

**From:** [Cllr Mark Wilkes](#)  
**To:** [reviews](#)  
**Cc:** [Cllr Craig Martin](#); [Durham Lib Dems](#)  
**Subject:** Liberal Democrat Submission: Durham County Council Boundary Review  
**Date:** 30 January 2023 23:30:45  
**Attachments:** [Durham County Council Boundary Review - Liberal Democrat Proposals.pdf](#)

---

Dear Sir/Madam

Further to emails from the Joint Administration I enclose a separate narrative (below) to sit alongside the JA submission from the Liberal Democrats which emphasises some key differences we have within the Consett and Chester-le-Street areas, and a suggestion for Coxhoe division.

Enclosed is our full submission. The excel files sent on behalf of the Joint Administration contain the polling district data in Option B which we support subject to the points raised below.

I hope this is clear but please do contact me if you need further clarity.

Kind regards

Mark

Councillor Mark Wilkes

Durham County Council

On Behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group and County Durham Liberal Democrats



# Boundary Review: Durham County Council

## Submission by the Liberal Democrats

The Liberal Democrats broadly support the submission made by the Joint Administration running Durham County Council of which we are part, however there are some key areas where we feel strongly that certain options and proposals should be adopted and we hope you will consider this.

We enclose our proposals which mirror the JA in many areas but emphasise some key points here:

### **Chester-le-Street Area**

We feel that our proposals enclosed provide a greater level of electoral parity than the alternative proposal from the Conservatives.

Our proposal recommends

- 3% from the recommended average for North Lodge
- 1.8% from average for the proposed Chester-le-Street division
- 0.7% from the average for the proposed Chester-le-Street South division

These boundaries, as the narratives outline, provide for divisions which meet with the boundary commission recommendations and ensure community links are protected.

### **Consett Area**

We feel very strongly that the proposals outlined in Option B from the JA are the best option.

The current Lanchester Division is too big, and there are no proper community links. Our proposal for two one member divisions for Consett South and Lanchester keeps electoral parity, ensuring the communities of Moorside, Castleside and The Grove are retained within a single member ward, and the rural areas are represented in the Lanchester Division.

### **Consett North**

Having reviewed the possible options for the centre of Consett it is our view that a two member Consett North Division is also an option and we would ask the boundary commission to consider this.

Our submission here recognises the benefits of the JA one member division, however keeping the Vila Real and Belle Vue polling areas within the division and bringing in part of the proposed Benfieldside division would allow for a two member division, whilst retaining parity in Leadgate and Medomsley, Delves Lane and Benfieldside.

Indeed it could provide for better electoral equality and we would ask that this is reviewed. A one member Benfieldside might be the solution to make Consett North a two member ward.

### **Coxhoe**

Having reviewed the submissions we are minded to support the retention of Hett and Croxdale within the Coxhoe division as this allows for better electoral equality.

Should you have any questions or requests for further information please contact Councillor Mark Wilkes:

Email: [mark.wilkes@durham.gov.uk](mailto:mark.wilkes@durham.gov.uk)

Phone: [REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED] **Notice**

We have recently updated our terms and conditions for all our services, including making some important updates to our privacy notices. To find out more about how we collect, use, share and retain your personal data, visit: [www.durham.gov.uk/dataprivacy](http://www.durham.gov.uk/dataprivacy)

Help protect our environment by only printing this email if absolutely necessary. The information it contains and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are only intended for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may be unlawful for you to use, share or copy the information, if you are not authorised to do so. If you receive this email by mistake, please inform the person who sent it at the above address and then delete the email from your system. Durham County Council takes reasonable precautions to ensure that its emails are virus free. However, we do not accept responsibility for any losses incurred as a result of viruses we might transmit and recommend that you should use your own virus checking procedures.

# Durham County Council

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Mark Wilkes  
**E-mail:** durhamlibdems.members@gmail.com  
**Postcode:** DH1 5DQ  
**Organisation Name:** County Durham Liberal Democrats

## Comment text:

Boundary Review: Durham County Council Submission by the Liberal Democrats Dear Sir/Madam  
The Liberal Democrats broadly support the submission made by the Joint Administration running Durham County Council of which we are part, however there are some key areas where we feel strongly that certain options and proposals should be adopted and we hope you will consider this. We are enclosing our proposals by email (due to file size), which mirror the JA in many areas but emphasise some key points here: Chester-le-Street Area We feel that our proposals enclosed provide a greater level of electoral parity than the alternative proposal from the Conservatives. Our proposal recommends - 3% from the recommended average for North Lodge - 1.8% from average for the proposed Chester-le-Street division - 0.7% from the average for the proposed Chester-le-Street South division These boundaries, as the narratives outline, provide for divisions which meet with the boundary commission recommendations and ensure community links are protected. Consett Area We feel very strongly that the proposals outlined in Option B from the JA are the best option. The current Lanchester Division is too big, and there are no proper community links. Our proposal for two one member divisions for Consett South and Lanchester keeps electoral parity, ensuring the communities of Moorside, Castleside and The Grove are retained within a single member ward, and the rural areas are represented in the Lanchester Division. Consett North Having reviewed the possible options for the centre of Consett it is our view that a two member Consett North Division is also an option and we would ask the boundary commission to consider this. Our submission here recognises the benefits of the JA one member division, however keeping the Vila Real and Belle Vue polling areas within the division and bringing in part of the proposed Benfieldside division would allow for a two member division, whilst retaining parity in Leadgate and Medomsley, Delves Lane and Benfieldside. Indeed it could provide for better electoral equality and we would ask that this is reviewed. A one member Benfieldside might be the solution to make Consett North a two member ward. Coxhoe Having reviewed the submissions we are minded to support the retention of Hett and Croxdale within the Coxhoe division as this allows for better electoral equality. Should you have any questions or requests for further information please contact Councillor Mark Wilkes: Email: mark.wilkes@durham.gov.uk Phone: 0300 268 788 / 07500 125 325

## Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded