

Community Network Boundaries Review Survey 2024

A total of 299 people responded to the Community Network Boundaries Review public consultation.

A total of 368 opinions were offered about the various networks. Of the proposed network boundaries, four had a higher response to be commented upon. These were:

- Network J: Annfield Plain & Tanfield, Craghead & South Moor, Pelton, Stanley: **79**
- Network C: Chester-le-Street North, Chester-le-Street South, Lumley & West Rainton, North Lodge, Sacriston & Witton Gilbert: **51**
- Network L: Weardale: **50**
- Network H: Brandon, Crook, Deerness, Lanchester & Burnhope, Langley & Esh, Willington & Hunwick: **48**.

Which of the local network boundaries do you wish to comment upon (the new electoral divisions are contained for the proposed networks)?

	Frequency
J: Annfield Plain & Tanfield, Craghead & South Moor, Pelton, Stanley	79
C: Chester-le-Street North, Chester-le-Street South, Lumley & West Rainton, North Lodge, Sacriston & Witton Gilbert	51
L: Weardale	50
H: Brandon, Crook, Deerness, Lanchester & Burnhope, Langley & Esh, Willington & Hunwick	48
A: Aycliffe North & Middridge, Aycliffe South, Sedgefield	28
I: Bowburn & Coxhoe, Chilton, Ferryhill, Spennymoor, Tudhoe	22
G: Blackhalls & Hesledens, Castle Eden & Passfield, Horden & Dene House, Peterlee, Thornley & Wheatley Hill, Trimdon & Wingate	18
E: Belmont, Elvet, Gilesgate & Shincliffe, Framwellgate & Newton Hall, Neville's Cross, Pitlington & Sherburn	17
B: Bishop Auckland, Shildon & Dene Valley, West Auckland	16
F: Dalton & Dawdon, Easington & Shotton, Murton & Seaham	14
K: Barnard Castle, Evenwood, Lower Teesdale, Upper Teesdale	14
D: Benfieldside, Consett North, Consett South, Delves Lane, Derwent & Pont Valley	11
Total	368

Network A: Aycliffe North & Midridge, Aycliffe South, Sedgefield

Just under two out of five (38%) of respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst nearly three in five (58%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area A?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	11.5%
Agree	7	26.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	3.8%
Disagree	5	19.2%
Strongly disagree	10	38.5%
Total	26	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alteration was to move Sedgefield to another network. The main reasons given for this were that:

- There are no community links (5 responses)
- Larger settlements will get all the funding (4)
- There are no public transport links (3).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Sedgefield to another network	10
Move Aycliffe to another network	2
Move Trimdon to another network	2
Move Chilton to another network	1
Total	15

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Sedgefield to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	5
Larger settlements will get all the funding	4
No public transport links	3
Geographical links and proximity	2
Current boundaries work well	1
Differing levels of deprivation	1
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
Does not fit new parliamentary boundaries	1

Network B: Bishop Auckland, Shildon & Dene Valley, West Auckland

Three out of four (75%) respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst one in four (25%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area B?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	6	37.5%
Agree	6	37.5%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	12.5%
Strongly disagree	2	12.5%
Total	16	100.0%

The most common comments were reasons why they agreed with the proposed boundaries (8 responses).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reason for agreement	8
Move Etherley parish to another network	2
Move West Auckland to another network	1
Total	11

Network C: Chester-le-Street North, Chester-le-Street South, Lumley & West Rainton, North Lodge, Sacriston & Witton Gilbert

Just under half (47%) of respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst just over half (51%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area C?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	19	37.3%
Agree	5	9.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	2.0%
Disagree	1	2.0%
Strongly disagree	25	49.0%
Total	51	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alteration was to move Pelton Ward area(s) to another network. The main reasons given for this were that:

- Community links already exist (7 responses)
- Current boundaries work well (4)
- There are no public transport links (4)
- There are no community links (3).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Pelton Ward area(s) to another network	17
Remain the same	4
Move West Rainton to another network	2
Total	23

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Pelton Ward/areas to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	7
Current boundaries work well	4
No public transport links	4
No community links	3
Geographical links and proximity	1
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	1

Network D: Benfieldside, Consett North, Consett South, Delves Lane, Derwent & Pont Valley

Over four in five (82%) respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst under one in five (18%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area D?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	18.2%
Agree	7	63.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	9.1%
Strongly disagree	1	9.1%
Total	11	100.0%

The most common reasonings were reasons why they agreed with the proposed boundaries (4 responses).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reason for agreement	4
Move Castleside to another network	1
Total	5

Network E: Belmont, Elvet, Gilesgate & Shincliffe, Framwellgate & Newton Hall, Neville's Cross, Pitlington & Sherburn

Over three in five (62%) respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst one in four (25%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area E?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	5	31.3%
Agree	5	31.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	12.5%
Disagree	2	12.5%
Strongly disagree	2	12.5%
Total	16	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alterations were to move Pitlington to another network and to move Sherburn to another network. The reasons given for moving Pitlington and Sherburn were the same and these were that:

- There are disproportionate population sizes of networks (1 response)
- There are no community links (1).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Pitlington to another local network	3
Move Sherburn to another local network	3
Increase size to include all local villages	1
Move Brandon to another local network	1
Split Deerness ward to include Bearpark and Ushaw Moor in Network E	1
Total	9

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Pitlington to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
No community links	1
No reason specified	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Sherburn to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
No community links	1
No reason specified	1

Network F: Dalton & Dawdon, Easington & Shotton, Murton & Seaham

An equal amount (46%) of responses agreed and disagreed with the proposed boundaries.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area F?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	23.1%
Agree	3	23.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	7.7%
Disagree	3	23.1%
Strongly disagree	3	23.1%
Total	13	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alterations were to move Easington to another network and to move Shadforth to another network. The reasons given for moving Easington were that:

- There are no community links (2 responses)
- There are differing levels of deprivation (1).

The reasons given for moving Shadforth were that:

- There are no community links (1 response)
- Geographical links and proximity (1)
- School links (1).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Easington to another network	3
Move Shadforth another network	3
Keep East Durham AAP area as it is	2
Move Sherburn to another network	2
Move Littleton to another network	1
Move Ludworth to another network	1
Move Shotton to another network	1
Total	13

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Easington to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	2
Differing levels of deprivation	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Shadforth to another network.

	Frequency
Geographical links and proximity	1
No community links	1
School links	1

Network G: Blackhalls & Hesledens, Castle Eden & Passfield, Horden & Dene House, Peterlee, Thornley & Wheatley Hill, Trimdon & Wingate

Just over two in five (41%) respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst just over one in three (35%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area G?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	4	23.5%
Agree	3	17.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	23.5%
Disagree	4	23.5%
Strongly disagree	2	11.8%
Total	17	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alteration was to reduce the area/population. The main reason given for this was that there are disproportionate population sizes of networks.

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reduce area/population	4
Wingate, Trimdons, Fishburn and Sedgfield should have own network	1
Total	5

Please state why you agree or disagree: Reduce area/population.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	2
Differing levels of deprivation	1
Insufficient funding for size of network	1
Partnership opportunities will be limited	1
Value for money	1

Network H: Brandon, Crook, Deerness, Lanchester & Burnhope, Langley & Esh, Willington & Hunwick

Just over one in ten (11%) of respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst just over eight in ten (81%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area H?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	6.4%
Agree	2	4.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	8.5%
Disagree	10	21.3%
Strongly disagree	28	59.6%
Total	47	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alteration was to reduce the area/population. The main reasons given for this were that:

- There are disproportionate population sizes of networks (6 responses)
- There are no community links (5).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reduce area/population	17
Keep current AAP boundaries	7
Move Crook to another network	4
Move Willington to another network	3
Change Deerness Ward boundary	2
Move Brandon to another network	2
Move Tow Law to another network	2
Move Bearpark to another network	1
Move Willow Burn Hospice into another network	1
Total	39

Please state why you agree or disagree: Reduce area/population.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	6
No community links	5
Insufficient funding for size of network	3
No public transport links	3
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	3
Geographical links and proximity	2
Larger settlements will get all the funding	2
Community links already exist	1
Doesn't match partner boundaries	1
School links	1
Value for money	1

Network I: Bowburn & Coxhoe, Chilton, Ferryhill, Spennymoor, Tudhoe

Just under a third (29%) of respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst two thirds (67%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area I?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0	0.0%
Agree	6	28.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	4.8%
Disagree	7	33.3%
Strongly disagree	7	33.3%
Total	21	100.0%

The most commonly suggested responses were to reduce the area/population and reasons given as to why the respondent agreed with the boundaries. The main reasons given for reducing the area/population were that:

- Larger settlements will get all the funding (4 responses)
- There is insufficient funding for size of network (2)
- There are disproportionate population sizes of networks (1).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reduce area/population	5
Reason for agreement	4
Move Bowburn to another network	2
Move Ferryhill to another network	2
Negative comment with no alteration	2
Area too small	1
Move Chilton to another network	1
Total	17

Please state why you agree or disagree: Reduce area/population.

	Frequency
Larger settlements will get all the funding	4
Insufficient funding for size of network	2
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1

Network J: Annfield Plain & Tanfield, Craghead & South Moor, Pelton, Stanley

Under one in ten (8%) respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst nine in ten (90%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area J?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	3.9%
Agree	3	3.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	2.6%
Disagree	1	1.3%
Strongly disagree	68	88.3%
Total	77	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alteration was to move Pelton Ward settlements to another network. The main reasons given for this were that:

- Community links already exist (19 responses)
- There are no community links (10).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Pelton Ward settlements to another network	35
Negative comment with no alteration	16
Keep current AAP boundaries	6
Reason for agreement	4
Total	61

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Pelton Ward settlements to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	19
No community links	10
Insufficient funding for size of network	4
No reason specified	4
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1
No public transport links	1
School links	1

Network K: Barnard Castle, Evenwood, Lower Teesdale, Upper Teesdale

Just under half (46%) of respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst just over half (54%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area K?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	15.4%
Agree	4	30.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	15.4%
Strongly disagree	5	38.5%
Total	13	100.0%

The most commonly suggested alteration was to move Etherley Parish to another network. The main reasons given for this were that:

- Engagement with parish council (3 responses)
- It will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network (3)
- Community links already exist (2).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Etherley Parish to be in one network	6
Reason for agreement	4
Total	10

Please state why you agree or disagree: Etherley Parish to be in one network.

	Frequency
Engagement with parish council	3
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	3
Community links already exist	2
No reason specified	2

Network L: Weardale

Just under three in five (58%) of respondents agreed with the proposed boundaries, whilst two in five (40%) disagreed with them.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area L?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	19	39.6%
Agree	9	18.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	2.1%
Disagree	3	6.3%
Strongly disagree	16	33.3%
Total	48	100.0%

The most common comments were reasons why they agreed with the proposed boundaries (23 responses).

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reason for agreement	23
Keep current AAP boundaries	6
Move Tow Law to another network	5
Move Crook to another network	3
Area too small	2
Combine 3 Towns and Weardale	1
Combine Dales into one network	1
Total	41

Comments and respondents

The most common further comments were negative comments about the survey/proposals (65 of the 167 different comments given).

Do you have any further comments regarding the local network reorganisation?

	Frequency
Negative comment on the survey/proposals	65
Miscellaneous comment	47
Funding comment	23
Positive comment on the survey/proposals	19
Negative comment on the process	13
Total	167

Nearly three quarters (209) of returns came from residents, with AAP board members being the next most frequent (40 returns).

Are you mainly responding as:

	Frequency	Percent
A resident	209	74.1%
An AAP Board member	40	14.2%
A county councillor	14	5.0%
A county council employee	7	2.5%
A VCS organisation member	4	1.4%
Other	8	2.8%
Total	282	100.0%

If other, please specify.

	Frequency
Parish Council	3
Cornforth Parish Council	1
Ferryhill Town Council	1
Great Aycliffe Town Council	1
Livin Housing (board members on four AAPs)	1
Shildon Town Council	1
Total	8

If a VCS organisation member, please specify.

	Frequency
Durham Area Youth	1
Pelton Community Centre	1
Pelton Fell Community Partnership	1
Weardale Community Transport	1
Total	4

Are you:

	Frequency	Percent
Male	83	39.0%
Female	130	61.0%
Total	213	100.0%

What is your age?

	Frequency	Percent
Under 18	1	0.5%
18-24	1	0.5%
25-34	22	10.3%
35-44	32	15.0%
45-54	39	18.3%
55-64	59	27.7%
65-74	45	21.1%
75+	14	6.6%
Total	213	100.0%

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	41	19.6%
No	168	80.4%
Total	209	100.0%

What is your religion or belief?

	Frequency	Percent
Christian	135	68.2%
None	58	29.3%
Buddhist	1	0.5%
Jewish	1	0.5%
Muslim	1	0.5%
Nordic animist	1	0.5%
Pagan	1	0.5%
Total	198	100.0%

What is your ethnicity?

	Frequency	Percent
White British	201	98.0%
Mixed Race	2	1.0%
Arab or Middle Eastern	1	0.5%
Asian or Asian British	1	0.5%
Total	205	100.0%

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

	Frequency	Percent
Heterosexual/straight	180	95.7%
Bisexual	4	2.1%
Gay or lesbian	4	2.1%
Total	188	100.0%

Appendices

Appendix 1: Full tables

Format of response

	Frequency	Percent
Mobile	133	44.5%
PC/Paper	149	49.8%
Tablet	17	5.7%
Total	299	100.0%

Which of the local network boundaries do you wish to comment upon (the new electoral divisions are contained for the proposed networks)?

	Frequency
J: Annfield Plain & Tanfield, Craghead & South Moor, Pelton, Stanley	79
C: Chester-le-Street North, Chester-le-Street South, Lumley & West Rainton, North Lodge, Sacriston & Witton Gilbert	51
L: Weardale	50
H: Brandon, Crook, Deerness, Lanchester & Burnhope, Langley & Esh, Willington & Hunwick	48
A: Aycliffe North & Middridge, Aycliffe South, Sedgefield	28
I: Bowburn & Coxhoe, Chilton, Ferryhill, Spennymoor, Tudhoe	22
G: Blackhalls & Hesledens, Castle Eden & Passfield, Horden & Dene House, Peterlee, Thornley & Wheatley Hill, Trimdon & Wingate	18
E: Belmont, Elvet, Gilesgate & Shincliffe, Framwellgate & Newton Hall, Neville's Cross, Pitlington & Sherburn	17
B: Bishop Auckland, Shildon & Dene Valley, West Auckland	16
F: Dalton & Dawdon, Easington & Shotton, Murton & Seaham	14
K: Barnard Castle, Evenwood, Lower Teesdale, Upper Teesdale	14
D: Benfieldside, Consett North, Consett South, Delves Lane, Derwent & Pont Valley	11
Total	368

Network A: Aycliffe North & Middridge, Aycliffe South, Sedgefield

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area A?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	11.5%
Agree	7	26.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	3.8%
Disagree	5	19.2%
Strongly disagree	10	38.5%
Total	26	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Sedgefield to another network	10
Move Aycliffe to another network	2
Move Trimdon to another network	2
Move Chilton to another network	1
Total	15

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Sedgefield to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	5
Larger settlements will get all the funding	4
No public transport links	3
Geographical links and proximity	2
Current boundaries work well	1
Differing levels of deprivation	1
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
Does not fit new parliamentary boundaries	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Aycliffe to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
Geographical links and proximity	1
Insufficient funding for size of network	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Trimdon to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1
No community links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Chilton to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1

Network B: Bishop Auckland, Shildon & Dene Valley, West Auckland

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area B?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	6	37.5%
Agree	6	37.5%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	12.5%
Strongly disagree	2	12.5%
Total	16	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reason for agreement	8
Move Etherley parish to another network	2
Move West Auckland to another network	1
Total	11

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Etherley Ward to another network.

	Frequency
Engagement with parish council	2

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move West Auckland to another network.

	Frequency
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1

Network C: Chester-le-Street North, Chester-le-Street South, Lumley & West Rainton, North Lodge, Sacriston & Witton Gilbert

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area C?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	19	37.3%
Agree	5	9.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	2.0%
Disagree	1	2.0%
Strongly disagree	25	49.0%
Total	51	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Pelton Ward area(s) to another network	17
Remain the same	4
Move West Rainton to another network	2
Total	23

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Pelton Ward/areas to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	7
Current boundaries work well	4
No public transport links	4
No community links	3
Geographical links and proximity	1
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Remain the same.

	Frequency
No reason specified	3
Community links already exist	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move West Rainton to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	1
No reason specified	1

Network D: Benfieldside, Consett North, Consett South, Delves Lane, Derwent & Pont Valley

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area D?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	18.2%
Agree	7	63.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	9.1%
Strongly disagree	1	9.1%
Total	11	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reason for agreement	4
Move Castleside to another network	1
Total	5

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Castleside to another network.

	Frequency
Does not fit new parliamentary boundaries	1

Network E: Belmont, Elvet, Gilesgate & Shincliffe, Framwellgate & Newton Hall, Neville's Cross, Pitlington & Sherburn

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area E?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	5	31.3%
Agree	5	31.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	12.5%
Disagree	2	12.5%
Strongly disagree	2	12.5%
Total	16	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Pitlington to another local network	3
Move Sherburn to another local network	3
Increase size to include all local villages	1
Move Brandon to another local network	1
Split Deerness ward to include Bearpark and Ushaw Moor in Network E	1
Total	9

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Pitlington to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
No community links	1
No reason specified	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Sherburn to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
No community links	1
No reason specified	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Increase size to include all local villages.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Brandon to another network.

	Frequency
School links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Split Deerness ward to include Bearpark and Ushaw Moor in Network E

	Frequency
School links	1

Network F: Dalton & Dawdon, Easington & Shotton, Murton & Seaham

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area F?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	23.1%
Agree	3	23.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	7.7%
Disagree	3	23.1%
Strongly disagree	3	23.1%
Total	13	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Easington to another network	3
Move Shadforth another network	3
Keep East Durham AAP area as it is	2
Move Sherburn to another network	2
Move Littletown to another network	1
Move Ludworth to another network	1
Move Shotton to another network	1
Total	13

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Easington to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	2
Differing levels of deprivation	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Shadforth to another network.

	Frequency
Geographical links and proximity	1
No community links	1
School links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Keep East Durham AAP area as it is.

	Frequency
Partnership opportunities will be limited	1
Value for money	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Sherburn to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	1
School links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Littletown to another network.

	Frequency
Geographical links and proximity	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Ludworth to another network.

	Frequency
Geographical links and proximity	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Shotton to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	1

Network G: Blackhalls & Hesledens, Castle Eden & Passfield, Horden & Dene House, Peterlee, Thornley & Wheatley Hill, Trimdon & Wingate

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area G?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	4	23.5%
Agree	3	17.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	23.5%
Disagree	4	23.5%
Strongly disagree	2	11.8%
Total	17	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reduce area/population	4
Wingate, Trimdons, Fishburn and Sedgfield should have own network	1
Total	5

Please state why you agree or disagree: Reduce area/population.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	2
Differing levels of deprivation	1
Insufficient funding for size of network	1
Partnership opportunities will be limited	1
Value for money	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Wingate, Trimdons, Fishburn and Sedgfield should have own network to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	1

Network H: Brandon, Crook, Deerness, Lanchester & Burnhope, Langley & Esh, Willington & Hunwick

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area H?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	6.4%
Agree	2	4.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	8.5%
Disagree	10	21.3%
Strongly disagree	28	59.6%
Total	47	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reduce area/population	17
Keep current AAP boundaries	7
Move Crook to another network	4
Move Wellington to another network	3
Change Deerness Ward boundary	2
Move Brandon to another network	2
Move Tow Law to another network	2
Move Bearpark to another network	1
Move Willow Burn Hospice into another network	1
Total	39

Please state why you agree or disagree: Reduce area/population.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	6
No community links	5
Insufficient funding for size of network	3
No public transport links	3
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	3
Geographical links and proximity	2
Larger settlements will get all the funding	2
Community links already exist	1
Doesn't match partner boundaries	1
School links	1
Value for money	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Keep current AAP boundaries.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	2
No reason specified	2
Current boundaries work well	1
Does not fit new parliamentary boundaries	1
No community links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Crook to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	3
No reason specified	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Wellington to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
No community links	1
No reason specified	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Change Deerness ward boundary.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1
Geographical links and proximity	1
No public transport links	1
School links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Brandon to another network.

	Frequency
Geographical links and proximity	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Tow Law to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	2

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Bearpark to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Willow Burn Hospice into another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1

Network I: Bowburn & Coxhoe, Chilton, Ferryhill, Spennymoor, Tudhoe

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area I?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	0	0.0%
Agree	6	28.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	4.8%
Disagree	7	33.3%
Strongly disagree	7	33.3%
Total	21	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reduce area/population	5
Reason for agreement	4
Move Bowburn to another network	2
Move Ferryhill to another network	2
Negative comment with no alteration	2
Area too small	1
Move Chilton to another network	1
Total	17

Please state why you agree or disagree: Reduce area/population.

	Frequency
Larger settlements will get all the funding	4
Insufficient funding for size of network	2
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Bowburn to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	2

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Ferryhill to another network.

	Frequency
Larger settlements will get all the funding	2
Community links already exist	1
Insufficient funding for size of network	1
No community links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Area too small.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Chilton to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1

Network J: Annfield Plain & Tanfield, Craghead & South Moor, Pelton, Stanley

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area J?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	3	3.9%
Agree	3	3.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	2.6%
Disagree	1	1.3%
Strongly disagree	68	88.3%
Total	77	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Move Pelton Ward settlements to another network	35
Negative comment with no alteration	16
Keep current AAP boundaries	6
Reason for agreement	4
Total	61

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Pelton Ward settlements to another network.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	19
No community links	10
Insufficient funding for size of network	4
No reason specified	4
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1
No public transport links	1
School links	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Keep current AAP boundaries.

	Frequency
No reason specified	4
Community links already exist	2

Network K: Barnard Castle, Evenwood, Lower Teesdale, Upper Teesdale

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area K?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	2	15.4%
Agree	4	30.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	15.4%
Strongly disagree	5	38.5%
Total	13	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Etherley Parish to be in one network	6
Reason for agreement	4
Total	10

Please state why you agree or disagree: Etherley Parish to be in one network.

	Frequency
Engagement with parish council	3
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	3
Community links already exist	2
No reason specified	2

Network L: Weardale

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed boundaries of Local Network Area L?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	19	39.6%
Agree	9	18.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	2.1%
Disagree	3	6.3%
Strongly disagree	16	33.3%
Total	48	100.0%

Please state why you agree or disagree: Alteration.

	Frequency
Reason for agreement	23
Keep current AAP boundaries	6
Move Tow Law to another network	5
Move Crook to another network	3
Area too small	2
Combine 3 Towns and Weardale	1
Combine Dales into one network	1
Total	41

Please state why you agree or disagree: Keep current AAP boundaries.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	1
Insufficient funding for size of network	1
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1
No community links	1
No reason specified	1
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Tow Law to another network.

	Frequency
No community links	3
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	2

Please state why you agree or disagree: Move Crook to another network.

	Frequency
Disproportionate population sizes of networks	2
Doesn't match partner boundaries	1
Larger settlements will get all the funding	1
School links	1
Value for money	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Area too small

	Frequency
Value for money	1
Does not fit new parliamentary boundaries	1
Will cause funding and administrative difficulties for the network	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Combine 3 Towns and Weardale.

	Frequency
Community links already exist	1

Please state why you agree or disagree: Combine Dales into one network.

	Frequency
Geographical links and proximity	1

Other comments and respondent details

Do you have any further comments regarding the local network reorganisation?

	Frequency
Negative comment on the survey/proposals	65
Miscellaneous comment	47
Funding comment	23
Positive comment on the survey/proposals	19
Negative comment on the process	13
Total	167

Are you mainly responding as:

	Frequency	Percent
A resident	209	74.1%
An AAP Board member	40	14.2%
A county councillor	14	5.0%
A county council employee	7	2.5%
A VCS organisation member	4	1.4%
Other	8	2.8%
Total	282	100.0%

If other, please specify.

	Frequency
Parish Council	3
Cornforth Parish Council	1
Ferryhill Town Council	1
Great Aycliffe Town Council	1
Livin Housing (board members on four AAPs)	1
Shildon Town Council	1
Total	8

If a VCS organisation member, please specify.

	Frequency
Durham Area Youth	1
Pelton Community Centre	1
Pelton Fell Community Partnership	1
Weardale Community Transport	1
Total	4

Are you:

	Frequency	Percent
Male	83	39.0%
Female	130	61.0%
Total	213	100.0%

What is your age?

	Frequency	Percent
Under 18	1	0.5%
18-24	1	0.5%
25-34	22	10.3%
35-44	32	15.0%
45-54	39	18.3%
55-64	59	27.7%
65-74	45	21.1%
75+	14	6.6%
Total	213	100.0%

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	41	19.6%
No	168	80.4%
Total	209	100.0%

What is your religion or belief?

	Frequency	Percent
Christian	135	68.2%
None	58	29.3%
Buddhist	1	0.5%
Jewish	1	0.5%
Muslim	1	0.5%
Nordic animist	1	0.5%
Pagan	1	0.5%
Total	198	100.0%

What is your ethnicity?

	Frequency	Percent
White British	201	98.0%
Mixed Race	2	1.0%
Arab or Middle Eastern	1	0.5%
Asian or Asian British	1	0.5%
Total	205	100.0%

How would you describe your sexual orientation?

	Frequency	Percent
Heterosexual/straight	180	95.7%
Bisexual	4	2.1%
Gay or lesbian	4	2.1%
Total	188	100.0%