

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Redcar & Cleveland

May 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Electoral Commission with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	11
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	13
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	17
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	19
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	35
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland: Detailed Mapping	37
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	43

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for the Western urban core and Redcar town is inserted inside the back cover of this report.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to the Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No. 3692). The Order also transferred to the Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and their implementation.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Kru Desai
Robin Gray
Joan Jones
Ann M Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of the electoral arrangements for Redcar & Cleveland on 16 October 2001. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us to complete the work of the LGCE.

- **This report summarises the submissions that were received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Redcar & Cleveland:

- **in nine of the 22 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and two wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 10 wards and by more than 20 per cent in four wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 90-91) are that:

- **Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council should have 59 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each borough councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In three of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in 21 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Guisborough, Lockwood, Saltburn, Marske & New Marske and Skelton & Brotton.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 14 May 2002. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**

- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission which is responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 8 July 2002:

**Team Leader
Redcar & Cleveland Review
Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Belmont	2	Kemplah parish ward and the proposed Belmont parish ward of Guisborough parish	Map 2 and Map A2
2	Brotton	3	The East Brotton parish ward and West Brotton parish wards of Skelton & Brotton parish; the Skinningrove parish ward of Loftus parish	Map 2 and Map A5
3	Coatham	2	Coatham ward; part of Redcar ward; part of West Dyke ward	Map 2
4	Dormanstown	3	Part of Dormanstown ward	Large map
5	Eston	3	Part of Dormanstown ward; part of Eston ward	Large map
6	Grangetown	2	Part of Dormanstown ward; part of Grangetown ward	Large map
7	Guisborough	3	The proposed Park and Tocketts parish wards of Guisborough parish	Map 2, Map A2 and the large map
8	Hutton	3	The proposed Hutton parish ward of Guisborough parish	Map 2 and Map A2
9	Kirkleatham	3	Kirkleatham ward; part of West Dyke ward	Large map
10	Lockwood	1	The Charltons & Margrove, Lingdale & Stanghow and Moorsholm parish wards of Lockwood parish	Map A4 and Map A5
11	Loftus	3	<i>Unchanged</i> ; the parish of Loftus	Map 2
12	Longbeck	3	Part of Longbeck ward	Large map
13	Newcomen	2	<i>Unchanged</i>	Large map
14	Normanby	3	Part of Eston ward; part of Normanby ward	Large map
15	Ormesby	3	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
16	Redcar	2	Part of Redcar ward	Map 2
17	St Germain's	3	St Germain's ward; part of Longbeck ward	Large map
18	Saltburn	3	Saltburn ward; the proposed Triangle parish ward of Skelton parish	Map A3 and the large map
19	Skelton	3	The Old Skelton, Skelton Green, North Skelton & Layland and New Skelton & Hollybush parish wards of Skelton & Brotton parish; the proposed Boosbeck parish ward of Lockwood & Skinningrove parish	Map A3, Map A4 and the large map
20	South Bank	3	South Bank ward; part of Dormanstown ward; part of Teesville ward	Large map
21	Teesville	3	Part of Grangetown ward; part of Normanby; part of Teesville ward	Large map
22	West Dyke	3	Part of West Dyke ward	Large map

Notes: 1 Redcar town and the Western urban core are the only unparished parts of the borough.

2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and Maps A1 – A5 in Appendix A and the large map inserted in the back of the report.

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Belmont	2	3,915	1,958	10	3,779	1,890	6
2	Brotton	3	5,404	1,801	1	5,928	1,766	-1
3	Coatham	2	3,808	1,904	7	3,670	1,835	3
4	Dormanstown	3	5,330	1,777	0	5,196	1,732	-3
5	Eston	3	5,567	1,856	4	5,420	1,807	2
6	Grangetown	2	3,639	1,820	2	3,541	1,771	-1
7	Guisborough	3	4,927	1,642	-8	5,319	1,773	0
8	Hutton	3	5,428	1,809	2	5,367	1,789	1
9	Kirkleatham	3	5,255	1,752	-2	5,584	1,861	5
10	Lockwood	1	2,034	2,034	14	1,992	1,992	12
11	Loftus	3	5,195	1,732	-3	5,071	1,690	-5
12	Longbeck	3	4,414	1,471	-17	5,362	1,787	0
13	Newcomen	2	3,456	1,733	-3	3,489	1,745	-2
14	Normanby	3	5,547	1,849	4	5,414	1,805	1
15	Ormesby	3	5,097	1,699	-5	4,989	1,663	-7
16	Redcar	2	3,662	1,831	3	3,567	1,784	0
17	St Germain's	3	5,311	1,770	-1	5,264	1,755	-1
18	Saltburn	3	5,701	1,900	7	5,622	1,874	5
19	Skelton	3	4,768	1,589	-11	5,438	1,813	2
20	South Bank	3	5,362	1,787	0	5,315	1,772	0
21	Teesville	3	5,530	1,843	4	5,413	1,804	1
22	West Dyke	3	5,362	1,877	5	5,737	1,912	4
	Totals	59	104,991	-	-	105,847	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,780	-	-	1,794	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations for the electoral arrangements for the borough of Redcar & Cleveland, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the borough of Redcar & Cleveland as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. The programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Redcar & Cleveland. Redcar & Cleveland's last review was undertaken the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) which reported to the Secretary of State in September 1975 (Report No. 43). Since that review was undertaken, Redcar & Cleveland has become a unitary authority.

3 In making these recommendations, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692), i.e the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - (c) achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Redcar & Cleveland was commenced by the Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fifth edition, published in October 2001).

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish councils in the borough.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equal representation across the borough as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that whatever council size interested parties may propose to us they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 The review is in four stages (see Table 3).

Table 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to us
Two	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Electoral Commission

9 Stage One began on 16 October 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Cleveland Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Cleveland Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the borough, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, the Members of the European Parliament for the North East Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 7 January 2002.

10 At Stage Two all the submissions received during Stage One were considered and our draft recommendations were prepared.

11 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 14 May 2002 and will end on 8 July 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

12 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to modify them, and submit final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order. The Electoral Commission will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

13 The borough of Redcar & Cleveland is a unitary authority covering an area of 24,050 hectares and serving a population of 137,900. It lies to the northeast of the country, with the boroughs of Scarborough and Hambleton to the south, and Middlesbrough to the west. The borough comprises the main urban settlements of Guisborough and Redcar and some overspill from Middlesbrough to the west. The remainder of the borough is relatively rural. The landscape is one of contrasts. Sea cliffs and sweeping bays; busy urban shopping centres and ancient market towns; heather moorlands and rural acres. The name Cleveland derives from the Viking name of "Cliff land".

14 Redcar & Cleveland borough's industrial base was steel, chemicals and heavy engineering industries, although tourism is now a fast growing area. The borough has good transport links with Middlesbrough and Scarborough, and lies along the Cleveland Way footpath. The borough contains five parishes in the more rural area, while Redcar and the Western urban core of Middlesbrough are all unparished, and between them comprise 69 per cent of the borough's total electorate.

15 The electorate of the borough is 104,991 (February 2001). The Council presently has 59 members who are elected from 22 wards, five of which are in Redcar, three in Guisborough, and six in the Western urban core while the remainder are predominantly rural. Of the 22 wards, 15 wards are each represented by three councillors and seven are each represented by two councillors. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

16 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor: elector ratio) varies from the borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

17 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,780 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,794 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in nine of the 22 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average and two wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Saltburn ward where each councillor represents 36 per cent more electors than the borough average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Redcar & Cleveland

Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Belmont	3	5,436	1,812	2	5,279	1,760	-1
2 Brotton	2	4,229	2,115	19	4,157	2,079	17
3 Coatham	2	3,233	1,617	-9	3,095	1,548	-13
4 Dormanstown	3	5,393	1,798	1	5,260	1,753	-1
5 Eston	3	5,526	1,842	4	5,381	1,794	1
6 Grangetown	3	4,556	1,519	-15	4,458	1,486	-16
7 Guisborough	3	4,830	1,610	-10	5,222	1,741	-2
8 Hutton	2	4,004	2,002	13	3,964	1,982	11
9 Kirkleatham	3	5,042	1,681	-6	5,371	1,790	1
10 Lockwood & Skinningrove	2	3,972	1,986	12	3,993	1,997	12
11 Loftus	3	5,195	1,732	-3	5,071	1,690	-5
12 Longbeck	3	6,203	2,068	16	7,144	2,381	34
13 Newcomen	2	3,465	1,733	-3	3,489	1,745	-2
14 Normanby	3	5,525	1,842	3	5,389	1,796	1
15 Ormesby	3	5,097	1,699	-5	4,989	1,663	-7
16 Redcar	2	3,691	1,846	4	3,594	1,797	1
17 St Germain's	3	3,522	1,174	-34	3,482	1,161	-35
18 Saltburn	2	4,842	2,421	36	4,763	2,382	34
19 Skelton	3	4,864	1,621	-9	5,437	1,812	2
20 South Bank	3	4,385	1,462	-18	4,340	1,447	-19

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
21 Teesville	3	5,588	1,863	5	5,471	1,824	2
22 West Dyke	3	6,393	2,131	20	6,498	2,166	22
Totals	59	104,991	-	-	105,847	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,780	-	-	1,794	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in St Germain's ward were relatively over-represented by 34 per cent, while electors in Saltburn ward were relatively under-represented by 36 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

18 At the start of the review the LGCE invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to it giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council and its constituent parish councils.

19 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers and members from the Borough Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. Nine representations were received during Stage One, including a borough-wide scheme from the Borough Council, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the Borough Council.

Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council

20 The Borough Council proposed a council of 61 members, two more than at present, serving a total of 23 wards, compared to the existing 22 mixed-member wards. It proposed amending the boundaries of eight of the existing wards in the borough. The Council's scheme provided for a slightly improved level of electoral equality for the borough as a whole, resulting in the number of electors per councillor varying by no more than 10 per cent in 18 of the Council's 23 proposed wards. This level of electoral equality was expected to remain the same by 2006.

Political Parties

21 South Cleveland Conservative Association (hereafter referred to as the Conservatives) also proposed a council size of 61 serving a total of 25 wards. It proposed substantially re-warding the borough with changes to 13 of the existing wards.

22 Redcar Labour Group (hereafter referred to as the Labour Group) broadly supported the proposals put forward by the Borough Council. However, it proposed a number of amendments to some of the ward boundaries put forward by the Council.

23 Redcar & Cleveland Liberal Democrat Group (hereafter referred to as the Liberal Democrats) proposed a number of boundary amendments to the Council's proposals in the Redcar, Markse and the Western urban core areas to better reflect community identity. It also objected to the Council's proposal to place the villages of Skinningrove and Carlin How in a ward with the town of Brotton at a borough level.

24 The East Cleveland Independence Party commented on the electoral arrangements for Brotton, Lockwood & Skinningrove and Loftus wards. It objected to the Council's proposed Brotton ward, arguing that the people of Skinningrove and Carlin How do not see themselves as part of Brotton. It argued that the Skinningrove and Carlin How areas have community links with the villages of Lockwood, Boosbeck and Lingdale and as a consequence the existing warding arrangements in the area should be kept in place.

Parish and Town Councils

25 We received two representations from parish councils. Loftus Town Council stated that it did not wish the boundaries of Loftus ward to change. Saltburn, New Marske & Marske Parish Council argued that the new area of development in the Mickdales area should be warded with the village of Markse rather than the Redcar area in order to reflect the community links between the New Markse area and the Mickledales area. It proposed that the existing Longbeck ward should be divided into two wards.

Other Representations

26 We received a representation from Councillor Kay, Councillor for Lockwood & Skinningrove ward. He suggested a minor boundary amendment to the boundary between the existing Belmont and Lockwood & Skinningrove wards, as had been requested by two residents who wrote to him. A resident objected to the splitting of the existing Lockwood & Skinningrove ward.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

27 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Redcar & Cleveland and welcome comments from all those interested relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, ward names, and parish council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

28 As described earlier, our prime aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Redcar & Cleveland is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

29 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

30 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

31 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for an authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate Forecasts

32 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 1 per cent from 104,991 to 105,847 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Longbeck and Skelton wards although a significant amount is also expected in Guisborough ward. Throughout the majority of the wards, the Council predicted a decrease in the number of electors over the next five years. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates.

33 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having considered the Borough Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

34 Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council presently has 59 members. The Borough Council proposed a council of 61 members, but provided no argumentation to justify this increase of two in the council size. The Conservatives also proposed a council size of 61. However, they also provided little evidence or argumentation to justify their proposed increase in council size of two. The Labour Group also expressed support for the proposed increase in council size to 61.

35 As set out in the *Guidance* from the Electoral Commission, when formulating our draft recommendations, deciding on the correct council size is our first objective. A number of authorities have used the PER as an opportunity to consider and propose changes to their council size as a result of or in anticipation of the changes to their political management structures. We have no particular view on whether the move towards new political management structures should result in increases, reductions or no change to the existing council sizes. However, whatever council size interested parties may be considering proposing to us, it is important that they demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed within the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structures. We look for clear evidence that this has taken place. As neither the Borough Council nor Conservatives provided adequate argumentation justifying their proposed increase of two, we requested further argumentation in support of the proposal for 61 members. We also contacted the Labour Group on the Council, as it generally supported a council size of 61, inviting it to provide further evidence.

36 In response to this request the Borough Council stated a preference for over- rather than under-representation in a number of areas, for example the Western urban core area, to which it had allocated an additional councillor. It also stated that it did not wish to dismember specific wards due to Single Regeneration Budgets or to dilute member input in deprived areas. The Conservatives reasserted their proposal for an increase of two in the size of the council arguing that the level of social deprivation in the Western urban core of the borough justified keeping the same number of councillors in South Bank and adding an extra councillor in Eston. It also argued that the new council structure that has led to councillors being “more active in their communities” justifies an increase in the size of the council and stated that “because of this extra interaction more councillors are needed. The rise would certainly aid the better functioning of the new system and achieve the aims of restructuring”.

37 After assessing the further evidence from the Borough Council and the Conservatives, we were not persuaded by the argumentation in support of an increase in council size to 61. We do not regard social deprivation as sufficient justification to alter or maintain the number of councillors representing a particular ward, nor is it consistent with our duty, among other matters, to make recommendations which provide for electoral equality across the whole of a local authority area. We considered that neither the Council nor the Conservatives provided strong enough argumentation to show how an increase in the size of the council could be justified by the new political management structure. We also noted that the Borough Council’s proposals failed to provide the correct allocation of councillors between the various areas of the borough. The resultant over- and under-representation in various parts of the borough would not, in our opinion, be in the interests of local democracy as there would be high levels of electoral inequality across the borough. We therefore analysed the number of councillors to which the distinct areas of the borough were entitled to under a range of council sizes from 57 up to 61 and we concluded that a council size of 59 would give the best allocation of councillors between the rural and urban areas.

38 Having not been persuaded by the evidence received to date that a council size of 61 members would be justified, we have looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, and concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 59 members.

Electoral Arrangements

39 Having decided to retain the existing council size of 59 members we have been unable to endorse the submissions received from Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council or those received from the Conservatives and the Labour Group in their entirety. However, a number of the wards put forward by the Borough Council make use of strong boundaries, provide good electoral equality and strengthen community links. Therefore we have been able to adopt some of the

Borough Council's proposed warding arrangements in the Western urban core and the rural east of the borough.

40 However, in order to provide for the correct allocation of councillors in the borough as a whole and to achieve a better balance between electoral equality and community identity we propose a number of our own boundary amendments. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Eston, Grangetown, Normanby, Ormesby, South Bank and Teesville wards;
- (b) Coatham, Dormanstown, Kirkleatham, Newcomen, Redcar and West Dyke wards;
- (c) Longbeck, St Germain's, Saltburn and Skelton wards;
- (d) Brotton, Lockwood & Skinningrove and Loftus wards;
- (e) Belmont, Guisborough and Hutton wards.

41 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Eston, Grangetown, Normanby, Ormesby, South Bank and Teesville wards

42 These six wards cover the unparished Middlesborough urban overspill area, to the west of the borough known as the Western urban core, and are each currently represented by three-members. Under the current council size of 59 members Eston, Normanby and Teesville have a councillor: elector ratio 4 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent above the borough average respectively. Grangetown, Ormesby and South Bank have councillor: elector ratios 15 per cent, 5 per cent and 18 per cent below the borough average. By 2006 Eston, Normanby and Teesville wards would have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent above the borough average. Grangetown, Ormesby and South Bank wards would have councillor:elector ratios 16 per cent, 7 per cent and 19 per cent below the borough average.

43 During Stage One Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council proposed amending the boundary between the existing South Bank and Teesville wards by moving the boundary southwards from the existing boundary so that it runs to the south of Eston Park School along the middle of Normanby Road to the south of Ravensworth Junior School, and to the rear of the properties on Craigan Road to create two new three-member wards. It also proposed amending the boundaries of Dormanstown, Eston and Grangetown wards to create three amended wards of the same names. It proposed extending the boundary of Eston ward to include Wilton village and amending the boundary between Dormanstown and Grangetown so that the Wilton chemical works are warded with Grangetown. The Borough Council argued that Wilton village has community and transport links with the Eston area, stating that "Wilton village had closer associations to Eston than to any other part of the borough" and is isolated from the rest of the ward in which it is currently situated. The Borough Council also proposed retaining the existing warding arrangements for Normanby and Ormesby wards.

44 The Conservatives proposed that in order to "reflect location of communities and restore parity of numbers per councillor", South Bank and Grangetown should be represented by two councillors, Normanby, Teesville and Ormesby by three councillors, and the Eston area by five. They proposed that the boundaries of South Bank ward should be amended to run east to west along the A1085, thereby creating a ward centred on the community of South Bank and more adequately reflecting community identity in the area stating that "South Bank is and has always been a separate town and is divided from the rest of the current ward by the A1085". They also proposed that the remainder of South Bank ward, to the south of the A1085 should be placed in a three-member ward with part of the existing Teesville ward, on the grounds that this would reflect the prevailing community links in the area and stating that the area to the south of the A1085, is part of the historic area of Teesville. The Conservatives also proposed that the boundary of the existing Grangetown ward should be amended to run to the rear of Cheddar

Close, Carnaeon Close and Atlee Road arguing that this new boundary would more adequately reflect the community of Grangetown. Additionally they proposed creating a new Whale Hill & Lazenby ward from the area to the north of the B1380, currently in Eston ward, and that the area to the south of the B1380 road should become Eston ward. They argued that Whale Hill is a distinct community with “residents associations, sports facilities and schools” and that the area to the south of the B1380 comprises the older parts of Eston. They also supported the Borough Council’s view that the village of Wilton should be placed in a ward with the area to the south of the B1380, arguing that it would give the villagers closer access to their local councillors.

45 The Labour Group expressed its support for the Borough Council’s proposals in this area stating that its proposals accurately reflect local communities. However, it suggested two minor amendments to the Council’s proposals, arguing that Kirkleatham village should be warded in Kirkleatham ward and that South Bank ward should be extended to take in a very small number of electors who live to the north of the A66.

46 The Liberal Democrats proposed that polling district HE of Normanby ward be extended to the Swan’s Corner roundabout so that the electors off Ormesby Bank do not have to travel to Guisborough to vote.

47 Under a council size of 59 the Western urban core of the borough is entitled to 16.7 councillors. In its Stage One submission the Council allocated it 18 councillors. In order to provide the correct allocation under a council size of 59, we are proposing that 17 councillors represent the Western urban core of the borough. Consequently, we have been unable to adopt either the Borough Council’s or the Conservatives’ proposals. However, we have attempted to base our proposed wards on those put forward by the Borough Council and the Conservatives’. Under our draft recommendations the wards of Normanby and Ormesby remain largely unchanged, albeit for a minor boundary amendment that we propose to the south-eastern boundary of Normanby ward. We propose uniting the whole of Woodlands Drive in Normanby ward rather than continuing the present division of the road between the existing Eston and Normanby wards. We have also adopted the Council’s proposed three-member Eston ward. We are of the opinion that the Council’s proposal to amend the boundary of the existing Eston ward in order to take in the village of Wilton better reflects community identity in the area and recognises that the village of Wilton is closer to the Eston area than it is to the rest of the existing Dormanstown ward.

48 When formulating our draft recommendations in the rest of this area, it was necessary for us to remove a councillor from either the existing South Bank or Grangetown areas in order to achieve the correct allocation of councillors for the Western urban core. We considered the Conservatives’ proposals to create a two-member South Bank ward, a three-member Teesville ward, two-member Whale Hill & Lazenby and Grangetown wards and a three-member Eston ward. However, despite the strong boundaries offered by some of the Conservatives, proposals and the argumentation supporting their views that South Bank, Grangetown, Whale Hill and Eston are each separate communities, adopting their proposals in their entirety would result in the Western urban core having an over-allocation of councillors under a 59-member council. We have therefore decided to create a two-member Grangetown ward by amending the boundary between Grangetown and Teesville ward. We propose moving the boundary north-eastwards to run to the rear of Cheddar Close and Carnaeon Close and then to follow the existing boundary along the middle of Church Road. We are of the opinion that our proposed boundary between Grangetown and Teesville wards is easily identifiable and removes an area to the north of Fabian Road and to the west of the school that does not have community links with the Grangetown area from the existing Grangetown ward. We also propose creating a three-member Teesville ward and a three-member South Bank ward, based on the existing wards. In order to provide good levels of electoral equality we propose amending the boundary between these two wards and moving it southwards to the rear of the properties on Spencer Road, Wordsworth Road and Carlyle Lane and along the middle of Normanby Road and then to the

rear of the properties on Lilac Road and The Birches. We also note that there are good road links between the area that we propose moving from Teesville to South Bank ward.

49 The Liberal Democrats' proposal to transfer electors from Hutton to Normanby ward is not detailed enough for us to consider, as they have not provided a specific boundary. We are therefore unable to adopt this as part of our draft recommendations.

50 Under our draft recommendations Eston, Grangetown, Normanby, Ormesby, South Bank and Teesville wards would have councillor:elector ratios 4 per cent, 2 per cent and 4 per cent above, 5 per cent below, equal to and 4 per cent above the borough average respectively (2 per cent above, 1 per cent below, 1 per cent above, 7 per cent below, equal to, and 1 per cent above by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Coatham, Dormanstown, Kirkleatham, Newcomen, Redcar and West Dyke wards

51 These six wards comprise the unparished town of Redcar in the north of the borough. The two-member wards of Coatham, Newcomen and Redcar have councillor:elector ratios 9 per cent below, 3 per cent below and 4 per cent above the borough average. The existing three-member Dormanstown, Kirkleatham and West Dyke wards have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent above, 6 per cent below and 20 per cent above the borough average. By 2006 Coatham, Newcomen and Redcar wards will have councillor:elector ratios 13 per cent below, 2 per cent below and 1 per cent above the borough average. Dormanstown, Kirkleatham and West Dyke wards will have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent below, 1 per cent above and 22 per cent above the borough average.

52 The Borough Council proposed creating two new wards in this area and amending the boundaries of two of the existing wards. It proposed creating a two-member Race Course Redcar ward from the area to the north of Scalby Road and the Strand, to the north of Ryehills Comprehensive School and to the west of Redcar Lane, currently in West Dyke ward. It also proposed a two-member West Dyke & Mickledales ward from the remainder of the West Dyke ward and the new Mickledale development in the existing Longbeck ward. It argued that these proposals would help to rectify the high level of electoral inequality in the existing West Dyke ward, while enabling the Mickledale development to be warded with the southern area of Redcar with which it will have links. It proposed that the western boundary of the existing Dormanstown ward be amended to move the Wilton chemical works into the proposed Grangetown ward. It also proposed that the southern boundary of the existing Dormanstown ward should be amended so that Wilton village is included in their proposed Eston ward, as discussed earlier. It proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between the existing Coatham and Newcomen wards by transferring an area to the north of the railway line currently in Newcomen ward into Coatham ward. It stated that this would help to rectify the high level of electoral inequality in Coatham ward.

53 The Conservatives also proposed creating two new two-member wards from the existing West Dyke ward. They proposed creating a two-member Redcar East ward with boundaries similar to those proposed by the Council but without the Wheatlands Park area. They also proposed a Turners ward with boundaries similar to the Council's West Dyke & Mickledales ward but excluding the proposed new development in the Mickledale area and with a revised boundary running east to west along Redcar Road. They argued that the two new wards that they proposed would reflect the different communities in the north and south of the existing ward and the different types of housing in each area, stating that their proposed warding arrangement "reflects the two different areas and leaves leeway for the extra electors in the continued building in the south of the town". They also stated that "the name Redcar East is derived from the location of the area in Redcar and the railway station in the ward know as East Halt..and Turners is the name locally given to that area around that part of Redcar Lane." The Conservatives also proposed amending the boundary between Kirkleatham and Dormanstown

wards by placing the area of the existing Dormanstown ward to the south of Kirkleatham Lane in a ward with the existing Kirkleatham ward, to create a three-member Kirkleatham ward and a new three member Dormanstown ward to the north of Kirkleatham Lane. They argued that at present the village of Yearby, to the south of Kirkleatham Lane, is isolated from the rest of the existing Dormanstown ward and that it has community links with the rest of Kirkleatham Ward. They also argued that Kirkleatham village, which is currently warded in Dormanstown ward, should be warded in a new Kirkleatham ward with which it has more community links. They also commented that the town of Dormanstown is a distinct community and should be warded separately, stating that "Dormanstown is a town in its own right and not a suburb of Redcar...because of its history, it is a separate community". The Conservatives also proposed that the existing Redcar ward be renamed Zetland ward in order to reflect the fact that the town lifeboat (which is based in the area) is called Zetland and that the name of the local park is Zetland Park.

54 The Labour Group expressed its total support for the proposals put forward by the Borough Council.

55 The Liberal Democrats proposed a number of boundary amendments in the Redcar area. They argued that the area to the north of the railway line which the Borough Council proposed transferring to Coatham ward is already situated in this ward. They also proposed an alternative boundary amendment to improve the electoral equality in Coatham ward. Additionally they proposed that an area of the existing Redcar ward to the west of Stanley Grove should be placed in a ward with Coatham ward in order to improve the level of electoral equality. The Liberal Democrats agreed with the Borough Council and the Conservatives that the existing West Dyke ward should be split into two wards but proposed different names; Ryehills for the ward comprising the north of the existing West Dyke ward and Mickledale for the ward comprising the south of the existing West Dyke ward and the new Mickledale development.

56 Under a council size of 59 this area is entitled to 15.2 councillors. In its Stage One submission the Council had allocated it 16 councillors. Therefore in order to provide the correct allocation of councillors under a council size of 59, we are proposing that 15 councillors represent the area. We are therefore unable to adopt the Council's proposals for this area of the borough. The Conservatives' had allocated the area 16 councillors and similarly we have been unable to adopt the Conservatives, proposals. We have therefore formulated our own warding arrangements for the town of Redcar to ensure that it is represented by the number of councillors to which it is entitled.

57 We noted that modifications were proposed at Stage One to the boundary between Coatham and Newcomen wards. The Borough Council and the Liberal Democrats disagreed on where the existing boundary runs. We have checked the existing arrangements and note that the Liberal Democrats based their proposals on the correct boundary. This disagreement has not affected our draft recommendations.

58 We propose that Redcar be represented by 15 councillors, being returned from three three-member wards and two two-member wards based on the existing six wards. We consider that the existing Newcomen ward utilises good boundaries while providing a reasonably good level of electoral equality. We therefore propose retaining the existing ward as part of our draft recommendations. We propose an enlarged Coatham ward in order to provide improved levels of electoral equality and to better reflect community interest and identity by placing an area of the existing West Dyke ward to the south of the railway and the north of the racecourse into Coatham ward. We are of the opinion that the electors of this area look north to Redcar town for shops and services, and we consider that Redcar Lane provides an adequate crossing point for the residents in the area to reach the remainder of Coatham ward. We also propose amending the boundary between Coatham and Redcar wards to unite the properties to the east of the Esplanade in Coatham ward. These two boundary amendments would create a two-member Coatham ward and a three-member Redcar ward with good levels of electoral equality which reflect community identity in the area.

59 In order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality we also propose amending the boundary between the existing Kirkleatham and West Dyke wards to include Wheatlands Park in Kirkleatham ward. We are of the opinion that this small area is a self-contained community and that placing it in Kirkleatham ward would have no detrimental effect on its identity while improving the level of electoral equality. We have noted the proposals of the Conservatives to include the village of Yearby in Kirkleatham ward. However, we are of the opinion that our proposed boundary amendments provide a better balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria under a 59-member council. We also propose moving the southernmost boundary of West Dyke ward northwards to run along Redcar Lane. This would enable all the electors in the Mickledale housing development to be united in the same ward, Longbeck ward, while also utilising a more easily identifiable boundary that does not run through the middle of some of the newly constructed houses. This is discussed in more detail later. We would welcome views on our proposed warding arrangements in this area at Stage Three.

60 Under our draft recommendations Coatham, Redcar and West Dyke wards would have councillor:elector ratios 7 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent above the borough average respectively. Our proposed Kirkleatham and Newcomen wards would have councillor:elector ratios of 2 per cent and 3 per cent below the borough average respectively. Our proposed Dormanstown ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the borough average. By 2006 our proposed Coatham, Kirkleatham and West Dyke wards would have councillor:elector ratios 3 per cent, 5 per cent and 7 per cent above the borough average respectively. Our proposed Dormanstown and Newcomen wards would have councillor:elector ratios 3 per cent and 2 per cent below the borough average respectively and our proposed Redcar ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the borough average. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Longbeck, St Germain's, Saltburn and Skelton wards

61 These four wards are situated to the south-east of Redcar town. Longbeck, St Germain's and Skelton wards are currently three-member wards, while Saltburn ward is currently represented by two councillors. Longbeck and Saltburn wards currently have councillor:elector ratios 16 per cent and 36 per cent above the borough average respectively. St Germain's and Skelton wards currently have a councillor:elector ratio 34 per cent and 9 per cent below the borough average respectively. By 2006 Longbeck and Saltburn wards will both have councillor:elector ratios 34 per cent above the borough average. St Germain's ward will have a councillor:elector ratio 35 per cent below the borough average and Skelton ward will have a councillor:elector ratio 2 per cent above the borough average.

62 During Stage One Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council proposed amending the boundary between the existing Longbeck ward and the existing West Dyke ward in order to include the proposed Mickledale development in its proposed West Dyke & Mickledales ward. It also proposed creating a new three-member West & New Marske ward comprising the remainder of the existing Longbeck ward. It argued that the proposed new Mickledale development would develop stronger community links with the Redcar area rather than with the Marske area. The Borough Council proposed that warding arrangements in the rest of this area remain unchanged.

63 The Conservatives proposed creating two new two-member New Marske & Mickledales and Marske wards. They proposed retaining the existing St Germain's ward. They proposed that the new development at Mickledale should remain in a ward with Marske rather than being placed in a ward with the Redcar town area. They argued that their proposed new ward would help to integrate the new development into the parish of Marske with which it would have stronger community links. They also argued that their proposed New Marske & Mickledales and Marske wards would ensure that these distinct communities are warded separately. They went on to state that "New Marske is a separate town and differs historically from Marske in that it is an ex-mining village whereas Marske grew out of a fishing community". They also argued that "if it

was felt necessary” they would not object a realignment of the boundary between Longbeck and St Germain’s ward but that on balance they were against the idea. They went on to argue that the creation of two new wards from the existing Longbeck ward would give the New Markse and Markse areas the same level of representation as the rest of the borough. The Conservatives also proposed that the existing Saltburn ward should remain unchanged arguing that the ward is a self-contained community and stating that “Saltburn is obviously a self-contained town with a Residents Association, 500 club...Christmas lights etc”.

64 The Labour Group expressed support for the proposals put forward by the Borough Council arguing that the Mickledale development “organically” belongs to Redcar and stating that “there is a clear physical barrier in the shape of the (hotly defended) green wedge’ between it [the Mickledale development] and Markse and New Markse”. It also proposed that there be a slight realignment of the boundary between the existing Longbeck and St Germain's ward in order to rectify a slight imbalance between the two wards.

65 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the boundary between Longbeck ward and St Germain’s ward should be amended to run along the middle of the Coast Road. This boundary amendment would transfer Valley Close, Mariners Court and West Street into St Germain’s ward.

66 Saltburn, New Marske & Marske Parish Council proposed that the area of new development in Mickledales should not be incorporated in West Dyke ward, arguing that the area of new development will not have any affinity with the Redcar town area and will have far stronger community links with the Marske/New Marske parish. It also argued that the existing Longbeck ward should be divided into two wards in order to recognise the division between New Marske and Mickledales and the remainder of Longbeck ward.

67 As stated earlier, we have decided not to adopt the Borough Council’s proposed council size of 61 and propose retaining the existing council size of 59. Under a council size of 59 the Marske area is entitled to 6.0 councillors and Saltburn and Skelton are together are entitled to 5.7 councillors, with Saltburn entitled to 2.36 councillors, and Skelton entitled to 3.31 councillors. In its Stage One submission the Council allocated the Markse area five councillors one less than it is entitled to, and the Saltburn area three councillors, one more than it is entitled to. However, in order to provide the correct allocations under a council size of 59, we are proposing that six councillors represent the Markse area and that six councillors represent Saltburn and Skelton. Consequently, we have been unable to adopt the Council’s or the Conservatives’ proposals for this area of the borough.

68 Therefore we propose our own boundary amendments in the area. We propose moving the boundary between the existing St Germain’s and Longbeck ward to run to along the middle of Coast Road, westwards along the middle of Churchill Drive , to the rear of the properties on The Garth, Kerridge Close, St Marks Close, Hall Close and Redcar Road, along the middle of Longbeck Road and eastwards along the railway line to rejoin the original boundary between the two wards. We are of the opinion that our proposed boundary amendment will secure a good balance between electoral equality and community identity in the area. We have been persuaded by the representations of the local parish council and the Conservatives and are of the opinion that the Mickledale area should be warded in the Markse area rather than being warded with Redcar town. We are therefore proposing that the southern boundary of West Dyke ward is moved northwards to run along Redcar Road, thereby enabling all the electors in the Mickledale housing development to be united in Longbeck ward.

69 We have noted the proposals put forward by the Conservatives to place the towns of Marske and New Markse in separate borough wards. However we have decided to base our wards in the area on the existing warding arrangements in the area and to amend the boundaries between Longbeck and St Germain’s ward to create two three member wards. We are of the opinion that this would minimise the level of disruption to warding arrangements in the

area. However at Stage Three we would welcome further comments on the viability of three two-member wards in the area.

70 We have noted the Council's proposal to leave the existing electoral arrangements of Saltburn ward unchanged. However, this would leave the area over-represented and in order to provide the correct allocation for the Saltburn area it is necessary to include an area of the neighbouring Skelton ward in Saltburn ward. We therefore propose creating a new Triangle parish ward in Skelton parish with a boundary running north to south along the Mineral Railway, to the rear of the properties on Eden Road, eastwards along the middle of Station Road and then rejoining the Mineral Railway. We propose warding this area at borough ward level with the existing Saltburn ward. We are aware that this breaks the boundaries of the self-contained community of Saltburn. However, in order to achieve the correct allocation for the area under a 59-member council, and therefore reasonable levels of electoral equality, we are of the opinion the boundaries of Saltburn have to be breached. By transferring this area, both the proposed Saltburn ward and the remainder of Skelton are entitled to three councillors. We also propose transferring the proposed Boosbeck parish ward of Lockwood parish to the proposed Skelton ward, in order to improve the electoral equality in the proposed Lockwood ward, as discussed later. We welcome proposals for alternative warding arrangements for this area at Stage Three that would provide comparable levels of electoral equality.

71 Under our draft recommendations, the council:elector ratio in our proposed St Germain's (comprising the St Germain's parish ward of Saltburn, Marske & New Marske parish), Longbeck (comprising the proposed Longbeck parish ward of Saltburn, Marske & New Marske parish) and Skelton (comprising the Brotton West, New Skelton & Hollybush, North Skelton & Layland, Old Skelton and Skelton Green parish wards of Skelton & Brotton parish) wards would be 1 per cent, 17 per cent and 11 per cent below the borough average respectively. Our proposed Saltburn ward (comprising the proposed Triangle parish ward of Skelton parish) would have a councillor:elector ratio 7 per cent above the borough average. By 2006 the councillor:elector ratio in our proposed St Germain's ward would remain 1 per cent below the borough average. Our proposed Longbeck ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 2 per cent above the borough average and our proposed Saltburn and Skelton wards would have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2, Map A3, Map A4 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Brotton, Lockwood & Skinningrove and Loftus wards

72 These three wards are situated in the east of the borough. Brotton and Lockwood & Skinningrove wards are each currently represented by two councillors, and have councillor:elector ratios 19 per cent and 12 per cent above the borough average respectively. Loftus ward is a three-member ward and has a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent below the borough average. By 2006 Brotton and Lockwood & Skinningrove wards will have councillor:elector ratios 17 per cent and 12 per cent above the borough average. Loftus ward will have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent below the borough average.

73 During Stage One the Borough Council proposed creating a new three-member ward by amending the boundary between Brotton and Lockwood & Skinningrove wards to include the Skinningrove and Carlin How settlements in an enlarged Brotton ward. It argued that the two settlements are within easy reach of Brotton and that Brotton, Carlin How and Skinningrove all share a common mining heritage. It also contended that the high level of over-representation in its proposed two-member Lockwood ward was preferable to under-representation. It stated that it had been unable to develop a solution that respected the integrity of communities in Lockwood and Loftus and which also tackled the high levels of electoral equality. The Borough Council went on to argue that there should be no change to the existing warding arrangements in the rest of the area and stated that "on the whole existing arrangements worked satisfactorily."

74 The Conservatives stated that the villages of Carlin How and Skinningrove should not be included in the same ward as Brotton. They argued that the two villages had stronger community links with other villages in the area rather than the settlement of Brotton stating that “the present Lockwood ward...[is] fair, logical and reflects the prevailing ties and communities”. They also commented that they were opposed to any proposal to allocate the remainder of Lockwood & Skinningrove ward, minus the Carlin How and Skinningrove areas, one councillor and proposed that all the wards in the area remain unchanged.

75 The East Cleveland Independence Party stated that wards in this area of the borough should remain unchanged. It argued that the Borough Council’s proposed Brotton ward ignored long-established community links in the area stating “Skinningrove and Carlin How people do not in any way see themselves as part of Brotton...Neither are part of Skelton & Brotton Parish Council [and], Skinningrove and Carlin How’s other links are with the Lockwood villages, not Brotton.”

76 The Liberal Democrats stated that they “do not see the necessity of switching Skinningrove and Carlin How into Brotton ward”, arguing that Skinningrove has no community links with Brotton and that Brotton ward is a “compact and easily identifiable area”.

77 The Labour Group supported the Borough Council’s proposals in the area commenting that the two villages of Carlin How and Skinningrove share “natural geography” with Brotton, “linked by a common main road, and the shared social and economic background”. However, it also suggested a possible way to rectify the high level of electoral inequality in the Council’s Lockwood ward, proposing that the areas of Slapewath, Margrove and the Charltons in the south-west of the ward be warded with Guisborough with the resultant Lockwood ward becoming a single-member ward.

78 A submission was also received from Loftus Town Council arguing that the boundaries of Loftus ward should remain unchanged. Councillor Kay supported the request of two residents of Slapewath, who argued that their house should be included in Lockwood & Skinningrove ward with the rest of the hamlet. A resident proposed that there should be no change to the existing Lockwood & Skinningrove ward.

79 As stated earlier in the chapter, we have decided not to adopt the Borough Council’s proposed council size of 61 and propose retaining the existing council size of 59. Under a council size of 59 the rural east of the borough is entitled to 7.4 councillors and Skelton is entitled to 3.31 councillors. In its Stage One submission the Council allocated the rural east of the borough eight councillors, one more than it is entitled to. In order to provide the correct allocations under a council size of 59 we are proposing that seven councillors represent the rural east of the borough.

80 Having considered the representations received we propose adopting the Borough Council’s proposed Brotton ward. We have noted the various representations received arguing against such a warding arrangement. However, having visited the area we are of the opinion that there are sufficient transport links between the villages of Carlin How, Skinningrove and Brotton to justify the Council’s proposals to place them together in a ward. We are also of the opinion that the road links between the two villages and the villages to the south of the existing Lockwood & Skinningrove ward are poor and note that to reach them necessitates travelling through the existing Brotton ward. We also attempted various warding arrangements which involved placing the two villages of Carlin How and Skinningrove in the existing Loftus ward. However, we are unable to consider any area in isolation and these arrangements resulted in worse levels of electoral equality in neighbouring wards. Therefore we propose adopting the Borough Council’s proposed Brotton ward. At Stage Three we would welcome further comments concerning this area of the borough, including alternative arrangements that would result in similar levels of electoral equality, while still respecting community identity.

81 We have considered the request of Councillor Kay on behalf of two residents of Slapewath who are currently in Belmont ward but wish to be included in Lockwood & Skinningrove ward with the remainder of the hamlet. We are unable to create a parish ward for only three electors as this would not provide effective and convenient local government at a parish level. However, this issue could be addressed as part of a parish review by the Borough Council, at a later date.

82 In order to address the high level of electoral inequality that occurs when the Carlin How and Skinningrove villages are removed from the existing Lockwood & Skinningrove ward, we propose reducing the level of representation from two councillors to one councillor and transferring an area from the existing Lockwood & Skinningrove ward into our proposed three-member Skelton ward. We propose warding Lockwood parish and creating a Boosbeck parish ward from the existing QA polling district, located in the northwest of the ward, and placing this with the proposed Skelton ward. We are of the opinion that there are good transport links between the village of Boosbeck and our proposed Skelton ward. As explained earlier, we propose warding part of the existing Skelton ward with Saltburn in order to ensure the correct allocation of councillors in the area and the creation of a single-member Lockwood ward. We also propose leaving Loftus ward unchanged, as we consider that the existing ward has good boundaries and provides a good level of electoral equality.

83 Under our draft recommendations Brotton ward (comprising the existing East Brotton and West Brotton parish wards of Skelton & Brotton parish and the proposed Skinningrove parish ward of Loftus parish) and Lockwood ward (comprising the Charltons & Margrove, Lingdale & Stanghow and Moorsholm parish wards of Lockwood parish) would have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent and 14 per cent above the borough average respectively. Loftus ward (comprising the parish of Loftus) would have a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent below the borough average. By 2006 our proposed Brotton and Lockwood wards would have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent below and 12 per cent above the borough average respectively. Our proposed Loftus ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent below the borough average. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and on Map A4 and Map A5.

Belmont, Guisborough and Hutton wards

84 These three wards lie in the centre of the borough, and cover the town of Guisborough. The three-member wards of Belmont and Guisborough currently have councillor:elector ratios 2 per cent above and 10 per cent below the borough average respectively. Hutton ward, a two-member ward, has a councillor:elector ratio 13 per cent above the borough average. By 2006 Belmont and Guisborough wards are projected to have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent and 2 per cent below the borough average respectively, while Hutton ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 11 per cent above the borough average.

85 During Stage One the Borough Council proposed that the existing wards in this area remain unchanged, as did the Conservatives. The Labour Group put forward a suggestion that part of the existing Lockwood ward be warded with the existing Guisborough ward in order to address the high level of electoral equality which resulted from the Borough Council's proposed Lockwood ward. As an alternative, it suggested leaving the three wards unchanged.

86 As stated earlier in the chapter, we have decided not to adopt the Borough Council's proposed council size of 61 and propose retaining the existing council size of 59. Under a council size of 59 this area of the borough is entitled to eight councillors. In its Stage One submission the Council had allocated this area eight councillors, and we are therefore willing to base our draft recommendations upon these proposals.

87 Having considered the proposals for the area put forward by the Borough Council we propose making a number of boundary amendments. We are of the opinion that a councillor:elector ratio 14 per cent above the borough average which results from the Council's proposed Hutton ward is unacceptable. Therefore we propose amending the boundary between the existing Belmont and Hutton wards so that polling district MC, situated at the west of

existing Belmont ward, is included in an amended two-member Hutton ward. We also propose moving the boundary between Guisborough and Belmont wards to run along the rear of the properties on Atherstone Drive, Barlow Close, Craven Vale, Grafton Close, Eridge Road, Kilkenny Road, Middleton Drive, Pytchley Road, Rockwood Close, Sunnington Close, and Vine Close across Belmangate and to the rear of the properties on Whitby Avenue and Rievaulx Way. We propose amending the boundary between the existing Hutton ward and Guisborough ward so that the area bordered by Park Lane, the Middlesbrough bypass, the miniature golf course and Middlesbrough Road is transferred to our proposed three-member Hutton ward from the existing Guisborough ward. We are of the opinion that our proposed boundary amendments in this area will help to secure good levels of electoral equality and make best use of the natural boundaries between different residential areas.

88 Under our draft recommendations Belmont (comprising the proposed Belmont parish ward of Guisborough parish) and Hutton (comprising the proposed Hutton parish ward of Guisborough parish) wards would have councillor:elector ratios 10 per cent and 2 per cent above the borough average respectively. Our proposed Guisborough ward (comprising the proposed Guisborough parish ward of Guisborough parish) would have a councillor:elector ratio of 8 per cent below the borough average. By 2006 our proposed Belmont and Hutton wards would have councillor:elector ratios 6 per cent and 1 per cent above the borough average respectively and our proposed Guisborough ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the borough average. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

89 By virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

Conclusions

90 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- a council of 59 members should be retained;
- there should be 22 wards;
- the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified and three wards should retain their existing boundaries.

91 Our draft recommendations would involve modifying all but three of the existing wards in Redcar & Cleveland borough, as summarised below:

- we propose new arrangements for the Western urban core of the borough to amend the boundaries of the existing Eston, Grangetown, Normanby, South Bank and Teesville wards;
- we propose new arrangements for Redcar town area, to amend the boundaries of the existing Dormanstown, Kirkleatham, Redcar and West Dyke wards;
- we propose new arrangements for the east of the borough to include amending the boundary between Brotton and Lockwood & Skinningrove, and the boundary between Lockwood & Skinningrove and Skelton wards;
- we propose amending the boundaries of Belmont, Guisborough and Hutton wards.

92 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will affect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2001 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2006.

Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	59	59	59	59
Number of wards	22	22	22	22
Average number of electors per councillor	1,780	1,780	1,794	1,794
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	9	3	10	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	2	0	4	0

93 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 9 to two. By 2006 only Lockwood ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

Draft Recommendation
 Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council should comprise 59 councillors serving 22 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover.

Parish Council Electoral Arrangements

94 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Guisborough, Saltburn, Marske & New Marske and Skelton & Brotton to reflect the proposed borough wards.

95 The parish of Guisborough is currently served by 16 councillors and is divided into five parish wards; Belmont, Hutton, Kemplah, Park and Tocketts (returning three, four, three, three and three councillors respectively). We proposed amending the parish ward boundaries of Belmont, Hutton and Tocketts with the proposed Hutton parish ward reflecting the boundaries of the proposed Hutton borough ward, Kemplah parish ward and the proposed Belmont parish ward reflecting the boundaries of the proposed Belmont borough ward, and Park and Tocketts and the proposed Guisborough parish ward reflecting the boundaries of the proposed Guisborough borough ward.

Draft Recommendation

Guisborough Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing five parish wards: Belmont (returning three councillors), Hutton (returning four councillors) Kemplah (returning three councillors), Park (returning three councillors) and Tocketts (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

96 The parish of Saltburn, Marske & New Marske is currently served by 18 councillors and is divided into three parish wards; Longbeck, St Germain's and Saltburn (returning seven, six and five councillors respectively). We propose amending the parish wards of Longbeck and St Germain's to reflect the proposed borough wards of the same name in this area. In order to provide a more representative allocation of parish councillors, we propose that each of the Longbeck, St Germain's and Saltburn parish wards should be represented by six parish councillors. We would welcome views on these arrangements at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

Saltburn, Marske & New Marske Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing three parish wards: Longbeck (returning six councillors), St Germain's (returning six councillors) and Saltburn (returning six councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as shown on the large map at the back of the report.

97 The parish of Skelton & Brotton is currently represented by 17 parish councillors and is divided into six parish wards; Brotton West, Brotton East, Old Skelton, Skelton Green, North Skelton & Layland and New Skelton & Hollybush. We propose creating a new Triangle parish ward which at borough ward level would be included in the amended Saltburn ward. We propose that this new parish ward should be served by two councillors, thereby increasing the total number of councillors on the parish council from 17 to 19.

Draft Recommendation

Skelton & Brotton Parish Council should comprise 19 parish councillors, instead of the current 17, representing seven wards, instead of the current six: Brotton West (returning four councillors), Brotton East (returning three councillors), Old Skelton (returning three councillors), Skelton Green (returning two councillors), North Skelton & Layland (returning two councillors), New Skelton & Hollybush (returning three councillors) and Triangle (returning two councillors). These wards are illustrated and named on Map A3 in Appendix A

98 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish councils in the borough.

Draft Recommendation

Parish council elections should continue to take place every four years, at the same time as elections for the borough ward of which they are part.

Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

99 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Redcar & Cleveland contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 8 July 2002. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the Borough Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

100 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Team Leader
Redcar & Cleveland Review
Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW

101 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, ***whether or not*** they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Electoral Commission, which cannot make the Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after it receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Redcar & Cleveland area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas, which are shown in more detail in Maps A2, A3, A4 and A5 the large maps at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Guisborough parish.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed boundaries between Saltburn and Skelton wards.

Map A4 illustrates the proposed boundaries between Skelton and Lockwood wards.

Map A5 illustrates the proposed boundaries between Lockwood and Brotton wards.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Redcar town and the Western urban core

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Guisborough Parish

Map A3: Proposed Boundaries between Saltburn and Skelton wards

Map A4: Proposed Boundaries between Skelton and Lockwood wards

Map A5: Proposed Boundaries between Lockwood and Brotton wards

APPENDIX B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm, requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Boundary Committee for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: The Boundary Committee for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods.
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.	We comply with this requirement.
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.	We comply with this requirement.

Appendix

Corrections

SCHEDULE OF MISTAKES AND INACCURACIES - Reply

Point 1:

- (a) There is a new Summary attached to this appendix which amends the mistakes in the Summary that result from the existing number of councillors for St Germain's and Saltburn wards having been transposed. St Germain's ward should read as having two councillors, and Saltburn ward should read as having three councillors. This has also been amended in the updated Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements, which is attached to this appendix. The Summary has also been amended in the light of the other errors which have been found in the report as a result of your letter dated 31 May 2002.
- (b) This transposing of the existing number of councillors has resulted in the incorrect over- and under-representations listed on page 16 beneath Table 4. However, while these errors are as a consequence of the original mistake, the way in which the draft recommendations was approached is not affected. Under a council size of 59 the area covered by St Germain's and Longbeck wards (the Marske area) is entitled to 6 councillors, as is the area covered by Saltburn and Skelton wards. This is calculated by working out the percentage of the total electorate in each area and then allocating it the same percentage of the total number of councillors.

Point 2:

This highlights discrepancies in Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Redcar & Cleveland, for the wards of Newcomen and West Dyke (2001 figures) and Brotton (2006 figures). The figures in the published are typographical errors and should in fact read 3,466, 5,631 and 5,298 respectively. These amended figures are included in the amended Table 2 which is attached to this appendix.

Point 3:

Similarly, the figures for Dormanstown and Normanby wards in the published Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements are incorrect typographical errors and should read 5,396 and 5,522 respectively. These corrected figures are included in the amended Table 4 which is attached to this appendix.

Point 4:

This refers to Appendix 1 which is attached to your letter dated 31 May 2002. The figures provided by the Council and those in the Committee's draft recommendations table differ due to the Committee not having adopted the Council's proposals in all wards. The figures for Brotton, Eston, Loftus, Newcomen and Ormesby that we used in our draft recommendations report are based on the figures for existing wards and polling districts on Proforma 1 (broken down to polling district level) which was provided by the Council.

Point 5:

A corrected Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements is attached to this appendix.

Point 6:

The report refers to the incorrect over-representation of Saltburn as a result of the transposition of the number of councillors referred to earlier. However, as explained in above (1a) this does not affect the way that our draft recommendations were formulated.

Point 7:

The transposition of the number of councillors between Saltburn and St Germain's, and the other mistakes that have been noticed in the report are rectified in this appendix and attachments. Copies of this appendix and attachments will be sent to all recipients of the draft recommendations.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of the electoral arrangements for Redcar and Cleveland 16 October 2001. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us to complete the work of the LGCE.

- **This report summarises the submissions we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Redcar and Cleveland:

- **in seven of the 22 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in eight wards and by more than 20 per cent in two wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements are that:

- **Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council should have 59 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each borough councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 19 of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in 21 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the re-distribution of councillors for the parishes of Guisborough, Lockwood, Saltburn, Marske & New Marske and Skelton & Brotton.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 14 May 2002. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission which is responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**

- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 29 July 2002:

**Team Leader
Redcar and Cleveland Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London
SW1P 2HW**

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Redcar and Cleveland

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Belmont	2	3,915	1,958	10	3,779	1,890	5
2	Brotton	3	5,404	1,801	1	5,298	1,766	-2
3	Coatham (Redcar)	2	3,808	1,904	7	3,670	1,835	2
4	Dormanstown	3	5,330	1,777	0	5,196	1,732	-3
5	Eston (Guisborough)	3	5,567	1,856	4	5,420	1,807	1
6	Grangetown (Guisborough)	2	3,639	1,820	2	3,541	1,771	-1
7	Guisborough	3	4,927	1,642	-8	5,319	1,773	-1
8	Hutton	3	5,428	1,809	2	5,367	1,789	0
9	Kirkleatham (Redcar)	3	5,255	1,752	-2	5,584	1,861	4
10	Lockwood	1	2,034	2,034	14	1,992	1,992	11
11	Loftus	3	5,195	1,732	-3	5,071	1,690	-6
12	Longbeck	3	4,414	1,471	-17	5,362	1,787	0
13	Newcomen (Redcar)	2	3,466	1,733	-3	3,489	1,745	-3
14	Normanby (Guisborough)	3	5,547	1,849	4	5,414	1,805	1
15	Ormesby (Guisborough)	3	5,097	1,699	-5	4,989	1,663	-7
16	Redcar (Redcar)	2	3,662	1,831	3	3,567	1,784	-1
17	St Germain's (Guisborough)	3	5,311	1,770	-1	5,264	1,755	-2
18	Saltburn	3	5,701	1,900	7	5,622	1,874	4
19	Skelton	3	4,768	1,589	-11	5,438	1,813	1
20	South Bank	3	5,362	1,787	0	5,315	1,772	-1
21	Teesville (Guisborough)	3	5,530	1,843	4	5,413	1,804	1
22	West Dyke (Redcar)	3	5,631	1,877	5	5,737	1,912	7
	Totals	59	104,991	-	-	105,847	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,780	-	-	1,794	-

Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Belmont	3	5,436	1,812	2	5,279	1,760	-2
2	Brotton	2	4,229	2,115	19	4,157	2,079	16
3	Coatham (Redcar)	2	3,233	1,617	-9	3,095	1,548	-14
4	Dormanstown	3	5,396	1,799	1	5,260	1,753	-2
5	Eston (Guisborough)	3	5,526	1,842	4	5,381	1,794	0
6	Grangetown (Guisborough)	3	4,556	1,519	-15	4,458	1,486	-17
7	Guisborough	3	4,830	1,610	-10	5,222	1,741	-3
8	Hutton	2	4,004	2,002	13	3,964	1,982	10
9	Kirkleatham (Redcar)	3	5,042	1,681	-6	5,371	1,790	0
10	Lockwood & Skinnigrove	2	3,972	1,986	12	3,993	1,997	11
11	Loftus	3	5,195	1,732	-3	5,071	1,690	-6
12	Longbeck	3	6,203	2,068	16	7,144	2,381	33
13	Newcomen (Redcar)	2	3,465	1,733	-3	3,489	1,745	-3
14	Normanby (Guisborough)	3	5,522	1,842	3	5,389	1,796	0
15	Ormesby (Guisborough)	3	5,097	1,699	-5	4,989	1,663	-7
16	Redcar (Redcar)	2	3,691	1,846	4	3,594	1,797	0
17	St Germain's (Guisborough)	2	3,522	1,761	-1	3,482	1,741	-3
18	Saltburn	3	4,842	1,614	-9	4,763	1,588	-12
19	Skelton	3	4,864	1,621	-9	5,437	1,812	1
20	Southbank	3	4,385	1,462	-18	4,340	1,447	-19
21	Teesville (Guisborough)	3	5,588	1,863	5	5,471	1,824	2
22	West Dyke (Redcar)	3	6,393	2,131	20	6,498	2,166	21
	Totals	59	104,991	-	-	105,847	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,780	-	-	1,794	-

Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	59	59	59	59
Number of wards	22	22	22	22
Average number of electors per councillor	1,780	1,794	1,780	1,794
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	7	3	8	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	0	0	2	0