

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

Categories:

As discussed this morning,

Further to the Boundary Commission report outlining their proposals related to the Fairfield Ward in Stockton on Tees Borough, for the next stage of consultation, we wish to comment on those proposals as noted in attachment.

Would you please confirm receipt of this email.

Thank you,

Councillors Maurice Perry and Bill Woodhead MBE.

Any opinions or statements expressed in this e mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.

This e mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you receive this in error, please do not disclose any information to anyone and notify the sender at the above address.

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council's computer systems and communications may be monitored to ensure effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

Although we have endeavoured to ensure that this e mail and any attachments are free from any virus we would advise you to take any necessary steps to ensure that they are actually virus free.

*****.

Fairfield Ward Boundary, Stockton on Tees.

We conclude the following for electorate equality for the Fairfield Ward.

What has been proposed by the Local Government Boundary Commission is to split the Fairfield ward into two separate areas is an indictment that serves no purpose for this long-standing community, dividing the solidarity that binds the Fairfield Ward in its entirety.

Our vision is based on strong communities that are diverse, cohesive, caring, and vibrant.

To this end, we totally disagree with the proposals put forward by the Boundary Commission and would like them to note our strongest feelings on this matter and for them to modify their proposals to ensure the Fairfield Ward remains collectively for the interests of the community. Especially when our findings and adjustments to the electorate areas can be made possible with some small amendments, as follows: -

Ref to page 2 of the draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Stockton on Tees Borough Council, (which states part), i.e. Some councillors currently represent many more or fewer than voters than others. This is 'Electoral inequality'. They say their aim is to create 'Electoral equality', where voters are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

The number of voters represented by each councillor should be approximately the same across the borough.

We have shown many examples in our reply to the Boundary Commission to negate the electoral variance of -13%, improving somewhat to within the 10% of equality with little interference to other Wards.

We are disappointed to note that little consideration has not been made in respect of the feelings of the residents that live in the Fairfield Ward and their collective thoughts on this very important matter. Sadly, more weight has been given, than ours, to Conservative briefings who have little bearing in this issue.

Our findings for Electoral Equality.

	Current Electorate	Estimated Electorate
	2020	2026
	Variance	Variance
Fairfield F1	2641	2736
Fairfield F2	<u>1900</u>	<u>1839</u>
Totals	<u>4541</u> -12%	<u>4575</u> -13%

Reference to page 5 of the Boundary Commission Report indicating the average number electors per councillor.

	2020	2026
Electorate for Stockton	145129	147797
No of Councillors	56	56
Ave no of Electors per Councillor	2592	2639
Fairfield Ward has 2 Councillors	5184	<u>5278 electorate</u>

For Electoral Equality for 2026 $5278 - 4575 = 703$

Therefore, we need to find 703 electorates.

With reference to item 6 Ward Patterns, in our reply to the Boundary Commission dated 7th June 2021, of possible refinement, to consider the following areas: -

1. North West Development 392 houses
2. West Side Fairfield Development 859 houses
 - a. Fairfield Proposed 121 houses
 - b. 50% total development 430 houses
3. Fairfield/Grangefield Ward 345 houses
4. Malcolm Drive 32 houses
5. North West Hartburn
 - a. Surbiton to Scalby 276 houses
 - b. To Green Beck 431 houses

Consider item 6 of our reply dated 07 June 2021 to determine Equality.

Needing 703 electorates.

A. Take item 2a. (West Side Fairfield Development) = 121 houses

Giving a variance of -11%.

B. Take item 1 and 2a, (North West Development and West Side Fairfield Development) 392 + 121 = 513 houses

Giving a variance of -1%.

C. Take item 1 + 2a + 5a, (North West Development + West Side Fairfield Development + North West Hartburn, Surbiton to Scalby)

392 + 121 + 276 = 789 houses

Giving a variance of +5%.

D. Take item 1 + 2b, (North West Development + 50% of West side Stockton Development) 392 + 430 = 822 houses.

Giving a variance of +6%.

E. Take item 1+ 2b + 5a, (North West Development + 50% of West Side Stockton Development + North West Hartburn, Surbiton to Scalby)

392 + 430 + 276 = 1098 houses

Giving a variance of +12.5%.

F. Take item 1 + 2b + 5d, (North West Development + 50% of West Side Stockton Development + North West Hartburn to Greens Beck)
392 + 430 + 500 = 1322 houses

Giving a variance of +18%.

G. Take item 2b (50% of the West Side Stockton Development) = 430 houses
Giving a Variance of -3%.

It's obvious to all, that drastic measures don't need to be taken to make the numbers up for electoral equality.

From the calculations assessed above, we conclude, the ideal solution would be to consider Reference B, C, D or G for electoral Quality. The preference would be to go for B as this would give least cause of concern or disruption to residents, even to other adjoining ward boundaries, giving a – 1% equality rating, which is well within the guidelines.

As noted previously the North West Area and West Side Stockton developments have not yet been established but prospective families can easily adapt into the deep rooted Fairfield community way of life and embrace all the facilities that are at hand without the inference of identity after any boundary changes.

To note, we have also considered the interest and identities of the local communities, in the Fairfield Ward, there are 2 Junior Schools, for pupils 5 to 11 year olds and 1 CE Academy for pupils 11 to 16 year olds, dentists, pharmacy, care home, two public houses, 1 Library, 1 Youth Club, Scout Assembly, 2 Shopping Parades, Chinese take away, a general store, 2 Garages – 1 for vehicle servicing and the other for supply of fuel including a general store and car wash facilities. These all facilitate the migration of residents from other nearby surrounding communities of different wards who have limited on no facilities established in close proximity. Overall, we consider the Electoral numbers that are shown for 2020, are deflated numbers when you consider the migration patterns of other residents using Fairfield Ward facilities.

In conclusion, from our proposals shown there is no need to split the Fairfield Ward into two parts, ripping the heart out of a well-established community. I just wonder if our learned friends from Government understand the Northern ethos within communities like ours. They would get a greater understanding of our beliefs and characteristics if they came and sat with us for a generous period to give more realistic outcomes to their solutions. Not just based on a whim and a prayer so it seems. Please do not destroy what has been achieved over the years, as the residents do not want it destroyed, they've got their identities and local interests established and don't want to lose it. Therefore, please consider our proposals for the betterment of our Fairfield Ward residents and community at large.

Thank you,

Councillors Maurice Perry and Bill Woodhead MBE.
Fairfield Ward Stockton on Tees.