Appendix 1 – 2nd Stage Consultation Responses - Community Governance Review

Total of 51 responses received through the consultation portal and email response received from Nunthorpe Parish Council

Question Number	Recommendation	Yes (total number of responses)	No (total number of responses)	Comments
1	That Stainton and Thornton Parish Council Ward Boundary is retained and unaltered.	44	5	* 2 people did not respond to this question
2	That the number of Parish Councillors to be elected for Stainton and Thornton either:			• With the increase in housing being built within the parish, we need more/extra councillors to represent our residents effectively. • 7 should be sufficient number of councillors for the community • From what I've seen just more friends will be elected. • 7 is sufficient • The increasing expansion of the Parish warrants an increase in the number of Councillors who volunteer their time to benefit residents • It seems very odd to be considering reducing the number of Parish Councillors at a time when the number of residents is increasing. • The larger the number of residents, the more potential work there is for volunteer Parish Councillors to undertake. • They are a waste of people's money and should be abolished, same as community councils. I have never been invited to a community council meeting or informed on minutes of them * **2 people did not respond to these questions**
2a	Remains at 7 Parish Councillors	30	19	
2b	Increases to 9 to cater for the large increase in the electorate	19	30	

Question Number	Recommendation	Yes (total number of responses)	No (total number of responses)	Comments
3	That Nunthorpe Parish Council is retained with the following proposed changes:			• Feel pleased that the ambiguity of Milan Grove and Yew Tree Grove's situation may finally be resolved
3a	the Parish Council boundary for Nunthorpe Parish Council is extended to be co- terminus with the Nunthorpe electoral ward boundary i.e. to include 1-29 Yew Tree Grove, TS7 8QX, 1-16 Milan Grove, TS7 0DQ (subject to a further consultation with those residents).	44	7	
3b	That the Principal Council electoral ward boundaries for Nunthorpe and Marton East wards be amended to include 12-16 Milan Grove and the Brethrens area.	43	8	
3c	That the number of Nunthorpe Parish Councillors either:			• To keep the Councillor/resident ratio equal. • Very positive to refresh things • Not logical to require "equal voice in both communities" when residents in most of Middlesbrough have no chance of a voice at any Parish Council. If this is a legal requirement, it would be fair to ask whether Stainton and Thornton Parish Council should mirror Nunthorpe Parish Council with a maximum of 11. The issue in practice is attracting volunteers to stand for election rather than deciding how best to limit the number of volunteers • 7 should be sufficient number of Councillors • I've never seen them we obviously have too many. • We have a great ward Councillor who is helpful, the conservative just blocks you for asking her questions. • They just pose for photographs but don't actually do anything.
i	Be reduced to 7 to mirror that of Stainton & Thornton Parish Council to ensure that electors have an equal voice within both communities.	31	20	
ii	Be reduced to 9 to mirror that of Stainton & Thornton Parish Council if the Council chooses to increase the number of Parish Councillors in Stainton and Thornton Parish Council to 9, to ensure that electors have an equal voice within both communities.	20	31	

				• I've only engaged them once and the chair was obnoxious and pompous. Very unhelpful, I always find if I have a problem councillor Rathmell is proactive and always gets results. • The parish council are bureaucratic nonsense, I've attended 2 meetings previously, never again. They just ramble on. • They're invisible • 7 is adequate as I don't know what they actually do. • Parish councils are outdated. They band together with the older gen of the village and stop new development of existing structures • More opinions, newer ideas, younger views. • More Councillors the better to challenge and make decisions more democratic • Reducing the number of Parish Councillors would increase workload for the volunteers and if this reduced to as low as 7 elections could be triggered at each re-election point which is a high cost to the residents. It is generally noted that the majority of residents are not interested in being involved in the Parish Council or anything else, mainly due to lack of time. • Reducing the number of parish Councillors will increase the workload for these volunteers • Nunthorpe is a growing community, with residents in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland areas. Therefore should have adequate representation from Parish Councillors. All of who volunteer to represent views of the area. • How much work does Middlesbrough Council expect unpaid volunteers to do for the Community? • I am not clear why it needs to mirror Stainton and Thornton. Each area is different. • Found a couple of the parish council to be unhelpful and obnoxious when recently asked for information • Can't we abolish the parish council, I've lived here 27 years and never found the point of them.

				• Parish Councils are outdated and bureaucratic in nature. We don't need so many in Nunthorpe especially as I've never heard of them. We have borough Councillors who are great both having their own strengths. • I've never heard of them I just pay through my council tax for them to do nothing • Never see them, never seem to stand up for residents when it comes to selling off land. Same faces on every group in the community ie community council, parish council, our greenways they are always trying to undermine the ward Councillors that we elected
Question Number	**Recommendation**	**Yes (total number of responses)**	**No (total number of responses)**	**Comments**
4	That a further detailed review of community councils by the Stronger Communities Team be undertaken, to consider how we engage with community groups and assess what support is required/available.	**37**	**14**	• You must work with Community Councils and provide funding to allow the residents to have their say. • "How Middlesbrough Council engage with community groups" (such as Community Councils and Parish Councils) was one of the main points announced by Middlesbrough Council when launching the Community Governance Review. It not clear why Middlesbrough Council has given up on its plan for an integrated review of all aspects of community governance and I do not support transfer of part of the Community Governance Review to a later date and to a different section of the Council. • The whole point of the governance review was to do this I thought • Not enough ground floor engagement. A lot of people are unaware of consultation and only having online excludes a large number of people from taking part. • Residents are not interested in community councils. They have sadly become political and are hijacked at election time by Independent candidates who have hidden agendas.

				• It is the same volunteers who have to do everything with very little support from Middlesbrough Council and residents. • It is not necessary to duplicate the functions of Parish and Community Councils where there already is a Parish Council. • Community Councils should be independent of Ward Councillors. Why is there a need for a Community Council in areas where there is a Parish Council? Residents who do not live in a ward but have a connection with it should be allowed to be on the executive. Willing volunteers are very hard to come by. • Urgent need for better updates from Middlesbrough Council re community councils, or abolish them and get on with sorting the place out. • They should be abolished too. • They were only active when one of our Councillors was involved. Never heard of them since despite his great achievements of getting them doing events. • They've stopped doing anything • unsure regarding the best way forward regarding this a review may be helpful as long as it is not a protracted business that just delays appropriate decisions being made

Email response submitted by Nunthorpe Parish Council

Nunthorpe Parish Council has no opinion on the most appropriate boundary of Stainton and Thornton Parish Council, nor on the optimum number of Parish Councillors for Stainton and Thornton. As stated in our response to the initial consultation, the circumstances of both Parish Councils differ. For example, in

Stainton and Thornton, it is our understanding that there is a preference to retain the existing significant difference between the Ward and Parish boundaries. Also the Ward is represented by one Councillor, whereas Nunthorpe has two. We believe that community diversity should be respected and retained, and that it would be unreasonable to require both of Middlesbrough's Parish Councils to have identical arrangements for governance.

We are pleased that Middlesbrough Council is endorsing the proposal from Nunthorpe Parish Council that the boundary of Nunthorpe Parish Council should be co-terminus with the Nunthorpe electoral ward boundary.

It follows that we would seek a further minor boundary extension of the Parish to mirror the change now proposed by Middlesbrough Council whereby the boundary of the Nunthorpe ward would incorporate all of the houses in Milan Grove and all of the Brethren Meeting Room site. (We assume that the Council's proposal relates to 12-16 Milan Grove rather than 1-3 Milan Grove as specified in the consultation document.)

We are prepared to agree to the proposed reduction in the number of Parish Councillors from 11 to 9, but not for the reasons identified.

We draw attention to the following:

- The consultation makes the interesting assumption that Stainton and Thornton should set the standard, which Nunthorpe is expected to "mirror" (rather than vice versa!) As the number of electors per Parish Councillor differs so greatly across England, and even within Local Authorities, we are not persuaded that both of Middlesbrough's Parish Councils need to be identical.
- Furthermore, as Stainton and Thornton wishes to retain having Officers of the Community Council in addition to Parish Councillors, whereas Nunthorpe has proposed an amalgamation of the two Councils, we feel that at least 9 Councillors are required if volunteers are to meet the wide range of community expectations.
- Our experience is that it is difficult enough to attract individuals to share the workload among 9 individuals, and a reduction below 9 Parish Councillors, with pro-rata increased workload, is likely to be a deterrent rather than an incentive to stand for election.

For these reasons, we strongly oppose the suggestion that Nunthorpe Parish Council might operate with only 7 Parish Councillors. However, in order to make progress, we are prepared to accept a reduction in the maximum from 11 to 9.

We are disappointed that there will be a delay in undertaking the full remit of the Community Governance Review within the timescale previously agreed, because one of the benefits of Middlesbrough Council's comprehensive Community Governance Review as initially proposed was the opportunity for integrated consideration of the interrelationship between Parish Councils and Community Councils. Such a coherent overview could now be lost if the remit of this Governance Review is confined to consideration of Middlesbrough's Parish Councils and another review considers Middlesbrough's Community Councils. In this context, we seek clarification about the process for responding to the outstanding issues raised by Nunthorpe Parish Council and Nunthorpe Community Council during the 1st Stage Consultation.