

County Durham

Personal Details:

Name: Mr David Freeman

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Durham County Council councillor Elvet and Gilesgate ward (District or county councillor)

Comment text:

Related subject: Elvet and Gilesgate

In responding to your proposal for the Elvet and Gilesgate ward I have two proposals for you to consider.

In your draft recommendations you comment:

'We note in particular that the Joint Administration's proposal to place the unparished area south of Sunderland Road in a division with the remainder of Elvet & Gilesgate division, and the area north of Sunderland Road in Belmont division, also results in good electoral equality.'

We would support this option. The Sherburn Road Estate (The Woodlands and the Hapgood Drive/Cuthbert Avenue) from a community perspective is one estate and should remain so. They have been within the same electoral ward for at least 50 years. Your draft proposal has part of this estate placed in Belmont and part in Elvet and Gilesgate. The community centre would be in Belmont but the school in Elvet and Gilesgate. On grounds of community cohesion we believe that the whole estate south of Sherburn Road (and the estate next to it which has planning permission but is yet to be built) should be in the same ward, and that this should be Elvet and Gilesgate. As you state this will also ensure electoral equality. The Gilesgate Estate would therefore remain in the Belmont ward. Geographically this makes sense as the Gilesgate Estate and the Gilesgate Moor estates merge into each other without the separation of a major road such as the Sunderland Road.

If you are minded to approve your draft recommendation then I would request consideration of the removal of The Woodlands Estate from Elvet and Gilesgate and place it in Belmont. This maintains the estate within one ward as explained above. I note that the present proposal has the

Elvet and Gilesgate ward as being 4% over the desired average number of electors per councillor and Belmont being -5%. The removal of the estate of 521 electors would therefore create a better balance.

Attached Documents:

None attached