

**Local Government Boundary Commission  
for England –  
Electoral Review of North Tyneside Council**

**North Tyneside Council  
Submission on Proposed  
Future Warding Arrangements**

**November 2022**



## Contents

1	<b>Background</b>
2	<b>Approach to Preparation of this Submission</b>
3	<b>A proposed new Warding Arrangement for North Tyneside</b>
4	<b>Rationale for the proposed Warding Arrangements</b>
5	<b>Concluding Remarks</b>

## List of Hyperlinks

The proposed new warding arrangements for North Tyneside can be viewed on the interactive maps linked below, which provide a zoom and magnification function:

- **Interactive proposed ward / street map:**  
[North Tyneside Draft Electoral Wards, November 2022](#)
- **Interactive aerial photographic map:**  
[North Tyneside Draft Electoral Wards \(Aerial / Topographic View\) November 2022](#)

## List of Appendices

- Annex 1: PDF Copy of Borough and Wards shown on interactive proposed ward / street map
- Annex 2: PDF Copy of Aerial Map of Borough and Wards shown on interactive aerial photographic map

# Local Government Boundary Commission for England – Electoral Review of North Tyneside Council

## North Tyneside Council Submission on Proposed Future Warding Arrangements

November 2022

### 1 Background

- 1.1 In August 2021 the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) advised North Tyneside Council (the Authority) that an electoral review of the Council was due to take place. By law, all councils in England are periodically reviewed by the LGBCE in order to assess and improve electoral equality. The last such review of North Tyneside Council's arrangements was in 2003.
- 1.2 The LGBCE briefed officers and members of the Authority in early 2022 about the purpose, methodology and timeframes of the electoral review. This included a specific briefing offered to all elected members, hosted by the LGBCE, which took place on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022. As explained by the LGBCE, an electoral review has the following key stages.
- (a) **Preliminary stage** – LGBCE gather initial information about the local authority, including electoral forecast data, and meet with councillors, officers and group leaders
  - (b) **Councillor numbers ('council size') stage** – LGBCE decide how many councillors should be elected to the Council in future, based on evidence. The LGBCE base this decision on four factors (the governance arrangements of the council; the council's scrutiny functions; the representational role of councillors; and future trends and plans for the council)
  - (c) **Warding arrangements stage** – LGBCE ask the Council and public for views on where the boundaries between wards should lie, and the names of wards
  - (d) **Draft recommendations** – LGBCE publish draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements, for consultation with the Authority and the public
  - (e) **Final recommendations** – LGBCE produce final recommendations on future electoral arrangements, which will be put before Parliament in a draft order to be made law. The draft order, if made, gives effect to the final recommendations and is laid before Parliament for a period of 40 sitting days.

- 1.3 In July 2022 the Authority provided a written evidence submission to LGBCE at the councillor numbers ('council size') stage of the electoral review. This was to assist the LGBCE with its decision on how many elected members North Tyneside would need in future. Following consideration of that submission the LGBCE announced on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2022 that North Tyneside Council should continue to be represented by 60 elected members in future. Those 60 members will cover 20 wards (three members per ward).
- 1.4 However the positioning of wards will need to change from those which are currently in place within the borough. In the period since the last review in 2003, significant changes in population in some parts of the borough, localised increases from major housing developments and the movement of people into, out of and within the local authority area have altered the levels of electoral equality across wards. This means that elected members are not representing broadly the same number of electors throughout each of the wards in the borough, and the electoral review affords an opportunity to address this.
- 1.5 Having determined the future council size / councillor numbers, the electoral review is therefore now at the 'warding arrangements' stage. During this stage the Authority is required to consider specific criteria developed by the LGBCE, and apply these criteria to the development of new warding arrangements for the borough which offer improved electoral equality. These criteria are set out further below (paragraph 2.5).
- 1.6 This paper sets out the approach adopted by the Authority to the development of new warding arrangements, and proposes a new warding pattern which – having regard to the LGBCE's criteria – is considered the best fit in balancing LGBCE's criteria and in ensuring electoral equality can be delivered within North Tyneside in future.

## 2 Approach to Preparation of this Submission

- 2.1 The Authority convened a small, cross-party and politically balanced working group of elected members, supported by officers, to consider how the future warding arrangements of the borough could be developed to attain optimal electoral equality as measured by the LGBCE's criteria.
- 2.2 The cross-party working group considered the forecast future electorate of North Tyneside in 2028, agreed with the LGBCE as likely to be circa 165,332 electors resident in the borough by that time.
- 2.3 The cross-party working group then considered the LGBCE's criteria when assessing warding arrangements, set out below, and how these criteria could be applied to the borough and the communities served by the Council:

- (a) **Delivering electoral equality for local electors:** the LGBCE require that as far as possible each ward in North Tyneside should have an equal number of electors in it so that there is equality of representation across the borough. North Tyneside's electorate forecast of 165,332 electors resident in the borough by 2028, and the councillor numbers decision already made by the LGBCE (60 councillors across 20 wards, with three councillors per ward), means that as far as possible any warding pattern proposed should therefore aim to have circa 8,268 electors in each ward.

The working group noted that the LGBCE recognise that it is unlikely that any local authority will be able to have exactly this number in every ward and a tolerance will therefore be applied when the proposed electorate in a ward deviates from this figure. However, the working group were mindful that electoral equality should be the starting point when developing a proposal on warding arrangements and have sought to make this the basis for the warding patterns submission developed and included in this paper.

- (b) **Interests and identities of local communities:** as far as possible any proposed warding pattern should avoid splitting local ties and should have boundaries which are easily identifiable. The working group have considered community interests carefully as part of their deliberations, and sought to gather available evidence to support the proposals set out in this paper, described below.
- (c) **Effective and convenient local government:** the working group was mindful that any proposed wards need to be capable of effective representation and that the new electoral arrangements must allow the local authority to conduct its business effectively. The working group also considered whether improvements could be made to the naming of wards, to better describe and reflect the communities within those proposed wards.

### 3 A proposed new Warding Arrangement for North Tyneside

3.1 An interactive ward and street map (with a zoom / magnifying function) showing a warding pattern of 20 proposed new wards for North Tyneside has been prepared, and can be viewed and explored via this link:

[North Tyneside Draft Electoral Wards, November 2022](#)

3.2 The same proposed warding pattern is also available to view as an interactive aerial photographic map, which again can be magnified which is helpful in identifying physical / topographic features and other elements of interest within the borough, via this link:

[North Tyneside Draft Electoral Wards \(Aerial / Topographic View\) November 2022](#)

3.3 In addition, a PDF version of the map, and of each proposed ward, is attached for ease of reference as **Annex 1** to this submission. Aerial photographs of each proposed ward are also attached as **Annex 2**.

3.4 The warding pattern proposed would result in the following elector numbers in each ward (with existing wards and ward variances also shown for comparison):

Existing Ward	Existing Ward Electorate (2028 Forecast)	Existing Ward Variance	Proposed New Ward	Proposed Electorate (2028 Forecast)	Variance
Weetslade	8,180	-1.1%	Weetslade	8,447	2.2%
Camperdown	7,852	-5.0%	Camperdown	7,645	-7.5%
Longbenton	8,442	2.1%	Longbenton	8,442	2.1%
Killingworth	11,220	35.7%	Killingworth	8,794	6.4%
Benton	7,992	-3.3%	Benton and Forest Hall	8,464	2.4%
Riverside	9,010	9.0%	Riverside	7,290	-11.8%
Northumberland	8,005	-3.2%	Wallsend North	8,002	-3.2%
Battle Hill	7,982	-3.4%	Battle Hill	7,993	-3.3%
Wallsend	7,618	-7.8%	Wallsend Central	9,024	9.2%
Howdon	7,869	-4.8%	Howdon	9,381	13.5%
Valley	10,263	24.2%	Valley	8,552	3.4%
Chirton	8,146	-1.5%	Chirton and Preston	8,653	4.7%
Collingwood	10,770	30.3%	Collingwood	8,973	8.6%
Preston	6,644	-19.6%	<i>replaced by Chirton &amp; Preston</i>	-	<i>n/a</i>
Tynemouth	8,543	3.3%	Tynemouth and Cullercoats	7,418	-10.3%
Cullercoats	7,634	-7.6%	Marden	8,055	-2.6%
Monkseaton South	7,765	-6.1%	Monkseaton	7,569	-8.4%
Whitley Bay	7,339	-11.2%	Whitley Bay	7,510	-9.1%
Monkseaton North	6,947	-16.0%	Whitley Sands	7,931	-4.1%
St Mary's	7,110	-14.0%	Brierdene	8,798	6.4%
<i>New ward</i>	-	<i>n/a</i>	North Shields	8,391	1.5%
<i>North Tyneside</i>	<i>165,332</i>		<i>North Tyneside</i>	<i>165,332</i>	

- 3.5 In developing this proposed warding pattern, the Working Group has closely considered and sought to apply the LGBCE's criteria set out at paragraph 2.5 above, and has been mindful of the LGBCE's acknowledgment that it will never be possible to achieve exact electoral equality across every ward (i.e. precisely 8,268 electors in every ward).
- 3.6 The proposed warding arrangements are therefore considered to represent the best fit against the LGBCEs criteria, and a fair and appropriate balance where those criteria compete. Electoral equality is much improved in the proposed arrangements. Where variances remain, they are overall much smaller than currently and wherever possible, the proposal has sought to contain these within plus or minus 10% of the average / target elector numbers per ward. Although three wards are slightly beyond the usual tolerance of 10%, these are long established, geographically contained communities and any splitting of those communities would be wholly artificial.
- 3.7 The rationale for the proposed warding arrangements and factors considered in respect of each proposed ward are set out in more detail below.

## **4 Rationale for the proposed Warding Arrangements**

- 4.1 Working north to south from the map, the working group propose the following twenty wards are implemented within North Tyneside. Some ward names are also changed from currently, better reflecting the communities proposed to be served by each new ward

### ***Weetslade***

- 4.2 The Weetslade ward is unique in North Tyneside in that it is surrounded on 3 sides by areas within the boundaries of Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland councils and, as such, the opportunity for change is limited. Our proposed ward is very similar to the current ward and is within 10% of the target electorate population of 8,268. The main change we make to the ward is the removal of the Cygnet Park area of polling district AA, as this community is currently isolated from the rest of the ward. While the rest of the ward uses services in Hazlerigg, Seaton Burn, Wideopen and Dudley, as well as looking further out of the borough to Cramlington, Cygnet Park does not. Transport links in the ward are designed specifically to move people around the villages which make up Weetslade, including both the road network and bus routes. All of the proposed ward is served by one neighbourhood police area and falls into the North West area for the Authority's Housing and Environmental services teams. All of the areas in this ward make up the majority of the North West of the borough's suburban/rural boundary area. We did consider placing the other two suburban/rural boundary areas in the North West at Annitsford and Fordley but it would produce a ward with an electoral variance above 10%, although the Authority proposes that the LGBCE should consider this as the community and local government link would warrant it.

### ***Camperdown***

- 4.3 The proposal we make for the Camperdown ward is very similar to the current ward and is within 10% of the target electorate population of 8,268. The changes we propose include adding the Cygnet Park area of polling district AA, as this area of the borough is most closely associated with the neighbouring Burradon / Killingworth areas in terms of transport links and accessing local shops and services. We also propose including the Greenacres street in the Camperdown ward, as the only residential houses it neighbours are in the Camperdown ward and it is not possible to get into the ward by car from Killingworth ward without driving into Camperdown first. Transport, bus routes, shopping and medical services are all located at the shopping centre in Camperdown ward. Various residents' groups transcend the local area.

### ***Briardene***

- 4.4 The proposal we make for the Briardene ward is focussed on uniting all of the rural area in the greenbelt in the North East of the borough. The ward is bordered at one side by the sea and the other by Northumberland



County. While the ward looks geographically large, it contains vast swathes of farm, scrub and wildlife areas that dominate the geography of the ward. The proposed ward would place all of this in the same ward allowing the issues which are unique to the communities in this ward to be tackled. Placing any of this boundary area into another other ward would mean these issues competing for attention with other significant issues, which are not relevant to this area. There is a vast network of footways, wagonways and other routes designed to move people around in this area. Numerous bus routes are designed to specifically serve the communities in this ward, with these communities often being under served by other means of public transport. The Brierdene is the constant in the ward, running from the seafront right up to the boundary with the A19 road. We are suggesting the ward be named Brierdene as it is the thread which runs from one end of the ward to the other.

### ***Killingworth***

- 4.5 The proposal we make for the Killingworth ward reduces the ward in size. This is necessary as if the ward were to be left with existing boundaries, it would be significantly over the target electorate due to housebuilding; and in addition, the proposed new boundaries fix a number of the community issues with the current ward. The future and current housing building in Killingworth and Killingworth Moor link well with the Palmersville area. Transport in this area, as well as services, are in the most part directed towards the local centre at Killingworth. The two areas we are proposing to move out of Killingworth address existing community issues in the current ward. The area south of Meadway has always been classed as Forest Hall and the people there access services in that locality rather than the wider Killingworth ward; similarly in the Holystone area, residents in Holystone often look east to access shops, leisure, schools and transport as opposed to towards the Killingworth ward. The key roundabout at Holystone is specifically designed to allow people, pedestrians, cyclists and drivers to flow between the two areas.

### ***Valley***

- 4.6 The proposals we make for the Valley ward include addressing the ward being over the target number of 8,268 electors. The Northumberland Park area was specifically designed to link with the Holystone area and many of the children from Northumberland Park go to School in Holystone and vice versa, as well as the local centre for Holystone being in Northumberland Park. This proposal keeps the Northumberland Park, Shiremoor and West Allotment communities together all of whom access services at the Northumberland Park local centre and have shared community and transport links. To name all of the communities in the ward would be too hard so we are suggesting sticking with the historical name for the ward.

### ***Whitley Sands***

- 4.7 The proposals we make for the Whitley Sands ward, encompassing much of the former Monkseaton North ward, include addressing the target number of electors required by LGBCE. This includes bringing the coastal section of Whitley Lodge into the ward as they share common characteristics and routes including the main road through the ward at the Links. The transport links for this area are mainly located along the Links for both the incoming Whitley Lodge area and the rest of the links areas. This also brings the ward in line with the way council service teams are aligned. We are recommending a name change due to this area now having the main part of Whitley Bay beach in the ward as well as adding part of Whitley Lodge with parts of Monkseaton, and Whitley Sands is now the most appropriate ward name.

### ***Monkseaton***

- 4.8 The current Monkseaton South ward fits all the LGBCE tests on electoral equality for local electors, interests and identities of local communities and effective and convenient local government therefore we are not recommending changes to the ward in terms of its warding arrangements. However, we are suggesting a name change to Monkseaton ward, due to most of Monkseaton currently bring in this ward.

### ***Whitley Bay***

- 4.9 The proposed changes we are making to the Whitley Bay ward are to allow it to meet its electoral size obligations, we believe the ward as it currently sits fit all of the LGBCE tests on electoral equality for local electors, interests and identities of local communities and effective and convenient local government therefore we are not recommending major changes to the ward in terms of its warding arrangements. We are recommending the ward adds part of polling district SD where many residents would class themselves as Whitley Bay anyway and, in order for them to access local services, they would have to go past the Whitley Bay local centre to access the Monkseaton local centre in their current ward.

### ***Tynemouth and Cullercoats***

- 4.10 We are recommending a new ward of Tynemouth and Cullercoats which contains the village of Cullercoats and the village of Tynemouth from their former wards. The Longsands beach is currently divided between the current Tynemouth and Cullercoats wards and this brings the wards together uniting the main physical feature in both areas but also a place where residents and visitors spend lots of leisure time. Services are also united with most of the Authority's coastal team operating in this area and would mean a single group of councillors representing this area rather than two, which has previously caused delays and confusion. The metro has two stops in the ward and is the main transport link between the two. The main coastal road route and the primary road (the Broadway) connect the areas of the ward. Many of the local community organisations work

collectively already on beach clean-ups and environmental actions. Tynemouth and Cullercoats are two of the most visited coastal communities in the area and as such face many of the same issues that a large number of visitors bring. It would allow for effective and convenient local government by having them in the same ward. Developments at Tynemouth Station and Tynemouth Library will add electors to Tynemouth and Cullercoats ward. This is supported by the brownfield housing fund commitment to the Tyne brand site which will bring forward accelerated development on the site. This will contribute to delivering electoral equality of within 10% in the proposed ward.

### ***Longbenton***

- 4.11 The current Longbenton ward fits all the LGBCE tests on electoral equality for local electors, interests and identities of local communities and effective and convenient local government therefore we are not recommending changes to the ward in terms of its warding arrangements.

### ***Benton and Forest Hall***

- 4.12 We are recommending only minor changes to the Benton and Forest Hall ward from the current ward as largely this ward fits the LGBCE tests on electoral equality for local electors, interests and identities of local communities and effective and convenient local government. The changes we recommend fix an existing community issue where the Meadway estate is currently divided between two areas. The proposal unites this estate into the area. The revised name now reflects the two main communities that make up the ward.

### ***Marden***

- 4.13 We are recommending a new ward of Marden which contains all the Marden estate and the Preston Grange estate, much of both of these areas are focussed on accessing local services within each other with shopping and medical facilities uniting the two at three main sites. This ward would take in much of the catchment area for the local school, and the local church parish is included in the ward. Transport links for both the areas coming together are focussed on the Preston North Road. Community facilities are widely used by all sections of the ward at the Foxhunters sports pavilion. Marden residents' association represent most of the community interests.

### ***Battle Hill***

- 4.14 The current Battle Hill ward fits all the LGBCE tests on electoral equality for local electors, interests and identities of local communities and effective and convenient local government therefore we are not recommending major changes to the ward in terms of its warding arrangements. We are however recommending a change in terms of uniting the Rising Sun Country Park and surrounding area in one ward as it faces specific issues only relevant to the rising sun and there has been

confusion about who is responsible for this area. Uniting it in one ward therefore allows for more effective and convenient local government.

### ***Collingwood***

- 4.15 We are proposing a Collingwood ward which contains much of the former Collingwood ward, however electorally we know Collingwood ward is too large (in terms of the target number of electors required by LGBCE) and therefore electors must be removed from within the current ward boundary. We have done this in the form of removing Preston Grange estate which has always played more closely to the Marden estate in any event. This means that Collingwood moves to a more reasonable level in terms of average electorate numbers required by the LGBCE, as the current ward minus Preston Grange is a better match in terms of all LGBCE criteria. This will be strengthened further by the build out of the strategic housing site in Murton.

### ***Chirton and Preston***

- 4.16 The new ward we proposed will connect two communities of Chirton and Preston Village. The areas are both parts of the wider North Shields community which all of the residents would identify with. The areas contain the number 1 and 306 bus routes designed specifically to connect the community to the North Shields town centre, a vital shopping and cultural connection. The area is almost all residential and residents share vastly the same issues across the ward allowing for a direct focus on similar services for all residents.

### ***Wallsend North***

- 4.17 The current Northumberland ward fits all the LGBCE tests on electoral equality for local electors, interests and identities of local communities and effective and convenient local government therefore we are not recommending changes to the ward in terms of its warding arrangements. However we are suggesting a name change due to the current name being disliked by residents and not thought to be reflective of the geography of the area, as well as often becoming confused with the county of Northumberland. We are therefore suggesting the new name of Wallsend North, which better reflects the area served.

### ***Wallsend Central***

- 4.18 We are recommending the Wallsend Central ward be created, this contains all of the current Wallsend ward but also adds in the Holy Cross area. Holy Cross is currently in the Howdon ward. While almost all pupils from Howdon go to Churchill School (in the Howdon ward), all of the pupils from Holy Cross go to Burnside School, so placing it in the Wallsend ward allows for much better links. Holy Cross is between Wallsend town centre and the Howdon local centre. The transport links and footfall from residents is all directed towards Wallsend town centre from Holy Cross. There is no primary school in Holy Cross and most of the children attend

St Peters or Richardson Dees within the current Wallsend ward. A change of name from Wallsend to Wallsend Central is proposed to still reflect that this ward has the town centre within it, but also to allow the Wallsend North name to be reflected for the former Northumberland ward.

### ***Howdon***

- 4.19 We are recommending changes to the Howdon ward for it to be truly reflective of the Howdon community. This brings together the two polling districts in the former Riverside ward with the polling districts of the Howdon estate to form Howdon ward. The metro station which serves Howdon is currently in Riverside ward meaning people from the Howdon ward (where an above average amount of people use public transport) have to leave the ward to get to the main transport hub, as is the local park and leisure area as well as a doctors surgery and Howdon's only dentist. Meanwhile currently all of the shops, bakers, butchers, hairdressers are located in the Howdon Estate which are the main shopping areas for residents in the Riverside ward. All of the bus transport in the area transits through both areas and the current dividing line between the wards is Tynemouth Road uniting a main route. This also allows for modern and convenient local government as currently the Howdon and Willington Quay sections of Riverside ward have different police neighbourhood teams, different Environmental and Housing patch teams from the rest of the Riverside ward and this proposal would allow the areas to be served by the same teams which currently serve the Howdon ward. This offers a much more straightforward and convenient service to residents, allowing for much simpler local government without confusion over which teams serve which part of the ward. While being a variance of greater than 10% the proposed Howdon ward meets the effective and convenient local government test and the interests and identities of local communities test. Therefore we believe while it does not meet the electoral equality test, significant weight should be placed on the other two tests to allow Howdon to unite in one community. Furthermore Howdon has almost no opportunities to expand further, with almost no potential for any other housing developments not currently accounted for.

### ***Riverside***

- 4.20 The proposed Riverside ward retains its name as it still has large parts of the old ward including East Howdon, Percy Main, Royal Quays, South Meadow Well, Royal Quays and Smith's Dock. However, it combines with large parts of the former Chirton ward including parts of Chirton, Meadow Well north and the Norham road area, to unite the Meadow Well and Percy Main communities. It places two parts of different wards together as they have far more in common in terms of location, issues, physical characteristics, community groups and transport links than they do with the old parts of their old ward. Almost all of the services accessed by residents in this ward are now united under the proposal as well. Brownfield and windfall housing sites within the ward and the investment from the brownfield housing fund into the Smiths dock development are

likely to accelerate development and contribute to electoral equality within 10% target.

### ***North Shields***

- 4.21 North Shields is a town centre that has previously been split across four different wards. The town centre is a community and cultural centre and under the new ward will be treated as a single, united, urban area. The area has a range of transport hubs including a metro station and a large number of bus routes which pass through the town centre. The four wards that previously covered this area had vastly different issues, especially the Tynemouth ward which included the east end of North Shields and is one example of hugely differing issues between its communities. The ward would not only unite the community but make business relations much easier for the Council as a large commercial centre would be under one easily identifiable ward. The area also follows all three of the LGBCE guidelines – reflecting local communities and allowing effective and convenient local government, alongside being of acceptable size in terms of the required average number of electors.

## **5 Concluding Remarks**

- 5.1 The elected member cross party working group, supported by officers, which was convened to develop these proposed warding arrangements, has worked hard to apply the criteria established by the LGBCE in a fair and logical way.
- 5.2 The cross party working group has consistently used the LGBCE principle of electoral equality as its starting point, deviating only where particularly strong community interests, or the need for modern and convenient local government, have shown that this was entirely necessary. The LGBCE has acknowledged the tension that exists between some of the criteria. However we believe that the proposal set out in this submission balances the weighting of the criteria in the most sensible way for our borough and the communities which we serve.
- 5.3 Accordingly, we would commend this proposed warding arrangement to the LGBCE as that which will best reflect the representational needs of North Tyneside into the future.