

# Middlesbrough

## Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Organisation Name: (Member of the public)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** South-West Middlesbrough

I am submitting my views both as a resident of the proposed 'Hemlington North' ward and as someone who has recently ran for local government office in the proposed 'Stainton & Hemlington South' ward (albeit more so in what it is now Stainton & Thornton).

I would like to first give my thoughts on the proposed boundaries for what is now 'Hemlington' ward. Splitting this ward into two, to me, would split an already functioning community into two, severely affecting community cohesion. Many residents both 'Hemlington North' and 'Hemlington South' have a shared common identity that has existed historically. Not only that, but many amenities like Hemlington Library, the Viewley Hill Centre, Hemlington Family Hub and the two primary schools (St Gerard's and Viewley Hill) are used universally by both residents in the proposed 'Hemlington North' and 'Hemlington South' boundaries - it is already a well established community.

And my views are the same on the already existing 'Stainton & Thornton' ward where residents used the same amenities; Stainton Memorial Hall, The Stainton Inn and various roads that connect the two villages (Thornton Rd, Seamer Rd and Strait Lane). These amenities are not shared with the residents in the proposed 'Hemlington South' boundary. In fact, residents who live in the Bs, Ds, Es, Fs and Dales Park are very much unlikely to use the amenities residents in Stainton already share use with Thornton residents. This proposed ward would not encourage community cohesion, but instead worsen it.

The proposals the LGBCE ought to be considering are the first proposals of a 'Hemlington' and 'Stainton & Stainsby Hill' ward. These wards are much more likely to have natural boundaries already in place (Stainton Way for 'Hemlington' and the beck that runs through the Jack Simon Way

estate for 'Stainton & Stainsby Hill'), as well as shared amenities (residents in the first 'Stainsby Hill' share the amenity of Low Lane with residents in nearby 'Stainton'). Furthermore, the previous proposal would make more sense than the recent proposal as there would be no electoral imbalance (2 councillors for 'Hemlington' and 2 councillors for 'Stainton & Stainsby Hill').

Also, as in 2027, residents in the existing 'Stainton & Thornton' ward would share the same demographics as those seen in the 'Stainsby Hill' boundary - newbuild housing. This would not be shared in the proposed 'Stainton & Hemlington South' ward. As a Hemlington resident, I appreciate that the LGBCE take the concerns of these proposals into consideration, especially if it intends to improve community cohesion, electoral balance and electoral participation.

## **Attached Documents:**

*None attached*