

<b>LGBC - Warding Patterns Consultation comments @ 02.11.20</b>	
<b>Political Group</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Labour</b>	<p>Our ward ( Parkfield &amp; Oxbridge) electorate already considerably exceeds the tolerance and will only get bigger in time. I would like therefore to propose that all property to the west of Hartburn Avenue, including those properties with even numbers, are moved into Hartburn ward So, that is Crayke, Kilburn, Bromley, Ropner and Hartburn Avenue west side.</p> <p>My rationale for this is that Hartburn Avenue itself is a natural boundary for the ward, being an A road - the A1027, and it is also the ring road. Hartburn ward already contains the properties to the west of Hartburn Lane in terms of Linden Avenue etc, and this is simply a natural continuation along the ring road. And finally, the people who live in these roads already consider themselves as living in the suburb of Hartburn. Only the other day someone asked me why my leaflets are headed <i>Parkfield and Oxbridge</i> when they live in neither.</p>
<b>Conservative</b>	<p>As a group we will be submitting our observations directly to the Commission.</p>
<b>Thornaby Independent Association</b>	<p>“Thornaby on Tees is a town that was once a municipal borough with its own unique identity that has remained intact despite a number of local government upheavals. Now, however, Thornaby on Tees is one of the constituent towns that makes up the Borough of Stockton on Tees – a unitary authority since 1974 and the only one that crosses traditional county boundaries.</p> <p>Thornaby on Tees is a town in the County of Yorkshire that was incorporated by Royal Charter as a municipal borough in 1892 with boundaries recognised under that charter. And though a number of local government reorganisations have meant that we no longer have autonomy, Thornaby on Tees remains the only town in what is referred to as the Tees Valley as a town by Royal proclamation.</p> <p>At this point in this submission, is worth pointing out that pre reorganisation when communities and townships voiced concern about loss of identity and threat of boundary distortion, a government statement declared: <i>'The new administrative areas will not alter the traditional boundaries, nor is it intended that the loyalties of people living in them will change, despite the different names adopted by the new administrative bodies.'</i> And that remains the case.</p> <p>The boundaries of Thornaby on Tees established by Royal Charter were once defined by the River Tees in the north and west and east to a shared boundary with Middlesbrough – the defining line being the Old River Tees, Fleet and Stainsby Beck now also defined by the A19. The southern boundary stretched out as far as Middleton on Leven and the villages of Maltby, Hilton and Ingleby Barwick were all within the administrative area of the Municipal Borough of Thornaby on Tees.</p>

	<p>Since 1968 however, successive authorities have allowed Thornaby on Tees to be systematically whittled away – particularly to the south where the new settlement of Ingleby Barwick has grown exponentially to the west of Bassleton Beck – i.e. the boundary separation from Thornaby on Tees established under the Ingleby Barwick master plan.</p> <p>Now however, government has quite recently allowed planning permission east of Bassleton Beck that planners initially accepted as an extension of Ingleby Barwick when in fact it is clearly in Thornaby on Tees by virtue of crossing a recognised boundary. Presumably, they also failed to see a road sign adjacent to this land bearing the Thornaby on Tees coat of arms and reading ‘Welcome to Thornaby on Tees.</p> <p>Where confusion arose is that some time ago in the last such exercise in defining wards within constituent towns, a now deceased Deputy Leader of Stockton Borough Council charged with ensuring numbers complied with what was being requested simply drew lines around built areas where electors were housed. Consequently, planners and others mistakenly took the outer lines to be town boundaries – effectively annexing a great swathe of Thornaby on Tees adjacent to Thornaby Road and Low Lane as referred to in the preceding paragraph.</p> <p>Therefore, as councillors representing Thornaby on Tees at both borough level and as Thornaby Town Councillors, we have objected in the strongest terms and we have been reassured that the Borough Council now recognize the error and so support our claim that the boundary between Thornaby on Tees and Ingleby Barwick remains the geographic Bassleton Beck Valley. As a result, the new housing soon to be built will now rightly sit in Village Ward, Thornaby on Tees and it is hoped that this will be taken into consideration when the commission makes its final assessment of requisite number of councillors to represent Thornaby on Tees.</p> <p>Area we propose to move from Village to Stainsby would be:</p> <p>Ledbury Drive          Kimble Drive          Sinnington Road          Ashdown Close          Epping Close          Sapley Close          Sherwood Road          Selwood Close</p> <p>This would give a clear dividing line along the green area to the North &amp; Thornaby Road to the West rather than the dog leg we have at present.“</p>
<p><b>Ingleby Barwick Independent Association</b></p>	<p><b>Ingleby Barwick</b></p> <p>Ingleby Barwick was approved for planning purposes by the Planning Inspectorate in 1978, with no conditions (Section 106 agreements etc). It was to be 7,940 new properties in 7 villages. Due to increased housing densities as part of Planning Guidance from Government, it will now be</p>

completed with 10,500 properties in the same 7 villages. More people requires more representation. In 2005 it went from 1 councillor (the biggest ward in the country) to 6 Councillors, even though locally, as part of the process, the main two political parties differed on how many seats it should have, 5 or 7. The Commission went for 6.

Thornaby has 7 seats for 16,987 electors. IB at the 2019 election has  $7680 + 9189 = 16,879$  electors, without the new homes built since on The Rings and Little Maltby Farm.

It now needs 7 for the following reasons:

#### **Ingleby Barwick West Ward**

For someone who represents Ingleby Barwick West Ward with my two colleagues, we had 9,189 electors for around 4,465 properties in May 2019. There have been another 200 properties built and occupied since then on The Rings, an estimated increased in 400 electors, taking it to around 9,600 with another 200 still to build on The Rings and 65 on Roundhill Village. This will likely lead to around 10,300 electors in 4 years' time when these developments are finished. This will complete the construction in IB West Ward.

**Potential Solution** – Residents in IB are familiar with the IB East and West Ward as they meet at the major road of Barwick Way, Ingleby Way, Myton Way and Queen Elizabeth Way, a simple and clear boundary. IB West could be divided into 2 wards using the southern part of Blair Avenue and the entrance to the 65 new homes site at the north western end of Roundhill Avenue to give two wards of 5,000 electors and 2 councillors in each. There is still a lot of projects to complete, such as 2 bridges over the River Tees and a 60 acre country park.

The above could be provided by reducing the number of Wards which have elector numbers that are below the 2,500 per councillor, in red above and creating larger wards.

#### **Ingleby Barwick East Ward**

Ingleby Barwick East Ward, had 7,680 electors for around 4,000 properties in May 2019. About 250 of these properties are in two villages of Maltby & Hilton, which have nothing to do with Ingleby Barwick. We ask you to consider moving these to Yarm Ward, as they have more links with Yarm and Kirklevington. This could reduce elector numbers by 500. There have been another 100 new homes built and occupied on Little Maltby Farm, with another an estimated increased of 200 electors, taking it to around 7,880 with another 1,000 new homes still to build on that village. This will likely lead to around 9,880 electors. However, the build is slow as the landowner is releasing land slowly (170 homes in 5 years), so in 6 years' time if the same build rate is applied another 210 occupied with 420 electors, giving a total of electors in 2026 of 7,800, so 3 councillors would suffice until then, when another review should consider if it needs to go the 4 Councillors like IB West.

#### **Other Considerations**

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Move the village of Wolviston into Billingham West Ward to reduce Northern Parishes and increase Billingham West by 500 electors approx.</li> <li>2. Amalgamate Northern and Western Parishes as well as adding the rural district of Eaglescliffe to form a 2 seat ward.</li> <li>3. Move the villages of Maltby and Hilton to Yarm Ward, or add to 2 above and call it Rural Parishes, which would be one ward for all of them, regardless of Parliamentary Constituency, which would have a minimal effect in such a rural setting. The rural villages should face the same issues.</li> </ol> <p><b>Parish Councils (these comments would be subject to a separate Community Governance process):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Little Maltby Farm (Village 7) in IB East Ward is in Maltby Parish, but is part of the IB urbanisation and should be considered for transferring to IB Town Council. Maltby is a small village and now this area is due for construction of 1400 new homes it should be transferred to IB Town Council as these are the services the population will rely upon. Maltby Village is a lovely countryside village separated from Little Maltby Farm by at least 800 yards and up to 1 mile.</li> <li>2. The land south of the B1264 opposite Conyers School, from the roundabout with the A67 to the end of the Borough at Saltergill Lane, is in Kirklevington Parish, but is part of the Yarm urbanisation and should be considered for transferring to Yarm Town Council. Kirklevington is a village and now this area is due for construction of 800 to 1000 new homes it should be transferred to Yarm Town Council as these are the services the population will rely upon.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Fairfield &amp; Yarm Independents</b></p>	<p>We feel there is adequacy of arrangements for: delivering electoral equality for voters, reflecting the interest and identities of local government, promoting effective and convenient local government within our Fairfield Ward boundary. Ensuring an active commitment throughout a 24 hour/day period and therefore conclude the electoral division boundary should remain the same as it is.</p>
<p><b>Lib Dem</b></p>	<p>As discussed, I have no changes/comments to make however I think it's important that the areas of Bishopsgarth and Elm Tree are kept together as geographic wards, since that is how people identify where they live.</p>
<p><b>West Words</b></p>	<p>Going from the table for 2026 Billingham West has 4367 electors.</p> <p>I believe Wolviston Village has around 565 electors.</p> <p>Adding the two sets together we have (Billingham West) a total 4934 which would be approximately 2500 per councillor against the recommended 2639.</p> <p>Another option would be to add all electors from the opposite side of Wolviston Road such as Wolviston Road up to the Bridge and the other</p>

	<p>side of Roseberry Road including Hambleton Square which would lift the numbers up a bit. This would not include St Oswalds etc.</p> <p>If Billingham West took in Wolviston Village I think an apt ward name Billingham West and Wolviston Village as it still gives identification.</p>
<b>Independent</b>	<p>With the new village 7 being built, I believe there should be an additional ward to cover these houses along with Hilton and Maltby.</p> <p>There is a way that we could add part of the Rings to the East ward ie Sandgate side down to include Apsley way and all roads off it.</p> <p>The Roads will separate from the rest of the Rings.</p>