

# Yorkshire and the Humber

---



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 Yorkshire and the Humber .....	8
4. How to have your say .....	55
Annex: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates .....	57

# 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 Yorkshire and the Humber reducing by four, to 50. 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 Yorkshire and the Humber?

We have revised 37 of the 50 constituencies we proposed in September 2011. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the boundaries of the remaining 13 constituencies. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, 15 constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber 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. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposals are based on new sub-regions, shown in the table below.

We have revised our proposals for North Yorkshire and the City of York, with the result that now all eight of these existing constituencies would be retained unchanged from the existing arrangements.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
North Yorkshire	8	8
Humberside	10	9
South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire	36	33

We have revised our proposals for all nine constituencies in the Humberside sub-region, to provide for a better reflection of the existing constituencies in Humberside and east Yorkshire.

We have revised our proposals for constituencies in the metropolitan boroughs of Barnsley, Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Leeds, and Wakefield.

Our proposals include a new cross-county boundary constituency in West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire.

After careful consideration, we have not revised any of our initial proposals for the constituencies in the metropolitan boroughs of Rotherham and Sheffield.

### **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 [yorkshumber@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:yorkshumber@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.<sup>1</sup>

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](mailto: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

<sup>1</sup> At [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us/](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us/).

# 2. Background to the review

2.1 In February 2011, the UK Parliament passed legislation<sup>2</sup> 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 Yorkshire and the Humber.

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*,<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>2</sup> Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011, available at [www.legislation.gov.uk](http://www.legislation.gov.uk).

<sup>3</sup> Available at [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/publications](http://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 over 9% of the existing constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber – 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 15 of the existing 54 constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber.

### **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 Yorkshire and the Humber. 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 955 unique written representations relating to Yorkshire and the Humber. We also heard 81 oral representations at the four public hearings in Yorkshire and the Humber. 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 149 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 – *Yorkshire and the*

*Humber: 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 Yorkshire and the Humber

3.1 In autumn 2011, we appointed three Assistant Commissioners for Yorkshire and the Humber – Alan McQuillan OBE, Peter Edmondson, and Stephen Wooler CB – 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 to 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 note the careful consideration the Assistant Commissioners have given to the issue of whether to split wards in West and South Yorkshire, in and around Leeds and Sheffield. Having carefully considered the issue ourselves in the light of the Assistant Commissioners' report and the representations made to them about this, we are satisfied that there are no exceptional and compelling circumstances that would justify splitting wards in either area, and we endorse the Assistant Commissioners' conclusion to that effect. We consider that the arrangement of constituencies recommended by the Assistant Commissioners is sensible and reasonable, without any need to resort to splitting wards.

3.4 We are also persuaded by the merits of their revisions to our sub-regional approach, and to the constituencies in North Yorkshire and Humberside. We consider that the Assistant Commissioners have arrived at a better solution for Humberside than the initial proposals, reflecting the evidence received regarding local ties in and around the City of Kingston upon Hull and allowing for the retention of more existing constituencies in East Yorkshire.

# Report by the Assistant Commissioners on Yorkshire and the Humber

## Introduction

AC1 The Boundary Commission for England ('the Commission') is required<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> The Commission determined that England should, for this purpose, be divided into regions, one of which is Yorkshire and the Humber.<sup>6</sup>

AC2 The Secretary of State has appointed<sup>7</sup> us (Alan McQuillan OBE, Peter Edmondson, and Stephen Wooler CB) as Assistant Commissioners to assist the Commission in the discharge of its functions with respect to Yorkshire and the Humber. While Alan McQuillan was designated as Lead Assistant Commissioner for the region and as such has led the work for Yorkshire and the Humber, we have all three agreed the contents of this report.

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

- on 13-14 October in Leeds;
- on 17-18 October in Sheffield;
- on 20-21 October in Northallerton; and
- on 24-25 October in Kingston upon Hull.

AC4 During the Initial Consultation period 81 people, on their own behalf or representing organisations made oral representations at the

public hearings, and 955 people or organisations made unique written representations. In the secondary consultation period, 149 people or organisations made unique 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 It is important to note that 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 *Yorkshire and the Humber: 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

<sup>4</sup> Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, section 3.

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

<sup>6</sup> *A guide to the 2013 Review*, published by the Commission, and *Yorkshire and the Humber: Initial proposals*, also published by the Commission.

<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986, Schedule 1 paragraph 6.

requirements for a fixed number of constituencies, and places an upper and lower limit on the size of the electorate of any constituency, save in relation to four protected constituencies that are outside Yorkshire and the Humber. 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:<sup>8</sup>

- 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 Yorkshire and the Humber.

<sup>8</sup> 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'.

AC12 Our report begins with an overview of the main issues we encountered during our consideration of the region, followed by a section on how we have approached the division of Yorkshire and the Humber into sub-regions. We then set out the basis of our recommendations for constituency boundaries. The Commission has proposed (as it was required to do) a name and designation for each of the constituencies in its initial proposals. Many of the representations that have been made suggest names different from those proposed by the Commission. We make our recommendations about names after we have set out and explained our recommendations about constituency boundaries.

### Overview

AC13 Yorkshire and the Humber comprises the counties of North Yorkshire, South Yorkshire, and West Yorkshire (which are administered by one county council, seven district councils, one unitary authority, and nine metropolitan councils), together with the four unitary authorities created from the former County of Humberside.

AC14 Its character ranges from sparsely populated countryside and moorland to densely populated towns and cities. There are four major conurbations that are industrial and commercial in nature (Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, and Kingston upon Hull), as well as many other substantial cities, towns, and ports such as York, Wakefield, Doncaster, and Grimsby. Many of the major population centres have a very clear and historic identity but lie so close together that in some cases they almost merge. Many of these towns continue to reflect the earlier dominance of the coal and textile industries.

AC15 There are at present 54 constituencies in the region, whereas its entitlement under the proposed new allocation is 50. Only 20 of the existing constituencies have electorates within the required 5% plus or minus of the electoral quota. These factors alone make substantial change inevitable.

AC16 A further problem flows from the size of wards within West Yorkshire, particularly, though not exclusively, in the cities of Leeds and Wakefield. The average size of a ward in Leeds is 16,525 electors; the largest has 19,030 electors and the smallest has 14,500 electors. This of itself limits flexibility when the difference between the maximum permitted size and the minimum permitted size of a constituency is 7,663. Most combinations of four wards fall short of the statutory minimum for a Parliamentary constituency; conversely five often exceed the statutory maximum. In Wakefield, the average ward size is 12,002 and the span between largest and smallest electorate is 2,944. Therefore, combinations of six wards tend to fall short of the statutory minimum while those containing seven wards are likely to exceed the statutory maximum.

AC17 In designing new constituencies to reflect fully the legislation and the Commission's policies, this poses immediate problems in that meeting the statutory criteria requires wards to be brought into constituencies from adjoining areas that may have quite different characteristics, community ties, and outlook. A particular example raised many times by contributors to the review, in many different places, was the lack of affinity an elector felt for an urban area, as they lived in a rural setting. The converse situation was also raised frequently by urban constituents, who identified with their town but not the adjacent rural hinterland that they saw as a very separate community.

AC18 The examples outlined above were replicated to a similar or lesser degree in other clusters of proposed constituencies. In attempting to construct cohesive constituencies, individual changes sometimes necessitated consequential changes in adjoining areas that then triggered the need for further changes in a 'ripple' effect often extending many miles away, where electors might reasonably assume that their position would remain unchanged.

AC19 Even constituencies that currently meet the numerical requirements may have to be changed so that the boundaries of adjacent constituencies can be adjusted to meet the numerical requirements.

AC20 Across the whole of the region many of these concerns were very well articulated in responses from political parties, electors, and other individual interested parties, such as council Returning Officers. Some responses simply outlined concerns whereas others presented suggestions ranging from local areas to schemes covering the entire region. Given the very specific characteristics of Yorkshire and the Humber, it was our experience that the constraints of the electoral quota and the issues of ward size mentioned above made it very difficult, if not impossible, to extract just those parts of counter-proposals which had merit and reflect them in adjustments to the Commission proposals. Instead, each set of proposals tended to be a package that had to be accepted or rejected more or less as a whole.

AC21 In short, our ambit of movement to deal with all individual concerns was, by the very nature of the legislation, curtailed. Parliament clearly intended a limited range of discretion, which gave rise to the aspects mentioned above. Additionally the Commission's *A guide*

*to the 2013 Review*, with its policy against splitting wards unless there are 'exceptional and compelling' circumstances, further restricted our latitude to deal more widely with individual issues. However, we do not criticise this policy, it being considered necessary and proportionate to avoid breaking local ties, disrupting political party organisations, and causing difficulties for Electoral Registration and Returning Officers.

AC22 It is right, however, to mention here that, in response to a significant number of representations, in very limited circumstances we did consider a very small number of 'ward splits' to mitigate the most serious effects of the quota margins. The issue was most significant in relation to South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire. We were mindful of the Commission's policy of not splitting wards unless there are exceptional and compelling circumstances. Our approach was therefore to assess first what configuration would strike the best balance between the statutory criteria, on the basis that each constituency would comprise whole wards, and formulate provisional recommendations to the Commission. We then went on to consider what other configurations would be possible if some wards were split; and whether any such configuration would offer a better balance between the statutory criteria so as to justify departure from the Commission's policy on the splitting of wards as set out at paragraph 31 of its *Guide*.

### ***The Commission's initial proposals***

AC23 The Commission's initial proposals by their very nature were developed without the benefit of the public consultations that have been of such great assistance in informing our work in this stage of the 2013 Review. Full details are contained in the Commission's publication *Yorkshire and the Humber: Initial proposals*.

### **Public consultation**

AC24 The consultation process is described at paragraphs AC3–AC5 above. We must note that the overall volume of submissions in Yorkshire and the Humber was very substantial, even though below the national average, and a great many of the submissions were of very high quality and detailed in their range and scope. Respondents had often taken great trouble to consider the issues and present alternative models. These ranged from recommendations on local areas to proposals for the entire region.

AC25 The Conservative Party (IP/025308) and Liberal Democrats (IP/025338) submitted detailed counter-proposals for the entire region on the first written consultation. The written proposals from the Liberal Democrats were a variant of those presented at the public hearing in Leeds, having been revised to take account of other representations.

AC26 The Labour Party (IP/025315) did not submit an overall detailed response at that stage, but we did have the benefit of some excellent submissions from individual Labour representatives and members. All three major parties attended and spoke at the public hearings and all three made well-argued submissions in the secondary (written) consultation period.

AC27 All of this material was of huge assistance to us in enabling this task to be undertaken and helping us to understand the real and genuinely held concerns of people from across the political spectrum about the region and the review. We considered all of this material in our deliberations. We were also very encouraged by the openness and passion with which the vast majority of respondents approached the issues and were particularly impressed by the number of occasions on

which submissions made ignored party considerations in favour of the best solution for local communities. We were also heartened by the good humour of people from all backgrounds and viewpoints in putting their own views forward, and in making points about others' submissions.

AC28 The list below sets out some of the most significant and recurring points which featured at the public hearings and in the subsequent written submissions. It is not exhaustive and the fact that a point was raised frequently does not necessarily give it validity. Moreover, the fact that a concern is valid does not mean that we can meet it; the arithmetical constraints are powerful.

- a. The decision to group West and North Yorkshire together to achieve constituencies within Leeds that were within the statutory parameters had a disproportionate effect on constituencies across the whole of North Yorkshire. All eight existing constituencies in North Yorkshire have electorates within the statutory parameters but the Commission's proposals required changes to all except the existing Scarborough and Whitby constituency.
- b. North Yorkshire is quite distinct and different from the former metropolitan counties of South and West Yorkshire, being a largely agricultural and rural county. It retains the 'non-metropolitan' two-tier governance structure.
- c. Should North Yorkshire be considered as a sub-region on its own, the inclusion of West Yorkshire with South Yorkshire as a sub-regional unit must not disadvantage electors in those counties merely to allow North Yorkshire to remain unchanged.

- d. The Commission's proposals divided towns and cities (in particular Leeds, Wakefield, Batley, Morley, and Dewsbury), sometimes in a manner that fragmented their centres and disrupted local community ties.
- e. There was avoidable disruption of natural existing boundaries in more rural areas such as (but not confined to) the Worth Valley and the Wensleydale group of wards, and through the creation of a constituency stretching from urban Leeds to Nidderdale which also divided Pateley Bridge.
- f. There was extensive criticism of the separation of the three wards of the Isle of Axholme, with Axholme North ward being placed in the proposed Goole and Cottingham constituency and the other two in the proposed Scunthorpe constituency.
- g. There are at present five constituencies serving Sheffield contained within the local authority boundary, and part of one other. The Commission's proposals breached that boundary three times. This was said to suggest that the policy of not splitting wards might not be right for Sheffield.

AC29 As indicated above, we did not look at these points in isolation but mention them here as examples that help illustrate the scale and range of the concerns raised. In addition to expressions of concern, we received a number of counter-proposals. These included full proposals for the region put forward by the Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats and by a number of individuals. The Labour Party commented but did not advance a comprehensive set of counter-proposals separate from those advanced, for example,

by the Shipley Constituency Labour Party (IP/023128) in its own name. In addition, other constituency Labour parties such as Halifax (IP/023050) and Scunthorpe (IP/024301) made submissions in relation to specific areas.

### **Determining the appropriate sub-regions**

AC30 From the earliest stage of our work, it was apparent to us that, because of the particular features of this region – with large conurbations with large ward sizes in one area – the choice of sub-regional groupings might have a critical impact upon the overall design of the proposed new constituencies. This was therefore an issue that we approached with special care.

AC31 Although the responses to the Commission's proposals covered a wide range of issues, many of the concerns expressed by the Parliamentary political parties and by others, both in the public hearings and in written submissions, commented adversely on the proposed sub-regions and the consequences that flowed from them.

AC32 The Conservative Party supported the principle of dividing the region into sub-regions but argued that North Yorkshire should be designated a sub-region in itself, with West Yorkshire being placed with South Yorkshire. Humberside would form another sub-region.

AC33 The Liberal Democrats' counter-proposal did not adopt the sub-regional approach, nor did it reflect the existing county boundaries that are the result of the 1972 Local Government Act. They commented that:

'The former Ridings boundaries continue to carry much more weight and commitment (in a community sense) than the current boundaries. Consequently we have given greater weight to these.'

AC34 The Labour Party accepted the Commission’s proposed sub-regions (including grouping West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire together) because of the difficulty of dividing West Yorkshire appropriately. However, it also commented as follows:

‘We note however that while these are convenient administrative units, within those units the counties concerned are of no greater status under the rules than are districts. Therefore there is not necessarily any greater merit in having fewer constituencies crossing over their boundaries if the result of that may compromise the respect for other criteria.’

AC35 It was also possible to identify from the evidence at the public hearings and from the written submissions a number of recurring themes that were linked directly or indirectly to the composition of the proposed sub-regions.

AC36 Our approach was to examine these themes (in the context of the submissions as a whole) and consider whether those which appeared to have merit could be more satisfactorily addressed by adopting a different configuration at sub-regional level from the Commission’s proposals.

AC37 Having evaluated the proposals and counter-proposals it was apparent to us that the fundamental source of the problem lay in West Yorkshire, where it was essential to ‘adopt’ smaller wards on the periphery of the Leeds conurbation so as to develop viable constituencies in that area within the statutory quota. The size considerations referred to in the overview above limited the options available if wards were not to be divided between constituencies. Moreover, the possible permutations would all involve leaving Leeds with only three or four constituencies entirely within the city, and a number of other

constituencies which comprised some wards from within Leeds and some from other metropolitan boroughs (or, in the Commission’s proposals, parts of North Yorkshire).

AC38 The result of this approach was that other areas themselves then had to be reconfigured, sometimes with the effect of ripples of exchange and counter-exchange proliferating considerable distances beyond the immediate interface between the City of Leeds and its environs. The problem was exacerbated in that large parts of the outer areas of the City of Leeds (such as Aireborough, Horsforth, Kippax, Morley, Otley, Pudsey, and Wetherby) were only brought into the city by the Local Government Act 1972. While the residents of these areas may now feel some affinity with the city from which they receive their services, and while many may consider Leeds a ‘hub’ for amenities, these towns remain proud and distinct (Stephen Whittaker: IP/025396). This makes our task even more difficult.

AC39 In practice, because of the geography, and the density of the Leeds/Bradford conurbation, the wards ‘adopted’ to develop a viable model of constituencies in West Yorkshire had to come predominantly from either the North Yorkshire or South Yorkshire sub-regions.

AC40 In adopting a sub-regional approach there were only two possible options for the area outside Humberside – to combine:

- a. West Yorkshire with South Yorkshire; or
- b. West Yorkshire with North Yorkshire.

AC41 In its proposals, the Commission had grouped West Yorkshire with North Yorkshire. This had led to two possibly avoidable consequences:

- a. It brought about a requirement to reorganise all the constituencies in North Yorkshire to make them fit within quota. However, from all the evidence, the existing constituencies within North Yorkshire were all within the statutory quota and appeared to be based upon settled communities with strong local ties. There was also very strong opposition to the Commission's proposals and we noted that Rule 5 in Schedule 2 of the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 and the Commission's own *Guide* at paragraph 32 specifically state that the Commission 'intends to have regard generally to existing constituencies as far as possible'.
  - b. To the south of Leeds, the Commission's proposals also failed to address the problems in peripheral towns, especially to the south-east of the region. Here the mathematics of trying to develop viable constituencies within quota still led to an undesirable degree of dividing of settled communities, which was again subject to considerable local objection.
- i. Humberside, South Yorkshire, and West Yorkshire plus North Yorkshire; or
  - ii. Humberside, North Yorkshire, and West Yorkshire plus South Yorkshire.
- c. The sub-regional model originally adopted by the Commission had consequences that forced a significant reorganisation of existing constituencies and was strongly opposed; those consequences might be obviated by a different approach.
  - d. The best possible configuration for the region as a whole could be achieved by treating North Yorkshire and Humberside as separate sub-regions and combining West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire together as a third sub-region.
  - e. We would not consider these sub-regional boundaries as absolute and, subject to the statutory criteria and the Commission's guidance, might break across sub-regional boundaries, where necessary and appropriate, to achieve a better solution for local communities.

AC42 We did also consider an approach based on no sub-regional boundaries. However, we concluded that this offered no real advantage and would bring its own difficulties.

### ***Sub-regions - conclusions***

AC43 Following extensive examination of the possible options, we concluded as follows:

- a. A model based upon no sub-regional boundaries offered few advantages.
- b. There were only two viable models for sub-regional boundaries:

### **Development of the recommendations for the region**

AC44 We now set out our assessments and recommendations in respect of each sub-region. The conclusions are summarised at paragraphs AC186–AC205 below. Of necessity, in drafting a report of this type we cannot deal in detail with every single representation made or every piece of evidence submitted. However, we do wish to emphasise that in making our recommendations we have carefully reviewed the totality of the evidence and have constantly and fairly referred back to all the material submitted in the consultation periods, as

well as the Commission's own initial proposals report.

***Recommendations for the North Yorkshire sub-region***

AC45 We noted above that the six existing constituencies that cover the area administered by North Yorkshire County Council and the two existing constituencies covering the City of York (a unitary authority) have electorates within the electoral quota.

AC46 Although this situation made the boundaries of existing constituencies of direct relevance, we did not regard that alone as a conclusive reason for their remaining unchanged. The other aspects of the statutory criteria and the evidence that we took into account included the following:

- a. Local authority boundaries are such that four of the eight local authority areas are served exclusively by a single constituency or (in the case of York) exclusively by two constituencies; Hambleton District Council and Scarborough Borough Council are each covered by two constituencies, while Harrogate Borough Council, which has a larger electorate, is covered by three constituencies.
- b. Four out of eight constituencies serve electorates in only one local authority area; three serve electorates from two local authority areas; and one serves electorates from three local authority areas.
- c. As far as the evidence shows, existing community ties are preserved, including those such as the relationships between the Richmondshire wards that had been reassigned by the initial proposals to the

proposed Skipton and Ripon constituency and the Hambleton wards that had been reassigned to the proposed Malton constituency. Many representations by town and parish councils as well as by individuals were directed at those proposals.

- d. No electors need to transfer from one constituency to another.
- e. The Conservative Party submitted strongly in favour of keeping all existing constituencies in North Yorkshire while the Labour Party criticised the fact that under the initial proposals only one existing constituency was unchanged, without developing its position further. The Liberal Democrats proposed a different configuration for North Yorkshire.
- f. There was also a body of opinion which supported the Commission's proposal for a Selby and Castleford constituency on the basis that the existing Selby and Ainsty constituency is unsatisfactory and merits change; this was, however, a minority view. Similarly, a very small number of those who responded argued for a different configuration in relation to the York constituencies.
- g. Above all, there was very strong, clear, and unequivocal evidence from the consultation that the existing constituencies were regarded by electors as fair and representative of settled communities. This was often expressed in forthright terms as 'If it isn't broke, don't fix it.'

AC47 These considerations led us to conclude that retention of the existing constituency configurations in North Yorkshire would strike

the best balance between the statutory criteria, taking into account the Commission's own policies, and we so recommend.

### ***Recommendations for the Humberside sub-region***

AC48 There are currently ten constituencies in this sub-region, only two of which (Beverley and Holderness, and East Yorkshire) have an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota. Of the remaining constituencies, all eight have electorates that are below the 5% limit. This includes the three that serve the wards of the City of Kingston upon Hull.

AC49 The Commission's initial proposals reduced the number of constituencies to nine – something which is accepted by all parties. The Commission also took a considered decision not to propose retention of either of the two existing constituencies that have an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota, in order to develop proposals under which all nine constituencies would be compliant.

AC50 Details are set out at paragraphs 27–35 of the Commission's publication *Yorkshire and the Humber: Initial proposals*.

### ***Representations received***

AC51 Both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats put forward detailed counter-proposals that are summarised below. The Labour Party made a more general submission that is also summarised below, but reserved its position on counter-proposals. Seventeen individuals spoke at a public hearing held in Kingston upon Hull, although their evidence did not relate exclusively to the Humberside sub-region and relevant evidence was received at other public hearings. In particular, the three Parliamentary political parties made submissions at the Leeds hearing relating to the region as a whole. These three

parties all submitted further representations during the secondary consultation period (Conservative Party (CR/004551), Labour Party (CR/004555), and Liberal Democrats (CR/004558)).

AC52 Some individuals who made verbal or written submissions confined themselves to specific issues and concerns while others put forward counter-proposals which covered either the whole sub-region (e.g. Adrian Bailey (CR/003452), Stephen Whittaker (CR/003587), and Alan Wise (IP/017059)) or a specific group of proposed constituencies (e.g. Diana Johnson MP (IP/024283)).

AC53 It is fair to say that this sub-region produced perhaps the greatest debate during the consultation and one of the greatest volumes of different proposals for the reconfiguration of constituencies in an urban area within the region. In all of this, there were a number of recurring themes:

- a. Despite some support for the Commission's proposal to incorporate the ward of South West Holderness into the proposed constituency of Kingston upon Hull East, the preponderance of views opposed this. Indeed, there was substantial support for retention of the existing constituencies of East Yorkshire, and Beverley and Holderness.
- b. It was widely pointed out that each of the existing constituencies meets the statutory electorate range and is considered a more natural reflection of community ties.
- c. Substantial criticism was made of the Commission's proposed constituency of Goole and Cottingham because it brought together two communities that have no geographical or community ties, with the

consequent breaking of the more natural ties that each community has. There was a strong view that Cottingham in particular has little to do with Goole and looks more to Hull (especially in the context of strong links to the university) and to the other Haltemprice villages as well as Beverley.

- d. In the context of Kingston upon Hull itself, the majority of those responding favoured looking to the west of the city (as opposed to east to Holderness) to incorporate the additional wards necessary to bring the three constituencies that currently serve the city within the electoral quota.
- e. There were significant concerns that the Derringham ward is physically separated (by a railway line) from the rest of the proposed Kingston upon Hull North constituency and that the City of Kingston upon Hull should be served by at least one constituency which is focused on the central area that gives the city its identity.
- f. It was also suggested by some that the River Hull would make a natural geographical boundary; others contradicted this.
- g. There was concern that the boundary of the proposed Grimsby constituency split Cleethorpes.
- h. There was extensive criticism of the separation of the three wards of the Isle of Axholme, with Axholme North being placed in the proposed Goole and Cottingham constituency and the other two wards in the proposed Scunthorpe constituency.

### *Assessment*

AC54 We decided in the light of the complexity of the issues and range of proposals to approach our assessment in three stages by:

- a. considering the criticisms of the Commission's proposed Bridlington and Beverley constituencies against the case for retaining the existing constituencies of East Yorkshire, and Beverley and Holderness;
- b. evaluating the impact of retaining those two existing constituencies on the configuration of constituencies serving the City of Kingston upon Hull; and
- c. examining the implications of any changes to the Commission's initial proposals as regards a. and b. above, including weighing the benefits of any changes against any consequential disadvantages for electors in other wards including the ability to address other issues that had been raised.

### *Consideration of representations in relation to the Commission's proposed constituencies of Bridlington and Beverley*

AC55 Although the Commission's proposals received some support (in particular in oral representations on behalf of the local Labour Party), this was limited. By contrast, there was strong and broad-based support for retaining the existing Beverley and Holderness constituency unchanged. Points raised included the extent to which residents of Holderness look towards Beverley for services and not to Bridlington. 'Holderness, of course, has a coastline and Bridlington is on the coast, but apart from that there is no connection between the two' (Greg Knight MP at the Kingston upon Hull public hearing, Day 1, p 22).

Two of the main political parties urged retention of the existing constituency, as it would retain existing boundaries and relate to a single local authority. Many representations were received stressing the links between the small towns that constitute Holderness, and their focus on Beverley that might otherwise be disrupted.

AC56 Similar considerations apply to the existing constituency of East Yorkshire. There has previously been a single constituency running down the east coast in the manner proposed by the Commission, so the communication and transport difficulties referred to by some witnesses do not seem insurmountable – especially in the 21st century. It would also retain existing boundaries and relate to a single local authority. We received evidence that East Yorkshire focuses around four towns: Bridlington, Driffield, Pocklington, and Market Weighton. They have good transport links and community links and are served by one newspaper group. Driffield is the hub of East Yorkshire and it was argued that moving it into Beverley would separate it from many of the Wolds villages.

AC57 The main driver for the Commission's proposed incorporation of the ward of South West Holderness into its proposed Kingston upon Hull East constituency was the need to add sufficient electorate to the wards of the City of Kingston upon Hull to sustain three constituencies. Beyond that, there was no further evidence of advantages. We concluded that the factors set out in Rule 5 militated in favour of retaining the two existing constituencies of Beverley and Holderness and East Yorkshire, and that their disruption could be justified only if no other satisfactory way of reconfiguring the wards of the City of Kingston upon Hull could be identified. It will be noted from paragraph AC70 below that we believe

satisfactory reconfiguration can be achieved and accordingly we recommend the retention of the two existing constituencies.

#### *Implications for the City of Kingston upon Hull*

AC58 The statutory requirement of the electoral quota means that the arrangements for the City of Kingston upon Hull must change significantly, because it cannot sustain the three existing constituencies without adding to the electorate; however, the regional and natural boundaries limit flexibility. It is unavoidable that Hull will have at least one constituency that contains wards both from the City of Kingston upon Hull and from a surrounding local authority area. The preponderance of the evidence favoured looking to the west of Hull (notably the Cottingham and Haltemprice areas) for the additional electorate. The opposition engendered by the alternative approach (incorporating the ward of South West Holderness) has been described above.

AC59 The arrangements for Kingston upon Hull also had to be considered in the context of the compelling body of evidence of strong socio-economic links between Hull and Cottingham and the widespread and trenchant criticism of the Commission's proposal for a Goole and Cottingham constituency. Two structured sets of alternative proposals were advanced – one by the Conservative Party and the other by the Liberal Democrats. Each had the effect of incorporating wards from Cottingham and the Haltemprice villages but in different configurations. The evidence submitted by Diana Johnson MP, Alan Wise, Stephen Whittaker, and Adrian Bailey each put forward further proposals and in particular suggested different permutations of the wards within Kingston upon Hull. Each option involves a different permutation of the same 28 wards except that the counter-proposal by the Liberal

Democrats incorporates one additional ward (South Hunsley) from the East Riding of Yorkshire local authority area.

AC60 We compared each option with the others as well as with the Commission's proposals and the existing constituencies, against the statutory criteria, and also to see how effective each was in meeting the most substantial concerns.

AC61 The Liberal Democrats' proposal differs from the others in significant ways. It proposes expansion of the existing Kingston upon Hull East constituency and realignment of the existing Kingston upon Hull North constituency to the extent of producing a central corridor linking the city centre to Cottingham. This approach reflects their assessment of the River Hull as a very significant community divide in Hull, with the community being more clearly divided by the river to the north of the city than in the city centre. By contrast, Alan Wise, Diana Johnson MP, and the Conservative Party all put less emphasis on the River Hull as a natural boundary, with Mr Wise saying in his submission:

'There are always powerful voices raised in Hull about the retention of the River Hull as the western boundary of Hull East; however the electorate is too large to achieve this in its entirety. Your proposal retains the southern section of the river as a boundary; mine retains the northern section.

'The western boundary of urban Hull is adjacent to built up areas in the old Haltemprice area and so flow homogeneously together. This could be the basis for a Hull West and Haltemprice seat. This leaves the remaining rural parts of east Yorkshire, not already allocated, to link up with the largely rural Boothferry

seat (my suggested name) centred on Goole.'

AC62 The Liberal Democrats' counter-proposal also separates the two Cottingham wards from the other Haltemprice villages and places them in a proposed Kingston upon Hull North and Cottingham constituency, contrary to what most commentators advanced as the natural grouping. In addition, it incorporates South Hunsley ward in a Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle constituency, whereas we received substantial representations about the community ties between the villages in this ward and those in the adjoining Dale ward. The Chairman of Elloughton-cum-Brough Town Council (IP/000067) made the point that Elloughton, Brough, and Welton have merged into one built-up area.

AC63 The Conservative Party counter-proposal creates two constituencies consisting solely of Kingston upon Hull wards (compared with one such constituency under the Commission's proposals) and therefore has a better balance in relation to local government boundaries. It also cuts across the River Hull to form a Kingston upon Hull Central constituency that incorporates the city centre and central areas. The party's proposed Kingston upon Hull North constituency also comprises solely Kingston upon Hull wards and largely respects the existing constituency. The party's third proposed constituency incorporates the five existing East Riding of Yorkshire wards that make up the Haltemprice villages, along with the remaining wards of Kingston upon Hull.

AC64 It is only fair to record that the first preference of Diana Johnson MP, the Member of Parliament for Kingston upon Hull North, would be the Commission's own proposals. However, she recognised the extent of the opposition to the proposals and suggested

amendments to the Conservative Party's counter-proposal for consideration if the Commission is minded (as we recommend) to restore the South West Holderness ward to the existing Beverley and Holderness constituency. It is her view that the Conservative Party proposal is the one that most closely reflects the statutory criteria, although it has a weakness in her view of dividing a natural and long-established North Hull Estate community around University, and Orchard Park and Greenwood wards. The Conservative Party in its secondary response commented that her amendments would be acceptable.

AC65 The counter-proposal by Alan Wise has some similarity to the Conservative Party counter-proposal in advocating a Kingston upon Hull Central constituency, but he combines this with a proposed Kingston upon Hull East constituency. His submission does not set out the rationale for the suggested distribution of wards.

AC66 Stephen Whittaker's counter-proposal involves only limited change from the existing constituencies. He proposes that the existing constituency of Kingston upon Hull East should extend across the River Hull to include Myton ward; and that the existing constituency of Kingston upon Hull North should expand to include Newington ward. Having regard to the traditional view that the River Hull constitutes the natural boundary of east Hull, Mr Whittaker suggests that Kingston upon Hull East should become Kingston upon Hull Central. The remaining Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle wards together with the five Haltemprice wards would form a constituency to be known as Kingston upon Hull and Haltemprice. Apart from compliance with the electoral quota and a belief that the benefit of minimal change in Kingston upon Hull (an advantage of the Commission's proposals) is outweighed by

the resultant disruption in East Yorkshire, the submission does not offer any rationale for the proposed configuration of wards.

AC67 The remaining counter-proposal from Adrian Bailey presents three variants but is again supported by little explanation or rationale save that each variant complies with the electoral quota.

AC68 Assessing these counter-proposals in the context of the concerns put forward leads to the following conclusions:

- a. All counter-proposals share the strong opposition to the linking of Cottingham with Goole.
- b. All counter-proposals would incorporate Cottingham and the Haltemprice villages into Kingston upon Hull, thus recognising the strong community ties between these places. Moreover, all counter-proposals group these five wards from the East Riding of Yorkshire local authority area (Cottingham North and South, Hessle, Tranby, and Willerby and Kirk Ella) into one constituency, except the Liberal Democrats' proposal that splits them between Kingston upon Hull North and Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle. This is material to the criterion relating to local authority boundaries, as it would divide East Riding of Yorkshire between more constituencies.
- c. All counter-proposals except that advanced by Stephen Whittaker meet the concerns of those advocating grouping together the wards of Bransholme East, Bransholme West, Kings Park, and Sutton in order to preserve community ties.
- d. All counter-proposals seem to meet the point made in the Liberal Democrats'

written submission and by Councillor David McCob (Kingston upon Hull public hearing, Day 1, pp 14-19) that the River Hull becomes a significant community divide towards the north of the city. That point is largely met by the grouping mentioned in the previous bullet point. However, the counter-proposal from Diana Johnson MP does not meet it to the same extent – she points out that the existing Kingston upon Hull North constituency extends across the River Hull.

- e. All counter-proposals have regard to the significance of the university community, although it is a matter of interpretation as to how wide that community stretches. The university and its student halls are in University ward and the two Cottingham wards. The Liberal Democrats describe ‘the wider university community’ as also embracing the Avenue, Newland, Beverley, and Bricknell wards. Their proposed Kingston upon Hull North constituency achieves that linkage, whereas the Conservative Party links the core of the university with only Bricknell ward. There appears to be a trade-off in that the Conservative Party has preserved the links between Haltemprice and the two Cottingham wards. Diana Johnson MP has three of the above wards (University, Newland, and Beverley) in the same constituency, as well as Orchard Park and Greenwood ward, which is viewed by some as a ‘university’ ward. Stephen Whittaker and Adrian Bailey (variant 3) also achieve that. Diana Johnson MP’s stated rationale for proposing amendments to the Conservative Party configuration for Kingston upon Hull is to reunite the North Hull estate, recognising the strong community ties between the

University ward and Orchard Park and Greenwood ward.

- f. Bricknell Estate is split between South Cottingham and Bricknell wards, which should therefore be kept together for Parliamentary purposes. All counter-proposals achieve that, except the proposal by Stephen Whittaker and variant 3 of the proposal by Adrian Bailey.
- g. All counter-proposals except those by Stephen Whittaker and Adrian Bailey (variant 1) keep together Avenue and Myton wards, which together serve Cranbourne Street.
- h. All counter-proposals (except variant 3 by Adrian Bailey) reunite Derringham ward with the proposed Kingston upon Hull West constituency.
- i. All counter-proposals (except that by the Liberal Democrats) keep Dale and South Hunsley wards together (the point made at the Kingston upon Hull public hearing (Day 2, pp 4-6) by Councillor Katrin McClure, and in numerous written submissions).

AC69 In striking the balance between these counter-proposals, we also took into account the following factors:

- a. All counter-proposals except one create two constituencies serving exclusively Kingston upon Hull electors; the Liberal Democrats’ submission does not.
- b. Four sets of counter-proposals create a central constituency that focuses on the city centre and central areas. Although this did not feature strongly in the representations made at the public hearing in Kingston upon Hull, the point

was made elsewhere that a central constituency helps to preserve the identity of the city and provides better representation for core issues.

- c. One counter-proposal is dependent on creating a constituency that is not wholly contained within the sub-region.
- d. All counter-proposals necessarily involve significant disruption, but this is an inevitable consequence of the need to add such a substantial number of electors to this group of constituencies.

AC70 We concluded that, on balance, the proposal advanced by Diana Johnson MP seems to fit more closely the statutory criteria. It takes account of existing community ties, including the majority of those where concerns were addressed in representations. It has regard for local authority boundaries and largely adopts the existing Kingston upon Hull North constituency boundaries. It also allows the Orchard Park and Greenwood, and University wards to be kept together in a neighbouring constituency. When adopted with the Conservative Party counter-proposal for the rest of Humberside it would allow Kingston upon Hull to be reviewed with two constituencies contained entirely within the city, as opposed to the Commission's proposals.

AC71 Diana Johnson MP suggested the name Kingston upon Hull South. We decided that Kingston upon Hull Central would be more appropriate as the proposed constituency contains the ward in which Kingston upon Hull city centre is located.

*Implications of the decisions taken in relation to East Yorkshire, Beverley and Holderness, and Kingston upon Hull in relation to the remainder of Humberside region*

AC72 We pointed out at the beginning of this report that many decisions concerning individual constituencies or groups of constituencies have significant consequential effects elsewhere. In considering the implications of our decisions in relation to the East Yorkshire, Beverley and Holderness, and three Kingston upon Hull constituencies, we were mindful of the need to avoid making proposals that might result in unfair changes being imposed in other areas – that is, at all stages and in every sub-region we considered the implications of the changes as a package and tried to ensure that no constituency was disproportionately impacted simply because of the need to find an optimal solution in a nearby area.

AC73 The suggested changes to the Commission's initial proposals that we set out above would require the South Hunsley ward to be relocated and steps to be taken to counter-balance the loss of 14,654 electors from the Commission's proposed Goole and Cottingham constituency as the result of including the two Cottingham wards in our suggested Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice constituency. Since South Hunsley is bounded on the south by the River Humber, geographical considerations point to South Hunsley being joined with the remaining wards of the Commission's proposed Goole and Cottingham constituency. Doing so would also reunite in one constituency the Dale and South Hunsley wards – whose proposed division generated a substantial volume of critical comment and concern.

AC74 There is a strong consensus among those who put forward counter-proposals that incorporation of the South Hunsley, Axholme Central and Axholme South wards with the remaining wards of the Commission's proposed Goole and Cottingham constituency would create a constituency of 77,823 electors that would best meet the statutory criteria in relation to respect for existing constituencies and local authority boundaries. It would also meet the extensive concerns expressed in verbal and written submissions about the possible breaking of community ties through the separation of the South Hunsley ward from the Dale ward and also the division of the three Axholme wards. The new constituency would be made up of six wards from the existing Brigg and Goole constituency and four from the existing Haltemprice and Howden constituency. It would serve two local authority areas.

AC75 This configuration accords with the counter-proposal from the Conservative Party and also those advanced by Adrian Bailey, Stephen Whittaker and Alan Wise. Diana Johnson MP said in a written submission: 'My suggested amendments to the Conservative Party submission are confined to wards within Hull and do not extend outside the City. For example, I do not propose any alteration to the Howden and Goole seat proposed by the Conservative Party, which includes the South Hunsley ward that they wish to remove from the Hull West and Hessle seat proposed by the Boundary Commission.' The Scunthorpe Constituency Labour Party positively encouraged the grouping of the Axholme wards, which they considered to lack any community identity with the remainder of the Scunthorpe wards.

AC76 The Liberal Democrats address the issues with a counter-proposal for a new

Goole and Thorne constituency that differs fundamentally from the proposal above. They build on the Goole and Cottingham proposal by including two wards (Thorne, and Stainforth and Moorends) from Doncaster (South Yorkshire) to achieve the electoral quota. The Liberal Democrats do not identify any benefits for local ties save that the arrangement meets the electoral quota and unites towns and villages along the M62/M18 corridor. They point out that the Hull to Leeds/Sheffield train routes join Brough, Howden, Goole, and Thorne. They also state that local authority boundaries are very artificial in this area and that Goole and Howden have been in many different constituencies and local authority areas.

AC77 There are weaknesses in this counter-proposal:

- a. The introduction of wards from another sub-region would require consideration of the consequential effects in that region. In particular, the Commission's initial proposals for Doncaster envisage retaining all three existing constituencies and a strong consensus has emerged in favour of that. There would need to be a strong justification for crossing the sub-regional boundary and careful consideration of the impact on the Doncaster constituencies as well as the further ripple effects.
- b. The party's proposed Goole and Thorne constituency would span three local authority areas whereas the proposal set out in paragraph AC74 above would involve only two local authority areas.
- c. The counter-proposal does not address the concerns raised about the Axholme wards.

AC78 A further counter-proposal was put forward by David Davis MP (IP/021927), Member of Parliament for Haltemprice and Howden. His counter-proposal would join the Haltemprice group of wards with Minster and Woodmansey, and St Mary's wards from the East Riding of Yorkshire local authority area to form a Haltemprice and Beverley constituency. Although this would be a viable option when considered in isolation, it has consequential implications for other areas. The proposal would require all three Holderness wards from East Riding of Yorkshire to be combined with the Kingston upon Hull East constituency, so that there would be only one constituency comprising solely Kingston upon Hull wards. We noted earlier the substantial concern caused by the Commission's proposal to incorporate the South West Holderness ward into the proposed Kingston upon Hull East constituency. Another consequence, at the western end of the sub-region, would be to separate the Axholme wards. There is an element of inconsistency, since Mr Davis appears to endorse the substantial criticism of the Commission's proposal to separate those wards, saying '... these wards have more in commons [sic] with each other than anywhere else, so it is odd to divide them'.

AC79 For the sake of completeness, we did consider whether it would be practical to adapt the Liberal Democrats' proposal by introducing two wards from Doncaster to the Goole and Thorne constituency and achieving unification of the Axholme wards by relocating Axholme North in a Scunthorpe constituency. This is not feasible because the latter constituency would then exceed the statutory maximum electorate figure.

*Consequential effects of counter-proposals on the Commission's initial proposals for the Scunthorpe, Brigg and Humberston, and Grimsby constituencies*

AC80 All those organisations and individuals who advanced the counter-proposal for a Goole and Howden constituency recognised that a consequential change would be necessary to counterbalance the transfer of Axholme Central and Axholme South wards from the proposed Scunthorpe constituency. The only counter-proposal to emerge would involve moving the ward of Burton upon Stather and Winterton into Scunthorpe. There was some support for this at the public hearings (Andrew Percy MP, Kingston upon Hull, Day 1, pp 9-12). The proposal would facilitate the strengthening of community ties in the Axholme wards, and numerous submissions stressed the links between Burton upon Stather and Winterton ward and Scunthorpe – the former being described as a suburb.

AC81 The written submission by the Scunthorpe Constituency Labour Party urges the removal of the Axholme wards from Scunthorpe and comments:

'We would, as an alternative, propose the addition of "Burton & Winterton" to the newly proposed Scunthorpe Constituency.

'The parishes that constitute the "Burton & Winterton" ward as with "Burringham & Gunness" have historically been a part of the Scunthorpe Constituency, which has never been the case with any parts of the Isle of Axholme.'

AC82 The Liberal Democrats endorse the three constituencies in the form proposed by the Commission (Scunthorpe, Brigg and Humberston, and Grimsby), which would have

been an option had we been minded to accept its proposal for a Goole and Thorne constituency. That proposal is not, however, consistent with any configuration that would reunite the Isle of Axholme wards, as it would be impossible to achieve compliance with the electoral quota.

AC83 The Labour Party (nationally) supports the unification of the three Axholme wards, accepting that the inclusion of those wards in the counter-proposed Goole and Howden constituency would have knock-on consequences ‘as would the transfer of the Burton upon Stather & Winterton ward to the Scunthorpe CC’. But it adds:

‘We note also that the Commission’s proposed Grimsby BC divides the town of Cleethorpes with the Haverstoe ward included in the Brigg & Humberston CC. We recognise however that any alternative would be likely to divide the town of Grimsby so we make no formal counter proposal in this area.’

AC84 We have taken this to mean that the Labour Party does not endorse the division of Cleethorpes but might prefer that to dividing Grimsby. However, the requirement of the electoral quota means that dividing Grimsby is the only way to accommodate the joining up of the Isle of Axholme wards without splitting wards. That flows from the transfer of the Burton upon Stather and Winterton ward, which is a pre-requisite of the changes proposed earlier – otherwise everything unravels because the removal of this ward reduces the electorate in the Commission’s proposed Brigg and Humberston constituency to below the statutory electorate range.

AC85 In its second stage response, the Labour Party comments adversely on the proposal to divide Grimsby (which was

advanced by the Conservative Party) as follows:

‘If therefore the Commission were convinced of the advantages of keeping Beverley and Holderness CC and East Yorkshire CC unchanged, we believe that they should only do so if they are able also to keep Grimsby BC as they have proposed it, which can probably only be done by a reconfiguration of wards within Kingston upon Hull, and potentially having two seats containing parts of Hull and parts of the Haltemprice area.’

AC86 The above is a very clear illustration of the operation of the electoral quota in requiring decisions to be taken on a ‘package’ basis because of the consequential effects of relatively modest variations. To put this in context as regards Humberside, the background to the Commission’s initial proposals around Grimsby and Cleethorpes is that the two existing constituencies are both far too small. Great Grimsby has eight wards totalling only 61,929 electors; that is 10,881 below the statutory minimum. The remaining seven wards of North East Lincolnshire (53,877 electors) together with two wards from North Lincolnshire (Barton and Ferry – 17,018 electors) comprise the existing Cleethorpes constituency, with only 70,895 electors. The Commission’s initial proposals gave two constituencies in place of the Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes constituencies and the southern part of the existing Brigg and Goole constituency. In drawing the boundary, Great Grimsby was retained and expanded but Cleethorpes was split with two wards (Croft Baker and Sidney Sussex) going from Cleethorpes to Grimsby. The remainder of Cleethorpes and its rural hinterland made up the Commission’s proposed Brigg and Humberston constituency, with an electorate

of 77,196. Moving the Burton upon Stather and Winterton ward to Scunthorpe reduces that electorate to 68,326. At first blush, the solution might seem to be to restore either the Croft Baker or the Sidney Sussex ward from Grimsby to Cleethorpes. However, this does not work because removing either from the proposed Grimsby constituency reduces it to more than 5% below the electoral quota. Producing two constituencies compliant with the quota requires wider reconfiguration so that some of the smaller (rural) constituencies are linked to Grimsby instead of Cleethorpes. In reality, the proposal put forward by the Conservative Party is the only one that can produce the two required constituencies within the statutory parameters. The Labour Party is right to suggest that any solution is to be found at the other end of the sub-region.

AC87 This assessment leads us to conclude that the proposals put forward by the Conservative Party for Grimsby, Cleethorpes, and the surrounding part of the North East Lincolnshire local authority area are the best that can be devised within the statutory framework. The division of Grimsby is balanced by the reuniting of Cleethorpes. All wards within Grimsby and Cleethorpes are part of the same local authority area and the two towns, despite different characteristics, are closely linked with each other and their surrounding hinterland. We propose two constituencies – Grimsby North and Barton, and Grimsby South and Cleethorpes. This configuration takes account of local ties by allowing Cleethorpes not to be split. It also meets the concerns of the many submissions that attached weight to the retention of Cleethorpes in a constituency name.

AC88 We have weighed the advantages and disadvantages across the region and consider that the structure we propose achieves the

greatest degree of compliance with the statutory criteria across the sub-region as a whole.

### ***Recommendations for the South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire sub-region***

AC89 This sub-region comprises four cities (Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, and Wakefield) together with five large metropolitan boroughs. The total electorate is 2,551,507. It is spread over 3,581 square kilometres and its geography, population, economy, heritage and current industry are all very diverse. They range from the densely populated inner city areas, some with high levels of social deprivation, to leafy suburbs with relatively affluent communities and rolling countryside and moorland where people enjoy a more rural existence – for example in the upper parts of the Worth Valley, those parts of the Peak District that fall within Sheffield, and the villages surrounding Keighley and Otley and the foothills of the Pennines that separate Yorkshire from Greater Manchester and Lancashire.

AC90 Although geographical features create natural boundaries and form impediments to communication in some areas, the sub-region for the most part enjoys extremely good transport links, with several major motorways serving the region as well as rail and other transport links to all parts of the country from major stations at Leeds, Sheffield, and Doncaster. It has many other transport hubs linking national travel networks to the more local ones.

AC91 The heritage of the sub-region includes long associations with coal mining, textiles, steel, and power generation as well as much other commerce and finance. These associations have shaped its historical development around many small and middle-sized towns and large villages, often associated

with particular aspects of industry such as collieries or mills. Whereas once many of these communities were also seats of local government, successive reorganisations have seen smaller authorities amalgamated, notably by the Local Government Act 1972 which provided for the creation of the metropolitan counties – including those of West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire – in a two-tier system that included a number of district councils. Further reforms and local government boundary reviews resulted in the abolition of the metropolitan counties and the current structure of unitary authorities, with electorates ranging from 145,167 in Calderdale (centred on Halifax) to 545,338 in the City of Leeds.

AC92 Neither South Yorkshire nor West Yorkshire now exists for administrative purposes, although they do for other specific functions such as policing. The diversity within individual local authority areas may also be large – for example, Bradford City Council serves some seriously disadvantaged inner city areas as well as the moorlands of ‘Brontë country’ around the villages of Haworth and the Worth Valley. We received a number of submissions to the effect that, although local authority boundaries are clearly relevant under the statutory criteria, they are no longer necessarily the best indicators in relation to community ties.

AC93 Paragraph AC43 above sets out the reasoning which led to our conclusion that the best possible configuration for the region as a whole could be achieved by treating North Yorkshire and Humberside as separate sub-regions and combining West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire together as a third sub-region. Our analysis had shown that we could satisfactorily address the majority of those concerns advanced during the consultation process and which we believed had merit by

resorting to only one cross-county boundary constituency incorporating one ward from West Yorkshire in a constituency otherwise comprising wards exclusively from Barnsley in South Yorkshire. We decided that it would be clearer to present our assessment and conclusions in relation to South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire separately.

#### *South Yorkshire*

AC94 There are currently 14 constituencies in South Yorkshire, only four of which (Doncaster Central, Doncaster North, Don Valley, and Rother Valley) have an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota. Of the remaining constituencies, all ten have electorates that are below the 5% limit. The Commission’s initial proposals would therefore have reduced the number of constituencies to 13.

AC95 These would have comprised the four within quota unchanged constituencies together with three wholly within the City of Sheffield (Sheffield Central, Sheffield South East, and Sheffield South West) and one (Sheffield West and Penistone) consisting of five Sheffield wards and one ward from Barnsley borough. The remaining constituencies proposed by the Commission were Barnsley West and Ecclesfield, Barnsley North, Barnsley South, Rawmarsh, and Rotherham and Sheffield East. Full details of the initial proposals are contained at paragraphs 36–43 of the Commission’s publication *Yorkshire and the Humber: Initial proposals*.

AC96 We first consider Doncaster. The Commission’s initial proposals envisaged retention of the three existing constituencies unchanged. Each, as now, would comprise wards from the Metropolitan Borough of Doncaster only and together they would serve the whole borough, thus respecting local

authority as well as existing constituency boundaries. Existing community ties would be unaffected. This approach was endorsed by both the Conservative Party and the Labour Party and we received a significant number of written representations in support of it. These included respondents such as Adrian Bailey (CR/03452) and Stephen Whittaker (IP/025396) who made submissions putting forward comprehensive commentaries, as well as individuals including Shane McAleavey (IP/017186), Lynne Rothwell (IP/018331), David Rothwell (IP/018334), and John Hoare (IP/020076), who commented on more specific issues.

AC97 There was a counter-proposal in relation to Doncaster from the Liberal Democrats, who proposed a substantial reconfiguration. They considered that the existing Doncaster Central constituency is inappropriate because it splits the town of Bessacarr between two constituencies. They suggested the removal from Doncaster Central of the Balby and Wheatley wards and the addition of the Finningley and Hatfield wards to constitute a constituency renamed Doncaster West. In addition, the Liberal Democrats contended that the other two existing Doncaster constituencies do not adequately reflect the ties and links of communities such as Thorne, Mexborough and Conisborough. They proposed two new constituencies – Maltby and Don Valley, and Doncaster North and Dearne. The former would comprise five wards from Doncaster borough and three from Rotherham; the latter would comprise five from Doncaster borough and two from Barnsley. Mexborough ward would become part of a revised Rawmarsh constituency, while Thorne ward would move into the proposed Goole and Cottingham constituency as a cross-county boundary constituency.

AC98 The effect of this proposal would be to spread the Doncaster borough wards between five separate constituencies – only one of which would comprise exclusively Doncaster wards. Three others would cover wards in two local authority areas and one would cover wards in three local authority areas. This proposal generated strong adverse comment in the secondary consultation period. Representations urging its rejection were received from both the Conservative and the Labour Party as well as from members of the public and parliamentarians including Rosie Winterton MP (CR/003287), the Member of Parliament for Doncaster Central. She said in particular of the Liberal Democrats' criticism:

'This gives the impression "Bessacarr" is, or was previously contained in one constituency. This is not the case. Furthermore, "Bessacarr" is not a separate town from the rest of Doncaster.'

AC99 Further representations against the proposal were made by Caroline Flint MP (CR/003466), Ed Miliband MP (CR/003295), and Kevin Barron MP (CR/003476).

AC100 Having considered all the evidence and representations, we are satisfied that the Commission's initial proposals gave better effect to the statutory criteria so far as Doncaster is concerned. There is no evidence that the counter-proposal would achieve greater consistency elsewhere so as to outweigh the adverse effect upon Doncaster. We therefore propose to adopt the Commission's initial proposals and recommend retention of the existing constituencies and their names.

AC101 We now review the evidence relating to Sheffield. The city has 386,512 electors, which would give an entitlement to 5.05 constituencies based on the electoral quota.

However, the wards range from 12,134 to 17,646 electors, with the average being 13,804, meaning that five average wards could not sustain a constituency that met the statutory minimum while six average wards would exceed the maximum.

AC102 Neither the Commission nor any individual or organisation from whom we have received representations has devised a configuration that would result in the City of Sheffield having constituencies that were either wholly within Sheffield or based on the existing constituencies without splitting wards. The city is at present covered by six constituencies, five of which comprise wards solely from within the local authority area; while Penistone and Stocksbridge includes three wards situated in the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley. This makes it inevitable that our proposals, like the initial proposals of the Commission, must include some constituencies that contain part of the City of Sheffield and part of an adjacent borough (either Barnsley or Rotherham), unless we recommend the splitting of wards. It is the policy of the Commissioners as set out at paragraph 31 of the Commission's *A guide to the 2013 Review* that in the absence of exceptional and compelling circumstances – having regard to the specific factors identified in Rule 5 – it would not be appropriate to divide wards in cases where it is possible to construct constituencies that meet the statutory electorate range without dividing them. We note that none of the three Parliamentary political parties that responded during the consultations proposed splitting wards in Yorkshire and the Humber, but there were limited representations on split wards at local level.

AC103 We received some strong representations advocating the creation of five constituencies exclusive to the City of Sheffield

by splitting wards. These included the response of Sheffield City Council (IP/023091) itself that put forward specific proposals based on splitting three wards. Jonathan Harston (IP/002920) advanced proposals developed by Jonathan Jordan that involved splitting two wards whereas Adrian Bailey (CR/003452) considered that only one ward needed to be split.

AC104 We approached the issue of split wards by first determining what configuration that did not split wards would be most consistent with the statutory criteria, and how it would affect the rest of the region. Once that was done, we assessed whether the splitting of wards would make possible a configuration that met the statutory objective and produced benefits that were so significant as to constitute exceptional and compelling circumstances to justify splitting wards.

AC105 In the event and having considered all the evidence and submissions in the context of the statutory test and the Commission's overall policy, we were forced to conclude that, in the case of Sheffield, the case for splitting wards fell significantly short of meeting the 'exceptional and compelling' test set by the Commission's policy. We also considered that, without splitting wards, we were able to develop a model for constituencies that was fair and reasonable, took account of the evidence submitted in the consultation, and fully met the statutory criteria. Details of our analysis of the evidence and our proposals for new constituency boundaries are set out below.

AC106 The Commission's initial proposals for the City of Sheffield included three constituencies comprising wards drawn exclusively from Sheffield (Sheffield Central, Sheffield South West, and Sheffield South East). However, the size of the wards in

Sheffield means that at least two constituencies have to cross the Sheffield boundary. As the south and west of Sheffield are constrained by the regional boundary, those constituencies crossing the local authority boundary have to be in the north and the east. The Commission proposed that Sheffield should, as at present, be served by six constituencies, which would be the three mentioned together with:

- a. Sheffield West and Penistone, which would include just one ward (Penistone West) from Barnsley borough;
- b. Barnsley West and Ecclesfield, which would include four Sheffield wards and two Barnsley wards (Darton West and Penistone East); and
- c. Rotherham and Sheffield East, which would include five Rotherham wards and two from Sheffield (Darnall, and Shiregreen and Brightside).

AC107 The overall number of representations received was modest having regard to the size of the electorate. The Conservative Party expressed broad support for the Commission's proposals in South Yorkshire, and in particular endorsed the proposals for the three constituencies comprising wards only from Sheffield together with the Sheffield West and Penistone constituency that contained just one ward (Penistone West) from Barnsley. It also supported the proposed Rotherham and Sheffield East constituency that would incorporate the Darnall, and Shiregreen and Brightside wards from Sheffield. The Conservative Party counter-proposal proposed linked changes that would incorporate into the Commission's proposed Barnsley West and Ecclesfield constituency the wards of Dodworth and Kingstone from Barnsley borough, and exclude Darton West ward so that it could be reunited with Darton East ward

in a modified constituency renamed Barnsley North and Hemsworth.

AC108 The Labour Party (IP/025315) expressed regret that the Commission's proposals did not provide five constituencies with wards drawn exclusively from Sheffield, but welcomed the fact that the proposals would provide for three whole constituencies entirely within the city and also retain in the proposed Sheffield Central, Sheffield South East, and Sheffield South West constituencies 'which are recognisable successors to existing seats'. It is appropriate to record at this point the acceptance by Sheffield City Council that the proposals for South Yorkshire represent the only practicable division of the sub-region within the rules defined by the Act and the presumption against splitting wards. It noted the proposed retention of the four constituencies within the sub-region that are within the electoral quota and added: 'The remaining constituencies covering Sheffield, Barnsley and Rotherham are the only possible option available to the Boundary Commission within its rules and guidelines.'

AC109 The Liberal Democrats' counter-proposals endorsed the Commission's initial proposals as regards Sheffield Central, Sheffield South East and Sheffield South West together with the proposal relating to Sheffield West and Penistone. We consider later in this report the party's comments as regards the interfaces between Sheffield, Barnsley, and Rotherham, but note that the comprehensive proposal they advanced for South Yorkshire was dependent on changes around Doncaster that gained only minimal support and were rejected by us.

AC110 Individual comments highlighted the points made in relation to the division of the Darton wards, as well as the perception that

the Ecclesfield wards together with Southey and Firth Park wards were to be forced into a Barnsley constituency. We do not agree with this view. In reality, the Commission's initial proposals would include them in a predominantly Sheffield constituency, and we propose that should be made clear by renaming the constituency.

AC111 Having considered the various submissions, we concluded that the counter-proposal by the Conservative Party would enhance compliance with the statutory criteria by avoiding the breaking of local ties through the division of the Darton wards and also by avoiding in part the separation of the ward of Dodworth from the western part of Barnsley. Dodworth is at present part of the Penistone and Stockbridge constituency along with the Penistone East ward with which, under the Conservative counter-proposal, it would remain linked along with the Kingstone ward. We propose that the name of the new constituency into which it should be incorporated (based on the Commission's proposed Barnsley West and Ecclesfield constituency) should be Sheffield North and Dodworth, reflecting the fact that the majority of the population live in Sheffield.

AC112 We now consider the overall position in relation to Barnsley. The Commission's initial proposals envisaged Barnsley borough being covered by three constituencies – Barnsley North and Barnsley South (each of which would comprise Barnsley wards only), and Barnsley West and Ecclesfield taking in four wards from Sheffield. This reflects the size of the Barnsley electorate (176,015), which equates to 2.4 constituencies having regard to the electoral quota. While there was broad support for the Commission's initial proposals, our acceptance of the merits of the Conservative Party counter-proposal above requires consequential changes. In addition,

we propose the adoption of a ward from Wakefield into Barnsley in order to create the flexibility needed in West Yorkshire to achieve greater compliance with the statutory criteria. The changes we propose may be summarised as follows:

- a. The Central and Dodworth wards would move from the proposed Barnsley North constituency to the proposed Barnsley South and Barnsley West and Ecclesfield constituencies (the latter to be renamed) respectively.
- b. Darton West ward would move from Barnsley West and Ecclesfield to be reunited with Darton East ward in Barnsley North; and Hemsworth ward would be incorporated from the City of Wakefield.
- c. Barnsley South would gain Central ward, with Kingstone ward moving to Barnsley West and Ecclesfield.
- d. Barnsley West and Ecclesfield would gain Dodworth and Kingstone wards. The balance of the constituency would remain predominantly Sheffield, and for this reason as well as in response to the concerns expressed, we propose to name it Sheffield North and Dodworth.

AC113 We turn now to the Metropolitan Borough of Rotherham. The electorate is 191,489 and equates to 2.5 constituencies by reference to the electoral quota. The Commission's initial proposals would have resulted in two constituencies (Rother Valley and Rawmarsh) comprising Rotherham wards only and a Rotherham and Sheffield East constituency, which would have a predominantly Rotherham population with two wards from Sheffield, with which there are links. The submission by the Liberal

Democrats observed: 'This area is the heartland of the steel industry in South Yorkshire and, although in two different local authorities, unites communities, such as Darnall, Brightside and Shiregreen, with parts of Rotherham with which they share very similar issues and backgrounds. Consequently there are strong community links between all parts of the constituency. Communication links are also very good throughout the constituency.' The Conservative Party also endorsed the proposed constituency.

AC114 There was also general support for the other two proposed Rotherham constituencies – especially for the retention of the existing Rother Valley constituency. However, the name Rawmarsh was widely criticised as giving disproportionate prominence to that town. The Liberal Democrats put forward a counter-proposal for South Yorkshire that would have the effect of increasing the crossing of local authority boundaries. In particular, they proposed the division of the existing Don Valley constituency by incorporating five wards from Doncaster; in addition, Rawmarsh would have been reconfigured and renamed to encompass wards from Barnsley, Doncaster, and Rotherham. The proposal is inconsistent with the criteria relating to local ties, local government boundaries and the respect for existing constituency boundaries. Its implications are wide and range well beyond Rotherham, attracting extensive criticisms, including from a Barnsley MP, Michael Dugher MP (CR/003207), who commented: 'The Liberal Democrats' proposal would see Barnsley wards split into six different constituencies.'

AC115 We do intend to recommend the three initially proposed constituencies (Rother Valley, Rotherham and Sheffield East, and Rawmarsh),

but we recommend renaming the proposed Rawmarsh constituency Rotherham North, since we received numerous submissions that Rawmarsh is not regarded as the main population centre.

AC116 We received extensive representations about the proposed constituency names in South Yorkshire, especially in relation to some of the names historically associated with constituencies in Sheffield. We set out later in this report, at paragraphs AC178–AC185 below, the names that we propose.

#### *West Yorkshire*

AC117 We now consider the position with regard to West Yorkshire. As we made clear in considering the issue of sub-regions at paragraphs AC30–AC43 above, many of the difficulties in developing a fully satisfactory configuration for constituencies in the whole region flow from the problems created by the size and shape of wards in West Yorkshire and especially in the City of Leeds. While average figures can be deceptive, based upon figures from the Commission's website<sup>9</sup> for the metropolitan local authorities in England, of the eight with the largest average ward sizes, five lie in the Yorkshire and the Humber region, and four of these lie in West Yorkshire. They are Leeds, Kirklees, Wakefield, and Bradford.

AC118 In the City of Leeds, for example, the average electorate in each ward is 16,525. A group of four wards thus has an average of only 66,100 electors – well below the statutory minimum for a constituency; while a group of five average wards would have 82,625 electors – significantly above the maximum permissible electorate. Moreover, the narrow range of electorate sizes makes it inevitable that, for the most part, wards from the central parts of Leeds and Bradford will have to be linked

<sup>9</sup> [www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk)

with the slightly smaller wards found on the outskirts, on the borders between the two cities and on the boundaries between them and the three metropolitan boroughs that adjoin them – Wakefield, Calderdale, and Kirklees. Without this, it would be impossible to devise configurations of wards within the 5% range of the electoral quota without splitting wards.

AC119 It is therefore unsurprising that West Yorkshire was the area in the region where we faced the greatest challenge in developing a satisfactory model, where the most compromises had to be made and where the question of whether or not the scale and nature of the problems encountered justified ward splitting was most finely balanced.

AC120 There are currently 22 constituencies within West Yorkshire, only six of which (Batley and Spen, Calder Valley, Dewsbury, Elmet and Rothwell, Hemsworth, and Morley and Outwood) have electorates within 5% of the electoral quota. Of the remaining constituencies, 13 have electorates below the statutory minimum and three have electorates above it. The total electorate of the five relevant local authority areas (the Cities of Bradford, Leeds, and Wakefield together with the Metropolitan Boroughs of Calderdale and Kirklees) amounts to 1,565,125 electors after adjustment for our decision to include the ward of Hemsworth in a constituency that is predominantly within the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley. The electoral quota therefore equates to 20 constituencies – a reduction of two compared with the present position. This made it inevitable that our proposals would bring about substantial change to the existing configuration and the Commission’s initial proposals.

AC121 We received many helpful submissions in relation to the Commission’s initial proposals, both at the public hearings and in writing. For the purposes of this report, it was helpful to look at them with three separate things in mind:

- a. Firstly, we considered carefully the many individual and specific points made about the appropriateness of particular proposals in terms of their effect on existing constituencies and community ties, looking for the recurring themes from which we could identify the key issues of concern such as different parts of towns and communities being split into separate constituencies, or simply the potential for disruption after relatively recent change. We were then able, when examining the possible configurations, to consider how far each one would satisfactorily address those concerns.
- b. Secondly, we had the benefit of a number of different submissions that contained comprehensive counter-proposals. We describe these more fully later. These submissions were particularly valuable given the limited flexibility in this part of the region, because our ability to address any individual concerns was dependent on finding not just an immediate solution but also one that would fit with arrangements for adjoining areas.
- c. Thirdly, among the submissions were a number which recommended solutions to perceived problems based upon splitting wards in the Leeds area, so as to allow configurations of proposed constituencies in the peripheral local authorities’ areas that, it was argued, better preserved local identity and community ties in those areas and were more logical.

AC122 During the consultation periods, we also visited all parts of the region in order to appreciate the geography and its implications, and to gain a better understanding of the nature and characteristics of the communities in order to put the submissions into context. As we worked our way through the responses to the consultation, we invested a significant amount of time in reviewing the data. This was with a view to identifying any alternative configurations with constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota that would achieve equivalent or better compliance with the other statutory criteria than the Commission's initial proposals and also address the concerns that had been raised with us. Having done that, we compared these alternative configurations with the various counter-proposals we had received.

*Key concerns and representations in relation to the Commission's initial proposals for constituencies in West Yorkshire*

AC123 Arising from the consultations there were a number of recurring themes. Many respondents raised concerns about the Commission's initial proposals, which they saw as dividing towns and cities, sometimes in a manner that fragmented their centres. In particular, the City of Wakefield was used as an example of fragmentation, since its 21 wards would be split between five separate constituencies (Kevin Swift, Leeds public hearing, Day 2, pp 3-5). There was strong concern that this would break community ties and did not have sufficient regard to existing Parliamentary boundaries or to the local government areas. The point was also made that the immediate city centre would itself be united but divided from the rest of central Wakefield. Mr Swift explained:

'In the case of Wakefield, we have a constituency that includes the town centre and then ends on the edge of the town

centre; something pretty similar in Dewsbury. You can't actually go any further than that in terms of severance. It's in the areas of the town centres that local ties are the strongest and the clearest, and to have constituency boundaries in those areas is something which inevitably creates the biggest breach of local ties.'

AC124 There were strong objections also to the splitting of Batley and Dewsbury such that different wards of the towns would be in separate constituencies, breaking community ties to an unacceptable extent. The three Parliamentary political parties that responded were unanimous in their criticism of this, and representations were received from Mohammed Pandor on behalf of the Indian Muslim Welfare Society (Leeds public hearing, Day 2, pp 19-21) and Councillor Shabir Pandor (Leeds public hearing, Day 2, pp 25-29). We also noted the evidence of the Reverend Andrew Johnson, the Vicar of Batley, who made an oral representation (Leeds public hearing, Day 2, pp 34-35) describing how the division of Batley between two constituencies would adversely affect its community identity and ties. His own church would be in a different constituency from its school which stood on the opposite side of the road.

AC125 Within Bradford, it was stressed by the Liberal Democrats in their counter-proposal (IP/025338) that the geography leads to a natural east/west division of the city, with communities having grown up either side of the valley and the main Manchester road which runs from north to south – something we saw for ourselves.

AC126 In Kirklees, the local authority area is currently served by four constituencies (Batley and Spen, Colne Valley, Dewsbury, and

Huddersfield) with an electorate of 304,578 that equates to four constituencies in terms of the electoral quota. However, they must be reconfigured because the distribution of electors across the wards does not permit the creation of four constituencies all within the statutory parameters (Peter Rock, chair of the Kirklees Labour Party at the Leeds public hearing, Day 2, pp 9-10).

AC127 The proposed inclusion of the Worth Valley ward in Calderdale was considered to cut across local ties, override local authority boundaries and create accessibility problems, especially in winter. This was raised both in written submissions and by numerous individuals at the Leeds public hearing including Peter Corkindale (Day 1, pp 32-34), who summed up the position graphically:

‘It’s difficult to do this without feeling passionate about it because, as I say, I live in the area and I know there are countless numbers of people who would prefer the Worth Valley to remain in Keighley. In the words of Jimmy Edwards, “You can’t put a tram ticket between Oakworth, Haworth and Keighley” where, as I say, that’s what we face. The 6033, which is the road that’s shown there, is the only road between the Worth Valley and the Calder Valley and at that point you’ve got there, it’s 1,500 feet above sea level and liable to closure during the winter months.’

AC128 There was opposition to the placing of the Eccleshill ward within a Leeds constituency, a proposal that was said to break its more natural links with the communities of Idle, Thackley, and Wrose, which in turn looked more to the group of communities that come together at the Five Lane Ends transport hub. The four wards which meet there are Windhill

and Wrose, Bolton and Undercliffe, Eccleshill, and Idle and Thackley.

AC129 Four Bradford wards were identified at the Leeds public hearing (Jeanette Sunderland representing the Liberal Democrats Group of Bradford City Council, Day 2, pp 44-46) as having strong community ties. They are Bolton and Undercliffe, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, and Bowling and Barkerend.

AC130 There was strong opposition from both the Conservative Party and Shipley Labour Party to the fragmentation of the existing Shipley constituency, with its six wards being dispersed into four separate constituencies. Shipley is a constituency with a long history although its composition has varied. It was contended that, although adjustments are inevitable, at least the four core wards could and should be kept together. The Liberal Democrats were not specific as to the retention of the existing constituency but described this aspect of the proposals as ‘a poor solution’ and commented that the Commission’s initial proposal ‘to put the town of Shipley into a Bradford inner city seat would not work from a cultural, social or even historical perspective’. Their counter-proposal for a Guiseley and Shipley constituency would retain much of the existing Shipley constituency but not the ward of Baildon – something that of itself would be contentious.

AC131 The composition of the Commission’s proposed Guiseley and Yeadon constituency attracted extensive criticisms. These related to the proposed transfer of Baildon from the existing Shipley constituency to be included with Leeds wards; conversely, respondents from Otley and Yeadon, and Guiseley and Rawdon wards had no appetite for inclusion in what they perceive as a Bradford constituency with which they have no ties.

AC132 In addition to these arguments, a number of parties and individuals submitted full counter-proposals for the configuration of future constituencies. These included the Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrats, the Shipley Labour Party, Stephen Whittaker (IP/025396 and CR/003587), Mark Holmes (IP/019396), and Lewis Baston (IP/019522).

AC133 The following table compares the impact of the various configurations in relation to their respect for existing constituencies, the extent to which local authority boundaries are respected and the incidence of ‘orphan’ wards<sup>10</sup> resulting from each proposal. The last point flows from various representations that the creation of constituencies with wards from predominantly one local authority area but with a single ward from elsewhere risks

under-representation. The point was made crisply by Chris Albrow in submission IP/010343:

‘The MP needs to build community links – how feasible is this if Eccleshill is tagged on to Leeds West?’

AC134 All the counter-proposals with the exception of the Liberal Democrats’ have broadly similar impact in relation to West Yorkshire as regards respect for existing constituencies and local authority areas. The Liberal Democrats’ counter-proposal would have only seven constituencies with wards from only one local authority area and 13 with wards drawn from two local authorities. Moreover, their configuration would involve three cross-county boundary

	Existing constituencies retained	Constituencies wholly within one LA area	Constituencies with wards within 2 LA areas	Constituencies with orphan wards
Commission’s initial proposals	0	11	10	3
Con counter-proposal	1 (Calder Valley)	11	9	5
Lib Dem counter-proposal	1 (Calder Valley)	7	13	8
Shipley Labour counter-proposal	1 (Calder Valley)	11	9	5
Stephen Whittaker counter-proposal	1 (Calder Valley)	11	9	5
Mark Holmes counter-proposal	0	12	8	1
Lewis Baston counter-proposal	0	13	7	5
Our proposal	1 (Calder Valley)	11	9	5

<sup>10</sup> ‘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.

constituencies with North Yorkshire and two with South Yorkshire.

AC135 In evaluating all these submissions, we have taken into account the fact that those configurations for West Yorkshire that are based on the Commission's North and West Yorkshire sub-region (those put forward by Mark Holmes and Lewis Baston) each have a higher number of constituencies within a single local authority area but at the expense of more changes to existing constituencies in North Yorkshire.

AC136 For the purpose of this exercise, we first set aside the counter-proposals of individuals whose configurations relied on the splitting of wards and developed the best model that we felt was possible to meet the statutory criteria within the Commission's policy on ward splitting. We then looked in considerable detail at what options might be available if ward splits were accepted and considered whether any such plan offered an overall solution that achieved greater compliance with the statutory criteria than our revised proposals to an extent that might be so 'exceptional and compelling' as to meet the Commission's policy for considering ward splits.

AC137 We now describe our proposals (without considering ward splitting), which draw substantially on the counter-proposals put to us but do not follow any one model. We propose three constituencies wholly within the City of Leeds – Elmet, Leeds North, and Leeds East. In this respect, we are adopting the counter-proposal of the Conservative Party while noting that the counter-proposal by Shipley Labour Party in each case corresponds as regards four out of five wards. Our proposed Elmet constituency comprises the three northerly wards of the old Elmet and Rothwell constituency but omits the latter name

because the corresponding ward would no longer be included.

AC138 We also propose three constituencies wholly within the City of Bradford area – Keighley, Shipley, and Bradford Central. They all derive from the counter-proposal advanced by Stephen Whittaker that we have adopted. This restores the Worth Valley ward to a Keighley constituency, whose three wards are kept together. The Craven and Ilkley wards remain included in the proposed Keighley constituency along with the Bingley Rural ward which we propose moving from the existing Shipley constituency so as not to split Bingley from Baildon, where local ties are strong. We think that this configuration is an improvement on the Commission's initial proposals and the Conservative Party's counter-proposal because it facilitates better respect for local ties in Bradford – especially those focused on Five Lane Ends. It is also necessary if Eccleshill ward is to be retained in a Bradford constituency as so many submissions suggested.

AC139 Our proposed Shipley constituency is based on the existing constituency's four key wards (Shipley, Baildon, Bingley, and Windhill and Wrose) and includes the wards of Heaton (as proposed by Shipley Labour Party and the Conservative Party), along with Thornton and Allerton (as proposed by the Conservative Party) and Clayton and Fairweather Green. The last two wards have local ties that, so we heard, would have been split under the Commission's initial proposals but that would be kept by this arrangement. Four of these wards also feature in the Liberal Democrats' proposal for Shipley and Guiseley.

AC140 Our third proposed constituency wholly in the local authority area is Bradford Central. It puts the City ward at the heart of the constituency and this configuration supports

the improvements we propose in relation to the Eccleshill ward and the wards that focus on Five Lane Ends.

AC141 We recognise the arguments put to us about the sensitivities associated with the interface between Leeds and Bradford and know that it is unlikely that our proposals will please everybody – but based upon all the evidence and submissions, we consider that this represents the best possible solution for the whole region that meets the statutory criteria and the Commission’s policies.

AC142 We propose that the Bolton and Undercliffe, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, and Idle and Thackley wards of Bradford be linked with the Calverley and Farsley, and Horsforth wards of Leeds to form Bradford East and Horsforth. The four Bradford wards form the core of the existing Bradford East constituency, and so this would avoid disruption in Bradford.

AC143 Some are likely to criticise the crossing of Calverley Wood and Ravenscliffe Wood but this seems more satisfactory than the Commission’s initial proposal to include the Eccleshill ward in its proposed Leeds West and Pudsey constituency. In this configuration, we avoid an ‘orphan’ ward and have more evenly balanced numbers of electors from Leeds and Bradford. This also keeps together three of the four wards described in numerous submissions as having close links and allows the four wards that meet at Five Lane Ends to be in two, rather than three, constituencies.

AC144 Our second crossing of the local authority boundary between Leeds and Bradford relates to the area that made up the Guiseley and Yeadon constituency under the Commission’s initial proposals. Adopting the configuration we suggest would leave only the Guiseley and Rawdon, and Otley and Yeadon wards, both in the City of Leeds. We build on

that by adding the Wharfedale (Bradford), Adel and Wharfedale (Leeds), and Alwoodley (Leeds) wards to form an Otley constituency. Wharfedale has strong ties to the Leeds ward of Otley and Yeadon along the A65 road, as evidenced by some of the representations received. Greg Mulholland MP (IP/023055) commented that the one Leeds City ward that could reasonably be joined with parts of Bradford would be Guiseley and Rawdon – although we cannot link it to Shipley as suggested by him.

AC145 Our third crossing between Leeds and Bradford creates a variant of the Commission’s initial proposal for a Leeds West and Pudsey constituency that had four Leeds wards and one Bradford ward. It was advanced as part of the Conservative Party counter-proposal and retains three of the four wards from the existing Leeds West constituency (Armley, Bramley and Stanningley, and Farnley and Wortley), thus providing some continuity and combining them with the ward of Pudsey. We add the Tong ward from Bradford because of its strong links with Pudsey and the proximity of the village that gives the ward its name. This accords with the suggestion made by Dick Newby in his oral representations at the Leeds public hearing (Day 1, pp 5-11) and endorsed by numerous others, including the Conservative Party.

AC146 We next consider the Metropolitan Borough of Kirklees, which under our proposals would be served by five constituencies – the minimum possible given the difficulties referred to earlier in this report. The Commission’s initial proposals for the constituencies of Huddersfield, and Colne Valley and Skelmanthorpe attracted the support of all parties as best respecting local ties. However, the name of the latter attracted widespread criticism as attaching undue

significance to one part of the Denby Dale ward. We propose to adopt the Commission's initial proposals but change the name to Colne Valley and Denby Dale so as to focus more widely on the ward.

AC147 We propose two constituencies that are predominantly Kirklees and that address two of the three key concerns relating to the area – the fragmentation of the existing Batley and Spen constituency and the division of the town of Dewsbury. We carefully considered whether any configuration would allow Batley and Spen to be retained, but that seemed mathematically impossible – a conclusion reinforced by the absence of any such counter-proposal among the submissions and recognised reluctantly by the current Member of Parliament (Mike Wood MP) at the Leeds public hearing (Day 2, pp 29–33). We therefore propose a Spen Valley constituency that will include four key wards of the existing constituency (Birstall and Birkenshaw, Cleckheaton, Heckmondwike, and Liversedge and Gomersal) and combine them with two Bradford wards (Royds and Wyke). This constituency meets so far as practicable the representations that Batley and Spen should be kept together and is more effective than the Commission's initial proposals in maintaining local ties. In particular, we received numerous submissions from electors in the Cleckheaton, and Birstall and Birkenshaw wards objecting to their inclusion in the Commission's proposed Bradford South and Cleckheaton constituency. We believe that this revised proposal has a very different feel and may go some way to addressing satisfactorily the concerns of those who felt that ties would be broken and their wards lose their identity in the much larger city.

AC148 The second predominantly Kirklees constituency we propose would be Dewsbury. It would join together the three Dewsbury

wards, the splitting of which by the Commission's initial proposals attracted extensive criticism. We considered whether we could unite the two Batley wards with the three Dewsbury wards, but that was precluded by the need to join the three Dewsbury wards with the Kirkburton and Mirfield wards unless the latter two are to be isolated. We therefore propose to add in Wakefield Rural, without which the constituency would fall below the statutory minimum.

AC149 These proposals leave the two Batley wards and we therefore propose to incorporate them with the two Morley wards (in Leeds). We understand that there are significant ties between the two areas, which have something of a common Parliamentary heritage, with Batley and Morley being the immediate forerunner (until 1983) of the existing Batley and Spen constituency. Both the Conservative Party's and the Liberal Democrats' counter-proposals support the linking of the Batley and Morley wards. The Liberal Democrats would prefer them to be combined with the Farnley and Wortley ward, whereas the Conservative Party suggested the Beeston and Holbeck ward and the Shipley Labour Party would prefer the Ardsley and Robin Hood ward. The common ground is that the two Batley wards should join with Leeds, and we find that Beeston and Holbeck would facilitate a more satisfactory configuration elsewhere. We so propose.

AC150 Turning to the Metropolitan Borough of Calderdale, we propose to adopt the two constituencies proposed by the Commission, with minor amendments to take account of the decision to recommend that the Worth Valley ward once again become part of Keighley. We achieve that by moving the Hipperholme and Lightcliffe ward from the proposed Halifax constituency to the proposed Calder Valley

constituency and making the Queensbury ward of Bradford part of Halifax. Queensbury has strong ties with Halifax, having been an urban district with Shelf prior to the 1974 local government reorganisation. These proposals have the support of all three main parties.

AC151 We turn now to the City of Wakefield, which has an electorate of 252,051 spread across 21 wards. This results in limited flexibility, because the wards are relatively large and the average size does not readily lend itself to groupings that fall within 5% of the electoral quota. Our three main objectives after considering the many submissions were to create a cohesive constituency drawing together the wards in central Wakefield; linking the 'Five Towns' of Castleford, Pontefract, Featherstone, Normanton, and Knottingley into no more than two constituencies if possible; and to reduce the degree of fragmentation that characterised the Commission's initial proposals for Wakefield.

AC152 We therefore propose a Wakefield constituency that unites the four Wakefield wards and combines them with the Crofton, Ryhill and Walton, Stanley and Outwood East, and Wrenthorpe and Outwood West wards. The Conservative Party counter-proposal best meets our requirement as regards the 'Five Towns' by dividing them into two constituencies (compared with the Commission's proposal which also divides them between two, but does so by pairing West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire). The Stephen Whittaker counter-proposal divides them between three constituencies. We therefore adopt the Conservative Party's proposal for a constituency, which we would call Normanton and Pontefract, that would draw together Pontefract (both wards) and the Featherstone and Normanton wards, along with the two

wards of Ackworth, North Elmsall and Upton, and South Elmsall and South Kirby.

AC153 The other two of the 'Five Towns' are Castleford and Knottingley. We have drawn these together with the wards of Airedale and Ferry Fryston, and Altofts and Whitwood, both of which are effectively part of the Castleford conurbation, as the core of a second constituency. However, arithmetical and geographical considerations require the crossing of the local authority boundary with Leeds. We therefore propose to incorporate the two Leeds wards of Kippax and Methley, and Rothwell to create a Leeds South East and Castleford constituency, recognising the shared heritage through the mining industry. This accords with a counter-proposal from the Conservative Party and is very similar to the proposal by the Shipley Labour Party. That party's proposed constituency of the same name differs only by the inclusion of the Leeds ward of Garforth and Swillington to the exclusion of Rothwell.

AC154 The final constituency serving Wakefield would be Leeds Metropolitan and Ossett. It is similar to the Commission's proposal for a Leeds South and Outwood constituency, which attracted significant criticism. However, no counter-proposal has been forthcoming in relation to the very large central wards of Leeds that avoids the use of smaller wards on the outskirts and boundaries of Leeds to construct a constituency within 5% of the electoral quota. The three Leeds wards must be combined with either the two Outwood wards or the two Ossett wards. The Conservative Party counter-proposal (which we adopt) breaks fewer ties than the Commission's proposal by linking the three Leeds wards to the Ossett wards. Taking Outwood (as per the Commission's proposals) would require division of either Wakefield or Ossett. If Ossett were

divided, the knock-on effect would be that Dewsbury was divided. The Conservative Party counter-proposal produces a constituency with an odd shape but has the advantage that both Wakefield and Dewsbury can be kept together.

#### *Considerations on ward splitting*

AC155 As Assistant Commissioners, having carefully considered all the evidence and representations made to us during this process we consider that the proposals outlined above offer the best possible configuration that meets the statutory criteria, take account so far as possible of representations made to us, and comply with the Commission's policies. We recognise that, because of the sheer mathematics of the ward sizes, this is not an ideal solution and that a number of significant compromises have had to be made.

AC156 We have mentioned at several points earlier in this report the representations we received suggesting that the inflexibility resulting from the requirement that all constituencies should be within 5% of the electoral quota could be mitigated by splitting some wards between constituencies. Such suggestions related mainly but not exclusively to Sheffield and Leeds because of the impact of the quota requirement in those cities.

AC157 However, the practice of splitting wards raises significant difficulties for the electoral system. It is also arguable that the ward, as the lowest electoral unit, is the most representative of local community and therefore splitting a ward is inherently more likely to break local ties. The Commission's policy is therefore that wards should only be split in 'exceptional and compelling circumstances'.

AC158 In carrying out our work in every area, we therefore decided that the appropriate course was first to review the whole region

and bring forward recommendations for the configuration which struck the best overall balance between the statutory criteria based on whole wards. We would then look further at the possibilities to see whether any configuration might be available through carefully targeted ward split(s) that would strike a better balance in relation to the statutory criteria. In that eventuality, we would consider whether any advantages flowing from the ward split(s) would render the configuration so superior as to justify recommending its adoption to the Commission.

AC159 In every area outside West Yorkshire, we found that there was sufficient flexibility within the statutory rules and the Commission's policy for us to develop models for constituencies where we felt that considering splitting wards was completely unnecessary – that any case that existed for ward splitting did not come near to meeting the 'exceptional and compelling' test required by the Commission.

AC160 However, the situation in West Yorkshire was different. There, the particular size and configuration of wards made it very difficult to develop a model for constituencies that fully reflected the issues of community ties and identity, and local concern. As Assistant Commissioners, as outlined in the preceding section of this report, we developed a model without splitting wards that we felt was acceptable, fully reflected the statutory rules and Commission policies and offered a 'best fit' solution. We were, however, clear that this model left us with a less than ideal solution in some proposed constituencies on the periphery of the urban centres where, quite simply, the mathematics forced us to make compromises to develop constituencies that lay within the legal limits.

*Representations on ward splitting*

AC161 When considering the possibility of split wards, we therefore focused on the South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire sub-region because making the cities within that sub-region 'self-contained' maximised the possibility of reducing the number of constituencies that would cross local authority boundaries. The proposals for Leeds described at paragraphs AC143–AC149 above involve six cross-local authority boundary constituencies – two with Wakefield, three with Bradford, and one with Kirklees.

AC162 We therefore considered that in this sub-region, to ensure that all options had been fairly and openly considered, it was essential that we consider what might be achieved by ward splitting in greater detail and determine if this might meet the Commission's test for considering this possibility. Various options were examined, but the main alternative scheme we considered relies on making splits in three Leeds wards (Hyde Park and Woodhouse, Middleton Park, and Headingley) along polling district boundaries so as to give electorates of Leeds East 79,242, Leeds North East 79,241, Leeds North West 79,525, Leeds South and Morley 80,300 and Leeds Central 80,003. The existing Elmet and Rothwell constituency would be unchanged while the Tong ward from Bradford would be included in a Pudsey constituency. Arithmetic dictates that it is impossible to have the City of Leeds covered by constituencies with wards exclusively from the city; there must be one ward from an adjoining local authority.

AC163 In adjusting our proposals for West Yorkshire to dovetail with these changes to Leeds City, we would create a Pontefract constituency to include Featherstone, Knottingley and Pontefract, together with the two Elmsall wards, which would otherwise be

isolated. The towns of Castleford and Normanton would be included in a single constituency, which must also include the Crofton, Ryhill and Walton, and Wakefield Rural wards in order to make the electorate fit the electoral quota. In order to improve the shape of this constituency, we considered including the two Outwood wards to the north of Wakefield, but the electoral numbers do not fit, nor did dividing the Outwood wards, so that the Wakefield Rural ward could be included in a Wakefield constituency. The four urban Wakefield wards would all be included in a Wakefield constituency, together with the two Outwood wards. One more ward would be required to make the electorate satisfy the permitted range. We would include the Horbury and South Ossett ward, thereby dividing Ossett between constituencies. This would mean that one Wakefield ward (Ossett) would be left over. This we would include in a Dewsbury and Batley constituency, together with the three Dewsbury wards and the two Batley wards.

AC164 We would make no change to our proposed Colne Valley and Denby Dale constituency or to the proposed Huddersfield constituency, as there was significant support for these constituencies. The remaining six Kirklees wards would then form a Spen Valley constituency that stretched from the Kirklees boundary with Bradford to the Kirkburton ward.

AC165 In Bradford, we would adopt the Keighley and Shipley constituencies as counter-proposed by the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats for Keighley only. This would leave 15 Bradford wards to be divided between two constituencies. It is impossible to do so while keeping within 5% of the electoral quota. We would therefore allocate seven Bradford wards each to a Bradford East and a Bradford West constituency with the remaining ward (Tong)

continuing to be allocated to a Leeds constituency (Pudsey).

AC166 We would not be able to include all of the four Five Lane Ends wards in one constituency, because the Windhill and Wrose ward is included in our proposed Shipley constituency.

AC167 This alternative configuration would therefore retain five of the constituencies for South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire that we have recommended above. They are:

Barnsley North and Hemsworth

Calder Valley

Colne Valley and Denby Dale

Halifax

Huddersfield

AC168 This alternative configuration would contain eight constituencies outside Leeds which differ from the proposals we make based on not splitting wards. They are:

Bradford East (comprising the Bolton and Undercliffe, Bowling and Barkerend, Bradford Moor, City, Eccleshill, Idle and Thackley, and Manningham wards)

Bradford West (comprising the Clayton and Fairweather Green, Great Horton, Little Horton, Royds, Toller, Wibsey, and Wyke wards)

Dewsbury and Batley (comprising the Batley East, Batley West, Dewsbury East, Dewsbury West, Dewsbury South, and Ossett wards)

Keighley (comprising the same wards as our proposed constituency but without

the Bingley Rural ward and including the Wharfedale ward)

Normanton and Castleford (comprising the Airedale and Ferry Fryston, Altofts and Whitwood, Castleford Central and Glasshoughton, Crofton, Ryhill and Walton, Normanton, and Wakefield Rural wards)

Pontefract (comprising the Ackworth, North Elmsall and Upton, Featherstone, Knottingley, Pontefract North, Pontefract South, and South Elmsall and South Kirkby wards)

Shipley (comprising the same wards as our proposed constituency but excluding the Clayton and Fairweather Green ward and including the Bingley Rural ward)

Spennings Valley (comprising the Birstall and Birkenshaw, Cleckheaton, Heckmondwike, Kirkburton, Liversedge and Gomersal, and Mirfield wards)

Wakefield (comprising the same wards as our proposed constituency but excluding the Crofton, Ryhill and Walton ward and including the Horbury and South Ossett ward)

AC169 The seven Leeds constituencies would be:

Elmet and Rothwell (which would comprise the existing constituency without any change)

Leeds Central (comprising the Armley, Beeston and Holbeck, City and Hunslet, and Kirkstall wards, together with parts of the Headingley, Hyde Park and Woodhouse, and Middleton Park wards)

Leeds East (comprising the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill, Cross Gates and Whinmoor, Gipton and Harehills, Killingbeck and Seacroft, and Temple Newsam wards)

Leeds North East (comprising the Alwoodley, Chapel Allerton, Moortown, and Roundhay wards, together with part of the Hyde Park and Woodhouse ward)

Leeds North West (comprising the Adel and Wharfedale, Guiseley and Rawdon, Otley and Yeadon, and Weetwood wards together with part of the Headingley ward)

Leeds South and Morley (comprising the Ardsley and Robin Hood, Farnley and Wortley, Morley North, and Morley South wards, together with part of the Middleton Park ward)

Pudsey and Tong (comprising the Bramley and Stanningley, Calverley and Farsley, Horsforth, and Pudsey wards from Leeds and the Tong ward from Bradford)

#### *Decision on ward splitting*

AC170 The Commission has set a clear policy on ward splitting which will only be considered if the circumstances are both 'exceptional and compelling'. We also note that this is a 'two component' test and that both components must be met before any solution based upon splitting wards may even be considered.

AC171 Given the configurations described above, we considered that this model might represent a significantly better overall configuration for constituencies in the sub-region – and to that extent might be considered compelling in that it offers a better solution. At the same time it is still not a perfect solution, even though it does go further

to meet the concerns we encountered during the consultation. Compromises have therefore still had to be made, albeit fewer compromises than in the model with no split wards.

AC172 However, we were also very conscious that this model cannot simply be considered in isolation. Our entire approach to this process is based upon assessing evidence in a fair, open and dispassionate way. While this alternative model appears more attractive, we have no effective means of assessing the impact of such proposals in the areas of Leeds to be split. Although some representations have been made in favour of splitting wards this is a significant problem, and we must also note that none of the three Parliamentary political parties that responded to the consultation has suggested splitting wards in this area.

AC173 We also understand the basis of the Commission's policies. We acknowledge that wards are the most basic electoral units and therefore are arguably the areas in which any split is likely to have the greatest impact on local ties.

AC174 We also acknowledge that there must also be significant problems for electoral staff in managing elections within split wards, although these are also balanced by the challenges of managing elections with so many constituencies running across local authority boundaries. This was made clear in the submission of the Leeds City Council Electoral Services Managers (IP/019430), who commented in relation to the initial proposals:

'By introducing so many cross-boundary constituencies into one area, we feel this would put us at a disadvantage and be a huge strain on our resources. We also have concerns that with so many complex arrangements required, there is more

scope for things to go wrong in what is already a very difficult period for us.’

AC175 The second fundamental test to be faced is, is there evidence that this situation is exceptional? As we have outlined above, the size of the wards in Leeds is a significant issue, but we understand that the situation also applies in other regions – for example the West Midlands. We are very conscious that colleagues in other regions have been grappling with this issue and that the Commission must approach it in a fair and equitable way across the whole country. Within other sub-regions, we have also faced these decisions and have been able to develop solutions that do not split wards but which we regard as fair and workable, while still recognising that they involve compromises in some areas.

AC176 Considering all this and evaluating the model based on ward splitting against the Commission’s policy, we are forced to conclude that we do not believe that the Commission would consider that the circumstances in Leeds as set out above fully meet the stringent test of both ‘exceptional’ and ‘compelling’ circumstances that would justify splitting wards in order to achieve what might otherwise be seen as an improved configuration of constituencies in some areas.

AC177 We therefore recommend to the Commissioners that the configuration of future constituencies in the West Yorkshire sub-region should be as set out in detail in our proposals at paragraphs AC137–AC154 above and in summary at paragraphs AC186–AC205 below.

### **The naming of constituencies**

AC178 The Commission is required by the Act to specify a name for each proposed constituency.

AC179 The representations we received left us in no doubt as to the importance that electors attach to the naming of constituencies. We took into account the many valid and carefully presented points included in the representations together with the Commission’s overarching policy when formulating our recommendations. The Commission’s policy is set out at paragraphs 42–44 of its *A guide to the 2013 Review* and in essence provides for the retention of the existing name wherever an existing constituency is retained largely unchanged; alterations should only be made where there is a good reason for change.

AC180 Generally, the Commission’s policy is for the name to reflect the main population centre(s) within the proposed constituency, although it will consider any suitable alternative which may be put forward if it commands greater support locally than that proposed by the Commission. The Commission adopts compass point names when there is not a more suitable name. Not everybody agreed with this policy (see for example Gareth Knight (IP/013694)) but we were not persuaded that we should suggest any change to it.

AC181 We set out below how we have applied the policy to our proposed constituencies. Most counter-proposals included suggestions as to constituency names, and these formed part of the overall consideration. In some instances, we adopted a counter-proposal as to the composition of a constituency but considered that a different name would be more suitable. The relevance of some of the points made specifically about the names of the Commission’s initially proposed constituencies diminished substantially as the result of the extensive changes we are recommending to those proposals.

AC182 We recommend the retention of existing names in the following proposed constituencies which would be completely or largely unchanged:

#### North Yorkshire

Harrogate and Knaresborough

Richmond (Yorks)

Scarborough and Whitby

Selby and Ainsty

Skipton and Ripon

Thirsk and Malton

York Central

York Outer

#### Humberside

Beverley and Holderness

#### East Yorkshire

Kingston upon Hull North (The proposed constituency contains seven of the nine wards which make up the existing constituency of this name.)

Scunthorpe (The proposed constituency contains all the wards of the existing constituency of the same name with some additions.)

#### South Yorkshire

Doncaster Central

Doncaster North

Don Valley

#### Rother Valley

Sheffield Central (The proposed constituency retains three of the five wards of the existing constituency of the same name and Sheffield is clearly the population centre from which it will take its identity.)

Sheffield Hallam and Penistone (The proposed constituency retains four of the five wards of the existing Sheffield, Hallam constituency.)

Sheffield Heeley (The proposed constituency retains four of the five wards of the existing constituency of the same name.)

#### West Yorkshire

#### Calder Valley

Dewsbury (The proposed constituency retains five of the six wards of the existing constituency of the same name.)

Halifax (The proposed constituency includes all eight wards of the existing constituency of the same name with one addition.)

Huddersfield (Five of the six wards which make up the proposed constituency are part of the existing constituency of the same name. The additional ward is part of the same population centre.)

Keighley (The proposed constituency includes all the wards of the existing constituency of the same name with one addition.)

Shipley (The proposed name reflects the retention of the four core wards of the existing constituency of the same name.)

Wakefield (The proposed constituency retains four of the six wards of the existing constituency of the same name, and Wakefield is clearly the population centre from which it will take its identity.)

AC183 We recommend the following constituency names based on the main population centre(s) within the proposed constituency:

#### Humberside

Kingston upon Hull Central (This is a new constituency which incorporates the wards within and around the city centre.)

Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice (This is a new constituency incorporating wards from the existing constituency of Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle as well as wards of East Yorkshire serving the group of villages known as Haltemprice.)

Goole and Howden (The proposed name reflects the two main population centres within this proposed new constituency. Goole is the larger and its name should appear first.)

Grimsby North and Barton (Barton is a larger town than Brigg.)

Grimsby South and Cleethorpes (The proposed name reflects the two main population centres within this proposed new constituency.)

#### West Yorkshire

Batley and Morley (These two towns sit in different local authority areas but have strong local ties and have previously been in the same Parliamentary constituency.)

Colne Valley and Denby Dale (The proposed constituency comprises five of the six wards of the existing Colne Valley constituency. Responses to the initial proposals contained strong criticism of the inclusion of Skelmanthorpe in the constituency name, on the basis that there was no reason to distinguish that town from others. Denby Dale is the ward added to the existing constituency.)

Elmet (The name is derived from the existing constituency of Elmet and Rothwell which encompasses three towns – Garforth, Wetherby, and Rothwell. However, Rothwell is no longer included in the proposed constituency and its name has therefore been dropped.)

Normanton and Pontefract (The proposed name is derived from the existing constituency of Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford, which must be split to meet the statutory requirements.)

Otley (The proposed constituency incorporates wards from both Leeds and Bradford – all of which have significant local ties. It takes its name from its main town.)

Spennithorne (The proposed constituency takes its name from the existing Batley and Spennithorne constituency and incorporates four of the wards which are the core of the Spennithorne Valley.)

AC184 In Leeds, Bradford, and Rotherham, the majority of existing constituencies are designated by the use of compass points which best describe the location of the constituency within the city or borough. We propose to continue on that basis except where an existing name can be retained, such as Elmet or Shipley. In some instances, we have added an

additional name. This usually indicates that the proposed constituency includes a ward or wards from an adjacent local authority area.

AC185 On the above basis, we recommend the following names:

#### South Yorkshire

Barnsley North and Hemsworth

Rotherham North (The Commission's initially proposed name was Rawmarsh but this was changed in response to submissions.)

Barnsley South

Rotherham and Sheffield East

Sheffield North and Dodworth

Sheffield South East

#### West Yorkshire

Bradford Central

Bradford East and Horsforth

Leeds North

Leeds East

Leeds West, Pudsey and Tong

Leeds South East and Castleford

Leeds Metropolitan and Ossett

### Conclusions

#### ***North Yorkshire***

AC186 The six existing constituencies which cover the area administered by North Yorkshire County Council and the two existing constituencies covering the City of York

(a unitary authority) all have electorates within the electoral quota. For all the reasons that appear earlier in this report, we conclude that they should remain unchanged.

#### ***Humberside***

AC187 The part of the sub-region where the Commission's proposals would create most change is around the City of Kingston upon Hull, because it cannot sustain the three existing constituencies without adding to the electorate. The regional and natural boundaries limit flexibility. The preponderance of the evidence favoured looking to the west of Hull (notably the Cottingham and Haltemprice areas) for the additional electorate and there was strong support, including from two of the three largest Parliamentary political parties, for retaining the existing Beverley and Holderness constituency unchanged. Its electorate (79,775) is within the 5% range. It would retain existing boundaries and relate to a single local authority.

AC188 Similar considerations apply to the existing constituency of East Yorkshire. There has previously been a single constituency running down the east coast in the manner proposed by the Commission, so the communication and transport difficulties referred to by witnesses do not seem insurmountable - especially in the 21st century. Nonetheless, there is no evidence of advantages that would justify the disruption that would flow from the Commission's proposals. We have concluded that both these existing constituencies should be retained in their present form.

AC189 We propose that wards covering Cottingham and the Haltemprice villages be incorporated with the wards of the three constituencies proposed by the Commission for Kingston upon Hull, except South Hunsley.

Several configurations were proposed to us, including one from Diana Johnson MP which we considered best reflected the community ties at the edges of the city while also creating a constituency that focused on the central area that is so crucial to the identity of the city. We have adopted that proposal.

AC190 Our proposal to include the two Cottingham wards within Kingston upon Hull reflects our acceptance that the community ties in that direction are substantially greater than any affinity with Goole. Consequently, we propose that there be a Howden and Goole constituency comprising the remaining wards of East Yorkshire together with the three Axholme wards. In order to maintain the electorate of Scunthorpe above the statutory minimum, we propose that the Burton upon Stather and Winterton ward become part of that constituency.

AC191 Finally, we propose that the town of Grimsby be divided between two constituencies that would comprise the Commission's proposed constituencies of Brigg and Humberston (less the Burton upon Stather and Winterton ward) and Grimsby. This is required so that all constituencies have an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota. The disadvantage of dividing Grimsby is to some extent counterbalanced by the opportunity to reunite Cleethorpes, which was divided by the Commission's initial proposals.

### **South Yorkshire**

AC192 There are currently 14 constituencies in South Yorkshire, with four having electorates within the statutory limits. The remaining ten constituencies are all below the 5% limit and the overall electorate for South Yorkshire equates to 13 constituencies based on the electoral quota - a reduction of one.

AC193 We have adopted the Commission's proposal to retain unchanged the four constituencies with electorates within the 5% range (Doncaster Central, Doncaster North, Don Valley, and Rother Valley) since it had strong overall support in the representations we received. We were not persuaded by a counter-proposal by the Liberal Democrats that would have the effect of spreading the Metropolitan Borough of Doncaster wards between five separate constituencies - only one of which would comprise exclusively Doncaster wards. It would have been disruptive and there was no evidence that it would achieve greater compliance elsewhere to outweigh its adverse impact on Doncaster.

AC194 Sheffield's electorate equates to an entitlement of five constituencies but neither the Commission nor anybody else has devised a configuration that would result in the City of Sheffield having constituencies that either lay wholly within the city or were based upon existing constituencies without splitting wards. Although we received several representations (including from Sheffield City Council) that we should split some wards in order to achieve that end, we noted that the City is currently covered by six constituencies - the same as proposed by the Commission - and decided that we should consider what configuration was most consistent with the statutory criteria without splitting wards.

AC195 The Commission's proposals for the City of Sheffield envisaged three constituencies with wards exclusively within the city, and:

- a. a Sheffield West and Penistone constituency, which would include just one ward (Penistone West) from the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley;
- b. a Barnsley West and Ecclesfield constituency, which would include four

Sheffield wards and two Barnsley wards (Darton West and Penistone East); and

- c. a Rotherham and Sheffield East constituency, which would include five Rotherham wards and two from Sheffield (Darnall, and Shiregreen and Brightside).

AC196 These proposals had broad support. Having considered the various submissions, we adopted the Commission's proposals for Sheffield subject to one change proposed by the Conservative Party to avoid the breaking of community ties through the separation of the Darton wards and also to avoid in part the separation of Dodworth from the western part of Barnsley. Because of this, we also propose renaming the Commission's proposed Barnsley West and Ecclesfield constituency Sheffield North and Dodworth.

AC197 We have adopted the Commission's proposals for three constituencies for Barnsley – Barnsley North and Barnsley South (each of which would comprise Barnsley wards only), and Barnsley West and Ecclesfield – subject to some modest changes. These include the adjustment to and renaming of the latter to become Sheffield North and Dodworth for the reason given in the previous paragraph. We also propose consequential changes to other wards and we propose the inclusion of one ward (Hemsworth) from the City of Wakefield into the Barnsley North and Hemsworth constituency in order to create the flexibility needed in West Yorkshire to achieve greater compliance with the statutory regime.

AC198 The totality of the changes to the Commission's proposals which we recommend is as follows:

- a. The Central and Dodworth wards would move from the proposed Barnsley North constituency to the proposed Barnsley

South and Barnsley West and Ecclesfield constituencies (the latter to be renamed) respectively.

- b. Darton West ward would move from Barnsley West and Ecclesfield to be reunited with the Darton East ward in Barnsley North; and the Hemsworth ward from the City of Wakefield would be included.
- c. Barnsley South would gain the Central ward with the Kingstone ward moving to Barnsley West and Ecclesfield.
- d. Barnsley West and Ecclesfield would gain the Dodworth and Kingstone wards. The balance of the constituency would remain predominantly Sheffield and for this reason, as well as in response to the concerns expressed, we propose to name it Sheffield North and Dodworth.

AC199 As regards the Metropolitan Borough of Rotherham, we endorse the Commission's proposals for three constituencies (Rother Valley, Rawmarsh, and Rotherham and Sheffield East) and propose in response to representations received that the name Rotherham North be used instead of Rawmarsh.

### ***West Yorkshire***

AC200 The effect of the electoral quota in West Yorkshire is to require the 22 existing constituencies to be reduced to 20. Taken in conjunction with the relatively large sizes of wards, especially in the City of Leeds, this required that, for the most part, wards from the central parts of Leeds and Bradford would have to be linked with the slightly smaller wards found on the outskirts, on the borders between the two cities and on the boundaries between them and the three metropolitan

boroughs which adjoin them – Wakefield, Calderdale, and Kirklees.

AC201 In formulating our proposals we drew substantially on the counter-proposals put to us but did not follow any one model. We propose three constituencies wholly within the City of Leeds (Elmet, Leeds North, and Leeds East) and three constituencies wholly within Bradford (Keighley, Shipley, and Bradford Central) as well as three constituencies that incorporate wards from both Leeds and Bradford. These are:

- a. Bradford East and Horsforth, which links the Bolton and Undercliffe, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, and Idle and Thackley cluster of wards (the core of the existing Bradford East constituency) with the Calverley and Farsley, and Horsforth wards;
- b. Otley, which links a cluster of wards in the City of Leeds with the Wharfedale ward in Bradford; and
- c. Leeds West, Pudsey and Tong, which is a variant of the Commission’s proposal for a Leeds West and Pudsey ward. It provides some continuity by retaining three of the wards from the existing Leeds West constituency.

AC202 As regards the Metropolitan Borough of Kirklees, we adopt the Commission’s proposals as regards the composition of constituencies for Huddersfield and for Colne Valley and Skelmanthorpe but, in response to strong representations, recommend that the name of the latter be Colne Valley and Denby Dale. We propose two other predominantly Kirklees constituencies which address key concerns relating to the area – the fragmentation of the existing Batley and Spennings constituency and the separation of the wards of the town of

Dewsbury. These constituencies are Spennings Valley and Dewsbury (which would also incorporate the Wakefield Rural ward).

AC203 In relation to the Metropolitan Borough of Calderdale, we propose to adopt the two constituencies proposed by the Commission with minor amendments to take account of our recommendation that the Worth Valley ward should continue to be part of the Keighley constituency.

AC204 Our proposals in relation to the City of Wakefield include a Wakefield constituency which will unite the four Wakefield wards (with others also in the city) and a Normanton and Pontefract constituency which will bring together three of the ‘Five Towns’ – Pontefract, Featherstone, and Normanton. The remaining ‘Five Towns’ are grouped together in our proposed Leeds South East and Castleford constituency. Our final proposed constituency covering Wakefield is Leeds Metropolitan and Ossett. It is similar to the Commission’s initial proposal for a Leeds South and Outwood constituency, which attracted significant criticism. However, no counter-proposal has been forthcoming in relation to the very large central wards of Leeds that avoids the use of smaller wards on the outskirts and boundaries of Leeds to construct a constituency within 5% of the electoral quota.

AC205 We must say that, because of the challenges posed by the size and configuration of wards in West Yorkshire, this is the sub-region in which we have had the least freedom of movement to respond to many of the genuine concerns raised in submissions to us. However, we are confident that these proposals for West Yorkshire would be effective in addressing as many as possible of the key concerns put to us – in particular the fragmentation of wards relating to the same

towns and cities, the impact on certain existing constituencies and the effect on local ties of aspects of the initial proposals as regards proposed constituencies covering Leeds, Bradford, and Wakefield. We therefore believe that, as in other sub-regions, our recommendations offer the best possible configuration for constituencies in West Yorkshire that can be developed within the statutory criteria and without splitting wards.

**Alan McQuillan OBE**

**Peter Edmondson**

**Stephen Wooler CB**

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](http://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 [yorkshumber@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:yorkshumber@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](mailto: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](http://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/](http://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
<b>1. Barnsley North and Hemsworth CC</b>			<b>79,302</b>
	Cudworth	Barnsley	8,117
	Darton East	Barnsley	8,389
	Darton West	Barnsley	8,317
	Monk Bretton	Barnsley	8,256
	North East	Barnsley	9,848
	Old Town	Barnsley	8,405
	Royston	Barnsley	8,315
	St Helens	Barnsley	7,692
	Hemsworth	Wakefield	11,963
<b>2. Barnsley South CC</b>			<b>75,020</b>
	Central	Barnsley	7,760
	Darfield	Barnsley	7,953
	Dearne North	Barnsley	8,059
	Dearne South	Barnsley	8,923
	Hoyland Milton	Barnsley	9,163
	Rockingham	Barnsley	8,670
	Stairfoot	Barnsley	8,394
	Wombwell	Barnsley	8,565
	Worsbrough	Barnsley	7,533
<b>3. Batley and Morley BC</b>			<b>74,678</b>
	Batley East	Kirklees	12,671
	Batley West	Kirklees	13,075
	Beeston and Holbeck	Leeds	14,562
	Morley North	Leeds	17,855
	Morley South	Leeds	16,515
<b>4. Beverley and Holderness CC</b>			<b>79,775</b>
	Beverley Rural	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,441
	Mid Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,339
	Minster and Woodmansey	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,289
	North Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	8,350
	St Mary's	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,853
	South East Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,869
	South West Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,634
<b>5. Bradford Central BC</b>			<b>74,104</b>
	Bowling and Barkerend	Bradford	11,258
	City	Bradford	9,891
	Great Horton	Bradford	10,905
	Little Horton	Bradford	10,457
	Manningham	Bradford	10,678
	Toller	Bradford	11,050
	Wibsey	Bradford	9,865
<b>6. Bradford East and Horsforth BC</b>			<b>80,005</b>
	Bolton and Undercliffe	Bradford	11,029
	Bradford Moor	Bradford	11,395
	Eccleshill	Bradford	10,865
	Idle and Thackley	Bradford	11,714
	Calverley and Farsley	Leeds	17,515
	Horsforth	Leeds	17,487
<b>7. Calder Valley CC</b>			<b>76,041</b>
	Brighouse	Calderdale	8,529
	Calder	Calderdale	8,824
	Elland	Calderdale	8,267

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Greetland and Stainland	Calderdale	8,443
	Hipperholme and Lightcliffe	Calderdale	8,661
	Luddendenfoot	Calderdale	7,965
	Rastrick	Calderdale	8,503
	Ryburn	Calderdale	8,535
	Todmorden	Calderdale	8,314
<b>8. Colne Valley and Denby Dale CC</b>			<b>80,466</b>
	Colne Valley	Kirklees	13,256
	Denby Dale	Kirklees	12,692
	Golcar	Kirklees	13,548
	Holme Valley North	Kirklees	12,694
	Holme Valley South	Kirklees	14,358
	Lindley	Kirklees	13,918
<b>9. Dewsbury CC</b>			<b>80,447</b>
	Dewsbury East	Kirklees	13,439
	Dewsbury South	Kirklees	12,864
	Dewsbury West	Kirklees	12,720
	Kirkburton	Kirklees	12,861
	Mirfield	Kirklees	15,058
	Wakefield Rural	Wakefield	13,505
<b>10. Don Valley CC</b>			<b>73,674</b>
	Conisbrough and Denaby	Doncaster	10,454
	Edlington and Warmsworth	Doncaster	10,412
	Finningley	Doncaster	11,979
	Hatfield	Doncaster	10,080
	Rossington	Doncaster	10,093
	Thorne	Doncaster	10,650
	Torne Valley	Doncaster	10,006
<b>11. Doncaster Central BC</b>			<b>73,874</b>
	Armthorpe	Doncaster	10,898
	Balby	Doncaster	11,098
	Bessacarr and Cantley	Doncaster	11,306
	Central	Doncaster	10,567
	Edenthorpe, Kirk Sandall and Barnby Dun	Doncaster	10,636
	Town Moor	Doncaster	10,021
	Wheatley	Doncaster	9,348
<b>12. Doncaster North CC</b>			<b>72,855</b>
	Adwick	Doncaster	10,672
	Askern Spa	Doncaster	9,818
	Bentley	Doncaster	9,888
	Great North Road	Doncaster	11,681
	Mexborough	Doncaster	11,390
	Sprotbrough	Doncaster	9,628
	Stainforth and Moorends	Doncaster	9,778
<b>13. East Yorkshire CC</b>			<b>80,435</b>
	Bridlington Central and Old Town	East Riding of Yorkshire	8,549
	Bridlington North	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,677
	Bridlington South	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,381
	Driffield and Rural	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,045
	East Wolds and Coastal	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,797
	Pocklington Provincial	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,820
	Wolds Weighton	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,166
<b>14. Elmet CC</b>			<b>79,420</b>
	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	Leeds	17,210
	Garforth and Swillington	Leeds	15,945
	Harewood	Leeds	14,786
	Temple Newsam	Leeds	16,070
	Wetherby	Leeds	15,409
<b>15. Goole and Howden CC</b>			<b>77,823</b>
	Dale	East Riding of Yorkshire	13,605
	Goole North	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,867
	Goole South	East Riding of Yorkshire	6,861
	Howden	East Riding of Yorkshire	3,930

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Howdenshire	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,985
	Snaith, Airmyn, Rawcliffe and Marshland	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,903
	South Hunsley	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,903
	Axholme Central	North Lincolnshire	5,610
	Axholme North	North Lincolnshire	6,448
	Axholme South	North Lincolnshire	5,711
<b>16. Grimsby North and Barton CC</b>			<b>74,064</b>
	East Marsh	North East Lincolnshire	7,364
	Freshney	North East Lincolnshire	7,479
	Immingham	North East Lincolnshire	8,577
	West Marsh	North East Lincolnshire	4,940
	Wolds	North East Lincolnshire	5,808
	Yarborough	North East Lincolnshire	8,456
	Barton	North Lincolnshire	8,252
	Brigg and Wolds	North Lincolnshire	9,132
	Broughton and Appleby	North Lincolnshire	5,290
	Ferry	North Lincolnshire	8,766
<b>17. Grimsby South and Cleethorpes BC</b>			<b>73,182</b>
	Croft Baker	North East Lincolnshire	8,653
	Haverstoe	North East Lincolnshire	8,140
	Heneage	North East Lincolnshire	8,255
	Humberston and New Waltham	North East Lincolnshire	8,711
	Park	North East Lincolnshire	8,960
	Scartho	North East Lincolnshire	8,081
	Sidney Sussex	North East Lincolnshire	8,338
	South	North East Lincolnshire	8,394
	Waltham	North East Lincolnshire	5,650
<b>18. Halifax BC</b>			<b>80,225</b>
	Queensbury	Bradford	11,099
	Illingworth and Mixenden	Calderdale	9,062
	Northowram and Shelf	Calderdale	9,058
	Ovenden	Calderdale	8,078
	Park	Calderdale	8,576
	Skircoat	Calderdale	9,366
	Sowerby Bridge	Calderdale	8,208
	Town	Calderdale	8,449
	Warley	Calderdale	8,329
<b>19. Harrogate and Knaresborough CC</b>			<b>75,044</b>
	Bilton	Harrogate	4,319
	Boroughbridge	Harrogate	2,400
	Claro	Harrogate	2,529
	Granby	Harrogate	4,508
	Harlow Moor	Harrogate	4,065
	High Harrogate	Harrogate	4,196
	Hookstone	Harrogate	4,453
	Killinghall	Harrogate	2,376
	Knaresborough East	Harrogate	3,950
	Knaresborough King James	Harrogate	4,036
	Knaresborough Scriven Park	Harrogate	4,186
	Low Harrogate	Harrogate	4,011
	New Park	Harrogate	4,004
	Pannal	Harrogate	4,361
	Rossett	Harrogate	4,823
	Saltergate	Harrogate	4,115
	Starbeck	Harrogate	4,425
	Stray	Harrogate	4,220
	Woodfield	Harrogate	4,067
<b>20. Huddersfield BC</b>			<b>79,698</b>
	Almondbury	Kirklees	13,488
	Ashbrow	Kirklees	13,541
	Crosland Moor and Netherton	Kirklees	13,017
	Dalton	Kirklees	12,650
	Greenhead	Kirklees	13,487
	Newsome	Kirklees	13,515

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
<b>21. Keighley CC</b>			<b>80,058</b>
	Bingley Rural	Bradford	13,087
	Craven	Bradford	12,213
	Ilkley	Bradford	11,224
	Keighley Central	Bradford	11,163
	Keighley East	Bradford	11,588
	Keighley West	Bradford	10,479
	Worth Valley	Bradford	10,304
<b>22. Kingston upon Hull Central BC</b>			<b>72,902</b>
	Avenue	Kingston upon Hull	9,163
	Drypool	Kingston upon Hull	9,429
	Holderness	Kingston upon Hull	10,173
	Marfleet	Kingston upon Hull	9,150
	Myton	Kingston upon Hull	9,450
	Pickering	Kingston upon Hull	8,990
	St Andrew's	Kingston upon Hull	4,873
	Southcoates East	Kingston upon Hull	5,708
	Southcoates West	Kingston upon Hull	5,966
<b>23. Kingston upon Hull North BC</b>			<b>77,213</b>
	Beverley	Kingston upon Hull	6,807
	Bransholme East	Kingston upon Hull	6,763
	Bransholme West	Kingston upon Hull	6,023
	Ings	Kingston upon Hull	9,399
	Kings Park	Kingston upon Hull	7,306
	Longhill	Kingston upon Hull	8,679
	Newland	Kingston upon Hull	6,602
	Orchard Park and Greenwood	Kingston upon Hull	9,137
	Sutton	Kingston upon Hull	9,646
	University	Kingston upon Hull	6,851
<b>24. Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice BC</b>			<b>77,927</b>
	Cottingham North	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,316
	Cottingham South	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,338
	Hessle	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,651
	Tranby	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,768
	Willerby and Kirk Ella	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,019
	Boothferry	Kingston upon Hull	9,594
	Bricknell	Kingston upon Hull	6,567
	Derringham	Kingston upon Hull	8,988
	Newington	Kingston upon Hull	7,686
<b>25. Leeds East BC</b>			<b>79,655</b>
	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill	Leeds	14,500
	Chapel Allerton	Leeds	16,661
	Gipton and Harehills	Leeds	14,935
	Killingbeck and Seacroft	Leeds	16,527
	Roundhay	Leeds	17,032
<b>26. Leeds Metropolitan and Ossett BC</b>			<b>78,809</b>
	Ardsley and Robin Hood	Leeds	17,044
	City and Hunslet	Leeds	19,030
	Middleton Park	Leeds	17,871
	Horbury and South Ossett	Wakefield	12,111
	Ossett	Wakefield	12,753
<b>27. Leeds North BC</b>			<b>79,539</b>
	Headingley	Leeds	14,787
	Hyde Park and Woodhouse	Leeds	14,949
	Kirkstall	Leeds	15,778
	Moortown	Leeds	17,105
	Weetwood	Leeds	16,920
<b>28. Leeds South East and Castleford BC</b>			<b>78,651</b>
	Kippax and Methley	Leeds	16,283
	Rothwell	Leeds	15,571
	Airedale and Ferry Fryston	Wakefield	11,625
	Altofts and Whitwood	Wakefield	12,512
	Castleford Central and Glasshoughton	Wakefield	12,039
	Knottingley	Wakefield	10,621

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
<b>29. Leeds West, Pudsey and Tong BC</b>			<b>80,236</b>
	Tong	Bradford	11,547
	Armley	Leeds	16,977
	Bramley and Stanningley	Leeds	16,506
	Farnley and Wortley	Leeds	17,961
	Pudsey	Leeds	17,245
<b>30. Normanton and Pontefract CC</b>			<b>75,206</b>
	Ackworth, North Elmsall and Upton	Wakefield	12,665
	Featherstone	Wakefield	12,702
	Normanton	Wakefield	12,309
	Pontefract North	Wakefield	12,088
	Pontefract South	Wakefield	12,090
	South Elmsall and South Kirkby	Wakefield	13,352
<b>31. Otley CC</b>			<b>77,410</b>
	Wharfedale	Bradford	9,108
	Adel and Wharfedale	Leeds	15,863
	Alwoodley	Leeds	17,471
	Guiseley and Rawdon	Leeds	17,491
	Otley and Yeadon	Leeds	17,477
<b>32. Richmond (Yorks) CC</b>			<b>78,902</b>
	Bedale	Hambleton	3,771
	Brompton	Hambleton	1,696
	Broughton and Greenhow	Hambleton	1,400
	Cowtons	Hambleton	1,527
	Crakehall	Hambleton	1,415
	Great Ayton	Hambleton	4,158
	Leeming	Hambleton	1,930
	Leeming Bar	Hambleton	1,539
	Morton-on-Swale	Hambleton	1,438
	Northallerton Broomfield	Hambleton	3,669
	Northallerton Central	Hambleton	3,415
	Northallerton North	Hambleton	2,966
	Osmotherley	Hambleton	1,471
	Romanby	Hambleton	3,303
	Rudby	Hambleton	2,995
	Stokesley	Hambleton	4,543
	Swainby	Hambleton	1,569
	Tanfield	Hambleton	1,464
	Addlebrough	Richmondshire	1,093
	Barton	Richmondshire	1,022
	Bolton Castle	Richmondshire	1,067
	Brompton-on-Swale and Scorton	Richmondshire	2,347
	Catterick	Richmondshire	1,911
	Colburn	Richmondshire	2,659
	Croft	Richmondshire	1,002
	Gilling West	Richmondshire	947
	Hawes and High Abbotside	Richmondshire	1,066
	Hipswell	Richmondshire	1,949
	Hornby Castle	Richmondshire	1,276
	Leyburn	Richmondshire	2,099
	Lower Wensleydale	Richmondshire	1,085
	Melsonby	Richmondshire	1,078
	Middleham	Richmondshire	1,024
	Middleton Tyas	Richmondshire	903
	Newsham with Eppleby	Richmondshire	1,008
	Penhill	Richmondshire	978
	Reeth and Arkengarthdale	Richmondshire	1,020
	Richmond Central	Richmondshire	2,169
	Richmond East	Richmondshire	2,122
	Richmond West	Richmondshire	2,081
	Scotton	Richmondshire	1,815
	Swaledale	Richmondshire	912
<b>33. Rother Valley CC</b>			<b>73,068</b>
	Anston and Woodsetts	Rotherham	8,940
	Dinnington	Rotherham	9,284
	Hellaby	Rotherham	9,205
	Holderness	Rotherham	9,470

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Maltby	Rotherham	9,040
	Rother Vale	Rotherham	9,075
	Sitwell	Rotherham	9,466
	Wales	Rotherham	8,588
<b>34. Rotherham and Sheffield East BC</b>			<b>73,631</b>
	Boston Castle	Rotherham	9,024
	Brinsworth and Catcliffe	Rotherham	9,033
	Keppel	Rotherham	9,286
	Rotherham East	Rotherham	8,786
	Rotherham West	Rotherham	9,004
	Darnall	Sheffield	14,711
	Shiregreen and Brightside	Sheffield	13,787
<b>35. Rotherham North CC</b>			<b>73,288</b>
	Hooper	Rotherham	8,942
	Rawmarsh	Rotherham	9,517
	Silverwood	Rotherham	9,522
	Swinton	Rotherham	8,937
	Valley	Rotherham	8,982
	Wath	Rotherham	9,094
	Wickersley	Rotherham	9,278
	Wingfield	Rotherham	9,016
<b>36. Scarborough and Whitby CC</b>			<b>76,078</b>
	Castle	Scarborough	3,270
	Cayton	Scarborough	3,557
	Central	Scarborough	3,370
	Danby	Scarborough	1,735
	Derwent Valley	Scarborough	3,724
	Eastfield	Scarborough	4,054
	Esk Valley	Scarborough	3,570
	Falsgrave Park	Scarborough	3,737
	Fylingdales	Scarborough	1,736
	Lindhead	Scarborough	1,876
	Mayfield	Scarborough	3,766
	Mulgrave	Scarborough	2,827
	Newby	Scarborough	5,193
	North Bay	Scarborough	3,451
	Northstead	Scarborough	3,132
	Ramshill	Scarborough	3,204
	Scalby, Hackness and Staintondale	Scarborough	3,423
	Seamer	Scarborough	3,724
	Stepney	Scarborough	3,494
	Streonshalh	Scarborough	3,587
	Weaponness	Scarborough	3,038
	Whitby West Cliff	Scarborough	3,237
	Woodlands	Scarborough	3,373
<b>37. Scunthorpe CC</b>			<b>75,401</b>
	Ashby	North Lincolnshire	8,592
	Bottesford	North Lincolnshire	9,111
	Brumby	North Lincolnshire	8,122
	Burringham and Gunness	North Lincolnshire	3,042
	Burton upon Stather and Winterton	North Lincolnshire	8,870
	Crosby and Park	North Lincolnshire	8,310
	Frodingham	North Lincolnshire	5,641
	Kingsway with Lincoln Gardens	North Lincolnshire	8,328
	Ridge	North Lincolnshire	10,253
	Town	North Lincolnshire	5,132
<b>38. Selby and Ainsty CC</b>			<b>73,580</b>
	Marston Moor	Harrogate	2,270
	Ouseburn	Harrogate	2,475
	Ribston	Harrogate	2,404
	Spofforth with Lower Wharfedale	Harrogate	2,504
	Appleton Roebuck	Selby	1,466
	Barby	Selby	3,084
	Brayton	Selby	4,799
	Camblesforth	Selby	3,294
	Cawood with Wistow	Selby	3,586

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Eggborough	Selby	2,907
	Fairburn with Brotherton	Selby	2,771
	Hambleton	Selby	4,248
	Hemingbrough	Selby	3,202
	Monk Fryston and South Milford	Selby	3,152
	North Duffield	Selby	1,501
	Riccall with Escrick	Selby	3,317
	Saxton and Ulleskelf	Selby	1,778
	Selby North	Selby	4,259
	Selby South	Selby	3,133
	Selby West	Selby	3,069
	Sherburn In Elmet	Selby	5,100
	Tadcaster East	Selby	3,033
	Tadcaster West	Selby	2,819
	Whitley	Selby	3,409
<b>39. Sheffield Central BC</b>			<b>73,171</b>
	Broomhill	Sheffield	12,974
	Burngreave	Sheffield	14,765
	Central	Sheffield	17,646
	Hillsborough	Sheffield	13,569
	Walkley	Sheffield	14,217
<b>40. Sheffield Hallam and Penistone CC</b>			<b>80,123</b>
	Penistone West	Barnsley	8,992
	Crookes	Sheffield	13,702
	Ecclesall	Sheffield	14,647
	Fulwood	Sheffield	14,047
	Stannington	Sheffield	14,159
	Stocksbridge and Upper Don	Sheffield	14,576
<b>41. Sheffield Heeley BC</b>			<b>79,790</b>
	Arbourthorne	Sheffield	12,551
	Beauchief and Greenhill	Sheffield	13,530
	Dore and Totley	Sheffield	13,477
	Gleadless Valley	Sheffield	13,882
	Graves Park	Sheffield	13,346
	Nether Edge	Sheffield	13,004
<b>42. Sheffield North and Dodworth CC</b>			<b>80,248</b>
	Dodworth	Barnsley	7,886
	Kingstone	Barnsley	7,598
	Penistone East	Barnsley	9,180
	East Ecclesfield	Sheffield	14,464
	Firth Park	Sheffield	13,566
	Southey	Sheffield	13,519
	West Ecclesfield	Sheffield	14,035
<b>43. Sheffield South East BC</b>			<b>78,338</b>
	Beighton	Sheffield	13,239
	Birley	Sheffield	12,898
	Manor Castle	Sheffield	12,134
	Mosborough	Sheffield	13,595
	Richmond	Sheffield	13,123
	Woodhouse	Sheffield	13,349
<b>44. Shipley CC</b>			<b>77,736</b>
	Baildon	Bradford	11,452
	Bingley	Bradford	13,205
	Clayton and Fairweather Green	Bradford	10,868
	Heaton	Bradford	10,133
	Shipley	Bradford	10,695
	Thornton and Allerton	Bradford	10,805
	Windhill and Wrose	Bradford	10,578
<b>45. Skipton and Ripon CC</b>			<b>77,098</b>
	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	Craven	2,940
	Barden Fell	Craven	1,338
	Bentham	Craven	3,004
	Cowling	Craven	1,833
	Embsay-with-Eastby	Craven	1,515

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
	Gargrave and Malhamdale	Craven	2,538
	Glusburn	Craven	3,168
	Grassington	Craven	1,358
	Hellifield and Long Preston	Craven	1,823
	Ingleton and Clapham	Craven	3,180
	Penyghent	Craven	1,468
	Settle and Ribblesbanks	Craven	2,958
	Skipton East	Craven	2,797
	Skipton North	Craven	2,814
	Skipton South	Craven	2,779
	Skipton West	Craven	2,919
	Sutton-in-Craven	Craven	2,921
	Upper Wharfedale	Craven	1,587
	West Craven	Craven	1,612
	Bishop Monkton	Harrogate	2,219
	Kirkby Malzeard	Harrogate	2,448
	Lower Nidderdale	Harrogate	2,402
	Mashamshire	Harrogate	1,918
	Newby	Harrogate	2,455
	Nidd Valley	Harrogate	2,140
	Pateley Bridge	Harrogate	2,031
	Ripon Minster	Harrogate	3,901
	Ripon Moorside	Harrogate	3,887
	Ripon Spa	Harrogate	4,276
	Washburn	Harrogate	2,546
	Wathvale	Harrogate	2,323
<b>46. Spen Valley BC</b>			<b>73,025</b>
	Royds	Bradford	11,270
	Wyke	Bradford	10,029
	Birstall and Birkenshaw	Kirklees	12,521
	Cleckheaton	Kirklees	12,846
	Heckmondwike	Kirklees	12,653
	Liversedge and Gomersal	Kirklees	13,706
<b>47. Thirsk and Malton CC</b>			<b>77,230</b>
	Easingwold	Hambleton	3,772
	Helperby	Hambleton	1,511
	Huby and Sutton	Hambleton	1,586
	Skipton	Hambleton	1,856
	Sowerby	Hambleton	3,328
	Stillington	Hambleton	1,581
	Thirsk	Hambleton	4,660
	Thorntons	Hambleton	1,509
	Tollerton	Hambleton	1,652
	Topcliffe	Hambleton	1,701
	White Horse	Hambleton	1,693
	Whitstonecliffe	Hambleton	1,591
	Amotherby	Ryedale	1,549
	Ampleforth	Ryedale	1,428
	Cropton	Ryedale	1,265
	Dales	Ryedale	1,172
	Derwent	Ryedale	2,764
	Helmsley	Ryedale	2,538
	Hovingham	Ryedale	1,420
	Kirkbymoorside	Ryedale	2,770
	Malton	Ryedale	3,866
	Norton East	Ryedale	3,016
	Norton West	Ryedale	2,666
	Pickering East	Ryedale	2,674
	Pickering West	Ryedale	2,850
	Rillington	Ryedale	1,428
	Ryedale South West	Ryedale	1,342
	Sherburn	Ryedale	1,568
	Sheriff Hutton	Ryedale	1,412
	Sinnington	Ryedale	1,400
	Thornton Dale	Ryedale	2,708
	Wolds	Ryedale	1,398
	Filey	Scarborough	5,453
	Hertford	Scarborough	4,103

Constituency	Ward	District/borough/city/county	Electorate
<b>48. Wakefield BC</b>			<b>79,716</b>
	Crofton, Ryhill and Walton	Wakefield	12,244
	Stanley and Outwood East	Wakefield	12,079
	Wakefield East	Wakefield	11,163
	Wakefield North	Wakefield	10,765
	Wakefield South	Wakefield	10,561
	Wakefield West	Wakefield	11,234
	Wrenthorpe and Outwood West	Wakefield	11,670
<b>49. York Central BC</b>			<b>75,656</b>
	Acomb	York	6,554
	Clifton	York	9,384
	Fishergate	York	6,761
	Guildhall	York	5,867
	Heworth	York	10,010
	Holgate	York	9,690
	Hull Road	York	7,650
	Micklegate	York	9,319
	Westfield	York	10,421
<b>50. York Outer CC</b>			<b>75,125</b>
	Bishopthorpe	York	3,260
	Derwent	York	2,980
	Dringhouses and Woodthorpe	York	8,905
	Fulford	York	2,187
	Haxby and Wigginton	York	10,104
	Heslington	York	3,817
	Heworth Without	York	3,173
	Huntington and New Earswick	York	9,805
	Osbaldwick	York	2,783
	Rural West York	York	8,376
	Skelton, Rawcliffe and Clifton Without	York	10,250
	Strensall	York	6,233
	Wheldrake	York	3,252

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

Tel: 020 7276 1102

Email: [information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:information@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk)

Website: [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://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/](http://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](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

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

This document can also be viewed on our website at: [www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk](http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk)

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

