

# Middlesbrough

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Mr Luke Hurst

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Postcode:** [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:** Middlesbrough Council (District or county councillor)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Ladgate / New Marton East

Further to my own submission in the last Consultation - I am going to argue that Marton Manor should form with Marton West.

I appreciate that the Commission will have considered my view and others who share it.

I note that the commission took note that the A174 dual carriageway as a dividing line - but then do not consider it as an adequate dividing line for the new Stainton and Stainsby Hall ward. It is quite clearly apparent that the dividing line should be Stokesley Road.

I strongly disagree and would challenge any claim made by anyone who says that there is a lack of commonality between Marton Manor and Marton West - they are quite clearly very similar and anyone who walks around either ward / estate would clearly see the similarities and understand why I put forward my initial proposal and any it was accepted by the Council and Labour group.

I spent a lot of time making sure that any proposals that I put forward had valid reasons as to why I proposed them - it would appear that the Commission takes into consideration a vocal minority (one councillor and his cabal) when considering their boundaries instead of reasoned thought. No one to my knowledge had any desire to alter the boundary for Marton East or to include Marton Manor into Marton East.

Also, to my knowledge, Marton Manor was originally in what is now considered Marton West and therefore adds credence to the argument that there is sufficient commonality and logic behind the proposals put forward by myself, the Council and the Labour Group.

I will be speaking to residents of both wards, as i know there is support for the proposals that I, the council and Labour group (testament to the cross party consensus of the proposal we put forward). I strongly suggest that the commission look at this again, and as noted by the report, the initial proposal only had a 2% variance and the arguements put forward in the report against the initial proposal were complete nonsense.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my views.

## **Attached Documents:**

*None attached*