

## PROPOSED NEW ELECTORAL PATTERN

**Durham County Council** endorses the Boundary Committee's recommendations in respect of the following Electoral Divisions, as options to be considered alongside further options detailed on the following pages.

<u>DIVISION</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>MEMBERS</u>
Annfield Plain	6567 (+3%)	2
Aycliffe North, the Dales and Middridge	8871 (-7%)	3
Aycliffe Central	5877 (-8%)	2
Aycliffe East	6191 (-3%)	2
Bishop Auckland Town	6901 (+8%)	2
Blackhalls	6668 (+5%)	2
Burnopfield & Dipton	6167 (-3%)	2
Coundon	3217 (+1%)	1
Craghead & South Moor	6361 (0%)	2
Dawdon	6219 (-2%)	2
Delves Lane	6737 (+6%)	2
Deneside	5630 (-12%)	2
Easington	6327 (-1%)	2
Evenwood	6885 (+8%)	2
Horden	6475 (+2%)	2
Hunwick	3506 (+10%)	1
Lanchester	6068 (-5%)	2
Leadgate & Medomsley	7124 (+12%)	2
Lumley	5582 (-12%)	2
Murton	5919 (-7%)	2
Passfield	3503 (+10%)	1
Pelton	9869 (+3%)	3
Peterlee East	5849 (-8%)	2
Peterlee West	6593 (+3%)	2
Sacrison	6992 (+10%)	2
Seaham	6255 (-2%)	2
Sedgefield	6017 (-6%)	2
Stanley	6545 (+3%)	2
Tanfield	6848 (+7%)	2
Ushaw Moor & Bearpark	5964 (-6%)	2
West Auckland	6770 (+6%)	2
Willington	6081 (-5%)	2
Wingate	3179 (0%)	1
Woodhouse Close	6077 (-5%)	2

## DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF THE REMAINING ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

The Council's response to the Boundary Committee's recommendations in respect of the remainder of the County are set out below:

### BENFIELDSIDE

Revert to original Durham County Council submission

		<b>Two Member Division</b>	
		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		5266 (- 16%)	5150 (- 19.2%)
Transfer from Leadgate to Benfieldside			
Polling District	MG	602	606
Transfer from Leadgate Part - Polling District (East Law)			
	MA	91	91
Transfer from Consett North to Benfieldside			
Polling District	OB	609	589
Polling District	OC	324	336
		6892 (+ 9.9%)	6772 (+ 6.2%)

### Supporting Evidence

The current Division is too small in electoral terms and that situation is projected to worsen. The Council recommends a transfer of electorate from Shotley Park, East Law and the St Mary's Hill area of Blackhill (currently part of the neighbouring Leadgate and Medomsley and Consett North Divisions) which are more readily identifiable as having links to the Benfieldside community. The resultant electoral equality would be acceptable.

This option closely reflects the boundary of the Community Partnership operating in that area for over 10 years and which continues to operate in the community setting (Blackhills, Bridge Hill, Benfieldside and Shortly Bridge Community Partnership).

## CONSETT NORTH

Revert to original Durham County Council submission

		<b>Two Member Division</b>	
		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		6712 (+ 7.1%)	7101 (+ 11.4%)
Transfer from Consett North to Benfieldside			
Polling District	OB	609	589
Polling District	OC	324	336
		5779 (- 7.8%)	6176 (- 3.1%)

### Supporting Evidence

(See below under Consett South).

## CONSETT SOUTH

Revert to original Durham County Council submission

		<b>New Single Member Division</b>	
		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Transfer from Delves Lane and Consett South			
Polling District	QA	1193	1210
Polling District	QB	1376	1722
		2569 (- 18%)	2932 (- 8%)

### Supporting Evidence

The proposal as originally submitted and outlined in paragraph 55 remains the preferred option for the electors covering the distinct Divisions of Consett North, East, South and Delves Lane.

This option closely reflects the boundary of the Community Partnership operating in that area for over 10 years and which continues to operate in the community setting.

Our original proposal provides variances that are within tolerance levels of

-8%, +11% and -3% this is projected to improve and will make for a more accountable working arrangement for the community surrounding the town centre of Consett as well as the towns folk of Central Consett itself.

There is no opposition to this proposal and we have received no verbal or written objections.

The Council accepts that the original submission was lacking in supportive evidence and this issue has been addressed. This is backed with evidence and community support as well as continued cross party agreement.

The Council maintains that the proposal covers and offers, as far as is practicable, within the variances allowable, the best fit in terms of community interests and identity.

We can confirm that our proposal does not give rise to street divisions and there is no division between estates as is evident in the counter proposal.

The counter Boundary Committee proposal would create a new three member division that is contentious and confusing to all the three distinct communities as individuals will be indirectly responsible for a geographical region with no commonality or direct correlation to where he or she lives.

We refute the argument that it is impossible to create a single member division without including around 500 electors from either Consett North or Delves Lane. The 500 electors in question are new electors living in newly built properties and have no allegiance with either community indeed they appropriately fit more closely with the single member ward than the other two existing wards.

This re-submission will be supported with further evidence forthcoming from elected members as well as community partnerships, organisations and individual members living in the affected areas and we firmly believe that this is a reasonable and fair position and carries substantial support across the whole geographic locality.

## ESH

### One Member Division

It is proposed that the Esh Electoral Division be made up of the following Polling Districts:

Polling Districts	FA	1170
	FB	1999
	FC	317
	FD	89
	FE	60
	FF	179
		<b>3814 (+19.7)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The Boundary Committee's proposed three Member Division for Esh, Esh Winning and Tow Law does not reflect the communities of interest, the recent consultation and setting up of Area Action Partnerships clearly demonstrate where communities are best placed. Linking Tow Law with Esh and Esh Winning does not reflect how people live and work.

There is no natural affinity between Tow Law and these two areas. Tow Law chose the Crook North option of road links, school provision, social and welfare connections (doctors, dentists, shopping and business links).

Esh Winning chose to stay in its Parish Boundary and the Area Action Partnership of Mid Durham Rural West. Esh Village, Cornsay Colliery, Langley Park have a commonality with the present Esh Division and also chose THE Mid Durham Rural West Area Action Partnership, road links, schooling, social and welfare were factors.

The Mid Durham Rural West Area Action Partnership is co-terminus with Parish Boundaries. Langley Park, Esh and Esh Winning have no empathy with Tow Law and the extremes of the proposed Boundary in any way at all; there are no transport links, no school provision, and no social or welfare association.

The Hamsteels Estate is presently in the Esh Division but it would seem sensible to include it in Esh Winning because of proximity, social and welfare and school links.

However while numbers vary throughout the proposed Division, a large geographical area with no tangible community of interest and poor or no transport links, then consideration of 3 single member wards would provide a possible solution.

Tow Law is very rural and a smaller than optimum number could be justified. Esh and Esh Winning although higher than the optimum numbers could be justified on communities of interest and settlement basis.

A local Member for the current Esh Division met with representatives of the Parish Council's in the affected area. All of these Parish Councils were opposed to the Boundary Committee's proposal for a 3 Member Division and gave their support for three one Member Divisions, while stressing that community identity should take preference over elector/Member ratio.

Local County Councillors from the respective Electoral Divisions (Councillors J Wilkinson, J Chaplow, R Rogers, J Bailey, P Jopling and J Armstrong) and representatives from four Quality Parish Councils (Brandon, Byshottles, Esh and Tow Law) are all supportive of 3 single member wards for this Electoral Division. The overriding criterion for those involved in these deliberations has been the importance of community identity and communities of interest in each of the areas under consideration.

## **ESH WINNING**

### **One Member Division**

It is proposed that the Esh Winning Electoral Division be made up of the following Polling Districts:

Polling Districts	HH	1216
	HI	1167
	HJ	412
	CC	663
Part	CB	140
		<b>3598 (+12.9%)</b>

### **Supporting Evidence**

See under Esh above.

This option unites the village of Esh Winning and links the close communities of Waterhouses and Cornsay Colliery. There is strong community identity that far out weighs the high elector/Member ratio.

## SHILDON AND DENE VALLEY

### Three Member Division

Having considered the Boundary Committee's recommendations, the Council would recommend that their original submission for a Shildon East Electoral Division and Dene Valley Electoral Division be joined to form a three member Division – re-named the Shildon and Dene Valley Electoral Division.

#### Current Shildon East (under the Council's original submission the division to be re-named Shildon Division)

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate	6713 (+ 7.1%)	6596 (+ 3.5%)
Transfer from Shildon East to Aycliffe		
Polling Districts		
DJ	274	270
DL	1276	1248
DK	1124	1161
DN	1099	1133
EX2A	372	387
Add Polling Districts from current Shildon West		
DF	754	1037
DH	1499	1564
DG	190	189
DC	1492	1467
DA	486	456
	6989 (+ 11.5%)	7110 (+ 11.5%)

#### Current Shildon West (under the Council's original submission to be re-named Dene Valley Division)

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate	5706 (- 9.0%)	5898 (-7.5%)
New Configuration		
Polling Districts		
CO	748	829
CP	282	314
CQ	218	240
CL	444	429
CK2	233	237
CK3	336	288
DI	305	281
DB	980	904
	3546 (+ 13.1%)	3522 (+ 10.5%)

**Proposed Shildon and Dene Valley Electoral Division**  
**Three Member Division**

Dene Valley	3522
Shildon	7110
	<b>10632 (+11.2%)</b>

**Supporting evidence**

The Council has expressed a clear desire to encompass all of the Shildon area and associated communities together. Although these areas have individual community identity they have strong links with one another in terms of transport, shops and community facilities. The proposal for a single Division would result in the proposed Shildon Town Council and Dene Valley Parish Council having County Council Members with Division boundaries coterminous to these Parish/Town Councils.

Bus service: Dene Valley (Coundon Grange, Close House, Eldon Lane) is linked with Shildon by 3 buses per hour, which continue servicing all areas of Shildon. In addition there is 1 bus per hour from Close House / Eldon Lane terminating in Shildon Centre. This reflects the links between communities.

## CHESTER-LE-STREET NORTH

### One Member Division

To comprise:

Polling Districts	A	869	
	B	2287	
		<b>3156</b>	<b>(-1%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The Electoral Divisions for Chester-le-Street, proposed by the Council, all have clear boundaries delineating the local communities created by the road network. Local residents clearly identify with the different Divisions. This can be evidence through contact with individual residents.

The Chester-le-Street North division proposed by the Council encompasses the distinct community of South Pelaw and was a separate ward on the former Chester-le-Street District Council for many years. It is almost exactly the right size for a single member division. Local councillors and residents consider the area, particularly to the west of the main east coast railway line, as distinct from the town of Chester-le-Street. Specifically there are few, if any, linkages with North Lodge, to which it would be joined under the initial proposals of the Boundary Committee.

## CHESTER-LE-STREET EAST

### Two Member Division

To comprise:

Polling Districts	AP	1806	
	AR	540	
	C	713	
	D	551	
	E	1139	
	Z	946	
		<b>5695</b>	<b>(-10.6%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The council proposes a two-member Chester-le-Street East division, bringing together the parish of North Lodge, which forms the northern extremity of County

Durham adjoining Gateshead and Sunderland boroughs, with the 'north end' of Chester-le-Street and the areas around Holmlands Park and Riverside to the east and south of the town centre.

The proposed division comprises continuous, mainly residential, development, bordered at all points to the west by either the main east coast railway line or the former Great North Road (now A6127) and to the east by the River Wear. There are strong road and transport links between different parts of the proposed division, notably the regular bus service (21/22) which runs several times per hour along the main north-south road and continues through the night. The division also unites the two sites of the Park View Community College (11-18) whose normal catchment area encompasses the proposed divisions of Chester-le-Street East and Lumley.

## **CHESTER-LE-STREET WEST CENTRAL**

**Two Member Division**

Existing Division	5244
Polling District AB part	605
	<b>5849 (-8.2%)</b>

### **Supporting Evidence**

The proposal is to extend the southern boundary of the Division along Waldrige Road and transfer those electorate living in the area between Waldrige Road and Waldrige Lane into the West Central Division.

## **CHESTER-LE-STREET SOUTH**

**Two Member Division**

Existing Division	6404
Less part AB	605
	<b>5799 (-9%)</b>

### **Supporting Evidence**

The council proposal retains the West Lane and Garden Farm area in a single division, rather than the split that would result from the initial Boundary Committee proposals. The council considers that this area has a clear community identity and has been included in a single ward or division for many years.

## SHERBURN

### Two Member Division

West Rainton	DI	1791	
Pittington	DH	1080	
Littletown	DHH	116	
Sherburn	DK	2504	
Sherburn Hill	DII	698	
Shadforth	DJ	362	
		<b>6551</b>	<b>(+2.8%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

This proposal links the adjacent semi-rural villages on the fringe of Durham City. These villages are not large enough to be discrete communities but all are within easy commuting distance with Durham.

## BELMONT

### Two Member Division

Polling Districts	DY	2141	
	DX	2906	
		<b>5047</b>	<b>(-20.8%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

It is recognised that this option for Belmont represents a significant reduction in the Boundary Committee's desired member/constituent ratio, however, Belmont is in a unique position, sandwiched between the motorway and the village's settlement boundary. Thus Belmont is a distinct community not linked to others outside Durham City.

## BRANDON

### Two Member Division

Polling Districts	HB	982	
	HA	4595	
	HC	1570	
	GA	340	
		<b>7487</b>	<b>(+17.5%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

Brandon, Meadowfield and Langley Moor are long linear settlements but with no distinct settlement boundaries. The former mining villages of Brandon,

Meadowfield and Langley Moor are as one community. Geographically there is no separation of these villages; residents can walk easily between all three.

In the mid to late 1960's, the migration of many hundreds of Langley Moor residents took place. When old colliery housing was demolished in Langley Moor and residents were re-housed in council properties in Brandon and Meadowfield. So it obviously follows that local people have and feel a real sense of one community between the three villages because of their shared history.

The area enjoys an excellent bus service, with buses traveling around Brandon and then through Meadowfield and on to Langley Moor and in the opposite direction. Buses travelling north to the city of Durham or south the town of Crook.

Educational links are strong, Brandon children attend Langley Moor School and the reverse is also true. Browney School in Meadowfield has pupils attending who reside in Brandon. Langley Moor has a long established Nursery School which is popular with Brandon infants. Brandon is fortunate in having a Sure Start facility which is used by youngsters from all areas of the three villages.

Shared medical facilities are also evident. Meadowfield has a large and popular Medical Centre/Doctors Surgery; again this facility is extremely well used by people from the three areas. It should be noted that Langley Moor has no medical centre and people use the surgery at Meadowfield or a smaller doctors surgery in Brandon. The only two chemists are in Brandon.

The largest centre for shopping is Langley Moor, with a busy high street now boasting two supermarkets. Both the supermarkets and other retailers are well used by the residents of Brandon and Meadowfield. Brandon however does have a Cooperative supermarket which has loyal customers from Meadowfield and Langley Moor. The employment of local people should be mentioned here, because once again, residents from all three areas are employed in retail and travel between the villages.

On the wider subject of employment, there are not many large employers in Brandon, on the other hand, Meadowfield and Langley Moor have large industrial estates employing people from Brandon, Meadowfield and Langley Moor.

Religious worship is once again spread between the villages. St Patrick's church in Langley Moor is the only Catholic Church locally, so is used by the people of the three villages. The same is true for those residents who are of the Methodist faith, the only Methodist Chapel being located in Brandon.

St Johns, Church of England, church, is located in Meadowfield and again is shared by the people of Brandon, Meadowfield and Langley Moor.

The people of Brandon, Meadowfield and Langley Moor are a very close knit community because of their history. To separate these villages would be a retrograde step, community spirit, community cohesion, is extremely important and these communities are as one.

## COXHOE

### Three Member Division

Existing Division		5361
Cornforth	CG	2192
Bowburn	DBB	2115
	DCC	497
	DB	53
		<b>10218 (+6.9%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The present Coxhoe Division is excessively low in terms of electorate per member and this situation is set to continue. The Council puts forward for consideration the option to transfer Cornforth and Bowburn, including the Cape Site, to this Division. There are good communication links between these communities. For example Bowburn and Coxhoe are linked by a main road and by the bus routes 56, 57, 58 and X1. Children from Parkhill attend Bowburn Infants and Junior School and residents of Bowburn travel to Coxhoe for services such as dentists and opticians. The community of Cassup cum Quarrington has been linked with Bowburn for electoral purposes for many years.

## CATHEDRAL AND GILESGATE– AMALGAMATE TO FORM A THREE MEMBER:

### ELVET AND GILESGATE DIVISION

Cathedral	6360
Gilesgate	3065
	<b>9425 (-1.4%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

Accepting the Boundary Committee's proposal, the Council's strongly believes that this densely populated area with a growing population would be better served by a three Member Division. Durham City has a large World Class University at its Centre which is also likely to grow. Unfortunately many University students fail to register. Under these circumstances the Council believes that residents would be better served by a three Member Division, bringing the core of Durham City together.

The council is proposing a name change to 'Elvet and Gilesgate'. Both of these names have been in usage for many years and are well recognised locally.

## DURHAM SOUTH

### One Member Division

Polling Districts	DO	113	
	DM	281	
	DN	1018	
	AO	17	
Part	AN	1884	
		<b>3313</b>	<b>(+4%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The Council accepts the Boundary Committee's proposal for this area.

## FRAMWELLGATE MOOR/NEWTON HALL

### Three Member Division

Existing Divisions		14055	
Less Witton Gilbert	2153		
Bearpark	1773	3926	
		<b>10129</b>	<b>(+5.9%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

This option supports the Boundary Committee's proposal to join the Framwellgate Moor Division and the Newton Hall Division to become one three-member division, called Framwellgate Moor and Newton Hall, with an electoral variance of 5.9% more than the average for the county by 2013. While Framwellgate Moor is predominately rural, it is correct that a significant part of the electorate is based in what could be described as overspill from Newton Hall. There are natural links between these communities which form a large and growing urban conurbation with several schools and retail parks.

## NEVILLES CROSS

### Two Member Division

Boundary Committee proposal		6306	
Less Langley Moor		<u>982</u>	
		<b>5324</b>	<b>(-16.5%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The Council would broadly accept the Boundary Committee's proposal, but proposes excluding Langley Moor as this is not part of Nevilles Cross. The river, Railway Bridge and distinct road network clearly divide these two areas.

Langley Moor is clearly part of the Brandon, Meadowfield, Langley Moor settlement and should not be divided.

## TUDHOE

### Two Member Division

Polling Districts	FA	1917
	FB	1058
	FC	2548
	FD	769
Croxdale	DG	553
Hett	DGG	214
		<b>7059 (+10.7%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The Council would support the Boundary Committee's proposal to include the villages of Croxdale and Hett in a Tudhoe Division as this better reflects community identity.

The boundary between Tudhoe and Spennymoor is provided by the route of a local waterway known as Kitty's Beck, as it flows from the hill below Kirk Merrington to the River Wear. The publication "The early History of Spennymoor" by JK Proud and RS Abley includes references that both sides of the beck were regarded as boundary points in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Centuries. The boundary continued to divide the land holding of the local gentry up to modern times. The boundary described is historic, well know and easily identifiable (See Annex 1).

Annex 2 provides a comparison of numbers in the Tudhoe / Spennymoor Areas. From this comparison it can be seen that by returning Kirk Merrington to its former place as part of Spennymoor will bring communities together and at the same time bring Spennymoor and Tudhoe in line with the ideal numbers required. With the exception of the inclusion of Woodside / Ox Close the boundary has been stable for some considerable time.

The Council believes that Low Spennymoor should be retained as part Tudhoe within its easily identifiable boundary. Kirk Merrington should be returned to Spennymoor where it has historically been. These changes do matter to communities and individuals.

## SPENNYMOOR

### Three Member Division

Polling Districts	FE1	1901	
	FE2	842	
	FF	2349	
	FG	2778	
	FI	687	
Kirk Merrington	FH	919	
		<b>9476</b>	<b>(-0.9%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

Although the Council would support the Boundary Committee's proposal for a Spennymoor three Member Division, as Kirk Merrington has clear links with Spennymoor, the Council puts forward the addition of Kirk Merrington to this Division as an option for consideration.

See the comments under Tudhoe above.

## CHILTON

### 2 Member Division

Current Division		7137	(+12%)
Less Kirk Merrington	FH	919	
		<b>6318</b>	<b>(-0.9%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

Chilton has a clearly defined community. This was confirmed during consultation undertaken by the Council prior to it establishing Area Action Partnerships. The communities of Chilton, Windlestone, Rushyford, Ferryhill Station, Chilton Lane and West Cornforth have been included in the same division for many years. The boundaries are also well understood locally. All of these communities are part of the Sedgefield Parliamentary Constituency and were formerly included in a single area forum under the former Sedgefield Borough Council. Chilton is linked to Windlestone, Ferryhill Station and Chilton Lane by bus route 3, with West Cornforth linked to Ferryhill Station and Chilton Lane by bus route 56.

It is acknowledged that the separate community of Kirk Merrington to the west, which has only been linked with the Chilton division in recent years, has close connections with Spennymoor and should be transferred in order to bring the number of electors very close to the electoral quota.

## FERRYHILL

### Two Member Division

Existing Division                      **7451 (+16.9%)**

### Supporting Evidence

The wider Ferryhill area is too large for a two member division but too small for a three member division. The Council believes that the community of Kirk Merrington to the west is better linked with Spennymoor, with which it has strong ties. The communities of Ferryhill Station and Chilton Lane have been included in the Chilton division for many years (see above) and the Council is proposing retaining this linkage. As a consequence the Council is proposing retaining the existing boundaries of the Ferryhill division, which it believes are well-established and well understood locally, although it is accepted that the resulting numbers are slightly outside normal tolerances.

## TOW LAW

### One Member Division

Tow Law	EA	1610
	DN	21
Sunniside	BA	290
	BB	489
Satley	CE	257
Cornsay	CA	67
	Part CB	9
East Hedley Hope	CD	170
		<b>2913 (-8.6)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

Tow Law has a very strong community identity. Although it has nothing in common with Esh or Esh Winning and little with Crook it does have similar needs and profile to the discreet rural communities of Sunniside, Satley, Cornsay and East Hedley Hope.

Bus services: The principal communities of Tow Law and Sunniside are linked by the main bus service serving the area (Tow Law – Sunniside – Crook – Darlington, one per hour). There are no bus service links with Esh Winning or Esh. This reflects actual travel patterns.

Tow Law is part of the Three Towns Area Action Partnership, the three Towns being Crook, Willington and Tow Law.

See also under Esh.

## CROOK

### Three Member Division

Billy Row	BC	653
Roddymoor	BD	380
Crook	BE	1165
	BF	1298
	BG	363
	BH	3025
	BQ	266
	BO	985
	BP	1054
Part	BR	150
		<b>9339 (-2.3%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

This proposal would unite the town of Crook within a single division and would give support to the Town's sense of community and belonging. The inclusion of Billy Row and Roddymoor is supported by the fact that these villages rely on Crook for their services, shopping, health care, market, sport, etc. It would also reflect the proposed boundary of the proposed Crook Town Council.

The Council believes that the current split between Crook North and Crook South is artificial, with one group of bungalows – Foundry Fields – split between the two divisions. The proposal would rectify such anomalies and provide a clear focus for the new three member division, providing a clear and understandable democratic link for residents.

The Council supports the Boundary Committee proposal for a single member Hunwick division. We believe that the consequence will be clearer, more definable boundaries for the divisions of Crook, Weardale and Willington.

## WEARDALE

### Two Member Division

Existing Division			6825
Less Witton-le-Wear			<u>573</u>
			<b>6252</b>
Plus		DL	42
	Thornley	DP	110
			<b>6404 (-0.5%)</b>

### Supporting Evidence

The current Division has acceptable electoral equality and strong community identity, with the exception of Witton-le-Wear. The Council proposes the transfer of a relatively small number of electorate in the Thornley area (currently part of the Crook North Division). This would restore a previous, stronger boundary which better reflects community identity without being detrimental to electoral equality.

## **BARNARD CASTLE – re-affirm Council’s submission**

The Council was surprised at the Boundary Committees recommendations for the Barnard Castle area in that it appeared to place more weight upon a small number of people who would prefer to be within North Yorkshire.

The local member felt so strongly in this respect that he contacted every parish council in that area for their views and this research has resulted in the following evidence to support the Council’s original submission for Barnard Castle.

### **BARNARD CASTLE EAST 6970 (+9.4%) Two Members Division**

		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		6863 (+ 9.5%)	7126 (+ 11.8%)
Transfer from Barnard Castle West to Barnard Castle East			
Polling Districts			
Barforth	BO3	69	79
Ovington	BO2	123	127
Wycliffe	BO5	78	85
Hutton	BO4	96	97
Rokeby	GR2	73	73
Barningham	BO1	148	149
Brignall	GR1	49	50
Scargill	BO7	23	20
Eggleston Abbey	GR4	14	17
Hope	BO6	15	18
Transfer from Barnard Castle East to Barnard Castle West			
Polling Districts			
Eggleston	EG1	380	404
Marwood Rural	EG2	160	170
Properties between Middleton Road and Staindrop Road - Part			
	BCN1	297	297
		6714 (+ 7.1%)	6970 (+ 9.4 %)

**BARNARD CASTLE WEST****6873 (+7.8%)****Two Member Division**

		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		6450 (+ 2.9%)	6717 (+ 5.4%)
Transfer from Barnard Castle West to Barnard Castle East			
Polling Districts			
Barforth	BO3	69	79
Ovington	BO2	123	127
Wycliffe	BO5	78	85
Hutton	BO4	96	97
Rokeby	GR2	73	73
Barningham	BO1	148	149
Brignall	GR1	49	50
Scargill	BO7	23	20
Hope	BO6	15	18
Egglestone Abbey	GR4	14	17
Transfer from Barnard Castle East to Barnard Castle West			
Polling Districts			
Eggleston	EG1	380	404
Marwood Rural	EG2	160	170
Properties between Middleton Road and Staindrop Road			
Polling District - Part	BCN1	297	297
		6599 (+ 5.3%)	6873 (+ 7.8%)

**Supporting Evidence**

The present configuration of Barnard Castle East & West is more of a north/south than an east/west split. Although it may look appropriate on a map, it does not reflect how people live and work. The main roads up the dale, west from Barnard Castle, are the B6278 which goes via Eggleston to Middleton, and the B6277 which goes via Cotherstone to Middleton. These roads converge on Barnard Castle, and it is the town which should be regarded as the east/west hinge of the dale and a natural cut off point.

Communities on both sides of the river are serviced by the same Doctors (Middleton and Barnard Castle), primary schools and secondary school, police team, voluntary groups/churches and fire stations. They share the same DL12 0 postcode. The new division will permit the journey between Barnard Castle and Middleton to be accomplished within one division by either road. At parish level, Eggleston works with Mickleton / Cotherstone in the mid Tees partnership.

What is being proposed by Durham County Council is a fairly modest change on the borders up to 2005. Eggleston used to be in Barnard Castle West until the last boundary review, and its residents still come to the Barnard Castle West Councillors with their problems. Many residents never understood why they were moved. Similarly Ovington & Barforth used to be in Barnard Castle East. The communities in the proposed new divisions are similar in character as well as from where they are serviced, and it is submitted that the new divisions proposed by Durham County Council reflect community identity much better.

The broad preference expressed by Durham County Council for 2 member wards is particularly appropriate in Teesdale. The town of Barnard Castle is too big for one Councillor but too small for two. There is a large rural hinterland to service. There are 30 plus parishes and most of them have councils, which rightly expect to get attention from their County Councillors. The current pattern of 4 Councillors covering this area has worked well hitherto and is desired to be continued.

The Annex 3 provides the evidence in support of these assertions.

## **Comments on the Boundary Committee's Proposals for Teesdale**

### **General**

The proposals for single member Electoral Divisions do not make for effective and convenient local government, in that they give poorest coverage per Councillors in terms of Councillors/acre, or Councillors/Parish Council. By confining one Councillor to the (compact and easily managed) Barnard Castle South Electoral Division they leave three Councillors to share the burden currently carried by four. This problem is most acute in the proposed South Tees Electoral Division. A particular weakness of the single member Divisions in the Boundary Committee's draft recommendation is the fact that one Councillor has a fairly easy workload, representing a compact area of Barnard Castle town, with only one Town Council, leaving only 3 to service all the rural areas. The South Tees Division will be particularly difficult to service in terms of area and parish councils.

The proposals also split the town of Barnard Castle in an unsatisfactory fashion; and split very similar communities up and down the river, as evidence elsewhere in this submission.

The small number of people advocating a 'south of the river tees' 'Old Yorkshire' ward, have not advanced any reasons, other than nostalgia, for such an arrangement. It is not the place of this review to reverse a change to county boundaries that was made some 35 years ago, precisely because of the strong community links that exist across the river. This review is how community identities and interests may be best reflected by Councillors at County Hall in Durham, not Northallerton.

## **Barnard Castle North Electoral Division**

From a town perspective this proposal splits the town in a most unsatisfactory fashion. For this reason the Town Council does not support the Boundary Committee's option. The Town Council prefers the County Council's proposal with consequent abolition of the North Town Division. The main roads out of the town to Middleton, Staindrop, Startforth, Darlington & Whorlton are at least main roads which do form obvious break points in the town. But the North Electoral Division boundary uses small residential roads which do not form obvious boundaries and which split residential roads like Green lane and Victoria Road into separate Electoral Divisions. This proposed boundary, following as it does residential rather than main roads is rather obscure and will not be easily understood by the electorate.

The proposal also splits the big infrastructure sites of the town: GSK, Sports Centre, Teesdale Secondary School, Green Lane Primary school- from the users or those affected by these operations, who will largely live in the Barnard Castle South Electoral Division. It does not make for effective local government if a Councillor's responsibilities are split in this way.

Further while Harmire Road does connect with Middleton, the properties in Dale Road to Victoria Road area have no connection with the dale west of Barnard Castle.

The salient to include Stainton & Streatlam north east of the town is clearly there to make up numbers only, as there is no connection with the dale west of Barnard Castle.

Overall this is an odd and contrived looking Electoral Division, which splits the town unsatisfactorily, taking a 'bite' out of the north east of it and lumping it in an otherwise mainly rural Electoral Division with which it has little connectivity.

Looking west up the dale, the proposed Electoral Division splits very similar communities as is discussed in the sections on the Durham County Council's proposals.

## **South Tees Electoral Division**

Looking west up the dale, the proposed Electoral Division splits very similar communities as is discussed in the sections on the Council's proposals. The issues and concerns of residents in Holwick (an upland dales hamlet) are very different from those in Hutton Magna (a lowland dales commuter village).

For example gritting runs follow a loop around the dale west of Barnard Castle along the top road to Middleton and back down the bottom one. Bins are emptied in a similar vein. It is convenient and effective for a Councillor to take up community concerns if his ward fits with Council services. It will be a fertile source of inconvenience if one Councillor has to talk to two officers in the same issue, or vice versa.

This does not make for convenient or effective local government.

Similarly the proposed South Tees Electoral Division splits similar communities east of Barnard Castle in the lower dale also. A notable example, being Gainford and the hamlet of Barforth over the river from it.

Other than the numbers fit, the proposal has nothing to commend it. There are no links along the STED to connect the communities. There is no bus service for example. The Electoral Division is too large an area and has too many parish councils for a single Cllr to serve effectively.

### **Barnard Castle South Electoral Division**

This one Councillor has a fairly easy workload, representing a compact area of Barnard Castle town, with only one Town Council. The problems with it are the fact that all the infrastructure sites (schools, GSK, Sports Centre etc) which residents here will use or be affected by, actually are located in the Barnard Castle North Electoral Division, outside this Councillor's area of responsibility. Once again the issues of split responsibility/multiple Councillor involvement come to the fore.

The other problem is that the boundary with the North Electoral Division, following as it does residential rather than main roads is rather obscure and will not be easily understood by the electorate.

For the remaining areas a number of options are put forward as being options preferable to the Boundary Committee's proposals. The Council believes that these options correspond more accurately with community identity:

## OPTION 1 – ORIGINAL SUBMISSION

### SHOTTON

#### Two Member Division

		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		6920 (+10.4%)	7369 (+ 15.6%)
Transfer Haswell Plough from Shotton to Thornley Polling District	L	341	352
		6579 (+ 5.0%)	7017 (+ 10.1%)

### Supporting Evidence

This Division currently represents the communities of Shotton and Haswell. The size of the electorate for the Division is on the limit of acceptance but the position is expected to worsen.

The nearby Thornley Division is presently low in terms of electoral equality and the Council option would be to transfer the discreet area of nearby Haswell Plough to Thornley to improve this situation. The proposal results in a Shotton Division with acceptable electoral equality.

The villages of South Hetton, Haswell and Haswell Plough have a strong affinity to the neighbouring / adjoining areas of the former east Durham coalfield. They have no association with the communities in the Sherburn Division proposed by the Boundary Committee.

## THORNLEY

### Two Member Division

		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		5301 (- 15.4%)	5299 (- 16.9%)
Transfer from Shotton Haswell Plough Polling District	L	341	352
Transfer from Sherburn Ludworth Polling District	DJJ	500	521
		6142 (- 2%)	6172 (- 3.2%)

### Supporting Evidence

The current Division comprises the communities of Thornley and Wheatley Hill. The Division is low in terms of electoral equality and is projected to slightly worsen. To address this imbalance the option proposes the transfer of Ludworth (currently in the Sherburn Division) which has close association with the Thornley and Wheatley Hill communities. In addition, to further improve electoral equality both for this Division and the neighbouring Division of Shotton, the option also proposes the transfer of the discreet area of Haswell Plough to Thornley. The resultant Thornley Division would have good electoral equality.

## TRIMDON

### Two Member Division

		<b>2008</b>	<b>2013</b>
Electorate		5783 (- 7.7%)	5861 (- 8.0%)

### Supporting evidence

The current Division has clear, identifiable boundaries and strong community identity. Electoral equality is acceptable and the Council believes therefore that the Division does not need any boundary reviews.

## OPTION 2

### SOUTH HETTON/HASWELL

#### One Member Division

South Hetton	K	2404
Haswell	M	1229
		<b>3633 (+13.9%)</b>

#### Supporting Evidence

The communities of South Hetton and Haswell are strongly opposed to the current proposals of the Boundary Commission because they are of the view that there are no community links whatsoever with the Sherburn area and also that such a spread out local government unit would be very difficult in terms of convenient local authority organisation and management, which is in fact reflected in the Commission's own guideline statement.

Both the Parishes of Haswell and South Hetton have objected to the current proposals as have individuals themselves from both areas and in addition a petition from members of the public in South Hetton has also been forwarded to the Commission.

The Parishes of South Hetton and Haswell have been inextricably linked since the creation of parishes within the original Rural District of Easington. The two Parishes were combined until only very recently and evidence of those links can be found in the fact that new local authority housing was provided in South Hetton for families living in sub-standard conditions in the villages of Haswell and Haswell Plough. Also until the closure of South Hetton Colliery many miners travelled from Haswell to work at the local Colliery which was linked underground. The current County Council area of Shotton which includes the Parishes of Haswell and South Hetton has been very closely linked since its creation many decades ago and it should also be recognised that these three parishes have worked very closely in terms of issues affecting the former mining communities in East Durham.

The new Health Centre in South Hetton was constructed with the view to its facilities being made available to the communities of Haswell/Haswell Plough in terms of Doctor, Nursing and Dental and pharmacy provision and the local Primary School also makes provision for the Haswell Parish as there is no specific provision within Haswell itself for any of these services. In terms transport there are appropriate links for the people of Haswell and Haswell Plough to gain access to services provided within South Hetton and there are also several walkways which connect the two communities which are quite close and well utilised.

## SHOTTON/HASWELL PLOUGH

One Member Division

Shotton	N	671	
	O	332	
	P	1730	
	Q	653	
Haswell Plough	L	352	
		<b>3738</b>	<b>(+17.3%)</b>

## THORNLEY/WHEATLEY HILL/LUDWORTH

Two Member Division

Existing Division	5299	
Ludworth (DJJ)	521	
	<b>5810</b>	<b>(-8.7%)</b>

## TRIMDON AND FISHBURN

Two Member Division

Current Division	<b>5861</b>	<b>(-8%)</b>
------------------	-------------	--------------

### Supporting evidence

The current Division has clear, identifiable boundaries and strong community identity. Electoral equality is acceptable and the Council believes therefore that the Division does not need any boundary review.

### OPTION 3

#### SOUTH HETTON/HASWELL

One Member Division

South Hetton	K	2404
Haswell	M	1229
		<b>3633 (+13.9%)</b>

#### SHOTTON

One Member Division

Shotton	N	671
	O	332
	P	1730
	Q	653
		<b>3386 (+6.2)</b>

#### THORNLEY/WHEATLEY HILL/LUDWORTH/HASWELL PLOUGH

Two Member Division

Existing Division		5299
Ludworth	DJJ	521
Haswell Plough	L	352
		<b>6172 (-3.2%)</b>

#### TRIMDON/FISHBURN

Two Member Division

Current Division		<b>5861 (-8%)</b>
------------------	--	-------------------

#### Supporting evidence

The current Division has clear, identifiable boundaries and strong community identity. Electoral equality is acceptable and the Council believes therefore that the Division does not need any boundary review.

## **Annex 1**

### **"The Early History of Spennymoor" by J. K. Proud and R. S. Abley**

So, part of the moor was sown with corn and supported that crop in the 14th century, but where, precisely, were the places mentioned in the grant? Wormdene, says Dodd, who had spoken to old people of the area, was the wood or wooded valley beside Ox Close, and the old dyke ran towards the wood. One of Dodod's sources of local knowledge, a man called Tate, contended, in the 1890's, that Uddesake was an old building at the back of Whitworth House. By that time, the name had been corrupted to Eater Slack.

John de Whitworth is named in Bishop Hatfield's survey and is stated to hold the vill of Whitworth by knight's service together with 14 shillings and 10 pence rent, sometime of Marmaduke Muschame, for a certain portion of two parts of the manor of Whitworth; and John paid to the Bishop's exchequer four pounds and eighteen pence.

Before continuing with the Whitworth story, it is of interest to note other happenings in the Spennymoor area in the 13th and 14th centuries. A charter of 1279 refers to another of the fish ponds in the area, this time the East Pool, in Tudhoe, close to the Durham road at Wood Vue. The theory is that this pool and the other at Binchester Blocks were used by the Prior and monks, of Merrington to supply themselves with fish on Fridays: This charter is important in that it contains the first historical reference to Spennymoor and Tudhoe. It contains an agreement between Hugh Gubyoun, Lord of Tudhoe, and the Prior of Merrington. Surtees records that

**A comparison of numbers in the Tudhoe / Spennymoor Areas**

The Boundary Commission proposals remove from the existing Tudhoe Division two areas Low Spennymoor (FD) and Woodside (FE2) and add Hett (DGG) together with Croxdale (DG) (Based on this two area's having some 767 voters)

Therefore Tudhoe: - 7134 -769-842+767                      6290   -1.3% (2Memb)

Spennymoor: - 7715 +769+842                                      9326   -2.46   (3Memb)

The initial proposal is to retain Low Spennymoor (FD) in Tudhoe but to accept moving Woodside back into Spennymoor.

Tudhoe: - 7134 -842    6292 – 1.29 (2 Member)

Spennymoor: - 7715 + 842    8557 -10.05 (3 Member)

If we now include Hett and Croxdale into Tudhoe

Tudhoe 6292 + 767    7059 + 10.75 (2 Member)

If we include Kirk Merrington (FH) in Spennymoor

Spennymoor 8557+919    9476 -.09 (3 Member)

Based on the above the Council would strongly recommend returning Kirk Merrington into Spennymoor (as it was prior to 2005) and retaining Low Spennymoor in Tudhoe. The inclusion of Hett and Croxdale should only be accepted after this.

## Barnard Castle

### Barnard Castle – further evidence in support of the Council’s proposals

#### 1. Public Transport Network - Buses

The bus service network focuses on Barnard Castle as the start and end of routes. There is a good bus service within each of the proposed Durham County Council Barnard Castle East and West Electoral Divisions. There is no bus service connecting the Boundary Committee’s South Tees Ward. Even changing at Barnard Castle getting from Hutton Magna to Holwick would seem to be very difficult. It is helpful for effective local government to link communities which have a natural affinity, which is assisted by good bus links.

**Source: Bus companies and Passenger Transport Section, DCC**

#### Evidence & Detail

*There is a good bus service connecting the villages of Durham County Council’s proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division with Barnard Castle town.*

Arriva runs a service (95, 96) between Barnard Castle and Middleton in Teesdale via Cotherstone, Romalldkirk, Mickleton and Eggleston. In detail, 95/96 Barnard Castle - Cotherstone - Romalldkirk- Mickleton- Middleton - Eggleston - Romalldkirk - Cotherstone - Barnard Castle (96 runs opposite direction round the outer loop i.e. Eggleston - Middleton - Mickleton): Combined frequency 1 per hour

72 Barnard Castle - Bowes. 4 journeys per day

71 Barnard Castle town service (various legs, including Startforth). 4 journeys on Startforth and Harmire legs, 9 on Green Lane leg per day

Alston Road Garage; runs between Langdon Beck and Barnard Castle (Monday to Saturday) and has some ‘demand responsive’ elements where passengers can pre-book or make a request to the driver.

*There is a good bus service connecting the villages of Durham County Council’s proposed Barnard Castle East Electoral Division with Barnard Castle town.*

Arriva runs a service (75, 76) from Darlington to Barnard Castle, either via Staindrop or Winston. In detail, 75 / 76 Darlington - Gainford – Staindrop (75 only) - Barnard Castle. Combined frequency 2 per hour one per hour continues across Barnard Castle to/from service 95 or 96:

Additionally 70 Barnard Castle - Whorlton - Staindrop - Darlington - every 2 hours.

79 Barnard Castle - Barningham - Richmond. 5 journeys per day

Compass Royston operate a service between Barnard Castle and Darlington (Monday to Saturday) via Whorlton, South Cleatlam, Staindrop, Ingleton and Gainford.

Hodgsons operate a service, on Wednesdays only, from Eppleby to Barnard Castle and return. There is only one bus on the day but it does go through

Ovington and Hutton Magna. Hodgsons also operate a service from Barnard Castle to Richmond (Monday to Saturday) via Eggleston Abbey, Greta Bridge and Barningham.

## **2. Durham Constabulary**

The Police are organised in a way that is close to the proposed DCC Barnard Castle East / West Electoral Division. The fit between the Dales PACT (Police & Communities Together) and Barnard Castle West is especially good. It is helpful for effective local government to link communities which have a natural affinity that is recognised by other bodies, as the Councillors often attend PACT meetings and have input into policing matters.

**Source: Durham Constabulary**

### Evidence & Detail

The Teesdale beat team is divided into 4 PACT areas (Police and Communities Together). The Dales PACT (Lartington, Cotherstone, Romalldkirk, Eggleston, Mickleton, Middleton, Upper Teesdale, Baldersdale and Lunedale); Barnard Castle PACT (the town, Startforth, Stainton and Stainton Grove); South Teesdale PACT (Bowes, Hutton Magna, Barningham, Ovington, Whorlton and Greta Bridge); East Teesdale and Gaunless Valley PACT, (Staindrop, Gainford, Ingleton, Winston, Cockfield, Woodland, Butterknowle, Copley). This structure as established because it provides the best geographical fit to deliver local neighbourhood policing and familiarity with the resources available.

## **3. Secondary Schools**

The attendances at the schools are a good fit with the proposed Durham County Council Barnard Castle East/West Electoral Divisions. It is helpful for effective local government to have school catchment areas which correlate with Councillors' Electoral Divisions, as transport issues to schools are a common piece of casework and it is, therefore, more appropriate for the Councillor to cover a similar area. School pupil movements are obviously also reflected by parental movements.

**Source: Durham County Council Schools Admissions**

### Evidence & Detail

Staindrop School takes 155 pupils from the proposed Barnard Castle East Electoral Division, 5 from the proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division and 30 from Barnard Castle town (East or West not known). 5 children attend from Ovington and 1 from Hutton Magna.

Teesdale School takes 88 pupils from the proposed Barnard Castle East Electoral Division, 236 from the proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division

and 360 from Barnard Castle town (East or West not known). No children attend from Ovington and 1 from Hutton Magna.

#### **4. Primary Schools**

The attendances at the schools are a good fit with the proposed Durham County Council Barnard Castle East/West Electoral Divisions, and show significant 'cross river' traffic. It is helpful for effective local government to have school catchment areas which correlate with Councillors' Electoral Divisions, as transport issues to schools are a common piece of casework and it is, therefore, more appropriate for the Councillor to cover a similar area. School pupil movements are obviously also reflected by parental movements.

**Source: Durham County Council Schools Admissions**

**Startfort Morritt** of its 103 pupils, 70% come from north of the river with 65% coming from the proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division.

**Cotherstone:** of its 48 pupils, 7% come from north of the river, 93% from south of the river, with 100% coming from the proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division.

**Middleton** of its 111 pupils, 74% come from north of the river with 26% coming from south of the river with 97.3% coming from the proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division.

**Gainford** of its 83 pupils, 77% come from Gainford village itself, with 10% coming from south of the river (all from Ovington) with 96.4% coming from the proposed Barnard Castle West Electoral Division.

#### **5. Community Organisations & Partnerships**

The Community Partnerships cover both sides of the river and are delineated by how far up the river they are, not whether they are north or south of it.

**Source: the partnerships**

##### Evidence & Detail

**Middleton Plus** covers the upper dale westwards from Eggleston on the north bank and Mickleton on the south bank (to include Lunedale).

**Mid Teesdale Partnership** covers the dale eastwards from Middleton on the north bank to Eggleston and Holwick on the south bank to Cotherstone. To include Lunedale & Baldersdale.

**Upper Teesdale Agricultural Support Services** covers the dale westwards from Barnard Castle on both sides of the riverbank.

##### **GPs practices**

These broadly reflect the Durham County Council proposed Barnard Castle East and Barnard Castle West Electoral Divisions, with the Middleton practice covering both sides of the river down to Marwood and Startforth, i.e., on the north of the River, Forest, Newbiggin, Middleton, Eggleston, Marwood, with a few patients in Barnard Castle. On the South side Holwick, Lunedale, Mickleton, Romaldekirk, Cutherstone, Baldersdale, Lartington, Bowes and Startford. The Barnard Castle practice covers mainly the town, but also extends to the surrounding villages. There is also a practice at Gainford which covers villages south of the river such as Ovington, as well as Gainord and environs.

Thus it is clear that the GP practices fit better with the County Council's proposals.

### **Durham County Council Highways and Streetscene**

Council operations like gritting, highway repairs and refuse collection broadly follow the proposed Barnard Castle East and Barnard Castle West split, which will make the Councillors task simpler when making representations about these services on behalf of constituents.

### **Housing Needs & Planning**

The Teesdale District Council Housing Strategy 2007-2010 looked at the housing market in the district based on Housing Needs Assessments given to all households in Teesdale. This (at p25) broke down Teesdale into market areas which fit well with Durham County Council proposed Barnard Castle East and Barnard Castle West Electoral Divisions, namely:

Middleton-in-Teesdale and Upper Teesdale (both sides of the river); Barnard Castle area; Commuter Villages (A66/A67 i.e. Winston, Gainford, Ovington, Barningham, Greta Bridge etc. These "market areas have been derived and evidenced on the basis of geographical location, transport links, migration patterns, and dwelling-stock and social-economic factors."

### **Royal Mail**

The postcodes cross the river as this is the most convenient way to deliver the mail! For example DL12 0 covers Mickleton, Eggleston including Folly Top, Middleton, Lunedale, Holwick, Newbiggin, Forest, Harwood.

### **North East Ambulance Service**

From 2006-2008 there was a big public campaign about the inadequacies of ambulance emergency response times in rural Teesdale. Interestingly North East Ambulance Service does now provide monitoring information of response times based on postcodes, with the DL12 0 area covering Mickleton, Eggleston including Folly Top, Middleton, Lunedale, Holwick, Newbiggin, Forest, & Harwood, being particularly sensitive.