

# County Durham

## Personal Details:

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

## Comment text:

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object to the inclusion of the parish and village of Staindrop in the proposed local government division of Evenwood in County Durham.

The attached document provides my reasoning and suggestions.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## Attached Documents:

- Draft recommendations for Local Government Boundary Commission for England.pdf

**Draft recommendations for Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**Staindrop, Co. Durham**

I wish to object to the inclusion of the parish and village of Staindrop in the proposed local government division of Evenwood.

The inclusion of Staindrop village in Evenwood seems all to do with the mathematical convenience of having divisions with similar numbers; nothing to do with the needs of the residents of the village and a complete denial of its identity, culture and heritage.

Staindrop is a village of the Tees Valley. It lies to the south of the escarpment separating the Tees and Wear Valleys and has traditionally been part of the administration of Tees Valley authorities and strongly identifies with Teesdale.

Staindrop is essentially a rural or agricultural village. It has no history of any heavy industry. Its existence lies as a village of artisans and farmers to support the adjacent Raby estate and as part of the ancient coaching route from Durham to Bowes.

Staindrop is not a settlement of the West Durham coalfield. It has none of the inherent issues concerned with rebuilding mining communities following the demise of the pits. It is a community centred on old stone-built houses surrounding a large and idyllic village green, not red brick terraces built around a colliery and railway sidings.

The issues which face Staindrop are ones associated with its compatibility with a busy through road and traffic management, issues of access and rights of way over farmland, of conservation of becks and ancient trees. It would not be best served by councillors concerned with urban decay and the remnants of heavy industry.

In short Staindrop has little in common with the other settlements of the new Evenwood division except perhaps for those, such as Ingleton which appear to have been lumped into the mix simply as make-weights.

I have no confidence that any councillor elected to a new three-member constituency of Evenwood will have their focus on interests and concerns of the rural communities of the Tees Valley and the residents of Staindrop will be poorly served by any such arrangements.

Though I acknowledge that it is also difficult to accommodate the large settlement of Barnard Castle in your plans. Perhaps Barnard Castle could have a two-member division for the town and single-member divisions for East (Staindrop, Stainton, Whorlton, Winston, Gainford, Langleydale, Headlam, Ingleton etc.) and Upper Teesdale (Middleton, Romaldkirk, Cotherstone, Mickleton etc.) leaving an Evenwood division to encompass the old mining communities of the region.

██████████  
████████████████████  
██████████  
██████████  
██████████