

Sunderland

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

Dear Sirs,

As a resident of Tunstall, I reject entirely my inclusion within the new Silksworth Ward - not least because this ward should at the very least be called Tunstall and Silksworth (though it does not include all of Tunstall and in fact splits Tunstall in two).

Residents of Tunstall do not typically use services in Silksworth. We are separated by a huge amount of green space (Tunstall Hills and farm lands) which can only be circumnavigated, not crossed directly with any ease. This will be even more the case when the new development at Silksworth Lane places even more obstacles between these two communities.

Tunstall residents use Ashbrooke and Tunstall's community assets: its community centre, its schools, its churches, its residents associations and its youth clubs. Silksworth residents are catered for by entirely different services which are, in some cases, shared with Farringdon and Lakeside. The inclusion of some of Tunstall in the current Silksworth Ward has to use a temporary cabin as a polling station because its community centres are in the rest of Tunstall which is in the St Michael's Ward: this underscores that the slither of Tunstall contained in the current Silksworth Ward really does not belong there, but should be united with the rest of Tunstall.

The decision to split Queen Alexandra Road between four wards shows poor judgement and is typical of the weakness of these proposals.

I also object to the proposed St Chad's Ward which imposes upon the St Nicholas Parish and makes no sense from the perspective of natural

community or coherent identity. Humbledon Hill has much more in common with Tunstall than the former does with East Herrington or the latter does with Silksworth.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Attached Documents:

None attached