

Sunderland

Personal Details:

Name: Antony Mullen
Email: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: (Representative of a local organisation)

Comment text:

Please find attached the Conservative Group's response to the most recent consultation.

We will, at a later date, be submitting a series of petitions that we have organised objecting to specific ward proposals.

Best wishes,
Antony

Attached Documents:

- conservative-party-response-to-the-local-government-boundary-commission-draft-proposals-of-february-2024.pdf

**Conservative Group response to the Local Government Boundary
Commission draft proposals of February 2024**

Introduction

This document summarises the Conservative Council Group's position in respect of the LGBCE's February 2024 set of proposals.

With two exceptions, the Conservative Group accepts in full and endorses the proposals for Washington and the wards north of the River Wear. Two minor suggestions are made later in the document. We endorse all the proposed names for the Washington wards.

The focus of this response is to explain why we reject in strong terms, and encourage a revision of, the wards in the Coalfields and south of the River Wear. In this regard, we recommend a return to the previous proposals for this area of the city.

Of particular concern to us is the proposed St Chad's Ward, which we see as an artificial construction which is clearly more of a numerical convenience than a reflection of genuine community – and the Commission appears to note the weaknesses with this suggestion in the report. We are pleased the Commission acknowledges that no local political parties or individuals proposed this; it is our strong view that nobody from Sunderland would have conceived of such a ward – and for good, valid reasons. The proposed St Chad's Ward looks glaringly obviously like a “what was left when other, seemingly more important, areas were settled” ward.

We set out in this response the nature of our concerns and point out some of the problems that the Commission has accidentally created – probably through oversight rather than by design – which need urgent correction. We discuss, for example, the fact that Queen Alexandra Road (a street with a consistent, singular identity, house style and distinctive appearance) now has a total of 12 different councillors representing it.

Whilst we appreciate that the Commission is trying to address the comments from residents made in response to the previous set of proposals, we feel that it has torn more communities apart in its aim to protect the ostensibly unique history of one or two others. We urge the Commission to exercise balance in respect of those previously received public representations that very clearly suggested previous proposals were to rename the area in which they live, rather than to treat of administrative boundaries.

Overview

1.1 In our original submission of proposals, we observed that – to deal with the elector numbers in the Coalfields area – there would either need to be five Coalfields Wards (instead of four) or that there would need to be a ward which acted as a bridge between the Coalfields and the Borough of Sunderland, south of the River Wear.

1.2 The Lib Dems made this same observation. Both the Conservatives and Lib Dems felt that the latter – a bridging ward – was the best way to achieve electoral equality and, despite no consultation between our parties, both proposed a ward designed around the Herringtons. The Labour Party proposed keeping the wards largely as they are now, which the Commission noted was not acceptable.

1.3 In the current proposals, the Commission has opted to consult on the former arrangement, whereby the Borough of Sunderland loses an entire ward and the Coalfields gain one. We believe that this is wrong – and that the Commission should revert to a bridging ward constructed around the Herringtons.

1.4 The current suggestion is for five small Coalfields Wards, whereby four are under the average elector number (with two of those four being at -10%).

1.5 This is achieved at the expense of the Borough of Sunderland which has a series of wards bordering the river and the sea which have been pushed to extreme end of the variance in terms of elector numbers. Namely, these are Pallion and Ford; Deptford and Hendon; and Grangetown. All of these are at +10%. Barnes and Thornhill, which sits at +8%, neighbours these.

1.6 This presents a problem that it did not in the Coalfields. We know that the city centre wards (i.e. these four, and Roker) have a higher rate of Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) than other wards.¹ We know that the tenants of HMOs tend to be more transient in that they do not reside for long periods of time and therefore do not register to vote; often they are students or foreign nationals who do not, or cannot, register to vote; or people who are being housed by a social or probation service for a temporary period and so do not register to vote.

¹ This is demonstrated by Sunderland City Council's public register of HMO licences:
https://www.sunderland.gov.uk/media/22473/Public-register-of-HMO/pdf/Q3-23-24_web_version.pdf?m=1707822711010

1.7 Our point, therefore, is that these three wards will have – in reality – a larger population than reflected in the official elector numbers. This is something that the Council’s boundary working group was agreed upon when discussing our submission on councillor numbers.

1.8 But whilst these people may not be registered to vote, they still use local amenities, require Council services, and have a right to contact the local councillors for the area. In short, the Commission has likely proposed three wards here which are all over +10% of the average number of electors, when factoring in those who are not registered to vote but who do live in these wards. Barnes and Thornhill is almost certainly over by more than +8% on this same basis. This would be an issue on a discrete basis, but it is a matter for urgent attention when it applies to a cluster of neighbouring wards.

1.9 There is then also the fact that councillors representing some of these areas also have additional responsibilities relating to major infrastructure projects, higher than average applications for development, and more visitors within their wards than others – all by virtue of being part of the city centre or on its immediate outskirts.

1.10 The previously proposed Herrington Ward was not only coherent, but it provided a logical means of bridging the gap between the Coalfields and the wards south of the River Wear – and therefore overcame this imbalance on either side of the A19. We strongly encourage the Commission to revert to the Herrington Ward as a means of addressing the unseen pressures faced by councillors in the city centre, where we do not believe three consecutive neighbouring wards at +10% is reasonable.

1.11 We deal with why the Herrington Ward was a logic proposal elsewhere in our response.

1.12 If the Commission will not reinstate the Herrington Ward and elects to continue with five wards in the Coalfields, then in the south of Sunderland it should look to create a pattern of wards which bring together Middle and East Herrington with Moorside; Lakeside, Farringdon and Silkworth; Tunstall, Plains Farm and Humbledon; Ashbrooke and Grangetown; and Ryhope and Burdon. It should also use the leeway in Pennywell and South Hylton to reduce elector numbers in neighbouring Pallion and Ford. These are geographically and culturally closer pairings with stronger local links than what has been proposed in the most recent consultation document.

Wards

1. Proposed St Chad's Ward

1.1 The Conservative Group simply rejects this proposal on the grounds that the communities contained within it are culturally, economically, socially and – most obviously – geographically unrelated to one another.

1.2 Plains Farm (North) and Humbledon have strong connections to one another by virtue of being physically integrated: indeed, they are physically integrated to a far greater extent than Plains Farm (North) is with Plains Farm (South). There is a shared community centre and social club for Plains Farm and Humbledon. East Herrington and Farringdon are culturally linked to one in that they are presently in the same ward and both in the St Chad's parish, with the church of the same name acting as a community hub, as well as a shared community centre in Farringdon which hosts youth provision and adult services for Farringdon and the Herringtons.

1.3 Nevertheless, Humbledon, Plains Farm, Herrington and Farringdon are four distinctive communities and they do not fit together – as a collective – easily or logically. Visually the ward is striking as it appears like an unending sprawl from the A690 from the A19 to Queen Alexandra Road, crossing multiple points which would be considered natural boundaries between communities.

1.4 Residents of Humbledon and Plains Farm do not use local amenities in Farringdon or East Herrington: youth clubs, social spaces, schools, local transport and shops are all entirely separate, with no overlap at all. North Moor Road, coupled with the Lakeside Park, serves as a large physical break between the two.

1.5 The notion proposed within the Commission report that neighbouring Silksworth has so little in common with Farringdon that they cannot be in the same ward raises questions about what precisely Farringdon has in common with Humbledon Hill that means these *can* or *should* be in the same ward.

1.6 We express concern that the Commission seems to think that Humbledon Hill represents Humbledon in its entirety: on the contrary Humbledon includes (in addition to Humbledon Hill): Scruton Avenue, Stamford Avenue, Shaftesbury Crescent,

Shrewsbury Crescent, Saxon Crescent, Sacriston Avenue and the part of Durham Road between that sits between them. These are a mixture of private occupier and Gentoo homes, they have 'Avenue/Crescent' street names, and they are a different style of housing to neighbouring Plains Farm and Springwell. Plains Farm is, by contrast, a mixture of private occupier and Home Group housing (which is visually different to the Gentoo stock). Yet the Commission has carved three Humbledon streets off from the rest of Humbledon and placed them in the proposed Grindon and Thorney Close Ward.

1.7 Returning to the point made at 1.5, we suggest that Silksworth and Farringdon have more in common than has been acknowledged. The current St Chad's and Silksworth Wards, for example, have jointly funded a Ranger (a form of Environmental Services Officer) to serve their two communities because the problems in Silksworth and Farringdon are the same – and this is made possible and practicable for a single Ranger to address because of the geographic proximity of these two communities. Delivery of a mutual service between Farringdon and Humbledon Hill, in this way, would be impossible because of the *distance* and the *difference* between the two. We attach at Appendix 1 a funding application from Youth Almighty Project (based in Silksworth) to operate its Ranger service across the St Chad's Ward: the application refers to the continued development of community partnerships in St Chad's (i.e. Farringdon and Lakeside) and we believe this underscores a greater community cohesion and commonality between Silksworth and Farringdon than the Commission has acknowledged in its interpretation of resident feedback. We therefore call into question Youth Almighty's previous submission to the Commission in which it said the Farringdon and Silksworth Ward proposal would threaten its service delivery: on the contrary, Youth Almighty actively delivers services on a geographic footprint that mirrors exactly the Farringdon and Silksworth Ward proposal.

1.8 In respect of the name, this causes further confusion. The St Chad's parish relates to Herrington, Farringdon and Gilley Law (aka Lakeside Village). The Commission's proposals place the latter outside of the St Chad's Ward (into Doxford Park Ward) and include in the new so-called "St Chad's" communities from the parish of St Nicholas and of St Mary and St Peter.

1.9 On every criteria the Commission asked us to follow, this ward fails. It has no clear sense of identity; its boundaries are obscure and absurd; there are no shared facilities, mutual services or central hubs that would bind this together. It would be impossible to be a councillor for this ward without driving, because it would take an hour and five minutes, according to Google Maps, to walk from east to west and because there are no bus services to help navigate it.

2. Proposed Herrington and Newbottle Ward

2.1 The Commission's suggestion that East and Middle Herrington have too little in common with the rest of Herrington to form a ward, but enough in common with Humbledon Hill – from which it is separated by a 65 minute long walk – to form a ward is, to us, unconvincing in theory and unworkable in practice.

2.2 First, we refute the idea the Herringtons do not have enough in common to form a single ward, as previously proposed. The Herringtons are widely recognised as a distinctive community with their own history dating back to the 14th century, when this community was first established as part of the manor of Herrington by Ranulf Flambard and his family. This is reflected not least by the marketing of the area by estate agents (see link)²; the dedicated Herrington area taxi company; the Herrington 1st Scouts group which operates across all of Herrington and, despite being based in Herrington Burn, has been funded by the current councillors for Middle and East Herrington; residents of all of the Herringtons using Herrington Country Park as their local park; the 'Herrington Heritage' group (see link) which documents the history of the Herringtons as a singular community³; the 'Friends of Herrington Village' which covers and operates within the whole of Herrington (West, East, Middle and New); and, not least but perhaps obviously, the shared name "Herrington" which gives cohesion to the area (quite simply because they *are* all Herrington). Many services are also shared within the community. Herrington Primary accepts students from across the Herringtons into its catchment area, as well as Farringdon Academy serving the community, rather than Thornhill Academy which serves the areas of Humbledon and Plains Farm. Sandhill View Academy sits between these

² The Herringtons Area Guide: <https://www.peterheron.co.uk/buy/area-guides/the-herringtons/>

³ Herrington Heritage: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/HerringtonHeritage/>

two, emphasising just how geographically disparate they are (i.e. that they are not even neighbouring schools).

2.3 The inclusion of “Herrington” in the ward name is also unacceptable on the grounds that New Herrington does not have an exclusive claim to this name: residents of East and Middle Herrington will question why they do not live in the ward which carries the name of their community and, indeed, why they are included in a ward with communities that are undeniably less connected (i.e. Humbledon, Plains Farm) than the rest of the historic Herrington village.

2.4 Having paid attention to representations which objected to Barnes Park being divided between two wards, the Commission now proposes to divide Herrington Country Park between two wards. To do so has the same implications as it did for Barnes Park: two sets of councillors will potentially have competing priorities for the same park and, through the Council’s funding structures, will be able to fund different, perhaps contradictory projects. It would double the number of consultees for licencing applications, for example, and it would mean that residents with complaints about the park would need to decide which side of the boundary their complaint pertains to and, therefore, to which set of councillors to direct it. The Commission listened to representations opposing the division of Barnes Park: for the same reasons it should now unify Herrington Country Park in a single ward.

2.5 We encourage the Commission to understand that Middle and East Herrington have demonstrable community and geographic links to the rest of Herrington, which they do not share with Plains Farm and Humbledon. Whilst there may be some weaknesses with the previously proposed Herrington Ward, these are nothing compared to the glaring problems with the newly proposed St Chad’s Ward. Of the two, the Herrington Ward proposal meets the Commission’s own tests for boundaries, community identity and shared amenity in a much more convincing and recognisable way than the new St Chad’s proposal, which fails on every one of these measures. Indeed, a Council officer has commented that it would be immensely difficult to find appropriate places to use as polling stations in this new St Chad’s Ward.

2.6 Aside from this, we also believe that Newbottle is more part of Houghton and has more in common with this community than any part of Herrington. As an example,

Houghton Keping School takes students from Houghton and Newbottle but not from Herrington. Likewise, GP surgeries and dentists in the Houghton area will cater for Newbottle in a way that they do not for Herrington.

2.7 We therefore think that both the Herrington and Newbottle communities are less well served by these proposals than they would have been by the previous proposals and we suggest that Labour has made suggestions to the contrary for political expedience: we note that no such proposals were made in their initial submissions.

2.8 We feel that the communities of the Herringtons would be better served under a single ward, as outlined above, and when linked with the Farringdon area, with which it shares several links, would be acceptable numerically to the Commission guidelines. A natural boundary could also be achieved at Railway Terrace and Langley Street. This is a recognised border between the communities and is split by the old railway line which is now a cycle path.

3. Proposed Silksworth Ward

3.1 The Conservative Group believes that this ward, as a minimum, would need to be renamed Tunstall but – more realistically – thinks it should not exist.

3.2 Firstly, we were deeply concerned by the public representations made in response to the proposed Silksworth and Farringdon Ward. It seemed clear from the replies that respondents were under the impression, in some cases, that Silksworth Village was going to be renamed not as a local government ward but in totality.

3.3 Some of these responses seemed to be pushing for a ward in which Silksworth Village stood alone, with no other communities included within the boundaries: this desire is not satiated by the current proposal which is, if anything, worse than the previous proposal because there is not even recognition of the vast area of Tunstall that sits within it (in fact, there is more Tunstall than Silksworth).

3.4 The Commission accepts Anne Lawson's point that the Herringtons are separated by a large amount of greenspace, yet it seems to have no concern at all that Silksworth and Tunstall are also separated by a large, insurmountable hill and miles of farming fields.

3.5 Second, there is no recognition of the fact that Tunstall has much stronger communities ties to Humbledon and Ashbrooke, rather than Silksworth. Essen Way, Tunstall Hills and Silksworth Sport and Ski Complex are all large barriers which separate Tunstall and Silksworth not just geographically, but also visually.

3.6 Whilst Tunstall residents may use the local Sainsbury's, they are likely to use the convenience stores on Queen Alexandra Road, at the bottom of Humbledon Hill, and the Asda in Grangetown. There is little incentive or means (in terms of transport and footpaths) for them to venture into Silksworth for this purpose.

3.7 Similarly, local schools in the area like Hill View are more likely to provide for this area than anything in Silksworth and, likewise, older people's groups for Tunstall residents are largely catered for by St Michael's Community Centre on Stannington Grove which borders Tunstall and Grangetown. St Nicholas' church is also a common place for older Tunstall residents to socialise/meet for groups. As we have mentioned, Youth Almighty Project, the principle youth provider in Silksworth also operates mutual services in Farringdon, but it operates no services (of youth provision or its Ranger programme) in Tunstall, where other youth groups and environmental programmes (like Blue Watch and ICOS) fulfil these provisions. The lack of community amenity in the Tunstall end of the current Silksworth Ward (the T02 polling district) is underscored by the fact that a temporary polling station has to be installed for elections, because there are no community facilities within the ward). The closest community centres are in St Michael's Ward – and the Council's policy is to avoid making residents cross ward boundaries to vote.

3.8 Another of the fundamental problems with this proposal, though, is that the Commission has not even included all of Tunstall in this ward. By using Tunstall Road as the boundary in the east, it has excluded several hundred Tunstall residents who are now included in the Grangetown Ward. The considerations it has given to Silksworth's desire to be a single cohesive unit has now been denied to this area: if the Commission feels strongly about the unity of historic Silksworth, it should be equally passionate about (equally) historic Tunstall.

3.9 We note that this ward excludes Tunstall allotments, which are in the Doxford Park Ward, despite these only being accessible from the Silksworth Ward. We believe this underscores the inappropriateness of these proposals.

3.10 Our own public consultation (to be submitted in the form of a petition) has over 200 objectors (at the time of writing) to this ward proposal.

4 Proposed Doxford Park Ward

4.1 The inclusion of the Lakeside Village in this ward makes no sense because a) this is genuinely a part of the St Chad's parish area, yet excluded from the ward of that name and b) this is geographically miles apart from Doxford.

4.2 Many of the residents of Lakeside Village are elderly people who have no means of transport (e.g. to attend a councillor's surgery) and they would usually shop locally or use the bus service at the bottom of their tower blocks which run through Silksworth and Farringdon (i.e. two areas we are told have nothing in common).

4.3 Lakeside Park, the recreation space used by many residents living in Knightsbridge for example, is in the new Silksworth Ward. Indeed, the name Lakeside Village is a reference to the proximity of the Village to Lakeside Park, which is part of the Silksworth Sports Complex (and the Sports Complex borders both Lakeside Village and Farringdon to the extent that the Farringdon branch of McDonalds sits within the grounds of the extended complex).

4.4 We agree with Michael Mordey's (Labour) representations in the limited respect that he and Sunderland Labour see a stronger relationship between Lakeside Village and Silksworth than between Lakeside Village and Doxford Park.

4.5 The proposed Doxford Park Ward also contains houses on a new development off Rotary Road which, impractically, can only be accessed via the Ryhope Ward. This further illustrates why this set of proposals is inferior to the previous set consulted upon.

4.6 Lakeside Village could easily belong to Silksworth Ward or sit alongside Farringdon and East Herrington (as at present). It is liminal to that extent, but only to that extent. The fact that it is in neither Silksworth or St Chad's, but that both of these wards does include communities which do not easily or logically sit together, indicates to us the

need for a major rethink. Too many of these wards have a long ‘reach’ into other communities: St Chad’s into Humbledon and Doxford Park into Lakeside are just two examples. We feel it would be very difficult to communicate these new boundaries to residents.

5. Proposed Fulwell Ward

5.1 For a tidier boundary, we suggest that the Commission should use Neale Street (from Fulwell Road in the West to Mere Knolls Road in the East) rather than the current inconsistent use of parts of Browne Road. This would have the benefit of including all of Browne Road in a single ward; be easier for residents to understand and for councillors to explain; and include the likes of Elvington Street, which is in Roker (as identified in the postal address on Google Maps, for example), in the new Roker Ward.

6. Proposed Albany and Biddick Ward

6.1 We feel this ward should include Albany Park, which is currently in the Concord Ward. Our view is that the Commission should seek to make use of the A1290 (i.e. east on Blue House Lane, towards and including Vermont) and then find an appropriate means of joining the boundary with the A1231 – either inclusive of, or running behind, Washington Academy.

7. Proposed Barnes and Thornhill Ward

7.1 We think that the inclusion of part of Ashbrooke – namely the properties on Tunstall Road – is questionable. This is clearly separated from the rest of the Barnes and Thornhill Ward by a distinctive road.

7.2 The Commission report makes the point that this is done to achieve good electoral equality in the neighbouring Grangetown Ward – but this should be a sign that the Grangetown Ward, as presented in its current formation, is too large. We refer Commissioners back to our previous point about the number of HMOs in this area.

7.3 We also think that it is unfair for wards like Barnes and Thornhill, and for residents of places like Tunstall Road, to be carved off into a ward solely for numerical purposes and not for reasons of community. When substantial changes have been made to satisfy

the community identities of one place (e.g. Silksworth, Hollycarrside), it is then counterintuitive to think that this principle should not apply to other areas too.

7.4 Back lanes are a major problem in the city centre suburbs, with constant fly-tipping, dog fouling and litter issues. To have, as the Commission proposes here, a back lane as a boundary will create confusion if a resident must contact one set of councillors to report an issue at the front of their house but another set of councillors for issues in the neighbouring ward, which just happens to start at the back of their property. We think the Commission should stick to its own advice regarding clear boundaries. Using back lanes as boundaries makes for inconvenient local governance.

8. Queen Alexandra Road, Ashbrooke

8.1 Special attention needs to be given to Queen Alexandra Road in Ashbrooke as a case study of what has happened under these new proposals.

8.2 This is a long, distinctive street which serves as the official, and well known, boundary between Ashbrooke, Thornhill and Tunstall, and so it has a clear sense of identity given its role as a place between three communities with historic identities (one of which is an official conservation area). We request Commissioners at least view it on Google Maps to see how distinctive this street is.

8.3 Under the current proposals, this street – which has 241 houses – is divided between four different wards: Grangetown, St Chad's, Silksworth, and Barnes and Thornhill. Residents of this street would, accordingly, be represented by 12 councillors. Ironically, given all of the place names of the wards it is divided between, Queen Alexandra Road is none of these.

8.4 The inclusion of part of the street in St Chad's Ward is particularly contrary to community identity because the area is part of the St Nicholas Parish – to the extent that the St Nicholas Vicarage is located at 200 Queen Alexandra Road. This is one of many reasons why 'St Chad's' is not a culturally appropriate name for this ward.

8.5 We feel this case study is illustrative in demonstrating that these proposals tear apart more communities than they create. The calls for Silksworth to be united in a single

ward should not be given so much attention that other parts of the city are pulled apart in this way.

8.6 Queen Alexandra Road is not Silksworth and it is not St Chad's: it is important that residents here feel their area is included in a ward that reflects the area they live in, rather than that they live in an area which was seen as a convenient administrative boundary for bureaucratic purposes (which, incidentally, neatly sums up the feel of these proposals overall: a numerical exercise, not one that has been sensitive to local community identity).

Conclusions

We are grateful to the Commissioners for the effort that they have put into this work and we understand their keenness to respond to public representations. However, we believe that these proposals are inferior to the previous proposals consulted upon and we urge a return to those. From there, small improvements as recommended by the Council's working group can be made. There is no reason, for example, that a Grangetown and Hollycarrside Ward (named as such) would not reflect the identity of Hollycarrside sufficiently (in contrast to it being within a singularly named Ryhope Ward). We note that Ryhope Community Spirit, which the Commission listened to in forming these new proposals, was objecting to Hollycarrside going into a new *Hendon* Ward, which was not proposed in any case.

There was a clear consensus, as the Council submission in response to the previous consultation demonstrated, to adopt those proposals with some minor changes. We did not agree precisely on how to deliver those improvements, but we were satisfied with the broad picture. No such consensus exists in respect of these proposals; they are ubiquitously unsatisfactory to the point that every political party has a different objection.

The Commission redrew Farringdon and Silksworth in response to public backlash, but we are confident that the proposals for the new Silksworth Ward are so unacceptable to Tunstall residents that even more people will oppose this (and they are right to do so for

the reasons we have outlined above). We know of at least 200 objectors who have responded to our petition.

It is of vital importance for the Commissioners to give very serious consideration to the point we have made about having three neighbouring city centre wards at +10%, when we know these wards also have the most residents not registered to vote. These people may not factor into the Commission's thinking formally, but they still place a demand upon councillors and Council resources. The Herrington Ward (proposed by us and the Lib Dems in different iterations) is an administratively unique and culturally sensitive way to address this problem.

We recommend returning to the previous boundaries for the south of the River Wear and making small, sensible improvements.

Signed

Conservative Group	Cllr Antony Mullen
Cllr Lyall Reed Cllr	Cllr Adele Graham King
Michael Dixon	Cllr Greg Peacock
Cllr Richard Dunn	Cllr Dominic McDonough
Cllr Simon Ayre	Cllr Chris Burnicle
Cllr Lynn Vera	Cllr Sam Johnston
Cllr Josh McKeith	Cllr Michael Hartnack

Appendix A

Application from Youth Almighty Project (based in Silksworth Youth and Community Centre) to operate its Ranger programme in neighbouring St Chad's Ward. This funding application was discussed at the March 2024 West Area Neighbourhood Board of Sunderland City Council. We do not accept the point made in the representation from Youth Almighty that "proposed changes to Silksworth Ward would have a devastating impact on many individuals who access our activities and services" because (as this bid demonstrates) they operate beyond the Silksworth Ward anyway.

Organisation Name	Youth Almighty Project
Address Line 1	Silksworth Youth and Community Centre
Address Line 2	Tunstall Village Road
City	Sunderland
Postcode	SR3 2BB

Project Details	
Project Title	St Chads Ranger
Project Overview (max. 50 words)	YAP would like to continue the existing St Chads Ranger Project to support the delivery of a ward based approach to neighbourhood management and environmental improvements and responding to local concerns across the ward. We will continue to encourage community partnerships, volunteering and improved use of green spaces.
Total Project Cost	£ 25,746

Match Funding	£ 6,048
Total NF Requested	£ 19,698
Project Start Date	Oct-24
Project End Date	Sep-25
Where will the project be based/delivered from?	St Chads Ward