

# Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the North East



# Contents

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>What is the Boundary Commission for England?</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background to the 2018 Review</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Revised proposals for the North East</b>	<b>13</b>
	The sub-region split	13
	Northumberland	15
	Newcastle upon Tyne, Gateshead, North Tyneside, South Tyneside, Sunderland, and County Durham	17
	Cleveland (Middlesbrough, Stockton, Hartlepool and Redcar) and Darlington	24
<b>4</b>	<b>How to have your say</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates</b>	<b>33</b>

# Summary

## Who we are and what we do

The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

## The 2018 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 501), resulting in the number of constituencies in the North East reducing by four, to 25. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions<sup>1</sup> – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

## How did we conduct the 2018 Review?

We published our initial proposals for new boundaries in September 2016 and consulted on them. We received written comments and oral submissions at public hearings held in each region. We published all the comments we received and we held a second consultation exercise in relation to them in March 2017. We are very grateful for all the comments that these two consultation exercises have generated. We have now completed the next stage of the review process and we are now publishing our revised proposals. For each region, the revised proposals report sets out our analysis of all the responses to our

initial proposals in the first and second consultations, and the conclusions we have reached as to how those proposals should be revised as a result. The annex to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency in our revised proposals for the relevant region; maps to illustrate these constituencies can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

## What are the revised proposals for the North East?

We have revised the composition of 20 of the 25 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining five.

Under our revised proposals, three constituencies in the North East would be the same as they are under the existing arrangements.

As it was not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, our initial proposals grouped together all the local authority areas in the North East. It was also necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposals divide the region into two sub-regions, as shown in the table overleaf.

<sup>1</sup> The specified exemptions in England to the rules on constituency size are the two constituencies in the Isle of Wight.

Northumberland	
Tyne and Wear, County Durham, Darlington, and Cleveland	

In our initial proposals we proposed three constituencies wholly contained within the County of Northumberland and one cross-county constituency with Tyne and Wear – Newcastle upon Tyne North West. In our revised proposals we have proposed three constituencies wholly contained within a separate Northumberland sub-region. The Ponteland East and Stannington ward is no longer included in a Newcastle upon Tyne North West constituency but is included in a Hexham and Cramlington constituency.

In our initial proposals we allocated 21 constituencies entirely contained within Tyne and Wear, County Durham, Darlington, and Cleveland (Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar, and Stockton) and one cross-county constituency with Northumberland (see above). Given numerical constraints, and the allocation of three constituencies to the County of Northumberland, we have decided to treat the rest of the North East region as one sub-region and propose it contains 22 constituencies. Our revised proposals have changed 17 of the initial proposals in this sub-region, and retained five of them unchanged.

In our revised proposals we have proposed four cross-county constituencies: Billingham and Sedgefield, Blaydon, Hartlepool, and Houghton and Seaham. In all instances, cross-county constituencies have been necessary to maintain local ties or due to numerical constraints.

## How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us. The best way to respond to our revised proposals is through our consultation website: [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk).

# 1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

**1.1** The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required by Parliament to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every five years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries. We also make recommendations for any changes in the names of individual constituencies.

**1.2** The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners take decisions on what recommendations to make for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 21 assistant commissioners (two or three allocated to each of the nine regions of England). Further information about the Commissioners and assistant commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our corporate website.<sup>2</sup>

**1.3** Our consultation website at [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk) contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing [information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk](mailto:information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk), by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

The Secretary to the Commission  
Boundary Commission for England  
35 Great Smith Street  
London  
SW1P 3BQ

<sup>2</sup> <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us>

## 2 Background to the 2018 Review

**2.1** There are four Boundary Commissions covering the UK with separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 states that they must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, every five years. Under the current review, we must report in September 2018. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the North East.

**2.2** Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. If our recommendations are accepted, they would be used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.

**2.3** The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 501. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our Guide to the 2018 Review of Parliamentary constituencies ('the Guide'),<sup>3</sup> published in the summer of 2016, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 71,031 and 78,507 electors.

**2.4** This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, the largest constituency currently has around twice as many electors as the smallest. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant scale of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

**2.5** If implemented, the recommendations that we will make in September 2018 will be the first set of boundaries to be defined under the new rules. While there has to be a significant amount of change across the country, we will, where possible, try to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors. Under the Act, we have a challenging job to do in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in a pattern of constituencies that is unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless the review has been one that we have conducted in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

**2.6** The revised proposals that we set out in this report, and in the reports for the other eight regions across England, are made on the basis of the evidence we received during two consultation exercises, the careful consideration of our assistant commissioners and the best judgement of the three Boundary Commissioners.

<sup>3</sup> Available at <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/2018-review>

We are confident that these revised proposals strike the best balance between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There may be particular areas across the country where our judgement has been a balanced and marginal one between competing alternatives, and in such cases we have made clear that we are looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many areas we are persuaded by the evidence we have received thus far, and we would therefore require new and significantly stronger arguments to make us depart from our revised proposals. If it exists, such new and compelling evidence would be welcome. However, we will not be assisted by repetition of arguments that have already been made, and which we have already considered. The requirement to keep constituencies within the permitted range of electors is strict, but otherwise we have sought to balance often conflicting considerations. Our proposals must also be comprehensive. We are acutely conscious that very often a change in one constituency necessarily requires an alteration in another and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.

**2.7** The Guide contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the Guide, to enable

greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

## The rules in the legislation

**2.8** The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 74,769. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- special geographical considerations, including the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency
- local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015
- boundaries of existing constituencies
- any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

**2.9** It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2015, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. The Guide

outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries that have been amended since 2015.

**2.10** In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 10% of the existing constituencies in the North East – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

**2.11** Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to balance all the factors. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain three (10%) of the existing 29 constituencies in the North East.

## The use of the regions used for European elections

**2.12** Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the North East. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the 2018 Review we decided, in agreement with all the main political parties, to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in the Guide and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

**2.13** In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence across the country to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report, and all other regional reports, continues to use the regional boundaries as a basis for proposals for constituencies.



## Timetable for the review

### Stage one – initial proposals

**2.14** We began this review in February 2016 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the data pages of our corporate website.<sup>4</sup> The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2016.

### Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

**2.15** We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2016 to 5 December 2016. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received more than 18,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including more than 950 unique written representations relating to the North East. We also heard more than 50 oral representations at the two public hearings in the North East. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

### Stage three – consultation on representations received

**2.16** The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to send us comments on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 28 February 2017 and invited comments on them until 27 March 2017. We received more than 7,500 unique written representations across the country as a whole during those four weeks.

### Stage four – publication of revised proposals

**2.17** As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation), on 17 October 2017, we are publishing this report – Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in North East – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 11 December 2017. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

<sup>4</sup> <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/data-and-resources>

## Stage five – final recommendations

**2.18** Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 11 December 2017, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this during September 2018. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in the Guide.

**2.19** At the launch of each stage of consultation, we have taken – and are continuing to take – all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

# 3 Revised proposals for the North East

**3.1** In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of two assistant commissioners for the North East – Eileen Brady and Adele Baumgardt – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. This included chairing public hearings held in the region to collect oral evidence, as follows:

- Newcastle: 14 – 15 November 2016
- Darlington: 17 – 18 November 2016

**3.2** We asked the assistant commissioners to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of evidence provided in the representations. It is important to stress that the assistant commissioners had no involvement in developing – and therefore no vested interest in supporting – our initial proposals. Accordingly, they came to the analysis with an independent mind, open to viable alternative proposals supported by evidence. We are incredibly grateful for the thorough and methodical approach the assistant commissioners have taken to their work.

**3.3** What follows in this chapter is:

- a brief recap of our initial proposals
- a description of the counter-proposals put forward during the consultations
- the assistant commissioners' analysis of the strength of the arguments for adoption of any of those counter-proposals
- our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.

**3.4** A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears at Annex A to this report.

**3.5** Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent's response we also include the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345. This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk). All representations received in response to the first two consultations are publicly available on this website. The representations received in response to these revised proposals will be published at the end of the review.

**3.6** The term 'ward' used throughout this document should be taken to mean electoral division in reference to Northumberland and County Durham.

## The sub-region split

**3.7** In developing our initial proposals we decided to review the North East as one region and not divide it into sub-regions when formulating Parliamentary constituencies. We considered that this would provide us with the greatest amount of flexibility in creating a pattern of constituencies across the whole region that were within 5% of the electoral quota. In developing the initial proposals we were also mindful of the need to respect natural boundaries and the external boundaries of local authorities as far as we could. As a result, we proposed a pattern of constituencies whereby only one constituency crossed the River Tyne within the Tyne and Wear metropolitan area, to the west of Newcastle upon Tyne and Gateshead, and only one constituency crossed the River Tees.

**3.8** A number of respondents proposed a different sub-regional framework. The Conservative Party (BCE-30304) and Aaron Fear (BCE-36097), among others, suggested that we should consider Northumberland as a sub-region in its own right. The rationale behind the Conservative Party's proposals were 'that as a vast rural county Northumberland is very different to the urban area of Tyne and Wear and should be reviewed separately'.

**3.9** There was also significant opposition to our proposed constituency of Newcastle upon Tyne North West. The main reason for this opposition was the inclusion of the 'orphan ward'<sup>5</sup> of Ponteland East and Stannington in this constituency, which crossed the county boundary between Tyne and Wear (the City of Newcastle upon Tyne) and Northumberland. We considered the numerous representations objecting to the inclusion of the ward in the constituency and whether the objections with regard to this ward were compelling enough to warrant revising our initial proposals and to consider Northumberland as a separate sub-region. In considering the representations we noted the submission from Christine Caisley (BCE-25649), who, in detailing the local ties that would be broken and 'the adverse effect on geographical considerations including size, shape and especially accessibility', also said, 'Newcastle North West ward is in an urban area whilst Ponteland East ward along with Stannington, and Whorlton are primarily rural areas with different needs and considerations'.

**3.10** A Northumberland sub-region would be entitled to three whole constituencies. Our assistant commissioners considered that there was considerable merit to the suggestions to treat Northumberland separately because it would then allow us to create constituencies that did not cross the county boundary between Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland. They therefore recommended to us that we treat Northumberland as a separate sub-region as this would allow for more cohesive constituencies in the entire region. We accept their recommendation and, as a result, we have therefore decided to adopt this configuration and treat Northumberland on its own. The proposed Northumberland sub-region would therefore comprise the existing constituencies of Berwick-upon-Tweed, Hexham, Wansbeck, and Blyth Valley. Among the counter-proposals, most broadly supported the treatment of Northumberland as a separate sub-region.

**3.11** In the next sections of our report, we consider each sub-region in turn, summarising our initial proposals followed by the responses and counter-proposals received, before setting out our recommendations on the basis of the evidence received and in accordance with the statutory rules for the 2018 Review. The North East region, although the smallest in England, presented particular challenges in having, proportionately, the largest reduction in constituencies. The geographic nature of the region, split between an urban east and south and a rural north and west, gave us and the assistant commissioners significant challenges in addressing the obvious

<sup>5</sup> 'Orphan ward' refers to a clear minority of wards (usually just one ward) from one local authority, in a constituency where the overwhelming majority of wards are from another local authority.

areas of objection, particularly in the rural hinterlands around urban areas. Inevitably, there are compromises that we must accept, given the statutory rules relating to the electorate size of each constituency – we have seen this in the North East region around the City of Durham and the communities to the east and south. However, we consider that our revised proposals better reflect the overall balance of the evidence and the statutory factors than the initial proposals.

## Northumberland

**3.12** Of the four existing constituencies in Northumberland, all have electorates that are currently more than 5% below the electoral quota. In developing our initial proposals we constructed three constituencies that were wholly contained within the county boundaries: Berwick and Ashington, Blyth Valley, and Hexham and Morpeth, and one cross-county boundary constituency, Newcastle upon Tyne North West.

**3.13** As the electorate of the existing Berwick-upon-Tweed constituency was only 55,548, we had included in the constituency wards that comprise the towns of Ashington and Newbiggin-by-the-Sea from the existing Wansbeck constituency. This change brought the new Berwick and Ashington constituency within the permitted electorate range. To compensate for the inclusion of the towns of Berwick and Ashington in our proposed Berwick and Ashington constituency, we included the Rothbury and Longhorsley wards, and the three wards of Morpeth Kirkehill, Morpeth North, and Morpeth Stobhill in our proposed Hexham and Morpeth constituency. In order to bring

the constituency within the permitted electorate range, wards from the towns of Bedlington, Sleekburn, and Stakeford were included in our proposed Blyth Valley constituency.

**3.14** We received some support for our initial configuration of constituencies in Northumberland from the Labour Party (BCE-33280) and Adam Gray (BCE-16526). The Labour Party supported our proposals in the main; however, they called for the Stakeford ward to be included in our proposed Berwick and Ashington constituency given its strong ties to Choppington. Adam Gray stated ‘I broadly support the Commission’s proposed division of the county.’ However, he went on to express reservations about a cross-county Newcastle upon Tyne North West constituency and suggested an alternative arrangement for this constituency.

**3.15** We received representations from the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281) and Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-28618) which suggested that parts of the town of Ponteland be included in a constituency with Newcastle upon Tyne wards. Our assistant commissioners considered that both proposals had merit, particularly as they avoided the creation of a constituency that crossed the River Tyne in the Newcastle upon Tyne area. However, as it was possible to create three constituencies wholly contained within the County of Northumberland, our assistant commissioners agreed that we should reject this proposal as they also considered that the urban and rural mix of the proposed constituency would cause unnecessary disruption to existing local ties. We agree with their recommendation to reject this counter-proposal.

**3.16** The Green Party (BCE-30227) proposed a pattern of constituencies in Northumberland that combined parts of north-west Newcastle upon Tyne with the town of Cramlington. However, our assistant commissioners noted that there is no physical connection between the Castle and Cramlington West wards as they are detached from each other by the Ponteland East and Stannington ward. In view of this, our assistant commissioners agreed that the Green Party's scheme for the Northumberland sub-region should be rejected. We agree.

**3.17** The majority of respondents preferred to link the towns of Berwick with Morpeth, and Ashington with Blyth and create a constituency which combined the towns of Hexham and Cramlington. The Conservative Party (BCE-30304), Alex Stannard (BCE-28426), Aaron Fear (BCE-36097), Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) and Paul Tinnion (BCE-16370) all suggested that this alternative pattern of constituencies would better reflect local community ties. In his representation David Hilton (BCE-36064) said, 'Morpeth has much better links with Alnwick and Berwick than it does with Hexham. Rothbury has strong links with Alnwick, Morpeth and Wooler, and has no direct public transport or even good road links with Hexham.' David Hilton also maintained that Ashington has very little in common with Berwick and has much closer cultural links with Blyth. This position was supported by Aaron Fear who said: 'Ashington, with its coal mining heritage, seems to me a closer fit with Blyth than with Berwick upon Tweed.'

**3.18** It was suggested that the revised Hexham and Cramlington constituency should contain all four Ponteland wards, thus avoiding the inclusion of any 'orphan wards' in the constituency. A number of the representations had expressed concern that Ponteland East and Stannington ward would become an 'orphan ward' in the proposed constituency of Newcastle upon Tyne North West and it was suggested that there were more closely established links between Ponteland and Hexham. On day one of the Newcastle upon Tyne public hearing Councillor Eileen Armstrong (BCE-28380) said, 'links to Hexham are far more accommodating in terms of travel time and expense'. Councillor Armstrong additionally expressed her reservations over the potential relationship between the rural Ponteland East and Stannington ward and the urban Newcastle upon Tyne area.

**3.19** Our assistant commissioners considered that the evidence provided by Aaron Fear (BCE-36097) was more persuasive than the counter-proposals submitted by the Labour Party (BCE-33280) and Adam Gray (BCE-16526), and, in view of the strong support for an alternative pattern of constituencies in Northumberland, they agreed that linking Berwick with Morpeth, Ashington with Blyth, and Hexham with Cramlington would better reflect local ties. This view was supported by representations and by the Member of Parliament for Berwick-upon-Tweed, Anne-Marie Trevelyan (BCE-32805), who considered that this configuration would 'see Northumberland having three natural constituencies comprised of like-minded communities that use the same



services'. In Aaron Fear's proposal, the constituency of Berwick and Morpeth would include the wards of Bellingham, Rothbury, Longhorsley, Choppington, and Stakeford. The wards of the town of Cramlington would be included in a constituency that included Hexham and all four Ponteland wards. The towns of Ashington and Newbiggin-by-the-Sea would be included in a Blyth Valley constituency.

**3.20** Having analysed the evidence submitted, it was evident to the assistant commissioners that Ashington has much closer ties to Blyth than it does to Berwick-upon-Tweed. Likewise, transport links connecting Berwick and Morpeth were considered to be better than those linking Hexham and Morpeth.

**3.21** Our assistant commissioners noted the counter-proposal submitted by the Conservative Party (BCE-30304), which maintained three constituencies wholly within the county boundaries of Northumberland. However, they considered that the division of the towns of Cramlington and Ashington was unnecessary and would result in significant disruption.

**3.22** Our assistant commissioners advised us that a revised solution that combines Berwick with Morpeth, Ashington with Blyth, and Hexham with Cramlington best reflects local ties in the area, given the constraints on the electorate size of each constituency. They were aware that a constituency that includes Hexham and Cramlington is not ideal as its geographical extent stretches east to west across much of the North

East region, but it was their view that the recommended constituency allowed for more cohesive constituencies in the rest of the sub-region.

**3.23** Our assistant commissioners considered that the counter-proposal presented by Aaron Fear (BCE-36097) maintained local ties and caused the least disruption as it avoided the division of the towns of Cramlington and Ashington. They therefore recommended to us that we adopt Aaron Fear's counter-proposal for all the constituencies in the Northumberland sub-region.

**3.24** We accept the assistant commissioners' recommendations for Northumberland.

### **Newcastle upon Tyne, Gateshead, North Tyneside, South Tyneside, Sunderland, and County Durham**

**3.25** Of the nine existing constituencies in the local authorities of Newcastle upon Tyne, North Tyneside, Gateshead and South Tyneside, only North Tyneside and Tynemouth are currently within 5% of the electoral quota. Both constituencies were retained unchanged in our initial proposals. Within the local authorities of Sunderland and County Durham, only Sunderland Central was within 5% of the electoral quota. We also retained this constituency unchanged in our initial proposals. Where possible, we attempted to minimise changes to existing constituencies. However, given the electoral constraints, some constituencies experienced significant changes to their configuration.

**3.26** In developing our initial proposals we considered the River Tyne, particularly in central Newcastle upon Tyne, to be a significant geographical barrier. We were also cognisant of the views expressed during the discontinued 2013 Review, where concerns were raised regarding the possibility of the re-creation of a cross-Tyne constituency. A number of respondents such as the Green Party (BCE-30227), Adam Gray (BCE-16526), Paul Tinnion (BCE-16370), Aaron Fear (BCE-36097) and Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) suggested in their representations the construction of a cross-Tyne constituency that included parts of the City of Newcastle upon Tyne with communities from the Borough of Gateshead. It was claimed in these counter-proposals that there are significantly more transport links and crossings at this point of the river than there are further west in Blaydon. Adam Gray drew attention to the fact that, following regeneration of the riverfront, there are more reasons for people to travel across from one side of the river to the other, and by implication, that objections might not be as strong as they had been in the past. However, a number of representations contradicted this viewpoint. The Labour Party (BCE-33280) said that the proposed Tyne Bridge constituency in the 2013 Review ‘was unpopular in that it put together two communities which were distinct and separate’.

**3.27** The Conservative Party (BCE-30304), the Labour Party (BCE-33280) and Alex Stannard (BCE-28426) all proposed crossing the River Tyne further west in Blaydon. We received a number of representations that objected to our initial proposals in which we had crossed the River Tyne in the Blaydon constituency. Pat McGee (BCE-16122) said, ‘there has formerly been a cross Tyne constituency, called Tyne Bridge. This faced similar problems which the current proposals will face. The historic division between Gateshead and Newcastle is one thing, but my main concern is the result which would have some wards taking issues to Newcastle Council, and some to Gateshead.’ Elizabeth Flint (BCE-29084) said, ‘The proposal for the new Blaydon constituency which includes Benwell and Scotswood is split by the river. It means that most of our newly proposed constituency would be south of the River Tyne and would have different interests to those of us who live in Benwell and Scotswood ... Our links to areas such as Fenham, Wingrove, Elswick and Blakelaw, which are north of the river, are much stronger and our needs are similar to theirs. We consider ourselves to reside in the west end of the city of Newcastle upon Tyne and consider ourselves to be part of the city and not part of the more rural area south of the river ... Benwell and Scotswood should be included in the new constituency of Newcastle upon Tyne North West and should NOT be assigned to the proposed Blaydon constituency.’



**3.28** As we had noted, the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281) did not propose crossing the Tyne at any point in Newcastle upon Tyne. However, this configuration of constituencies had a significant knock-on effect on their proposals for Northumberland in which they created a Newcastle upon Tyne North West constituency containing the two Northumberland wards of Ponteland East and Stannington, and Ponteland South with Heddon. The Liberal Democrats considered that this configuration would prevent any danger of Ponteland East and Stannington being an ‘orphan ward’ in the proposed constituency. The presence of ‘strong connections between much of Ponteland and the North & West of Newcastle’ was also cited as justification for this proposal.

**3.29** In Newcastle upon Tyne, apart from the reuniting of the two Gosforth wards (East and West) and the unchanged constituencies of North Tyneside and Tynemouth, our assistant commissioners considered that there was no consistent pattern of constituencies counter-proposed by respondents.

**3.30** Our assistant commissioners considered evidence, both written and oral, that had been received. Despite a number of representations that proposed the re-creation of a Tyne Bridge constituency, they concluded that such a proposal should not be adopted. The assistant commissioners considered that this point had been reinforced following their visit to the area where the River Tyne was

observed and considered to be a notable geographical barrier separating the two communities either side of it. As a result, our assistant commissioners agreed that the constituencies of Newcastle upon Tyne North West and Newcastle upon Tyne East should both be bound by the River Tyne to their south. The revised Newcastle upon Tyne East constituency would be very similar to the existing constituency plus the inclusion of the two Gosforth wards. We agree.

**3.31** The assistant commissioners noted the objections to crossing the River Tyne in our proposed Blaydon constituency and considered the objections articulated by individuals such as Brian Tate (BCE-30110) and Councillor Rob Higgins (BCE-28369). A number of alternatives were examined. However, given that the recommendations to consider Northumberland as a separate sub-region in its own right had been agreed with three constituencies wholly contained within the county, the numerical and geographical constraints meant that a constituency that crossed the River Tyne somewhere was unavoidable.

**3.32** Our assistant commissioners acknowledged the ties that the wards of Elswick, and Benwell and Scotswood shared with other Newcastle upon Tyne wards, as expressed, among others, by Councillor Ann Schofield (BCE-28114), who said, ‘Elswick currently is in close geographical proximity on or near the river with the Newcastle Wards of Benwell & Scotswood, Fenham, Wingrove, Westgate and parts of Blakelaw often known as

the 'Inner West' area of the city. This provides a working logic for collaboration between these wards that is cost saving and meaningful across public, voluntary and private sectors providing services.' We also received a petition with 304 signatures on behalf of the Black Asian Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities from Councillor Habibur Rahman (BCE-29058). Our assistant commissioners considered that this, and the other evidence that had been submitted regarding this issue, was persuasive and that these links should be retained where possible. However, they concluded that it would not be possible to also include the Benwell and Scotswood ward in the Newcastle upon Tyne North West constituency in the context of their recommendations for the other constituencies elsewhere. For that reason, our assistant commissioners considered including the Elswick ward in the proposed Newcastle upon Tyne North West constituency and the Benwell and Scotswood ward in the Blaydon constituency. To compensate for this change, they recommended that the Westerhope ward also be included in the Blaydon constituency given that the ward lay adjacent to the Denton ward. We agree.

**3.33** Both our proposed North Tyneside and Tynemouth constituencies received widespread support in the representations. Our assistant commissioners recommended that keeping these two constituencies unchanged would be more compliant with the statutory criteria. We agree.

**3.34** Our initial proposals in the South Shields area were largely opposed, particularly with regard to the inclusion of Simonside and Rekendyke ward, and the Boldon Colliery ward, in the Jarrow and South Shields constituencies respectively. Local residents of Simonside and Rekendyke argued that they have closer ties with the South Shields constituency than they do with Jarrow. Vic Young (BCE-30997), in his representation said: 'I am a local businessman of over 40 years' standing in South Shields and currently employ nearly 90 staff within my car sales and repair business, the majority of whom are local residents. My business is based within the Simonside and Rekendyke ward. I am also proud to have been born and raised in South Shields. I believe that your initial proposals to move Simonside and Rekendyke into Jarrow are flawed and deeply unpopular. The riverside communities of Tyne Dock, Holborn, Rekendyke and Simonside have always been part of South Shields and all of these residents regard themselves as proud 'Sand-dancers'.'

**3.35** We received a counter-proposal petition from South Tyneside Council (BCE-33254 and BCE-36813) with 409 signatures which asked for the return of the Simonside and Rekendyke ward to South Shields and the Boldon Colliery ward to Jarrow. To compensate for these changes to our initial proposals, the petition proposed that the Bede ward be split, with the LC (Brockley Whins) polling district being included in the South Shields constituency with the rest of the Bede ward remaining in the Jarrow constituency. The counter-proposal stated that the Commission's initial proposals

showed ‘no knowledge or understanding of the historical and social cohesion they cut through’. South Tyneside Council said that its proposal would ‘retain strong cohesive community links’ and urged the Commission to adopt it. The Green Party (BCE-30227) representation suggested an identical treatment of the Bede ward in its counter-proposal for the area.

**3.36** Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence received from the district council and local residents regarding the Simonside and Rekendyke, and Boldon Colliery wards. They acknowledged the strength of feeling, and noted that the only counter-proposals that would address these two issues, which did not result in either a Tyne crossing between Newcastle and Gateshead or significant disruption to the Sunderland constituencies, resulted in the splitting of the Bede ward. Noting that the evidence to split a ward had to be ‘exceptional and compelling’, our assistant commissioners did not consider that there was persuasive evidence to justify the resulting break in community ties in the area. This was confirmed by their observations on the site visit they carried out.

**3.37** Our assistant commissioners noted that Brockley Whins was a small, tightly knit residential estate containing facilities and services used by residents from polling districts LC and LD – for example, the social club the Red Hackle. They considered that the proposal to split Bede ward and transfer polling district LC to the South Shields constituency would break the established community ties between

polling districts LC and LD of Bede ward. It was further observed that the A1300 John Reid Road was a significant barrier that clearly separated the communities of Bede ward, and Simonside and Rekendyke ward. The assistant commissioners considered that, in the absence of compelling evidence, they could not recommend splitting the Bede ward in order to address the local ties issues. However, the assistant commissioners encouraged us to specifically invite further evidence on this issue as part of the revised proposals consultation.

**3.38** They therefore recommended a South Shields constituency as proposed in our initial proposals, with the three wards of Castle, Redhill, and Washington North being included in a revised Washington and Sunderland West constituency (see below) rather than in a Jarrow constituency. Our assistant commissioners recommended a proposed enlargement of the Jarrow constituency by including the four wards of Felling, High Fell, Pelaw and Heworth, and Windy Nook and Whitehills, to the west of the constituency. A revised Gateshead West constituency would comprise five wards from the existing Blaydon constituency and seven wards from the existing Gateshead constituency. Our assistant commissioners were aware that this configuration had not been suggested in the counter-proposals, but they considered that it was an appropriate solution in the area and a consequence of resolving issues elsewhere in the region. We agree.

**3.39** In Wearside, the majority of the counter-proposals agreed with our approach to retain the existing Sunderland Central constituency unchanged. A substantial number of respondents proposed variations to the existing Washington and Sunderland West constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-30304), Aaron Fear (BCE-36097) and Oskar Avery (BCE-29234) proposed that the existing constituency should be augmented by the inclusion of the Sandhill ward. Some respondents included the town of Washington in a constituency with the town of Chester-le-Street. There was significant opposition to the town of Washington being split, such as from Katie D'Arcy (BCE-24013) who stated 'this proposed change concerns me. I live in Washington, an area which already feels neglected by its local authority and MPs as the feeling is that attention is focused on Sunderland city centre rather than the outlying areas. This proposal splits Washington in two, with Washington Village which is in reality the centre of Washington sitting right on the edge of the constituency with the whole area of the town north of the boundary being pushed into the Jarrow area.' Despite various patterns of constituencies for Wearside, the majority of the counter-proposals received included all five wards of the town of Washington in a single constituency.

**3.40** In view of the degree of support for the unchanged Sunderland Central constituency, the assistant commissioners did not consider that any changes to this constituency would be necessary. We agree.

**3.41** The evidence received by the Members of Parliament for Washington and Sunderland West, Sunderland Central, and Houghton and Sunderland South, as well as members of the public, regarding Washington and Sunderland was examined and thoroughly considered. The Conservative Party (BCE-30304) and Aaron Fear (BCE-36097) suggested a revised constituency of Washington and Sunderland West which would be the same as the existing constituency plus the addition of the Sandhill ward. The assistant commissioners considered that this proposal would keep all the Washington wards together while also respecting existing constituencies where possible. A revised Houghton and Seaham constituency was suggested by the assistant commissioners that included the wards of Dawdon, Deneside, and Seaham to compensate for the inclusion of the Sandhill ward in the Washington and Sunderland West constituency that they agreed should be revised. The A690 and A19 roads were considered to be accessible transport routes that would serve the entire constituency. They were also aware that Dawdon, Deneside, and Seaham look towards the Easington and Murton wards, but numerical constraints meant that these wards could not also be included in the same constituency. We agree with these recommendations.

**3.42** In County Durham, most respondents included the two Barnard Castle wards of Barnard Castle East and Barnard Castle West in a constituency with Bishop Auckland. It was claimed this would be a naturally cohesive constituency given that the transport links ran west-east along the A688. In the City of Durham, the majority of the representations broadly agreed with our initial proposals by including the wards of Brandon, and Deerness in a constituency with the City of Durham. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281) proposed the inclusion of the City of Durham in a constituency with Chester-le-Street suggesting that both city and town were connected via the A1 corridor. Conversely, the Conservative Party (BCE-30304) proposed a constituency linking the City of Durham with Newton Aycliffe and Sedgfield.

**3.43** Our assistant commissioners considered a proposal for a North Durham and Chester-le-Street constituency that is the same as the existing North Durham constituency plus the inclusion of the ward of Framwellgate and Newton Hall. They noted that the electorate of the existing North Durham constituency was just below the permitted electorate range and that the addition of one ward would bring it within 5% of the electoral quota. In formulating this revised constituency, the assistant commissioners considered that the proposal submitted by the Liberal Democrat Party had some merit, in that Framwellgate and Newton Hall was well connected to Chester-le-Street via the A167. It was considered that this would act as an essential transport link for constituents.

**3.44** Our assistant commissioners considered that there were no specific features to prevent the ward of Framwellgate and Newton Hall being added to the proposed North Durham and Chester-le-Street constituency, which was confirmed by their site visit. They were not convinced of any overriding need to keep that ward with the City of Durham. The assistant commissioners acknowledged that the inclusion of that ward in the North Durham and Chester-le-Street constituency was untested, and considered that further evidence on this issue should be invited on this aspect of the revised proposals. We agree.

**3.45** In order to achieve the best balance between the evidence and the statutory criteria across the region, it is acknowledged that the City of Durham constituency requires considerable change from the initial proposals. The assistant commissioners advised us that, for that reason, it was necessary to combine the City of Durham with the coastal towns to its east of Easington and Peterlee. They acknowledged that the links between the City of Durham and these coastal towns were not the most obvious nor established. Furthermore, they acknowledged that the town of Easington may look more towards Dawdon and Deneside while the City of Durham had more established ties with the surrounding wards of Brandon, Coxhoe, and Framwellgate and Newton Hall. However, it was their view that this configuration allowed a better pattern of constituencies across the North East region as a whole. They recommended combining four wards of the proposed City of Durham constituency, namely Belmont, Durham South, Elvet and Gilesgate, and Neville's Cross with the towns of Easington,

Horden, Murton, Peterlee, Sherburn, and Shotton. This revised constituency would be called City of Durham and Easington. We challenged the assistant commissioners on this constituency, given its unusual make-up and the fact that this composition was not extensively consulted on. They replied that, in order to address the issues to the north and south of this area (discussed elsewhere), the best balance between the statutory factors for the whole region would be achieved by recommending this constituency. We accept their recommendations.

**3.46** Our assistant commissioners considered that the existing North West Durham constituency should be maintained as far as possible, and suggested only minimal changes. The wards of Burnopfield and Dipton, and Willington and Hunwick were included in the revised Blaydon and Bishop Auckland constituencies respectively (see below). They also recommended that the wards of Brandon, Deerness, and Esh and Witton Gilbert be included in the revised North West Durham constituency from the proposed City of Durham. We agree with their recommendations.

**3.47** There were a large number of representations from respondents that proposed the ‘reuniting’ of the Barnard Castle East and Barnard Castle West wards, and our assistant commissioners examined ways in which this could be achieved. The evidence submitted by the Mid Teesdale Project Partnership (BCE-24953) persuaded the assistant commissioners that dividing the town of Barnard Castle between constituencies would be divisive and damaging to the

local community. Ian Moorhouse, writing on behalf of the Partnership said: ‘it seems a divisive step to split Barnard Castle into two constituencies. This, our nearest town, is a united community and it is difficult to imagine any benefit accruing either to it or to the area from your current proposals.’ A revised Bishop Auckland constituency was therefore proposed which was the same as the existing constituency plus the addition of the ward of Willington and Hunwick. The existing constituency was therefore maintained as best it could be, with the assistant commissioners agreeing that the evidence provided by Richard Child (BCE-19737) was particularly relevant. He said, ‘the main road links tend to run west-east in Teesdale rather north-south and I consider Teesdale to be the region covered by the two Barnard Castle wards.’ The A688 was considered to be a vital road link as it connected the town of Barnard Castle to Bishop Auckland. The assistant commissioners considered the evidence submitted and recommended a revised Bishop Auckland constituency. We agree.

### **Cleveland (Middlesbrough, Stockton, Hartlepool and Redcar) and Darlington**

**3.48** Of the seven existing constituencies in the Cleveland and Darlington area, Stockton South is the only constituency currently within 5% of the electoral quota. The constituencies of Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland, Redcar, and Stockton North are all below the permitted electorate range. In developing our initial proposals, we proposed changes to all the existing constituencies in this area.



**3.49** In our initial proposals, we proposed a Hartlepool and Billingham constituency comprising nine wards from the Hartlepool local authority, and four of the five Billingham wards. The Billingham West ward was included in a proposed Stockton West constituency. The majority of residents objected to this proposed constituency on the basis that the towns of Hartlepool and Billingham shared very little commonality and were geographically distinct. Stuart Cowling (BCE-18596) said, 'The proposed constituency would result in an 8 mile distance between Billingham and Hartlepool centres and, indeed, 2 clear miles of "green belt" at their closest points.' Further objections came from Councillor Chris Clough (BCE-22897), who stated, 'Hartlepool and Billingham are very different communities, which have little or nothing in common and have no cross cultural links that can be identified. The centres are separated by 5 miles of open country. To move the majority of Billingham into Hartlepool has nothing to recommend it.'

**3.50** Respondents also expressed concern over the Billingham West ward being included in a different constituency to the rest of the town under our initial proposals. It was submitted by Richard Radley (BCE-17230) that the new A19 bypass would be a more suitable boundary which would allow all five wards that formed the town of Billingham to remain together. Furthermore, Councillor Ann McCoy (BCE-16929) said that 'splitting one of the Billingham Wards from the rest will break up the community identity that the people of Billingham value.'

**3.51** There were two main patterns of constituencies that were proposed for the Hartlepool local authority. A number of respondents suggested only minor changes to our proposed Hartlepool and Billingham constituency. These changes involved including all five Billingham wards in a constituency with Hartlepool and consequently placing the Jesmond ward in a constituency with parts of East Durham. The second alternative put forward for the Hartlepool area, by individuals such as Adrian Bailey (BCE-30239) and Aaron Fear (BCE-36097), suggested a Hartlepool constituency containing the entirety of the Hartlepool local authority, together with the Durham wards of Blackhalls and Wingate.

**3.52** The counter-proposals from the Conservative Party (BCE-30304), Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281) and Oskar Avery (BCE-29234) suggested the inclusion of all five Billingham wards in a constituency with Hartlepool. All three made the point that the Billingham West ward would be in a separate constituency to the rest of the town. Alternatively, some counter-proposals looked to include the entire town of Billingham in a constituency with Sedgefield. Edward Carlsson-Browne (BCE-28618), Paul Tinnion (BCE-16370), Alex Stannard (BCE-28426) and Adrian Bailey (BCE-30239) were among those who suggested such a configuration.

**3.53** Our assistant commissioners were mindful that, if the proposals to reunite all five Billingham wards in a single constituency were to be adopted, it would not be possible to accommodate the counter-proposals received from Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) or Pete

Whitehead (BCE-28665) who had not included this aspect in their proposals. Oliver Raven included two Billingham wards in a Stockton constituency and three Billingham wards in a constituency with Hartlepool, while Pete Whitehead placed the Billingham West ward in a Stockton constituency.

**3.54** Our assistant commissioners considered there was merit in both the Conservative Party (BCE-30304) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281) counter-proposals. Both combined the five Billingham wards in a single constituency, and the three Norton wards of Norton West, Norton North, and Norton South also in a single constituency. However, both counter-proposals also combined the towns of Billingham and Hartlepool in the same constituency. Furthermore, both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrat Party removed the Jesmond ward from the proposed Hartlepool and Billingham constituency. Given its location, the assistant commissioners believed Jesmond was an integral part of the town of Hartlepool and that such a constituency would fail to meet the needs of the local community.

**3.55** Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the representations received that objected to the proposed Hartlepool and Billingham constituency, and sought alternative solutions. Respondents pointed to the fact that in the initial proposals the two Hartlepool wards of Hart and De Bruce would be included in a constituency with large parts of east Durham. This was outlined by Stephen Allison (BCE-21845) who claimed that ‘the Hart and De Bruce wards will

become orphans and detached from their established communities. They will be isolated outliers in a new constituency.’ On the basis of this evidence, which the assistant commissioners considered to be persuasive, they recommended to us a Hartlepool constituency containing the whole of the Hartlepool local authority plus the two Durham wards of Blackhalls and Wingate. They acknowledged that these wards may not look to Hartlepool, but elsewhere to the north and west, but they considered that the numerical constraints in constructing appropriate constituencies meant that the options before them were limited. The revised Hartlepool constituency would be similar to the existing constituency with the addition of the two aforementioned wards. We agree with this recommendation.

**3.56** Having reluctantly included Hartlepool in a constituency with parts of Durham, the assistant commissioners looked to avoid the splitting of the town of Billingham and to retain all five of its wards in a single constituency. Therefore, they recommended that the town of Billingham be included in a constituency with Sedgefield. They identified the A689 and A177 as essential transport links that would connect one end of the Billingham and Sedgefield constituency to the other. Our assistant commissioners proposed that this constituency be called Billingham and Sedgefield. While, again, we have reservations about the natural fit of these communities, we note that this constituency allows for a better pattern overall. We therefore agree.



**3.57** Our initial proposals for the Darlington constituency meant that the constituency boundaries would be coterminous with the borough boundary. This configuration received widespread support from local residents; however, we received some representations that suggested alterations to our initially proposed Darlington constituency, among them the Labour Party (BCE-33280) and Oliver Raven (BCE-39493). Our assistant commissioners took the view that, given the constituency would now be coterminous with the borough boundary under their recommendations, the constituency would be more compliant with the statutory factors. They also noted the widespread support this constituency received in the initial proposals, for example from Councillor Pauline Culley (BCE-22406) who said: 'I am in favour of the proposed boundaries as they will ensure that the rural wards of Heighington, Middleton St. George, Sadberge and Hurworth, which are included in Darlington for local government purposes, are aligned at last to the central government boundaries.' They considered that the counter-proposals would cause significant and unnecessary disruption to the local area. They therefore recommended to us that the proposed Darlington constituency should be retained and, in light of the match to local authority boundaries, we agree with them.

**3.58** Our initial proposals for the Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland constituency retained the five Middlesbrough wards of Coulby Newham, Marton East, Marton West, Nunthorpe, and Park End & Beckfield with 11 Redcar and Cleveland wards. The Hemlington, and Stainton & Thornton wards were included in our proposed Middlesbrough

West and Stockton East constituency, and the Ladgate ward was included in the proposed Middlesbrough North East and Redcar constituency.

**3.59** The initial proposals for Middlesbrough North East and Redcar constituency included six wards from the Middlesbrough local authority. Three wards of the existing Redcar constituency (Eston, Normanby, and Ormesby) were included in the proposed Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland constituency. Our proposed Stockton West constituency comprises wards forming the existing Stockton North and Stockton South constituencies and our initially proposed Middlesbrough West and Stockton East constituency was comprised of some wards from the existing Stockton North, Stockton South, Middlesbrough, and Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland constituencies.

**3.60** We received some support for parts of our initial proposals in the Cleveland area, namely the inclusion of Yarm and Eaglescliffe in the same constituency, for example, from the Conservative Party (BCE-30304), Paul Tinnion (BCE-16370), Adrian Bailey (30239) and Alex Stannard (BCE-28426). This was reiterated by David Oliver (BCE-40283) who said, 'Yarm & Eaglescliffe have a long tradition of close collaboration reflecting their close proximity. They are geographically and historically a ribbon development of Stockton and quite distinct from Middlesbrough as well as some distance from it.' We have additionally received a local campaign (BCE-37268) led by the then Member of Parliament for Stockton South, James Wharton, urging us to keep both Yarm and Eaglescliffe together.

**3.61** A counter-proposal from Graeme Robertson (BCE-20061) on behalf of the North Billingham Residents Association suggested the inclusion of the three wards of Yarm, Stainton & Thornton, and Loftus, in different North Yorkshire constituencies. We had agreed with our assistant commissioners to reject this proposal as the respondent did not consider the knock-on effects this proposal would have on otherwise largely undisturbed constituencies in North Yorkshire. As a result, we had decided that the North East regional boundary should not be crossed with any other region.

**3.62** The Labour Party's (BCE-33280) counter-proposal returned the Stockton Town Centre ward to a Stockton constituency. It was claimed this would provide the proposed Stockton West constituency with a focal point for the community as it would contain the town centre. However, a large number of respondents voiced their objection to the Labour Party's proposal to place the Yarm and Eaglescliffe wards in separate constituencies. Furthermore, the Labour Party's counter-proposal kept the local authorities of Middlesbrough and Stockton split across three different constituencies and left the town of Billingham divided.

**3.63** Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence that had been received. In view of the overwhelming level of support to include both the Yarm and Eaglescliffe wards in the same constituency, our assistant commissioners considered that the proposals from the Labour Party, Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281), Adam Gray (BCE-16526) and Oskar Avery (BCE-29234), which placed them in separate

constituencies, could not be adopted as suitable options. They were of the view that such a configuration for the area would unnecessarily break existing local ties. This was underlined by Lisa Taylor (BCE-38704) and Shirley Bond (BCE-41167) during the second period of public consultation. The assistant commissioners therefore recommended to us that we reject counter-proposals that place the wards of Yarm and Eaglescliffe in different constituencies. The assistant commissioners recommended Yarm and Eaglescliffe be included in a Stockton and Yarm constituency. We agree.

**3.64** The majority of representations received expressed concern over the division of the local authorities of Middlesbrough and Stockton between three constituencies. John Stuart (BCE-26303), representing Middlesbrough Borough Council, said that the local authority 'would be the minority authority' in the proposed constituencies for the area. There was also objection to the centres of both Middlesbrough and Stockton being included in the same constituency in our initial proposals. On day two of the public hearing held in Darlington, Councillor Matthew Storey (BCE-32885) objected to our initial proposals on the basis of the existing demographics and related socio-economic issues, saying, 'for a Member of Parliament to have to represent both of those conurbations would be particularly problematic and difficult. Also, it just does not make sense for Stockton's main economic centre and Middlesbrough's main economic centre to be in one parliamentary constituency. That to us did not really seem to make a lot of sense.'

**3.65** A number of counter-proposals were received which included the Stockton Town Centre ward in a predominantly Stockton constituency. This was to avoid both Middlesbrough and Stockton town centres being included in the same constituency, as highlighted above. These counter-proposals came from the Labour Party (BCE-33280), Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28281) and Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) among others. Our assistant commissioners also noted two emerging themes in the counter-proposals for the constituencies in the Redcar area: representations from the Conservative Party (BCE-30304), and Aaron Fear (BCE-36097) proposed that parts of Middlesbrough should be included in a constituency with the coastal town of Redcar, while others suggested they should be included in a Redcar and Guisborough constituency, for example Adam Gray (BCE-16526), who said, 'I have never really understood the point of combining remote rural wards with parts of the town of Middlesbrough. Instead I have combined the Cleveland parts of the constituency that used to be known as Langbaugh (and before that Cleveland and Whitby) with Redcar.' Lin Pilling (BCE-23383) also stated, 'the village of Marske-by-the-Sea and its town, Redcar, have much more in common with Saltburn-by-the-Sea and the East Cleveland area than with East Middlesbrough. The areas it was previously linked to.'

**3.66** The assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence submitted by local residents regarding the division of Middlesbrough across three constituencies. We received multiple representations claiming there were few links that existed between Middlesbrough and Redcar. This was outlined by local resident Ian Blades (BCE-16284) who stated: 'Middlesbrough has its own identity, the people of Middlesbrough have no association with the people of Redcar'. The assistant commissioners also noted that the industrial area in the Dormanstown ward appeared to provide a divide between the Middlesbrough and Redcar areas. They agreed that the evidence provided by Ian Blades, among others, was more persuasive than the evidence submitted by the Conservative Party (BCE-30304), the Labour Party (BCE-33280) and Aaron Fear (BCE-36097), who each called for different variations of a Middlesbrough East and Redcar constituency. The assistant commissioners considered that a constituency that contained both the towns of Redcar and Guisborough would allow for Middlesbrough to be divided across two different constituencies instead of three. Furthermore, they considered that a Redcar and Guisborough constituency would be more cohesive than a Middlesbrough and Redcar constituency as it would be more closely aligned with the local authority boundary of Redcar and Cleveland.

**3.67** Having examined the evidence submitted, the assistant commissioners considered the counter-proposals put forward by Alex Stannard (BCE-28426) and Adrian Bailey (BCE-30239). They noted that these counter-proposals acknowledged the existing links between the Yarm and Eaglescliffe wards and additionally combined all five Billingham wards in a single constituency. Moreover, these alternatives managed to include the Stockton Town Centre ward in a Stockton constituency as well as rejoin all three Norton wards in the same constituency. Although in both configurations the local authority of Middlesbrough is divided across two constituencies, we considered that this is an improvement on the initial proposals which divided Middlesbrough across three constituencies. Both proposals also avoid the construction of a constituency which stretches from Middlesbrough to the coastal town of Redcar.

**3.68** Our assistant commissioners believed these counter-proposals had considerable merit and therefore proposed three constituencies in this area: Middlesbrough South and Thornaby, Middlesbrough and Eston, and Redcar and East Cleveland. We agree.

## 4 How to have your say

**4.1** We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Government.

**4.2** While people are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. While we will consider representations that comment again on the initial proposals that we have not revised, it is likely that particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to depart at this late stage in the review from those of our initial proposals, which have withstood intensive scrutiny of objections in the process of consultation and review to which they have already been subject. Representations relating to initial proposals that we have not revised and that simply repeat evidence or arguments that have already been raised in either of the previous two consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.

**4.3** When responding, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament and the decisions we have taken regarding adoption of a regional approach and use of local government wards discussed in chapter 2 and in the Guide. Most importantly:

- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight).
- We are obliged by law to use the Parliamentary electorate figures as they were in the statutory electoral register published by local electoral registration officers between December 2015 and February 2016. We therefore cannot base our proposals for this constituency review on any subsequent electorate figures.
- We are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (at May 2015) as the building blocks of constituencies. Exceptional and compelling evidence needs to be provided to persuade us that splitting a ward across two constituencies is necessary or appropriate.
- We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Particularly compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

**4.4** These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a representation on a specific area to bear in mind the knock-on effects of their counter-proposals. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

### How can you give us your views?

**4.5** We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk), when contributing to our consultation. That website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can instantly and directly submit to us your views on our revised proposals. If you are unable to access our consultation website for any reason, you can still write to us at 35 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BQ.

**4.6** We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available in our Data Protection and Privacy Policy, at:

<http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/freedom-of-information-and-data-protection>

### What do we want views on?

**4.7** We would like particularly to ask two things of those considering responding on the revised proposals we have set out. First, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so, as well as telling us where you object to them. Past experience suggests that too often people who agree with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals. Second, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, do please use the resources available on our website and at the places of deposit (maps and electorate figures) to put forward counter-proposals which are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.

**4.8** Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in September 2018.

# Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
1. Berwick and Morpeth CC			77,026
	Alnwick	Northumberland	7,449
	Amble	Northumberland	3,408
	Amble West with Warkworth	Northumberland	3,318
	Bamburgh	Northumberland	3,450
	Bellingham	Northumberland	3,050
	Berwick East	Northumberland	3,215
	Berwick North	Northumberland	3,146
	Berwick West with Ord	Northumberland	2,943
	Choppington	Northumberland	3,442
	Druridge Bay	Northumberland	3,936
	Longhorsley	Northumberland	3,201
	Longhoughton	Northumberland	3,286
	Morpeth Kirkhill	Northumberland	4,015
	Morpeth North	Northumberland	3,650
	Morpeth Stobhill	Northumberland	3,502
	Norham and Islandshires	Northumberland	3,440
	Pegswood	Northumberland	3,833
	Rothbury	Northumberland	3,957
	Shilbottle	Northumberland	3,962
	Stakeford	Northumberland	3,505
	Wooler	Northumberland	3,318
2. Billingham and Sedgefield CC			78,205
	Aycliffe East	Durham	6,240
	Aycliffe North and Middridge	Durham	7,790
	Aycliffe West	Durham	5,403
	Bishop Middleham and Cornforth	Durham	2,937
	Chilton	Durham	2,970
	Coxhoe	Durham	9,280
	Ferryhill	Durham	8,151
	Sedgefield	Durham	6,274
	Billingham Central	Stockton-on-Tees	5,136
	Billingham East	Stockton-on-Tees	4,935
	Billingham North	Stockton-on-Tees	6,943
	Billingham South	Stockton-on-Tees	4,671
	Billingham West	Stockton-on-Tees	4,521
	Northern Parishes	Stockton-on-Tees	2,954
3. Bishop Auckland CC			71,135
	Barnard Castle East	Durham	6,492
	Barnard Castle West	Durham	6,319
	Bishop Auckland Town	Durham	5,947
	Coundon	Durham	3,010
	Evenwood	Durham	6,231
	Shildon and Dene Valley	Durham	9,384
	Spennymoor	Durham	8,444
	Tudhoe	Durham	6,079
	West Auckland	Durham	6,375
	Willington and Hunwick	Durham	6,822
	Woodhouse Close	Durham	6,032



Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
4. Blaydon CC			76,791
	Burnopfield and Dipton	Durham	5,962
	Blaydon	Gateshead	6,953
	Chopwell and Rowlands Gill	Gateshead	6,954
	Crawcrook and Greenside	Gateshead	6,659
	Ryton, Crookhill and Stella	Gateshead	6,818
	Winlaton and High Spen	Gateshead	6,702
	Benwell and Scotswood	Newcastle upon Tyne	8,020
	Denton	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,356
	Lemington	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,030
	Newburn	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,894
	Westerhope	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,443
5. Blyth and Ashington CC			78,241
	Ashington Central	Northumberland	3,181
	Bedlington Central	Northumberland	3,483
	Bedlington East	Northumberland	3,130
	Bedlington West	Northumberland	3,577
	Bothal	Northumberland	3,420
	College	Northumberland	3,368
	Cowpen	Northumberland	3,050
	Croft	Northumberland	2,883
	Hartley	Northumberland	3,883
	Haydon	Northumberland	3,486
	Hirst	Northumberland	3,113
	Holywell	Northumberland	3,966
	Isabella	Northumberland	3,102
	Kitty Brewster	Northumberland	4,009
	Lynemouth	Northumberland	3,207
	Newbiggin Central and East	Northumberland	3,378
	Newsham	Northumberland	3,179
	Plessey	Northumberland	3,283
	Seaton with Newbiggin West	Northumberland	3,425
	Seghill with Seaton Delaval	Northumberland	4,146
	Sleekburn	Northumberland	3,180
	South Blyth	Northumberland	3,579
	Wensleydale	Northumberland	3,213
6. City of Durham and Easington CC			77,002
	Belmont	Durham	10,115
	Durham South	Durham	1,619
	Easington	Durham	5,559
	Elvet and Gilesgate	Durham	4,081
	Horden	Durham	5,809
	Murton	Durham	5,820
	Neville's Cross	Durham	6,502
	Passfield	Durham	3,539
	Peterlee East	Durham	5,484
	Peterlee West	Durham	6,119
	Sherburn	Durham	6,531
	Shotton and South Hetton	Durham	6,413
	Trimdon and Thornley	Durham	9,411
7. Darlington BC			74,929
	Bank Top and Lascelles	Darlington	4,550
	Brinkburn and Faverdale	Darlington	4,553
	Cockerton	Darlington	4,534
	College	Darlington	3,288
	Eastbourne	Darlington	4,571
	Harrowgate Hill	Darlington	4,809
	Haughton and Springfield	Darlington	4,733
	Heighington and Coniscliffe	Darlington	3,276



Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Hummersknott	Darlington	3,168
	Hurworth	Darlington	2,867
	Mowden	Darlington	3,102
	North Road	Darlington	4,231
	Northgate	Darlington	2,453
	Park East	Darlington	4,488
	Park West	Darlington	3,282
	Pierremont	Darlington	4,233
	Red Hall and Lingfield	Darlington	2,548
	Sadberge and Middleton St. George	Darlington	4,598
	Stephenson	Darlington	2,474
	Whinfield	Darlington	3,171
8. Gateshead West BC			75,965
	Birtley	Gateshead	5,984
	Bridges	Gateshead	5,316
	Chowdene	Gateshead	6,892
	Deckham	Gateshead	6,371
	Dunston Hill and Whickham East	Gateshead	6,586
	Dunston and Teams	Gateshead	5,823
	Lamesley	Gateshead	6,963
	Lobley Hill and Bensham	Gateshead	6,860
	Low Fell	Gateshead	6,910
	Saltwell	Gateshead	5,470
	Whickham North	Gateshead	6,307
	Whickham South and Sunnyside	Gateshead	6,483
9. Hartlepool CC			77,215
	Blackhalls	Durham	6,101
	Wingate	Durham	2,913
	Burn Valley	Hartlepool	5,903
	De Bruce	Hartlepool	5,597
	Fens and Rossmere	Hartlepool	7,003
	Foggy Furze	Hartlepool	6,286
	Hart	Hartlepool	6,731
	Headland and Harbour	Hartlepool	5,358
	Jesmond	Hartlepool	6,179
	Manor House	Hartlepool	7,188
	Rural West	Hartlepool	5,815
	Seaton	Hartlepool	6,693
	Victoria	Hartlepool	5,448
10. Hexham and Cramlington CC			77,181
	Bywell	Northumberland	3,457
	Corbridge	Northumberland	3,353
	Cramlington East	Northumberland	2,751
	Cramlington Eastfield	Northumberland	3,840
	Cramlington North	Northumberland	4,015
	Cramlington South East	Northumberland	3,738
	Cramlington Village	Northumberland	3,445
	Cramlington West	Northumberland	3,737
	Haltwhistle	Northumberland	3,583
	Haydon and Hadrian	Northumberland	3,321
	Hexham Central with Acomb	Northumberland	3,235
	Hexham East	Northumberland	3,228
	Hexham West	Northumberland	3,177
	Humshaugh	Northumberland	3,244
	Ponteland East and Stannington	Northumberland	3,297
	Ponteland North	Northumberland	3,644
	Ponteland South with Heddon	Northumberland	3,351
	Ponteland West	Northumberland	3,275
	Prudhoe North	Northumberland	4,112
	Prudhoe South	Northumberland	3,739

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	South Tynedale	Northumberland	3,831
	Stocksfield and Broomhaugh	Northumberland	3,808
11. Houghton and Seaham CC			75,771
	Dawdon	Durham	5,868
	Deneside	Durham	5,280
	Seaham	Durham	5,270
	Copt Hill	Sunderland	8,767
	Doxford	Sunderland	7,563
	Hetton	Sunderland	8,632
	Houghton	Sunderland	9,016
	Shiney Row	Sunderland	9,719
	Silksworth	Sunderland	8,109
	St. Chad's	Sunderland	7,547
12. Jarrow BC			74,770
	Felling	Gateshead	5,586
	High Fell	Gateshead	5,895
	Pelaw and Heworth	Gateshead	6,373
	Wardley and Leam Lane	Gateshead	5,972
	Windy Nook and Whitehills	Gateshead	7,065
	Bede	South Tyneside	5,956
	Fellgate and Hedworth	South Tyneside	5,835
	Hebburn North	South Tyneside	6,930
	Hebburn South	South Tyneside	6,234
	Monkton	South Tyneside	6,307
	Primrose	South Tyneside	6,293
	Simonside and Rekendyke	South Tyneside	6,324
13. Middlesbrough and Eston BC			76,979
	Acklam	Middlesbrough	4,288
	Berwick Hills & Pallister	Middlesbrough	5,879
	Brambles & Thorntree	Middlesbrough	5,418
	Central	Middlesbrough	4,953
	Linthorpe	Middlesbrough	4,266
	Longlands & Beechwood	Middlesbrough	6,171
	Newport	Middlesbrough	5,012
	North Ormesby	Middlesbrough	1,570
	Park	Middlesbrough	6,383
	Park End & Beckfield	Middlesbrough	5,625
	Eston	Redcar and Cleveland	4,928
	Grangetown	Redcar and Cleveland	2,879
	Normanby	Redcar and Cleveland	5,589
	Ormesby	Redcar and Cleveland	4,575
	South Bank	Redcar and Cleveland	4,604
	Teesville	Redcar and Cleveland	4,839
14. Middlesbrough South and Thornaby BC			73,457
	Ayresome	Middlesbrough	3,988
	Coulby Newham	Middlesbrough	6,366
	Hemlington	Middlesbrough	4,386
	Kader	Middlesbrough	4,413
	Ladgate	Middlesbrough	3,860
	Marton East	Middlesbrough	4,066
	Marton West	Middlesbrough	4,210
	Nunthorpe	Middlesbrough	3,891
	Stainton & Thornton	Middlesbrough	1,844
	Trimdon	Middlesbrough	3,573
	Ingleby Barwick East	Stockton-on-Tees	7,467
	Ingleby Barwick West	Stockton-on-Tees	8,184
	Mandale and Victoria	Stockton-on-Tees	7,267
	Stainsby Hill	Stockton-on-Tees	4,740
	Village	Stockton-on-Tees	5,202

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
15. Newcastle upon Tyne East BC			72,409
	Byker	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,074
	Dene	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,083
	East Gosforth	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,874
	North Heaton	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,746
	North Jesmond	Newcastle upon Tyne	5,945
	Ouseburn	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,283
	South Heaton	Newcastle upon Tyne	5,636
	South Jesmond	Newcastle upon Tyne	5,561
	Walker	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,297
	Walkergate	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,782
	West Gosforth	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,128
16. Newcastle upon Tyne North West BC			71,031
	Blakelaw	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,696
	Castle	Newcastle upon Tyne	8,578
	Elswick	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,495
	Fawdon	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,035
	Fenham	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,521
	Kenton	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,498
	Parklands	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,562
	Westgate	Newcastle upon Tyne	5,039
	Wingrove	Newcastle upon Tyne	6,086
	Woolsington	Newcastle upon Tyne	7,521
17. North Durham and Chester-le-Street CC			74,985
	Annfield Plain	Durham	5,670
	Chester-le-Street East	Durham	2,919
	Chester-le-Street North	Durham	2,999
	Chester-le-Street South	Durham	5,937
	Chester-le-Street West Central	Durham	5,825
	Craghead and South Moor	Durham	5,177
	Framwellgate and Newton Hall	Durham	10,175
	Lumley	Durham	5,527
	North Lodge	Durham	2,828
	Pelton	Durham	9,889
	Sacriston	Durham	5,357
	Stanley	Durham	6,187
	Tanfield	Durham	6,495
18. North Tyneside BC			76,427
	Battle Hill	North Tyneside	7,985
	Benton	North Tyneside	7,622
	Camperdown	North Tyneside	7,711
	Howdon	North Tyneside	7,717
	Killingworth	North Tyneside	8,087
	Longbenton	North Tyneside	7,845
	Northumberland	North Tyneside	6,580
	Riverside	North Tyneside	7,805
	Wallsend	North Tyneside	7,425
	Weetslade	North Tyneside	7,650
19. North West Durham CC			74,154
	Benfieldside	Durham	6,180
	Brandon	Durham	7,146
	Consett North	Durham	5,761
	Consett South	Durham	2,886
	Crook	Durham	8,995
	Deerness	Durham	9,018
	Delves Lane	Durham	6,026
	Esh and Witton Gilbert	Durham	6,192
	Lanchester	Durham	5,871
	Leadgate and Medomsley	Durham	6,440

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Tow Law	Durham	3,233
	Weardale	Durham	6,406
20. Redcar and East Cleveland CC			72,951
	Brotton	Redcar and Cleveland	5,151
	Coatham	Redcar and Cleveland	3,598
	Dormanstown	Redcar and Cleveland	4,951
	Guisborough	Redcar and Cleveland	5,512
	Hutton	Redcar and Cleveland	5,841
	Kirkleatham	Redcar and Cleveland	5,397
	Lockwood	Redcar and Cleveland	1,509
	Loftus	Redcar and Cleveland	4,586
	Longbeck	Redcar and Cleveland	5,355
	Newcomen	Redcar and Cleveland	3,124
	Saltburn	Redcar and Cleveland	4,664
	Skelton	Redcar and Cleveland	5,641
	St. Germain's	Redcar and Cleveland	4,835
	West Dyke	Redcar and Cleveland	5,943
	Westworth	Redcar and Cleveland	3,436
	Zetland	Redcar and Cleveland	3,408
21. South Shields BC			71,143
	Beacon and Bents	South Tyneside	6,735
	Biddick and All Saints	South Tyneside	6,429
	Boldon Colliery	South Tyneside	7,358
	Cleadon and East Boldon	South Tyneside	6,954
	Cleadon Park	South Tyneside	5,695
	Harton	South Tyneside	6,775
	Horsley Hill	South Tyneside	7,114
	West Park	South Tyneside	6,205
	Westoe	South Tyneside	5,568
	Whitburn and Marsden	South Tyneside	5,781
	Whiteleas	South Tyneside	6,529
22. Stockton and Yarm CC			75,818
	Bishopsgarth and Elm Tree	Stockton-on-Tees	5,023
	Eaglescliffe	Stockton-on-Tees	7,912
	Fairfield	Stockton-on-Tees	4,535
	Grangefield	Stockton-on-Tees	5,133
	Hardwick and Salters Lane	Stockton-on-Tees	4,813
	Hartburn	Stockton-on-Tees	5,256
	Newtown	Stockton-on-Tees	4,771
	Norton North	Stockton-on-Tees	4,767
	Norton South	Stockton-on-Tees	4,517
	Norton West	Stockton-on-Tees	5,062
	Parkfield and Oxbridge	Stockton-on-Tees	5,117
	Roseworth	Stockton-on-Tees	4,922
	Stockton Town Centre	Stockton-on-Tees	3,971
	Western Parishes	Stockton-on-Tees	2,634
	Yarm	Stockton-on-Tees	7,385
23. Sunderland Central BC			71,232
	Barnes	Sunderland	8,501
	Fulwell	Sunderland	8,984
	Hendon	Sunderland	7,538
	Millfield	Sunderland	6,920
	Pallion	Sunderland	7,202
	Ryhope	Sunderland	7,964
	Southwick	Sunderland	7,885
	St. Michael's	Sunderland	8,157
	St. Peter's	Sunderland	8,081

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
24. Tynemouth BC			74,618
	Chirton	North Tyneside	7,771
	Collingwood	North Tyneside	8,096
	Cullercoats	North Tyneside	7,424
	Monkseaton North	North Tyneside	6,869
	Monkseaton South	North Tyneside	7,427
	Preston	North Tyneside	6,587
	St. Mary's	North Tyneside	6,844
	Tynemouth	North Tyneside	8,201
	Valley	North Tyneside	8,301
	Whitley Bay	North Tyneside	7,098
25. Washington and Sunderland West BC			74,961
	Castle	Sunderland	8,332
	Redhill	Sunderland	8,107
	Sandhill	Sunderland	7,976
	St. Anne's	Sunderland	8,084
	Washington Central	Sunderland	8,654
	Washington East	Sunderland	8,801
	Washington North	Sunderland	8,183
	Washington South	Sunderland	7,846
	Washington West	Sunderland	8,978