

**Boundary Review – June 2021**

WARD	POLITICAL PARTY	COMMENTS
<p><b>Fairfield North &amp; Elm Tree, Hardwick &amp; Bishopsgarth and Roseworth</b></p>	<p><b>Fairfield &amp; Yarm Independents (FYI)</b></p>	<p>Warding Patterns - Further to our comments on the recent Member Survey for the review of ward boundaries in Stockton, we provide our views on Ward Patterns related to the Fairfield Ward.</p> <p>Firstly, we would like you to note that the overview and arrangements established in the Fairfield Ward have been maintained for many years and run in a well-defined and orderly manner by two serving Councillors. Time and effort have no boundaries, whatever it takes to establish good common-sense practices and getting the right results for the benefit of the residents. Ward boundaries are not defined by fences or brick walls, they are defined by communities in established areas and the number of residents that reside within.</p> <p>Looking at the most recent Electoral Data for the Fairfield Ward shows the Electorate for 2020 at 4541, with a variance of - 12%, and 4575 at variance of - 13% for 2026. Although Councillor/resident representation is lower than the norm, one should consider the interest and identities of the local communities, as for example, in the Fairfield Ward, there are 2 junior Schools for pupils 5 to 11 year olds and 1 CE Academy for pupils 11 to 16 year olds, two public Houses, 1 Library, 1 Youth Club, Scout assembly, 2 Shopping parades, a General Store, 2 Garages - 1 for vehicle servicing and the other for supply of fuel including a general store and car wash facilities. These all facilitate the migration of residents from other nearby surrounding communities of different Wards, who have limited or no facilities established in close proximity. Overall, we consider the Electorate numbers that are shown for 2020 are deflated numbers when you consider the migration patterns of other local residents using the Fairfield Ward facilities.</p> <p>If it is the case to establish electoral equality for local voters i.e. Councillors represent the same number of people for each Ward area, then Boundary patterns could be established by making some small adjustments to the Ward boundaries, which are easily identifiable for effective representation.</p> <p>The following are a few suggestions that would need to be considered, to establish Electorate Equality in the Fairfield Ward.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider the North West Area of the West Side Stockton Development as indicated in Zone D of the Development Plan. This lies at the head of Fairfield Ward, separated by Darlington Back Lane. The scheme consists at the moment of 392 dwellings, including shopping and community hub arrangements.</li> <li>2. Consider the Stockton West Side Development which in part is encapsulated by the present Fairfield Ward Boundary. The plans indicate that 121 dwellings would be provided out of 859 in total for Zone E development. Adjusting the boundary arrangements further south of the original location to include about half the permitted development, would increase the electorate from 171 to 430 approximate i.e. half the permitted development. It would also reflect on the growth of the Hartburn Ward in this circumstance, as it would even out the variance for the Hatburn Ward in 2026, reflecting positively for the variance of the Fairfield Ward.</li> </ol> <p>Also, to note that within the Fairfield development there are proposals, to include for a Primary School which offer 525 places, with an admission number of 75 pupils per year and to include pre-school Nursery provision of 52 places. Once again, we should consider the interest and identities of local communities and the migration patterns of other nearby Ward residents using the facilities in the Fairfield Ward.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Consider the area inclusive of part Surbiton Road that continues from the beck south of the Fairfield/Hartburn boundary, including residents of Hayling Way, Symons Close, Greenfields Way, part of Moulton Grove, Elton Grove, Aiskew Grove, Lyndon Way, Knayton Grove, Sadberge Grove, Scalby Grove and Muker Grove. This area consists of around 276 houses. With the provision of item 2 this would easily provide electoral equality.</li> <li>4. Consider the area of Fairfield Road. The Fairfield/Grangefield Wards are split with the boundary running down the middle of the road. If you take the rest of Fairfield road in the Grangefield Ward including residents of Claremont Gardens, Fairfield Close, Gilling Road, The Avenue, Bishopton Road West and Bishopton Court, this community consists of around 345 houses. To note, the houses in these areas, once formed part of the Fairfield Ward but was placed into the Grangefield Ward from a previous Electoral Division of Boundaries. To say the least, a lot of residents in these areas, to this day, believe they still reside in the Fairfield Ward, i.e. as per the number of residents contacting the Fairfield Councillors with their problems on a regular basis.</li> <li>5. Consider the area of Darlington Back Lane across the way from Malcolm Drive. The Fairfield /Elm Tree Wards are split with the boundary running down the middle of the road. If you take the number of houses opposite Malcolm Drive on Darlington Back Lane there are about 32 Houses that could be taken into consideration for electoral equality moving forward.</li> </ol> <p>In summary you could make adjustments in many ways to attain the required electoral equality as noted above, ensuring each local Councillor represents roughly the same number of people. But, consideration must be given, that reflect the interests and identities of local communities. We would not like to see Boundary adjustments just for the sake of making the numbers up, or for any political manoeuvring. Each Ward has a different perspective in maintaining and running their objectives, some Wards have complex needs whilst others more or less manage themselves, with very little input. Over the years we have created good harmony and excellent feedback from the residents, ensuring effective representation and that local ties are maintained at all times. If adjustments are made to Boundaries to suit electoral equality for each ward, then we must ensure that there is no discrimination between Ward Councillors, due to any boundary changes, and Councillor/resident relationships are not diminished for the pursuance of number crunching.</p> <p><u>Supplementary Note:-</u></p> <p>Further to the Boundary Commission report outlining their proposals related to the Fairfield Ward in Stockton on Tees Borough, for the next stage of consultation, we wish to comment on those proposals as follows,</p> <p>Firstly we find it difficult to understand why anyone would want to split a community into two separate units, i.e. Fairfield North and Fairfield South, dividing the cohesive nature that binds the Fairfield Ward in its entirety, nor do we find your comments favourable to the notation of Bishopton Road West forming a strong boundary, which in our and residents opinion is not a sensible reflection of the communities, access routes, and general geography of the area. Bishopton Road West with the other major roads running through the Fairfield Ward such as Fairfield Road, Rimswell Road, Upsall Grove and Surbiton Road form the major networks to the housing communities within the area, with Bishopton Road West being the centre of the road network to its communities. This is the perfect parallel that binds the community together inclusive of local interests and identities of the local communities within the ward as it stands. As mentioned in our views in the attachment provided, considering the interests and identities of the local communities, the two ward councillors have worked tirelessly for the Fairfield community who have created</p>

WARD	POLITICAL PARTY	COMMENTS
		<p>good harmony, ensuring effective representation and local ties are maintained at all times. Splitting the Fairfield Ward would destroy all that has been achieved in the many years of progression. The residents can also remember, with regret, the time when boundary changes were made encapsulating Fairfield ward into Elm Tree Ward, and then Bishopsgarth Ward for short periods then back to Fairfield Ward which had disastrous effects until Fairfield Ward became the norm to the relief of the residents and communities.</p> <p>Again please do not destroy what has been achieved over the years, as the residents do not want it destroyed, they've got their identities and local interests established and don't want to lose it.</p> <p>In addition to our comments made in the Fairfield Electoral Data attached, with your comments on you're draft recommendations we would like to suggest the following proposal, to establish Electorate Equality in the Fairfield Ward.</p> <p>6. Warding Patterns.</p> <p>a. Consider linking the North West Area of the West Side Stockton Development as indicated in Zone D of the Development Plan in with the Fairfield Ward West Side Development. This lies at the head of Fairfield Ward, separated by Darlington Back Lane. The scheme consists at the moment of 392 dwellings, including shopping and community hub arrangements. This would complement the migration patterns of school children to the new school in the proposed West Side Fairfield Development including interests and identities of the Fairfield community.</p> <p>b. The Stockton West Side Development which in part is encapsulated by the present Fairfield Ward Boundary. The plans indicate that 121 dwellings would be provided out of 859 in total for Zone E development. Adjusting the boundary arrangements further south of the original location to include about half the permitted development, would increase the electorate from 171 to 430 approximate i.e. half the permitted development. It would also reflect on the growth of the Hartburn Ward in this circumstance, as it would even out the variance for the Hartburn Ward in 2023, reflecting positively for the variance of the Fairfield Ward. Also, to note that within the Fairfield development there are proposals, to include for a Primary School which offer 525 places, with an admission number of 75 pupils per year and to include pre-school Nursery provision of 52 places. Once again, we should consider the interest and identities of local communities and the migration patterns of other nearby Ward residents using the facilities in the Fairfield Ward.</p> <p>Considering a and b, Families are not identified as of yet and therefore can be easily merged into the Fairfield Ward interests and patterns, once established at the early stage of developing the community, without the inference of who they identified with after the Boundary changes.</p> <p>c. Also to include, the area of part Surbiton Road that continues from the beck south of the Fairfield/Hartburn boundary to Greens beck, including residents of Hayling Way, Symons Close, Greenfields Way, part of Moulton Grove, Elton Grove, Aiskew Grove, Lyndon Way, Knayton Grove, Sadberge Grove, Scalby Grove and Muker Grove, Elton Way, Merring Close, Kildale Grove, Greenbank Grove Bedale Close Masham Grove, Rounton Grove and Upsall Grove (part). This area consists of over 500 houses and with the provision of the areas a and b noted would easily provide good levels of electoral equality in the ward. It would also negate the requirement of an extra Ward Councillor for the Hartburn Ward and with other minor adjustments would compliment existing Ward Boundaries for their established communities.</p> <p>On an aggravated note it would seem that Ward Boundary proposals have taken direct notification of the Conservative recommendations without further considerations of the people and ward councillors views, they that know their wards. We always thought that the Boundary Commission for England after consultation, would submit without prejudice, independent comments without the administration of political parties.</p> <p>In the interest of openness and transparency we would welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue further.</p> <p>Thank you, Councillors Bill Woodhead MBE and Maurice Perry.</p>
	<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A proportion of the current Hardwick boundaries be absorbed into the new Roseworth boundaries and return a 2 or 3 member ward (depending on how much of wards are combined).</li> <li>2) Current Bishopsgarth boundaries be absorbed into the new North Fairfield and Elm Tree ward, including Durham Road-Darlington Lane around Newham Grange Park and return a 2/3 member ward (again depending on population)</li> <li>3) Of the new North Fairfield and Elm Tree ward all the houses west of Rimswell Road and north if Bishopton Road West up to the Darlington Back Lane and Bishopton Road West junction be absorbed into Fairfield South and return a 2 member ward</li> </ol>
<b>Thornaby</b>	<b>Thornaby Independent Association (TIA)</b>	<p>Thornaby Independent Association (TIA) wish to strongly object to the draft proposals for the Thornaby Wards.</p> <p>Thornaby on Tees is a Royal Charter Town and a constituent township within the Borough of Stockton on Tees, as such its identity and boundaries are inviolable and demand the same respect as other towns within the borough.</p> <p>Despite recommendations from both TIA and the full Stockton Borough Council decision that ward patterns should follow the existing Thornaby Town Council boundaries established in 1892, you have suggested that an area of Thornaby be annexed into the new Southern Parishes ward. For the sake of clarity, we state again our position that the town boundary runs the length of Low Lane up to the western boundary of Bassleton Beck and this area falls within the Village Ward. The resultant planning permissions already granted for this area bringing up the numbers required within Thornaby wards to acceptable limits. It should be noted that in the words of The Planning Inspectorate when dealing with an appeal in the area noted that Bassleton Beck valley was "a clear and linear break between Thornaby &amp; Ingleby Barwick".</p>

WARD	POLITICAL PARTY	COMMENTS
		<p>The dividing line between Stainsby Hill &amp; Village should also run straight up Thornaby road and not cross over as shown on your map, properties to the west of Thornaby Road have always been part of Village Ward and have a strong identity with it, they do not belong in Stainsby Hill Ward.</p> <p>We also object the proposals for moving the boundaries between Village &amp; Mandale wards and the loss of a councillor.</p> <p>Mandale &amp; Victoria is a ward of high depravation with a transient population who for one reason or another do not appear on the electoral roll; these people who although not registered to vote tend to have the greatest problems and require the greatest level of intervention and support. It has high levels of immigration, poverty, reliance on food banks, drug related crime and myriad social problems demanding huge effort and time on the existing three Councillors, it can not be compared with other more affluent wards within the borough and it is patently unfair to base the figures solely on registered electors.</p> <p>You only appear to have taken the views of the Conservative Group and 1 member of the public who is in fact an Ingleby Barwick Councillor into consideration; they obviously have a political interest in reducing the number of Councillors within Thornaby who since their inception in 2003 have been one of the major opposition parties within the Council and currently hold every seat in Thornaby for both town and borough.</p>
Ingleby Barwick	Ingleby Barwick Independent Society (IBIS)	<p>There has been a lot of good work undertaken by the Boundary Commission, with on our part, just a few minor adjustments we think would add some finishing touches to what has already been proposed.</p> <p>IBIS is dedicated to Ingleby Barwick (IB), so our proposals concern our town as we don't profess to understand how other areas should be 'warded' under this review, and we will leave that to those who live there and those who represent those areas.</p> <p>The adjustments we think may add value are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Part of the area north west of the Low Lane and Thornaby Road junction remains in the town of Thornaby and we would like to see ward proposals reflect this.</li> <li>2. We have no issues with the north / south split of IB, and welcome the creation of 'Southern Parishes'. However, the latter proposal includes Little Maltby Farm (LMF), which is really part of Ingleby Barwick. We would like to see this 'village' included in the Ingleby Barwick wards, even though this would reduce the size of the Southern Parishes Ward, which would mean it would have less electors (around 2,214 based upon our predictions and changes described below) than the average number of electors of 2,639 for each of the 56 councillors. However, we feel that the inclusion of LMF in the IB wards far outweighs the issue of 2,214 electors being technically 'over-represented' (-16%) by having 1 councillor (out of a total number of councillors of 56).</li> </ol> <p>Here is our proposal</p> <p>LMF currently has around 180 new properties completed with around a minimum of further 1,100 still to be constructed over the coming years. It is known as 'Village 7' and was included in the 1977 IB Master Plan. The new homes are advertised a 'Ingleby Manor' (see attached photograph) with its identity described as being part of IB. IBIS has carried out some further analysis of elector number in IB by examining existing electoral registers, and using the predictions included within the initial supporting document to this review. We estimate the voter numbers in IB would exceed the average of 2,639 per each of the 6 councillors in the draft recommendations from the Commission, but can be retained within around 10% of that number. We estimate this could be undertaken by making the following adjustments.</p> <p>IB could be split into 3 wards as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Rings (including all properties in Stanegate, Pagan Drive, Fosse Court etc) &amp; Broom Hill villages plus Roseville Nursing Home, which is adjacent to the Rings – providing 3,213 electors on The Rings &amp; 2,495 electors for Broom Hill, plus around 110 in Roseville totalling 5,805 electors and titled as IB North).</li> <li>2. Lowfields and Beckfields Villages plus the town centre and the properties bounded Blair Avenue (roads off Brecon Crescent, Thirlwall Drive, Rochester Court, Cradoc Grove etc), plus the area north West of Blair Avenue (Snowden and Rowan Groves, Marchlyn Crescent and all roads off it. This would produce an electorate of around 5,800 and could be entitled as 'Ingleby Barwick Central'.</li> <li>3. The remainder of Roundhill village (1,955 electorate), plus Sober Hall (2,821 electorate), Little Maltby Farm (800 electorate) could be called 'Ingleby Barwick South' with a total electorate of 5,576 approximately.</li> <li>4. All rural properties outside of the IB conurbation to be transferred to Southern Parishes. Our suggestion is that these are: High Leven, Bridgewater, Leven Camp Caravan Park, Those properties at the junction of the A1044 (Low Lane) and Barwick Lane. This would produce an electorate in Southern Parishes around 2,214.</li> </ol> <p>Alternatively, if the above can be achieved by the creation of two 3 councillor wards we would also be very supportive of that option as well. The key issue would be ensuring all those that live in IB villages are in wards which are IB specific and do not include rural areas, which have totally different needs (Southern Parishes) to those of IB.</p> <p>Please note our figures are based upon the 2026 projections provided by the Boundary Commission, with some adjustments taken from the current electoral register and that used in 2019. This enabled us to 'drill down' on particular areas in Roundhill, Sober Hall, Little Maltby Farm and rural areas to try and estimate the effect of splitting areas in and out of the current wards and into our proposals above.</p> <p>IBIS acknowledges the above figures are estimates and may require some adjustments by the Boundary Commission.</p>

WARD	POLITICAL PARTY	COMMENTS
	<b>Independent</b>	<p>Independent - Ingleby Barwick</p> <p>I totally agree with the new proposed wards North and South replacing East and West.</p> <p>I totally disagree with the ridiculous proposals to split Round Hill between North and South wards.</p> <p>Residents do not associate with "Wards" BUT do associate with the "Village" they live in and these villages must NOT be split up</p>
<b>Yarm and Southern Parishes</b>	<b>Fairfield &amp; Yarm Independents (FYI)</b>	<p>Cllr Andrew Sherris objects to the proposal that will remove Kirklevington from the Yarm Ward. Kirklevington has an affinity and close ties with Yarm that serves the village with services such as shopping, doctors etc.</p> <p>I would also object to the perceived lack of impartiality where the Commission appears to rely heavily on the Conservative Group input.</p>
<b>Billingham &amp; Wolviston</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<p>We propose that Billingham Town Council retain 3 Councillors per ward. The proposed changes take a Councillor from Billingham South, which is the largest ward, and move it to Billingham West which is the smallest ward meaning that Billingham South has 2 Councillors and Billingham West will have 4.</p> <p>Billingham South will have a projected 2026 electorate of 5717 and Billingham West &amp; Wolviston will have 4734. Wolviston will retain it's existing Parish Council so the Billingham Town Council Ward of Billingham West will have around 4000 electors as there are approximately 700 residents in Wolviston Parish according to the last published census data.</p> <p>Also, there is a mistake in the draft recommendation which reads Billingham Town Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing 5 wards: However, we have 15 Councillors at present and the new breakdown they have provided also adds up to 15.</p>

No comments were received relating to the following wards:

- Norton
- Central Stockton
- Hartburn & Fairfield
- Eaglescliffe
- Northern Parishes