

Eastern region



Revised proposals

Contents

Revised proposals summary	2
1. What is the Boundary Commission for England?	4
2. Background to the review	5
3. Revised proposals for the Eastern region	8
4. How to have your say	49
Annex: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	51

Revised proposals 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.

2013 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 502), resulting in the number of constituencies in the Eastern region reducing by two, to 56. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 72,810 and no larger than 80,473.

Revised proposals

Following the publication of our initial proposals in September 2011, and two extensive consultation exercises, we have now published our revised proposals. Information about the proposed constituencies is now available on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

What are the revised proposals for the Eastern region?

We have revised 32 of the 56 constituencies we proposed in September 2011. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the boundaries of the remaining 24 constituencies. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, 11 constituencies in the Eastern region would remain 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 some local authority areas into sub-regions. It was also necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries. We have retained the same sub-regions as the basis of our revised proposals, shown in the table below.

Following careful consideration of all representations we received on the Eastern region, we have decided to revise many of our initial proposals. In particular, we are proposing substantial revisions to the constituencies in the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region; to the constituencies in Cambridgeshire in the Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk sub-region; and to six constituencies principally in the south-east of the Essex sub-region.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire	17	16
Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk	23	23
Essex	18	17

We have revised our initial proposal for a constituency that places the town of Newmarket with the District of East Cambridgeshire, proposing instead that it be included in a Suffolk constituency.

We have revised our proposals for constituencies in and around the towns of Bedford, Harpenden, Hemel Hempstead, Hitchin, Stevenage, and Watford.

We have also revised our proposals for constituencies in and around the towns of Ely, Huntingdon, Peterborough, and St Neots in Cambridgeshire, and for constituencies in and around the towns of Chelmsford and Southend-on-Sea in Essex.

After careful consideration, we have not revised our initial proposals for the constituencies in and around the towns of Brentwood, Dunstable, Harlow, Great Yarmouth, and Luton.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 16 October 2012 to 10 December 2012. 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 before 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.

You can find more details of how to respond on our website, or you can write to us direct or email eastern@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk. You can also find more details about the rest of the review on our website.

1. What is the Boundary Commission for England?

1.1 The Boundary Commission for England 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.

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, Mr Justice Sales, and two further Commissioners take decisions on recommendations for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 27 Assistant Commissioners, 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 website.¹

1.3 Our website also 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@bcommengland.x.gsi.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

¹ At www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us/.

2. Background to the review

2.1 In February 2011, the UK Parliament passed legislation² stating that all four Boundary Commissions covering the UK (there are separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland) must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, by October 2013. 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 Eastern region.

2.2 Parliamentary constituency boundaries are important, as they define the area that a Member of Parliament will represent once elected to Parliament. The next General Election is expected to be in 2015. Therefore, any recommendations we make, if accepted, are likely to be used for the first time at the General Election in 2015.

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 502. 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 *A guide to the 2013 Review*,³ published in the summer of 2011, 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 72,810 and 80,473 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, constituencies currently range in electorate size from 55,077 to 110,924. 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 amount of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

2.5 *A guide to the 2013 Review* 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

2.6 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 72,810 and 80,473 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 76,641. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- a. special geographical considerations, including the size, shape, and accessibility of a constituency;
- b. local government boundaries as they existed on 6 May 2010;
- c. boundaries of existing constituencies; and

² Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011, available at www.legislation.gov.uk.

³ Available at www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/publications and at all places of deposit.

- d. any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

2.7 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 2010. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2010, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. *A guide to the 2013 Review* outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries.

2.8 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 section, 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 just under 16% of the existing constituencies in the Eastern region – 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).

2.9 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 ensure that all the factors are balanced satisfactorily. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain 11 of the existing 58 constituencies in the Eastern region.

The use of the regions used for European elections

2.10 Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the Eastern region. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. In early 2011, following a consultation exercise on the issues, we decided to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in *A guide to the 2013 Review* 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.

2.11 In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report continues to use the regions as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for the review

Stage one – initial proposals

2.12 We began this review in March 2011 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 regional

pages of our website. 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 2011.

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

2.13 We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2011 to 5 December 2011. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received over 22,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including 1,452 unique written representations relating to the Eastern region. We also heard 102 oral representations at the four public hearings in the Eastern region. 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

2.14 The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to make representations on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 6 March 2012 and invited comments on them until 3 April 2012. We received 353 unique written representations during that four-week period.

Stage four – publication of revised proposals

2.15 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 16 October 2012, we published this report – *Eastern region: Revised proposals* – 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 10 December 2012. 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.

Stage five – final recommendations

2.16 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 10 December 2012, 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 by 1 October 2013. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in *A guide to the 2013 Review*.

2.17 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 Eastern region

3.1 In autumn 2011, we appointed three Assistant Commissioners for the Eastern region – Len Jackson, Heather Peck, and Jeremy Rintoul – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. We asked them to consider all the written and oral representations and make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of the representations.

3.2 What follows in this chapter is their full report to us. After careful consideration of their report, and discussion with the Assistant Commissioners themselves, we accept and endorse their recommendations in full, and confirm that those recommendations form our revised proposals. We accept their reasoning and the conclusions they have drawn from the evidence received in the representations.

3.3 In particular, we are persuaded by the Assistant Commissioners' recommendations for Leigh and Southend, recognising that our initial proposals for those areas provoked substantial opposition. We are satisfied that their recommendations for Leigh and Southend, and the other consequential changes in the surrounding area, reflect the evidence provided to the Assistant Commissioners regarding local ties.

3.4 We also find the Assistant Commissioners' recommendation to retain the initial proposal to link Luton North with Dunstable convincing, despite recognising that there is force in the opposing views presented in this area. We consider that the recommendations made by the Assistant Commissioners for Luton and Bedfordshire better reflect the statutory factors to be taken into account.

Report by the Assistant Commissioners on the Eastern region

Introduction

AC1 The Boundary Commission for England ('the Commission') is required⁴ to submit a report to the Secretary of State before 1 October 2013, showing the constituencies into which it recommends that England be divided in order to give effect to the rules set out in legislation.⁵ The Commission determined that England should, for this purpose, be divided into regions, one of which is the Eastern region.⁶

AC2 The Secretary of State has appointed⁷ us (Len Jackson, Heather Peck, and Jeremy Rintoul) as Assistant Commissioners to assist the Commission in the discharge of its functions with respect to the Eastern region. While Len Jackson was designated as Lead Assistant Commissioner for the region, and as such has led the work for the Eastern region, we have all three agreed the contents of this report.

AC3 Public hearings, chaired by Len Jackson and attended by members of the Commission's staff, were held in the region in 2011 as follows:

- on 31 October–1 November in Colchester;
- on 3–4 November in Norwich;
- on 7–8 November in Luton; and
- on 10–11 November in Cambridge.

AC4 During the initial consultation period, 102 people, on their own behalf or representing organisations, made oral representations at the public hearings, and 1,486 people or organisations made written representations.

In the secondary consultation period, 353 people or organisations made written representations.

AC5 Following the conclusion of the two consultation periods, the task that we have been set by the Commission is to review all the representations that have been made (whether oral or written) and to provide to the Commission a written report that makes recommendations as to whether – and, if so, how – the Commission's initial proposals should be revised.

AC6 We were not involved in the preparation of the Commission's initial proposals. The evidence that we have received from the Commission to explain and justify its initial proposals is contained in the booklet published by the Commission entitled *Eastern region: Initial proposals*. While we have been provided with maps and other assistance by the Secretariat to the Commission, we have neither sought nor been provided with evidence from the Commission that has not been published.

AC7 The distribution of Parliamentary constituencies is governed by rules laid down in the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 2, which was substantially amended by the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011. As a result of the amendments, the rules which govern the current review of constituency boundaries are different in important respects from those which applied to previous reviews. Most significantly, the new legislation has introduced requirements for a fixed number of constituencies, and places an upper and lower limit on the size of the electorate of any

⁴ Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, section 3.

⁵ The rules are set out in the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 2 as amended.

⁶ *A guide to the 2013 Review*, published by the Commission, and *Eastern region: Initial proposals*, also published by the Commission.

⁷ Pursuant to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 1 paragraph 6.

constituency, save in relation to four protected constituencies that are outside the Eastern region. Applying the new statutory electorate range has required extensive and wide-ranging changes.

AC8 Subject to the mandatory provision of Rule 2 that the electorate of a constituency is to be within 5% of the electoral quota, Rule 5 enables the Commission to take into account the following four factors:⁸

- a. special geographical considerations, including the size, shape, and accessibility of a constituency;
- b. local government boundaries as they existed on 6 May 2010;
- c. the boundaries of existing constituencies; and
- d. any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

AC9 While Rule 2 requires that the electorate of each constituency be within 5% of the electoral quota, this does not require the Commission to define constituencies as close as possible to the electoral quota. Rule 2 therefore allows a degree of flexibility which contributes to the ability of the Commission to give effect, to some extent, to the factors in Rule 5.

AC10 We have read all the written representations and the transcripts of the public hearings, together with the written material that was handed to the Lead Assistant Commissioner and the Commission staff at the public hearings. We are very grateful to the many people who must have put in a great

deal of time and effort in preparing their representations. We are grateful also to those who appeared at the public hearings for presenting their representations in a succinct manner, which enabled all the representations to be heard properly while adhering to the two-day limit for each hearing required by the legislation.

AC11 In making our recommendations to the Commission, we have taken into consideration all the representations (both written and oral) and all the written material handed in by speakers at the public hearings. In this report we have dealt with what we consider to be the main issues and the main points that we consider have arisen from all the representations made. We have not, therefore, commented on all the representations made but we have, nonetheless, considered all the representations made in coming to our conclusions and making our recommendations. We have taken account of all the factors listed in Rule 5 as far as possible, subject to the statutory electorate range. In formulating our recommendations, we have found that representations which proposed viable solutions in line with the rules as laid down by Parliament have often carried more weight than those which disagreed with the Commission's initial proposals without offering alternatives. Our recommendations to the Commission are therefore based on our view of the best reflection of the statutory factors (subject to the electorate range) for the Eastern region.

AC12 Our report begins with an overview of the main issues we encountered during our consideration of the region, followed by a section relating to the question of the division

⁸ An explanation as to how the Commission has interpreted and applied these factors (and an explanation of factors that are not relevant) is set out in paragraphs 26–40 of the booklet *A guide to the 2013 Review*, published by the Commission. It may be noted that Schedule 2 lists a fifth factor which does not apply to the 2013 Review but will apply to subsequent reviews: 'e. the inconveniences attendant on such changes'.

of the Eastern region into sub-regions. We then set out the basis of our recommendations for constituency boundaries in each sub-region. The Commission has proposed (as it was required to do) a name and designation for each of the constituencies in its initial proposals. Some of the representations that have been made suggest names different from those proposed by the Commission. In addition, some of our proposed changes to the Commission's proposals mean that the original name is no longer appropriate. We make our recommendations about names after we have set out and explained our recommendations about constituency boundaries.

Overview

AC13 We worked, at all stages of the review, within both:

- a. the legal provisions of the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 2 as amended by the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011 ('the Act'); and
- b. the guidance issued by the Boundary Commission for England in its document *A guide to the 2013 Review (the Guide)*.

AC14 The Eastern region comprises the counties of Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk. These are covered by a mix of county and district councils and unitary authorities. The region currently has 58 constituencies, and the Boundary Commission's initial proposals sought to reduce this by two to 56.

AC15 The Commission's initial proposals and its rationale for their formulation are explained in chapter 3 of its booklet *Eastern region: Initial proposals*. We draw attention to these, but do not need to repeat them here.

Initial representations

AC16 During the initial consultation period, the Commission received 1,486 representations. Of these, 34 were standard text pro-forma letters relating to a campaign run in response to the Commission's initial proposals concerning the Letchworth constituency. Excluding these pro-formas there were, therefore, 1,452 unique representations. These included 32 from Members of Parliament, 20 from local authorities, 214 from local councillors, parish and town councils and other elected officials, and 81 from other organisations or individuals. A total of 1,105 representations were also received from members of the public.

AC17 Although representations were received from all three Eastern sub-regions, the largest number of responses related to the initial proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. Relatively few representations were received concerning the proposed Suffolk constituencies.

Secondary representations

AC18 During the four-week secondary consultation period, the Commission received 353 representations relating to the Eastern region. Of these, nine representations were from Members of Parliament, 41 from various local authority representatives, 17 from other organisations or individuals, and 286 from members of the public.

Counter-proposals

AC19 Each of the three Parliamentary political parties (IP/025304 (Conservative), IP/025315 (Labour) and IP/025339 (Liberal Democrats)) made counter-proposals at the initial consultation stage. These were presented on day one of the first public hearing in Colchester and were also provided in documentary form.

In summary, there were no changes suggested to 29 of the 56 initially proposed constituencies. One constituency (North West Essex) attracted considerable consensus in terms of a name change. We will return to the matter of constituency names later in this report (see paragraphs AC51–AC52, AC124–AC126, and AC228).

AC20 There were proposals for changes from at least one of the three Parliamentary political parties in 26 constituencies. No constituencies have identical counter-proposals from all three parties. A number of members of the public also made detailed counter-proposals. Many have merit. Some have been adopted, either in whole or in part.

The sub-regions

AC21 The Commission has sought to produce initial proposals for the Eastern region in which 56 whole constituencies each have a total electorate within 5% of the electoral quota of 76,641. In so doing, it has taken an approach which involves splitting the region into three sub-regions, largely along county boundary lines. These three regions are: Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire; Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk; and Essex. Initial representations were overwhelmingly in support of this approach, and we have seen no reason to move away from it during our deliberations. However, we consider below those counter-proposals that suggested an alternative sub-regional approach.

Cross-regional representations

AC22 In addition to the submissions from the three Parliamentary political parties, we have received a number of cross-regional representations from individual members of the public.

AC23 Stephen Whittaker (IP/025396) produced some interesting and coherent proposals across all three sub-regions. In Essex, he recommended changes which reduced the size and complexity of the Commission's proposal for the Billericay and Great Dunmow constituency. Unfortunately, his counter-proposal significantly increased the size of North West Essex, already a large constituency, and we rejected this part of his representation on that basis. In Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, he proposed changes to both the Luton constituencies and to all of the Commission's Hertfordshire proposals. Our view is that the Luton/Dunstable decision is pivotal to the way in which we propose dealing with this sub-region and, as we explain later in this report (see paragraphs AC153–AC175), we do not agree with his (and others') solution. In Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk, we have been impressed with his proposals and have accepted many of them. Again, detail is provided in paragraphs AC71–AC105.

AC24 Peter Whitehead (IP/017720) produced a set of counter-proposals that we considered in detail. He too dislikes the shape and make-up of the proposed Billericay and Great Dunmow constituency. However, his solution crosses the county boundary at Bishop's Stortford and is thus at odds with the sub-regional approach that has found almost universal support elsewhere. His approach also affects almost all of the constituencies in the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region and includes the linking of Luton South with Harpenden, which we have rejected. His approach in Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk joined with others in criticising the Commission's proposal to create a Newmarket and Ely constituency. His solution, while retaining Newmarket in Suffolk, changed all of the other Suffolk constituencies in order to do

so. We believe that there is a better solution, and this is outlined in paragraphs AC71-AC105.

AC25 Anthony Kelly (IP/017352) produced a detailed proposal for the East of England, predicated very largely on retaining historic county boundaries. While it endeavours to observe the requirements of the electoral quota, it does, in consequence, group Bedfordshire and Norfolk with Cambridgeshire, a recommendation at odds with not only the Commission's initial proposals but with nearly all of the other representations we have received. While his approach is interesting, the retention of historic boundaries is not a statutory factor for us to consider, and his proposals ignore many of the factors that we may take into account, including local ties.

AC26 Peter Smyth (IP/019602) provided us with detailed representations across the region. His Essex counter-proposals were particularly interesting. Those for the Southend West, Rochford and Southend East, Rayleigh and Wickford, and Castle Point constituencies are at odds with most of the public representations we have received. His suggested changes to Billericay and Great Dunmow are, perhaps, the best we have seen in terms of creating manageable constituencies around Chelmsford. The significant downside to his scheme is the hugely extended North West Essex proposal, which extends from Little Waltham, just north of Chelmsford (some 35 miles by road to Stump Cross north-west of Saffron Walden) in one direction and almost 30 miles north-east (around Braintree) to Pentlow in the other. It is hard to argue, on the one hand, that the proposed Billericay and Great Dunmow constituency contains communities with little in common other than that they are all rural, while on the other hand countenancing his North West Essex proposal as an alternative. In Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk, he

proposed the creation of a March and Ely constituency and a South East Cambridgeshire constituency, which would include wards from Huntingdon and South Cambridgeshire. The knock-on effect of his proposals involved further changes in Norfolk and, after careful consideration, we believe that Mr Whittaker's proposals provide a better solution. Mr Whittaker's proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire involved the creation of a Harpenden and Luton South constituency and, as we explain in our detailed proposals for this sub-region, we have rejected that approach.

AC27 Adrian Bailey (CR/004467) submitted a counter-proposal for the Eastern region. He based his proposal on seven constituencies for Suffolk, retaining Newmarket within a wholly Suffolk constituency, with 16 constituencies shared between Norfolk and Cambridgeshire. A major difficulty with regard to his proposal was that it left only one of the existing Suffolk constituencies unchanged, compared with five in the Commission's proposals. In Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, his proposals involved a Harpenden and Luton South constituency (see comments in paragraph AC23 above).

The sub-region of Essex

Introduction

AC28 The Essex sub-region is the most southerly of the eastern counties of England. It is bordered to the south by the Thames Estuary and to the east by the lower reaches of the North Sea. It has county boundaries to the south-west with Greater London; to the west with Hertfordshire (with the boundary largely defined by the River Lee and its tributary the Stort); to the north-west with Cambridgeshire; and to the north, along the River Stour, with Suffolk.

AC29 It should be noted that, within the sub-region, there are two unitary authorities, Thurrock and Southend-on-Sea. All references to the Essex sub-region which follow include these two authorities, while recognising their status.

AC30 Essex has a diverse pattern of settlements. The new towns of Basildon and Harlow were originally developed to resettle Londoners following the destruction of housing during World War Two. Epping Forest and the Metropolitan Green Belt have both acted as protective barriers to further urban spread. However, the major population centres of Basildon, Southend, and Thurrock are within the Thames Gateway and, as such, are designated for additional development. To the north of the green belt, with the exception of several major towns such as Colchester and Chelmsford, the county is largely rural. This is important when considering constituency boundaries, in that we have not always been able to create constituencies in which all parts can be said to have local ties or, indeed, simple transport links.

AC31 The main airport in the sub-region is London Stansted, which serves destinations across the UK and in Europe and Asia. Applications have been made to build an additional runway, which would significantly expand operations at Stansted. The Port of Tilbury is one of Britain's major ports.

AC32 The M25 and M11 motorways both cross the sub-region in the south and west, linking those parts of the county with Kent, Hertfordshire, and Cambridgeshire. The A127 and A13 trunk roads are important radial routes, connecting the southern and eastern parts of the county with London. The A12 is also a significant conduit, running north-east

across the county around Chelmsford and Colchester and on into Suffolk.

Representations

AC33 There are currently 18 constituencies in the sub-region, only five of which (Chelmsford, Colchester, Rayleigh and Wickford, Saffron Walden, and Thurrock) have electorates within 5% of the electoral quota. All of the remaining 13 have electorates below the 5% limit. The Commission's initial proposals are to reduce the number of constituencies to 17 and to avoid crossing any sub-regional boundaries. While there have been a small number of counter-proposals on this matter, including a number to link Essex with Hertfordshire, all political parties and the vast majority of public responses have been in favour of the Commission's proposal and we see no reason, from the representations we have seen, to change this approach.

AC34 Given the number of constituencies with electorates below the 5% limit, it is inevitable that there should be significant boundary changes. Indeed, the Commission's initial proposals changed all but two constituencies (Colchester and Thurrock). Five of the proposed 17 constituencies have, nonetheless, met with almost universal approval. Braintree and Witham, Colchester, Harwich and Clacton, North East Essex, and Thurrock have all received positive comment from members of the public and none of the political parties have raised any objections to their make-up. We do not, therefore, recommend any changes to these proposed constituencies.

AC35 By far the most contentious of the Commission's proposals has been the movement of the Leigh and West Leigh wards from Southend West constituency to Castle Point constituency. We have received

numerous objections from local residents (e.g. IP/002427; IP/004553; IP/006402), from local councillors (e.g. IP/003434), from David Amess, MP for Southend West (IP/015444), and from the Conservative Party. Almost without exception these objectors are in favour of the Conservative Party counter-proposal (IP/025304). In addition, we have received representations from many individuals and community organisations concerned that the knock-on effects of the Commission's initial proposals move the Hockley and Hullbridge wards from Rayleigh and Wickford into Rochford and Southend East. The Conservatives' counter-proposals have the advantage of dealing with these issues too.

AC36 We have conducted site visits around Castle Point, Leigh, and Southend-on-Sea. While we can see the rationale behind the Commission's initial proposals, we are of the view that, in terms of both local ties and natural geographical boundaries, Leigh has much more in common with Southend than it does with Castle Point. As has been pointed out by many Leigh residents, the initially proposed constituency boundary within Southend is difficult to define – and indeed much of it actually divides individual streets. The alternative proposal (supported by almost all of the representations received) moves Pitsea South East into Castle Point constituency and Leigh and West Leigh wards into Southend West constituency. While we consider that this option also has its flaws (addressed later in this report – see paragraphs AC37–AC43), it does seem to us to be by far the better proposal.

AC37 Given our views above, and in order to comply with Rule 2 of Schedule 2 to the 1986 Parliamentary Constituencies Act (electoral quotas), it is necessary to transfer several wards from the Rochford and Southend East constituency into the Rayleigh and Wickford

constituency. We therefore propose to move the Hockley Central, Hockley North, Hockley West, and Hullbridge wards back into the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency. We have received many representations from members of the public and from community organisations requesting this change, and both Hockley and Hullbridge Parish Councils (IP/010538 and IP/011319 respectively) have also been supportive. We have, as with the Leigh/Castle Point issue described above, conducted site visits to each of these wards.

AC38 We are particularly grateful to the Chair of Hullbridge Parish Council (IP/011319), who provided some compelling evidence of local ties concerning school catchment areas and third sector organisations. All of the latter appear to provide services to Hullbridge and Hockley from bases in Rayleigh. The local Citizens Advice Bureau (IP/013224) shared its own views and provided information concerning public transport links. The linked point common to all of the representations is that, if these proposals are accepted, one Member of Parliament will represent all of these communities.

AC39 The transfer of wards into Rayleigh and Wickford, as described above, would make it more than 5% above the electoral quota. In consequence, we propose that the Pitsea South East, and Rettendon and Runwell wards be transferred from the initially proposed Rayleigh and Wickford constituency to the Castle Point, and Billericay and Great Dunmow constituencies respectively.

AC40 With regard to the Pitsea South East ward transfer into the Castle Point constituency, this change completes the counter-clockwise moves required to facilitate transferring the Leigh and West Leigh wards back into the Southend West constituency.

The overall effect of these various transfers does separate the two Pitsea wards (Pitsea North West and Pitsea South East). However, we have, again, conducted a site visit and it is clear to us that they do not fit together as seamlessly as Leigh, West Leigh, and Southend. Indeed, there is a significant barrier between the two in the shape of the A127 trunk road. We have paid specific attention to the secondary representations made concerning Essex, in order to determine whether there has emerged a strong local objection to these counter-proposals (made by the Conservative Party and others), but have found very little.

AC41 Our decision to recommend the transfer of Rettendon and Runwell ward into Billericay and Great Dunmow constituency has two distinct, but connected, benefits: it ensures that the proposed Rayleigh and Wickford constituency complies, in terms of electorate numbers, with the statutory electorate range; and it also allows us to deal with the many representations that we have received from members of the public concerning the ward of Galleywood, which sits adjacent to the town of Chelmsford. The Commission's initial proposals exclude Galleywood from the Chelmsford constituency, placing the ward in the neighbouring constituency of Billericay and Great Dunmow. This was done in order to ensure that both constituencies have electorate numbers within 5% of the quota.

AC42 The Commission's proposals gave the Chelmsford constituency an electorate of 73,426. Returning the Galleywood ward (which contains 4,409 electors) creates a constituency of 77,835. Its removal from the Billericay and Great Dunmow constituency is compensated for by the inclusion of the Rettendon and Runwell ward, as mentioned above.

AC43 The counter-proposal to maintain the existing Chelmsford constituency unchanged has met with almost universal approval (e.g. IP/001692; IP/002444; IP/003638). It does, however, have its downside. The constituency of Billericay and Great Dunmow, which partially surrounds it, is not ideal. It is an unusual shape, has poor transport links, and its various communities fall into three different local authority areas. We have received a number of criticisms of the Commission's proposals in this regard. We have decided, however, after much deliberation, that it constitutes the 'least worst' option, in that any attempts to significantly change the proposal results in anomalies elsewhere. It is inevitable that in rural Essex, as in other parts of the country, constituencies made up of many small settlements will be large, even ungainly, in nature.

AC44 We turn now to the proposed Brentwood and Ongar constituency. The Commission has proposed that the Thurrock ward of Orsett be moved to the Brentwood and Ongar constituency. The Conservative Party counter-proposals, supported by several members of the public (e.g. IP/010327; IP/009501), would seek to return this ward to the Basildon and Thurrock East constituency, thus reducing the number of constituencies crossing the boundary between the unitary authority of Thurrock and the County of Essex to one. While this proposal has merit, it does also have downsides. It would require several other wards to be moved in order to ensure that the Brentwood and Ongar constituency (and the neighbouring constituency of Epping Forest) remained within the numerical constraints imposed by the legislation. We have visited the Orsett ward, and we consider that Orsett's inclusion in the Brentwood and Ongar constituency is the best way of meeting the statutory factors across the sub-region as a whole. Local bus services are available, and

we were able to drive along the A128 from Brentwood to Orsett in no more than 20 minutes. We have decided, therefore, not to make any recommendations to change the Commission's proposals in this regard.

AC45 There have been a number of representations concerning the Brentwood and Ongar, and Epping Forest constituencies which relate to the above issues. The Conservative Party and several local MPs and councillors (e.g. IP/018613; IP/023958) have proposed returning Lambourne ward to Brentwood and Ongar from Epping Forest. This would require several other ward moves between the Epping Forest, Brentwood and Ongar, Harlow, and Billericay and Great Dunmow constituencies, in order to ensure that all of these constituencies have electorates within 5% of the electoral quota. Others, including Epping Forest District Council (IP/014624), are content with the Commission's proposals as they stand. The latter provide some compelling evidence with regard to Lambourne in particular, pointing out the links with Theydon Bois, the local transport infrastructure, and simple proximity. We are persuaded by these arguments and have decided, therefore, to leave the Commission's initial proposals unchanged in this regard.

AC46 The Commission's proposals for North West Essex have been supported by all three Parliamentary political parties. The Liberal Democrats and the Conservative Party have, however, along with many members of the public, proposed that the name of the constituency revert to Saffron Walden. We comment further on this matter at the end of our report on this sub-region (see paragraph AC51). There have also been a number of representations expressing concern for several wards to the south of Stansted Airport. Most have no counter-proposals to make. However, despite their party at the regional level

supporting the Commission's proposals, the Saffron Walden branch of the Liberal Democrats (IP/018563) has proposed quite significant changes in an effort to retain as many Uttlesford District Council wards as possible within one constituency. Their proposals are not without merit. However, they do impact on three other proposed constituencies: Braintree and Witham, Maldon, and Billericay and Great Dunmow. Braintree and Witham, in particular, has overwhelming support from all three Parliamentary political parties and from members of the public, and we would be loath to propose any changes here. In addition, the counter-proposal for North West Essex itself does, by removing the wards of Rayne and Three Fields, create a very unusually shaped constituency with two distinct parts joined together by just one small ward, Bumpstead. John Mitchell (IP/023761) on behalf of Uttlesford District Council has also made counter-proposals providing a similar rationale. Their proposals do produce a more balanced alternative for North West Essex; however, they too impact significantly upon three other neighbouring constituencies. Overall, these counter-proposals appear to create as many problems as they solve. We have decided, therefore, not to recommend any changes to the Commission's initial proposals for North West Essex other than the name change, which we deal with later (see paragraphs AC51-AC52).

AC47 A number of individual members of the public have taken the time and trouble to produce detailed counter-proposals across the region. We are grateful to them for their interest and are conscious that several representations have informed our own deliberations as we have worked towards viable alternative proposals which reflect public, local authority, and political party views. We have dealt with those proposals that

cross all three sub-regions in paragraphs AC23–AC27. However, several detailed proposals focus on Essex specifically. For example, Edward Carlsson Browne (IP/019519) and David Shipton (IP/002049) support several of the Commission’s initial proposals, including North West Essex, but would both deal with Billericay and Great Dunmow (albeit in different ways) by splitting the existing Chelmsford constituency. There has been almost universal support for retaining Chelmsford unchanged, and our recommendation follows public opinion in this regard.

AC48 We examined one other independent counter-proposal in some detail. John Chanin (IP/011111) produced two alternative proposals, only the second of which met the statutory electorate range. While it contains various assumptions with which we would disagree (that Basildon would ideally be contained in one constituency, for example), nevertheless the various proposals have merit. The one overriding downside, however, is the need, in order to make numerical sense of all of his other proposals, to create a new Great Dunmow constituency which crosses four local authorities and stretches for over 30 miles from South Hanningfield (south of Chelmsford) to Berden (north-west of Stansted Airport) on the border with Hertfordshire. We eventually rejected Mr Chanin’s proposals for this reason.

AC49 Having carefully considered all of the representations and counter-proposals received, we have decided to recommend that:

- a. the Leigh and West Leigh wards be returned to the Southend West constituency;
- b. the Milton and St Luke’s wards be transferred from Southend West into the

Rochford and Southend East constituency;

- c. the Hockley Central, Hockley North, Hockley West, and Hullbridge wards be returned to the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency;
- d. the Pitsea South East, and Rettendon and Runwell wards be transferred from the initially proposed Rayleigh and Wickford constituency to the Castle Point, and Billericay and Great Dunmow constituencies respectively; and
- e. the Galleywood ward be returned to the existing Chelmsford constituency.

AC50 We further recommend that all of the other constituencies in the Essex sub-region remain as per the Commission’s initial proposals.

Constituency names

AC51 Finally, with regard to the Essex sub-region, we deal with representations to rename proposed constituencies. We have received many representations concerning North West Essex. The vast majority are in favour of reverting to the traditional and long-standing name of Saffron Walden. We see no reason why this constituency name should not be retained, and we therefore recommend that North West Essex be named Saffron Walden.

AC52 A number of members of the public and community organisations have made representations to us concerning the make-up of the Rochford and Southend East constituency. In light of these comments and the counter-proposals received, we have made a number of recommendations, not least the inclusion of the Milton and St Luke’s wards

from Southend West. It has been pointed out to us by several respondents that these proposed changes will mean that the majority of voters in this constituency will come from Southend wards. We have decided, therefore, to recommend that the constituency be renamed Southend East and Rochford in order to better reflect these changes.

The sub-region of Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk

Introduction

AC53 The three counties of Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk together constitute the geographical area known informally as 'East Anglia'. The northern and eastern boundaries are formed by the North Sea, and to the north-west the region borders on The Wash. The two coastal counties of Norfolk and Suffolk are the most easterly counties in the UK. The County of Cambridgeshire to the west of the sub-region borders Lincolnshire to the north, Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire to the west, and Essex and Hertfordshire to the south. The modern county was formed from the historic counties of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, together with the Isle of Ely and the Soke of Peterborough. These historical origins are reflected in some of the representations we have received.

AC54 The entire area is predominantly low-lying, with very few hills or ridges. Holme Fen in Cambridgeshire is notable for being the UK's lowest physical point at nine feet below sea level. The soils are predominantly based on sands and clays except in the substantial areas of reclaimed land of Cambridgeshire and Norfolk, where the soils are the highly fertile black fen peat. This topography, which is maintained through the active management of an extensive system of drainage dykes and canals, together with major rivers such as the Yare and the Nene and associated estuaries,

impacts on ease of access, transport, and the development of local links. The coastal areas are not only low-lying, but also largely composed of relatively soft substrates, which are eroding rapidly. Coastal erosion is therefore a common concern across these districts.

AC55 The entire sub-region has only four major centres of relatively dense population: Norwich, Peterborough, Ipswich, and Cambridge. The remainder of the sub-region is rural, with a relatively low population density across wide areas, interspersed with market towns and villages of various sizes. This means that some constituencies have relatively wide geographical spreads with no single major centre of population. Others, particularly on the coast, need to embrace both areas of relatively concentrated industrial activity, such as a port, together with their more rural hinterland.

AC56 The sub-region is not well served by road transport links. Norfolk and Suffolk are two of the few counties in England that do not have a motorway. The A11 connects Norfolk to Cambridge and London via the M11. Running west, only the A47 and the A17 have direct links to the A1 from Norfolk, while the main east-west route across Suffolk and Cambridgeshire is the much criticised and often problematical A14. The main rail links run up and down the East Coast Main Line through Peterborough to London and the North East. The Great Eastern mainline links London to Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk with regular fast trains running between London Liverpool Street and Norwich. There are also a number of more rural branch lines serving smaller centres of population. These issues, together with the discontinuities of transport caused for example by the Yare, which has no bridges crossing it between Norwich and Great Yarmouth, mean that existing local links are an important issue. We have therefore not always been able to create

constituencies in which all parts can be said to have local ties, or indeed simple transport links.

AC57 The only unitary authority within the sub-region is that of the City of Peterborough. Elsewhere, Norfolk has seven district, borough or city councils, Suffolk has six, and Cambridgeshire has four district councils and the city council. There are also parish and town councils throughout the sub-region. The overriding requirement of the electoral quota means that some constituencies will overlap with more than one district council. Where this is the case, we seek to minimise the numbers involved as far as is possible, given the need to find the best fit of the statutory factors for the whole sub-region.

Representations

AC58 In this sub-region, by far the largest number of representations received from the public were concerned with the proposals relating to the Great Yarmouth constituency. Other areas of particular public concern related to the proposals concerning Newmarket, Peterborough (especially the impact on Whittlesey), St Neots, and Huntingdon. Representations made by the public and other interested parties are considered in greater detail below.

AC59 There are currently 23 constituencies in the sub-region of Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk. The Commission's initial proposals did not propose any change in the number of constituencies. However, in order to bring all the constituency electorates within 5% of the electoral quota, the initial proposals were to make changes to the majority of constituencies. Only eight were left unchanged, specifically Cambridge, South Norfolk, Norwich South, and five constituencies in Suffolk (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, Ipswich, South Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal, and Waveney).

AC60 All three Parliamentary political parties supported the allocation of 23 constituencies to the sub-region, the creation of two cross-county boundary constituencies, the retention of five Suffolk constituencies unchanged, and the limited degree of change with regard to the proposed constituencies of Bury St Edmunds and West Suffolk. This support was not necessarily shared by affected members of the public or by elements of a district and a county council. These points are also covered below.

AC61 A number of pan-regional proposals were received from individuals. With regard to this sub-region, all these individuals argued for seven constituencies wholly within Suffolk and 16 shared between Cambridgeshire and Norfolk, thus necessitating only one cross-county boundary constituency rather than the two in the Commission's proposals.

AC62 In order to retain the existing Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency unchanged, the Commission proposed to reduce the size of the existing Bury St Edmunds constituency, by moving three wards of the District of Mid Suffolk (Badwell Ash, Gislingham, and Rickingham and Walsham) and one ward of the Borough of St Edmundsbury (Pakenham) to a proposed West Suffolk constituency. A corollary to this change was the proposal to include the Suffolk town of Newmarket in a new Newmarket and Ely constituency, creating a cross-county boundary constituency. This had the particular benefit of enabling five of the seven Suffolk constituencies to be retained without change, and fulfilled the obligation to take account of existing constituency boundaries where possible.

AC63 As noted above, all three Parliamentary political parties recognised the need for

cross-county boundary constituencies. Both the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrats specifically supported the creation of a constituency which linked the Suffolk town of Newmarket with the Cambridgeshire town of Ely. That the Newmarket and Ely proposal facilitated the minimisation of change to the Suffolk constituencies was noted and widely supported.

AC64 Alternative proposals were received from a variety of sources. The Labour Party made an alternative proposal (IP/025315) as part of a major restructuring of the proposed constituencies around Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. Two Suffolk Conservative groups objected to the inclusion of Newmarket in a constituency with Ely and made counter-proposals, while (as mentioned above) a number of representations were based on seven constituencies wholly within Suffolk and 16 shared between Cambridgeshire and Norfolk. A decision in relation to Newmarket cannot, therefore, be considered in isolation from the implications for the rest of the sub-region.

AC65 On the single issue of the proposed Newmarket and Ely constituency, and taking account of both the first and the second rounds of consultation, the representations were fairly evenly balanced, with slightly more representations opposing the proposal than supporting it. It was noted that those in favour included Forest Heath District Council (IP/023678), the City of Ely Council (IP/002990), and Haddenham Parish Council (IP/008340).

AC66 East Cambridgeshire District Council (IP/004006) fully supported the proposed Newmarket and Ely constituency, welcoming in particular the inclusion of the whole of the boundaries of the district within one

constituency and stating that ‘the inclusion of the central wards of Newmarket recognises the importance of joint working with Forest Heath District Council’ and that ‘the proposals will strengthen the representation of the horse racing industry in Parliament in these challenging times’. Other comments in favour included that the linkage with Littleport made sense at the constituency level, that the Newmarket wards had good links to nearby villages such as Dullingham and Cheveley, and that communications between Newmarket and Ely were good.

AC67 Comments opposing the proposal included objections about crossing the county boundary, that the proposal further divides the old Isle of Ely, and that communications are poor.

AC68 More detailed counter-proposals were received from the Conservative groups of Suffolk County Council (IP/023702) and Mid Suffolk District Council (IP/018918), both of which argued for keeping Newmarket in a Suffolk constituency. The Mid Suffolk proposal failed to take account of the impact of these changes elsewhere in the sub-region. However, we did not dismiss the representation on this basis, but considered it on its merits.

AC69 The Suffolk County Council Conservative group proposal was more broadly drawn. They argued for seven constituencies wholly within Suffolk and 16 for Cambridgeshire and Norfolk. As regarded Newmarket, they referred to its long history as a Suffolk town and stated that the residents’ needs of ‘a large part of West Suffolk, including the villages of Freckenham, Red Lodge, Gazeley, Dalham, Tuddenham, Herringswell and to some extent Mildenhall’ were all provided by Newmarket. For Suffolk, they proposed that the Newmarket and Exning wards should remain in West

Suffolk and, to reduce the electorate, the wards of Pakenham and Badwell Ash should be moved to the Bury St Edmunds constituency, while the wards of Gislingham, and Rickingham and Walsham should be moved to the Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency. This would then result in the need for a further move of a ward (Hacheston) from this constituency to the Suffolk Coastal constituency, but no changes to the Waveney, Ipswich or South Suffolk constituencies.

AC70 Other comments from individuals included a small number of representations from the wards of Badwell Ash, Gislingham, and Rickingham and Walsham, which in general objected to the proposed changes but did not propose alternative solutions.

AC71 A detailed counter-proposal was received from Mr Stephen Whittaker (IP/025396), followed up by a further representation (CR/003549) supporting his original proposals, which, he argued, resulted in less change to existing constituency boundaries and therefore better compliance with the statutory factors.

AC72 Mr Whittaker took the same line as a number of other representations, in arguing that there should be seven constituencies in Suffolk and 16 in Cambridgeshire and Norfolk. His proposals for Suffolk left four constituencies unchanged (Ipswich, South Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal, and Waveney) and involved relatively minimal change in the remaining three. He recommended that the Gislingham ward move from Bury St Edmunds to the Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency, and that the Horringer and Whelnetham, and Pakenham wards move to the West Suffolk constituency. As he pointed out, this would mean that only three wards

would change constituency, compared with eight in the Commission's proposals.

AC73 Looking at the spread of district councils within constituencies, the Commission's proposals for Suffolk would result in two constituencies including only one district council, three constituencies covering two district councils (in whole or in part), and two constituencies covering three district councils. Mr Whittaker's proposals would involve two constituencies including only one district council, four containing elements of two district councils, and one constituency covering three district councils. In addition, while the Commission's proposals involved two cross-county boundary constituencies within the sub-region, Mr Whittaker's proposals required only one.

AC74 We noted that the submission from the Conservative group of the Mid Suffolk District Council preserved the West Suffolk constituency unchanged but introduced changes in two constituencies, which the initial proposals had not (Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, and South Suffolk). We also noted that a counter-representation from Daniel Summers (CR/002853) disagreed with the proposal on the grounds that the transfer of the Barking and Somersham, and Ringshall wards into South Suffolk leaves settlements immediately outside Stowmarket in a different constituency. The point was also made that 'it is inevitable in a predominantly rural county that constituencies will be large in terms of area' and that the criticism of lack of connection and distance between the extreme points of the proposed West Suffolk constituency could equally well be levelled at the Mid Suffolk proposal with regard to Barking and Somersham at one end of their proposed constituency and Clare ward at the other end. Mr Summers went on to say that he feels 'there

are strong links between Gislingham, Badwell Ash, and Rickinghall and Walsham wards, and the wards in the north of St Edmundsbury such as Barningham, Ixworth and Stanton'. The proposal from the Conservative group of the Suffolk County Council proposed a different set of adjustments, based on the importance of the history of Newmarket and of local links with Suffolk villages, which they stated but did not support with evidence.

AC75 All the varying proposals based on the premise of maintaining seven Suffolk constituencies shared the common problem that they resulted in more changed constituencies in Suffolk than the Commission's proposals. The most attractive of these counter-proposals was that received from Mr Whittaker, which avoided a cross-county boundary constituency, left four constituencies unchanged, involved moving only three wards, and was favourable as regarded the number of district council boundaries crossed by individual constituencies. We recognised that the Horringer and Whelnetham ward had close links with other wards in the Bury St Edmunds constituency that this proposal would break; but also noted that this move was integral to a solution which could well constitute the best fit for the sub-region as a whole.

AC76 In considering the proposals and counter-proposals purely with respect to Newmarket, Ely, and the Suffolk constituencies, we have taken account of the views expressed both for and against the initial proposals, the numbers of constituencies that would be affected by changes in boundaries, and the numbers of district council boundaries crossed by individual constituencies. We note that, while there is some opposition to a constituency linking Newmarket and Ely – and there were a number of proposals pointing out that the numbers of electors in Suffolk could

be encompassed in seven constituencies – there was also significant support for the cross-county boundary constituency as proposed by the Commission. We further note that only Mr Whittaker has succeeded in marshalling an alternative proposal that has as little effect on existing constituencies as the Commission's proposals; and that the retention of five unchanged Suffolk constituencies appears to be dependent on the creation of the Newmarket and Ely constituency.

AC77 Taking account of all these points, we conclude that a judgement as to which proposals best reflect the statutory factors for this part of the sub-region is fairly evenly balanced between the Commission's proposals and those of Mr Whittaker. However, as noted above, the conclusion with regard to the proposed cross-county boundary constituency of Newmarket and Ely cannot be considered in isolation from the recommendations with regard to Cambridgeshire and the City of Peterborough. These are considered in detail below.

AC78 A small number of representations were received which dealt with individual constituencies and proposed adjustments with regard to one ward or a limited number of wards. In many cases, the representation did not deal with the impact of such a change on other constituencies elsewhere in the sub-region. These included:

- a. a proposal that Ipswich be divided into two constituencies;
- b. a complaint that the Commission had been unfair to Ipswich, but without making a specific proposal as regarded an alternative;
- c. a request that Redgrave be retained within the Bury St Edmunds constituency;

- d. a proposal that The Saints ward be moved from the Waveney constituency to Suffolk Coastal; and
- e. a complaint that the shape of the Waveney constituency was sub-optimal.

AC79 While respecting the views in these representations, the cases made for introducing these changes were not sufficiently strong to counterbalance the fact that they would create more change for Suffolk constituencies than the original proposals and/or would create a breach of the electoral quota requirement.

AC80 The Commission's proposals left Cambridge unchanged, but proposed changes to the existing Huntingdon, and South Cambridgeshire constituencies in order to accommodate changes to the existing North East Cambridgeshire, North West Cambridgeshire, South East Cambridgeshire, and Peterborough constituencies. These included the creation of: a new constituency of St Neots; two constituencies for the City of Peterborough (Peterborough South and Peterborough North), taking the River Nene as the boundary between the two; and a new cross-county boundary constituency of Wisbech and Downham Market, grouping wards from the west of the Borough of King's Lynn and West Norfolk (including the town of Downham Market) with wards from the District of Fenland (including the towns of March and Wisbech).

AC81 All three Parliamentary political parties supported the proposal with regard to the cross-county boundary constituency of Wisbech and Downham Market. We received only a limited number of other representations, with slightly more in favour than opposed. Those in favour tended to express their support succinctly, as exemplified by Vibeke Lawrie

(IP/001910): 'I will possibly be the only person whole heartedly supporting the proposed changes to Wisbech Downham Market constituency'. Some of the representations in favour were content with the proposed boundaries, but proposed a change of name. Naming issues are considered in greater detail below (see paragraphs AC124–AC126).

AC82 Those representations that were opposed mentioned a number of factors, including the differing natures of Wisbech and Downham Market (IP/001921), that the constituency would cross a county boundary (IP/000216), and that Downham Market had stronger links with King's Lynn than with Wisbech. None of these representations included detailed counter-proposals.

AC83 Beginning with the City of Cambridge, we noted that the initial proposals left the Cambridge constituency unchanged. This was supported by all three of the Parliamentary political parties. A counter-proposal was put forward in a number of representations from members of the public which noted that, in order to meet the requirement of the electoral quota, one ward of the City of Cambridge had to be excluded from the constituency. In the existing constituency, the ward of Queen Edith's is included in the South Cambridgeshire constituency and the ward of Cherry Hinton in the Cambridge constituency. The objectors argued that Queen Edith's is in effect a genuinely city-style and city-looking ward, while Cherry Hinton has more of a rural village feel and has a degree of separation geographically from the city proper. Hence the small number of representations proposed that Cherry Hinton be included in the South Cambridgeshire constituency and Queen Edith's in the Cambridge constituency.

AC84 We noted, and had some sympathy with, the very small number of individuals who advanced the counter-proposal. However, we also note that the Commission's proposal for no change to the existing constituency is supported by the three Parliamentary political parties and that it accords more closely with the statutory requirements than does the counter-proposal. We have, therefore, decided to uphold the Commission's proposed Cambridge constituency.

AC85 Both the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrats supported the Commission proposals with respect to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. However, in response to the initial consultation, the Labour Party tabled a substantial proposal setting out a different solution for Cambridgeshire, Peterborough, and the constituency crossing the county boundary of Cambridgeshire and Suffolk. They supported the proposed cross-county boundary constituency of Wisbech and Downham Market on the grounds that it comprised the 'towns and villages of the fenland of Cambridgeshire and Norfolk with a strong community of interest'.

AC86 Starting with Newmarket and working clockwise round the county of Cambridgeshire, the Labour Party proposal was that Newmarket, together with nine wards from the South East Cambridgeshire constituency plus the ward of Cottenham from the South Cambridgeshire constituency, would form a South East Cambridgeshire and Newmarket constituency. The South Cambridgeshire constituency would include the remaining wards from South Cambridgeshire plus two wards (Fenstanton, and Gransden and The Offords) from the existing Huntingdon constituency.

AC87 The Labour Party regretted the separation of St Neots from the Huntingdon constituency and considered the proposed constituencies of St Neots and Huntingdon unwieldy, with disruptive knock-on effects for the South Cambridgeshire constituency. They argued that, although St Neots is a fast-expanding town, its location on the county boundary meant that it was not a focal point for the proposed constituency, and that wards such as Brampton and Ellington had ties to Huntingdon, while parts of South Cambridgeshire District looked rather towards Cambridge. Their alternative proposal was that St Neots should remain within the Huntingdon constituency and that it should also include the Earith ward from the North West Cambridgeshire constituency. A new North West Cambridgeshire constituency would also include wards from the Peterborough constituency, leaving the other Peterborough wards, including the Fletton ward south of the River Nene, to make up a single Peterborough constituency.

AC88 Mr Whittaker proposed five constituencies that were similar to the existing constituencies. He supported the creation of a Wisbech and Downham Market constituency, but proposed that it 'be restricted within Cambridgeshire to those Fenland wards north of Elm and Christchurch ward, inclusive'. This would mean that the District of Fenland did not need to be divided into three constituencies, but would also mean that the Wisbech and Downham Market constituency would need to include three wards from the District of Breckland (Mid Forest, Nar Valley, and Swaffham), thus giving it a spread across three district councils.

AC89 Mr Whittaker has proposed six constituencies (Huntingdon, North East Cambridgeshire, North West Cambridgeshire,

Peterborough, South East Cambridgeshire, and South West Cambridgeshire) that are based upon the six existing constituencies in Cambridgeshire.

AC90 There were a small number of detailed comments, from other members of the public, with respect to various wards near Peterborough or elsewhere in North Cambridgeshire. Most objected to the proposed fate of their particular constituency in the Commission's proposals, and often expressed a preference for the status quo without making specific proposals that took account of the statutory requirements. At least one proposed splitting a ward.

AC91 In support of its proposal, the Labour Party argued that more electors would remain in the main successor constituency than in the Commission's proposals. Reviewing the representations from the public and other parties, we noted that with regard to St Neots, the numbers of representations received showed a significant balance of support in favour of the Commission's proposals. Those supporting the Commission's proposals included the St Neots Town Council (IP/013068). Members of the public who commented in favour welcomed the move to 'give St Neots its own MP', and many argued it was right that the 'largest town in Cambridgeshire' should form the basis of a constituency.

AC92 Those who objected to the proposal were either concerned about the break-up of the Huntingdon constituency or deplored the linkage of a range of South Cambridgeshire District wards with St Neots rather than with either Huntingdon or Cambridge. For example, Frederick Rason (IP/002944) objected to the removal of the wards of Bar Hill, Bassingbourn, Bourn, Caldecote, Comberton, Gamlingay, Hardwick, Longstanton, and Papworth and

Elsworth from the South Cambridgeshire constituency into the proposed St Neots constituency on the grounds that 'the proposal ignores the long existing history of linkage of these contiguous villages with Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and ignores geographic proximity'. Hilary Stroude (IP/002856) objected on the grounds that the proposals ignored the impact of the planned new village of Northstowe. However, the Act provides that the electorate figures that are to be used for a review are those that were in the version of the electoral register published on the review date. For this review this means that the electorate figures used must be those from the registers that were required to be published on 1 December 2010.

AC93 Views with respect to the Peterborough proposals were more evenly balanced. A number of representations were received supporting the Commission's proposals, with a lot of support for the validity of the Nene as a boundary between constituencies. For example, Jean Sewell (IP/020887) wrote that 'the River Nene makes a very good, clear boundary' and that 'it is right that the villages north of the River Nene are placed in the same seat as the main urban area of the city ... they come under the Peterborough Local Education Authority and Primary Care Trust, elect City Councillors and look to Peterborough for local hospital healthcare, leisure, policing and fire cover and shopping as well as a commuter hub.' An example of a representation adducing existing local ties was that from Susan Squibb (IP/019227), who also supported the Commission's proposals and specifically opposed the Labour counter-proposal to move the Fletton ward into a north Peterborough constituency. She pointed out that, as a resident of Orton with Hampton ward, she used a number of local services in the Fletton ward and that local children from Fletton 'attend

many of the existing southern Peterborough schools such as Stanground College and Hampton College and primary school children also attend Nene Valley Primary School at the Botolph Bridge district centre as well as the nearby Brewster Avenue Infant School'. She added that the 'social housing in "Old Fletton" on London Road is ... actually in Orton with Hampton ward and children from that area go to Old Fletton Primary School'.

AC94 On the other hand, a similar number of representations were received which opposed the Commission's proposals. As an example, Angus Ellis (IP/018477) argued that the Commission proposals 'take in too many rural areas whilst ignoring the natural urban area' and added that the Labour Party proposals make sense, because 'Fletton is right in the centre of the city only yards away from Bridge Street and the Town Hall, it also has the City's Football Team, Peterborough United located in Fletton'.

AC95 The majority of representations objecting to the Commission's proposals for Peterborough - and certainly those most strongly expressed - were specifically opposed to the linkage of Whittlesey with Peterborough. These representations argued that Whittlesey had little in common with Peterborough, was geographically separated from it, and had far more in common with the other fenland towns such as March. A preference was expressed for a Fenland constituency 'incorporating Chatteris, March, Whittlesey and Wisbech' (IP/018975). Concerns were strongly expressed that the interests of Whittlesey residents would be lost and Whittlesey 'swallowed up' in Peterborough. Some of the concerns were based on an assumption that a change of constituency boundary would lead, ineluctably, to loss of town and district councils, and loss of facilities funded by such councils. In this

context it is therefore probably worth reiterating that the constituency boundaries, whether changed or unchanged, do not impact either on the local authority boundaries or on local authority budgetary decisions.

AC96 To explore the issues further with regard to Whittlesey, a site visit was carried out, encompassing the town centres of Chatteris, March, and Whittlesey, and the route from Whittlesey to Peterborough. We agree that the town centres of the three towns are superficially similar in some respects and evidence a degree of common heritage. There is also a noticeable similarity of hinterlands around Chatteris and March and the area between Whittlesey and March. However, the nature and character of the countryside, as observed from the main road, changes as one travels from Whittlesey to Peterborough, and it is not always easy to see where one ends and the other starts. From the map it was apparent that the countryside between the two centres is largely fenland, dykes and drovers' tracks. Along the A605 there is a fairly consistent margin of light industrial and storage units, etc., between Whittlesey and Peterborough. The suburbs of the two centres are relatively similar.

AC97 Mr Whittaker's solution would satisfy those who wished Newmarket to remain within a wholly Suffolk constituency. It would potentially disappoint those, including the respective councils, who welcomed the proposals regarding St Neots. It would not satisfy those who supported the Commission's proposals with respect to Peterborough, and it created the same problem as the Labour proposals with respect to the breaking of local links between certain Peterborough wards. It would please those who argued in favour of Fletton ward being within the central Peterborough constituency and it might go some way towards appeasing those who were

concerned about the impact of the Commission's proposals with respect to Whittlesey. It would disappoint the East Cambridgeshire District Council, which was pleased that the Commission proposed that their area should fall within one constituency.

AC98 The number of district council boundaries that would be crossed by the various proposed constituencies was also considered. In this respect the Labour Party proposals were markedly worse, in that more of their proposed constituencies would cross more district boundaries than either of the other options.

AC99 We noted that the Commission's proposals with regard to Peterborough and Cambridgeshire were supported in their entirety by the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrats. We also noted that the individual responses from members of the public were by no means unanimous, and opinions were divided on a number of points. We concluded that the key issues for Peterborough and Cambridgeshire were:

- a. the constituencies in and around Peterborough, the validity of the River Nene as a constituency boundary, the fate of the city wards south of the River Nene, and the relationship of Whittlesey with Peterborough;
- b. the solution for Ely and a range of District of Fenland wards, which was inextricably bound up with the question of a Newmarket and Ely cross-county boundary constituency; and
- c. the rearrangement of constituency boundaries across the county of Cambridgeshire, which encompassed the issue of a constituency based on St Neots

and was also dependent on the Newmarket question.

AC100 Alternative proposals had been tabled by the Labour Party, two local Conservative groups, and a number of individuals. Of these, we found that the counter-proposals put forward by Mr Whittaker had the most merit with regard to respecting both local government boundaries and the boundaries of existing constituencies. His proposals had a similar impact to the Commission's proposals with regard to the numbers of district councils with which sitting MPs would have to deal. Over the whole sub-region, Mr Whittaker's proposals would leave eight constituencies unchanged as would the Commission's proposals, but he achieved this with fewer moves of wards, less radical boundary change, and only one cross-county boundary constituency.

AC101 If, however, the opinions expressed in other representations were taken into account, it was clear that Mr Whittaker's proposals would not be universally welcomed – any more than those of the Commission had been. In particular, while his proposals with respect to Peterborough would be welcomed by those who support the inclusion of Fletton with the City wards north of the River Nene, they would not satisfy those who expressed concern about the breaking of local links between Fletton and the Ortons. On the other hand, those who were concerned about the inclusion of Whittlesey in a Peterborough South constituency might prefer the North East Cambridgeshire option outlined by Mr Whittaker.

AC102 In the St Neots area, the reversion to a Huntingdonshire constituency would not be welcomed by the majority who supported a constituency based on St Neots. However, this

issue might possibly be resolved by a name change for the constituency in question.

AC103 The Newmarket issue was more polarised. While Mr Whittaker's proposals would please those who have advocated the continuation of Newmarket in a wholly Suffolk constituency, the proposals would disappoint those who welcomed the Newmarket and Ely proposal, including the relevant local councils and a representation arguing its benefits for the horse-racing industry.

AC104 Having given careful consideration to all the statutory factors and all the representations received, both straightforward and complex, we noted that if we considered Peterborough and Cambridgeshire in isolation, then Mr Whittaker's solution achieved a slightly better fit with the statutory factors than the Commission's proposals, but that opinion as expressed to us on the key issues concerning these counties would be likely to be divided fairly equally between the two.

AC105 Turning to the other Norfolk constituencies and starting in the east, by far the most controversial Commission proposal was that intended to raise the electoral numbers of the Great Yarmouth constituency. The existing Great Yarmouth constituency is too low in numbers and the proposal was to extend it to the north by adding three wards from the District of North Norfolk (Stalham and Sutton, Waterside, and Waxham). The remaining 31 wards of the District of North Norfolk would form the North Norfolk constituency.

AC106 This proposal was supported by the Conservative Party and by Mr Whittaker. It was opposed by the other two Parliamentary political parties. The Labour Party proposed that instead the District of Broadland wards of Acle and Marshes should be added to the

Great Yarmouth constituency, leaving the three wards of Stalham and Sutton, Waterside, and Waxham with North Norfolk. To take account of the impact of these changes, they also proposed that the District of North Norfolk ward of The Raynhams should be moved to Broadland and Dereham. The key argument they put forward was that, in their view, the Acle and Marshes wards looked towards Great Yarmouth, while the North Norfolk wards had ties to North Walsham and other communities in the North Norfolk District. This proposal was also put forward by Mr Smyth (IP/019602) and Mr Bailey (CR/004467).

AC107 The Liberal Democrats' representation put forward an alternative proposal, which involved moving just the single ward of Waterside to Great Yarmouth, leaving the other two wards in North Norfolk. This would mean the electorate would fall within 5% of the quota. They contended that this would involve less change, would break fewer local links, would better reflect local government boundaries, and would minimise change from existing boundaries.

AC108 The public representations received during the first round of consultations were consistently opposed to the inclusion of the District of North Norfolk wards with Great Yarmouth. In general, they pointed out that 'the various parishes concerned were very much rural' and had little relationship with the 'urban' Great Yarmouth. They commonly went on to praise the understanding and service of their current Member of Parliament, whom they did not wish to lose (which – while no doubt gratifying to the Member concerned – was not a factor to which we could have regard). An example of the representations received was that from Lee Sutton (IP/004643), who argued that 'the area is better served by a more rural parliamentary seat as it is now' and that a more

balanced approach would be to 'add Acle and the Marshes wards to Great Yarmouth and keep the Raynhams in Broadland'.

AC109 In the secondary consultation period, the Conservative Party (CR/004483) noted the alternative proposal from the Liberal Democrats, but expressed the view that including only one ward with Great Yarmouth would lead to a greater degree of isolation for that ward, which had ties to Waxham, and Stalham and Sutton that would be broken by that counter-proposal. There were also further representations from the public during the secondary consultation period. Most were similar to that quoted above. A smaller number supported the initial proposals, making the point that 'the wards which extend from Winterton to Stalham are similar areas and it has always seemed an anomaly that they were separated. Coastal erosion in particular is something which will be tackled more effectively by adding these wards to the Great Yarmouth constituency.'

AC110 To assist in considering these counter-proposals and representations, a site visit was undertaken. This encompassed the three District of North Norfolk wards of Stalham and Sutton, Waterside, and Waxham, the adjacent wards of East Flegg, West Flegg, Fleggburgh, and Ormesby, and the centre of Great Yarmouth.

AC111 There was no case made for any special geographic considerations, beyond the argument made by the relatively large number of public representations (over 80) that the three District of North Norfolk wards were rural and Great Yarmouth was urban in nature. On the basis of the site visits and the detailed mapping available, it is inarguable that there are significant differences of style, prevalent industry, and sources of income between the

North Norfolk wards and the centre of Great Yarmouth. The same could also be said of the wards of Acle and Marshes. This argument is, however, flawed in so far as it ignores the nature and style of the other wards that make up the existing Great Yarmouth constituency. The wards of East Flegg, West Flegg, Fleggburgh, and Ormesby have much in common with the wards of Stalham and Sutton, Waterside, and Waxham. All these wards are a mixture predominantly of agricultural land, small towns (with limited light industry), and villages of various sizes. They all have significant interests in tourism (holiday letting, caravan parks and boat hire, etc.) as a source of income, and all the coastal areas share concerns regarding coastal erosion, as has been pointed out.

AC112 We reviewed the impact on local government boundaries and in particular the number of district council boundaries that would be crossed by individual constituencies. The Labour Party counter-proposal was slightly worse than the initial proposal in this respect, in that two affected constituencies would cross two council boundaries compared with only one in the Commission's proposal or the Liberal Democrats' counter-proposal.

AC113 As regarded the level of change imposed on constituents, the Liberal Democrats' proposal had some merit. However, there was no real difference of style, nature or commonality of interest that would allow a distinction to be drawn between Waterside and the other two District of North Norfolk wards. The argument that these three wards did share links was noted.

AC114 The nature of the two District of Broadland wards of Acle and Marshes was also considered. It could perhaps be argued that there was a little less focus on tourism in these

wards than in the more coastal wards, but the major and most persuasive argument against including these wards in the Great Yarmouth constituency was the knock-on effects in the Broadland and Dereham constituency.

AC115 In the interests of achieving the best outcome across the sub-region, we concluded that the Commission's proposals constituted the better reflection of the statutory factors than either of the counter-proposals. However, we were also very conscious of the various concerns expressed by the members of the public who responded. It was interesting to note that, to most of those who expressed a view, the existing Great Yarmouth constituency appeared to consist of Great Yarmouth alone. We debated whether this misperception might be corrected, to some degree, if the constituency name better reflected the nature of the constituency. The Conservative Party response to the second consultation made the proposal that it be named Great Yarmouth and Stalham, to reflect the major centre of population in the northern wards. However, we also noted both that some representations had argued that all constituencies in Norfolk should contain the name Norfolk (or Norwich), and that a useful precedent existed in Suffolk where a constituency also included both a port (Felixstowe) and the adjacent coastal region. We would recommend, therefore, that the initial proposal which grouped the wards of Stalham and Sutton, Waterside, and Waxham with the existing Great Yarmouth constituency should stand, but that the new constituency should be called Norfolk Coastal.

AC116 Moving clockwise round the county, we consider next the constituencies in the south and centre of Norfolk. The changes necessary to bring the three existing constituencies of Great Yarmouth, North Norfolk, and Norwich North within 5% of the electoral quota mean

that the neighbouring existing constituencies of Broadland, Mid Norfolk, South West Norfolk, and North West Norfolk also needed to be changed.

AC117 In the City of Norwich, no change was proposed to the existing Norwich South constituency, and it was proposed that the Norwich North constituency should be extended, by including the two Drayton wards and the two Taverham wards from the District of Broadland. A representation argued that, on the contrary, the Drayton wards should be included in a Broadland constituency (IP/000051), but in general these proposals were welcomed. A small number of representations were also received welcoming the inclusion of the Fakenham ward in the North Norfolk constituency.

AC118 As noted above, Mr Whittaker supported the Commission's proposals with respect to Great Yarmouth, North Norfolk, Norwich North, Norwich South, and South Norfolk. He proposed changes to the remaining Norfolk constituencies which were largely to take account of the constituency boundaries he proposed for Cambridgeshire. We have already noted in relation to the proposed cross-county boundary Cambridgeshire/Norfolk constituency that, having moved three District of Breckland wards (Mid Forest, Nar Valley, and Swaffham) into the Wisbech and Downham Market constituency, then the Two Rivers ward needed to move to the Thetford and Swaffham constituency which, in view of the loss of Swaffham, could be renamed. His proposals also included leaving the existing North West Norfolk constituency unchanged.

AC119 The recommendation with respect to Great Yarmouth can stand alone, and for the reasons outlined above, we concluded that the Commission's proposals, subject to a change

in name to Norfolk Coastal, best reflected the statutory factors in this case.

AC120 Alternative proposals from a variety of sources were considered at some length. As we have noted above, we found that the counter-proposals put forward by Mr Whittaker had the most merit with regard to respecting both local government boundaries and the boundaries of existing constituencies. His proposals had a similar impact to the Commission's proposals with regard to the numbers of district council boundaries crossed by individual constituencies. Over the whole sub-region his proposals would leave eight constituencies unchanged, as would the Commission's proposals, but he achieved this with fewer moves of wards, less radical boundary change, and only one cross-county boundary constituency. It could be argued, therefore, that his representation constituted the best fit with the statutory factors relating to local government and existing constituency boundaries.

AC121 However, we felt duty-bound to respect – and, where appropriate, to take into account – the other views which have been expressed to us on various points. We have noted above that, exactly as the Commission's proposals divided opinion with respect to Peterborough, St Neots, Newmarket, etc., so too would Mr Whittaker's. We have therefore reviewed these issues and sought to relate the various concerns specifically to 'any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies ... and the inconveniences attendant on such changes'.

AC122 One of the difficulties we faced was that, while some evidence had been adduced with respect to local links, in general they were simply asserted without benefit of supporting data. Moreover, in many cases there was an equivalent weight of opinion pointing in each

direction. Beyond the overriding requirement of the electoral quota, we have therefore concluded that we can best fulfil our statutory obligations by giving greatest weight to the factors of local government and existing constituency boundaries. We will, however, seek to respect local concerns where this is also possible.

AC123 We conclude therefore that, while the issues with respect to this sub-region are finely balanced, the best fit with the statutory factors was achieved by the proposals put forward by Mr Whittaker. Our overall conclusion for the sub-region is therefore that, subject to proposals with regard to constituency names (which are summarised below), and noting that in many instances Mr Whittaker has supported the original proposals, we recommend accepting Mr Whittaker's counter-proposal for new constituency boundaries.

Constituency names

AC124 A number of representations have been concerned solely or additionally with the names of constituencies. Those with respect to this sub-region are set out below. We are not proposing any changes to the constituency names for Suffolk, which for completeness are listed below:

Bury St Edmunds
Central Suffolk and North Ipswich
Ipswich
South Suffolk
Suffolk Coastal
Waveney
West Suffolk.

St Neots

AC125 Although there was considerable local support for a constituency name that mentioned St Neots, there were also proposals that put forward a number of alternative names. We would recommend that, in view of the geographical spread of the constituency which it is proposed will include the town of St Neots, it should be named the St Neots and Huntingdon constituency. Taking account of Mr Whittaker’s proposals, the constituencies for Cambridgeshire would therefore be:

- Cambridge
- North East Cambridgeshire
- North West Cambridgeshire
- Peterborough
- St Neots and Huntingdon
- South East Cambridgeshire
- South West Cambridgeshire.

Norfolk constituencies

AC126 While specific issues have been raised with respect to individual Norfolk constituencies, for example that which we covered in relation to the constituency which includes Great Yarmouth (see paragraph AC115), we have also noted the generic comment that all Norfolk constituencies should include either ‘Norfolk’ or ‘Norwich’ in their titles. We agree that in relatively thinly populated constituencies which include several towns rather than one main centre of population, selecting one of them to name the constituency can seem invidious. We therefore recommend the following constituency names for Norfolk:

- Mid Norfolk (previously proposed as Broadland and Dereham)
- Norfolk Coastal (for the new constituency which includes Great Yarmouth and the coastal wards to the north)
- North Norfolk
- North West Norfolk
- Norwich North
- Norwich South
- South East Norfolk (previously proposed as South Norfolk)
- South West Norfolk (previously proposed as Thetford and Swaffham).

Summary recommendations for Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk

AC127 The following eight existing constituencies remain unchanged: Ipswich, South Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal, Waveney, Cambridge, North West Norfolk, Norwich South, and South Norfolk (new name South East Norfolk).

AC128 The configuration of the following three constituencies remains as initially proposed by the Commission: Great Yarmouth (new name Norfolk Coastal), North Norfolk, and Norwich North.

AC129 Only minor change is required to six constituencies, as set out in Mr Whittaker’s proposals: Bury St Edmunds, Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, West Suffolk, Huntingdon (new name St Neots and Huntingdon), North West Cambridgeshire, and Peterborough.

AC130 We agree with the Commission’s proposal for a cross-county boundary

constituency of Wisbech and Downham Market, but recommend Mr Whittaker's version of this.

AC131 We also adopt Mr Whittaker's proposals with respect to: North East Cambridgeshire, South East Cambridgeshire, South West Cambridgeshire, and Broadland and Dereham (new name Mid Norfolk).

The sub-region of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire

Introduction

AC132 The Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region is the most westerly of the subdivisions within the Eastern region. It borders on the London region to the south, the South East region to the west, and the East Midlands region to the north and west. It has county boundaries with Greater London to the south, Buckinghamshire to the west, and Northamptonshire to the north and west; it also borders Cambridgeshire and Essex to the north and east.

AC133 There are within this area the following unitary authorities: Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, and Luton. The remainder of the area is covered by districts of Hertfordshire: Broxbourne, Dacorum, East Hertfordshire, Hertsmere, North Hertfordshire, St Albans, Stevenage, Three Rivers, Watford, and Welwyn Hatfield.

AC134 The sub-region has a diverse pattern of settlement. It includes the garden cities of Letchworth and Welwyn as well as the new town of Stevenage. It also includes a number of larger towns, although it becomes much more rural and agricultural towards the north, as one moves away from London. Luton is the largest town in the sub-region, and forms a unitary authority. It has an electorate of 127,286 - too

many for one constituency and too few to form two.

AC135 The town of Bedford has, for some time, been linked with the smaller town of Kempston to the south-west but, without the addition of some of the villages in the surrounding area, its electorate is too small to be a single constituency. The Borough of Bedford authority covers a considerably greater area. With the exception of Luton, none of the towns in the sub-region contain in themselves a large enough electorate to create a constituency without the addition of surrounding wards. These often contain small villages and are generally more rural in nature. That is a factor that we have borne in mind, and we have not always been able to create constituencies in which all parts can be said to have local ties or, indeed, simple transport links.

AC136 The largest airport in the sub-region is Luton, serving a significant number of primarily European and Mediterranean destinations. There are also a number of rail links, most running north-south out of London, linking the centres of Bedford, Luton, and St Albans to London and onwards to Gatwick Airport and Brighton.

AC137 The West Coast Main Line passes through the sub-region, connecting Watford, Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted, and Tring to London Euston to the south, and Northampton and Milton Keynes to the north. There are also rail services from Stevenage, Welwyn Garden City, and Hertford into London King's Cross and Moorgate. Other services from this part of the region also connect Hertford and Bishop's Stortford with London Liverpool Street. Some of the towns in the southern part of the region (Rickmansworth, Chorleywood, and Moor Park) are served by the Metropolitan Line of the

London Underground. A branch of that line also serves Croxley and Watford.

AC138 The southern part of the sub-region is crossed by the M25. The M1 and the A1(M) also cross it, running roughly north-south. Other road links running east-west are not so well developed – a common theme in some of the submissions from members of the public.

AC139 There are currently 17 constituencies in the sub-region, and the Commission's proposals reduce this to 16. The combined electorate of the three unitary authorities (Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, and Luton) that were part of the former County of Bedfordshire was 432,090, which indicates an allocation of 5.6 constituencies. The Commission concluded that it was not possible to allocate six whole constituencies to Bedfordshire with electorates within 5% of the electoral quota, and that Bedfordshire needed to be grouped with a neighbouring county.

AC140 The Commission also noted that the County of Hertfordshire had an electorate of 811,936, which indicates an allocation of 10.6 constituencies. With an allocation of 11 constituencies, the average of each constituency would be 73,812, just 1,002 electors above the lower limit (72,810) of the statutory electorate range. They considered that it would prove difficult to design 11 satisfactory constituencies all with electorates within the 5% target, and therefore decided to review Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire together and allocate 16 constituencies, one fewer than at present.

Representations

AC141 While there have been a small number of counter-proposals on this matter, including one from Robert Holgate (IP/001956) suggesting moving the wards Royston

Meridian, Royston Heath, and Royston Palace from the proposed Letchworth constituency to a South Cambridgeshire constituency, all three Parliamentary political parties and the vast majority of public responses have been in favour of the Commission's proposal and we see no reason, from the representations we have seen, to change this approach. The proposal to move the Royston wards takes no account of the impact that this would have on the existing constituencies, nor does it provide a sufficient reason for crossing the county boundary.

AC142 Three constituencies proposed by the Commission cross the boundary between Hertfordshire and the District of Central Bedfordshire. One proposed constituency crosses the boundary between the Borough of Bedford and the District of Central Bedfordshire. One proposed constituency crosses the boundary between the District of Central Bedfordshire and the Borough of Luton.

AC143 The Commission did, however, in making its proposals, accept that it was not necessary to alter the existing South West Hertfordshire constituency, which would have an effect on the neighbouring Hemel Hempstead and Watford constituencies.

AC144 There was, initially, some support for the main thrust of the proposals from all three Parliamentary political parties at a regional level, subject to submissions from the Conservative Party, supported by the Liberal Democrats, that the existing South West Hertfordshire constituency should be retained as it is. It was, however, accepted by most that Carpenders Park ward should be moved from Watford to Hertsmere.

AC145 Three interlinked proposals in particular have generated a substantial number of

submissions and are the most contentious. These are the proposal to:

- a. cross the Bedfordshire/Hertfordshire border in three places, it being argued that this was not necessary;
- b. include Dunstable within a new Luton North and Dunstable constituency; and
- c. divide the District of Central Bedfordshire between six constituencies.

AC146 Central Bedfordshire Council, the MPs for Mid Bedfordshire and South West Bedfordshire, and many others in the area objected to proposals which included parts of Central Bedfordshire in six different constituencies.

AC147 These counter-proposals affect a large number of constituencies to the extent that it would be impractical to summarise them here. It is, however, appropriate to note at this point that a number of the submissions objecting to the inclusion of the wards of Potton, and Stotfold and Arlesey within Letchworth, the inclusion of Langford and Henlow Village, Shefford, and Silsoe and Shillington within Hitchin and Harpenden, and the inclusion of the South East Bedfordshire ward within Hemel Hempstead are inextricably linked with the principal issues.

AC148 There was also substantial opposition to the combining of North Luton with Dunstable, an issue which is linked to the proposals for Central Bedfordshire.

AC149 The inclusion of the Bromham and Turvey wards within the Commission's proposed Bedford constituency has resulted in a substantial number of supportive submissions.

AC150 The inclusion of Ashridge ward (Dacorum) in a South West Hertfordshire constituency rather than a Hemel Hempstead constituency, as it is at present, was opposed by the overwhelming majority of those making submissions on this issue. This one proposal, relating to a ward of 2,138 electors, resulted in more than 100 submissions, all but one or two opposing the change.

AC151 There were several submissions from individuals in Chesfield objecting to that ward being included in Stevenage. These are dealt with in detail below. We note that several submissions opposing the extension of the Hitchin and Harpenden constituency into Bedfordshire make comments suggesting that the two towns should be separated and that the linking of these disparate towns has not been popular. We also noted that there has been strong support for retaining the Welwyn Hatfield constituency as has been proposed. A significant number of individuals made submissions to the Commission supporting these proposals.

AC152 We have also noted that there was broad support for the proposals for Broxbourne, Hertford and Stortford, Hertsmere, and Welwyn Hatfield, and - with the exceptions of the region-wide and sub-region-wide proposals from Mr Matthew Bedford and Mr Paul Zukowskyj (IP/006099), Mr Whitehead, Mr Kelly, Mr Bailey, Mr Smyth, and Mr Whittaker - few counter-proposals.

AC153 Central Bedfordshire Council (IP/022041) has made a counter-proposal, which we set out in detail below. In summary, it objects to the removal of the Mid Bedfordshire constituency and the crossing of the Hertfordshire/Bedfordshire border in three places. Its counter-proposal alters significantly the proposal for Luton, seeking to link Luton

South with Harpenden. Its proposals also seek to redraw much of the rest of the sub-region.

AC154 As the adopted solution in Luton has a significant impact on surrounding constituencies and beyond, we consider that we must deal with this matter first. Many of the sub-region-wide counter-proposals are predicated on linking Luton South with Harpenden, or in one case Luton North with Houghton Regis.

AC155 Luton is a relatively small and compact unitary authority. The Commission's proposal is to link Luton North and Dunstable, which is currently in the South West Bedfordshire constituency. The new constituency would therefore include the following wards of Luton: Bramingham, Challney, Ickniel, Leagrave, Lewsey, Limbury, Northwell, and Sundon Park – as well as Dunstable Downs, Ickniel, Northfields, and Watling from Central Bedfordshire.

AC156 To compensate for the loss of Dunstable, the Commission has proposed that South West Bedfordshire should be extended northwards to include four Central Bedfordshire wards, including the town of Flitwick, currently in the existing Mid Bedfordshire constituency. This, and the need to make adjustment to the Bedford constituency itself, led the Commission to make proposals restructuring Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, and to a lesser extent Hertfordshire.

AC157 There have been over 80 submissions from residents of Dunstable supported by Andrew Selous MP (IP/016271), Dunstable Town Council (IP/023689), and other organisations within Dunstable and the surrounding area, all objecting to Dunstable being linked with Luton North.

AC158 Some of these submissions, including from Dunstable Town Council, favoured Central Bedfordshire Council's counter-proposal, as does Mr Selous, but for the most part, submissions in the first stage made no counter-proposals. The general flavour of submissions from members of the public is that Dunstable and Luton have little or nothing in common. They stress that Dunstable is an independent market town, and that the constituents of Luton and Dunstable are entirely different. Examples are IP/003025, IP/004760, and IP/017784.

AC159 A few of the submissions raised concerns that the linking of Dunstable with Luton would result in a decrease in house prices and/or raising of insurance prices. No evidence has been produced to support either assertion, nor are they factors we could properly take into account. A number of submissions, including one from Mr Waterworth, Principal of All Saints Academy, Dunstable (IP/016107), drew attention to educational issues.

AC160 Mr Selous objects to the proposals on the basis that there would be only one Parliamentary constituency wholly within the Central Bedfordshire Council area. He also comments that the majority of children who attend All Saints Academy live in Houghton Regis and that the Central Bedfordshire College, based in Dunstable, would have different Members of Parliament for the Dunstable site and its Kingsland campus in Houghton Regis.

AC161 We note that many institutions of higher education are split between different campuses and are located in different constituencies. We note, also, that in urban areas it is common for school catchment areas to cover more than one constituency. We do,

however, also note that Mr Selous's other concern – that South East Bedfordshire ward should not be included in a Hemel Hempstead constituency – is addressed by the counter-proposal by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj (see paragraph AC180 below).

AC162 Apart from the campaign to support Central Bedfordshire's counter-proposals, there are relatively few submissions concerning Luton and Dunstable in the secondary consultation period.

AC163 The counter-proposal from Central Bedfordshire Council (IP/022041), supported by Nadine Dorries MP (IP/023666), notes that the Commission's proposals would result in Central Bedfordshire District being represented by six MPs, rather than the current four. They note also that Central Bedfordshire is a relatively new authority.

AC164 They proposed substantial changes to the Commission's proposals. In summary, they advocate:

- a. abolishing Hitchin and Harpenden, by adding five Hitchin wards to Letchworth;
- b. creating a Harpenden and Luton South constituency from part of the proposed constituencies of Luton South (eight wards), Hitchin and Harpenden (four wards), and Hemel Hempstead (one ward);
- c. creating a Hoo constituency out of five wards from South West Bedfordshire, six wards from Hitchin and Harpenden, and four from North Bedfordshire; and
- d. preserving a South West Bedfordshire constituency.

AC165 There is support from a number of individuals and councils for the Commission's proposals from several sources, particularly individuals who made submissions supporting the changes in their entirety.

AC166 During the secondary consultation period, we received a substantial number of submissions from parish and town councils and members of the public in support of Central Bedfordshire Council's (CBC's) proposals. Some of the submissions we received (such as CR/004644 and CR/004707) have the heading 'suggested text'. This text is repeated, either in full or in part, in the overwhelming majority of the submissions in favour of the CBC's proposals.

AC167 We note that the text appears to have been sent to a number of organisations or bodies that disagreed with it – see, for example, CR/004163. Some, such as CR/004460, do add to the suggested text but do not address the impact of the proposals on other constituencies. The submissions make five main points.

- a. 'The Boundary Commission proposal crosses county boundaries three times (the largest number in the entire UK), while the CBC proposal only crosses them twice.'
- b. 'The Boundary Commission proposal will "move" many more voters than the CBC proposal.'
- c. 'The CBC proposal contains lines of communications that are much shorter and therefore more effective.'
- d. 'The CBC proposal maintains Central Bedfordshire's sense of place as a rural area distinct from the urban conurbations to the north and south.'

- e. 'This strong rural definition is a tourist attraction and economic asset for the area as has been recently confirmed with the announcement of the new Center Parcs site in addition to Woburn Safari Park, Woburn Abbey and Elstow Abbey.'

AC168 The submissions also make the point that 'Parliamentary boundaries should concord with a sense of place' and refer also to 'a loss of identities at local level and confusion among residents of responsibility levels as a result of the changes which have occurred recently'.

AC169 There is difficulty in attaching much weight to the 'suggested text' submissions. First, they suffer from the same defect as the main proposals, in failing to address the substantial changes made to Hertfordshire. Second, while they are from different parish councils, there is little or no attempt to explain the impact on that particular parish.

AC170 We consider that these submissions do not take into account the fact that Central Bedfordshire is at present covered by four existing constituencies. There is insufficient detail with regard to 'lines of communication' and we note that Central Bedfordshire covers a diverse area. The individual submissions based on the standard text are not specific. A sense of place or identity is an elusive and subjective concept, and we are not satisfied that the change of constituency boundaries would alter this or affect tourism in the area.

AC171 We consider that the counter-proposal suggests substantial changes across Hertfordshire, splitting up existing ties, and is predicated on linking Harpenden and Luton and thus dividing Hitchin and Harpenden. We accept that there are good rail and road links between Luton and Harpenden, but the open parkland of the Luton Hoo estate lies between

them. There is no continuous built-up area, as there is with Luton and Dunstable.

AC172 The point is made that it is difficult to see where Houghton Regis ends and Dunstable begins. We accept that point, but it applies equally to the continuous built-up area between Dunstable and Luton. Most of the boundary between Lewsey ward (Luton) and Icknield ward (Central Bedfordshire) follows a residential street, Poynters Road. The A505 connects the centres of Dunstable and Luton and is surrounded by development.

AC173 CBC states that including Dunstable within Luton North is 'contrary to the fundamentals of a broad community of interest', yet fails to (a) say what that is, or (b) relate it to a statutory factor.

AC174 There is an inconsistency in CBC saying that the connection with Luton is a convenient transport link, while accepting, by implication, the link with the hospital. CBC asserts that some residents of Dunstable would shop in Milton Keynes, others in Luton, and that the 'cultural lifestyle of Luton is significantly different from that enjoyed by the residents of Dunstable' but without saying what that difference is. CBC wants to reinstate the Mid Bedfordshire constituency as it is an agricultural area, 'shares same values and interests and (small towns apart – Flitwick and Ampthill) the electorate is spread out'. We note also that CBC refers to the fact that the area is growing due to new housing, but would point out that that is not a relevant factor.

AC175 We note that the proposed Mid Bedfordshire and Hoo constituency would stretch for many miles from Luton Airport in the south to Flitwick in the north, and that Welwyn Hatfield would stretch as far as Mundens, which is at a substantial distance from Welwyn Garden City or Hatfield, with no

direct road or rail connection. We consider that these are significant issues of accessibility, and do not sit well with the statutory factors. We therefore recommend the Commission's proposed Luton North and Dunstable, and Luton South constituencies.

AC176 At the public hearing in Luton, Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj put forward an alternative to the Commission's proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. We consider that it is necessary to set this out in some detail, as it involves changes to 12 of the proposed 16 constituencies within the sub-region, leaving intact only the Commission's proposed constituencies of Bedford, Hertsmere, Luton North and Dunstable, and Luton South.

AC177 Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj made the point that there are 13 local authorities across the two counties, only one of which has the right number of electors for a single constituency (Welwyn Hatfield). Their counter-proposals result in a greater number of electors changing constituency, but consider that this is balanced by a closer alignment with local authority boundaries such that no local authority is split between more than four constituencies.

AC178 Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj proposed an alternative Broxbourne constituency, consisting of all of the wards of Broxbourne Borough Council plus Hunsdon, Sawbridgeworth, and Stanstead Abbots, from East Hertfordshire. Their justification for this is the strong link between Great Amwell and Ware, and that the three East Hertfordshire wards form a single county electoral division. They also proposed moving Northaw and Cuffley ward to Welwyn Hatfield.

AC179 They proposed a similar Hertford and Stortford constituency to that proposed by the

Commission, with the addition of Braughing, Great Amwell, Hertford Rural North, Hertford Rural South, and Puckeridge. In consequence, Hunsdon and Sawbridgeworth are to be added to Broxbourne. The reasoning behind this change is to reverse the dividing of the Hertford Rural wards from Hertford at the previous review, and the linking of Great Amwell with Ware. We have, however, received only one submission on that issue (IP/002885), and did not consider that such a transfer would best reflect the statutory factors.

AC180 The counter-proposal makes a substantial change to the Hitchin and Harpenden constituency, by removing Hitchin and reuniting it with Letchworth and Baldock. This results in the constituency becoming the sole cross-county boundary constituency, reducing the number of constituencies incorporating wards from Central Bedfordshire Council from six to four. It comprises a coherent block of small towns and villages along both sides of the county boundary, skirting around proposed compact urban constituencies in Luton. It proposed, also, that the constituency be named Harpenden and Mid Bedfordshire, consisting of: Barton, Langford and Henlow Village, Shefford, Silsoe and Shillington, South East Bedfordshire, and Stotfold and Arlesey wards from Central Bedfordshire; Cadwell, Hitchwood Offa and Hoo, and Kimpton from North Hertfordshire; and Harpenden East, Harpenden North, Harpenden South, Harpenden West, and Wheathampstead from St Albans.

AC181 Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj also proposed a substantial reconfiguring of Letchworth, by adding the wards of Hitchin Bearton, Hitchin Highbury, Hitchin Oughton, Hitchin Priory, and Hitchin Walsworth to the constituency proposed by the Commission. They further proposed: the addition of Potton

to North Bedfordshire; Stotfold and Arlesey to Hitchin and Harpenden (to be renamed Harpenden and Mid Bedfordshire); Braughing and Puckeridge to Hertford and Stortford; and Mundens and Cottered ward to Stevenage. Letchworth would be altered substantially as a result, and the proposal is for it to be called North Hertfordshire, comprising for the most part the towns of Hitchin, Baldock, Letchworth, and Royston.

AC182 Minor changes are suggested to the Commission's proposed North Bedfordshire and South West Bedfordshire constituencies, by moving Cranfield and Marston wards from North Bedfordshire to South West Bedfordshire and adding Barton to the proposed new constituency of Harpenden and Mid Bedfordshire, and adding Pottton to North Bedfordshire.

AC183 Minor changes are also proposed to St Albans, by moving the Bedmond & Primrose Hill ward to Hemel Hempstead, and to the proposed Stevenage constituency, by adding Mundens and Cottered from Letchworth and Watton-at-Stone from Welwyn Hatfield. The changes result in only one constituency crossing the county boundary between Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. The changes proposed to South West Hertfordshire, to Watford, and to Hemel Hempstead are similar to a number of other proposals, and we deal with these in detail below.

AC184 There is support for these proposals from the Liberal Democrats, and the fact that they reduce cross-county boundary constituencies is noted in the secondary consultation period submissions from the Conservatives.

AC185 We note that these counter-proposals address many of the concerns raised by Central Bedfordshire Council and others. In particular,

there were a number of submissions from electors in Pottton objecting to being linked with Hertfordshire. It satisfies too those members of the public in Puckeridge who did not want to be separated from Stanton in the adjacent Hertford and Stortford constituency. The proposals also address some of the concerns raised by those who support Central Bedfordshire Council's counter-proposals, as they minimise cross-county boundary constituencies. We note that, of the 78,055 electors within the proposed Harpenden and Mid Bedfordshire constituency, 42,709 would be from Central Bedfordshire. It is our view that moving Bedmond & Primrose Hill ward from St Albans makes sense, as it is separated from the centre of St Albans by the M1 to the east and by the M25 from Watford to the south, but has close links to Kings Langley and Hemel Hempstead immediately to the north. These ties were also referred to by Alexander Walkington at the Luton public hearing.

AC186 There is further support from Three Rivers District Council (CR/002073), which also prefers the counter-proposal from Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj to that proposed by the Commission. We note in passing that, although Three Rivers District Council is small in terms of electorate, no objection has been raised to the fact that it would fall into four proposed constituencies. We do, however, also note that there are a substantial number of submissions, albeit part of a campaign, in support of the Commission's proposals for Welwyn Hatfield.

AC187 Aside from the organised campaign in support of the Central Bedfordshire counter-proposal during the secondary consultation period, which differs significantly from Mr Bedford's and Mr Zukowskyj's counter-proposal, there were no express submissions opposed to the latter.

AC188 We are satisfied, viewing the counter-proposal as a whole, that it reflects the statutory factors better than the Commission's proposals, in that it preserves the status quo in Hemel Hempstead and South West Hertfordshire, and reduces the cross-county boundary constituencies to one. While we have taken careful note of the secondary consultation period representations from Central Bedfordshire and from the Conservative Party, we consider that the solution for Luton that best fits the statutory factors is that put forward by the Commission, and that the solution put forward for the rest of Bedfordshire by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj is equally persuasive in minimising cross-county boundary constituencies.

AC189 On that basis, we reject the counter-proposals put forward by Central Bedfordshire and others, as they are, for the most part, dependent on a division of Luton and its linking to Harpenden, which we have rejected.

AC190 The Commission noted that the existing Bedford constituency is too small and so proposed adding two wards to it – Bromham and Turvey – from the existing North Bedfordshire constituency. This in turn required additions to the latter. This solution has been supported by the Conservative Party in its response to the initial proposals, submitting that Bromham, and in particular Biddenham within that ward, have close ties to Bedford, and that Turvey has close links with Kempston, already included within the proposed constituency.

AC191 The Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats proposed an alternative, submitting that Bromham and Turvey are more rural, and so should be included in North Bedfordshire, and that the Eastcotts, Wilshamstead, and Wootton

wards to the south of the proposed constituency should be included in Bedford in place of Bromham and Turvey. This counter-proposal would not affect other proposed constituencies, and both constituencies would be within the statutory limit.

AC192 Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj's counter-proposal supports the Commission's proposal for Bedford, but suggests that Potton be included in the North Bedfordshire constituency, and Cranfield and Marston removed. This would give North Bedfordshire an electorate of 77,514. If the Eastcotts, Wilshamstead, and Wootton wards were exchanged with Bromham and Turvey, then North Bedfordshire would have 75,158 electors and Bedford would have 80,014 electors, both within the statutory electorate range.

AC193 We are aware that there have been recent amendments to the ward boundaries within Bedford, and that some names have also changed. The Commission did not take the new boundaries into account, and we are concerned to note that, using any of the counter-proposals above, some of the 'new' wards will be split between North Bedfordshire and Bedford.

AC194 We acknowledge that there is substantial support for including Bromham in Bedford, and we do note that part of the ward is an extension of the built-up part of Bedford. There is less strong support for the inclusion of Turvey, which is more rural in nature.

AC195 The objections to the inclusion of Bromham, and to a greater extent Turvey, such as that of the Bedford Borough Labour Group (IP/025028), stress that they are rural. We have a submission from Bromham Parish Council (IP/023541), which supports that view and recommends that Bromham should be included in North Bedfordshire. We note that

Bedford Borough Council also supports the inclusion of the three southern wards.

AC196 The counter-proposal, supported by the Liberal Democrats and the Labour Party, stressed that there are new housing developments within Wootton, Wilshamstead, and Eastcotts (see, for example, IP/012568), suggesting that parts of the wards are within the urban sprawl. We note also that the Labour Party refers to bus routes as linking the southern wards. That is not disputed by other submissions, but neither is it determinative.

AC197 We took careful note of the submission from John Guthrie (CR/001677) that all the wards in question are in part rural. We find there is merit in that observation, and that the three southern wards fan out from the centre of Bedford along arterial roads. There has, as stated above, clearly been recent housing development towards the Bedford end of these wards, and we note that there are several streets north of the A421 bypass within Wilshamstead ward which form a continuous urban development.

AC198 Some of the objections to inclusion of the three southern wards point out that they are separated by dual carriageway of the A421. That is perhaps true of Eastcotts, but it crosses Wilshamstead, dividing it in two, and there is no such separation dividing Wootton from Kempston South.

AC199 We did consider retaining only Bromham ward within Bedford, as was suggested by Mr Whittaker, while placing Turvey ward in a North Bedfordshire constituency. The electorate is small enough for that to be done, but it does result in North Bedfordshire becoming a 'doughnut

constituency'. While this is less than ideal, it does, we note, occur elsewhere around the country.

AC200 We considered also whether it would be appropriate to split the three southern wards, but given our acceptance of the counter-proposal by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj, that would result in an orphan ward⁹ (or wards), which we wish to avoid if possible. Further, the size of the wards means that Bromham must be left out of Bedford, if the three southern wards are included.

AC201 After reviewing all of the submissions received, we consider that Bromham and the three Southern wards all have close local ties to Bedford. They cannot all be included, and nor has it been suggested that we should split wards.

AC202 We find that, on balance, we are persuaded that the statutory factors are better met by the inclusion of Bromham within Bedford, given the strong links between it and the rest of Bedford. We are not persuaded that this is necessarily so with Turvey ward, which we consider is more closely linked to rural Bedfordshire, and so we propose that it should be included within a North Bedfordshire constituency. We are, of course, aware that this is not the ideal solution, but it is the solution which best fits the statutory factors, and we note that it may well change in future, given the changes in ward boundaries within Bedford since May 2010.

AC203 In South West Hertfordshire, and Watford, the Commission proposed moving three wards – Langleybury, Abbots Langley, and Leavesden ('the Abbots Langley wards') – from the existing Watford constituency into the South

⁹ 'Orphan' ward(s) 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.

West Hertfordshire constituency, and moving Ashridge (Three Rivers), Hayling, Moor Park & Eastbury, Northwick, and Oxhey Hall ('the Three Rivers wards') into Watford. It also proposed moving Ashridge (Dacorum) from Hemel Hempstead to South West Hertfordshire. The Commission did acknowledge that these transfers were not essential.

AC204 The Commission also proposed moving Carpenders Park ward into Hertsmere, as the electorate in the existing Hertsmere constituency is too small. This then allowed it to minimise changes to St Albans and Welwyn Hatfield. With a few exceptions (e.g. IP/004172, IP/004190, and IP/007051) which set out no counter-proposals, there was broad support for the proposed move from councils, individuals, and from the Parliamentary political parties. We acknowledge that there is little connection between Carpenders Park and the rest of Hertsmere, but no other solution better meets the statutory factors, and this proposal has the advantage of minimising changes elsewhere.

AC205 We note that the Abbots Langley wards have a total of 11,406 electors and that the Three Rivers wards have a total electorate of 15,272. On that basis, these two groups of wards cannot simply be swapped, as that would increase South West Hertfordshire's electorate to over the statutory maximum. Only if Ashridge (Dacorum) ward is returned to Hemel Hempstead (the status quo) will this counter-proposal work in numerical terms.

AC206 We note that two of the Parliamentary political parties – the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats – as well as Watford Borough Council (IP/012886) and Abbots Langley Parish Council (IP/020876) support a return to the status quo, as do the counter-proposals from Central Bedfordshire Council and from Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj. The boundary

between the Abbots Langley wards and Watford runs through a built-up area, and the wards have all been part of the Watford constituency since 1983. We note also that there is a narrow green belt boundary between the Three Rivers wards in the built-up area of Watford.

AC207 The Labour Party made a counter-proposal that the Leavesden ward should be retained in Watford and that the Moor Park & Eastbury ward should be retained within South West Hertfordshire. This would result in Langleybury and Abbots Langley also being retained in South West Hertfordshire. There was substantial opposition to this proposal, including from Abbots Langley Parish Council (IP/020876) and others, indicating that it would be difficult to divide the wards on this basis, given the strong links between them. We find substantial merit in that argument.

AC208 We have also taken note of the submissions stressing that South Oxhey forms a community in itself, separate from Moor Park, and that, as it is predominantly a London County Council estate constructed in the 1950s, it has much more in common with Watford and the council estates there. We consider that the green belt gap separating the three wards from Oxhey Hall ward is, although not wide, a significant and identifiable gap, more so than the boundary with the Abbots Langley wards. The boundary between Leavesden and Watford's Woodside ward cuts through a number of residential streets, as does the boundary between Leavesden, Langleybury, and Abbots Langley wards.

AC209 We accept that retaining the Three Rivers wards in South West Hertfordshire will, as several submissions indicate, mean that the electorate is only 66 short of the statutory maximum, and so makes this likely to be a

temporary solution. We do not, on reflection, consider that this is a matter to which we can attach much weight. We cannot predict changes in electorate in the proposed constituencies, or those surrounding them, or their impact on future reviews.

AC210 We consider that we should deal with Ashridge (Dacorum) ward in some detail, given that although it contains only 2,138 electors, it generated more than 100 submissions in the initial stage of consultation, all (bar one) urging that it be retained within Hemel Hempstead. That solution is supported by the MPs for South West Hertfordshire and Hemel Hempstead, by Three Rivers District Council, several parish councils, local councillors, and members of the public.

AC211 The submissions draw attention to a number of different issues: transport, employment, shopping links to Hemel Hempstead, and links to doctors and dentists, etc. Others draw attention to the rural nature of the ward and its historic links to Hemel Hempstead.

AC212 The submission from Mike Penning, MP for Hemel Hempstead (IP/021243), draws together a number of these concerns, stating:

‘There are many examples of the natural affinity and close relationship between the inhabitants of the Ashridge villages and urban Hemel Hempstead. Residents throughout the Ashridge ward, for example, will use facilities in Hemel Hempstead to access secondary schools, doctors surgeries, dentists, the train station, the Post Office, the Registrar of Births and Deaths, supermarkets and the Library. As our rural communities suffer the constant loss of facilities brought about by economic necessities they become more and more reliant upon

nearby urban centres for essential services and facilities. This is exactly what has happened in our area. The affinity works in the other direction as well. One of the largest employers in the Hemel Hempstead area is the Management College at Ashridge. Many Hemel town residents work there.’

AC213 Looking at the submissions overall, we believe that the counter-proposal – that the Abbots Langley wards should be retained in a Watford constituency, that the Three Rivers wards be retained within a South West Hertfordshire constituency, and that the Ashridge (Dacorum) ward be retained in a Hemel Hempstead constituency – better reflects the statutory factors.

AC214 We next turn to the Hemel Hempstead and St Albans constituencies. As the electorates of the existing constituencies are too small, the Commission proposed adding the South East Bedfordshire ward of Central Bedfordshire (currently mostly in Luton South) to Hemel Hempstead. They proposed extending St Albans northwards to include Redbourn and Sandridge wards, which although in the existing Hitchin and Harpenden constituency are within the City of St Albans District. This was supported by the Conservative Party. Mr Bedford’s and Mr Zukowskyj’s counter-proposal proposes retaining Ashridge ward within the Hemel Hempstead constituency and adding Bedmond & Primrose Hill ward from the District of Three Rivers.

AC215 For the reasons already set out, we consider that Ashridge ward should be retained in Hemel Hempstead, as should the Bedmond & Primrose Hill ward. We have considered also that the statutory factors are best met by South East Bedfordshire ward being included in a new Mid Bedfordshire and

Harpenden constituency, as suggested by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj, but with a different name, to reflect the fact that most of the electors in the constituency will be drawn from Central Bedfordshire.

AC216 We have grouped together for comment the proposed Broxbourne, Hertford and Stortford, Letchworth, Stevenage, and Welwyn Hatfield constituencies, as the submissions and counter-proposals for them suggest, for the most part, slightly differing, but discrete, configurations. We received comparatively few submissions with regard to these constituencies, over and above the sub-region-wide and region-wide counter-proposals, referred to above.

AC217 In the context of these constituencies, we have attached little weight to the submissions from Mr Bailey, Mr Whittaker, Mr Smyth, and Mr Whitehead as, for the reasons set out above, their submissions are predicated on the linking of Luton South to Harpenden, which we have rejected, and in some cases on the splitting of wards and a cross sub-region solution, which we have also rejected.

AC218 The Commission noted that, of the remaining five existing constituencies in Hertfordshire, only the Hertford and Stortford constituency is within 5% of the electoral quota, but that that constituency would have to be altered to accommodate the changes that need to be made to the other four, Broxbourne, North East Hertfordshire, Stevenage, and Welwyn Hatfield. The initial proposal was to extend the existing Stevenage constituency northwards to include the Chesfield ward of North Hertfordshire District and eastwards to include the Walkern ward of East Hertfordshire District.

AC219 We received around 15 submissions from members of the public opposing the

inclusion of Chesfield ward in the Stevenage constituency. Most of these related to concerns that by including rural villages such as Graveley and Wymondley, the town of Stevenage would encroach into the green belt within the ward.

AC220 In their initial submissions, the Conservative Party supported the addition of the Chesfield and Walkern wards, proposing also that the Watton-at-Stone ward should be added to the constituency on the basis that it has far closer ties and community links with Stevenage than with Welwyn Hatfield. The Liberal Democrats made no counter-proposals. The Labour Party, while supporting the inclusion of Chesfield, proposed that Walkern should be retained within Letchworth.

AC221 Oliver Heald, MP for North East Hertfordshire, was concerned to see that the Watton-at-Stone ward was not included in the proposed Stevenage constituency. He proposed its inclusion, given that it has rail links to Stevenage (which is its largest shopping centre) and that it has few ties with Welwyn Hatfield. We accept that there are significant transport links between the centre of Watton-at-Stone and Stevenage and there are also links to Hertford to the south, but few to the proposed Welwyn Hatfield constituency.

AC222 Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj's counter-proposal is similar to the proposal put forward by the Commission, but with the addition of Mundens and Cottered, and Watton-at-Stone wards from the District of East Hertfordshire. We do, however, have reservations about the counter-proposal by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj, given the effect it had on the initially proposed Broxbourne constituency which, if the proposals were adopted, would run from Waltham Cross in the south to Sawbridgeworth in the north, a distance of some 12 miles. The proposed

constituency is long and narrow, and the roads and other links between Sawbridgeworth and the rest of the constituency fall outside its boundaries. Nonetheless, for the reasons set out below, we consider that this can be resolved, and accordingly that the counter-proposal by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj (subject to the revisions set out below) is viable and, viewing the sub-region as a whole, best reflects the statutory factors.

AC223 We considered whether it would be possible to alter the make-up of the constituencies in the east and south of Hertfordshire, so that the advantages of the proposals for Central Bedfordshire and Luton set out above could be preserved. We consider that this can and should be done, and that doing so has the effect of best fit with the statutory factors across the sub-region as a whole.

AC224 We therefore propose a new South East Hertfordshire constituency, which differs slightly from the Commission's proposed Broxbourne constituency by the addition of Hertford Heath and Hunsdon wards, which we consider do have links with each other, and the removal of Northaw and Cuffley, which allows the District of Welwyn Hatfield to remain entirely within one constituency.

AC225 The creation of Mid Bedfordshire and Harpenden constituency makes it necessary to amend substantially the Commission's proposed Letchworth constituency. We therefore propose that the Hertfordshire towns of Letchworth, Hitchin, Royston, and Baldock should be grouped together, as proposed by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj, in a constituency to be named North Hertfordshire. There are significant links between these

towns, as they are all, with the exception of one ward, from North Hertfordshire District Council.

AC226 We propose a revised Welwyn Hatfield constituency that differs from the Commission's proposal by the addition of Northaw and Cuffley (discussed above), and the removal of Watton-at-Stone. We accept the arguments put by a substantial number of respondents suggesting that Watton-at-Stone should be included within the Stevenage constituency.

AC227 Finally, we also propose that the Stevenage constituency include the East Hertfordshire ward of Mundens and Cottered, as per the counter-proposal by Mr Bedford and Mr Zukowskyj, and that Hertford and Stortford should be as proposed by the Commission, but with the addition of Braughing and Puckeridge wards in place of Hertford Heath and Hunsdon wards, thus allowing Puckeridge to remain with Thundridge & Standon (see submissions IP/002445 and IP/005730 in favour of this).

Constituency names

AC228 Other than the proposed name changes above, which reflect changes to the Commission's proposals, we have received few submissions regarding the names of constituencies in this sub-region. In consequence, we propose no further changes.

Conclusions and recommendations¹⁰

AC229 For the Essex sub-region, the configuration of the following constituencies remains as initially proposed: Basildon and Thurrock East, Braintree and Witham, Brentwood and Ongar, Colchester, Epping Forest, Harlow, Harwich and Clacton, Maldon, North East Essex, North West Essex (Saffron Walden), Thurrock.

¹⁰ Note: proposed name changes are indicated in brackets following the initially proposed constituency names.

AC230 These constituencies differ from the initial proposals: Billericay and Great Dunmow, Castle Point, Chelmsford, Rayleigh and Wickford, Rochford and Southend East (Southend East and Rochford), Southend West.

AC231 In relation to Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk, the configuration of the following constituencies remain as initially proposed: Cambridge, Great Yarmouth (Norfolk Coastal), North Norfolk, Norwich North, Norwich South, South Norfolk (South East Norfolk), Ipswich, South Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal, Waveney.

AC232 The following constituencies differ from the initial proposals: St Neots and Huntingdon, North East Cambridgeshire, North West Cambridgeshire, Peterborough, South East Cambridgeshire, South West Cambridgeshire, Wisbech and Downham Market, Mid Norfolk, North West Norfolk, Thetford and Swaffham (South West Norfolk), Bury St Edmunds, Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, West Suffolk.

AC233 For the sub-region of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, the following constituencies remain as initially proposed: Hertsmere, Luton North and Dunstable, Luton South.

AC234 The following constituencies differ from the initial proposals: Bedford, Broxbourne (South East Hertfordshire), Welwyn Hatfield, Hemel Hempstead, Hertford and Stortford, Hitchin and Harpenden (Mid Bedfordshire and Harpenden), Letchworth (North Hertfordshire), North Bedfordshire, South West Bedfordshire, South West Hertfordshire, St Albans, Stevenage, Watford.

Len Jackson
Heather Peck
Jeremy Rintoul
July 2012

4. How to have your say

4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 16 October 2012 to 10 December 2012. We encourage everyone to use this 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 People are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, but our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. These appear in red on the accompanying maps. We will consider representations on initial proposals we have not revised (blue on the maps). However, particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to make changes now to proposals that have already withstood intensive scrutiny of representations made in the earlier stages of consultation. Further representations on unmodified initial proposals that simply repeat evidence or arguments already raised in previous 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 *A guide to the 2013 Review*. Most importantly:

a. 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);

- b. we are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (as at May 2010) as the building blocks of constituencies. Our view is that, in the absence of exceptional and compelling circumstances it would not be appropriate to divide wards in cases where it is possible to construct constituencies that meet the 5% statutory requirement without doing so; and
- c. we have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. 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, at www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk, when contributing to our consultation. The 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 have your say on our revised proposals.

4.6 You can also contribute to our consultation by writing directly to us or by emailing us with your views, to eastern@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk. If you wish to comment on more than one region, please send your email to reviews@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk. You can also find these details on the separate summary sheet, copies of which can be found at your local place of deposit, or downloaded from our website, at www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk.

4.7 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 at www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/privacy-and-cookies/.

What do we want views on?

4.8 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 are happy with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a rather 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.

4.9 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 2013.

4.10 It would be very helpful if in your response you specify clearly in what form you accessed this revised proposals report, i.e. either:

- a. in electronic form (even if you then printed it off to read); or
- b. as a hard copy publication.

Annex: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
1. Basildon and Thurrock East CC			74,720
	Fryerns	Basildon	9,261
	Laindon Park	Basildon	8,252
	Langdon Hills	Basildon	6,900
	Lee Chapel North	Basildon	8,705
	Nethermayne	Basildon	8,748
	St Martin's	Basildon	5,798
	Corringham and Fobbing	Thurrock	4,485
	East Tilbury	Thurrock	4,746
	Stanford East and Corringham Town	Thurrock	6,476
	Stanford-le-Hope West	Thurrock	4,682
	The Homesteads	Thurrock	6,667
2. Bedford BC			75,432
	Brickhill	Bedford	6,339
	Bromham	Bedford	6,413
	Castle	Bedford	5,805
	Cauldwell	Bedford	5,630
	De Parys	Bedford	4,405
	Goldington	Bedford	6,174
	Harpur	Bedford	5,285
	Kempston East	Bedford	4,345
	Kempston North	Bedford	4,030
	Kempston South	Bedford	5,549
	Kingsbrook	Bedford	6,143
	Newnham	Bedford	3,896
	Putnoe	Bedford	6,421
	Queen's Park	Bedford	4,997
3. Billericay and Great Dunmow CC			74,460
	Billericay East	Basildon	9,170
	Billericay West	Basildon	9,338
	Burstead	Basildon	8,482
	Crouch	Basildon	6,367
	Boreham and The Leighs	Chelmsford	4,688
	Broomfield and The Walthams	Chelmsford	6,295
	Chelmsford Rural West	Chelmsford	2,188
	Rettendon and Runwell	Chelmsford	3,908
	South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Chelmsford	4,403
	Writtle	Chelmsford	4,330
	Barnston and High Easter	Uttlesford	1,346
	Felsted	Uttlesford	3,871
	Great Dunmow North	Uttlesford	2,830
	Great Dunmow South	Uttlesford	3,849
	Takeley and the Canfields	Uttlesford	3,395
4. Braintree and Witham CC			72,978
	Black Notley and Terling	Braintree	3,075
	Bocking Blackwater	Braintree	5,977
	Bocking North	Braintree	3,483
	Bocking South	Braintree	4,104
	Bradwell, Silver End and Rivenhall	Braintree	3,671
	Braintree Central	Braintree	5,893
	Braintree East	Braintree	4,965
	Braintree South	Braintree	5,242
	Coggeshall and North Feering	Braintree	3,975
	Cressing and Stisted	Braintree	1,791
	Great Notley and Braintree West	Braintree	5,185
	Hatfield Peverel	Braintree	3,474

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Kelvedon	Braintree	3,934
	Witham Chipping Hill and Central	Braintree	3,546
	Witham North	Braintree	3,432
	Witham South	Braintree	6,242
	Witham West	Braintree	4,989
5. Brentwood and Ongar CC			74,240
	Brentwood North	Brentwood	4,556
	Brentwood South	Brentwood	4,211
	Brentwood West	Brentwood	4,973
	Brizes and Doddinghurst	Brentwood	4,704
	Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon	Brentwood	2,940
	Hutton Central	Brentwood	2,885
	Hutton East	Brentwood	2,851
	Hutton North	Brentwood	3,079
	Hutton South	Brentwood	3,047
	Ingatestone, Fryerning and Mountnessing	Brentwood	4,769
	Pilgrims Hatch	Brentwood	4,553
	Shenfield	Brentwood	4,167
	South Weald	Brentwood	1,407
	Tipps Cross	Brentwood	3,042
	Warley	Brentwood	4,508
	Chipping Ongar, Greensted and Marden Ash	Epping Forest	3,313
	High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings	Epping Forest	1,737
	Moreton and Fyfield	Epping Forest	1,720
	North Weald Bassett	Epping Forest	3,529
	Passingford	Epping Forest	1,772
	Shelley	Epping Forest	1,705
	Orsett	Thurrock	4,772
6. Bury St Edmunds CC			79,579
	Bacton and Old Newton	Mid Suffolk	1,965
	Badwell Ash	Mid Suffolk	2,151
	Elmswell and Norton	Mid Suffolk	4,168
	Haughley and Wetherden	Mid Suffolk	1,768
	Needham Market	Mid Suffolk	3,634
	Onehouse	Mid Suffolk	1,795
	Rattlesden	Mid Suffolk	1,640
	Rickinghall and Walsham	Mid Suffolk	3,711
	Ringshall	Mid Suffolk	2,153
	Stowmarket Central	Mid Suffolk	3,674
	Stowmarket North	Mid Suffolk	6,947
	Stowmarket South	Mid Suffolk	3,756
	Stowupland	Mid Suffolk	1,844
	Thurston and Hessett	Mid Suffolk	3,504
	Woolpit	Mid Suffolk	1,632
	Abbeygate	St Edmundsbury	3,683
	Eastgate	St Edmundsbury	1,809
	Fornham	St Edmundsbury	1,729
	Great Barton	St Edmundsbury	1,771
	Minden	St Edmundsbury	3,533
	Moreton Hall	St Edmundsbury	5,490
	Northgate	St Edmundsbury	1,821
	Risbygate	St Edmundsbury	3,553
	Rougham	St Edmundsbury	1,820
	St Olaves	St Edmundsbury	3,237
	Southgate	St Edmundsbury	3,421
	Westgate	St Edmundsbury	3,370
7. Cambridge BC			75,259
	Abbey	Cambridge	6,138
	Arbury	Cambridge	6,047
	Castle	Cambridge	5,900
	Cherry Hinton	Cambridge	5,968
	Coleridge	Cambridge	5,643
	East Chesterton	Cambridge	6,048
	King's Hedges	Cambridge	5,579
	Market	Cambridge	5,822
	Newnham	Cambridge	5,715
	Petersfield	Cambridge	5,504
	Romsey	Cambridge	5,806

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Trumpington	Cambridge	5,534
	West Chesterton	Cambridge	5,555
8. Castle Point BC			73,019
	Pitsea South East	Basildon	8,457
	Appleton	Castle Point	5,018
	Boyce	Castle Point	5,003
	Canvey Island Central	Castle Point	4,636
	Canvey Island East	Castle Point	4,587
	Canvey Island North	Castle Point	4,962
	Canvey Island South	Castle Point	4,701
	Canvey Island West	Castle Point	3,394
	Canvey Island Winter Gardens	Castle Point	4,570
	Cedar Hall	Castle Point	4,407
	St George's	Castle Point	4,416
	St James	Castle Point	5,056
	St Mary's	Castle Point	4,635
	St Peter's	Castle Point	4,812
	Victoria	Castle Point	4,365
9. Central Suffolk and North Ipswich CC			78,290
	Castle Hill	Ipswich	5,976
	Whitehouse	Ipswich	6,063
	Whitton	Ipswich	5,907
	Barking and Somersham	Mid Suffolk	1,801
	Bramford and Blakenham	Mid Suffolk	3,247
	Claydon and Barham	Mid Suffolk	3,655
	Debenham	Mid Suffolk	1,862
	Eye	Mid Suffolk	1,665
	Fressingfield	Mid Suffolk	1,888
	Gislingham	Mid Suffolk	2,113
	Helmingham and Coddanham	Mid Suffolk	1,810
	Hoxne	Mid Suffolk	1,727
	Mendlesham	Mid Suffolk	1,825
	Palgrave	Mid Suffolk	1,870
	Stradbroke and Laxfield	Mid Suffolk	2,108
	The Stonhams	Mid Suffolk	1,846
	Wetheringsett	Mid Suffolk	1,991
	Worlingworth	Mid Suffolk	1,920
	Earl Soham	Suffolk Coastal	1,656
	Framlingham	Suffolk Coastal	3,564
	Grundisburgh	Suffolk Coastal	1,819
	Hacheston	Suffolk Coastal	1,591
	Kesgrave East	Suffolk Coastal	7,316
	Kesgrave West	Suffolk Coastal	3,076
	Otley	Suffolk Coastal	1,774
	Rushmere St Andrew	Suffolk Coastal	4,924
	Wickham Market	Suffolk Coastal	1,694
	Witnessham	Suffolk Coastal	1,602
10. Chelmsford BC			77,835
	Chelmer Village and Beaulieu Park	Chelmsford	8,127
	Galleywood	Chelmsford	4,409
	Goat Hall	Chelmsford	4,347
	Great Baddow East	Chelmsford	6,416
	Great Baddow West	Chelmsford	4,512
	Marconi	Chelmsford	5,167
	Moulsham and Central	Chelmsford	7,329
	Moulsham Lodge	Chelmsford	4,311
	Patching Hall	Chelmsford	6,705
	St Andrews	Chelmsford	6,729
	Springfield North	Chelmsford	6,714
	The Lawns	Chelmsford	4,220
	Trinity	Chelmsford	4,425
	Waterhouse Farm	Chelmsford	4,424
11. Colchester BC			73,638
	Berechurch	Colchester	6,330
	Castle	Colchester	6,796
	Christ Church	Colchester	3,187
	Harbour	Colchester	4,367

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Highwoods	Colchester	6,628
	Lexden	Colchester	4,309
	Mile End	Colchester	6,942
	New Town	Colchester	5,966
	Prettygate	Colchester	5,937
	St Andrew's	Colchester	6,073
	St Anne's	Colchester	6,419
	St John's	Colchester	4,091
	Shrub End	Colchester	6,593
12. Epping Forest CC			73,785
	Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing	Epping Forest	1,618
	Buckhurst Hill East	Epping Forest	3,438
	Buckhurst Hill West	Epping Forest	5,154
	Chigwell Row	Epping Forest	1,813
	Chigwell Village	Epping Forest	3,221
	Epping Hemnall	Epping Forest	4,805
	Epping Lindsey and Thornwood Common	Epping Forest	4,874
	Grange Hill	Epping Forest	4,797
	Lambourne	Epping Forest	1,573
	Loughton Alderton	Epping Forest	3,311
	Loughton Broadway	Epping Forest	3,173
	Loughton Fairmead	Epping Forest	3,227
	Loughton Forest	Epping Forest	3,373
	Loughton Roding	Epping Forest	3,470
	Loughton St John's	Epping Forest	3,407
	Loughton St Mary's	Epping Forest	3,373
	Theydon Bois	Epping Forest	3,258
	Waltham Abbey High Beach	Epping Forest	1,775
	Waltham Abbey Honey Lane	Epping Forest	4,569
	Waltham Abbey North East	Epping Forest	3,186
	Waltham Abbey Paternoster	Epping Forest	3,328
	Waltham Abbey South West	Epping Forest	3,042
13. Harlow CC			73,223
	Hastingwood, Matching and Sheering Village	Epping Forest	1,671
	Lower Nazeing	Epping Forest	3,198
	Lower Sheering	Epping Forest	1,708
	Roydon	Epping Forest	1,743
	Bush Fair	Harlow	5,572
	Church Langley	Harlow	6,204
	Great Parndon	Harlow	5,062
	Harlow Common	Harlow	5,486
	Little Parndon and Hare Street	Harlow	5,750
	Mark Hall	Harlow	5,029
	Netteswell	Harlow	5,377
	Old Harlow	Harlow	5,338
	Staple Tye	Harlow	4,978
	Summers and Kingsmoor	Harlow	5,300
	Toddbrook	Harlow	5,284
	Broad Oak and the Hallingburys	Uttlesford	2,746
	Hatfield Heath	Uttlesford	1,408
	The Rodings	Uttlesford	1,369
14. Harwich and Clacton CC			76,724
	Alton Park	Tendring	3,392
	Beaumont and Thorpe	Tendring	1,845
	Bockings Elm	Tendring	3,517
	Burrsville	Tendring	1,741
	Frinton	Tendring	3,362
	Golf Green	Tendring	3,929
	Great and Little Oakley	Tendring	1,725
	Hamford	Tendring	3,228
	Harwich East	Tendring	1,874
	Harwich East Central	Tendring	3,559
	Harwich West	Tendring	3,883
	Harwich West Central	Tendring	3,770
	Haven	Tendring	1,756
	Holland and Kirby	Tendring	3,847
	Homelands	Tendring	1,667
	Peter Bruff	Tendring	3,245

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Pier	Tendring	3,323
	Ramsey and Parkeston	Tendring	1,732
	Rush Green	Tendring	3,462
	St Bartholomews	Tendring	3,885
	St James	Tendring	3,441
	St Johns	Tendring	3,797
	St Marys	Tendring	3,715
	St Pauls	Tendring	3,711
	Walton	Tendring	3,318
15. Hemel Hempstead CC			75,569
	Adeyfield East	Dacorum	3,927
	Adeyfield West	Dacorum	4,037
	Apsley and Corner Hall	Dacorum	6,236
	Ashridge	Dacorum	2,138
	Bennetts End	Dacorum	4,481
	Boxmoor	Dacorum	6,277
	Chaulden and Warners End	Dacorum	6,754
	Gadebridge	Dacorum	4,121
	Grovehill	Dacorum	5,544
	Hemel Hempstead Town	Dacorum	3,954
	Highfield	Dacorum	4,093
	Kings Langley	Dacorum	3,897
	Leverstock Green	Dacorum	6,760
	Nash Mills	Dacorum	2,121
	Watling	Dacorum	4,149
	Woodhall Farm	Dacorum	4,072
	Bedmond & Primrose Hill	Three Rivers	3,008
16. Hertford and Stortford CC			78,690
	Bishop's Stortford All Saints	East Hertfordshire	5,642
	Bishop's Stortford Central	East Hertfordshire	7,090
	Bishop's Stortford Meads	East Hertfordshire	4,317
	Bishop's Stortford Silverleys	East Hertfordshire	4,032
	Bishop's Stortford South	East Hertfordshire	6,440
	Braughing	East Hertfordshire	1,996
	Hertford Bengeo	East Hertfordshire	5,784
	Hertford Castle	East Hertfordshire	6,192
	Hertford Kingsmead	East Hertfordshire	3,891
	Hertford Sele	East Hertfordshire	4,174
	Little Hadham	East Hertfordshire	1,850
	Much Hadham	East Hertfordshire	2,212
	Puckeridge	East Hertfordshire	2,034
	Sawbridgeworth	East Hertfordshire	6,555
	Thundridge & Standon	East Hertfordshire	2,265
	Ware Chadwell	East Hertfordshire	2,305
	Ware Christchurch	East Hertfordshire	3,855
	Ware St Mary's	East Hertfordshire	4,086
	Ware Trinity	East Hertfordshire	3,970
17. Hertsmere CC			74,672
	Aldenham East	Hertsmere	3,674
	Aldenham West	Hertsmere	3,551
	Borehamwood Brookmeadow	Hertsmere	5,219
	Borehamwood Cowley Hill	Hertsmere	5,835
	Borehamwood Hillside	Hertsmere	6,496
	Borehamwood Kenilworth	Hertsmere	3,996
	Bushey Heath	Hertsmere	5,062
	Bushey North	Hertsmere	4,652
	Bushey Park	Hertsmere	3,371
	Bushey St James	Hertsmere	5,396
	Elstree	Hertsmere	3,574
	Potters Bar Furzefield	Hertsmere	4,826
	Potters Bar Oakmere	Hertsmere	5,484
	Potters Bar Parkfield	Hertsmere	5,896
	Shenley	Hertsmere	3,740
	Carpenders Park	Three Rivers	3,900
18. Ipswich BC			75,195
	Alexandra	Ipswich	5,730
	Bixley	Ipswich	5,636

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Bridge	Ipswich	5,928
	Gainsborough	Ipswich	6,180
	Gipping	Ipswich	5,901
	Holywells	Ipswich	5,323
	Priory Heath	Ipswich	6,036
	Rushmere	Ipswich	6,112
	St John's	Ipswich	6,384
	St Margaret's	Ipswich	5,904
	Sprites	Ipswich	5,346
	Stoke Park	Ipswich	5,296
	Westgate	Ipswich	5,419
19. Luton North and Dunstable BC			78,957
	Dunstable Downs	Central Bedfordshire	11,089
	Icknield	Central Bedfordshire	5,219
	Northfields	Central Bedfordshire	5,076
	Watling	Central Bedfordshire	5,393
	Bramingham	Luton	5,611
	Challney	Luton	8,328
	Icknield	Luton	5,756
	Leagrave	Luton	7,708
	Lewsey	Luton	8,421
	Limbury	Luton	5,594
	Northwell	Luton	5,309
	Sundon Park	Luton	5,453
20. Luton South BC			75,106
	Barnfield	Luton	5,434
	Biscot	Luton	8,439
	Crawley	Luton	4,865
	Dallow	Luton	8,848
	Farley	Luton	7,000
	High Town	Luton	4,705
	Round Green	Luton	7,606
	Saints	Luton	8,659
	South	Luton	5,964
	Stopsley	Luton	5,393
	Wigmore	Luton	8,193
21. Maldon CC			78,059
	Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Chelmsford	4,048
	Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Chelmsford	6,570
	South Woodham-Chetwood and Collingwood	Chelmsford	6,474
	South Woodham-Elmwood and Woodville	Chelmsford	6,242
	Tiptree	Colchester	6,106
	Althorne	Maldon	3,331
	Burnham-on-Crouch North	Maldon	3,016
	Burnham-on-Crouch South	Maldon	3,141
	Great Totham	Maldon	2,944
	Heybridge East	Maldon	3,232
	Heybridge West	Maldon	3,074
	Maldon East	Maldon	1,654
	Maldon North	Maldon	3,251
	Maldon South	Maldon	3,036
	Maldon West	Maldon	3,078
	Mayland	Maldon	3,409
	Purleigh	Maldon	2,712
	Southminster	Maldon	3,181
	Tillingham	Maldon	1,779
	Tollesbury	Maldon	1,616
	Tolleshunt D'Arcy	Maldon	3,252
	Wickham Bishops and Woodham	Maldon	2,913
22. Mid Bedfordshire and Harpenden CC			78,055
	Barton	Central Bedfordshire	5,749
	Langford and Henlow Village	Central Bedfordshire	6,522
	Shefford	Central Bedfordshire	6,776
	Silsoe and Shillington	Central Bedfordshire	6,172
	South East Bedfordshire	Central Bedfordshire	6,034
	Stotfold and Arlesey	Central Bedfordshire	11,456
	Cadwell	North Hertfordshire	1,765

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Hitchwood, Offa and Hoo	North Hertfordshire	5,589
	Kimpton	North Hertfordshire	1,752
	Harpenden East	St Albans	5,377
	Harpenden North	St Albans	5,211
	Harpenden South	St Albans	5,291
	Harpenden West	St Albans	5,656
	Wheathampstead	St Albans	4,705
23. Mid Norfolk CC			75,749
	Dereham-Central	Breckland	4,581
	Dereham-Humbletoft	Breckland	2,001
	Dereham-Neatherd	Breckland	3,316
	Dereham-Toftwood	Breckland	3,607
	Eynsford	Breckland	1,867
	Hermitage	Breckland	1,710
	Launditch	Breckland	1,627
	Springvale and Scarning	Breckland	3,773
	Swanton Morley	Breckland	1,796
	Taverner	Breckland	1,780
	Upper Wensum	Breckland	1,780
	Acle	Broadland	2,220
	Aylsham	Broadland	5,844
	Blofield with South Walsham	Broadland	4,446
	Brundall	Broadland	4,522
	Burlingham	Broadland	2,039
	Buxton	Broadland	1,958
	Coltishall	Broadland	2,069
	Eynesford	Broadland	2,410
	Great Witchingham	Broadland	1,924
	Hevingham	Broadland	2,127
	Horsford and Felthorpe	Broadland	3,486
	Marshes	Broadland	2,357
	Plumstead	Broadland	2,292
	Reepham	Broadland	1,983
	Spixworth with St Faiths	Broadland	4,220
	Wroxham	Broadland	4,014
24. Norfolk Coastal CC			79,323
	Bradwell North	Great Yarmouth	5,062
	Bradwell South and Hopton	Great Yarmouth	5,148
	Caister North	Great Yarmouth	3,659
	Caister South	Great Yarmouth	3,555
	Central and Northgate	Great Yarmouth	5,370
	Claydon	Great Yarmouth	5,472
	East Flegg	Great Yarmouth	3,895
	Fleggburgh	Great Yarmouth	1,868
	Gorleston	Great Yarmouth	4,071
	Lothingland	Great Yarmouth	4,331
	Magdalen	Great Yarmouth	5,228
	Nelson	Great Yarmouth	4,971
	Ormesby	Great Yarmouth	3,505
	St Andrews	Great Yarmouth	3,425
	Southtown and Cobholm	Great Yarmouth	3,489
	West Flegg	Great Yarmouth	4,002
	Yarmouth North	Great Yarmouth	3,475
	Stalham and Sutton	North Norfolk	3,416
	Waterside	North Norfolk	3,593
	Waxham	North Norfolk	1,788
25. North Bedfordshire CC			79,740
	Carlton	Bedford	2,365
	Clapham	Bedford	4,636
	Eastcotts	Bedford	2,397
	Great Barford	Bedford	5,301
	Harrold	Bedford	2,490
	Oakley	Bedford	1,880
	Riseley	Bedford	2,289
	Roxton	Bedford	2,315
	Sharnbrook	Bedford	2,339
	Turvey	Bedford	2,226
	Wilshamstead	Bedford	4,459

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Wootton	Bedford	4,139
	Amphill	Central Bedfordshire	5,555
	Biggleswade	Central Bedfordshire	12,202
	Maulden and Houghton Conquest	Central Bedfordshire	5,885
	Northill and Blunham	Central Bedfordshire	6,861
	Potton	Central Bedfordshire	5,728
	Sandy	Central Bedfordshire	6,673
26. North East Cambridgeshire CC			77,570
	Downham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	3,414
	Ely East	East Cambridgeshire	2,918
	Ely North	East Cambridgeshire	4,821
	Ely South	East Cambridgeshire	3,002
	Ely West	East Cambridgeshire	3,342
	Haddenham	East Cambridgeshire	4,564
	Littleport East	East Cambridgeshire	3,788
	Littleport West	East Cambridgeshire	2,337
	Stretham	East Cambridgeshire	3,017
	Sutton	East Cambridgeshire	3,005
	Bassenhally	Fenland	1,287
	Benwick, Coates and Eastrea	Fenland	3,548
	Birch	Fenland	1,869
	Delph	Fenland	1,547
	Doddington	Fenland	1,749
	Kingsmoor	Fenland	1,240
	Lattersey	Fenland	1,917
	Manea	Fenland	1,607
	March East	Fenland	5,718
	March North	Fenland	5,448
	March West	Fenland	5,567
	St Andrews	Fenland	2,075
	St Marys	Fenland	2,033
	Slade Lode	Fenland	1,890
	The Mills	Fenland	2,071
	Wenneye	Fenland	2,031
	Wimblington	Fenland	1,765
27. North East Essex CC			76,092
	Birch and Winstree	Colchester	4,429
	Copford and West Stanway	Colchester	1,484
	Dedham and Langham	Colchester	2,429
	East Donyland	Colchester	2,020
	Fordham and Stour	Colchester	4,136
	Great Tey	Colchester	2,212
	Marks Tey	Colchester	2,005
	Pyefleet	Colchester	2,158
	Stanway	Colchester	6,364
	West Bergholt and Eight Ash Green	Colchester	3,983
	West Mersea	Colchester	5,914
	Wivenhoe Cross	Colchester	3,223
	Wivenhoe Quay	Colchester	4,151
	Alresford	Tendring	1,670
	Ardleigh and Little Bromley	Tendring	1,844
	Bradfield, Wrabness and Wix	Tendring	1,830
	Brightlingsea	Tendring	6,424
	Great Bentley	Tendring	1,788
	Lawford	Tendring	3,451
	Little Clacton and Weeley	Tendring	3,756
	Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley and Tendring	Tendring	3,634
	St Osyth and Point Clear	Tendring	3,510
	Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead and Great Bromley	Tendring	3,677
28. North Hertfordshire CC			80,088
	Buntingford	East Hertfordshire	4,122
	Arbury	North Hertfordshire	2,095
	Baldock East	North Hertfordshire	2,231
	Baldock Town	North Hertfordshire	5,612
	Ermine	North Hertfordshire	2,005
	Hitchin Bearton	North Hertfordshire	5,929

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Hitchin Highbury	North Hertfordshire	5,933
	Hitchin Oughton	North Hertfordshire	3,609
	Hitchin Priory	North Hertfordshire	3,590
	Hitchin Walsworth	North Hertfordshire	5,987
	Letchworth East	North Hertfordshire	4,133
	Letchworth Grange	North Hertfordshire	5,688
	Letchworth South East	North Hertfordshire	5,632
	Letchworth South West	North Hertfordshire	5,865
	Letchworth Wilbury	North Hertfordshire	3,947
	Royston Heath	North Hertfordshire	4,035
	Royston Meridian	North Hertfordshire	4,114
	Royston Palace	North Hertfordshire	3,939
	Weston and Sandon	North Hertfordshire	1,622
29. North Norfolk CC			72,870
	Astley	North Norfolk	1,775
	Briston	North Norfolk	1,863
	Chaucer	North Norfolk	1,886
	Corpusty	North Norfolk	1,888
	Cromer Town	North Norfolk	2,879
	Erpingham	North Norfolk	1,970
	Gaunt	North Norfolk	1,985
	Glaven Valley	North Norfolk	1,760
	Happisburgh	North Norfolk	2,038
	High Heath	North Norfolk	1,626
	Holt	North Norfolk	2,924
	Hoveton	North Norfolk	1,686
	Lancaster North	North Norfolk	2,767
	Lancaster South	North Norfolk	3,245
	Mundesley	North Norfolk	3,430
	North Walsham East	North Norfolk	3,362
	North Walsham North	North Norfolk	3,213
	North Walsham West	North Norfolk	3,326
	Poppyland	North Norfolk	1,899
	Priory	North Norfolk	3,246
	Roughton	North Norfolk	1,821
	St Benet	North Norfolk	1,808
	Scottow	North Norfolk	1,861
	Sheringham North	North Norfolk	2,884
	Sheringham South	North Norfolk	3,165
	Suffield Park	North Norfolk	3,295
	The Raynhams	North Norfolk	1,936
	The Runtons	North Norfolk	1,783
	Walsingham	North Norfolk	1,819
	Wensum	North Norfolk	1,848
	Worstead	North Norfolk	1,882
30. North West Cambridgeshire CC			75,010
	Elton and Folksworth	Huntingdonshire	2,148
	Ramsey	Huntingdonshire	6,440
	Sawtry	Huntingdonshire	4,941
	Somersham	Huntingdonshire	4,543
	Stilton	Huntingdonshire	2,339
	Upwood and The Raveleys	Huntingdonshire	2,397
	Warboys and Bury	Huntingdonshire	4,889
	Yaxley and Farcet	Huntingdonshire	7,847
	Barnack	Peterborough	2,339
	Glington and Wittering	Peterborough	5,134
	Northborough	Peterborough	2,187
	Orton Longueville	Peterborough	6,754
	Orton Waterville	Peterborough	6,489
	Orton with Hampton	Peterborough	8,160
	Stanground Central	Peterborough	6,243
	Stanground East	Peterborough	2,160
31. North West Norfolk CC			73,269
	Brancaster	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,526
	Burnham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,600
	Clenchwarton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,792
	Dersingham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,920
	Docking	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,672

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Fairstead	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,890
	Gayton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,826
	Gaywood Chase	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,539
	Gaywood North Bank	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	5,940
	Grimston	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,935
	Heacham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	4,059
	Hunstanton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	4,687
	North Lynn	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,595
	North Wootton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,947
	Old Gaywood	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,507
	Priory	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,951
	Rudham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,938
	St Margarets with St Nicholas	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,870
	Snettisham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,481
	South and West Lynn	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,181
	South Wootton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,579
	Spellowfields	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,767
	Springwood	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,539
	Valley Hill	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,876
	Walpole	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,748
	West Winch	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,904
32. Norwich North BC			76,747
	Drayton North	Broadland	2,127
	Drayton South	Broadland	1,973
	Hellesdon North West	Broadland	4,730
	Hellesdon South East	Broadland	3,961
	Old Catton and Sprowston West	Broadland	6,318
	Sprowston Central	Broadland	4,171
	Sprowston East	Broadland	5,619
	Taverham North	Broadland	3,970
	Taverham South	Broadland	3,695
	Thorpe St Andrew North West	Broadland	5,840
	Thorpe St Andrew South East	Broadland	5,078
	Catton Grove	Norwich	7,544
	Crome	Norwich	7,211
	Mile Cross	Norwich	7,246
	Sewell	Norwich	7,264
33. Norwich South BC			73,569
	Bowthorpe	Norwich	8,189
	Eaton	Norwich	7,223
	Lakenham	Norwich	7,028
	Mancroft	Norwich	7,666
	Nelson	Norwich	7,350
	Thorpe Hamlet	Norwich	8,148
	Town Close	Norwich	8,253
	University	Norwich	7,506
	Wensum	Norwich	7,941
	New Costessey	South Norfolk	4,265
34. Peterborough CC			80,047
	Bretton North	Peterborough	6,176
	Bretton South	Peterborough	2,209
	Central	Peterborough	5,350
	Dogsthorpe	Peterborough	5,884
	East	Peterborough	5,904
	Eye and Thorney	Peterborough	4,751
	Fletton	Peterborough	7,260
	Newborough	Peterborough	2,179
	North	Peterborough	3,438
	Park	Peterborough	5,520
	Paston	Peterborough	5,599
	Ravensthorpe	Peterborough	4,278
	Walton	Peterborough	4,068
	Werrington North	Peterborough	5,698
	Werrington South	Peterborough	5,350
	West	Peterborough	6,383

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
35. Rayleigh and Wickford CC			78,289
	Pitsea North West	Basildon	9,136
	Vange	Basildon	6,750
	Wickford Castledon	Basildon	6,198
	Wickford North	Basildon	9,532
	Wickford Park	Basildon	6,887
	Downhall and Rawreth	Rochford	3,708
	Grange	Rochford	2,811
	Hockley Central	Rochford	5,256
	Hockley North	Rochford	1,676
	Hockley West	Rochford	1,658
	Hullbridge	Rochford	5,425
	Lodge	Rochford	3,231
	Rayleigh Central	Rochford	3,360
	Sweyne Park	Rochford	3,261
	Trinity	Rochford	2,905
	Wheatley	Rochford	3,245
	Whitehouse	Rochford	3,250
36. Saffron Walden CC			74,218
	Bumpstead	Braintree	2,015
	Gosfield and Greenstead Green	Braintree	2,041
	Halstead St Andrew's	Braintree	5,247
	Halstead Trinity	Braintree	3,512
	Hedingham and Maplestead	Braintree	5,161
	Panfield	Braintree	1,715
	Rayne	Braintree	1,744
	Stour Valley North	Braintree	1,795
	Stour Valley South	Braintree	1,733
	The Three Colnes	Braintree	3,958
	Three Fields	Braintree	3,147
	Upper Colne	Braintree	1,716
	Yeldham	Braintree	1,640
	Ashdon	Uttlesford	1,336
	Birchanger	Uttlesford	1,076
	Clavering	Uttlesford	1,152
	Elsenham and Henham	Uttlesford	2,826
	Littlebury	Uttlesford	1,303
	Newport	Uttlesford	2,668
	Saffron Walden Audley	Uttlesford	3,754
	Saffron Walden Castle	Uttlesford	3,635
	Saffron Walden Shire	Uttlesford	4,093
	Stansted North	Uttlesford	2,606
	Stansted South	Uttlesford	2,378
	Stebbing	Uttlesford	1,228
	Stort Valley	Uttlesford	1,174
	Thaxted	Uttlesford	2,676
	The Chesterfords	Uttlesford	1,278
	The Eastons	Uttlesford	1,213
	The Sampfords	Uttlesford	1,464
	Wenden Lofts	Uttlesford	1,207
	Wimbish and Debden	Uttlesford	1,727
37. South East Cambridgeshire CC			78,194
	Queen Edith's	Cambridge	6,032
	Bottisham	East Cambridgeshire	3,009
	Burwell	East Cambridgeshire	4,766
	Cheveley	East Cambridgeshire	3,191
	Dullingham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	1,574
	Fordham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	2,812
	Isleham	East Cambridgeshire	1,771
	Soham North	East Cambridgeshire	3,562
	Soham South	East Cambridgeshire	4,642
	The Swaffhams	East Cambridgeshire	1,538
	Balsham	South Cambridgeshire	3,664
	Duxford	South Cambridgeshire	2,079
	Fulbourn	South Cambridgeshire	3,389
	Histon and Impington	South Cambridgeshire	7,019
	Linton	South Cambridgeshire	3,612

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Milton	South Cambridgeshire	2,984
	Sawston	South Cambridgeshire	5,391
	Teversham	South Cambridgeshire	1,783
	The Abingtons	South Cambridgeshire	1,741
	The Shelfords and Stapleford	South Cambridgeshire	5,524
	The Wilbrahams	South Cambridgeshire	2,087
	Waterbeach	South Cambridgeshire	3,961
	Whittlesford	South Cambridgeshire	2,063
38. South East Hertfordshire CC			76,318
	Broxbourne	Broxbourne	4,972
	Bury Green	Broxbourne	4,751
	Cheshunt Central	Broxbourne	5,427
	Cheshunt North	Broxbourne	5,456
	Flamstead End	Broxbourne	5,234
	Goffs Oak	Broxbourne	6,170
	Hoddesdon North	Broxbourne	5,400
	Hoddesdon Town	Broxbourne	5,299
	Rosedale	Broxbourne	3,316
	Rye Park	Broxbourne	4,846
	Theobalds	Broxbourne	5,243
	Waltham Cross	Broxbourne	4,764
	Wormley & Turnford	Broxbourne	6,730
	Great Amwell	East Hertfordshire	2,118
	Hertford Heath	East Hertfordshire	2,158
	Hunsdon	East Hertfordshire	2,097
	Stanstead Abbots	East Hertfordshire	2,337
39. South East Norfolk CC			77,317
	Beck Vale	South Norfolk	1,786
	Bressingham and Burston	South Norfolk	2,257
	Brooke	South Norfolk	2,148
	Bunwell	South Norfolk	2,148
	Chedgrave and Thurton	South Norfolk	2,166
	Cringleford	South Norfolk	3,825
	Dickleburgh	South Norfolk	2,246
	Diss	South Norfolk	5,788
	Ditchingham and Broome	South Norfolk	1,922
	Earsham	South Norfolk	2,022
	Easton	South Norfolk	2,091
	Forncett	South Norfolk	2,208
	Gillingham	South Norfolk	2,319
	Harleston	South Norfolk	3,772
	Hempnall	South Norfolk	2,075
	Hetherset	South Norfolk	4,523
	Loddon	South Norfolk	2,060
	Mulbarton	South Norfolk	4,088
	Newton Flotman	South Norfolk	2,071
	Old Costessey	South Norfolk	5,090
	Poringland with the Framinghams	South Norfolk	3,881
	Rockland	South Norfolk	2,341
	Roydon	South Norfolk	1,851
	Scole	South Norfolk	1,897
	Stoke Holy Cross	South Norfolk	2,306
	Stratton	South Norfolk	4,221
	Tasburgh	South Norfolk	1,970
	Thurlton	South Norfolk	2,245
40. South Suffolk CC			72,965
	Alton	Babergh	3,203
	Berners	Babergh	3,133
	Boxford	Babergh	1,772
	Brett Vale	Babergh	1,667
	Brook	Babergh	3,255
	Bures St Mary	Babergh	1,424
	Chadacre	Babergh	1,631
	Dodnash	Babergh	2,888
	Glemsford and Stanstead	Babergh	2,980
	Great Cornard North	Babergh	3,329
	Great Cornard South	Babergh	3,330
	Hadleigh North	Babergh	3,406

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Hadleigh South	Babergh	3,002
	Holbrook	Babergh	1,669
	Lavenham	Babergh	1,473
	Leavenheath	Babergh	1,448
	Long Melford	Babergh	3,148
	Lower Brett	Babergh	1,744
	Mid Samford	Babergh	3,226
	Nayland	Babergh	1,474
	North Cosford	Babergh	1,846
	Pinewood	Babergh	3,309
	South Cosford	Babergh	1,781
	Sudbury East	Babergh	3,350
	Sudbury North	Babergh	3,438
	Sudbury South	Babergh	3,431
	Waldingfield	Babergh	3,252
	Cavendish	St Edmundsbury	1,652
	Clare	St Edmundsbury	1,704
41. South West Bedfordshire CC			80,146
	Cranfield	Central Bedfordshire	3,720
	Flitwick East	Central Bedfordshire	6,382
	Flitwick West	Central Bedfordshire	5,842
	Grovebury	Central Bedfordshire	7,067
	Houghton Regis	Central Bedfordshire	11,913
	Leighton Linlade Central	Central Bedfordshire	11,276
	Marston	Central Bedfordshire	4,368
	Plantation	Central Bedfordshire	5,929
	South West Bedfordshire	Central Bedfordshire	5,604
	Southcott	Central Bedfordshire	5,200
	Toddington	Central Bedfordshire	5,181
	Woburn and Harlington	Central Bedfordshire	7,664
42. South West Cambridgeshire CC			73,161
	Earith	Huntingdonshire	4,787
	Fenstanton	Huntingdonshire	2,380
	Gransden and The Offords	Huntingdonshire	3,586
	Bar Hill	South Cambridgeshire	3,821
	Barton	South Cambridgeshire	1,887
	Bassingbourn	South Cambridgeshire	3,512
	Bourn	South Cambridgeshire	6,075
	Caldecote	South Cambridgeshire	1,878
	Comberton	South Cambridgeshire	1,746
	Cottenham	South Cambridgeshire	5,980
	Fowlmere and Foxton	South Cambridgeshire	1,894
	Gamlingay	South Cambridgeshire	3,843
	Girton	South Cambridgeshire	3,272
	Hardwick	South Cambridgeshire	2,020
	Harston and Hauxton	South Cambridgeshire	1,826
	Haslingfield and The Eversdens	South Cambridgeshire	2,057
	Longstanton	South Cambridgeshire	1,896
	Melbourn	South Cambridgeshire	4,333
	Meldreth	South Cambridgeshire	1,906
	Orwell and Barrington	South Cambridgeshire	1,836
	Papworth and Elsworth	South Cambridgeshire	3,576
	Swavesey	South Cambridgeshire	1,905
	The Mordens	South Cambridgeshire	1,908
	Willingham and Over	South Cambridgeshire	5,237
43. South West Hertfordshire CC			78,269
	Aldbury and Wigginton	Dacorum	1,876
	Berkhamsted Castle	Dacorum	4,560
	Berkhamsted East	Dacorum	4,474
	Berkhamsted West	Dacorum	4,533
	Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield	Dacorum	6,438
	Northchurch	Dacorum	2,160
	Tring Central	Dacorum	3,969
	Tring East	Dacorum	2,177
	Tring West and Rural	Dacorum	4,096
	Ashridge	Three Rivers	2,582
	Chorleywood East	Three Rivers	3,310
	Chorleywood West	Three Rivers	4,252

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Croxley Green	Three Rivers	4,275
	Croxley Green North	Three Rivers	2,618
	Croxley Green South	Three Rivers	2,726
	Hayling	Three Rivers	2,427
	Maple Cross & Mill End	Three Rivers	4,046
	Moor Park & Eastbury	Three Rivers	4,455
	Northwick	Three Rivers	3,232
	Penn	Three Rivers	2,513
	Rickmansworth	Three Rivers	3,281
	Rickmansworth West	Three Rivers	2,751
	Sarratt	Three Rivers	1,518
44. South West Norfolk CC			73,540
	All Saints	Breckland	1,874
	Buckenham	Breckland	1,386
	Burgh and Haverscroft	Breckland	2,916
	Conifer	Breckland	1,521
	East Guiltcross	Breckland	1,661
	Haggard De Toni	Breckland	1,798
	Harling and Heathlands	Breckland	3,322
	Necton	Breckland	1,636
	Queen's	Breckland	5,465
	Shipdham	Breckland	1,689
	Templar	Breckland	2,282
	Thetford-Abbey	Breckland	3,172
	Thetford-Castle	Breckland	1,392
	Thetford-Guildhall	Breckland	5,156
	Thetford-Saxon	Breckland	4,871
	Two Rivers	Breckland	3,331
	Upper Yare	Breckland	1,917
	Watton	Breckland	5,501
	Wayland	Breckland	1,682
	Weeting	Breckland	1,779
	West Guiltcross	Breckland	1,743
	Wissey	Breckland	1,935
	Abbey	South Norfolk	2,296
	Cromwells	South Norfolk	1,970
	Hingham and Deopham	South Norfolk	2,356
	Northfields	South Norfolk	2,342
	Rustens	South Norfolk	1,980
	Town	South Norfolk	2,472
	Wicklewood	South Norfolk	2,095
45. Southend East and Rochford CC			77,736
	Ashingdon and Canewdon	Rochford	3,503
	Barling and Sutton	Rochford	1,444
	Foulness and Great Wakering	Rochford	4,477
	Hawkwell North	Rochford	3,540
	Hawkwell South	Rochford	3,349
	Hawkwell West	Rochford	3,294
	Rochford	Rochford	5,740
	Kursaal	Southend-on-Sea	7,113
	Milton	Southend-on-Sea	6,986
	St Luke's	Southend-on-Sea	8,068
	Shoeburyness	Southend-on-Sea	7,942
	Southchurch	Southend-on-Sea	7,423
	Thorpe	Southend-on-Sea	7,414
	West Shoebury	Southend-on-Sea	7,443
46. Southend West BC			73,861
	Belfairs	Southend-on-Sea	7,422
	Blenheim Park	Southend-on-Sea	7,786
	Chalkwell	Southend-on-Sea	7,088
	Eastwood Park	Southend-on-Sea	7,616
	Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,298
	Prittlewell	Southend-on-Sea	7,575
	St Laurence	Southend-on-Sea	7,537
	Victoria	Southend-on-Sea	7,081
	West Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,089
	Westborough	Southend-on-Sea	7,369

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
47. St Albans CC			75,912
	Ashley	St Albans	5,314
	Batchwood	St Albans	5,376
	Clarence	St Albans	4,730
	Colney Heath	St Albans	4,103
	Cunningham	St Albans	4,608
	London Colney	St Albans	6,627
	Marshalswick North	St Albans	4,887
	Marshalswick South	St Albans	5,223
	Park Street	St Albans	5,536
	Redbourn	St Albans	4,778
	St Peters	St Albans	5,514
	St Stephen	St Albans	5,231
	Sandridge	St Albans	3,844
	Sopwell	St Albans	5,105
	Verulam	St Albans	5,036
48. St Neots and Huntingdon CC			75,530
	Alconbury and The Stukeleys	Huntingdonshire	2,512
	Brampton	Huntingdonshire	4,759
	Buckden	Huntingdonshire	2,586
	Ellington	Huntingdonshire	2,359
	Godmanchester	Huntingdonshire	4,791
	Huntingdon East	Huntingdonshire	6,689
	Huntingdon North	Huntingdonshire	3,506
	Huntingdon West	Huntingdonshire	4,505
	Kimbolton and Staughton	Huntingdonshire	2,516
	Little Paxton	Huntingdonshire	2,657
	St Ives East	Huntingdonshire	4,901
	St Ives South	Huntingdonshire	4,914
	St Ives West	Huntingdonshire	2,200
	St Neots Eaton Ford	Huntingdonshire	5,289
	St Neots Eaton Socon	Huntingdonshire	4,235
	St Neots Eynesbury	Huntingdonshire	7,246
	St Neots Priory Park	Huntingdonshire	5,071
	The Hemingfords	Huntingdonshire	4,794
49. Stevenage CC			80,273
	Datchworth & Aston	East Hertfordshire	1,937
	Mundens and Cottered	East Hertfordshire	1,907
	Walkern	East Hertfordshire	2,098
	Watton-at-Stone	East Hertfordshire	1,738
	Chesfield	North Hertfordshire	5,173
	Codicote	North Hertfordshire	2,095
	Knebworth	North Hertfordshire	4,122
	Bandley Hill	Stevenage	4,865
	Bedwell	Stevenage	4,873
	Chells	Stevenage	4,899
	Longmeadow	Stevenage	4,474
	Manor	Stevenage	4,969
	Martins Wood	Stevenage	4,670
	Old Town	Stevenage	5,858
	Pin Green	Stevenage	4,538
	Roebuck	Stevenage	4,681
	St Nicholas	Stevenage	4,446
	Shephall	Stevenage	4,408
	Symonds Green	Stevenage	4,380
	Woodfield	Stevenage	4,142
50. Suffolk Coastal CC			76,932
	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Coastal	2,691
	Farlingaye	Suffolk Coastal	1,574
	Felixstowe East	Suffolk Coastal	3,335
	Felixstowe North	Suffolk Coastal	3,225
	Felixstowe South	Suffolk Coastal	3,313
	Felixstowe South East	Suffolk Coastal	3,548
	Felixstowe West	Suffolk Coastal	4,788
	Hollesley with Eyke	Suffolk Coastal	1,673
	Kyson	Suffolk Coastal	1,598
	Leiston	Suffolk Coastal	4,755
	Martlesham	Suffolk Coastal	4,019

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Melton and Ufford	Suffolk Coastal	3,895
	Nacton	Suffolk Coastal	3,629
	Orford and Tunstall	Suffolk Coastal	1,422
	Peasenhall	Suffolk Coastal	1,711
	Rendlesham	Suffolk Coastal	2,378
	Riverside	Suffolk Coastal	1,653
	Saxmundham	Suffolk Coastal	3,789
	Seckford	Suffolk Coastal	1,563
	Snape	Suffolk Coastal	1,520
	Sutton	Suffolk Coastal	1,841
	Trimleys with Kirton	Suffolk Coastal	5,419
	Walberswick and Wenhaston	Suffolk Coastal	1,528
	Yoxford	Suffolk Coastal	1,617
	Blything	Waveney	1,760
	Halesworth	Waveney	3,899
	Southwold and Reydon	Waveney	2,990
	Wrentham	Waveney	1,799
51. Thurrock BC			77,667
	Aveley and Uplands	Thurrock	6,337
	Belhus	Thurrock	6,563
	Chadwell St Mary	Thurrock	7,147
	Chafford and North Stifford	Thurrock	5,227
	Grays Riverside	Thurrock	6,682
	Grays Thurrock	Thurrock	6,122
	Little Thurrock Blackshots	Thurrock	4,498
	Little Thurrock Rectory	Thurrock	4,461
	Ockendon	Thurrock	6,726
	South Chafford	Thurrock	4,610
	Stifford Clays	Thurrock	4,850
	Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park	Thurrock	4,298
	Tilbury St Chads	Thurrock	4,172
	West Thurrock and South Stifford	Thurrock	5,974
52. Watford BC			77,039
	Abbots Langley	Three Rivers	3,701
	Langleybury	Three Rivers	3,774
	Leavesden	Three Rivers	3,981
	Oxhey Hall	Three Rivers	2,576
	Callowland	Watford	4,976
	Central	Watford	5,433
	Holywell	Watford	5,663
	Leggatts	Watford	5,142
	Meriden	Watford	5,467
	Nascot	Watford	5,687
	Oxhey	Watford	5,028
	Park	Watford	5,763
	Stanborough	Watford	5,192
	Tudor	Watford	4,556
	Vicarage	Watford	4,975
	Woodside	Watford	5,125
53. Waveney CC			79,132
	Beccles North	Waveney	3,991
	Beccles South	Waveney	3,959
	Bungay	Waveney	3,827
	Carlton	Waveney	3,480
	Carlton Colville	Waveney	6,164
	Gunton and Corton	Waveney	3,715
	Harbour	Waveney	5,664
	Kessingland	Waveney	4,070
	Kirkley	Waveney	5,398
	Lothingland	Waveney	1,747
	Normanston	Waveney	5,306
	Oulton	Waveney	3,286
	Oulton Broad	Waveney	3,733
	Pakefield	Waveney	5,387
	St Margaret's	Waveney	6,354
	The Saints	Waveney	1,816
	Wainford	Waveney	1,802
	Whitton	Waveney	5,722
	Worlingham	Waveney	3,711

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
54. Welwyn Hatfield CC			79,760
	Hertford Rural North	East Hertfordshire	1,796
	Hertford Rural South	East Hertfordshire	1,934
	Brookmans Park and Little Heath	Welwyn Hatfield	4,585
	Haldens	Welwyn Hatfield	4,770
	Handside	Welwyn Hatfield	5,205
	Hatfield Central	Welwyn Hatfield	4,588
	Hatfield East	Welwyn Hatfield	4,687
	Hatfield South	Welwyn Hatfield	3,533
	Hatfield Villages	Welwyn Hatfield	3,901
	Hatfield West	Welwyn Hatfield	5,538
	Hollybush	Welwyn Hatfield	5,242
	Howlands	Welwyn Hatfield	4,483
	Northaw and Cuffley	Welwyn Hatfield	4,264
	Panshanger	Welwyn Hatfield	4,918
	Peartree	Welwyn Hatfield	5,133
	Sherrards	Welwyn Hatfield	4,418
	Welham Green	Welwyn Hatfield	2,864
	Welwyn East	Welwyn Hatfield	4,779
	Welwyn West	Welwyn Hatfield	3,122
55. West Suffolk CC			80,399
	All Saints	Forest Heath	2,604
	Brandon East	Forest Heath	3,973
	Brandon West	Forest Heath	2,641
	Eriswell and The Rows	Forest Heath	3,084
	Exning	Forest Heath	1,561
	Great Heath	Forest Heath	2,778
	Iceni	Forest Heath	1,401
	Lakenheath	Forest Heath	3,110
	Manor	Forest Heath	1,296
	Market	Forest Heath	2,774
	Red Lodge	Forest Heath	2,224
	St Mary's	Forest Heath	4,158
	Severals	Forest Heath	4,653
	South	Forest Heath	1,327
	Bardwell	St Edmundsbury	2,006
	Barningham	St Edmundsbury	2,100
	Barrow	St Edmundsbury	1,801
	Chedburgh	St Edmundsbury	1,720
	Haverhill East	St Edmundsbury	5,308
	Haverhill North	St Edmundsbury	5,554
	Haverhill South	St Edmundsbury	3,666
	Haverhill West	St Edmundsbury	3,895
	Horringer and Whelnetham	St Edmundsbury	1,728
	Hundon	St Edmundsbury	1,751
	Ixworth	St Edmundsbury	1,798
	Kedington	St Edmundsbury	1,598
	Pakenham	St Edmundsbury	2,513
	Risby	St Edmundsbury	1,964
	Stanton	St Edmundsbury	2,001
	Wickhambrook	St Edmundsbury	1,783
	Withersfield	St Edmundsbury	1,629
56. Wisbech and Downham Market CC			76,490
	Mid Forest	Breckland	1,572
	Nar Valley	Breckland	1,775
	Swaffham	Breckland	5,501
	Clarkson	Fenland	1,414
	Elm and Christchurch	Fenland	3,739
	Hill	Fenland	3,480
	Kirkgate	Fenland	1,675
	Medworth	Fenland	1,622
	Parson Drove and Wisbech St Mary	Fenland	3,822
	Peckover	Fenland	1,764
	Roman Bank	Fenland	5,155
	Staithe	Fenland	1,712
	Waterlees	Fenland	3,372
	Airfield	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,489
	Denton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	5,476
	Downham Old Town	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,874

Revised proposals

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	East Downham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,202
	Emneth with Outwell	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,754
	Hilgay with Denver	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,938
	Mershe Lande	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,025
	North Downham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,686
	St Lawrence	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,978
	South Downham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,932
	Upwell and Delph	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,915
	Walton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,124
	Watlington	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,868
	Wiggenhall	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,685
	Wimbotsham with Fincham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,039
	Wissey	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,902

Boundary Commission for England
35 Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BQ

Tel: 020 7276 1102

Email: information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this document should be sent to us at: information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk

This document can also be viewed on our website at: www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk

The material used in this publication is constituted from 75% consumer waste and 25% virgin fibre.

