

Barnsley

Personal Details:

Name: Marie Tidball

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: not given

Organisation Name: (Member of Parliament)

Comment text:

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached a letter from Marie Tidball MP.

With best wishes,

[REDACTED]

Office of Marie Tidball MP, Member of Parliament for Penistone and Stocksbridge

Attached Documents:

- letter-from-marie-to-the-local-government-boundary-commission.pdf
- email-from-stainborough-parish-council.pdf



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Local Government Boundary Commission
Review Officer (Barnsley)
LGBCE
PO Box 133
Blyth
NE24 9FE

Our Ref: MT00207

9 September 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Local Government Boundary Commission – Barnsley, South Yorkshire review

I am writing on behalf of constituents in Stainborough Parish Council asking that you consider the submissions that they have made as part of the Boundary Review of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, and offer assurances for the concerns they have raised.

Stainborough Parish Council are, quite fairly, concerned about access to services in Penistone, including GP services. They are also concerned about the potential harm that could be done of moving them from the predominantly rural ward of Penistone East, which has other settlements that are of similar size and character to Stainborough.

I hope the Boundary Commission will not the objections herein, and consider them in the development of their proposals.

Yours faithfully,

Marie Tidball MP

Review Officer (Barnsley)

LGBCE

PO Box 133

Blyth

NE24 9FE

By e-mail reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

Local Government Boundary Commission – Barnsley, South Yorkshire review

Stainborough Parish Council have been made aware of the new proposals of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC) regarding the Boundary Review including the proposal to move Stainborough Parish into a new ward "Dodworth, Stainborough and Tankersley Ward".

The Parish Council wishes to make the Boundary Commission Review Officer aware that Stainborough Parish Council **does not support** the proposals of (BMBC) which have been sent to yourselves.

To provide some background information in relation to this matter, the Parish Council has had very little time to consult with our residents regarding the proposals as they were instructed by BMBC that the draft proposals were NOT AVAILABLE for public consultation until they were made public on the BMBC website the week before the Cabinet meeting of BMBC which was held on 14th August 2024. The proposals put before Cabinet were made available on 7th August. In anticipation of the draft proposals being made public the Parish Council Chair called an Extraordinary Meeting of Stainborough Parish Council on 8th August in order to consult with residents. At that hastily called meeting 49 residents attended. As the Parish only has approximately 350 residents, the attendees represented a large proportion of the residents, despite it being during the holiday period.

The outcome of the meeting was a resolution to notify BMBC that their proposals did NOT have the support of Stainborough Parish Council, that residents would be writing to yourselves at the Boundary Commission, as would the Parish Council, to object to the new proposals of BMBC.

The Parish Council advised BMBC by e-mail that they did not support the proposals BMBC had put forward and to note their objections to the proposals, and that Stainborough Parish Council did not wish for Stainborough Parish to move out of the Penistone East Ward and into a new Ward with Dodworth and Tankersley. Although the Parish Council notified BMBC by email prior to the Cabinet meeting, we have, as yet, received no acknowledgement or response to our email. Despite this the draft proposals were approved by BMBC Cabinet, and the Minutes do not record our objections to the proposal. In view of this, the Parish Council felt it essential to notify the Boundary Commission of the feelings of parishioners and the Parish Council regarding the new proposals from BMBC which you will be reviewing.

The Parish Council would like the Boundary Commission to note our disappointment that we were not able to consult with our residents until after 7th August which has given us very little time to respond.

Below are our reasons for **objection** to the proposal from Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:

- Stainborough Parish has always been in the Penistone East Ward and sits in that Ward alongside 8 other rural Parish Councils. It has a rural identity and as a small rural Parish wishes to retain this identity. As it currently sits alongside other rural Parish Councils, some of whom are of a similar size, it fits well with the current character of the rural Penistone East Ward.

- Penistone East Ward has a rural nature and Stainborough Parish is a rural community. Stainborough Parish has a strong rural community identity, and it is important for us and our residents to retain this rural community identity.
- The proposal of BMBC is the creation of a new rural Ward which will consist of Dodworth, Tankersley and Stainborough. However, there is concern that this will be rural in name but not in nature. Dodworth and Tankersley both have direct access to the M1 motorway links, Stainborough does not.
- Stainborough Parish is only 350 electors, so moving such a small number of residents from the rural Ward they have been in for a number of years seems to be un-necessary to equalise the number of electors in Penistone East Ward as new housing planned in the Dodworth area will exceed the actual number of residents in Stainborough Parish
- Stainborough Parish residents have strong community ties with Penistone including for recreation, education and commercial use. There is no link for residents with Dodworth. For example, there are bus services from the villages of Hood Green and Stainborough (which make the Stainborough Parish) but none to Dodworth. Children school in local villages of Silkstone Common and Thurgoland, then onto Penistone Grammar, not to Dodworth. The church attended by residents of the Parish is called "All Saints Church, Silkstone with Stainborough", which sits in Silkstone, a neighbouring Parish, which is also part of the Penistone East Ward.
- Unlike the current situation in Penistone East Ward, whereby Stainborough Parish sits alongside similar parishes, in the proposed new Ward, Stainborough Parish (350 residents) will sit alongside Dodworth over 10,000 and Tankersley approx. 2,000 residents. The concern is that Stainborough Parish would not be able to make its voice heard as it is a very small parish compared to Dodworth and Tankersley.
- Stainborough Parish is very rural in nature. Dodworth and Tankersley both have industrial and commercial sites. Stainborough Parish has a strong rural community identity with no industrial or commercial areas.
- Stainborough Parish has numerous sites of Biodiversity, Conservation areas and areas of historic interest, such as Wentworth Castle and Gardens managed by the National Trust, with the vast majority of the Parish in the Green Belt. This is not the same for Dodworth or Tankersley.
- Stainborough Parish, as a small village (Hood Green) and a hamlet (Stainborough), both of which have very strong ties to each other formed over centuries, has a number of issues which arise which can be said to be rural in nature. The issues facing smaller rural villages are vastly different to those issues facing larger urban areas. Currently there is support from other local rural parish councils who may have similar issues as Stainborough Parish. It is felt that urban areas such as Dodworth would not face such issues and support could be limited.
- Overall for Stainborough Parish residents there is no affinity with either Dodworth or Tankersley

We therefore wish the Boundary Commission to note the objection of Stainborough Parish Council to the proposals of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council and wish to register our objection to move Stainborough Parish out of Penistone East Ward into a new Ward of Dodworth, Stainborough and Tankersley.

Yours faithfully

Avril Sturdy
Clerk to the Council