

Parliamentary Constituencies – June 2021

WARDS TO WHICH COMMENTS RELATE	POLITICAL PARTY	COMMENTS
All Thornaby wards	Thornaby Independent Association (TIA)	<p>These comments are initial comments only, intended to form part of the submission to Stockton Borough Council Cabinet and Full Council meetings and we will be making further representations direct to the Boundary Commission and at any future public hearings.</p> <p>Thornaby Independent Association (TIA) wish to object in the strongest possible terms against the proposed PCC Boundary Review, which literally splits the <u>TOWN</u> of Thornaby on Tees in half.</p> <p>This goes completely against the expressed intention as stated at the beginning of the review document, VIZ:</p> <p><u><i>As far as possible, we try to have regard to local ties, geographic factors, local government boundaries (as they were known at 1 December 2020), existing constituencies, and minimising disruption caused by proposed change</i></u></p> <p><u><i>We use local government wards as the building blocks for proposed constituencies, but will consider splitting a ward where there is a strong case for doing so that helps us better respect the factors above</i></u></p> <p>The <u>TOWN</u> of Thornaby on Tees is a Royal Charter Town established in 1892 and as such has clearly defined boundaries, it is not the same as a Ward or an area within an estate or larger conurbation. The town has an elected Town Council comprising 13 Councillors and 7 Councillors serve on Stockton Borough Council. It has a proud heritage and strong identity.</p> <p>Your proposal also crosses County lines with half of the town being lumped in with Stockton West constituency in County Durham and half in Middlesbrough Borough constituency within North Yorkshire. For the benefit of doubt the Royal Charter Town of Thornaby on Tees lies within and has always been within the County of North Yorkshire since time immemorial.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, we will be left with the wholly invidious position of houses within the same street being in totally different parliamentary constituencies and this will cause enormous confusion to the Electorate and residents about the identity of their MP. Parliamentary protocol prevents an MP dealing with enquiries from another MP's constituency and contacting the wrong representative can cause significant delays and disruption, how will an issue that affects the whole street be handled? It will also cut across two entirely different Unitary Authorities again causing confusion and disparity.</p> <p>Central Government have also recognized the identity of our TOWN by awarding it £23.9m of funding as part of the Town Deal to be spent across all areas of the town.</p> <p>Your document also states:</p> <p><u><i>Our proposals leave two of the existing 29 constituencies wholly unchanged, and 11 with only minor substantive changes of one to two wards.</i></u></p> <p>We contend that the division of our <u>TOWN</u> is far from a minor substantive change!</p> <p>To add insult to injury neither proposed PCC mention the name of Thornaby on Tees, we contend that the whole of the town should be within one constituency boundary and that the constituency name should include the name of Thornaby on Tees within the title. Whether that constituency is Middlesbrough or Stockton is a matter for the numbers involved, but the town must remain complete.</p>

No comments were received relating to the following wards:

- Billingham & Wolviston
- Central Stockton
- Eaglescliffe
- Fairfield North & Elm Tree, Hardwick & Bishopsgarth and Roseworth
- Hartburn & Fairfield
- Ingleby Barwick
- Northern Parishes
- Norton
- Yarm and Southern Parishes