

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council

Personal Details:

Name:

E-mail:

Postcode:

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I write to strenuously object to the proposed LGBC changes to the northern Kirklevington Parish boundary, currently under review. Why is there no real background explanation on the LGBC website as to potential triggers for why the proposed changes are being seen to be of benefit, and to where this benefit goes? As I see it as being detrimental to the community of Kirklevington then that would indicate the beneficiary to be the community of Yarm where in the recent local elections at least one candidate was campaigning on the grounds that Yarm was already too big? What is not obvious is how individual householders would benefit from this change, please explain the LGBC rationale on this point? Who first proposed these changes and what explanations were given that persuaded the LGBC employees to change a fixed boundary, far from anomalous, that has been in place for around a thousand years and more? It seems that all Roman roads have stood the test of time in Britain so it is important for the Commission to address in public why a modern day Committee, however legally formed in status, views it as their "duty" to overturn history without fully informing all of those it will affect in advance? I question how a consultation without the facts taken into consideration is even worthy of being termed a consultation? Past experience of government consultations at many levels constantly leaves the impression that by the time a consultation is offered to the public to view the principle details are already set in stone but the provision of a consultation period allows another box to be ticked? I can only hope that this is not the case here? Given that the new developments included in the redrawn boundary were accorded planning permission, subsequently built and then sold all whilst being within the parish of Kirklevington it is definitely puzzling, and somewhat galling that now they are occupied the parish of Kirklevington is to be denied the parish precepts that would have gone to help Kirklevington grow as a community as also I would expect the children from these new homes would help our village maintain a local village school going forwards into the 21st century. The wider impact of the proposed changes will also include the current permissions granted near the old Kirklevington Hall (now the "Judges" hotel), split farm(s) between two parishes and also put Kirklevington Prison into Yarm so why has the Commission proposed this particular meandering Southern edge instead of the current no nonsense straight line boundary? It was insulting enough that once the planners had finished building to the South of Yarm on the then Kebbell development and built the new Conyers school that it was only then they looked to find a new site for the Yarm railway station and realizing they had covered all possibilities to site it within Yarm proceeded to let it be built in Kirklevington parish whilst still calling it Yarm. At the very least it would have been respectful of Kirklevington had it been named the "Kirklevington and Yarm Station"? We would struggle without the social bureaucracies that structure our societal living but their importance is only fully realized when all relevant information is shared with those they serve. Given the importance the LGBC apparently attaches to the work they do I note with dismay the mention of a "Public warding consultation" (27.10.2020 – 11.01.2021) as without advance notice of it taking place how is a member of the Public able to involve them self at that stage? It is unclear from Section 2, 13., as to who exactly sets the parameters for this review given it mentions the powers being devolved from central government, please clarify. As the LGBC has not been fully transparent in the sense of an absence of real background details to their proposed changes how is the average lay person to effectively judge what they are being asked to give a judgement on? Section 2, 15., should not be applied to this, in my view, as the current boundary between Kirklevington and Yarm has never been anomalous and the new developments were not built "across the boundaries" they were built in a different parish and known from the outset to be in adjoining parishes and should remain as such. At all British boundaries, whether local or national, people have neighbours in different parishes, towns, cities and even countries but that does not require changes for them to be good neighbours Section 2, 16., Has any Council, either Stockton, Yarm or Kirklevington requested the LGBC to carry out a Governance review of the Kirklevington/Yarm boundary? If so, who, and on what terms were you asked? 16. makes similar references to "clearly defined boundaries, tied to firm ground features, and remove the many anomalous parish boundaries" none of which can truly be said to not exist here previously given that Green Lane, formerly a Roman road, is a clearly

defined boundary, firmly tied to the ground it covers and is not nor has it ever been "anomalous"? As per Section 2, 18. And 39 -43., was a community governance review petition actioned seeking these changes and if so why isn't it referenced in your work? The questions above are a summary of my own extreme dissatisfaction with the changes being proposed by the LGBC to the Green Lane boundary between Kirklevington and Yarm. When even my own residence is wrongly depicted on your supposedly current map, has been known as "Manor Farm" since 1968, before which it had been known as "High Forest Farm", is misrepresented some 53 years later how can I have any faith in the rest of your plan being promulgated on assumed superior knowledge? Prior to 1974 "Ravensgarth", built by my parents, was known as "Manor Farm" until my parents moved down the road. Whilst it took the Ordnance Survey until the mid 80's to correct their maps the Council have always sent our post from them to the correct address so how can you have got this wrong? Small, avoidable errors such as these only heighten my concerns as to the reliability of your proposed changes. As the LGBC has failed to demonstrate with facts that the current arrangement is broken then please leave well alone, do not try to "fix" something that is not broken with a bodge of bureaucratic proportions. If these changes are put in place without the LGBC, currently under the leadership of Jolyon Jackson CBE, providing answers to the concerns I have expressed above then I am left to question what is the difference between them and a thief in the night? Accordingly I confirm my objection to the LGBC proposed changes.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded