APPENDIX

BCE Revised Proposals – October 2012

Stockton-on-Tees Administrative Area

1. Hartlepool, Stockton-on-Tees, Redcar and Middlesbrough have been considered together with the area of County Durham when formulating the revised proposals for these areas. The full details of the proposals are attached.

2. Blackhalls ward has been included in the proposed Hartlepool constituency, instead of the Billingham North Ward.

3. A proposed Stockton and Billingham constituency will include ten wards from the existing Stockton North Constituency, together with Sedgefield ward, and the wards of Aycliffe East, Aycliffe North, and Aycliffe west, and the new constituency will be called Stockton North and Aycliffe.

Stockton South Constituency

4. There will be a constituency comprising nine of the wards of the current Stockton South constituency, and four wards from Stockton North. It will be called Stockton South constituency.

5. This constituency will include only Stockton-on-Tees wards, being the wards of:-

Bishopsgarth
Eaglescliffe
Fairfield
Grangefield
Hartburn
Ingleby Barwick East
Ingleby Barwick West
Parkfield and Oxbridge
Yarm
Western Parishes
Newtown
Stockton Town Centre
Hardwick

Stockton North and Aycliffe Constituency

6. This constituency will include 14 wards, ten of which will be Stockton-on-Tees wards:-

Billingham North
Billingham Central
Billingham South
Billingham East
Billingham West
Northern Parishes
Norton North
Norton South
Norton West
Roseworth
Sedgefield
Aycliffe East
Aycliffe North
Aycliffe West

7. The Annex to the Commission report which details the revised proposals, shows both proposed Stockton Constituencies as County, rather than Borough Constituencies, notwithstanding that of the 73,391 electorate in Stockton North and Aycliffe, 56,345 are Stockton Borough electors, and that all of the electorate in the Stockton South Constituency are Stockton Borough electors.

8. The Thornaby wards of Mandale and Victoria, Stainsby Hill and Village will be included in a new Middlesbrough constituency, called Middlesbrough.

included in the proposed Gateshead West constituency in the proposed Jarrow and Gateshead East constituency. The Bede ward from the existing Jarrow constituency, which the initial proposals included within the Jarrow and Gateshead East constituency, would be included in the proposed South Shields constituency. The Fellgate and Hedworth ward (which is in the existing Jarrow constituency and the Commission's proposed Jarrow and Gateshead East constituency) would be included instead within the proposed Washington constituency, as would the ward of Boldon Colliery. Again, in order to retain two wards (Birtley and Lamesley) in a constituency including only Gateshead wards, other wards would have to move from their existing constituency and have their local ties broken. We do not consider that this option would better reflect the statutory criteria than the initial proposals. We do not therefore recommend making those changes for that reason alone. In addition, however, we consider that these counter-proposals involve a less satisfactory reflection of the statutory criteria as the initial proposals retained some wards (the Bede, and Feldgate and Hedworth wards) in their existing constituency whereas the counter-proposals would not.

AC80 The Conservative Party did not make counter-proposals for the Gateshead West or Jarrow and Gateshead East constituencies, describing the initial proposals for the latter as a logical extension of the existing position. The Conservative Party also considered the initial proposals for the Birtley and Lamesley wards as the most logical approach. The Conservative Party included counter-proposals similar to the changes we recommend for the Ryhope, Redhill, and St Anne's wards.

County Durham and Teesside

AC81 We consider the area of County Durham, and Hartlepool, Stockton-on-Tees, Redcar, and Middlesbrough together, as there is a degree of overlap between the east of County Durham and Teesside. We note the overwhelming opposition to the proposed Consett and Barnard Castle constituency within County Durham. Within Teesside, the initial proposals proposed a Stockton and Billingham constituency, and a Sedgefield and Yarm constituency. We have also received considerable representations about the precise combination of the existing constituencies of Stockton North, Stockton South, and Sedgefield.

AC82 In summary, for the reasons set out in the following paragraphs, we would recommend the following changes to the initial proposals so far as they affect County Durham and Teesside:

a. There would not be a Consett and Barnard Castle constituency.

b. The existing North West Durham constituency would be retained, less the ward of Burnopfield and Dipton but with the addition of the ward of Chopwell and Rowlands Gill.

c. The existing Bishop Auckland constituency would be retained with the addition of Chilton and Shildon East wards.

d. The Deerness Valley ward would remain in the existing City of Durham constituency (and the constituency would be named City of Durham).

e. The proposed Easington constituency would include the Trimdon ward but would not include the Blackhalls ward.

f. The proposed Hartlepool constituency would include the Blackhalls ward but would not include the Billingham North ward.

g. The proposed Stockton and Billingham constituency would include ten wards from the existing Stockton North constituency, together with the ward of Sedgefield and the three wards of Aycliffe East, Aycliffe North, and Aycliffe West, and be named Stockton North and Aycliffe.

h. The proposed Darlington constituency would include the Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe wards.

i. There would be a constituency comprising nine of the wards of the existing Stockton South constituency and four wards from Stockton North; it would be named Stockton South.

j. The proposed Middlesbrough, Middlesbrough South and Guisborough, and Redcar constituencies would have changes made to reflect the existing constituencies to a greater extent; Middlesbrough South and Guisborough would be named Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland.

County Durham

AC83 The initial proposals proposed a Consett and Barnard Castle constituency. This constituency would involve a large geographic area stretching from the town of Barnard Castle in the south across Weardale and would include the wards of Haltwhistle and South Tynedale in Northumberland. It would also include wards from the three existing constituencies of North West Durham, Bishop Auckland, and Hexham. There has been opposition to the proposed constituency.

AC84 First, for the reasons given in paragraphs AC30 and AC31 above, we consider that the wards of Haltwhistle and South Tynedale should not be included in the proposed constituency but should remain in a Hexham constituency.

AC85 Secondly, we would recommend that three wards from the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency (Crook North and Tow Law, Crook South, and Willington) be included in a modified Consett and Barnard Castle constituency. These wards form part of the existing North West Durham constituency. We would recommend that three wards from the proposed Consett and Barnard Castle constituency (the wards of Evenwood, Barnard Castle East, and Barnard Castle West) be included instead in the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency. Those wards already form part of the existing Bishop Auckland constituency.

AC86 The changes would ensure that both the proposed constituency for the north-west Durham area, and the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency include a greater part of the existing constituencies for those areas. Ten of the 11 wards proposed for a north-west Durham constituency already form part of the existing North West Durham constituency. Furthermore, the evidence is that there are long-established ties between the Crook North and Tow Law, Crook South, and Willington wards and Weardale in north-west Durham (see, for example, North West Durham Constituency Labour Party (IP/016478)). Including these three wards within a North

West Durham constituency, rather than including them within the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency, would avoid changes which would break those existing local ties.

AC87 Having regard to the boundaries of the existing constituencies and the local ties that would be broken by the changes proposed in the initial proposals, we consider that the proposed Consett and Barnard Castle constituency should not include the wards of Barnard Castle East, Barnard Castle West, Evenwood, Haltwhistle, or South Tynedale. However, it should include the wards of Crook North and Tow Law, Crook South, and Willington.

AC88 We also recommend that the proposed Consett and Barnard Castle constituency should include the ward of Chopwell and Rowlands Gill, which should be included in this constituency rather than in the proposed Hexham constituency for the reasons given in paragraph AC32 above.

AC89 We consider that the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency should not include the ward of Deerness Valley, which should be included in the proposed Durham constituency. First, the ward is part of the existing City of Durham constituency. Secondly, we have received many representations about the strong local ties that exist between Deerness Valley and the City of Durham (in oral representations at the public hearing in Darlington, and see for example Brancepeth Parish Council (IP/022077), Brandon and Byshottles Parish Council (IP/008217), and Krystyna Stenhose (IP/003309)). We consider that those ties would be broken if the ward were included in the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency rather than being retained in the proposed Durham constituency.

AC90 Having regard, therefore, to the existing boundaries of the constituencies of North West Durham, the City of Durham, Bishop Auckland, and Northumberland, and to avoid changes which would break local ties, we recommend changes to the proposed Consett and Barnard Castle constituency so that it would:

a. include the wards of Benfieldside, Consett North, Delves Lane and Consett South, Esh, Lanchester, Leadgate and Medomsley, Weardale, Crook North and Tow Law, Crook South, and Willington (all within the existing North West Durham constituency), and the ward of Chopwell and Rowlands Gill (from the existing Blaydon constituency); but

b. not include the wards of Barnard Castle East, Barnard Castle West, Evenwood, Haltwhistle, or South Tynedale.

We recommend that the proposed constituency be named North West Durham.

AC91 We recommend the following changes to the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency. It would include the wards of Barnard Castle East, Barnard Castle West, and Evenwood which are part of the existing Bishop Auckland constituency. There are also local ties between Barnard Castle and Bishop Auckland which we consider would be broken if the changes proposed by the initial proposals were made and the three wards were transferred to a different constituency. The evidence that we have received is that residents in the two Barnard Castle wards and the Evenwood ward look to the area of Bishop Auckland for local services, schools, and employment (see for example the representations of the Member of Parliament for Bishop Auckland, Helen Goodman MP (IP/015414)). Retaining the three wards within a Bishop Auckland constituency, rather than including them within the proposed

Consett and Barnard Castle constituency, would avoid changes which would break those existing local ties. We would recommend that the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency does not include the wards of Crook North and Tow Law, Crook South, and Willington.

AC92 We recommend one further change to the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency: we would include the ward of Shildon East, part of which is currently within the existing Sedgefield constituency. The proposed Bishop Auckland constituency, with the changes we recommend, would not satisfy the statutory electorate range and a ward has to be added. We consider that the Shildon East ward is the most appropriate ward to be added. The ward has ties with Shildon West, which is included in the existing and proposed Bishop Auckland constituency (see Shildon Town Council (IP/005464)). The existing constituency of Sedgefield will no longer exist and so Shildon East cannot remain within its existing constituency in any event. For all these reasons, we consider that Shildon East should be included in the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency.

AC93 We recognise that the ward of Shildon East includes not only part of Shildon but also part of the town of Newton Aycliffe. Including the ward within one constituency necessarily means that either the town of Newton Aycliffe is divided (if the ward is included, as we recommend, in the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency) or the town of Shildon will be divided (if Shildon East is included in a different constituency). We have received a counter-proposal that the ward be divided (see John Clare (IP/023347)). The general policy of the Commission is that wards should only be divided if there are exceptional and compelling circumstances and that it would not be appropriate to divide wards in cases where it is possible to construct cases that meet the statutory electorate range without dividing them (see paragraph 31 of the Commission document *A guide to the 2013 Review*). We consider that it is possible here to create constituencies that satisfy the statutory electorate range without dividing the Shildon East ward. We do not consider that there are exceptional and compelling circumstances which justify dividing the ward of Shildon East. The counter-proposal points to the fact that, following recommendations from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, an order had been made on 2 November 2011 amending the boundary for local government purposes with effect from the date of the council elections due in May 2013. But, while the Commission may have regard to existing local government boundaries, this means the local government boundaries as they existed on 6 May 2010. The fact that there have been subsequent changes does not, in our view, amount to compelling and exceptional circumstances justifying dividing a ward. The counter-proposal also points to earlier constituency boundaries and to the fact that different parts of the ward have different geographical and community links to different areas. We accept that that may well be the case. However, we do not consider that those factors constitute exceptional and compelling circumstances justifying the division of the ward of Shildon East. For those reasons we do not recommend the proposals for splitting the Shildon East ward contained in the counter-proposal.

AC94 Having regard to the existing boundaries of the constituency of Bishop Auckland and to the ties that would be broken if the proposed changes in the initial proposals were made, and having regard to the need to ensure that the proposed constituency satisfies the statutory electorate range, we recommend

that the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency:

a. include the wards set out in the initial proposals but with the addition of the wards of Barnard Castle East, Barnard Castle West, Evenwood, and Shildon East; but

b. does not include the wards of Crook North and Tow Law, Crook South, Willington, and Deerness Valley.

We consider that these recommended changes will ensure that the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency better reflects the statutory criteria.

AC95 We note that the majority of the representations received support the proposed changes to the proposed constituencies described at paragraphs AC90 and AC94 above. We also note that all three Parliamentary political parties now support the counter-proposals that result in a proposed North West Durham constituency described at paragraph AC90 and the changes recommended to the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency described in paragraph AC94, and the inclusion of the Deerness Valley ward in the proposed Durham constituency.

AC96 In relation to the proposed Durham constituency, we have set out in paragraph AC89 above our reasons for including the Deerness Valley ward within the proposed constituency. If Deerness Valley is included, as we recommend, in the proposed Durham constituency, the inclusion of the Trimdon ward as well would mean that the proposed constituency would exceed the statutory electorate range. However, we do not consider that the Trimdon ward should be included in this constituency but should instead be included in the proposed Easington constituency. The Trimdon ward is part of the existing Sedgefield constituency, not the City of Durham constituency (by contrast the Deerness Valley ward is part of the existing City of Durham constituency). The Trimdon ward has greater ties with wards such as Thornley (which is also part of the existing Sedgefield constituency) and the initial proposals proposed that Thornley should be included in the Easington constituency (see, by way of example, Phil Wilson MP (IP/021634)). In our opinion, having regard to the boundaries of the existing constituency of the City of Durham, and the ties that exist between the Deerness Valley ward and Durham which would be broken if Deerness Valley were to be transferred elsewhere, it is preferable to include the Deerness Valley ward rather than the Trimdon ward in the proposed Durham constituency and to include the Trimdon ward in the proposed Easington constituency. We consider that these recommended changes better reflect the statutory criteria. We note that there is considerable support for the changes we recommend and that all three Parliamentary political parties now support these changes. We would call the proposed Durham constituency City of Durham.

AC97 We make one further change to the proposed constituency of Easington which also affects the proposed constituency of Hartlepool. In order to ensure that the proposed Hartlepool constituency meets the statutory electorate range, the initial proposals proposed including the ward of Billingham North from the existing Stockton North constituency. Billingham North is one of five wards that together make up the town of Billingham. That change, however, involves breaking the existing local ties between Billingham North and the remainder of the town of Billingham. Counter-proposals have been made by all three Parliamentary parties

and others that the ward of Blackhalls be included within the proposed Hartlepool constituency instead of the ward of Billingham North. That would avoid changes that would break ties between Billingham North and the remainder of the town of Billingham (see for example North Billingham Residents' Association (IP/003732) and John Fletcher (IP/016887), and see also Billingham Town Council (IP/013446)). Residents of the Blackhalls ward, however, object to this proposal, as including the ward within Hartlepool would break their local ties which lie with the wards that form the existing and proposed Easington constituency and not with the proposed Hartlepool constituency (see by way of example Kelvin Stanley (CR/000659) and Monk Hesleden Parish Council (CR/000804)). We also note that either proposed change would affect existing constituencies. If the ward of Blackhalls were included within the proposed Hartlepool constituency, the existing constituency of Easington would be affected. If the ward of Billingham North were included, the existing constituency of Stockton North would be affected. In both cases, there will also, of necessity, be wards from two local government areas within the proposed constituency of Hartlepool, as either a ward from County Durham (Blackhalls) or a ward from Stockton-on-Tees (Billingham North) will be included. We have considered carefully if there are other changes which could be made but, in our opinion, there are not.

AC98 In our opinion, including the ward of Blackhalls within the proposed Hartlepool constituency will facilitate other changes to the initial proposals which, overall, will ensure that the proposed constituencies better reflect the statutory criteria. It will facilitate the inclusion of the ward of Trimdon within the proposed constituency of Easington which we have recommended to ensure that changes elsewhere in County Durham better reflect the statutory criteria. If, as we recommend, the ward of Trimdon is included in the proposed Easington constituency, and if the ward of Blackhalls is also included, then the proposed constituency would exceed the statutory electorate range. Consequently, both wards cannot be included and one ward has to be included in another proposed constituency. We conclude that including the ward of Blackhalls in the proposed constituency of Hartlepool is the least worst option available and would enable proposed constituencies to be recommended which would better reflect the statutory criteria.

Sedgefield and Yarm, and Stockton and Billingham

AC99 The Commission's initial proposals proposed a Sedgefield and Yarm constituency running north–south from the towns of Sedgefield and Newton Aycliffe in County Durham, through the wards of Sadberge and Whessoe, and Middleton St George in Darlington, to Yarm and other areas in Stockton-on-Tees. The proposals included wards from three existing constituencies and three local authority areas (Darlington, County Durham, and Stockton-upon-Tees). The initial proposals also proposed a Stockton and Billingham constituency which would include four of the five wards making up the town of Billingham, eight other wards from the existing Stockton North constituency, and four wards from the existing Stockton South constituency.

AC100 We received a number of representations opposing the initial proposals for the proposed constituency of Sedgefield and Yarm. These representations stressed that there were no links between areas such as the wards of Yarm, Eaglescliffe, Ingleby Barwick West, and Ingleby Barwick East in the south

with areas such as the town of Newton Aycliffe in the north. Rather, the evidence is that wards such as Eaglescliffe have existing ties with wards in the south of the town of Stockton-on-Tees such as Fairfield, Hartburn, and Grangefield (see, by way of example, Egglescliffe and Eaglescliffe Council (IP/003393)).

AC101 In relation to the proposed Sedgefield and Yarm constituency, in our opinion the wards of Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe should be included in the proposed Darlington constituency (see North Billingham Residents' Association, John Fletcher, Catherine Gilsenan (IP/024940), and Bishopton Parish Council (IP/004638)). This would ensure that the whole of the unitary authority of Darlington would be within one proposed constituency.

AC102 Secondly, the proposed Sedgefield and Yarm constituency would include the following 13 wards: Bishopgarth and Elm Tree, Eaglescliffe, Fairfield, Grangefield, Hartburn, Ingleby Barwick East, Ingleby Barwick West, Parkfield and Oxbridge, and Yarm and the wards of Western Parishes, Newtown, Stockton Town Centre, and Hardwick (all of which are within the local authority area of Stockton-on-Tees). The proposed constituency would not include the Shildon East ward, which we recommend be included within the proposed Bishop Auckland constituency for the reasons given in paragraph AC92 above.

AC103 Nine of the 13 wards in the constituency which we recommend are currently within the existing Stockton South constituency. All the wards in our recommended constituency would be within a single local authority area (Stockton-on-Tees) whereas the initial proposals included wards from three local authority areas. The changes we recommend would also avoid breaking existing local ties between the ward of Eaglescliffe and the wards of Fairfield, Hartburn, and Grangefield. Having regard to the boundaries of the existing Stockton South constituency, existing local government boundaries, and the existing ties that would be broken if the changes in the initial proposals were made, we recommend a constituency composed of the wards set out in paragraph AC102 above. We recommend that the name of the constituency be Stockton South.

AC104 In relation to the proposed Stockton and Billingham constituency, we recommend that the constituency include all five Billingham wards, together with the wards of Northern Parishes, Norton North, Norton South, Norton West, and Roseworth (included within the existing Stockton North constituency) together with Sedgefield, Aycliffe East, Aycliffe North, and Aycliffe West (included in the existing Sedgefield constituency).

AC105 The recommended changes would ensure that ten of the 14 wards in the proposed constituency are within the existing constituency of Stockton North. The changes would also avoid breaking the existing local ties between Billingham North and the remainder of the town of Billingham, which would be broken by the changes proposed by the initial proposals. We recognise that the proposed constituency would include wards from two local authority areas, rather than one as proposed by the initial proposals. However, the recommended changes that we propose to the proposed Sedgefield and Yarm constituency would ensure that wards from only one local authority area (rather than three) were included in that proposed constituency and that all of the area of the unitary authority of Darlington would be within one proposed constituency. Overall, therefore, the changes

that we recommend for the two existing Stockton constituencies and the existing Sedgefield constituency better reflect existing local government boundaries.

AC106 Having regard, therefore, to the existing boundaries of Stockton North and the ties that would be broken by the initial proposals, we recommend that the Stockton and Billingham constituency be composed as described in paragraph AC104 above. We recommend that the name of the proposed constituency be Stockton North and Aycliffe.

AC107 There have been a number of counter-proposals in relation to the proposed Sedgefield and Yarm, and Stockton and Billingham constituencies. In relation to the Parliamentary political parties, the Labour Party's counter-proposal supported a Sedgefield and Yarm constituency, to be called Sedgefield and Billingham. This would include all five wards of the town of Billingham and the wards of Northern Parishes and Western Parishes (from the existing Stockton North constituency), the wards of Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe, and also the wards of Eaglescliffe and Yarm (from the existing Stockton South constituency) and Sedgefield and the three Aycliffe wards (from the existing Sedgefield constituency). Similar counter-proposals were made by the Member of Parliament for Sedgefield, Phil Wilson MP (IP/021634). The Labour Party also proposed that the Stockton and Billingham constituency become a Stockton-on-Tees constituency. This would include the remaining wards of the existing Stockton North and Stockton South constituencies, including the wards of Ingleby Barwick East, Ingleby Barwick West, and Parkfield and Oxbridge, but would not include the five Billingham wards. We note that the Member of Parliament for Stockton North, Alex Cunningham MP, made similar proposals (IP/009281 and CR/000732). We agree that the Billingham, Sedgefield, and Aycliffe wards should be included within one proposed constituency. We do not consider, however, that including the wards of Middleton St George, Sadberge and Whessoe, Eaglescliffe, and Yarm better reflect the statutory criteria than our recommended changes, for the reasons given above. Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe are, in our opinion, better included within the constituency of Darlington. Including Eaglescliffe and Yarm in a proposed Stockton constituency (which we recommend be called Stockton South) minimises disruption to the existing constituency and avoids breaking existing links between the ward of Eaglescliffe and the wards of Fairfield, Grangefield, and Hartburn. We consider that the changes to the initial proposals that we recommend better meet the statutory criteria.

AC108 The Liberal Democrats' counter-proposal includes the three Aycliffe wards, and the Sedgefield, Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe wards (from the existing Sedgefield constituency) and nine wards from the existing Stockton North constituency (the five Billingham wards, and the Northern Parishes, Norton West, Norton North, and Norton South wards) within one constituency. The remainder of the wards in the existing Stockton South and Stockton North constituencies would be included within a proposed Stockton constituency. We agree that the five wards of Billingham, the three Norton wards, the ward of Northern Parishes, the ward of Sedgefield, and the three Aycliffe wards should be included in a single constituency. We would also include the ward of Roseworth to ensure that this proposed constituency is within the statutory electorate range. However, for the reasons we have given in paragraph AC101 above, we recommend that

the Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe wards should be included in the proposed Darlington constituency.

AC109 The Conservative Party, and also the Member of Parliament for Stockton South, James Wharton MP (see IP/003684 and CR/001079), proposed a constituency, which they called Sedgefield and Billingham, which included all five wards from the town of Billingham, the wards of Hardwick, Northern Parishes, Norton North, Norton South, Norton West, and Roseworth (from the existing Stockton North constituency), and the ward of Sedgefield and the three Aycliffe wards (from the existing Sedgefield constituency). They proposed a Stockton South constituency which would include nine wards from the existing Stockton South constituency (including Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe) and three additional wards (Newtown, Stockton Town Centre, and Western Parishes from the existing Stockton North constituency). As indicated, we agree that the five wards of Billingham, the three Norton wards, and the ward of Northern Parishes should be included in a constituency with the ward of Sedgefield and the three Aycliffe wards. We also agree that nine of the wards of the existing Stockton South constituency should be included in one constituency together with the wards of Newtown, Stockton Town Centre, and Western Parishes. However, we consider that the wards of Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe ought to be included in the proposed Darlington constituency for the reason given in paragraph AC101 above. As a consequence, we have included one other ward, Hardwick, in the proposed Stockton South constituency. We note that the Conservative Party (CR/003380) had much sympathy for the view that Middleton St George, and Sadberge and Whessoe be included in the proposed Darlington constituency but considered that, on balance, it would be difficult as a result of this to achieve coherent constituencies elsewhere. In our opinion, the changes that we propose to the initial proposals do result in coherent constituencies that better reflect the statutory criteria than the counter-proposals. In particular, we note that all the wards in the unitary authority of Darlington can be included within one proposed Darlington constituency and that the proposed Stockton South constituency includes wards from one local authority area. Furthermore, we consider that our recommended changes, which would result in a constituency including ten wards from the existing Stockton North constituency with the ward of Sedgefield and the three wards of Aycliffe is a coherent constituency. Overall, therefore, we consider that, in so far as our recommended changes differ from those in these counter-proposals, the recommended changes better reflect the statutory criteria.

AC110 There have been a number of other counter-proposals or suggestions made for proposed constituencies, or in respect of individual wards or groups of wards, in respect of the proposed Sedgefield and Yarm, and Stockton and Billingham constituencies. We have considered all the counter-proposals carefully. However, for the reasons given above, we consider that the changes that we recommend to the initial proposals will, overall, ensure that the proposed constituencies better reflect the statutory criteria.

Middlesbrough, Middlesbrough South and Guisborough, and Redcar

AC111 The initial proposals proposed significant changes to the existing constituencies of Middlesbrough, Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland, and Redcar. We recognise the constraints imposed by the need to ensure that constituencies

satisfy the statutory electorate range. Further, any changes are restricted by the sea to the east and by the boundary between the North East region and the neighbouring region to the south. We see no compelling case for crossing that boundary. As a result, we recognise that constituency boundaries are likely to move progressively westwards (away from the coast) to ensure that proposed constituencies meet the statutory electorate range, and that this implies significant changes to existing constituencies. Nevertheless, we have received considerable representations that the changes proposed in the initial proposals involve greater disruption to existing constituencies than is necessary.

AC112 In relation to the proposed Middlesbrough constituency, the initial proposals did not include the four wards of North Ormesby and Brambles Farm, Pallister, Thorntree, or Beckfield which are in the existing Middlesbrough constituency. Rather, the initial proposals included these wards within the Redcar constituency. The initial proposals also proposed including the two wards of Ladgate and Marton in the Middlesbrough constituency. Those two wards are in the existing Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland constituency.

AC113 First, in relation to the proposed Middlesbrough constituency, we recommend that the wards of North Ormesby and Brambles Farm, Pallister, and Thorntree are included in the proposed constituency of Middlesbrough and that the wards of Ladgate and Marton are not included. That minimises the disruption to the existing constituencies of Middlesbrough, and Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland. We recognise that the ward of Beckfield needs to be included within the proposed Redcar constituency in order to ensure that that constituency satisfies the statutory electorate range, and so cannot be included within the proposed Middlesbrough constituency. We recommend that the Brookfield ward needs to be included in the proposed Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency in order to ensure that that constituency satisfies the statutory electorate range. Overall, however, if our recommended changes are accepted, 13 of the 15 wards included in the existing Middlesbrough constituency are included in the proposed Middlesbrough constituency.

AC114 Secondly, in relation to the proposed Redcar constituency, we recommend that the ward of St Germain's be included in this constituency. The St Germain's ward is in the existing constituency of Redcar. Furthermore, we have received considerable evidence that there are strong links between the wards of St Germain's and Longbeck (which is also in the existing Redcar constituency): see by way of example Marilyn Marshall (IP/000686) and Chris Abbott (IP/011650). Together they form the town of Marske-by-the-Sea. The initial proposals included the Longbeck ward in the Redcar constituency but included the St Germain's ward in the Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency. The initial proposals would, therefore, divide the town of Marske-by-the-Sea into two. We recommend including the St Germain's and Longbeck wards in the proposed Redcar constituency, thereby avoiding changes which would break the existing local ties within the town of Marske-by-the-Sea. We would also include the wards of Ormesby and Normanby in the proposed Redcar constituency. Those two wards are in the existing Redcar constituency but the initial proposals proposed that they be included in the Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency. We would not include the ward of Park End in the proposed Redcar constituency. That ward is in the existing Middlesbrough

South and East Cleveland constituency and we consider that it should continue to be included in that constituency. We consider that the changes we recommend to the initial proposals would result in less disruption to both the proposed Redcar, and Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituencies (see, for example, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (IP/023872)). All 14 of the wards within the existing constituency of Redcar remain in the proposed Redcar constituency. In addition, the constituency would include the ward of Beckfield to ensure that the constituency is within the statutory electorate range.

AC115 We would recommend one further change to the Redcar constituency: we would include the ward of Saltburn within the proposed constituency. One further ward needs to be included in order to ensure that the Redcar constituency is within the statutory electorate range. The ward of Saltburn is within the existing constituency of Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland, although it is also within the local authority area of Redcar and Cleveland. There is evidence that the ward of Saltburn has ties with the ward of St Germain's (see, by way of example, Chris Abbott). The inclusion of Saltburn therefore is, in our opinion, an appropriate means of ensuring that the proposed constituency of Redcar is within the statutory electorate range.

AC116 In relation to the proposed Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency, we would include the wards of Ladgate, Marton, and Park End. These three wards are within the existing constituency (currently called Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland). We would recommend that the wards of St Germain's, Ormesby, and Normanby (which are in the existing constituency of Redcar) are not included. We also recommend that Saltburn is not included (but be included in the proposed Redcar constituency to ensure that that constituency satisfies the statutory electorate range). Finally, we would include the ward of Brookfield from the existing Middlesbrough constituency to ensure that the proposed Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency is within the statutory electorate range. If those changes are accepted, the proposed constituency will include 15 of the 16 wards of the existing Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland constituency, together with the ward of Brookfield. We recommend that the constituency be named Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland.

AC117 We consider that the changes we recommend will minimise disruption to existing constituencies. If our recommended changes are accepted, there would be fewer changes to the existing Middlesbrough, Redcar, and Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland constituencies than proposed in the initial proposals. Furthermore, the strong ties between the wards of St Germain's and Longbeck will not be broken. We recognise that the proposed Redcar constituency will include one ward from the local authority area of Middlesbrough, and the remaining wards are from the local authority area of Redcar and Cleveland. The proposed constituency will therefore include wards from two local authority areas. However, the initial proposals also included wards from the two local authority areas which results from the need to ensure that the proposed Redcar constituency is within the statutory electorate range. The changes we recommend, therefore, have no less regard to existing local government boundaries than the initial proposals (and, arguably, have greater regard as only one, rather than five, wards from a second local authority area are included in the Redcar constituency).

AC118 Having regard to the boundaries of the existing constituencies, and the existing local ties between the wards of St Germain's and Longbeck that would be broken by the changes included in the initial proposals, we consider that the changes that we recommend to the three proposed constituencies of Middlesbrough, Redcar, and Middlesbrough South and Guisborough better reflect the statutory criteria.

AC119 We have considered carefully all the counter-proposals and suggestions for these proposed constituencies and for particular wards or groups of wards. In terms of the three Parliamentary political parties, the Labour Party did not make formal counter-proposals for these proposed constituencies. However, the Labour Party supported the inclusion of the four wards currently included within the existing Middlesbrough constituency in the proposed Redcar constituency and the inclusion of three wards (Normanby, Ormesby, and St Germain's) within the proposed Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency, although it recognised that ties may be broken by the changes. For the reasons set out above, the changes included in the initial proposals would involve greater disruption to existing constituencies than is necessary and, in our opinion, our recommended changes better reflect the statutory criteria.

AC120 The Liberal Democrats' counter-proposals to the initial proposals for the Teesside area include proposed changes to the Middlesbrough, Redcar, and Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituencies. We broadly agree with the counter-proposals which correspond to the changes that we recommend for these proposed constituencies. The Conservative Party counter-proposals support the initial proposals save that they propose including the ward of Longbeck within the proposed Middlesbrough South and Guisborough constituency (in order to avoid breaking existing ties between the wards of Longbeck and St Germain's), and including Normanby in the proposed Redcar constituency. We agree that the wards of Longbeck and St Germain's should be included in the same constituency, in order to avoid breaking existing ties. But the two wards are presently included within the existing Redcar constituency and we consider, for the reasons given above, that the two wards should be included in the proposed Redcar constituency.

The names of the proposed constituencies

AC121 We recommend the following changes to the names of the proposed constituencies set out in the initial proposals.

AC122 We recommend that the proposed Berwick and Morpeth constituency should be named Berwick, Alnwick and Morpeth. The initial proposals proposed extending the existing constituency of Berwick to include the town of Morpeth. Counter-proposals have been made that the proposed constituency bear the name of Berwick, Alnwick and Morpeth, as the proposed constituency includes three market towns of similar size and nature (see for example Berwick-upon-Tweed Conservative Association (IP/020828) and William Veniard (IP/000215)). We agree.

AC123 We recommend that the proposed Chester-le-Street constituency be named North Durham. The proposed constituency is essentially the existing constituency of North Durham with one additional ward (Burnopfield and Dipton). In accordance with paragraph 42 of *A guide to the 2013 Review*, therefore, we consider that the existing name should be retained. There is strong support for the proposed constituency to retain its existing

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
22. Stockton North and Aycliffe CC			**73,391**
	Aycliffe East	Durham	5,042
	Aycliffe North	Durham	6,338
	Aycliffe West	Durham	5,666
	Sedgefield	Durham	5,644
	Billingham Central	Stockton-on-Tees	5,267
	Billingham East	Stockton-on-Tees	5,321
	Billingham North	Stockton-on-Tees	7,324
	Billingham South	Stockton-on-Tees	4,972
	Billingham West	Stockton-on-Tees	4,828
	Northern Parishes	Stockton-on-Tees	2,695
	Norton North	Stockton-on-Tees	5,036
	Norton South	Stockton-on-Tees	4,896
	Norton West	Stockton-on-Tees	5,206
	Roseworth	Stockton-on-Tees	5,156
23. Stockton South CC			**73,529**
	Bishopsgarth and Elm Tree	Stockton-on-Tees	5,304
	Eaglescliffe	Stockton-on-Tees	8,288
	Fairfield	Stockton-on-Tees	4,837
	Grangefield	Stockton-on-Tees	5,324
	Hardwick	Stockton-on-Tees	4,842
	Hartburn	Stockton-on-Tees	5,480
	Ingleby Barwick East	Stockton-on-Tees	7,498
	Ingleby Barwick West	Stockton-on-Tees	7,457
	Newtown	Stockton-on-Tees	4,954
	Parkfield and Oxbridge	Stockton-on-Tees	4,953
	Stockton Town Centre	Stockton-on-Tees	4,206
	Western Parishes	Stockton-on-Tees	2,630
	Yarm	Stockton-on-Tees	7,756
24. Sunderland Central BC			**76,292**
	Barnes	Sunderland	8,959
	Fulwell	Sunderland	9,211
	Hendon	Sunderland	8,744
	Millfield	Sunderland	7,656
	Pallion	Sunderland	7,602
	Ryhope	Sunderland	8,227
	St Michael's	Sunderland	9,031
	St Peter's	Sunderland	8,566
	Southwick	Sunderland	8,296
25. Tynemouth BC			**76,494**
	Chirton	North Tyneside	8,267
	Collingwood	North Tyneside	8,578
	Cullercoats	North Tyneside	7,513
	Monkseaton North	North Tyneside	6,996
	Monkseaton South	North Tyneside	7,686
	Preston	North Tyneside	7,040
	Riverside	North Tyneside	7,930
	St Mary's	North Tyneside	6,909
	Tynemouth	North Tyneside	8,407
	Whitley Bay	North Tyneside	7,168
26. Washington BC			**74,686**
	Birtley	Gateshead	6,321
	Lamesley	Gateshead	6,849
	Castle	Sunderland	8,668
	Redhill	Sunderland	8,705
	Washington Central	Sunderland	8,998
	Washington East	Sunderland	8,856
	Washington North	Sunderland	8,824
	Washington South	Sunderland	8,275
	Washington West	Sunderland	9,190