

Middlesbrough

Personal Details:

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

Comment text:

See attached

Attached Documents:

- 0000587_202409161330.pdf



Ref: Response to Ward
Boundary Commission -
Review, Middlesbrough

12.4.24.

Dear Sir or Madam

Can you please add this to the letter dated 9.10.24, that arrived with yourselves on 13.9.24.

What I haven't made clear was that I understand that you are based in Blyth and that you rely on the Towns responses for the direction of your revised Boundary proposals. So you rely on the Maps, the information you've been given to draw your conclusions and that this is a review that can be changed.

You particularly requested residents from Ayresome to respond (current named ward) and I have, along with other residents done our best to encourage a response and have assured residents that their comments will be taken seriously and yes its worth the effort. I touched on the issue that residents have not been informed and understand that a message was issued on the 9th of September, reminding residents that closing dates were 16th of September from MBC. I am unaware of residents being told you were here in the first place, as Cllr J. Young alerted her Ward, so how are residents, who have not had the benefit of workshops here, supposed to understand this process? I was in a scrutiny meeting where a woman called Gill was contacting the short amount of time residents were being allowed to respond in due to the general Election, when others in the Council would get sight of the Review ^{long} before we did. It was rejected due to the time constraints, I think. How is this reasonable or fair? Workshops, feedback and the support of the Boundary Commission have been afforded to the Cllrs but all residents get is a meeting with a 67 year old grandmother who clearly doesn't understand the process. How is that fair? While myself and others have done their best, a large chunk of Actlams four wards will have no idea, you are in touch, not the serious nature of your business.

* Please could residents have an Extension to the 16th of September Deadline?

② MBC have been advised on a regular basis that pertinent and relevant information has not been reaching the majority of their residents, for the last six years. The last Draft local Plan received over 1000 responses with the help of residents, you received 63, clearly there is an issue here, that has yet to be resolved. Residents have the highest stake here, yet are not being allowed a voice, surely that has to change?

I have concentrated on Aylesome Ward so far pulling in both Koder and Thudon as we see the Boundary Commissions proposals giving a large tract of Actlawn land to Stanton and Thornton (current) Ward, across the A174, a dual carriage way. I'm thinking this is where a mistake has been made, with you being given unclear information, as some of these sentences, leave residents confused and not even recognising the area they are describing. This must be even worse for yourselves who will not know the area. Totally confusing when you're told the A174 is a natural boundary, when it clearly is not.

The current Stanton and Thornton ward Cllr should stay safely over on the other side of the A174 and if there needs to be movement to satisfy variance then it should move East into Hellington. He clearly says that his residents have more in common over there. I understand 2 residents from the new estates on how here say they have/feel more in common with Stanton and Thornton but this is a red herring. The new estates are on Actlawn land as are the Farns, Stambly Hall and Stambly Grange these should stay this side of the A174 as there is a hard and busy motorway disconnecting Actlawn and Stanton + Thornton land. MBC and developers don't help here with their choice of names, suggesting its all part of Stanton, this is incorrect. It is Actlawn land and should remain so.

I would suggest a lone ward Cllr for the new builds and either 3, 2 Cllr wards for Hellington, so that David could have support if needed, so 2 Cllrs for Stanton and Thornton, or any other combination of the 1, 2, 2, 2. Cllrs per ward.

③ I am not in favour of 3 Cllr wards in our Town as many of our Cllrs have problems working together. It causes 3 lots of work as they all vie to complete the same jobs as the various different stripes won't work together.

This is poor governance and a poor result for residents. It has been this way for years and I think that the Harbour Groups recent late submission to the Boundary Commission is a good example of that poor working attitude, with the Councils Harbour all likely all belonging to the Harbour Group itself. I am sure you will be getting some interesting emails from the opposition, who will know their own wards well and have convincing arguments.

I also understand that you have refused the Town an extra Cllr, despite a lot of the movement of ward boundaries. There is thinking here if we were given an extra Cllr then some of that movement would not be necessary. What I don't understand this fully, could you please reconsider? Especially if this could leave some ward boundaries intact.

There seems to be a lot of focus on projected housing figures. My understanding here is that the Boundary Commission looks at housing for the next 5 years, so I am confused when you talk about figures beyond 2029, is this actually in your remit? Could I also point out that ^{Projections} ~~projects~~ are just that and there is no certainty that this housing will be delivered before you are back to our Town in 2023.

The Town had a 2014 Local Plan and the housing has not all been built in 10 years. It would seem to be "certainty" is needed here, and for any uncertain projects, these should not be added into the equations for 2023 projections.

Again, you are being guided by the information both from our Council and the Harbour Groups have given you. Also MBC build executive homes, the Tees Valley is flooded with them, but the government wants social and affordable homes built, so this will surely change the landscape of our Town, by the time you return in 2023? P70

② Could I please point out that while paragraphs 65 and 68 mention Actlan West and Whinney Banks, neither paragraphs point out that the land attached has been removed and given to Stanton and Thornton (proposed Stanton and Staunby Hall Farm).

• Paragraph 61 says land upto Mandale Road would be added to the proposed Stanton + Staunby Hall Ward.

But this is the only sentence ~~that~~ that suggests any loss of land from the Actlan West and Whinney Banks ward. And that is in the write up from Stanton and Staunby Hall Ward. This is not clear AT ALL. Unless you were aware this is a major issue and know to look for it, then you would have no idea that land is being removed from Actlan East and Whinney Banks (old Aylesome).

Why would those who do not have the time to look further afield, understand they were about to lose Mandale Meadows - looking only at their Ward?

Not once is Mandale Meadows mentioned in the write up of Actlan West and Whinney Banks.

• Also Appx 2 - Consideration of proposals for revised warding - appears to be MISSING

the current Aylesome, Koder and Thurston, proposed changes.

All three wards have had their boundaries changed, because your proposals give their land to Stanton and Thornton Ward.

Why are they not listed here?

Your proposals do not say these changes in clear statements, that an ordinary resident could understand, are not mentioned in the write up about Actlan West and Whinney Banks and only appear in Stanton and Thornton Boundary Change.

If you can read maps and zoom in your large map does show the land in Stanton and Staunby Hall Ward, but for those who are not aware or haven't been involved in saving Mandale, these little clues would mean nothing.

• In paragraph 65 you state that Actlan West and Whinney Banks is identical to the old Aylesome Ward

⑤ That is incorrect, as Mandale Meadows has been removed and given to Staunton and Stanbury Farm. If someone with better knowledge of these documents had not flagged up that the land had been removed, it would have passed the majority of residents, in Actlam West and Whinney Bank by.

All three wards, Aynscombe, Kader and Trundon, when named should have had a clear statement that told them their land had been removed.

Also, Aynscombe, Kader and Trundon should have surely all been included in Appx 2 due to the FACT their ward boundaries had been changed.

When you write a sentence that says West Actlam and Whinney Bank is identical to old Aynscombe Ward, that is likely where residents stop reading.

You rejected the Labour group's proposal to set the ward back to 2013, so it looks like the only outstanding issue is the name change.

When in reality Mandale Meadows was going to be given away, 6 years of toil for nothing.

I am well aware that the Boundary Commission how to take the lead and direction from the other responses already received, but I am at a loss to understand why the Boundary Commission hasn't made this issue clearer. There's a mention of

Flash points, surely somebody flagged this issue up for you? Again, you are disadvantaged, because you do not know the area and it must inevitably lead to mistakes.

I find it interesting that those responsible for helping you understand our town and communities have not given you more guidance here, as they have a clear picture, after 6 years of exactly how passionate the residents in this town are about our dwindling green spaces.

I don't think they have given you clear statements either, as, as a resident of Middlesbrough, and even living in the immediate area, some descriptions are very hard to fathom.

I am hoping that these are all easily rectified as we move into the next phase, or that we can even have an extension?

⑥ Community Cohesion.

I have mentioned earlier that the harbour group are suggesting that there is little community cohesion in the Actlan West and Whinney Banks Ward.

This is also incorrect.

One of the biggest issues that bind us is the Green Spaces as we have all banded together to protect not only Mandale Meadows but also Hewick fields, and Bottom field from threat.

A Mosque on Hewick field / Bottom field was successfully rejected, as it would have been built on a pig farm.

Also in the Draft Local Plan letters went in protecting Actlan West fields and Teesaurus Park. All looking out for each other.

We all use each others fields eg I used Hewick with wheelchair access to take my family out in Covid.

When Gypsy sites were earmarked for our lands we again stuck together, a resounding No.

You can see that the wider community of Actlan have all come together to see off the latest, threat to our fields, "them being given away."

The paths on Mandale worn thin and wide as we all used the land for health during Covid.

Neighbours help each other here, keeping an eye on our elderly and any poor behaviour, which is soon sorted by Jackie (Cllr Young)

All our ward uses the 3 shopping areas in our ward, the land and the available transport, which takes us to the Village and Main Town. We can get buses to Stockton but now have to get a second in the Town to go further afield.

Residents use the Green Centre right in the heart of "old" Whinney Banks and the children of the area go to Whinney Banks school.

Cllr Jackie Young travels the length and breadth of her ward helping anyone who needs it.

Please leave our settled community as it is, as we support and encourage others to join in the lives we live in our immediate community.

You will be doing this community a great disservice

⑦ If you take the land ~~not~~ agree with any future proposals to chop up Mandale and move settled residents back to Toder Ward.

Here are my main points.

1. * Please return Actlan West and Whinney Banks land as it was before your proposals.

◦ Return the land to Toder and Trundon Wards.

2. * Resist any push to chop up our Ward, leave it as it was before your proposals.

◦ Please allow us to keep our very effective Cllr Jackie Young to continue her hard work for All of the Actlan West and Whinney Banks.

You will see from other responses that for the first time in many years, we have somebody who understands and wishes to help our Ward move forward.

◦ We do have a strong community, that supports each other and while yes there are differences, when push comes to shove, we stand together.

◦ The full community uses the shops, church school and Green Centre, along with Jack Hatfields Social Club for meetings.

◦ We are trying to open a Neighbourhood Plan, but have been caught up with:

By election.

Draft local Plan

General Election and now the

Boundary Review - all of which the

residents of this ward have engaged with.

If we could just have a breather, we intend to contact all of our current Ward, including residents, schools and business to see how the residents see our ward change and grow for the better and future generations.

If you need to make choices for variance or any other issue, the most important issues for this ward are stated * above.

Please leave our Ward intact, so that we can all move forward in a positive way.

Yours Sincerely