced that such a realignment of the boundary would be desirable in terms of the interests of effective and convenient local government. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore did not propose a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Mumbles.

Bishopston and Pennard

- 6.4 Councillor Marsh suggested a change to move a property at Barlands Common together with adjoining buildings from the Community of Pennard into the Community of 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. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard to transfer the property and adjoining buildings at Barlands Common from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston.
- 6.5 Councillor Marsh 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 was through that Community. Although Councillor Marsh mentioned Cliff Cottage from what we were able to determine the two cottages that can be considered to be 'on the beach' at Pwlldu Bay were Ship Cottage and Beaufort House. Having investigated the area it appeared to us that road access to these properties was via Bishopston. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard to transfer Ship Cottage and Beaufort House from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston.

Mawr and Llangyfelach

- 6.6 Mawr Community Council suggested the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach be realigned along the M4 / Llangyfelach Road. The Council considered that the M4 acted as a boundary between the areas to the north and south of it. We noted however that there are good road links between the two areas crossing either below or above the M4. 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 proposed to be transferred was of a similar nature to areas in the Community of Llangyfelach to the south of the M4. It did not appear to us that the residents of the area to the north of the M4 had closer ties with the Community of Mawr than they did with the remainder of the Community of Llangyfelach. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore did not proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach.

Mawr and Pontardulais

- 6.7 Mawr Community Council 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. It appeared to us that the area of Cwm Dulais was 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 and the properties in that area appeared to be accessed through Pontardulais. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore

did not proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Pontardulais.

Clydach

- 6.8 Clydach Community Council suggested that the area of Baran Carnllechart, Gellionnen be transferred into their Community. We had difficulty in locating this area both from maps of Clydach and from the description given and considered the possibility that Baran Carnllechart, Gellionnen may be within the County Borough of Neath Port Talbot and therefore outside the scope of the review. In our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore did not propose a change to the boundary of Clydach but invited further clarification on the area involved.

7. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE FURTHER DRAFT PROPOSALS

- 7.1 In response to our Further Draft Proposals report we received representations from Swansea City and County Council, Clydach Community Council, Llangyfelach Community Council, Pennard Community Council and a resident of Clydach. A summary of these representations can be found at Appendix 3.

8. ASSESSMENT

Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed

- 8.1 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the communities of Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed be realigned so as to include the whole of the Tircoed settlement within the Community of Pontlliw and Tircoed. We noted that this proposal was supported by Swansea City and County Council. In view of the support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Community of Llangyfelach and the Community of Pontlliw and Tircoed as shown on the map at Appendix 4.

Llangyfelach and Mynyddbach

- 8.2 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the communities of Llangyfelach and Mynyddbach be realigned so as to include all of the properties at Bryn Hedydd within the Community of Llangyfelach. We noted that this proposal was supported by Swansea City and County Council. In view of the support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Community of Llangyfelach and the Community of Mynyddbach as shown on the map at Appendix 5.

Cockett and Townhill

- 8.3 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the communities of Cockett and Townhill be realigned so as to include all of the small business area at Webbons Way and Meadow Street, together with several properties on Heol-y-Gors, within the Community of Cockett. We noted that Swansea City and County Council and The Rt. Hon. Alan Williams MP were opposed to this proposal. We also received representations from Councillors Veronyca Bates-Hughes, Keith Morgan and James Kelleher putting forward a counter-proposal that the existing boundary be realigned so as to include the whole of the small business area at Webbons Way and Meadow Street within the Community of Townhill. We noted that Swansea City and County Council said that they would prefer the existing community boundary to be retained but we consider that the anomaly in the existing community boundary (see paragraph 4.5 above) should be addressed if possible. We noted that the counter proposal put forward by Councillors Bates-Hughes, Morgan and Kelleher addressed the boundary anomaly without affecting any electors and we therefore considered that their proposed realignment of the boundary should be adopted. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Community of Townhill and the Community of Cockett as shown on the map at Appendix 6.

Cockett and Penderry

- 8.4 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the communities of Cockett and Penderry be realigned so as to include all of the area of Llwyn Teg and the Pontardulais Road and Fforestfach Retail Parks within the Community of Cockett. We received representations supporting the proposed transfer of the residential area of Llwyn Teg into the Community of Cockett from Councillors Veronyca Bates-Hughes, Keith Morgan and James Kelleher who considered that doing so would improve access to polling stations for the residents. The Rt. Hon. Alan Williams MP also supported our proposed changes to the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry. We noted that Swansea City and County Council were opposed to this proposal and said that they would prefer the existing boundary to be retained. We also noted the Penderry Ward Labour Party Branch's objection to the proposed realignment of the boundary on the grounds that this would also alter the boundary between the parliamentary constituencies of Swansea East and Swansea West. We would wish to point out that changing the boundary between the Communities of Penderry and Cockett would not automatically change the boundary between the parliamentary constituencies of Swansea East and Swansea West although it would result in an anomaly whereby the parliamentary constituency boundaries were no longer co-terminous with the local government boundaries. Such an anomaly would need to be dealt with by means of a review conducted by the parliamentary Boundary Commission for Wales who would be informed by this Commission of any changes to local government boundaries necessitating such a review.
- 8.5 We consider that the anomaly in the existing boundary between the communities of Cockett and Penderry at Llwyn Teg and the Pontardulais Road and Fforestfach Retail Parks needs to be addressed and note the point made by Councillors Bates-Hughes, Morgan and Kelleher that doing so would improve access to polling stations for the residents. Realigning the boundary to transfer the properties

adjacent to Llwyn Teg at Heol Iscoed and Heol Islwyn into the Community of Penderry would divide them from a similar built up area in Cockett and would not address the issue of the boundary anomaly at the Pontardulais Road and Fforestfach Retail Parks. We remain of the view that the change proposed in our Draft Proposals is in the interests of effective and convenient local government, in that it improves access and provides a clearly defined boundary and we therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry as shown on the map at Appendix 7.

- 8.6 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the communities of Cockett and Penderry be realigned so as to include all of the residential area of Courtlands Way and adjoining areas of Beaufort Court, Richmond Way, Cranmer Court and Chantry Court within the Community of Cockett. We noted that The Rt. Hon. Alan Williams MP supported our proposed changes to the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry. We received representations from Swansea City and County Council, the Penderry Ward Labour Party Branch, Councillors Veronyca Bates-Hughes, Keith Morgan and James Kelleher who all objected to our proposal. We noted the counter proposal put forward by Swansea City and County Council and Councillors Bates-Hughes, Morgan and Kelleher that the properties affected by the boundary anomaly should transfer to the Community of Penderry. However, we do not consider that any such alternative realignment of the boundary would address the anomaly of those properties on Courtlands Way and adjacent properties currently in the Community of Penderry being accessed solely through the Community of Cockett.
- 8.7 We note the point made by Councillor Kelleher that our proposal will increase the councillor to elector ratio for County Council representation for the Cockett electoral division and as a result make it more difficult for councillors to provide a service to the electorate. However, we give consideration to any consequential changes required to County Council electoral arrangements as a result of any changes we make to the community boundaries. It should also be noted that the electoral arrangements for Swansea City and County Council will be reviewed as part of our review of Welsh local authority electoral arrangements which is currently in progress. We again noted the Penderry Ward Labour Party Branch's objection to the proposed realignment of the boundary on the grounds that this would also alter the boundary between the parliamentary constituencies of Swansea East and Swansea West and reiterate our answer to this point at paragraph 8.4 above. We remain of the view that the change proposed in our Draft Proposals is in the interests of effective and convenient local government, in that it improves access and provides a clearly defined boundary and therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry as shown on the map at Appendix 8.
- 8.8 Swansea City and County Council and Councillors Veronyca Bates-Hughes, Keith Morgan and James Kelleher submitted a suggestion that the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry be realigned so that properties at Heol Calfin, Ffordd Y Brain and Rhodfa'r Brain be transferred from the Community of Cockett into the Community of Penderry. The location of these properties is adjacent to Courtlands Way and this suggestion appeared to us to be closely linked to the suggestion that all of the residential area of Courtlands Way should be transferred into the Community of Penderry rather than the Community of Cockett.

Had this been the case then the suggestion put forward for Heol Calfin, Ffordd Y Brain and Rhodfa'r Brain to be transferred into Penderry would have been a logical additional realignment of the boundary. However, we have proposed at paragraph 8.6 above that the area of Courtlands Way should be transferred into the Community of Cockett and therefore need to consider the suggestion that properties at Heol Calfin, Ffordd Y Brain and Rhodfa'r Brain be transferred from the Community of Cockett into the Community of Penderry on its own merits. We could see little evidence that such a realignment of the boundary would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government and considered that the existing boundary appeared logical and clearly defined. We therefore do not make any proposal for a realignment to the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry in the area of Heol Calfin, Ffordd Y Brain and Rhodfa'r Brain.

Landore and Morriston

8.9 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Morriston be realigned to include the whole of the Plasmarl Industrial Estate and adjoining area within the Community of Morriston. We received representations from Swansea City and County Council and Councillor Rob Speht who agreed with our proposal to transfer the whole of the Plasmarl Industrial Estate into the Community of Morriston but objected to our inclusion of the adjacent area in such a realignment of the boundary. They pointed out that this area contained recreational facilities which had strong historical links with the Community of Landore and suggested an amended realignment of the boundary to follow Beaufort Road. We accept the reasons put forward by Swansea City and County Council and Councillor Speht why the recreational facilities adjacent to the Plasmarl Industrial Estate should not be transferred into the Community of Morriston and agree that our proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Morriston should be amended to follow Beaufort Road. We note the comment by Councillor Mike Hedges that Birmingham Mount in Morriston was only accessible through the Community of Landore. We therefore sought the views of the residents of Birmingham Mount by writing to them and the views of the Councillors representing the area. There are 8 electors at Birmingham Mount. We received a response from Councillor Rob Speht who supported the proposed change. We also received a response from a resident of Birmingham Mount who pointed out that there was pedestrian access between Birmingham Mount and Morriston and that they could see no reason to change the boundary when Birmingham Mount had been part of Morriston for a many years. Whilst we note that the existing boundary appears anomalous in term of vehicle access we also note the point raised that pedestrian access to Morriston exists, and on the basis of the responses which we have received to the consultation and in all the circumstances, we are not satisfied that the proposed change would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not propose to change the boundary between the Communities of Morriston and Landore at Birmingham Mount. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Morriston as shown on the map at Appendix 9.

Bonymaen and Llansamlet

8.10 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Bonymaen and Llansamlet be realigned to include the whole of the Llansamlet and Winch Wen Industrial Estates within the Community of Llansamlet. We noted that Swansea City and County Council supported this realignment to the boundary between the Communities of Bonymaen and Llansamlet. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Bonymaen and Llansamlet as shown on the map at Appendix 10.

Penllergaer and Llwchwr

8.11 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llwchwr be realigned to follow the A484 road thereby transferring Garngoch Hospital and surrounding area from the Community of Llwchwr into the Community of Penllergaer. We noted that Swansea City and County Council supported our proposal. We received representations from Llwchwr Town Council, Edwina Hart AM and Councillor W Evans objecting to our proposal. Although we have received conflicting evidence regarding the historical association of Garngoch with the Community of Penllergaer we do not consider that this factor alone would be sufficient grounds for determining a community boundary and we based our proposal principally on the A484 road being more clearly defined than the existing boundary. We note Councillor Evans' point that such a realignment to follow the A484 may lead to similar requests from neighbouring communities with adverse affect to the Community of Llwchwr. However, we have not received any such requests as part of this community review exercise and do not consider that it should have any bearing on our decision relating specifically to the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llwchwr in this area. We note the points made by Edwina Hart AM and Llwchwr Town Council that there is no evidence of dissatisfaction with the existing boundary and that there is a close working relationship between Garngoch Hospital and the Community of Llwchwr. After careful consideration we agree that in respect of Garngoch Hospital the existing boundary should be retained and that the Hospital should remain in the Community of Llwchwr. We also consider that the A484 would make a more satisfactory boundary for the area east of the Hospital. We therefore propose that the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llwchwr be realigned as shown on the map at Appendix 11.

Birchgrove and Clydach

8.12 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Birchgrove and Clydach be realigned to include the whole of the village of Glais within the Community of Birchgrove, it being our view that the existing boundary, which divides the village of Glais, represents an anomaly which needs to be rectified. We received support for our proposal from 3 residents and two local councillors together with standard letters signed by 78 residents of Glais village stating that they wanted the whole of Glais village to be included within the Llansamlet electoral division (which includes the Community of Birchgrove) and the Swansea East parliamentary constituency. Swansea City and County Council and

Clydach Community Council objected to our proposal and stated that Glais should be transferred to the Community of Clydach. We note that there is some significant support amongst Glais residents for our Draft Proposals and the points made that there are some historic connections between Glais and Llansamlet / Birchgrove, with Glais residents making use of the church and school there. We also note, however, the points made by Clydach Community Council that there are also historical links between Glais village and Clydach, that residents of Glais make use of the facilities in Clydach such as the Community Hall, Health Centre, Forge Fach Resource Centre and Library and that the Community Council have made significant contributions to the Glais Development Trust. In addition both Glais and Clydach are situated adjacent to each other in the Swansea Valley and Glais village is geographically closer to Clydach than any similar built up area in the Community of Birchgrove. We remain of the view that the existing boundary represents an anomaly which needs to be rectified. After careful consideration we consider that there is a stronger case for the whole of Glais village to be included within the Community of Clydach. We therefore propose that the boundary between the Communities of Clydach and Birchgrove be realigned as shown on the map at Appendix 12.

Dunvant and Upper Killay

8.13 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Dunvant and Upper Killay be realigned to transfer the three properties at Ddol Lane from the Community of Upper Killay into the Community of Dunvant. Swansea City and County Council supported our proposal. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Dunvant and Upper Killay as shown on the map at Appendix 13.

Clydach and Morrison

8.14 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Clydach and Morrison be realigned to transfer the area of Caermawr from the Community of Morrison into the Community of Clydach. Swansea City and County Council supported our proposal. Clydach Community Council supported our proposal and argued that the Pen-y-Rhedyn and Hills Colliery area of the Community of Morrison should also be transferred into the Community of Clydach. We previously noted that the area of Pen-y-Rhedyn appeared to be of a similar rural nature to other adjacent areas in the Community of Morrison and had good access through that Community and therefore we did not include it in the area to be transferred into Clydach with Caermawr. Clydach Community Council state that the residents of Pen-y-Rhedyn use and benefit from facilities in the Community of Clydach, however the area of Pen-y-Rhedyn is somewhat sparsely populated and the same argument could be applied to the near by settlement at Ynystawe which will remain within Morrison. We note Councillor Mike Hedges' comment that Pen-y-Rhedyn will only be accessible through Clydach or Llanyfelach but would point out that this is not strictly correct as it is proposed that the main access to Pen-y-Rhedyn, Mynydd Gelli Wastad Road, be the boundary between the Communities of Morrison and Llanyfelach and will not fall wholly within either Community. We therefore propose that the boundary between

the Communities of Clydach and Morriston be realigned as shown on the map at Appendix 14.

Llangyfelach and Morriston

8.15 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Morriston be realigned to transfer the area to the west of Pant Lasau Road and Mynydd Gelliwastad Road from the Community of Morriston into the Community of Llangyfelach. Swansea City and County Council supported this proposal and also suggested that the Commission may wish to consider transferring the area to the west of Pant Lasau Road and Mynydd Gelliwastad Road into the Community of Mawr. A similar suggestion was received from Mawr Community Council that the area in the vicinity of Pant Lasau Road and Rhyd-y-Pandy Road be transferred into the Community of Mawr. We note that the area is of a similar sparsely populated nature to both Communities of Llangyfelach and Mawr. However we consider that owing to its location it would more conveniently fall within the boundary of the Community of Llangyfelach. We therefore propose that the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Morriston be realigned as shown on the map at Appendix 15.

Townhill and Castle

8.16 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Townhill and Castle be realigned to transfer properties at Nicander Place from the Community of Castle into the Community of Townhill. Swansea City and County Council supported this proposal. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Townhill and Castle as shown on the map at Appendix 16.

Cwmbwrla and Penderry

8.17 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Cwmbwrla and Penderry be realigned to transfer properties at Brenig Road from the Community of Cwmbwrla into the Community of Penderry. Swansea City and County Council and the Penderry Ward Labour Party Branch supported this proposal. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Cwmbwrla and Penderry as shown on the map at Appendix 17.

Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron

8.18 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron be realigned to transfer three properties at Bryn Car, Rose Cottage and Gors-fawr from the Community of Gorseinon into the Community of Grovesend and Waungron. Swansea City and County Council and Gorseinon Town Council supported this proposal. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We

therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron as shown on the map at Appendix 18.

Gorseinon and Llchwyr

- 8.19 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr be realigned to transfer the residential area in the vicinity of Clos y Nant, Heol Pant y Dwr and Heol Pen y Cae from the Community of Llchwyr into the Community of Gorseinon. Swansea City and County Council and Gorseinon Town Council supported our proposal. We noted the objections to our proposal from Llchwyr Town Council and Edwina Hart AM on the grounds that there was no evidence of dissatisfaction with the existing boundary arrangements and that the resulting reduction in precept for Llchwyr Town Council could adversely affect their services. We consider however, that the anomaly in the existing boundary, which divides the residential area in the vicinity of Clos y Nant, Heol Pant y Dwr and Heol Pen y Cae, should be rectified and we note Swansea City and County Council's point that the affected properties are already incorrectly included within Gorseinon on the electoral register under the Penyrheol electoral division. We noted Llchwyr Town Council's alternative boundary, which follows Heol Pentre Bach east, and then Frampton Road until rejoining the existing boundary. We did not consider however that the alternative boundary suggested by Llchwyr Town Council was as effective as our proposal as it still left divided an area of housing which we consider clearly belongs together in the same community. We note Llchwyr Town Council's point that nearby Gwynfaen Farm, whilst being in the Community of Gorseinon, is only accessible through the Community of Llchwyr thereby establishing the principle of properties in one community being accessed through another. However, whilst we agree that this too represents an anomaly in the existing boundary, it is not one in respect of which we had previously received representation and we consider that it does not detract from our proposal to address the boundary anomaly at Clos y Nant, Heol Pant y Dwr and Heol Pen y Cae. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr as shown on the map at Appendix 19.
- 8.20 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr be realigned to transfer the area of the former Bryngwyn steelworks to the east of the River Lliw from the Community of Gorseinon into the Community of Llchwyr. Swansea City and County Council and Gorseinon Town Council supported our proposal and Llchwyr Town Council stated that they had no objection to it. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Llchwyr and Gorseinon as shown on the map at Appendix 20.
- 8.21 In our Draft Proposals Report we considered the suggested realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr to transfer the properties along West Street from the Community of Llchwyr into the Community of Gorseinon but made no proposal for change as we were not satisfied that the existing boundary presented a significant anomaly in terms of effective and convenient local government. We received no representations regarding this

suggestion in response to our Draft Proposals report and we therefore remain of the view that the existing boundary should be retained.

Gorseinon and Penllergaer

8.22 In our Draft Proposals Report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Penllergaer be realigned to transfer a building belonging to a property at the end of Windsor Terrace from the Community of Penllergaer into the Community of Gorseinon. Swansea City and County Council and Gorseinon Town Council supported our proposal. In view of this support for our Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Penllergaer as shown on the map at Appendix 21.

Llanrhidian Higher

8.23 In our Draft Proposals report we considered the suggestion that the Three Crosses Ward of the Community of Llanrhidian Higher should be removed from that Community to form a new Community by itself as it had little affinity with the other two Wards of Penclawdd and Llanmorlais. We also considered the alternative that the Three Crosses Ward to be transferred into the Community of Upper Killay or the Community of Ilston. We received a representation from Councillor Paxton Hood-Williams together with a petition of 402 signatures supporting the removal of the Three Crosses Ward from Llanrhidian Higher Community Council and the establishment of a separate Three Crosses Community Council. Llanrhidian Higher Community Council did not comment on the suggested change in respect of the Three Crosses Ward. We received no comments in respect of the suggestion that the Three Crosses Ward could be amalgamated with either of the Communities of Upper Killay or Ilston. We note the point made to us in the representations received that the Three Crosses Ward, being inland, has little affinity with the other coastal Wards of Penclawdd and Llanmorlais. It appears to us that there is a significant level of support amongst residents of the Three Crosses Ward for the formation of a separate Three Crosses Community and that such a community would be viable in terms of electorate and would still leave the remainder of the Community of Llanrhidian Higher viable. We therefore propose that the existing Community of Llanrhidian Higher is dissolved and the new Community of Llanrhidian Higher, made up of the Penclawdd and Llanmorlais Wards of the existing Community, and the new Community of Three Crosses, made up of the Three Crosses Ward of the existing Community, are created. We further propose that the new Community of Llanrhidian Higher be warded with the new wards being called Penclawdd and Llanmorlais with boundaries co-terminous to the existing wards of Penclawdd and Llanmorlais. Our proposal is shown on the map at Appendix 22.

8.24 In our Draft Proposals report we considered the suggestion that the boundary between the Penclawdd and Llanmorlais Wards of the Community of Llanrhidian Higher be realigned to transfer the upper part of Station Road from the Penclawdd Ward into the Llanmorlais Ward. We considered that this suggestion had merit but we were unable to propose this change as we were not proposing any change to the community boundary of Llanrhidian Higher which would justify such a

consequential change to the electoral arrangements for that Community. However, in view of the changes to the Community of Llanrhidian Higher which we are proposing at paragraph 8.23 above we also propose that the consequential change to the boundary between the Penclawdd and Llanmorlais Wards be made to transfer the upper part of Station Road from the Penclawdd Ward into the Llanmorlais Ward as shown on the map at Appendix 23.

Penllergaer and Llangyfelach

8.25 In our Draft Proposals report we considered the suggestion that the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llangyfelach be realigned to transfer the whole of Penllergaer Valley Woods and area of the former Penllergaer Estate from the Community of Llangyfelach into the Community of Penllergaer. It appeared to us that this suggestion had been made for largely historical reasons rather than to improve effective and convenient local government and we therefore made no proposals for change to the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llangyfelach. We received a representation from Councillor Wendy Fitzgerald who expressed disappointment that we had not made a proposal for a realignment of the boundary to transfer the whole of Penllergaer Valley Woods and area of the former Penllergaer Estate from the Community of Llangyfelach into the Community of Penllergaer. She accepted that the suggested change made no impact on effective and convenient local government but considered that the area's historical connections with the Community of Penllergaer was important as many residents of Penllergaer still associated the area with their Community. Whilst we acknowledge that it would be preferable for areas to be included within the communities to which they have historic ties, this is not always possible due to changes in population, new developments and changes to local government arrangements. Section 54 (1) of the Local Government Act (as amended) states that proposals should be made 'for effecting changes appearing to the Commission desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government' and this therefore is our principle criterion when making any decisions regarding local government boundaries. We therefore remain of the view that there should be no change to the existing boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llangyfelach in this area.

Dunvant and Upper Killay

8.26 In our Draft Proposals report we considered the suggestion that the boundary between the Communities of Upper Killay and Duvant should be realigned to transfer Dunvant Rugby Club from the Community of Upper Killay into the Community of Dunvant. We were unable, however, to identify an appropriate realignment of the boundary. We received no further representations regarding this area in response to our Draft Proposals report and we therefore remain of the view that the existing boundary between the Communities of Dunvant and Upper Killay in the area of Dunvant Rugby Club should be retained.

Townhill

8.27 In our Draft Proposals report we considered the suggestion that the Community of Townhill be abolished and two new communities called Townhill and Mayhill be established in its place. We made no proposals for change to the Community of

Townhill but invited further representations. We noted that there was considerable support amongst local residents for dividing the existing Community, as was demonstrated by several representations received including a petition of 198 signatures. We note the points made in these representations that the Mayhill area has its own distinct identity and facilities and that resident's problems required the attention of a dedicated councillor. However we also noted the points made by the Townhill Ward Labour Party, Andrew Davies AM and Councillors Nick Bradley and Billy Jones that the Community of Townhill was a cohesive community with similar housing, social and economic needs and with facilities and infrastructure geared to one community.

- 8.28 It appears to us that the existing Community of Townhill is a cohesive one and that although the Mayhill area is distinct it is still of a very similar nature in terms of housing and social requirements to the remainder of the Community. We also note that the area of Mayhill comprises approximately half of the Community of Townhill and therefore are not convinced that the problems of Mayhill residents are not sufficiently dealt with by County Councillors covering the whole community. Although we note the points made that Mayhill is a distinct area with its own issues we also note the points made that the whole community is of a similar nature and that the existing arrangements work well. We do not consider that any evidence has been submitted to us which demonstrates that the existing arrangements for the Community of Townhill are so unsatisfactory as to justify the change suggested. After careful consideration we are of the view that the existing arrangements for the Community of Townhill are satisfactory in terms of effective and convenient local government and we therefore make no proposal for change to these arrangements.

Landore and Castle

- 8.29 In our Further Draft Proposals report we proposed that the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Castle be realigned to transfer a number of properties at Llangyfelach Road, Hafod Park, Pentremawr Road and Odo Street from the Community of Castle into the Community of Landore. We noted that this proposal was supported by Swansea City and County Council. In view of the support for our Further Draft Proposals for this area we are of the view that the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Community of Landore and the Community of Castle as shown on the map at Appendix 24.

Bishopston and Mumbles

- 8.30 In our Further Draft Proposals report we considered the suggestion that the boundary between the Community of Mumbles and the Community of Bishopston be realigned to include the whole of Caswell Bay within the Community of Bishopston. We were not convinced that such a realignment of the boundary would be desirable in terms of the interests of effective and convenient local government and we therefore did not propose a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Mumbles. We received no further representations regarding this area in response to our Further Draft Proposals report and we therefore remain of the view that there should be no change to the existing boundary.

Bishopston and Pennard

- 8.31 In our Further Draft Proposals Report we proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard to transfer the property and adjoining buildings at Barlands Common from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston. We received a representation supporting this proposal from Swansea City and County Council. We also received a representation from Pennard Community Council who pointed out that our proposed realignment of the existing boundary divided land belonging to Kittle Hill Farm and suggesting an amendment to our proposal to address this. We consider that the amendment put forward by Pennard Community Council should be adopted in order to retain all land belonging to Kittle Hill Farm within the same community. In view of the support for our Further Draft Proposals for this area we consider the change proposed, as amended by Pennard Community Council, is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Community of Bishopston and the Community of Pennard as shown on the map at Appendix 25.
- 8.32 In our Further Draft Proposals Report we proposed a change to the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard to transfer Ship Cottage and Beaufort House from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston. We received a representation supporting this proposal from Swansea City and County Council. In view of the support for our Further Draft Proposals for this area we consider the change proposed is in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose the change to the boundary between the Community of Bishopston and the Community of Pennard as shown on the map at Appendix 26.

Mawr and Llangyfelach

- 8.33 In our Further Draft Proposals Report we considered the suggestion that the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach be realigned along the M4 / Llangyfelach Road. It did not appear to us that the suggested change to the boundary was in the interests of effective and convenient local government and in our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore did not propose a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach. We received a representation from Llangyfelach Community Council who objected to any change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach at the M4 / Llangyfelach Road. In view of the lack of support for a realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Llangyfelach at the M4 / Llangyfelach Road we remain of the view that it would not be in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not make any proposal for such a change to the boundary.

Mawr and Pontardulais

- 8.34 In our Further Draft Proposals Report we considered the suggestion 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. It did not appear to us that the suggested change to the boundary was in the interests of effective and convenient local government and in

our Further Draft Proposals report we therefore did not propose a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr and Pontardulais. We received no further representations in respect of this suggested boundary realignment and we therefore remain of the view that it would not be in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not make any proposal for such a change to the boundary.

Clydach and Mawr

- 8.35 In our Further Draft Proposals Report we considered the suggestion that the boundary of the Community of Clydach be realigned to include the areas of Baran Carnllechart and Gellionnen. We had difficulty in locating the area involved in this suggestion and in our Further Draft Proposals Report we therefore did not propose a change to the boundary of Clydach but invited further clarification on the area involved. We received representations from Clydach Community Council and a resident of Clydach who both supported the transfer of Baran Carnllechart and Gellionnen into the Community of Clydach. The representation from the resident of Clydach clarified that the area in question was currently part of the Community of Mawr. Both Clydach Community Council and the resident of Clydach pointed out that the area had historical connections with the area of Clydach and contained numbered footpaths that required maintenance. They considered that Clydach Community Council would be in a better position to maintain these footpaths than Mawr Community Council given its larger revenue base. The resident of Clydach pointed out that one possible realignment of the existing boundary would be to follow the line of the Lower Clydach River.
- 8.36 Having established the location of the areas involved we are able to give the suggested boundary realignment our full consideration. We note the points made by the Clydach Community Council and the resident that the area is historically associated with Clydach and that Clydach Community Council would be in a better position financially to maintain the footpaths. We also note that the proposed change had previously been supported by Edwina Hart AM at the Draft Proposals stage of this review and who had also pointed to the ability of Clydach Community Council to better maintain the footpaths. However, we have learnt from Swansea City and County Council that the maintenance of the footpaths in the area is their responsibility, although the Community Council can take on responsibility for some aspects of footpath maintenance. Should the area of Mawr containing the footpaths be transferred into Clydach it would still be the responsibility of Swansea City and County Council in the first instance to maintain them. We do not consider that the possibility that Clydach Community Council may choose to undertake some aspects of the maintenance of these footpaths is sufficient reason on its own to justify the transfer of such a substantial area of the Community of Mawr into the Community of Clydach. Whilst we also acknowledge the historical ties of the area with Clydach it appears to us that the communication links within the area run east / west rather than north / south. The scattered dwellings and farms in the area all have access links to the west through the Craig-cefn-parc Ward of the Community of Mawr. It therefore seems logical that the area is part of the Community of Mawr to the west rather than part of the Community of Clydach to the south. After careful consideration we consider that the issue of road links and access outweigh the argument of historical association and footpath maintenance. We are therefore not satisfied that such a change to the boundary between the Communities of Mawr

and Clydach would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government and do not make any proposal for a change to the boundary in this area.

9. PROPOSALS

- 9.1 Having considered all of the evidence available to us we propose that the boundaries of the Communities of Birchgrove, Bishopston, Bonymaen, Castle, Clydach, Cockett, Cwmbwrla, Dunvant, Gorseinon, Grovesend and Waungron, Landore, Llangyfelach, Llanrhidian Higher, Llansamlet, Llchwyr, Morriston, Mynyddbach, Penderry, Penllergaer, Pennard, Pontlliw and Tircoed, Townhill and Upper Killay should be realigned in the area under review to follow the boundaries shown in green on the maps at Appendices 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.
- 9.2 Detailed maps to a larger scale showing the proposed new boundaries can be inspected at the offices of the Swansea City and County Council and at the office of the Commission in Cardiff.

10. CONSEQUENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS

- 10.1 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. The electoral statistics used in this report were provided by Swansea City and County Council.

Community Council Electoral Arrangements

- 10.2 The Communities of Birchgrove, Bonymaen, Castle, Cockett, Cwmbwrla, Dunvant, Landore, Llansamlet, Morriston, Mynyddbach, Penderry, and Townhill 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.
- 10.3 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.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Bishopston	Bishopston	1,638	7	234
	Murton	1,150	7	164
		2,788	14	199

*E/C – electors per councillor

- 10.4 Under our proposals the Bishopston Ward will increase by 1 to 1,639 electors and the Murton Ward will increase by 2 to 1,152 electors. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Bishopston. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Bishopston	Bishopston	1,639	7	234
	Murton	1,152	7	165
		2,791	14	199

*E/C – electors per councillor

- 10.5 The Community of Clydach is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Clydach, Glais, Graigfelen and Vardre. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Clydach	Clydach	2,188	6	365
	Glais	284	1	284
	Graigfelen	1,320	4	330
	Vardre	2,131	5	426
		5,923	16	370

*E/C – electors per councillor

- 10.6 Under our proposals the Glais Ward will increase by 663 to 947 electors and the Graigfelen Ward will increase by 116 to 1,428 electors. The substantial increase in the electorate for Glais would appear to us to merit additional representation on Clydach Community Council and we consider that the appropriate level of representation for this Ward is 3 councillors. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Clydach	Clydach	2,188	6	371
	Glais	947	3	315
	Graigfelen	1,428	4	360
	Vardre	2,131	5	427
		6,694	18	371

*E/C – electors per councillor

- 10.7 The Community of Gorseinon is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Gorseinon Central, Gorseinon East, Gorseinon West and Penyrheol. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Gorseinon	Gorseinon Central	1,204	4	301
	Gorseinon East	1,904	4	476
	Gorseinon West	1,473	3	491
	Penyrheol	2,110	5	422
		6,691	16	418

*E/C – electors per councillor

- 10.8 Under our proposals the Gorseinon West Ward will increase by 72 electors to 1,545. We have noted the disparity in representation for the Gorseinon Central Ward and we consider that the appropriate level of representation for this Ward is 3 councillors. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Gorseinon	Gorseinon Central	1,204	3	401
	Gorseinon East	1,904	4	476
	Gorseinon West	1,545	3	515
	Penyrheol	2,110	5	422
		6,763	15	451

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.9 The Community of Grovesend and Waungron is not warded for community electoral purposes. Our proposals for the Community do not involve the transfer of any electors and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

10.10 The Community of Llangyfelach is not warded for community electoral purposes and has 1,822 electors represented by 9 councillors with an elector to councillor ratio of 202. Under our proposals the electorate will decrease by 18 to 1,804 with an elector to councillor ratio of 200. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require a reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

10.11 The Community of Llanrhidian Higher is currently divided for Community electoral purposes into the Community Wards of Three Crosses, Penclawdd and Llanmorlais. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Llanrhidian Higher	Three Crosses	1,229	4	307
	Penclawdd	1,982	7	283
	Llanmorlais	1,064	3	355
		4,275	14	305

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.12 Under our proposals the existing Community of Llanrhidian Higher will be dissolved and two new Communities called Llanrhidian Higher and Three Crosses will be created. The new Llanrhidian Higher Community will comprise the existing Community Wards of Penclawdd and Llanmorlais with the community ward boundary being realigned to transfer part of Station Road from Llanmorlais into Penclawdd as outlined at paragraph 8.23 above and on the map at Appendix 23. We note, however, that the existing arrangements would leave Penclawdd slightly over represented with 278 electors per councillor compared with 366 electors per councillor for Llanmorlais. We consider that the level of representation for Llanmorlais should be increased by 1 councillor and the level of representation for Penclawdd reduced by 1 councillor. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Llanrhidian Higher	Penclawdd	1,946	6	324
	Llanmorlais	1,100	4	275
		3,046	10	305

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.13 The new Three Crosses Community will comprise the existing Llanrhidian Higher Community Ward of Three Crosses. The current level of representation for the Three Crosses Ward of the Community of Llanrhidian Higher of 4 councillors will be inadequate for Three Crosses to function effectively as a community council in its own right. We therefore consider that a suitable level of representation for this Community of 1,229 electors would be 7 councillors giving an electors per councillor ratio of 176.

10.14 The Community of Lluchwr is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Garden Village, Kingsbridge, Lower Loughor and Upper Loughor. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Lluchwr	Garden Village	1,107	3	369
	Kingsbridge	2,176	5	435
	Lower Loughor	1,794	4	449
	Upper Loughor	2,177	5	435
		7,254	17	427

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.15 Under our proposals the Upper Loughor Ward will decrease by 72 electors to 2,105. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Lluchwr. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Lluchwr	Garden Village	1,107	3	369
	Kingsbridge	2,176	5	435
	Lower Loughor	1,794	4	449
	Upper Loughor	2,105	5	421
		7,182	17	422

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.16 The Community of Penllergaer is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of East and West. Our proposals for the Community do not involve the transfer of any electors and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

10.17 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.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Pennard	Kittle	540	3	180
	Southgate	1,725	11	157
		2,265	14	162

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.18 Under our proposals the Kittle Ward will decrease by 2 to 538 electors and the Southgate Ward will decrease by 1 to 1,724 electors. We consider that the existing

number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Pennard. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

Community	Ward	Electors	Councillors	E/C*
Pennard	Kittle	538	3	179
	Southgate	1,724	11	157
		2,265	14	162

*E/C – electors per councillor

10.19 The Community of Pontlliw and Tircoed is not warded for community electoral purposes and has 2,050 electors represented by 10 councillors with an elector to councillor ratio of 205. Under our proposals the number of electors will increase by 97 to 2,147 with an elector to councillor ratio of 215. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

10.20 The Community of Upper Killay is not warded for community electoral purposes and has 1,044 electors represented by 10 councillors with an elector to councillor ratio of 104. Under our proposals the number of electors will decrease by 3 to 1,041 with an elector to councillor ratio of 104. We have noted the existing low number of electors per councillor in this Community and we are concerned that the Community may be considered to be currently over-represented. However, we do not consider that the proposed decrease in electors represents a significant enough change to require a reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community.

County Borough Council Electoral Arrangements

10.21 The Bishopston electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Bishopston, currently has 2,788 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Bishopston would see a rise in the number of electors in the Bishopston electoral division to 2,791.

10.22 The Castle electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Castle, currently has 10,841 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 10,649.

10.23 The Clydach electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Clydach, currently has 5,923 electors represented by 2 councillors. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Clydach would see a rise in the number of electors in the Clydach electoral division to 6,694.

10.24 The Cockett electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Cockett, currently has 10,534 electors represented by 4 councillors. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Cockett would see a rise in the number of electors in the Cockett electoral division to 10,759.

10.25 The Cwmbwrla electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Cwmbwrla, currently has 6,229 electors represented by 3 councillors. The

proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Cwmbwrla would see a fall in the number of electors in the Cwmbwrla electoral division to 6,160.

- 10.26 The Dunvant electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Dunvant, currently has 3,600 electors represented by 2 councillors. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Dunvant would see a rise in the number of electors in the Dunvant electoral division to 3,603.
- 10.27 The Fairwood electoral division consists of the Community of Upper Killay and the Three Crosses ward of the Community of Llanrhidian Higher and currently has 2,273 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Upper Killay would see a fall in the number of electors in the Fairwood electoral division to 2,270.
- 10.28 The Gorseinon electoral division consists of the Gorseinon Central and Gorseinon East wards of the Community of Gorseinon and currently has 2,959 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Gorseinon East Ward of the Community of Gorseinon would see a fall in the number of electors in the Gorseinon electoral division to 2,944.
- 10.29 The Landore electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Landore, currently has 4,696 electors represented by 2 councillors. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Landore would see a rise in the number of electors in the Landore electoral division to 4,823.
- 10.30 The Llangyfelach electoral division consists of the Communities of Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed and currently has 3,872 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundaries of the Communities of Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed would see a rise in the number of electors in the Llangyfelach electoral division to 3,951.
- 10.31 The Llansamlet electoral division consists of the Communities of Llansamlet and Birchgrove and currently has 10,793 electors represented by 4 councillors. The proposed amendment to the boundaries of the Communities of Llansamlet and Birchgrove would see a fall in the number of electors in the Llangyfelach electoral division to 10,130.
- 10.32 The Morryston electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Morryston, currently has 13,194 electors represented by 5 councillors. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Morryston would see a fall in the number of electors in the Morryston electoral division to 13,070.
- 10.33 The Mynyddbach electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Mynyddbach, currently has 7,131 electors represented by 3 councillors. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Mynyddbach would see a fall in the number of electors in the Mynyddbach electoral division to 7,068.
- 10.34 The Penderry electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Penderry, currently has 8,268 electors represented by 3 councillors. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Penderry would see a fall in the number of electors in the Penderry electoral division to 8,112.

- 10.35 The Pennard electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Pennard, currently has 8,268 electors represented by 3 councillors. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Penderry would see a fall in the number of electors in the Penderry electoral division to 8,112.
- 10.36 The Penyrheol electoral division consists of the Gorseinon West and Penyrheol Wards of the Community of Gorseinon and the Community of Grovesend and Waungron and currently has 4,500 electors represented by 2 councillors. The proposed amendments to boundaries of the Communities of Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron would see a rise in the number of electors in the Penyrheol electoral division to 4,572.
- 10.37 The Townhill electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Townhill, currently has 5,994 electors represented by 3 councillors. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Townhill would see a rise in the number of electors in the Townhill electoral division to 6,059.
- 10.38 The Upper Loughor electoral division, which is coterminous with the Upper Loughor Ward of the Community of Llŵchwr, currently has 2,177 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Community of Llŵchwr would see a fall in the number of electors in the Upper Loughor electoral division to 2,105.
- 10.39 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.
- 10.40 We have proposed changes to the boundaries of the Communities of Birchgrove, Clydach, Cockett, Dunvant, Landore, Llangyfelach, Morriston, Mynyddbach, Penderry and Upper Killay which cross the parliamentary constituency boundaries of Gower CC, Swansea East BC and Swansea West BC. These proposals will be reported to the parliamentary Boundary Commission for Wales in due course.

11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

12. THE NEXT STEPS

- 12.1 Having completed our consideration of the review of community boundaries in the City and County of Swansea and submitted our recommendations to the Welsh Assembly Government, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Act.
- 12.2 It now falls to the Welsh Assembly Government, if it thinks fit, to give effect to these proposals either as submitted by the Commission or with modifications, and if the Welsh Assembly Government decides to give effect to these proposals with modifications, it may direct the Commission to conduct a further review.
- 12.3 Any further representations concerning the matters in the report should be addressed to the Welsh Assembly Government. They should be made as soon as possible, and in any event not later than six weeks from the date that the Commission's recommendations are submitted to the Welsh Assembly Government. Representations should be addressed to:

Democracy Team
Local Government Policy Division
Welsh Assembly Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

MR P J WOOD (Chairman)

REV. HYWEL MEREDYDD DAVIES BD (Deputy Chairman)

Mr D J BADER (Member)

E H LEWIS BSc. DPM FRSA FCIPD (Secretary)

February 2010

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 Ddeddf”) 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 schedule 11 to the Government of Wales Act 2006 (2006 c.38).

Summary of Representations Received in Response to the Draft Proposals

The City and County of Swansea Council – said that their Council Members had met to consider the Commission's Draft Proposals Report and had reached the following decisions:

- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Pontlliw and Tircoed to include the whole of Tircoed village within the Community of Pontlliw and Tircoed;
- A majority of Members supported the Commission's proposal in respect of the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Mynyddbach to include the whole of the Bryn Hedydd estate within the Community of Llangyfelach;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Bonymaen and Llansamlet to include the whole of the Llansamlet and Winch Wen Industrial Estates within the Community of Llansamlet;
- A majority of Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llchwyr to transfer the Garngorch Hospital and adjacent area into the Community of Penllergaer;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Dunvant and Upper Killay to transfer the properties at the end of Ddol Path into the Community of Dunvant;
- A majority of Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Clydach and Morryston to transfer the area of Caermawr into the Community of Clydach;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Townhill and Castle to transfer Nicander Place into the Community of Townhill;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Cwmbwrla and Penderry to transfer the whole of Brenig Road into the Community of Penderry;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Grovesend and Waungron to transfer 4 properties into the Community of Grovesend and Waungron;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr to transfer the whole of Clos Y Nant, Heol Pant Y Dwr and Heol Pen Y Cae into the Community of Gorseinon. It was noted that the properties involved had been erroneously included within the Penyrheol (Gorseinon) Electoral Division;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llchwyr to transfer Mardy and Kingsbridge Business Park into the Community of Llchwyr;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Penllergaer to transfer the whole of Gorswadden Farm into the Community of Gorseinon.
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Morryston to include the whole of the Plasmarl Industrial Estate within the Community of Morryston. However, the Members considered that the proposed boundary should be amended to follow

Beaufort Road, thereby leaving the sports facilities to the south within the Community of Landore;

- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Morryston to transfer properties north of Pant Lasau Road and Mynydd Gelli Wastad Road into the Community of Llangyfelach. Members also thought that the Commission may wish to consider the option of transferring the area into the Community of Mawr instead;
- A majority of Members were opposed the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Birchgrove and Clydach to transfer the whole of the village of Glais into the Community of Llansamlet. A counter proposal was submitted that the Glais polling district in the Community of Birchgrove and Llansamlet Electoral Division be transferred to the Community of Clydach and Clydach Electoral Division;
- Members were opposed to the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Townhill to include the whole of the Webbons Way business area within the Community of Cockett. Members' preference was for the existing boundary to be retained;
- Members were opposed the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry to include the whole of the Fforestfach Retail Park and adjacent new housing development within the Community of Cockett. Members' preference was for the existing boundary to be retained;
- Members were opposed the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry to include the properties at Beaufort Court, Richmond Way, Cranmer Court, Courtlands Way and Chantry Court within the Community of Cockett. Members submitted a counter proposal that the properties affected by the boundary anomaly be included within the Community of Penderry;
- Members proposed that the whole of the properties at Heol Calfin, Ffordd Y Brain and Rhodfa'r Brain should be transferred from the Community of Cockett into the Community of Penderry;

In a further representation the 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 the Council was opposed to the Commission's proposal to include the whole of the village of Glais within the Community of Birchgrove. They pointed out that the village had a traditional and historic link to Clydach, was closer to Clydach than Birchgrove and that village residents used the facilities available in Clydach rather than those in Birchgrove or Llansamlet. These facilities included the Health Centre, Library, Community Hall and Forge Fach Resource Centre. Clydach Community Council is represented on the Glais Development Trust has provided grants to the Trust on more than one occasion. The Council supported the Commission's proposal that Caermawr be transferred into their Community from the Community of Morryston but were disappointed that this proposal did not extend to Pen-y-Rhedyn. They argued that the residents of Pen-y-Rhedyn including the Hills Colliery would benefit from the facilities in the Community of Clydach.

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

Gorseinon Town Council supported all the Commission's proposals in relation to their Community boundary. In respect of the consequential electoral arrangements the Council considered that increasing the representation for Gorseinon West from 3 to 4 members would produce a better balance of electors to councillors across the Council Wards whilst retaining the existing level of representation.

Llanrhidian Higher Community Council considered that there would need to be further discussions with the electorate of the Three Crosses Ward before the Council could put forward a view on the Commission's suggestion that the Three Crosses Ward form a new Community. The Council also disappointed that the Commission had not acted on their suggestion for the realignment of the boundary between the Community Wards of Llanmorlais and Penclawdd and pointed out the residents in the area involved considered themselves part of the Llanmorlais Ward and had to pass a polling station in Llanmorlais in order to vote in Penclawdd.

Llwchwr Town Council objected to the Commission's proposal to change the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llwwchwr at Garngoch Hospital for the following reasons:

- There was no historical basis for transferring Garngoch Hospital into Penllergaer as Penllergaer was originally known as Gorseinon Common;
- Garngoch Hospital is historically and physically linked to the Community of Llwwchwr;
- Garngoch Hospital is closely linked to the settlements of Garden Village and Kingsbridge;
- Garngoch Hospital works closely with Llwwchwr Town Council and Community through charitable and other donations and funding for the Alzheimers centre;
- Although the A484 makes an identifiable boundary it is more important to take account of the interest of the Community.

The Council proposed an alternative realignment of the boundary between Penllergaer and Llwwchwr which would leave Garngoch Hospital within the Community of Llwwchwr.

In respect of the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llwwchwr the Council were concerned about the loss of a substantial number of properties and precept. They considered that the area was historically linked to the Community of Llwwchwr and should remain so. They submitted an alternative proposal to realign the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llwwchwr to follow the centre of Heol Pentre Bach to its junction with Frampton Road then down the centre of Frampton Road to its junction Alexandra Road which would address the anomaly access to properties being from an adjoining community.

The Council had no objection to the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Gorseinon and Llwwchwr in the area of the former Bryngwyn Steel Works.

Mawr Community Council proposed that the land the entire length of Heol Pant Lasau should be included within the Community of Mawr. They also 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 farms and residencies at Cwm Dulais that are accessed from the highway leading from Felindre to Garnswllt should be included in the Community of Mawr.

Rt Hon Alan Williams MP was opposed to the Commission's proposal to realign the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Townhill and was opposed to the suggestion that the Community of Townhill should be divided into two new communities. He supported the Commission's proposed realignments of the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry.

Edwina Hart AM supported Clydach Community Council's proposal that Baran Carnllechart be included within the Community of Clydach as she considered that Clydach Community Council had both the policies and resources to manage the footpaths in the area. She was also opposed to the proposed realignments to the boundary of the Community of Llŵchwr as she considered that the resulting reduction in tax base from such changes could have a detrimental affect of the management and maintenance of the Welfare Hall. She said that she had no evidence that there was any dissatisfaction with the existing arrangements.

Andrew Davies AM considered that the Community of Townhill was one distinct community which should not be divided. He said that residents who had attended his office did not distinguish between Mayhill and Townhill but rather referred to the whole Community as 'the Hill'.

Penderry Ward Labour Party disagreed with the Commission's proposal to realign the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry to transfer the Pontardulais Road Retail Park and housing at Llwyn Teg into the Community of Cockett. They pointed out that this change would affect the parliamentary boundary between Swansea East and Swansea West.

They also disagreed with the Commission's proposal to realign the boundary between the Communities of Cockett and Penderry to transfer Beaufort Court, Richmond Way, Cranmer Court, Chantry Court and Courtlands Way into the Community of Cockett. They pointed out that this change would affect the parliamentary boundary between Swansea East and Swansea West.

They agreed with the Commission's proposal to realign the boundary between the Communities of Penderry and Cwmbwrla to transfer Brenig Road into the Community of Penderry as access to Brenig Road was through Penderry and it was more convenient for residents to vote in the Penderry Ward.

Townhill Ward Labour Party objected to the suggestion that the Community of Townhill be divided into the separate Communities of Townhill and Mayhill as they believed that there would be no advantage to the local area and voters in dividing the existing cohesive Community. They pointed out that the whole of the existing Townhill Community had the same type of housing and socio / economic needs and is part of a Communities First area and covered by a Community Development Trust.

Cllr R Speht considered that the Commission's proposal to realign the boundary between the Communities of Landore and Morryston should not include the land to the south of Beaufort Road containing the sports and recreation facilities. He pointed out that these facilities such as the RTB Landore, Plasmarl Sports Club and Landore Sports and Social Club were used by residents of Landore and Plasmarl and if these facilities were transferred into Morryston the historical connection with Landore and Plasmarl would be lost. He suggested that the proposed boundary be amended to follow Beaufort Road.

Cllr Mike Hedges said that he did not like the Commission's proposals for realignments to the boundaries between the Communities of Morryston, Clydach and Llanyfelach. He pointed out that the Commission's realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Morryston and Clydach meant that the Pen-y-Rhedyn area was now only accessible through Clydach although remaining in Morryston. He also pointed out that the area of Birmingham Mount was only accessible through the Community of Landore.

Cllr Wendy Fitzgerald said that the Commission should again consider realigning the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llanyfelach so as to include the whole of the Penllergaer Valley woods and former Dillwyn Llewelyn Estate within the Community of Penllergaer due to its historic connections with Penllergaer.

Cllr W Evans objected to the Commission's proposed change to the boundary between the Communities of Penllergaer and Llŵchwr. He pointed out that the A484 dissected the entire Community of Llŵchwr from Cadle to Loughor Bridge and considered that the proposed change could lead to similar requests from Penderry, Cockett and Gowerton to extend their community boundaries up to the A484 resulting in a large loss of land adversely affecting the settlements of Garden Village, Kingsbridge and Loughor. He also considered that Garngoch common was not historically part of the Community of Penllergaer.

Cllr Dennis James supported the Commission's recommendation to include the whole of the Glais village within the Llansamlet electoral division of the City and County of Swansea. He said that the anomaly of a division within the village had left the smaller part isolated within Clydach to which it had no historic links. He said he had received much representation in the past to bring both parts of the village together within the Llansamlet electoral division.

Cllr Keith Marsh 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 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.

Cllr Nick Bradley was opposed to the suggestion that the Community of Townhill should be split into two new Communities of Townhill and Mayhill. He considered that there was a strong bond between residents across the existing Community. He said that the existing arrangements worked well and were supported by the electors. Splitting the Community would be divisive and pointless and would go against Communities First and Objective 1 funding which had emphasised the unity of the existing Community.

Cllr Billy Jones opposed the suggested division of the existing Community of Townhill to form separate Communities of Townhill and Mayhill. He considered that the Community of Townhill had always been the “Hill” with facilities and infrastructure geared to one community.

Cllr Veronyca Bates-Hughes, Cllr James Kelleher and Cllr Keith Morgan proposed the following changes to the Community of Cockett which should either improve access to polling stations for residents or make a clearer boundary:

- Heol Iscoed, Heol Islwyn and Llwyn Teg to be transferred from the Community of Penderry into the Community of Cockett;
- Heol Calfin, Ffordd Y Brain and Rhodfa'r Brain to be transferred from the Community of Cockett into the Community of Penderry;
- Beaufort Court, Burgley Court, Cantref Court, Chantrey Court, Courtlands Way, Cranmer Court, Hatfield, Lancaster Court, Latimer Court and Richmond Way to be transferred from the Community of Cockett into the Community of Penderry;
- The whole of Webbons Way to be transferred from the Community of Cockett into the Community of Townhill

Cockett is a semi rural Community with isolated farms and dwellings and it is therefore more difficult to provide a high level of service than to the more urban Communities of Townhill and Penderry. Cockett should therefore have a smaller councillor/elector ratio than the other two communities whereas the Commission's proposals are having an opposite effect.

Yvonne Jardine (Chair of Llansamlet Ward) supported the Commission's recommendation to include the whole of the Glais village within the Llansamlet electoral division of the City and County of Swansea (comprised of the Communities of Llansamlet and Birchgrove). She considered that Glais village had no historic links with Clydach and that the residents of the village supported the proposal to unite their village within the Llansamlet electoral division.

A resident of Glais supported the Commission's recommendation to include the whole of the Glais village within the Llansamlet electoral division of the City and County of Swansea. He also submitted copies of the following stock letter signed by 63 residents of Glais Village:

Dear Sir

I would appreciate it if you could record my support to the proposal of the Boundary Commission for Wales' intention to unite the whole of Glais within the Llansamlet Ward and Swansea East Constituency.

Yours sincerely

A resident of Glais supported the Commission's recommendation to include the whole of the Glais village within the Llansamlet electoral division of the City and County of Swansea and said that there was support within the village for such a change to the boundary. He said that the anomaly of a division within the village had left the smaller part isolated for a long time and that Glais village had always had an historic link with Llansamlet going back 100 year through its church and school.

A resident of Glais supported the Commission's recommendation to include the whole of the Glais village within the Llansamlet electoral division of the City and County of Swansea. She considered that the smaller part of the village had been isolated due to its remote position in relation to the village of Clydach.

A resident of Townhill supported the suggested division of the existing Community of Townhill to form separate Communities of Townhill and Mayhill. She considered that there was a distinct community in Mayhill which was generally recognised by both Mayhill and Townhill residents. The existing arrangement with 3 councillors covering the whole of Townhill meant that Mayhill issues could become lost and therefore she considered that it would be better for Mayhill to have its own councillor who could become familiar with Mayhill issues and address them.

A resident of Townhill supported the suggested division of the existing Community of Townhill to form separate Communities of Townhill and Mayhill. He considered that there should be one councillor responsible for and only dedicated to issues relating to the residents of Mayhill. He pointed out that Mayhill had its own distinct facilities such as shops, community and family centres and school etc. The residents of Mayhill were disillusioned with the existing electoral arrangements and did not know who their councillors were.

A resident of Upper Killay supported the suggested division of the existing Community of Townhill to form separate Communities of Townhill and Mayhill and agreed with the Commission's suggested line for the dividing boundary. He said that his experience supported the view that residents of Mayhill considered themselves to belong to Mayhill rather than Townhill. He pointed out that both Mayhill and Townhill had separate bus services to and from the centre of Swansea. He considered that separate communities would lead to better governance for both Mayhill and Townhill residents. They also submitted a Petition: *The Mayhill area should be declared a separate community from Townhill because Mayhill has always had its own identity through its own community facilities, including shops, school and community centre, that separate it from the rest of Townhill and make it self-sufficient. Mayhill needs to be recognised as different from Townhill by those outside the area in the same way that those living here know it to be the case.* **198 signatures**

Summary of Representations Received in Response to the Further Draft Proposals

The City and County of Swansea Council said that their Council Members had met to consider the Commission's Further Draft Proposals Report and had reached the following decisions:

- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard to transfer the properties of Brookside, The Orchards and out buildings at Barlands Common from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston;
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Bishopston and Pennard to transfer the properties of Ship Cottage and Beaufort House from the Community of Pennard into the Community of Bishopston; and
- Members supported the Commission's proposed realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Castle and Landore to transfer Odo Street, Hafod Park, Pentremawr Road and nos. 189 to 215 Llangyfelach Street from the Community of Castle into the Community of Landore.

Llangyfelach Community Council supported the Commission's conclusion that the boundary between the Communities of Llangyfelach and Mawr should not be realigned to follow the M4 and that the existing boundary should be retained.

Clydach Community Council said that the areas of Baron, Carnllechart and Gellionnen had historically been part of the Gellionnen Ward of the Parish of Rhyndwyclydach. This area had included Banc John and the Baron Mountain Road and had followed the Lower Clydach River as far south as Pont-y-Lon at the existing boundary between Mawr and Clydach. The Council considered that although Banc John and the Baron Mountain Road were now part of Neath Port Talbot, the remainder of this area within Swansea, including Llwyn Ifan Farm, the two Nant Moel Farms, Ty Felin Uchaf and Lechart Farm which were currently in the Community of Mawr should be transferred into the Community of Clydach. The Council considered that as they had a larger revenue base than Mawr Community Council they would be better able to maintain and upgrade the numbered footpaths within the area.

Pennard Community Council said that the Commission's proposed change to the boundary between the communities of Pennard and Bishopston at Barland Common divided land belonging to Kittle Hill Farm. The Council suggested an amended realignment of the boundary which would leave all land belonging to Kittle Hill Farm within the Community of Pennard.

A resident of Clydach said that the footpaths at Baran Carnllechart, Gellionnen had historically been part of Clydach and should be transferred from the Community of Mawr into the Community of Clydach. In order to achieve this he suggested that the boundary should be realigned to follow the Lower Clydach River north until meeting the county boundary between Swansea and Neath Port Talbot. He considered that, in addition to this area's historical association with Clydach, Clydach Community Council were better resourced and therefore more able to undertake the maintenance required for the upkeep of the footpaths.