

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
East Middlesbrough	8
South-east Middlesbrough	10
South-west Middlesbrough	11
Central Middlesbrough	12
Conclusions	14
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Middlesbrough Council	20
B Glossary and abbreviations	22

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We conducted an electoral review of Middlesbrough Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aimed to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in June 2012.

This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
26 June 2012	Consultation on council size
27 November 2012	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to the LGBCE
19 February 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
14 May 2013	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
6 August 2013	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 46 members comprising two single-member, ten two-member and eight three-member wards. During the consultation period on a warding pattern for Middlesbrough, we received 54 submissions, including three borough-wide submissions: one from Middlesbrough Council, one from the Conservative Group and one from Councillor Williams (Liberal Democrat). All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Our draft recommendations for Middlesbrough sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

Submissions received

During the consultation on the draft recommendations for Middlesbrough, we received 34 submissions. These included submissions from Middlesbrough Labour Group, Mr Andrew McDonald MP, 14 borough councillors (some of whom made joint submissions), three community councils, one local organisation and 19 members of the public.

All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

Middlesbrough Council has forecast an increase in electorate of approximately 0.1% across the borough by 2018.

Following publication of our draft recommendations, we did not receive any comments on the electorate figures. Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content that the Council's projected figures are the best available at the present time. These figures form the basis of the final recommendations.

General analysis

We have considered all submissions received during the consultation on our draft recommendations. As a result, we have proposed to make minor amendments to the boundary between our Marton West and Nunthorpe wards, to the boundary between our Newport and Ayresome wards and to the boundary between our Acklam and Kader wards. Elsewhere, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

Our final recommendations for Middlesbrough are that the Council should have 46 members representing two single-member, 10 two-member and eight three-member wards. None of the wards will have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. Having taken into account the evidence we have received during consultation, we believe that our final recommendations will ensure good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and providing for effective and convenient local government.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Middlesbrough Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Middlesbrough Council in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

Our final recommendations can also be viewed at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Middlesbrough Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to Middlesbrough Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during the consultation on warding patterns informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Middlesbrough Council*, which were published on 14 May 2013. Consultation on our draft recommendations took place until 5 August 2013.

What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Middlesbrough?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2011 electorate figures, 30% of the existing wards have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. Furthermore, Middlehaven ward had 35% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough.

How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish or town council wards you vote in. Your ward name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change as a result of our recommendations.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Middlesbrough Council.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Middlesbrough is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

11 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

13 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Middlesbrough Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Submissions received

14 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Middlesbrough Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 34 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations. All submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

15 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have been assisted by officers of the Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

Electorate figures

16 As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 0.1%. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account planned developments across the borough, as well as population forecasts made by the Office for National Statistics.

17 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content that the Council's projected figures are the best available at the present time. These figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

18 The Council currently has 48 councillors elected from 23 wards, comprising one single-member, 19 two-member and three three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed reducing the council size to 46 members. A proposal from the Labour Group also proposed 46 members. Submissions from the Conservative Group and Councillor Williams (Liberal Democrat) both proposed a council size of 38 members. A submission from Councillor Michna (Green) proposed a council size of 26 members.

19 Having taken into account the submissions we received we considered that the evidence supporting a council size of 46 was the most persuasive. We therefore decided to consult on reducing the council size to this number. During the consultation on council size we received 11 submissions. These showed mixed support for the Council's proposal. We carefully considered the evidence received and concluded that the Council had put forward the strongest rationale arguing for the reduction from the existing council size.

20 We considered that the Council's original submission had sufficient regard to its governance and management structure, scrutiny of the council, work on outside bodies, members' representational role and the Council's other statutory functions.

21 During the consultation on warding pattern we received no comments in relation to council size. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 46. During consultation on our draft recommendations we again received no comments in relation to council size.

22 We are content that a council size of 46 members would not impact adversely on governance arrangements, member workload or councillors' representational role. We have therefore confirmed a council size of 46 members for Middlesbrough Council as final.

Electoral fairness

23 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

24 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (101,468 in 2012 and 101,560 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 46 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,206 in 2012 and 2,208 by 2018.

25 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed 20 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our final recommendations for Middlesbrough.

General analysis

26 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations we received 54 submissions on warding arrangements for Middlesbrough. The Council, the Conservative Group and Councillor Williams (Liberal Democrat) submitted borough-wide proposals based on a council size of 46. We received additional representations from six borough councillors, two of whom sent in two joint submissions, one parish council, six community councils, one local organisation, 35 local residents and one anonymous submission.

27 All three borough-wide proposals resulted in good levels of electoral equality across the borough. A supplementary submission from the Conservative Group supported Councillor Williams' proposals with a minor exception in the south-west of the borough where they proposed a slightly different boundary between their proposed Nunthorpe and Marton wards.

28 We noted that a number of proposed wards within these submissions divided communities and did not appear to use strong boundaries, particularly in the central and eastern areas of the borough. In those areas we modified the proposals to provide stronger ward boundaries and to better reflect our statutory criteria.

29 In the south-east of Middlesbrough the Council and Councillor Williams put

forward different proposals. We considered that the proposals made by Councillor Williams for this area provided for clear and identifiable boundaries and better reflected our statutory criteria. We therefore decided to adopt these proposed wards for south-east Middlesbrough as part of our draft recommendations. In the south-west of the borough the Council and Councillor Williams made broadly similar proposals. In this area we decided to adopt the proposed wards as part of our draft recommendations, subject to a number of minor amendments to improve electoral equality and provide for stronger ward boundaries.

30 During the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 34 submissions. These included submissions from Middlesbrough Labour Group, Mr Andrew McDonald MP, 14 borough councillors (some of whom made joint submissions), three community councils, one local organisation and 19 members of the public.

31 We received significant support for our proposals for the south-east of the borough as well as for some individual wards across the borough. Some submissions objected to our proposals in localised areas, most notably in Kader and Acklam wards in the south-west of the borough and Linthorpe and Park wards in the centre of the borough.

32 We have considered all submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations. In our final recommendations for Middlesbrough, we have sought to address evidence received during consultation and achieve good levels of electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests.

33 Our final recommendations are for two single-member, 10 two-member and eight three-member wards, the same as under our draft recommendations. No ward would have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 20–1) and on Map 1 accompanying this report.

Electoral arrangements

34 This section of the report details the submissions we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Middlesbrough. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- East Middlesbrough (pages 8–10)
- South-east Middlesbrough (pages 10–11)
- South-west Middlesbrough (pages 11–12)
- Central Middlesbrough (pages 12–14)

35 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 20–1 and illustrated on Map 1 accompanying this report.

East Middlesbrough

36 East Middlesbrough is a densely populated area comprising the communities of North Ormesby, Berwick Hills, Pallister, Brambles Farm, Thorntree and Park End. The area is bordered by the neighbouring authority of Redcar & Cleveland to the east and south, the A66 to the north and a railway line and beck to the west. Our

draft recommendations for were for a single-member North Ormesby ward and three three-member wards of Brambles & Thorntree, Berwick Hills & Pallister and Park End & Beckfield.

37 During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received four submissions which commented on our proposals for East Middlesbrough. These were from three borough councillors and one from a member of the public.

North Ormesby and Brambles & Thorntree

38 We received a joint submission from Councillor Junier and Councillor Loughborough who proposed a two-member North Ormesby ward which included the northern part of our Berwick Hills & Pallister ward. As part of this alternative proposal the number of members representing the Berwick Hills & Pallister ward would reduce from three to two members. The wards of North Ormesby and Berwick Hills & Pallister proposed by the councillors would have electoral variances of 39% fewer and 28% more per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively. We consider that this proposal did not provide for good levels of electoral equality, nor did it use clear and identifiable boundaries. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our proposed North Ormesby ward as final.

39 We did not receive any submissions regarding our draft recommendations for Brambles & Thorntree ward. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this ward as final.

40 Under our final recommendations, North Ormesby and Brambles & Thorntree wards would have 3% more and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

Berwick Hills & Pallister and Park End & Beckfield

41 This area comprises the communities of Berwick Hills, Pallister, Park End and Beckfield.

42 In response to consultation on our draft recommendations we received a submission from a member of the public who stated that he was 'disappointed' that a Berwick Hills ward has not been proposed. We consider that the proposed Berwick Hills & Pallister ward uses strong and identifiable boundaries and reflects community identities in the area as it does not divide the Berwick Hills community. Having considered the submission received, we have decided to confirm our proposed Berwick Hills & Pallister ward as final.

43 We received two submissions relating to our proposed Park End & Beckfield ward. These submissions were from Councillor Hubbard and Councillor Saunders. Both were concerned that the Park End community was being divided between wards. Councillor Saunders argued that our draft recommendations could result in 'a significant part of Park End losing its identity' while Councillor Hubbard stated that Park End is 'a very strong community'. However neither submission made a clear proposal for an alternative warding arrangement in this area.

44 We have considered a variety of alternatives to our draft recommendations in this area. However, we have been not been able to identify an alternative warding arrangement that satisfies our statutory criteria. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our proposed Park End & Beckfield ward as final.

45 Under our final recommendations, Berwick Hills & Pallister and Park End & Beckfield wards would have 4% fewer and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

South-east Middlesbrough

46 South-east Middlesbrough comprises the communities of Coulby Newham, Marton and the parish of Nunthorpe. The area is bounded by the authority boundary to the east and south and by the B1365 to the west. Our draft recommendations for this area of Middlesbrough were based on the proposals of Councillor Williams (Liberal Democrat). Our draft recommendations were for the five two-member wards of Nunthorpe, Marton East, Marton West and Ladgate and the three-member ward of Coulby Newham. Under our draft recommendations no ward was projected to have a variance greater than 10% from the borough average by 2018.

47 We received eight submissions commenting on our draft recommendations for this area. One submission was made by Councillors Chris and John Hobson, one was received from Marton West Community Council and six were from members of the public. All eight submissions were broadly in support of our draft recommendations.

Nunthorpe and Coulby Newham

48 The submissions made by Councillors Chris and John Hobson and by Marton West Community Council both commented on St Cuthbert Avenue, a cul-de-sac in the west of our proposed Nunthorpe ward. They stated that the inclusion of St Cuthbert Avenue in our proposed Nunthorpe ward 'looks totally wrong and also does not fit in with Nunthorpe'. Marton West Community Council argued that the proposal seemed to be 'against the principle of a "strong boundary" using Dixons Bank as the line'.

49 Having considered the evidence received we have decided to modify our draft recommendations in this area. We have decided to include St Cuthbert Avenue in our Marton West ward with the boundary now running along Dixons Bank (the A172). This modification has only a minor effect on electoral equality and results in the ward having an easily identifiable boundary.

50 We did not receive any submissions relating to our proposed Coulby Newham ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as final. Our final recommendations are for a two-member Nunthorpe ward and a three-member Coulby Newham ward, which would have 2% more and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018, respectively.

51 We received eight submissions in regard to the Marton area. Six submissions were made by members of the public, five of whom wrote in support of our proposed Marton West ward with one resident writing in support of recommendations for both Marton wards. As outlined paragraph 48, there was some concern over the proposed boundary between Marton West and Nunthorpe wards which we have modified as part of our final recommendations.

52 Aside from the modification to the boundary between Marton West and Nunthorpe described in paragraph 49, we confirm as final the draft recommendations for Marton East and Marton West wards. These wards would both have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018.

Ladgate

53 We did not receive any submissions relating to our proposed Ladgate ward and therefore confirm as final the draft recommendations for this ward. Under our final recommendations our two-member Ladgate ward would have 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018.

South-west Middlesbrough

54 South-west Middlesbrough comprises the parish of Stainton & Thornton, the community of Brookfield and the area south of Acklam. The area is bounded by the borough boundary to the west and south. Our draft recommendations were largely based on the proposals from the Council, Councillor Williams and the Conservative Group. They all proposed broadly similar warding arrangements for this area.

55 We received nine submissions commenting on our draft recommendations for this area. Submissions were made by councillors Pearson and Arundale (who made a joint submission), Acklam Community Council, Brookfield Community Council, the Acklam 2020 environmental group and five members of the public.

Hemlington and Stainton & Thornton

56 We did not receive any submissions relating to our proposed Hemlington and Stainton & Thornton wards and therefore confirm as final the draft recommendations for these wards. Under our final recommendations our two-member Hemlington ward and our single-member Stainton & Thornton ward would have 6% more and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018, respectively.

Trimdon and Kader

57 We received nine submissions commenting on our proposed Trimdon and Kader wards. Two members of the public voiced their opposition to the name of our proposed Trimdon ward, both stating that the name has 'no relevance' to the local area. Alternative suggestions of 'Brookfield' and 'Thornhill' were proposed. The name Trimdon was originally proposed by both the Council and Councillor Williams and is taken from the main road, Trimdon Avenue, which runs through the centre of the ward. Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that the name Trimdon is appropriate as it reflects the significant internal communication link in the ward.

58 We received a further submission in relation to the Trimdon area. This submission was from Brookfield Community Council which was 'disappointed in the draft proposals for the Brookfield Ward' (Brookfield is the existing ward which covers part of this area and is similar to our proposed Trimdon ward). However, the Community Council suggested no alternative warding proposal. Having considered the evidence received, we have decided to confirm our proposed Trimdon ward as final.

59 We received six submissions relating to our proposed Kader ward. A joint submission was made by Councillor Arundale and Councillor Pearson who supported our draft recommendations and considered them 'very fair'. However, five further submissions, one of which included 51 signed template letters from local residents, opposed our proposals in this part of the borough. Respondents opposed our proposed boundary between the Kader ward and neighbouring Acklam ward. Respondents stated that the 'triangular section' of properties between Acklam Road, Hall Drive and the avenue of trees should be included in the Acklam ward and not

the Kader ward. The respondents also considered that the avenue of trees leading to Acklam Hall should also be included in the Acklam ward.

60 We noted the weight of opposition to our proposed Kader ward and investigated alternative warding arrangements, in particular whether it was possible to include the properties located in the 'triangular section' described above in the Acklam ward. Our investigation indicated that including the 'triangular section' in the Acklam ward would result in the ward having 13% more electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018. In the absence of persuasive community identity evidence we considered this to be an unreasonable level of electoral equality.

61 To improve this level of electoral equality would require a number of significant amendments to the surrounding wards. We consider that evidence has not been received to make substantial changes to the surrounding wards particularly as we have received support for them in response to the consultation and consider they provide the best balance between our statutory criteria. However, we have decided to make a small modification to our proposed Acklam ward. We were persuaded that the avenue of trees leading to Acklam Hall, should be included in our Acklam ward. We have therefore decided to amend the boundary between Kader and Acklam wards so that it runs to the west of the avenue of trees rather than to the east. Other than this modification we confirm our draft recommendations for Kader ward as final.

62 Under our final recommendations our two-member Trimdon and Kader wards would have 1% fewer and 3% more electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018, respectively.

Central Middlesbrough

63 Central Middlesbrough stretches from the industrial area to the north of the town centre, to the communities of Acklam and Beechwood. The area is bounded by the borough boundary to the north and west and the railway line to the east. Our draft recommendations were for the three two-member wards of Acklam, Ayresome and Linthorpe and four three-member wards of Central, Newport, Park and Longlands & Beechwood.

64 We received 12 submissions that commented on the central area of Middlesbrough. These were from Middlesbrough Labour Group, six borough councillors (three of whom made a joint submission), Acklam Community Council, the Acklam 2020 environmental group and five members of the public.

Ayresome

65 Submissions from the Labour Group, Councillor Taylor and Councillor Williams all commented on the boundary between our proposed Ayresome and Newport wards. All three stated that the 12 properties on Stockton Road in the north of our proposed Ayresome ward were isolated from the rest of the ward. They considered that the electors living on this road would be better served by being included in our Newport ward, with which they have a direct road link. Having considered the evidence received, we have decided to modify our draft recommendations in this area. As part of our final recommendations we propose that the boundary between Ayresome and Newport wards runs east to west along the A66, which results in Stockton Road being included in our Newport ward.

66 We also received a submission from Councillor Hawthorne who considered that our draft recommendations for this area were ‘devastating and unnecessary’. However, he proposed no alternative warding pattern. Subject to the modification described in paragraph 65 we confirm our draft recommendations for Ayresome ward as final. Under our final recommendations our two-member Ayresome ward would have 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018.

Central and Newport

67 As described in paragraph 65 we received some submissions in opposition to the boundary between our proposed Newport and Ayresome wards and as a result we propose a minor modification to our draft recommendations in this area. We received no further submissions regarding our proposed Central and Newport wards and we therefore, subject to the amendment detailed above, confirm our draft recommendations for both wards as final

68 Under our final recommendations our three-member Central and Newport wards would have 2% fewer and 4% more electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018, respectively.

Linthorpe, Park and Acklam

69 As detailed in paragraphs 59–61 we received some opposition to the boundary between our proposed Acklam and Kader ward and, as a result, we propose a small modification in this area. We also received submissions covering this part of the borough from Councillor Williams, Acklam Community Council and two members of the public. They also commented on the northern boundary of our proposed Acklam ward which under our draft recommendations incorporated Ravenscroft Avenue and part of Emerson Avenue. The submissions suggested that the boundary should run along Emerson Avenue. Acklam Community Council considered that Ravenscroft Avenue has always been seen as part of Linthorpe. Having considered the evidence received we have decided to modify the boundary between Acklam and Park wards so that it runs along Emerson Avenue, resulting in Ravenscroft Avenue being included in Park ward.

70 Subject to this modification and the modification detailed in paragraph 61 we confirm our proposed Acklam ward as final. Under our final recommendations our two-member Acklam ward would have 3% more electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018.

71 In addition to the comments regarding Ravenscroft Avenue we received submissions from the Labour Group, Councillor Williams and a joint submission from Councillors Bloundele, Hussain and Rostron that commented on the boundaries between our proposed Linthorpe and Park wards. All three submissions indicated that under our draft recommendations the Linthorpe Conservation Area would be divided between the two wards. The Labour Group and the joint submission from councillors Bloundele, Hussain and Rostron put forward alternative proposals for the area which were similar.

72 The alternative proposals made by the Labour Group and by councillors Bloundele, Hussain and Rostron were for a three-member Linthorpe West ward and a two-member Linthorpe Village ward. We investigated the alternative warding patterns proposed. Whilst both proposals would result in reasonable levels of electoral equality both submissions made significant reference to the socio-economic

characteristics of the two areas and argued that they are distinct in this regard. We consider that the socio-economic status of an area is not necessarily an indicator of community identity.

73 We also note that during the consultation on warding arrangements the submissions we received proposed dividing the conservation area between wards. The Council’s proposal divided the area between three wards while Councillor Williams’ proposal divided it between two wards. Under the current warding arrangements the conservation area is divided between three wards. Having considered the evidence we are of the view that there is not sufficient cause to amend our draft recommendations in this area.

74 Subject to the minor amendment to the southern boundary of Park ward described in paragraph 69 we confirm our draft recommendations for Linthorpe and Park wards as final. Under our final recommendations our two-member Linthorpe and three-member Park wards would have 5% more and 8% more electors per councillor respectively than the average for the borough by 2018.

Longlands & Beechwood

75 We received no submissions commenting on our proposed Longlands & Beechwood ward and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations our three-member Longlands & Beechwood ward would have 8% more electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2018.

Conclusions

76 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2018
Number of councillors	46	46
Number of wards	20	20
Average number of electors per councillor	2,206	2,208
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	3	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Final recommendation

Middlesbrough Council should comprise 46 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

77 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

78 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Middlesbrough Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

79 Our final recommendations do not result in any parish being divided by ward boundaries. Therefore consequential parish electoral arrangements are not required in any part of the authority.

3 What happens next?

80 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Middlesbrough Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Middlesbrough Council in 2015.

Equalities

81 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Middlesbrough

82 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Middlesbrough Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Middlesbrough Council.

You can also view our final recommendations for Middlesbrough on our interactive maps at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Middlesbrough Council

	Ward Name	Number of Councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of Electors per Councillor	Variance from Average %	Electorate (2018)	Number of Electors per Councillor	Variance from Average %
1	Acklam	2	4,624	2,312	5%	4,543	2,272	3%
2	Ayresome	2	4,317	2,159	-2%	4,222	2,111	-4%
3	Berwick Hills & Pallister	3	6,556	2,185	-1%	6,368	2,123	-4%
4	Brambles & Thorntree	3	6,256	2,085	-5%	6,331	2,110	-4%
5	Central	3	6,502	2,167	-2%	6,467	2,156	-2%
6	Coulby Newham	3	6,970	2,323	5%	6,751	2,250	2%
7	Hemlington	2	4,851	2,426	10%	4,696	2,348	6%
8	Kader	2	4,608	2,304	4%	4,538	2,269	3%
9	Ladgate	2	4,214	2,107	-4%	4,250	2,125	-4%
10	Linthorpe	2	4,762	2,381	8%	4,644	2,322	5%
11	Longlands & Beechwood	3	7,103	2,368	7%	7,156	2,385	8%
12	Marlon East	2	3,847	1,924	-13%	4,279	2,140	-3%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Middlesbrough Council

Ward Name	Number of Councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of Electors per Councillor	Variance from Average %	Electorate (2018)	Number of Electors per Councillor	Variance from Average %
13 Marton West	2	4,318	2,159	-2%	4,300	2,150	-3%
14 Newport	3	7,232	2,411	9%	6,881	2,294	4%
15 North Ormesby	1	2,231	2,231	1%	2,268	2,268	3%
16 Nunthorpe	2	4,060	2,030	-8%	4,085	2,043	-7%
17 Park	3	7,199	2,400	9%	7,174	2,391	8%
18 Park End & Beckfield	3	6,305	2,102	-5%	6,126	2,043	-8%
19 Stainton & Thornton	1	1,751	1,751	-21%	2,108	2,108	-5%
20 Trimdon	2	3,762	1,881	-15%	4,373	2,187	-1%
Totals	46	101,468	-	-	101,560	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,206	-	-	2,208	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Middlesbrough Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral division 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

Appendix B

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision-making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or district, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the borough or district council

