

THE SCHEME FOR ENGLAND

Background

1. Members will recall attending the Secretariat's office between 8 and 12 November 2010 to consider a draft scheme for England. The scheme was based upon the rules set out in the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Bill that was published in July 2010.
2. The scheme was based on the 2010 UK electorates (1 December 2009) and the application of the Sainte-Laguë methodology, which was set out in the Bill. This resulted in an allocation of 503 constituencies to England. The UK electoral quota (UKEQ) was calculated as being 75,862 and all the constituencies were required to have an electorate that was within 5% of the UKEQ (72,069-79,655).
3. It was decided to use the electoral regions to allocate the 503 constituencies: the use of which was specifically provided for by the Bill. Members also decided that it would be appropriate to use the Sainte-Laguë methodology to produce an exact allocation of 503 constituencies to the regions.

Issues that arose during the discussion of the scheme

4. The major issue that arose during the consideration of the draft scheme related to the sub-division of the regions. In all regions, except one (the North East), the Secretariat had created either three or four sub-regions. In most, this was based on either a single county, or a pair or group of neighbouring counties. All of the selected sub-regions were chosen so that they could be used to easily create a whole number of constituencies with electorates within 5% of the UKEQ. In two regions (London and the North West), this did not provide distributions that Members considered to be suitable and further sub-regions were created.
5. In London, Members were concerned about the extension of the East North London sub-region across the River Lee. This had been proposed because it had not proved possible to create constituencies with electorates within 5% of the UKEQ in those boroughs to the east of the River Lee. In Central North London and West North London, Members also expressed concern that the arbitrary division between the two parts did not allow them to fully consider a range of options. At the request of Members the Secretariat created new sub-regions and produced additional options that met Members' requirements in both areas.
6. In the North West region, Members did not object to the linkage of the Cheshire East unitary authority with Greater Manchester, but considered that it would be better if the sub-region also included the Cheshire West and Chester, Halton, and Warrington unitary authorities. As the Borough of Wirral in Merseyside needed to be included with Cheshire West and Chester, the Secretariat created a single sub-region that united all of the former county of Cheshire with Greater Manchester, and Merseyside. An option was created for the sub-region which met the requirements of Members.

7. Following discussions with the Secretariat, and the preparation of additional options, not only for the regions listed above but also for other regions, Members selected a scheme for England where all constituencies had electorates that were within 5% of the UKEQ and it had not been necessary to divide a ward between constituencies. It was noted that prior to the creation of the scheme, 192 (38.2%) of the existing constituencies had electorates that were within 5% of the UKEQ. However, once the scheme had been created, it had been possible to retain only 62 of the existing constituencies (12.3% of the 503 allocated). It was also noted that 58.2% of the constituencies in the scheme had electorates that were within 2% of the UKEQ and that figure rose to 79.8% which had electorates within 3% of the UKEQ.

The 2011 electorates (1 December 2010)

8. The 2011 electorates for each part of the UK were published by the Office for National Statistics on 23 February 2011 and are set out in the table below.

Country	Electorate
England	38,332,557*
Northern Ireland	1,190,635
Scotland	3,873,387#
Wales	2,281,596
Total	45,678,175

*less the electorate of the Isle of Wight (110,924)

#less the electorate of Na h-Eileanan an Iar (21,837) and Orkney and Shetland (33,755)

9. The total number of electors, when divided by 596, produces a UKEQ of **76,641** (to the nearest whole number) for the 2013 review. This means that all the constituencies in England, with the exception of the two protected constituencies for the Isle of Wight, must have an electorate that is no smaller than **72,810** and no larger than **80,473** (within 5% of the UKEQ).

10. The allocation of precisely 600 constituencies, as required by the Act, is achieved using the Sainte-Laguë methodology (excluding the four preserved constituencies). This produces the allocations shown in the table below.

Country	Electorate	Entitlement	Allocation	Reduction
England	38,332,557*	500.16	500(+2)	31
Northern Ireland	1,190,635	15.54	16	2
Scotland	3,873,387#	50.54	50(+2)	7
Wales	2,281,596	29.77	30	10
Total	45,678,175		600	50

*less the electorate of the Isle of Wight

#less the electorate of Na h-Eileanan an Iar and Orkney and Shetland

The number of constituencies to be allocated to each of the electoral regions

11. In Newsletter No.2/2011, issued on 4 March 2011, Members consulted on their proposed use of the electoral regions for the initial allocation of the 502 constituencies which would be achieved by using the Sainte-Laguë methodology. The outcome of that consultation was very positive with only one representation completely opposed to the use of the regions. Members decided that the initial proposals for England should be prepared on the basis of a regional approach. The allocation of constituencies to the electoral regions that results from applying the Sainte-Laguë methodology is set out in the table below.

Region	Electorate	Exact TE	Allocation
Eastern	4,280,707	55.85	56
East Midlands	3,361,089	43.85	44
London	5,266,904	68.72	68
North East	1,971,246	25.72	26
North West	5,253,019	68.54	68
South East	6,192,504*	80.80	81
South West	4,042,475	52.75	53
West Midlands	4,115,668	53.70	54
Yorkshire and the Humber	3,848,942	50.22	50
England	38,332,557	500.15	500
UK EQ	76,641		

*less the electorate of the Isle of Wight

12. It should be noted that the Sainte-Laguë methodology does not allocate London its full theoretical entitlement. It allocates 68 constituencies against a theoretical entitlement of **68.72**. This means that, on average, every constituency in London will be 811 electors above the UKEQ. This region was allocated 68 constituencies at the time the scheme for England was approved in November 2010.

13. It should also be noted that the North West region has a theoretical entitlement to 68.54 constituencies and it too will be allocated 68 constituencies. In the scheme for England, this region was originally allocated 69 constituencies. The reduction of one constituency will require a number of alterations to be made to the way the counties are grouped into sub-regions. The approach the Secretariat considered should be adopted for this region was explained to Members at the meeting on 4 April 2011: it was agreed that the Secretariat should proceed as planned.

The effect of the 2011 electorates on the draft scheme

14. In applying the 2011 electorates to the 503 constituencies in the draft scheme, the Secretariat noted that that 41 (8.2%) had electorates that were outside of the 5% parity target – 18 were above the 80,473 maximum and 23 were below the 72,810 minimum.

The Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011

15. By the time the Bill received Royal Assent on 16 February 2011 a number of amendments had been introduced. The majority of these do not affect the considerations applied to the scheme for England in 2010. The changes made to the rules that relate directly to the scheme are those in respect of:-

- the Isle of Wight; and
- the existing constituencies.

The Isle of Wight

16. The Act provides for the Isle of Wight (110,924 electors) to be divided into two protected constituencies which may have electorates that are not within 5% of the UKEQ. Whilst creating two constituencies on the island with electorates close to 55,000 has not proved difficult, it is necessary to adjust a number of the constituencies in Hampshire that formed part of the agreed draft scheme to ensure that all of them are within 5% of the UKEQ. With an allocation of 17 constituencies to the sub-region (Hampshire, Portsmouth, and Southampton) against a theoretical entitlement to 17.13 constituencies the Secretariat considered that it would be possible to create constituencies with electorates within 5% of the UKEQ and that pairing Hampshire with West Sussex would not be necessary.

The existing constituencies

17. The new rule 5(1)(c) states that “a Boundary Commission may take into account, if and to such extent as they think fit-“ the boundaries of the existing constituencies. This provision was inserted during the passage of the Bill. At the outset of preparing the scheme for England, it was agreed that the Secretariat should not adopt a “clean sheet” approach and that it would need to be mindful of the current arrangement of constituencies and should consider how many of the existing constituencies, that had electorates within the 5% parity target, could be retained unchanged. Therefore, the introduction of rule 5(1)(c), and observance of it which is discretionary, was factored into the draft scheme.

The scheme for England

18. In noting the changes made to the Bill during its passage, particularly those in respect of the rules, the Secretariat has updated the draft scheme for England to take account of the effects of the altered rules and the 2011 electorates.

19. In many sub-regions, the electorates of the constituencies continued to be within 5% of the UKEQ once the 2011 electorates had been applied. However, in each case the review team has considered whether the new electoral data allows for any improvements to be made to the option originally selected, particularly with a view to whether any communities that were previously divided between constituencies can now be re-established in one constituency.

20. In those constituencies where change has been required because a constituency (or constituencies) is no longer within the 5% parity target, it has been possible in a number of cases to restrict the degree of change to the exchange of a ward (or wards) between the affected constituency and one of its neighbours. However, in other areas (e.g. the North West region) the degree of change required is far more significant with a number of constituencies being affected.

Action required

21. Members are asked to note the content of this briefing paper to enable them to attend the Secretariat’s office during the week 16-20 May 2011 and consider the options for each sub-region with a view to confirming the scheme for England.

22. The changes that the review teams have made to the draft scheme approved by members in November 2010 are set out in Appendixes A-I which are attached to this paper. These are the same Appendixes that were attached to BCE/2010/Paper 33 which was considered at the meeting of 21 December 2010. The original text is shown with a yellow shaded background and the changes considered by each review team have been added below. Appendix J has been provided to show the distribution of constituencies around the electoral quota (76,641), and within the 5% parity target, that would result if the options recommended by the Secretariat were selected. Obviously, these figures will vary according to whichever options are selected by Members.

23. Members are asked to give careful consideration to the schemes for each sub-region when they attend the Secretariat's office and provide clear reasons as to their preference for the selected option, with particular strengths being highlighted and any weaknesses (acceptable/unavoidable) described.

24. Members are also asked to give very careful consideration to the names allocated to each of the 502 constituencies, as names have always proven to be controversial at previous reviews. In this respect, the minutes from the meeting of 24 May 2010 where Members considered their policy in respect of the naming of constituencies is attached at Appendix K. It should be noted that section 3(4) of the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended) which is the only section of the Act that refers to the naming and designation of constituencies, was not changed by the 2011 Act.

25. The review team leaders (Katy Budge, Mia Spreadbury, and Gerald Tessier) and the review area co-ordinators (Sam Hartley and Glenn Reed), along with Bob Farrance, will attend each session where Members consider the schemes to provide any background information required by Members, any information required about the changes made to the original scheme, to record a note of the Members' decisions and the reasons for them, and to undertake any further changes required.

26. Appendix L sets out the order in which the Secretariat propose to present the options for each region to Members. This has been presented so that Members can take the opportunity to read about the proposals for each region ahead of the day on which they are considered.

Eastern Region

1. The Eastern region is currently allocated a total of 58 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 56, a reduction of 2. The electorate of the region is 4,280,707 giving an average electorate per seat of 76,441.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved Seats (2010 Review)			Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>Eastern</i>	4,280,707	56 (-2)						
Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Luton	1,244,026	16 (-1)	1	16	100%	1	6%	
			2	6	38%	0	0%	
Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Peterborough and Suffolk	1,756,137	23 (=)	1	21	91%	7	30%	
			2	16	70%	7	30%	
Essex, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock	1,280,544	17 (-1)	1	6	35%	2	11%	
			2	5	29%	2	11%	

Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, and Luton

2. The Secretariat had prepared three schemes and Members agreed that the whole of the town of Dunstable should be included in a Luton constituency, as proposed in scheme 2. They also preferred the inclusion of the towns of Welwyn and Hatfield in the same constituency and not divided as in scheme 1. They considered that scheme 2 was the preferred option and selected that scheme.

3. On the 2010 electorates, seven of the existing seventeen constituencies had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and only one (South West Hertfordshire CC) is unchanged in the preferred scheme. Five constituencies (Broxbourne and Cheshunt CC, Hitchin and Harpenden CC, Letchworth CC, Stevenage CC and Welwyn Hatfield CC) contain parts of three districts. Two districts (North Hertfordshire and Three Rivers) are divided between four constituencies, one district (East Hertfordshire) is divided between five constituencies, and one district (Central Bedfordshire) is divided between six constituencies.

4. All the constituencies in the accepted scheme still have electorates that are within the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

5. There is no change to any of the proposed constituencies as they are all within the 5% of the parity target.

Scheme 2 - accepted

6. The Secretariat has prepared an alternative scheme that attempts to improve some of the constituency boundaries, particularly by including the whole of the town of Flitwick within one constituency and to reduce the size of Stevenage CC.

7. Alterations have been made to South West Hertfordshire CC and Watford BC to include the Three Rivers District wards of Ashridge (No.2), Hayling (No.10), Moor Park and Eastbury (No.14) and Northwick (No.15) in Watford BC and the Three Rivers District wards of Abbot Langley (No.1), Langleybury (No.11) and Leavesden (No.12) in a renamed West Hertfordshire CC.

8. The Secretariat has also suggested minor changes to Broxbourne and Cheshunt CC, Hertford and Stortford CC, Letchworth CC, Stevenage CC and Welwyn and Hatfield CC to improve the shape of Stevenage CC and of Broxbourne and Cheshunt CC.

9. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Broxbourne and Cheshunt CC	76,327
Hemel Hempstead CC	76,457
Hertford and Stortford CC	78,915
Letchworth CC	78,161
North Bedfordshire CC	79,874
South West Bedfordshire CC	77,807
Stevenage CC	76,628
Watford BC	78,279
Welwyn and Hatfield CC	77,234
West Hertfordshire BC	79,167

10. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept scheme 2, which it is considered improves upon the shapes of the constituencies, without adversely affecting local ties.

Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Peterborough, and Suffolk

11. The Secretariat had prepared three schemes and Members preferred scheme 1, which included the town of Newmarket in a Cambridgeshire constituency, except for the City of Peterborough, where they considered that the alternative division proposed in scheme 3 was preferable. The Secretariat had created a fourth scheme that gave effect to this change.

12. On the 2010 electorates, thirteen of the existing twenty-three constituencies, had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and seven (Cambridge BC, Ipswich BC, Ipswich North and Framlingham CC, Norwich South BC, South Suffolk CC, Suffolk Coastal CC and Waveney CC) are unchanged. Three constituencies (Ipswich North and Framlingham CC, Newmarket and Ely CC and Peterborough South and Ramsey CC) contain parts of three districts and two

constituencies (Mildenhall and Haverhill CC and St Ives and Charteris CC) contain parts of four districts. One district (South Cambridgeshire) is divided between four constituencies.

13. Two constituencies, Huntingdon CC (72,225) and South Norfolk CC (80, 784) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

Huntingdon CC

14. In the original scheme, the Huntingdonshire District ward of Sawtry (No.23) was included in Peterborough South and Ramsey CC. It is proposed to include the ward in Huntingdon CC.

South Norfolk CC

15. In the original scheme, the South Norfolk District wards of Dickleburgh (No.9) and Scole (No.30) were included in South Norfolk CC. It is proposed to include these wards in Thetford and Swaffham CC.

16. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Huntingdon CC	77,166
Peterborough South and Ramsey CC	74,238
South Norfolk CC	76,641
Thetford and Swaffham CC	79,733

Scheme 2 - accepted with some alterations to seats 8 and 23 and some alterations to names

17. The Secretariat has proposed an alternative scheme that does not divide the District of East Cambridgeshire between constituencies, only divides the District of South Cambridgeshire between two constituencies, and by including the town of Huntingdon in St. Ives and Charteris CC (and renaming it Huntingdon and Charteris), the seat will only contain parts of two districts instead of four districts as in scheme 1.

18. The effect of changes results in the following electorates:-

Huntingdon and Charteris CC	75,731
Mildenhall and Haverhill CC	73,670
Newmarket and Ely CC	74,049
South Cambridgeshire CC	76,320
St Neots CC	77, 721

19. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept scheme 2, which it is considered improves upon the shapes of the constituencies in Cambridgeshire, whilst reducing the number of cross-county and district boundary constituencies.

20. The Secretariat had produced four schemes, of which the fourth had improved upon scheme 1, by not having a constituency containing parts of five districts. Members considered that this was preferable to schemes 2 and 3, which they rejected because of the division of the town of Basildon in each scheme.

21. On the 2010 electorates, six of the existing eighteen constituencies, had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and two (Colchester BC and Thurrock BC) are unchanged. Two constituencies (Billericay and Writtle CC and Maldon CC) contain parts of four districts. No district is divided between four or more constituencies.

22. One constituency, Castle Point BC (71,651) has an electorate that is now outside the 5% parity target.

Castle Point BC

23. In the original scheme, the Southend-on-Sea Borough ward of West Leigh (No.16) had been included in Castle Point BC. To increase the electorate of Castle Point BC, the Basildon District ward of Pitsea South East (No.11) was included instead of the West Leigh ward. This meant that other changes had to be made to neighbouring seats to bring them all within the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

24. The inclusion of the Pitsea South East ward in Castle Point BC meant that changes had to be made to Basildon CC, Billericay and Writtle CC, Brentwood and East Thurrock CC, Harlow and Epping CC, Rayleigh and Wickford CC, Rochford and Southend East CC, Southend West BC and Waltham Abbey CC.

25. In addition to these changes, growth in the electorate of Braintree District meant that it was no longer necessary to include the Uttlesford District ward of Stebbing (No.18) in Braintree CC. The Braintree District ward of Three Fields (No.24) is included in Saffron Walden and Halstead CC and the Uttlesford District wards of Great Dunmow North (No.8) and Great Dunmow South (No.9) are included in Billericay and Writtle CC.

26. The consequence of these amendments is that Billericay and Writtle CC now contains parts of five districts. Due to the changes made to Harlow and Epping CC and Waltham Abbey CC, the names have been changed to Harlow and Epping Forest respectively.

27. The effect of these changes results in the following electorates:-

Basildon CC	78,399
Billericay and Writtle CC	73,779
Braintree CC	72,963
Brentwood and East Thurrock CC	79,709
Castle Point BC	73,019
Epping Forest CC	75,557
Harlow CC	72,949
Rayleigh and Wickford CC	78,413

Rochford and Southend East CC	74,537
Saffron Walden and Halstead CC	74,154
Southend West BC	73,766

Scheme 2 - accepted with some alterations to names

28. The Secretariat has prepared an alternative scheme that attempts to improve the shape of some of the constituencies and to ensure that no constituency contains parts of more than three districts. Alterations have been made to twelve of the seventeen constituencies.

29. The effect of these changes results in the following electorates:-

Basildon and East Thurrock CC	74,720
Billericay and Writtle CC	74,961
Braintree CC	72,978
Brentwood and Ongar CC	74,240
Castle Point BC	78,949
Epping Forest CC	73,785
Harlow CC	73,223
Maldon CC	78,059
Rayleigh and Wickford CC	76,639
Rochford and Southend East CC	76,697
Saffron Malden and Halstead CC	74,218
Southend West BC	74,528

30. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept scheme 2, which it is considered improves the shapes of the constituencies and does not have any constituency with parts of more than three districts.

East Midlands Region

1. The East Midlands region is currently allocated a total of 46 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 44, a reduction of 2. The electorate of the region is 3,361,089 giving an average electorate per seat of 76,388.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>East Midlands</i>	3,361,089	44 (-2)					
Derby and Derbyshire	775,435	10 (-1)	1	8	80%	0	0%
			2	8	80%	0	0%
Leicester, Leicestershire, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire, Northamptonshire and Rutland	2,050,726	27 (-1)	1	27	100%	4	14%
			2	18	67%	6	21%
Lincolnshire	534,928	7 (=)	1	5	71%	3	43%
			2	4	57%	2	29%

City of Derby and Derbyshire

2. On visiting the Secretariat in November 2010, Members were presented with 2 schemes to consider.

3. Members considered that the division of the south of the county in the two schemes was satisfactory, but that the inclusion of Derbyshire Dales District wards in a constituency with wards from North East Derbyshire District was inappropriate. The Secretariat created an alternative scheme that included all bar one of the Derbyshire Dales wards in a Derbyshire Dales constituency. This allowed the whole of North East Derbyshire District to form one constituency. The four Belper Town wards were included in the Amber Valley constituency and the four Amber Valley Borough wards around the town of Alfreton were included in the Bolsover constituency.

4. On application of the 2011 electoral data to Members' preferred scheme, the Secretariat noted that one constituency, Derby South BC, had an electorate of 80,778 and therefore fell outside of the 5% electoral parity target. The Secretariat sought to create a scheme which returned this constituency to within the target.

5. Members are presented with two schemes to consider.

Scheme 1 (Posted No.8) – accepted

6. This scheme returns Derby South BC to within the 5% electoral parity target by transferring wards between Derby North BC and Derby South BC. The Arboretum ward is relocated from Derby South to Derby North and the Derwent ward transferred from Derby North to Derby South. The boundary between the two constituencies is, for the most part, coterminous with a railway line transecting the city. As the ward transfers have resulted in an east/west, rather than north/south, division of the City of Derby, the Secretariat has altered the constituency names for the two Derby constituencies accordingly. Of the 10 constituencies from the Members' preferred 2010 scheme, eight remain unchanged.

7. The effect of these alterations results in the following electorates:

Derby East BC	80,417
Derby West BC	73,846

8. In this scheme, none of the existing constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged. Two constituencies (Bolsover CC and Derbyshire Dales CC) contain parts of three districts. No district is divided between four or more constituencies.

Scheme 2 (Posted No.7) – rejected

9. In this scheme the Secretariat has chosen to make alternative ward transfers between the constituencies of Derby North BC and Derby South BC. The Abbey ward is transferred from Derby North BC to Derby South BC and the Oakwood ward from Derby South BC to Derby North BC. The relocation of these wards results in a Derby north/south divide as in the approved November 2010 scheme. As in Scheme 1, eight constituencies are unchanged from the 2010 scheme.

10. The effect of these changes results in the following electorates:

Derby North BC	73,941
Derby South BC	80,322

11. As in scheme 1, none of the existing constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged. Two contain parts of three districts and no district is divided between four or more constituencies.

Recommendation

12. While both schemes are viable and result in minimal amendment to the Members' preferred 2010 scheme, the Secretariat considers scheme 1 to be the favoured option due to the division of the two City of Derby constituencies. The Secretariat recommends that Members approve Scheme 1.

13. On visiting the Secretariat's office in November 2010, Members were presented with two schemes to consider.

14. Members considered that scheme 2 was the preferred option, in which the towns of Daventry and Lutterworth were combined in one constituency and the towns of Harborough and Wigston combined in another. They accepted the minor amendments suggested by the Secretariat, whereby the town of Shepshed would be wholly included in the Ashby-de-la-Zouch and Keyworth constituency and the town of Loughborough wholly included in the Loughborough and Coalville constituency.

15. Members noted that the options for creating constituencies in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire were limited and that the selected scheme divided the town of Sutton-in-Ashfield between Ashfield CC and Mansfield CC, and the town of Hucknall between Arnold and Bulwell BC and Ashfield CC.

16. On the application of the 2011 electoral data, the Secretariat noted that none of the 27 constituencies in the approved scheme fell outside the 5% parity target. However, due to the weaknesses identified in the accepted 2010 scheme, alterations and improvements have been made and are presented in scheme 2.

17. Members are presented with two schemes to consider.

Scheme 1 (Posted No.5) – rejected

18. This scheme reflects exactly the scheme that the Commissioners approved on visiting the Secretariat in November 2010.

19. Four existing constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged (Rutland and Melton CC, Leicester South BC, Leicester East BC and Corby CC). Four constituencies contain parts of three districts and one constituency contains parts of four districts. Two districts are divided between four constituencies.

Scheme 2 (Posted No.12) – accepted with some alterations to names

20. This scheme seeks to improve upon the Members' approved 2010 scheme by addressing the division of Sutton-in-Ashfield and Hucknall, and the shape of Loughborough and Coalville CC.

Sutton-in-Ashfield and Hucknall

21. In order to re-unite the town of Sutton-in-Ashfield, the Sutton-in-Ashfield North ward is transferred from Mansfield CC to Ashfield CC.

22. Additionally, in order to re-unite the town of Hucknall, the Hucknall West ward is transferred from Ashfield CC to Arnold and Bulwell BC. This results in the re-creation of the Ashfield constituency as created following the 5th Review.

23. In order to bring both constituencies within the 5% electoral parity target following these alterations, it proved necessary to make further ward transfers.

24. Firstly, the Meden ward is transferred from Sherwood CC to Mansfield CC. Whilst it would have been preferable to transfer both the Meden and Birklands wards to the constituency of Mansfield both to preserve local ties and in order to create a boundary coterminous with that of the Mansfield district, this did not prove possible.

25. Consequently, a transfer of electors to the Sherwood constituency is necessary in order to restore it within the 5% electoral parity target. As Arnold and Bulwell BC remained significantly above the electoral quota, swapping wards between these constituencies seemed to be the most suitable option. During this process all of the Arnold wards were transferred to Sherwood CC and consequently the Secretariat proposes the re-naming of this constituency. With Sherwood's electorate having been significantly under the electoral quota, it also became necessary for it to swap wards with Newark CC.

26. The result of the above changes is that the towns of Sutton-in-Ashfield and Hucknall are reunited within one constituency, Ashfield CC and Arnold and Bulwell BC respectively. As Arnold and Bulwell BC no longer contains the Arnold wards and has incorporated all of Hucknall, the Secretariat proposes to rename it as Hucknall and Bulwell CC.

27. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:

Ashfield CC	77,049
Hucknall and Bulwell CC	73,222
Mansfield CC	75,502
Newark CC	76,405
Sherwood CC	75,220

Loughborough and Coalville CC

28. In order to improve the shape of this constituency, the Secretariat aimed to re-create the existing Loughborough seat as created following the 5th review. Coalville and Whitwick are therefore moved into Ashby-De-La-Zouch and Kegworth CC and the Shepshed East and Shepshed West wards are transferred back into Loughborough CC, in addition to four wards from Charnwood CC. As a result of these changes, Ashby-De-La-Zouch and Kegworth CC was above the 5% electoral parity target and Charnwood CC significantly below.

29. As the existing Charnwood seat already crosses the Hinckley and Bosworth district boundary, the Secretariat proposes that Charnwood should continue to be extended into this district in order to avoid the breaking of further district boundaries. Three Bosworth wards were transferred to increase the electorate and restore it to within the 5% electoral parity target. To increase the electorate of Bosworth CC and reduce the high electorate of Ashby-De-la-Zouch and Kegworth CC, wards from the latter were given to the former, including all four Ashby wards. It thus became necessary for the Secretariat to remove Ashby from the constituency name and establish it as 'Coalville and Kegworth CC'.

30. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:

Bosworth CC	74,131
Charnwood CC	75,135
Coalville and Kegworth CC	72,896
Loughborough CC	77,884

Recommendation

31. As the towns of Sutton-In-Ashfield and Hucknall are re-united and the Loughborough constituency is significantly improved, the Secretariat considers scheme 2 a substantial improvement on the accepted November 2010 scheme (scheme 1). The consequence of these alterations is that existing boundaries (as created at the 5th Review) of two additional constituencies (Ashfield CC and Loughborough CC) are re-established.

32. The Secretariat thus recommends that Members approve the proposed scheme 2.

Lincolnshire

33. On visiting the Secretariat in November 2010, Members were presented with two schemes to consider.

34. Members considered that there was no need to make extensive change in this County. The preferred scheme was a mixture of the two presented by the Secretariat, which was the minimum amount of change necessary to bring all seven constituency electorates within 5% of the EQ. Of the existing seven constituencies, five had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and three of the existing constituencies (Gainsborough CC, Grantham and Stamford CC, and South Holland and the Deepings CC) are unchanged in the preferred scheme. No constituency contains parts of three districts and no district is divided between three or more constituencies.

35. On the application of the 2011 electoral data to the Commissioners' preferred scheme, the Secretariat noted that one constituency, Louth and Horncastle CC, had an electorate of 72,343 and therefore fell outside the 5% electoral parity target. The Secretariat sought to create a scheme which returned this constituency to within the electoral parity target.

36. Members are presented with 2 schemes to consider.

*Scheme 1 (Posted No.8) – **accepted with some alterations to names***

37. The Secretariat made the minimal change necessary to the scheme accepted by Members in November 2010, transferring the ward of Frithville from Boston and Skegness CC to Louth and Horncastle CC. This transfer slightly increases the coterminosity of the boundary between the two constituencies with that of the East Lindsey / Boston districts. Five constituencies (Gainsborough CC, Grantham and Stamford CC, South Holland and the Deepings CC, Sleaford CC and Lincoln and North Hykeham BC) are completely unchanged from the November 2010 scheme.

38. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:

Boston and Skegness CC	72,958
Louth and Horncastle CC	73,895

39. Three of the existing constituencies (as established following the 5th Review) are unchanged, (Gainsborough CC, Grantham and Stamford CC and South Holland and The Deepings CC). No constituency contains parts of three districts and no district is divided between three or more constituencies.

Scheme 2 (Posted No.9) – rejected

40. This scheme returns the constituency of Louth and Horncastle to within the 5% electoral parity target by transferring the Wragby ward from Gainsborough CC to Louth and Horncastle CC. In doing so, the eastern boundary of the former and the western boundary of the latter become coterminous with the East Lindsey / West Lindsey district boundary. In order to compensate for the removal of electors from Gainsborough CC, the ward of Skellingthorpe is transferred from Lincoln and North Hykeham BC to Gainsborough CC, thus restoring the latter to within the 5% electoral parity target. Four constituencies are unchanged from the November 2010 scheme.

41. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:

Gainsborough CC	74,724
Lincoln and North Hykeham BC	75,885
Louth and Horncastle CC	74,193

42. Two of the existing constituencies (as established following the 5th Review) are unchanged, (Grantham and Stamford CC and South Holland and The Deepings CC). As in scheme 1, no constituency contains parts of three districts and no district is divided between three or more constituencies.

Recommendation

43. While greater changes are made to return Louth and Horncastle CC to within the 5% parity target in Scheme 2, the Secretariat considers that the advantage of establishing a boundary coterminous with that of the East Lindsey / West Lindsey districts, albeit consequently relocating Skellingthorpe from Lincoln and North Hykeham BC, makes this the preferred option. The Secretariat noted that Skellingthorpe has not always formed part of Lincoln BC; in the 4th Review, it formed part of the Sleaford and North Hykeham constituency.

44. The Secretariat therefore recommends that Members approve Scheme 2.

London Region

1. The London region is currently allocated a total of 73 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 68, a reduction of 5. The electorate of the region is 5,266,904 giving an average electorate per seat of 77,455.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved Seats (2010 Review)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>London</i>	5,266,904	68 (-5)					
North East London	1,474,214	19 (-1)	1	14	74%	0	0%
			2	0	0%	2	10%
North West and Central London	1,862,660	24 (-2)	1	12	50%	2	8%
			2	1	4%	2	8%
South London	1,930,030	25 (-2)	1	9	36%	0	0%
			2	1	4%	0	0%

North East London

2. The Secretariat had prepared two schemes and Members were concerned that, although options were limited in parts of the review area, four of the suggested constituencies in both schemes crossed the River Lee. Members considered that the River was a very identifiable boundary which should only be crossed if it was essential. The Secretariat created an alternative scheme that only contained one cross river constituency, in the south between the boroughs of Newham and Tower Hamlets, where there had been a previous cross river constituency.

3. Of the 2010 electorates, only six of the existing twenty constituencies had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and none were unchanged in the preferred scheme. No constituency contains parts of three boroughs. Four boroughs (Barking and Dagenham, Hackney, Redbridge and Tower Hamlets) are divided between four constituencies.

4. Two constituencies, Hackney Central BC (80,712) and West Ham BC (82,195) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

Hackney Central BC

5. In the original scheme, the Hackney Borough wards of Clissold (No.4) and Stoke Newington Central (No.17) were included in Hackney Central BC. It is proposed to include these wards in a renamed constituency to Tottenham and Stoke Newington BC and the Hackney Borough wards of Cazenove (No.2) and Springfield (No.16) in a renamed Hackney Central and Clapton BC.

West Ham BC

6. In the original scheme, the Newham Borough wards of Boleyn (No.2) and Green Street East (No.11) were included in West Ham BC. It is proposed to include the Boleyn ward in Beckton and the Isle of Dogs BC and the Green Street East ward in East Ham and Ilford South BC. The Newham Borough wards of Manor Park (No.14) and Plaistow South (No.16) are included in West Ham BC.

7. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Beckton and the Isle of Dogs BC	80,118
East Ham and Ilford South BC	77,588
Hackney Central and Clapton BC	78,673
Tottenham and Stoke Newington BC	76,254
West Ham BC	80,454

Scheme 2 - accepted with some alterations to seats 2 and 13 and some alterations to names

8. The Secretariat has proposed an alternative scheme that does not include more than two boroughs in a constituency. The Secretariat has decided to cross the borough boundary between Chingford (in Waltham Forest) and Edmonton (in Enfield), where the North Circular links the two, rather than between Poplar and Canning Town. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets is contained within two constituencies. Romford has been amended to add more Romford wards than in the first scheme. The link between Rainham and Dagenham has been broken as there is no continuous development across this boundary.

9. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Barking BC	79,651
Bethnal Green and Bow BC	77,333
Canning Town and Plaistow BC	73,255
Chingford and Edmonton BC	75,414
Dagenham BC	74,095
East Ham BC	76,350
Enfield North BC	75,526
Enfield, Southgate BC	76,021
Hackney East BC	80,473
Hackney West BC	76,060
Hornsey and Wood Green BC	79,594
Ilford BC	76,673

Poplar and Limehouse BC	77,167
Romford BC	80,166
Stratford BC	77,777
Tottenham BC	79,615
Upminster BC	80,227
Walthamstow BC	80,255
Wanstead and Woodford BC	78,562

10. The Secretariat has created, in the second scheme, a strong alternative where no constituency contains more than two London Boroughs. Whilst the areas of Chingford and Edmonton have not previously been linked in a constituency before, the Secretariat consider that this is a satisfactory crossing point, which allows for other boroughs to be divided between constituencies in a much better manner. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept scheme 2.

North West and Central London

11. Members were concerned that the suggested Central North London and West North London review areas did not allow for a full consideration of this part of Greater London. The Secretariat combined the two review areas and created a new scheme that had all twenty-four constituencies with electorates within 5% of the EQ. Members were content that the City of London was included in a constituency with Islington South, instead of with the City of Westminster. Members objected to the inclusion of the Greenford area of Ealing Borough in a constituency with wards from Harrow Borough and to the inclusion of the Chiswick area of Hounslow Borough in a constituency with the Acton area from Ealing Borough. Members were content with the inclusion of Richmond upon Thames Borough in the West North London review area; even though this meant that a constituency containing Richmond and Twickenham would cross the River Thames.

12. Of the 2010 electorates, only seven of the existing twenty-six constituencies had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and only one (Chipping Barnet BC) is unchanged. One constituency (Hounslow and Southall BC) contains parts of three boroughs and one constituency (Acton and Shepherd's Bush BC) contains parts of four boroughs. Three boroughs (Camden, Hillingdon and Hounslow) are divided between four constituencies and two boroughs (Brent and Ealing) are divided between five constituencies.

13. Three constituencies, Hendon BC (81, 956), Hounslow and Southall BC (80,813) and The City of London and Islington South BC (80,808) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

Hendon BC

14. In the original scheme, the Brent Borough ward of Dollis Hill (No.4) was included in Hendon BC. It is proposed to include this ward in Brent East BC. This meant that changes had to be made to neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

Hounslow and Southall BC

15. In the original scheme, the Hillingdon Borough ward of Yeading (No.21) was included in Hounslow and Southall BC. It is proposed to include this ward in Hayes and Harlington BC and to include the Hounslow Borough ward of Heston West (No.12) in Hounslow and Southall BC. This meant that changes had to be made to neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

The City of London and Islington South BC

16. In the original scheme, the Islington Borough wards of Highbury East (No.7) and Mildmay (No.12) were included in The City of London and Islington South BC. It is proposed to include the wards in Islington North BC and to include the Camden Borough wards of Holborn and Covent Garden (No.11) and King's Cross (No.14) in The City of London and Islington South BC. This meant changes had to be made to neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

17. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Brent East BC	73,896
Brent North BC	79,678
Harrow East BC	74,756
Harrow South BC	79,042
Hayes and Harlington BC	79,172
Hendon BC	74,329
Hillingdon BC	80,087
Hounslow and Southall BC	80,236
Islington North BC	78,138
Kensington and Chelsea BC	75,603
The City of London and Islington South BC	78,907
Westminster and Camden Town BC	80,454

Scheme 2 - accepted with some alterations to names

18. The Secretariat has proposed an alternative scheme that does not include more than two boroughs in any constituency, except for the constituency that contains The City of London. Scheme 2 creates a Richmond and Twickenham constituency, that has a direct link across the River Thames, whereas scheme 1 combines Richmond with Teddington without a direct road crossing of the Thames within the constituency. The scheme also includes all of the Greenford and Northolt wards of Ealing Borough in one constituency. The town of Uxbridge is not divided between constituencies.

19. The effect of the changes results in the following electorate:-

Brent Central BC	77,279
Brentford and Isleworth BC	74,543
Camden and Regent's Park BC	79,897
Chelsea and Fulham BC	80,247
Ealing Central BC	78,832
Feltham and Hayes BC	77,904

Finchley and Golders Green BC	78,776
Greenford and Northolt BC	73,272
Hammersmith and Acton BC	78,165
Hampstead and Kilburn BC	79,445
Hampton and Hanworth BC	74,175
Harrow East BC	74,756
Harrow South BC	78,985
Hendon BC	74,329
Islington North BC	78,138
Paddington and North Kensington BC	80,251
Richmond and Twickenham BC	78,790
Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner BC	78,802
Southall and Heston BC	78,584
The City of London and Islington South BC	78,907
Uxbridge South and Ruislip BC	80,193
Wembley and Perivale BC	73,319
Westminster and Kensington BC	78,616

20. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept Scheme 2. This scheme respects the ties that Members identified in the original scheme, whilst making significant improvements to some of the constituencies by reducing the number of borough boundary crossings.

South London

21. The Secretariat had prepared two schemes, and Members considered that scheme 2 was the best option, even though they noted that some areas, such as Battersea, Catford, Putney, Sutton, and Wimbledon were divided between constituencies. On the 2010 electorate, only four of the existing twenty-seven constituencies had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and only one (Bermondsey and Old Southwark BC) is unchanged. One constituency (Kingston North and Roehampton BC) contains parts of three boroughs and one constituency (Eltham and Welling BC) contains parts of four boroughs. Four boroughs (Bexley, Croydon, Lambeth and Lewisham) are divided between four constituencies, two boroughs (Bromley and Merton) are divided between five constituencies and one borough (Wandsworth) is divided between six constituencies.

22. Two constituencies, Bexleyheath and Crayford BC (72, 698) and Greenwich and Woolwich BC (82,637) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

Bexleyheath and Crayford BC

23. In the original scheme, the Bexley Borough ward of North End (No.16) is included in Bexleyheath and Crayford BC. It is proposed to include this ward in Erith and Thamesmead BC and to include the Bexley Borough ward of Northumberland Heath (No.17) in Bexleyheath and Crayford BC.

Greenwich and Woolwich BC

24. In the original scheme, the Greenwich Borough ward of Middle Park and Sutcliffe (No.11) was included in Greenwich and Woolwich BC. It is proposed to include this ward in Lewisham BC. This meant that changes had to be made in neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

25. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Bermondsey and Old Southwark BC	77,112
Bexleyheath and Crayford BC	73,060
Carshalton and Wallington BC	80,083
Clapham BC	79,570
Deptford and Peckham BC	72,832
Dulwich and West Norwood BC	78,820
Erith and Thamesmead BC	79,410
Greenwich and Woolwich BC	73,418
Lewisham BC	75,956
Lewisham South and Penge BC	76,987
Mitcham and Morden BC	74,889
Streatham and Balham BC	80,253
Sutton and Cheam BC	80,008
Tooting BC	76,653
Vauxhall BC	79,577
Wandsworth BC	74,260

Scheme 2 - accepted with some alterations to names

26. The Secretariat has proposed an alternative scheme that does not include more than two London Boroughs in a constituency. The London Borough of Bromley border is not crossed and there are three constituencies that remain wholly within this borough. A Kingston and Surbiton constituency is created wholly within the Borough of Kingston upon Thames. Battersea, Catford, Putney and Wimbledon are not divided between constituencies.

27. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Battersea and Vauxhall BC	78,199
Beckenham BC	73,517
Bermondsey and Old Southwark BC	75,255
Bexleyheath and Sidcup BC	73,605
Brixton BC	77,575
Bromley and Chislehurst BC	77,196
Camberwell and Peckham BC	78,537
Croydon Central and Wallington BC	80,458
Croydon East BC	75,924
Deptford and Greenwich BC	75,986
Dulwich and Sydenham BC	73,152
Eltham BC	79,188
Erith and Thamesmead BC	79,660
Kingston and Surbiton BC	75,384

Lewisham East BC	75,757
Mitcham and Morden BC	75,777
Orpington BC	80,115
Purley and Carshalton BC	80,141
Putney BC	80,073
Streatham and Tooting BC	76,177
Sutton and Cheam BC	79,860
Wandsworth and Clapham BC	79,354
Wimbledon and Malden BC	77,494
Woolwich BC	77,484

28. The second scheme for South London has many positives including the fact that no constituency contains more than two London Boroughs. There is a stronger South West London that avoids dividing Kingston and Wimbledon between constituencies. It differs significantly from scheme 1 and therefore provides Members with a radically different proposal. The Secretariat recommends the selection of scheme 2 as the stronger option for South London.

North East region

1. The North East region is currently allocated a total of 29 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 26, a reduction of 3. The electorate of the region is 1,971,249, giving an average electorate per seat of 75,817.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010 Review)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>North East</i>	<i>1,971,249</i>	<i>26 (-3)</i>	1	17	65%	1	3%
			2	12	46%	0	0%
			3	14	54%	1	3%

Darlington, Durham, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Northumberland, Redcar and Cleveland, Stockton-on-Tees, Tyne and Wear.

2. The two schemes presented by the Secretariat were both rejected by Members. They considered that it was preferable not to divide the Borough of Hartlepool between constituencies and that the existing Easington constituency should not be divided between constituencies. They also considered that the Berwick constituency should not be extended to Hexham, but that it should be extended down the coast. They noted that the county town of Morpeth could fit in a constituency with either Berwick or with Hexham, but that ward shapes forced the inclusion of Morpeth in a constituency with Berwick. Members further considered that it was inappropriate for a constituency to be formed that included wards from the City of Newcastle upon Tyne and Northumberland County adjacent to the border with Scotland. They decided that it would not be necessary to create a constituency that crossed the River Tyne between the Borough of Gateshead and the City of Newcastle upon Tyne.

3. A new scheme was created that took account of all the above issues. Of the existing twenty-nine constituencies, only five had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and none of the existing constituencies is unchanged in the preferred scheme. Only two constituencies (Newcastle upon Tyne West and Cramlington BC and Sedgefield and Stockton CC) contain parts of three districts. Four districts (Gateshead, Newcastle upon Tyne, North Tyneside and Stockton-on-Tees) are divided between four constituencies and two districts (Durham and Northumberland) are divided between six constituencies.

4. On the 2011 electoral data, Berwick and Morpeth CC (72,664), Hexham CC (72,225), and Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC (72,394) have electorates that are now outside the 2011 EQ 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

5. This scheme seeks to bring the three constituencies of Berwick and Morpeth CC, Hexham CC, and Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC within the 2011 EQ 5% parity target.

Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC

6. To increase the electorate, it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves a number of neighbouring constituencies. Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC is bounded by the North Sea to the east, the river Tyne to the south and the Northumberland county border to the north. The Secretariat suggests the North Tyneside Borough ward of Chirton (No.4) be included in the constituency as it was in the fifth review. By adding Chirton, the electorate of neighbouring Wallsend BC falls to 72,849 just 39 electorates within the 5% parity target. To the north, the Northumberland electoral division of Holywell (No.35) remains within Blyth and Ashington BC. This solution results in Tynemouth and Whitley BC being wholly within the metropolitan county boundary of North Tyneside and does not cross the county boundary with Northumberland.

Berwick and Morpeth CC

7. To increase the electorate, it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves neighbouring Blyth and Ashington BC as Berwick and Morpeth CC is bounded by the North Sea and the Scottish border. The Secretariat suggests that the Northumberland electoral division of Stakeford (No.63) be added from Blyth and Ashington BC.

Hexham CC

8. To increase this constituency's electorate, it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves neighbouring West Durham CC. Hexham CC is surrounded by Berwick and Morpeth CC, the Scottish border, the Tyne and Wear County boundary and the Durham county boundary. The Secretariat suggests the inclusion of the Northumberland electoral division of Haltwhistle (No.27) in Hexham CC. As a consequence, the electorate of West Durham CC falls below the 5% parity target. The Durham electoral division of Crook North and Tow Law is therefore included in West Durham CC from Bishop Auckland CC to compensate. The electorate of West Durham CC is now 76,637. A name change to this constituency is proposed from West Durham CC to Weardale and Teesdale CC.

Advantages

9. The advantage of this scheme is that Berwick and Morpeth CC does not extend westwards but down the coastline. Also, it does not increase significantly in geographical size. In addition, only minimal change is needed to bring Berwick and Morpeth CC, Hexham CC and Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC within 5% of the EQ.

Disadvantages

10. A disadvantage to this scheme is that the town of Crook is divided as a consequence of the Durham electoral division of Crook North and Tow Law being located in West Durham CC. In addition, the town of Cramlington remains divided between two constituencies, Newcastle upon Tyne West and Cramlington BC and Wallsend BC. It is also considered that the constituency of Billingham BC has an unsatisfactory shape.

11. The effect of the changes is the following electorates:-

Berwick and Morpeth CC	76,430
Bishop Auckland CC	72,816
Blyth and Ashington BC	76,216

Hexham CC	76,093
Newcastle upon Tyne East BC	73,906
Newcastle upon Tyne West and Cramlington BC	72,817
Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC	76,618
Wallsend BC	72,849
Weardale and Teesdale CC	76,637

Further Considerations for Members

12. As West Durham CC is not limited to the Durham county boundary but extends into Northumberland, it is considered that the name of West Durham might be considered as inappropriate. The Secretariat seeks Members' views as to whether a change from West Durham CC to a name that is more reflective of the geography should be considered. The Secretariat propose Weardale and Teesdale CC instead.

13. Whilst no changes have been made to Sedgefield and Stockton CC, the Secretariat suggests that Members consider whether the constituency's name should be changed to Stockton West and Sedgefield CC as Stockton is effectively divided between two constituencies.

14. In addition, whilst no changes have been made to Billingham BC, the Secretariat suggests that Members consider whether the name of the constituency should be changed to Billingham and Stockton BC, to more accurately reflect its composition.

15. The Secretariat is aware that Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland CC has not changed since the 5th general review. However, given that the entity of East Cleveland no longer exists, Members are asked to consider whether the constituency's name should be changed to Middlesbrough South and Guisborough BC.

16. Although the Jarrow constituency has not changed, Members are asked to consider whether the name should be changed from Jarrow BC to Jarrow and Gateshead South BC, since the constituency contains six Gateshead Borough wards and six South Tyneside Borough wards.

17. Members are also asked to consider whether Sunderland BC should be changed to Sunderland Central BC as it contains less than a third of the area of the City of Sunderland.

Scheme 2 – accepted with some alterations to names and designations

18. This scheme also seeks to avoid dividing the towns of Cramlington, Crook and Spennymoor across two constituencies. In addition, it also seeks to improve the shape of the existing Billingham BC, Gateshead BC and Jarrow BC.

Newcastle Upon Tyne and North Tyneside

19. To increase the electorate of Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC to within the 5% parity target, and to avoid Wallsend BC extending beyond the A19 and including the Northumberland electoral division of South East Cramlington (No.23), it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves significant changes to all the constituencies in the Newcastle upon Tyne and North Tyneside areas and leads to the creation of two constituencies based on an east/west axis along the River Tyne from the Northumberland county boundary to the North Sea coast.

20. In achieving the 5% parity target, this scheme does not give weight to historical or community ties. Notwithstanding this, many riverside wards which do maintain some historical and community bonds have been included in the same constituency.

21. Due to the significant changes in Newcastle upon Tyne, the names of a number of the constituencies have been altered to take these changes into account (see the table at paragraph 30).

Berwick and Morpeth CC

22. To increase the electorate of Berwick and Morpeth CC, it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves neighbouring Hexham CC. The Secretariat has therefore included the Northumberland electoral division of Ponteland East (No.50). This brings Berwick and Morpeth CC back within the 5% parity (76,351) without any significant increase in its geographical size.

Hexham CC

23. To increase the electorate of Hexham CC, a solution has been sought which involves neighbouring Gateshead BC. The Gateshead Borough ward of Ryton, Crookhill and Stella (No.16) has therefore been included in the constituency. By including this ward in Hexham CC, the Secretariat considers that there is an improvement to the shape of Gateshead CC.

Jarrow BC

24. The Secretariat considers that the shape of Jarrow BC could be improved by including the Gateshead Borough ward of Felling (No.10) in Jarrow and including the Gateshead Borough ward of Low Fell (No.14) in Gateshead BC. It could also be argued that more of central Gateshead is now included in Gateshead BC. The Secretariat suggests that the name of the constituency be changed to Jarrow and Gateshead East BC to reflect this change.

Bishop Auckland CC

25. To avoid the town of Spennymoor being divided between two constituencies, as is the case in the original scheme, it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves neighbouring Durham CC and Sedgefield and Stockton CC. The Secretariat suggests that the Durham electoral division of Tudhoe (No.58) be included in Bishop Auckland CC. Consequently, the electorate of the constituency increases beyond the 5% parity target. To compensate, the electoral division of Shildon East (No. 50) is located in Sedgefield and Stockton CC. As the electorate of Durham CC now falls below the 5% parity target, the electoral division of Trimdon (No. 57) is included in the constituency to compensate.

Billingham CC

26. The Secretariat considered that the shape of Billingham BC could be significantly improved by transferring the Stockton-on-Tees Borough wards of Bishopsgarth and Elmtree (No.6), Fairfield (No.8), Grangefield (No.9), and Hartburn (No.11) from Sedgefield and Stockton CC to Billingham BC. The Stockton-on-Tees Borough wards of Ingleby Barwick East (No.12), Ingleby Barwick West (No.13), and Parkfield and Oxbridge (No.20) are transferred to Sedgefield and Stockton CC. To reflect the changes, it is suggested that Billingham BC becomes Stockton and Billingham BC, and that Sedgefield and Stockton CC changes to Sedgefield and Ingleby Barwick CC.

Advantages

27. The advantages to this scheme are that the towns of Cramlington, Crook and Spennymoor are not divided between two constituencies. In addition, it is considered that the shape of Jarrow BC, Gateshead BC and Billingham BC are improved.

Disadvantage

28. A disadvantage to this scheme is that significant change is caused to all constituencies within the Newcastle upon Tyne and North Tyneside metropolitan boroughs.

29. The effect of the changes is the following electorates:-

Berwick and Morpeth CC	76,351
Bishop Auckland CC	79,163
Durham CC	78,549
Gateshead BC	73,466
Hexham CC	74,937
Jarrow and Gateshead East BC	77,865
Newcastle upon Tyne Central BC	76,006
Newcastle upon Tyne East and Tynemouth BC	76,167
Newcastle upon Tyne North and Cramlington BC	77,038
Newcastle upon Tyne South BC	73,443
Sedgefield and Ingleby Barwick CC	73,210
Stockton and Billingham BC	78,324
Whitley Bay BC	73,213

Consideration for members

30. Members are asked to consider the following changes to constituency names which either reflect changes to the composition of the constituencies or propose what are more appropriate names.

Existing proposed constituency name	Suggested constituency name
Billingham BC	Stockton and Billingham BC (as in scheme 1)
Jarrow BC	Jarrow and Gateshead East BC
Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland CC	Middlesbrough South and Guisborough CC (as in scheme 1)
Newcastle upon Tyne Central BC	Newcastle upon Tyne South BC
Newcastle upon Tyne East BC	Newcastle Upon Tyne Central BC
Newcastle upon Tyne West and Cramlington BC	Newcastle upon Tyne North and Cramlington BC
Sedgefield and Stockton CC	Sedgefield and Ingleby Barwick CC
Sunderland BC	Sunderland Central BC (as in scheme 1)
Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC	Whitley Bay BC
Wallsend BC	Newcastle Upon Tyne East and Tynemouth BC
West Durham CC	Weardale and Teesdale CC (as in scheme 1)
Washington CC	Washington BC

Scheme 3 - rejected

31. This scheme attempts to improve upon on schemes 1 and 2 and includes elements of both. The scheme represents the same distribution for Newcastle upon Tyne and North Tyneside as in scheme 1 and the distribution for the rest of the scheme is as in scheme 2, except for the Billingham, and Hartlepool constituencies, where the Stockton Borough ward of Billingham East (No.2) is included in the Hartlepool constituency instead of the Billingham North ward (No.3), which, in turn, is included in the Billingham constituency.

Advantages

33. The Secretariat considers that this scheme represent the best elements of both schemes 1 and 2. The advantage is that minimal change is needed to bring Berwick and Morpeth CC, Hexham CC, and Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC to within 5% of the EQ.

34. In addition, the towns of Crook and Spennymoor are not divided between two constituencies. Furthermore, it is considered that the appearance of the Jarrow, Gateshead and Billingham constituencies is improved.

Disadvantages

35. The town of Cramlington remains divided between two constituencies, Newcastle upon Tyne West and Cramlington BC and Wallsend BC. In addition, it is considered that Billingham BC has an unsatisfactory shape in comparison to that of scheme 2. The effect of the changes are the following electorates:-

Berwick and Morpeth CC	76,351
Bishop Auckland CC	79,163
Durham CC	78,549
Gateshead BC	73,466
Hexham CC	74,937
Jarrow and Gateshead East BC	77,865
Sedgefield and Ingleby Barwick CC	73,210
Stockton and Billingham BC	80,327
Tynemouth and Whitley Bay BC	76,618

Consideration for members

37. Members are asked to consider the following constituency name changes:

Existing proposed constituency name	Suggested constituency name
Jarrow BC	Jarrow and Gateshead East BC (as in scheme 2)
Middlesbrough South and East Cleveland CC	Middlesbrough South and Guisborough CC (as in scheme 1)
Sedgefield and Stockton CC	Sedgefield and Ingleby Barwick CC (as in scheme 2)
Sunderland BC	Sunderland Central BC (as in scheme 1)
West Durham CC	Weardale and Teesdale CC (as in scheme 1)
Billingham BC	Stockton and Billingham BC (as in scheme 1)
Washington CC	Washington BC

North West Region

1. The North West region is currently allocated 75 constituencies. The proposed 2013 Review allocation for the region is 68, a reduction of seven and, significantly, a reduction of one from the recently modelled 2010 scheme.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010 scheme)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>North West</i>	5,253,019	68 (-7)					
Cheshire and Wirral	1,021,524	13 (-2)	1	2	15%	1	7%
			2	0	0%	0	0%
Greater Manchester	1,957,990	26(-1)	1	8	31%	0	0%
			2	5	19%	2	7%
Merseyside (less Wirral)	771,343	10(-1)	1	7	70%	2	18%
Cumbria and Lancashire	1,502,162	19(-3)	1	4	21%	1	5%
			2	2	14%	0	0%

2. Members will recall that, on visiting the office of the Secretariat in November 2010, they were presented with a number of schemes to consider. While Members did not object to the pairings suggested by the Secretariat, they considered that the scheme would be improved if the review areas were altered, specifically that the Cheshire unitary authorities were included within one review area and were paired with Greater Manchester and Wirral. The Secretariat consequently produced a scheme for the region which paired areas accordingly¹ and which met the requirements of Members.

3. Additionally, Members will recall that the 2010 scheme was modelled with the assumption that the region would be allocated 69 constituencies, as per the entitlement indicated by the application of the Sainte-Laguë methodology using 2010 electoral data. However, the application of the methodology using 2011 electoral data results instead in an allocation of 68 constituencies which has consequently necessitated the adoption of a different scheme development approach to that of the 2010 modelling.

4. On considering how areas might be paired within the region, the Secretariat was mindful of the preferences expressed by Members in November. The following table outlines the distribution of constituencies within each area, detailing both entitlements and allocations according to 2010 and 2011 electoral data.

¹ Review areas were as follows: Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Greater Manchester, Halton, Merseyside and Warrington; and Blackburn with Darwen, Blackpool, Cumbria and Lancashire.

2010			2011		
	Entitlement	Allocation		Entitlement	Allocation
Cheshire and the Wirral	13.49	13	Cheshire and the Wirral	13.33	13
Greater Manchester	25.52	26	Greater Manchester	25.55	26
Cumbria	5.15	5	Cumbria	5.09	5
Lancashire	14.55	15	Lancashire	14.51	14
Merseyside (less the Wirral)	10.20	10	Merseyside (less the Wirral)	10.06	10
	68.91			68.54	
Allocation		69			68

5. Members will note that the reduction (albeit very slight) in Lancashire's entitlement to 14.51 makes it the obvious area in which to seek to 'lose' a seat. Additionally, Members will note that the allocation of 26 constituencies to Greater Manchester, the entitlement of which is 25.55, indicates that the pairing of Greater Manchester and Lancashire and the creation of a cross-boundary constituency appears the most effective method through which to achieve this. The entitlement and allocation of the paired areas would total 40.06 and 40 respectively.

6. In seeking to enable this pairing, the Secretariat commenced by considering the interaction between the area comprising the two Cheshire unitary authorities, and the boroughs of Halton, Warrington and Wirral (henceforth referred to as 'Cheshire' for ease) and Greater Manchester. While the 2010 electoral data required the inclusion of some 40,000 'Cheshire' electors in two cross-boundary constituencies with Greater Manchester, the reduced 2011 entitlement enables the allocation of 13 constituencies to the area and the retention of more electors within 'Cheshire'. It is suggested that one cross-boundary constituency with Greater Manchester is created which will include just 11,805 electors (from the Poynton ward) from 'Cheshire'.

7. The inclusion of fewer 'Cheshire' electors in a Greater Manchester constituency allows a scheme to be developed in which Greater Manchester additionally absorbs electors from Lancashire. A cross-boundary constituency, proposed to include 54,523 electors from the north-east of the Borough of Rochdale (in Greater Manchester) and 25,912 electors from the Borough of Rossendale (in Lancashire), allows the required 'loss' of one constituency from Lancashire. Additionally, the pairing of Lancashire with Greater Manchester in this way allows the county boundary between Lancashire and Cumbria to be respected, with the latter allocated five seats. In this respect, the Secretariat noted that if Lancashire and Cumbria were not paired with Greater Manchester, the average electorate per constituency for the review area would be 79,061 which, given the upper electoral limit of 80,473, would render the creation of a viable scheme extremely challenging and likely unachievable (without dividing a significant number of wards).

8. Such an approach additionally enabled the Secretariat to consider Merseyside in isolation from the other review areas and, as detailed below, the application of the 2011 electoral data allowed the Secretariat to re-establish the Members' preferred scheme.

9. Details of the development of each scheme are outlined below. Members will note that, unlike in the descriptions of other regions, the Secretariat has excluded the electorate change lists for constituencies as it was felt that they would not prove particularly helpful due to the extensive alterations within the region.

Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Halton, Warrington and Wirral

10. On considering the proposed Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Halton, Warrington and Wirral ('Cheshire') scheme, Members noted that it had only been possible to create one scheme in which the electorates of all constituencies fell within the 5% parity target.

11. On the application of the 2011 electoral data, the Secretariat noted that the electorates of two constituencies (Chester CC and Macclesfield CC) fell outside the 5% parity target.

12. The Secretariat therefore sought to create a scheme in which all constituencies were returned to within the 5% electoral parity target. Additionally, amendments were made to enable the incorporation of 11,805 electors from the Cheshire East ward of Poynton in a cross-boundary seat in the south-east of Greater Manchester.

Scheme 1 – accepted with some alterations to names and designations

13. In order to return Chester CC to within the 5% electoral parity target it proved necessary to extend the constituency northwards to incorporate both the Ledsham and Willaston ward from Holylake and Neston CC and the Groves and Whitby ward from the Ellesmere Port constituency, and to transfer the Boughton Heath and Vicars Cross ward from Chester to Eddisbury CC. The Secretariat noted that, given both the electoral size and geographical shape of wards in this area, this constituency represented the only viable option in which the City of Chester was not divided.

14. Subsequent to the changes necessary to create a Chester constituency within the 5% electoral parity target, the Ellesmere Port constituency is extended northwards, incorporating the Halton wards of Hale and Ditton. Consequently a seat is created, which the Secretariat proposes be named Ellesmere Port and Frodsham CC, in which both the River Mersey and the Manchester Ship Canal are crossed, despite there being no cross-river transport link at this point.

15. As a result of the inclusion of these Halton wards within Ellesmere Port and Frodsham CC, Halton CC is extended eastwards with resultant amendments to Warrington North BC and Warrington South BC.

16. Macclesfield CC is amended slightly from the 2010 approved scheme to enable the incorporation of 11,805 'Cheshire' electors from the Poynton ward in a Greater Manchester cross-boundary constituency. The boundaries of Crewe and Nantwich CC and Congleton CC are unchanged from the approved 2010 scheme.

17. The constituencies within the Borough of Wirral closely reflect those approved in the 2010 scheme, though the application of the 2011 electoral data enabled the Secretariat to improve the division between the constituencies of Birkenhead and Wallasey. The

coterminosity, however, of constituency boundaries with the borough boundary between Wirral and Cheshire West and Chester is reduced as a result of the western extension of Ellesmere Port and Frodsham CC and northern extension of Chester CC.

18. The boundary of Crewe and Nantwich CC is unchanged both from that of the approved November 2010 scheme and that of the existing constituency (as created following the 5th General Review). Additionally, Congleton CC is unchanged from the approved 2010 scheme. One constituency (Ellesmere Port and Frodsham CC) contains parts of three districts. One district (Cheshire East) is split between six constituencies; two districts Cheshire West and Chester are split between five constituencies; two districts, (Halton and Wirral) are split between four constituencies, and one district (Warrington) is split between three constituencies.

Scheme 2 – rejected

19. In this scheme, the Secretariat sought to propose an alternative to the Ellesmere Port and Frodsham cross-river constituency. Members will note that the consequent scheme necessarily includes a number of unattractive features, such as the division of towns between constituencies.

20. The constituencies within the Borough of Wirral, Chester CC and Macclesfield CC reflect exactly those of scheme 1. However, significant alterations are made elsewhere to compensate for the creation of an Ellesmere Port constituency that does not cross the River Mersey.

21. Rather than extending north across the river, the Ellesmere Port constituency continues eastwards and incorporates the Halton wards of Beechwood, Halton Lea, Heath and Norton South. Additionally, the Cheshire West and Chester ward of Weaver is transferred to Northwich CC. The Secretariat proposes that the resultant constituency be named Ellesmere Port and Runcorn CC.

22. Consequently, the Northwich and Knutsford constituency of scheme 1 is amended, notably extending northwards to gain wards from the boroughs of Halton and Warrington, rather than east to incorporate Knutsford. The Secretariat therefore proposes that the constituency be named Northwich CC. The alterations in the south of the constituency, namely the transfer of the Winsford North and East ward from Eddisbury CC to Northwich CC, result in the division of the town of Winsford between the two constituencies.

23. The town of Knutsford, and surrounding wards, included in the Northwich seat of scheme 1, is instead combined with many of the southern Borough of Warrington wards. The resultant constituency extends from Knutsford to the centre of Warrington, and the Secretariat proposes that it be named Warrington Central and Knutsford CC.

24. Additionally, necessary alterations to Eddisbury CC and Crewe and Nantwich CC result in the division of the town of Nantwich between the two. The Secretariat proposes that the latter be re-named Crewe CC.

25. No constituencies are unchanged from the approved November 2010 scheme.

26. No existing constituencies (as created following the 5th General Review) are unchanged. Two constituencies (Ellesmere Port and Frodsham CC and Nantwich CC) contain parts of three districts. One district (Cheshire East) is split between six constituencies; one district (Cheshire West and Chester) is split between five constituencies; two districts (Warrington and Wirral) are split between four constituencies; and one district (Halton) is split between three constituencies.

Recommendation

27. The Secretariat considers that, while the Ellesmere Port and Frodsham CC of scheme 1 is far from ideal, the negative consequences of avoiding a cross-river constituency (namely, the division of Nantwich and Winsford and the inclusion of Knutsford and the surrounding wards in a constituency extending to the centre of Warrington) far outweigh the benefits. The Secretariat therefore proposes that Members approve scheme 1.

Greater Manchester

28. On considering the proposed November 2010 Greater Manchester scheme, Members noted that it had only been possible to create one viable option, which they approved.

29. On the application of the 2011 electoral data, the Secretariat noted that the electorates of six constituencies (Manchester Ardwick BC, Oldham East and Saddleworth CC, Oldham West and Chadderton BC, Salford and Cheetham BC, Stalybridge and Denton BC, and Stockport BC) fell outside the 5% parity target, all of which were located in the eastern half of the review area. Additionally, as noted by Members in November, seven constituencies crossed the City of Manchester boundary.

30. The Secretariat therefore sought to develop a scheme in which all constituencies were returned to within the 5% electoral parity target and the City of Manchester boundary was better respected. Additionally, amendments were made to enable the incorporation of 11,805 electors from the Cheshire East ward of Poynton in a cross-boundary seat in the south-east of Greater Manchester, and 25,912 electors from the Lancashire Borough of Rossendale in a cross-boundary seat in the north-east.

31. The Secretariat produced two schemes. In the first, amendments are made only to the east of the region while the western section remains unaltered, reflecting exactly the constituencies approved by Members in 2010. In the second, the Secretariat considered whether, in addition to the amendments in the east (as suggested in scheme 1), the application of the 2011 electoral data enabled the improvement of those constituencies in the west of the review area.

Scheme 1 - rejected

32. In this scheme the seats in the western half of the review area represent exactly those that were approved by Members in November 2010.

33. A cross-boundary constituency is created in the south-east which incorporates 11,805 electors from the Cheshire East ward of Poynton in a slightly reconfigured Hazel Grove constituency. The Secretariat proposes that the resultant constituency is re-named Hazel Grove and Poynton CC.

34. Additionally, a further cross-boundary constituency is created in the north-east which includes 25,912 electors from the Lancashire Borough of Rossendale and 54,523 electors from wards in the Borough of Rochdale. The remaining Borough of Rochdale wards (which were previously incorporated into Rochdale CC) are included in a seat containing wards from the north of the Borough of Oldham. The Secretariat proposes that the resultant constituencies are renamed Rochdale North and Rawtenstall CC and Rochdale South BC. Additionally, it is proposed that the amended Oldham constituency is named Oldham and Saddleworth CC.

35. As a result of these alterations, minor amendments are also required to the 2010 scheme constituencies of Cheadle, Denton, Stalybridge and Hyde, and Stockport.

36. For the most part, the City of Manchester boundary is respected in this scheme. Additionally, the constituencies within the City of Manchester, City of Salford and Trafford boroughs are largely based on existing boundaries (as created at the 5th General Review).

37. None of the existing constituencies (as created following the 5th General Review) are unchanged. One constituency (Chadderton and Middleton BC) contains parts of three boroughs. One borough (City of Manchester) is split between six constituencies, five boroughs (Bolton, Oldham, Salford, Stockport and Wigan) are split between four constituencies, and two boroughs (Tameside and Trafford) are split between three constituencies.

Scheme 2 – accepted with some alterations to names

38. In this scheme the Secretariat has made minor alterations to scheme 1 in order to restore the constituency of Wigan (in the west of Greater Manchester) to its existing boundaries (as established following the 5th General Review). Consequently, minor changes are also required to the boundaries of Hindley and Westhoughton CC and Makerfield CC.

39. Two existing constituencies (as created following the 5th General Review) are unchanged (Wigan CC and Bury South BC). One constituency (Chadderton and Middleton BC) contains parts of three boroughs. One borough (City of Manchester) is split between six constituencies, , five boroughs (Bolton, Oldham, Salford, Stockport and Wigan) are split between four constituencies, and two boroughs (Tameside and Trafford) are split between three constituencies.

Recommendation

40. Due to the retention of a greater number of existing seats (as created at the 5th General Review), the Secretariat recommends that Members approve scheme 2.

Cumbria and Lancashire

41. On considering the proposed scheme for Cumbria and Lancashire in November 2010, Members noted that it was not necessary to cross the county boundary between Cumbria and Lancashire. They did not like the division of the City of Preston in scheme 1, nor the inclusion of wards from the south of the City of Preston in a constituency that contained all of the Borough of Ribble Valley. Members considered that Lytham St Annes should not be included in a Blackpool South constituency and the Cleveleys and Fleetwood area should be included in a Blackpool North constituency. Members also noted that the number of electors in the districts of south-east Lancashire meant that they would have to be divided in order to form constituencies with electorates within 5% of the electoral quota. Members selected scheme 3, which included a constituency (Morecambe and Milnthorpe CC) that crossed the Cumbria/Lancashire boundary.

42. On applying the 2011 electoral data to the Members' approved scheme, it was noted that one constituency (Blackpool North and Fleetwood BC) fell outside the electoral parity target. In addition, and due to the need to reduce the number of constituencies within the sub-region by one (from 20 to 19), the Secretariat was required to make significant alterations, whilst remaining mindful of the preferences expressed by Members in November.

43. As previously outlined, in developing the scheme for Greater Manchester the Secretariat created a cross-boundary constituency between Rochdale and Rossendale which absorbed 25,912 electors from Lancashire, thus facilitating the 'loss' of one constituency. Consequently, in the development of the following schemes the Secretariat was able to respect the county boundary between Cumbria and Lancashire, allocating five seats to Cumbria and 14 (plus the electors absorbed in a cross-boundary seat) to Lancashire.

44. Members are presented with two schemes for the area, both of which include an identical cross-boundary Rochdale North and Rawtenstall constituency.

Scheme 1 - rejected

45. As a consequence of the inclusion of Rossendale wards in a cross-boundary constituency, significant amendments are required to the south-east Lancashire constituencies where it proved difficult to develop constituencies that both respected local ties and met the electoral parity target.

46. However, the preferred November 2010 constituencies of Blackburn, Chorley and West Lancashire remain unchanged and very minor alterations are made to the South Ribble constituency.

47. Where possible, the Secretariat has sought to reflect the preferences expressed by Members with regards to the city of Preston and the borough of Blackpool, as outlined in paragraph 41.

48. In Cumbria, the Barrow and Furness constituency is extended to the east and incorporates wards to the south of Kendal. Consequently, the Secretariat proposes that the constituency be re-named Barrow-in-Furness and Ulverston CC. The Secretariat noted, however, that this arrangement resulted in a constituency in which the sole direct transport link between the extremities of the seat is the West Coast Mainline (rail).

49. Additionally, the Copeland constituency is extended eastwards to take in wards to the immediate west of Kendal. However, the northern boundary is moved to become coterminous with the district boundary between Allerdale and Copeland.

50. Carlisle BC is amended to incorporate all but two of the City of Carlisle wards. The remaining wards are included in a large Kendal and Penrith constituency that stretches from Carlisle to the Lancashire border.

51. Four constituencies (Blackpool North and Fleetwood BC, Blackpool South BC, Blackburn BC and Workington CC) remain unchanged from the approved November 2010 scheme.

52. One existing constituency (as created following the 5th General Review) is unchanged (West Lancashire CC). One constituency (Lancaster and Wyre CC) contains parts of five districts and four constituencies (Darwen BC, Fylde CC, Ribble Valley CC and South Ribble CC) contain parts of three districts. Three districts (Preston, South Lakeland, and Wyre) are split between three constituencies.

Scheme 2 – accepted with some alterations to names

53. In scheme 2 the Secretariat sought to address and improve on the above scheme by seeking increased coterminosity with district and borough boundaries, and improving access within constituencies.

54. In Lancashire, the cross-boundary constituency reflects exactly that of scheme 1, as does Blackburn BC. However, an alternative division of towns within south-east Lancashire is proposed.

55. Additionally, minor alterations are made to the constituencies of West Lancashire and South Ribble and further amendments to Chorley CC and Preston BC result in increased coterminosity between constituency and borough boundaries. The Ribble Valley constituency is also altered and includes two City of Preston wards.

56. While Fylde CC is amended to include all wards from the Borough of Fylde (in addition to five wards from Wyre), the Blackpool constituencies are unchanged from scheme 1. The existing boundaries of Morecambe and Lunesdale CC (as created at the 5th General Review) are almost re-established, with consequent minor changes to Lancaster and Wyre CC.

57. In Cumbria, the eastward extension of Barrow-in-Furness and Ulverston CC is minimised by transferring South Lakeland district wards to Kendal and Penrith CC, improving access and communication links within Barrow-in-Furness and Ulverston CC. As a consequence of the inclusion of these South Lakeland district wards in Kendal and Penrith CC, two City of Carlisle wards are transferred from Kendal and Penrith CC to Carlisle CC. Workington CC is subsequently extended northwards to incorporate one City of Carlisle ward, and eastwards towards Penrith. Additionally, the Allerdale ward of Harrington is transferred to Copeland and Windermere CC from Workington, decreasing the coterminosity of the constituency boundary with the boundary between the districts of Allerdale and Copeland.

58. One constituency (Blackburn BC) is unchanged from the approved November 2010 scheme.

59. No existing constituencies (as created following the 5th General Review) remain unchanged. One constituency (Ribble Valley CC) contains parts of four districts, and three constituencies (Copeland and Windermere CC, Darwen BC, and Workington CC) contain parts of three districts. Three districts (Preston, South Lakeland, and Wyre) are split between three constituencies.

Recommendation

60. Due to both the increased coterminosity between constituency and district boundaries and the improved access and communication links within constituencies, the Secretariat recommends that Members approve Scheme 2.

Merseyside (less Wirral)

61. On considering the proposed November 2010 Merseyside scheme, Members noted the difficulties in producing constituencies within the electoral parity target. While Members accepted the proposed scheme, which represented the only valid option, they preferred an alternative in Merseyside in which wards were re-located between the Liverpool constituencies of Riverside, West Derby and Walton. While this latter scheme (y) resulted in a constituency that was marginally outside the 5% target using 2010 electoral data, the Secretariat intended to consider whether it might prove possible upon the application of 2011 electoral figures.

62. On applying the 2011 electoral data to the Commissioners' approved 2010 scheme, it was noted that no constituencies had electorates outside the 5% parity target. Additionally, it was noted that the preferred scheme was also viable using 2011 electoral data.

63. As the latter scheme represents Members' preferences in this area, and the Secretariat does not consider that the electoral figures allow for any further viable schemes, the Commission is presented with the one scheme.

Scheme 1 – accepted with some alterations to names

64. This scheme exactly represents the preferences expressed by Members on visiting the Secretariat in November 2010.

65. In this scheme the area of Merseyside less the Borough of Wirral (which is included in the Cheshire review area) is allocated ten constituencies

66. Two existing constituencies (as created following the 5th General Review) are unchanged (St Helens North BC and St Helens South and Whiston BC). No constituency contains more than three boroughs. One borough (City of Liverpool) is split between six constituencies, one (Knowsley) is split between five constituencies, and another (Sefton) is split between four constituencies.

Recommendation

67. The Secretariat recommends that Members approve scheme 1.

South East region

1. The South East region is currently allocated a total of 84 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 83, a reduction of 1. The electorate of the region is 6,303,428, giving an average electorate per seat of 75,945.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010 scheme)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>South East</i>	6,303,428	83 (-1)					
Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes and Oxfordshire	1,625,170	21	1	15	71%	2	10%
Brighton and Hove, East Sussex, Kent and Medway	1,824,726	24(-1)	1	18	75%	3	13%
			2	19	79%	3	13%
Surrey and West Sussex	1,429,656	19	1	17	89%	5	26%
			2	17	89%	4	21%
Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton	1,312,952	17	1	0	0%	0	0%
			2	0	0%	0	0%
Isle of Wight	110,924	2	1	0	0%	0	0%
			2	0	0%	0	0%
			3	0	0%	0	0%

Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes and Oxfordshire

2. Members preferred the division of the counties in scheme 3, particularly in respect of Aylesbury and Oxford, except for the Milton Keynes area, where they preferred scheme 2. This was incorporated into a new scheme 4, which was accepted by the Members. No constituency crosses the boundary between the former Berkshire and Buckinghamshire, or the boundary between Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. The constituencies of Reading North and Henley CC and Wantage and Hungerford CC cross the boundary between the former Berkshire and Oxfordshire.

3. Of the existing 21 constituencies, 14 had an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota and three (Beaconsfield CC, Slough CC and Witney CC) are unchanged. Three constituencies (Henley CC, Wantage CC and Windsor CC) contain parts of three districts. One district (Wycombe) is divided between four constituencies.

4. Milton Keynes North CC (72,066), Oxford North and Abingdon CC (72,694) and Slough BC (81, 327) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Milton Keynes North CC

5. The wards in the Borough of Milton Keynes have electorates that range from 3,530 to 11,792. Attempts to increase the electorate of Milton Keynes North CC by a simple exchange of wards with Milton Keynes South BC have not proved possible. Therefore, a more major realignment has been necessary.

6. In the proposed scheme, the Milton Keynes Borough wards of Loughton Park (No.12) and Stony Stratford (No.19) have been transferred from Buckingham CC to Milton Keynes South BC. The Milton Keynes Borough wards of Bletchley and Fenny Stratford (No.1) and Eaton Manor (No.6) and the Aylesbury Vale District wards of Great Brickhill (No.13) and Newton Longville (No.21) have been transferred from Milton Keynes South to Buckingham CC. The Milton Keynes Borough wards of Bradwell (No.2) and Campbell Park (No.3) have been transferred from Milton Keynes North CC to Milton Keynes South BC, whilst the Milton Keynes Borough wards of Middleton (No.13), Walton Park (No.20) and Danesborough (No.4) have been transferred from Milton Keynes South BC to Milton Keynes North CC.

7. The effect of the changes are the following electorates:-

Buckingham CC	75,412
Milton Keynes North CC	76,553
Milton Keynes South BC	75,126

Oxford North and Abingdon CC

8. In order to increase the electorate of Oxford North and Abingdon CC, the Secretariat considers that the most satisfactory option is the inward transfer of the City of Oxford ward of Carfax (3) from the neighbouring Oxford constituency.

9. The effect of this change is the following electorates:-

Oxford BC	76, 103
Oxford North and Abingdon CC	76, 569

Slough BC

10. On the 2011 electorates, Slough BC (81,327) has an electorate that is now above the 5% parity target. The Secretariat has therefore moved the Slough Borough ward of Foxborough (9) from Slough BC into Windsor CC.

11. As a result of the change to Slough BC, the electorate of Windsor CC is raised above the 5% parity target. Consequently, the Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead ward of Cox Green (10) has been transferred from Windsor CC to Maidenhead CC. The Secretariat considers that this transfer is particularly desirable as it reunites the ward with the centre of the town of Maidenhead.

12. The effect of these changes are the following electorates:-

Maidenhead CC	80, 009
Slough BC	75, 998
Windsor CC	75, 480

Additional considerations

13. The Secretariat considers that it is appropriate to make some changes to constituency names to reflect the alterations that were made to the original scheme and seeks Members' views. It considers that Henley CC should be renamed Reading North and Henley CC to take account of the crossing of the Oxfordshire and Berkshire county boundary and the inclusion of a number of Reading wards in the constituency. Similarly, the Secretariat suggests Members consider whether Wantage and Didcot CC should be renamed Wantage and Hungerford CC to reflect that the Oxfordshire and Berkshire county boundary has been crossed and that a large area of Berkshire has been included in the constituency.

Existing constituency name	Proposed constituency name
Henley CC	Reading North and Henley CC
Wantage and Didcot CC	Wantage and Hungerford CC

14. The Secretariat has also considered the other constituencies and concluded that the 2011 electorates do not provide an opportunity to make further changes that will improve the provisional scheme agreed by Members.

All changes accepted with some alterations to names and designations

Brighton and Hove, East Sussex, Kent, and Medway

15. When members attended the Secretariat's office in November 2011, they preferred scheme 2, particularly in respect to Brighton and Hove, Dartford and Gravesham. Only one constituency crossed the boundary between East Sussex and Kent.

16. On the 2010 electorates, of the existing 25 constituencies, 10 had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and four (Eastbourne BC, Folkestone and Hythe CC, Hastings and Rye CC and Sittingbourne and Sheppey CC) are unchanged. Three constituencies (The Weald CC, Tonbridge and Staplehurst CC and Tunbridge Wells CC) contain parts of three districts. Three districts (Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling, and Wealden) are divided between four constituencies.

17. Both Folkestone and Hythe CC (84,156) and Lewes CC (80,746) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - rejected

Lewes CC

18. Lewes CC is located between Brighton and Hove Central BC (76,009) and Seaford and Uckfield CC (73,806). Whilst both these constituencies have electorates that are low enough to absorb some of the electors from Lewes CC, it is not possible to transfer electors to Brighton and Hove Central BC, as the wards along the boundary with Lewes have electorates that are too high.

19. The Secretariat therefore proposes that the electorate of Lewes CC be reduced by moving electors into Seaford and Uckfield CC. The Secretariat has therefore transferred the Lewes District ward of Newick (No.11) from Lewes CC to Seaford and Uckfield CC.

20. In addition, the Secretariat proposes that Lewis CC should be renamed Brighton East and Lewes CC as it contains four wards from the City of Brighton and Hove and seeks members' views.

21. The effect of this change is the following electorates:-

Brighton East and Lewes CC	78,782
Seaford and Uckfield CC	75,770

Folkestone and Hythe CC

22. To reduce the electorate of Folkestone and Hythe CC, it has been necessary to seek a solution which involves a number of neighbouring constituencies. It was noted that Folkestone and Hythe CC is surrounded by Ashford CC (80,027), Dover CC (77,390) and Hastings and Rye CC (76,422).

23. The Secretariat proposes that the Borough of Ashford Borough ward of Saxon Shore (No.22) be moved from Folkestone and Hythe CC and included in Ashford CC, as it was in the fourth review. This would increase the electorate of Ashford CC to above the 5% parity target. To compensate, it proposes that the Ashford Borough ward of Downs North (No.8) be moved from Ashford CC and included in Canterbury and Faversham CC and that the Ashford Borough ward of Biddenden (No.3) be transferred from Ashford CC and included in Battle and Cranbrook CC (previously named The Weald CC).

24. The effect of these changes are the following electorates:-

Ashford CC	80,090
Battle and Cranbrook CC	75,826
Canterbury and Faversham CC	78,086
Folkestone and Hythe CC	80,060

25. One disadvantage of this scheme is that a similar approach formed the initial proposals of the Commission at the fifth review. Following the local inquiry the Assistant Commissioner concluded that there was no support for moving the Downs North and

Biddenden wards and that it would break local ties. However, the Secretariat considers that the changed circumstances now warrant this solution in the area.

Scheme 2 – accepted, with alterations to seats 8, 13, 19, and some alterations to names and designations

Lewes CC

26. The same solution for Lewes as in Scheme 1 is suggested for this scheme.

Folkestone and Hythe CC

27. The Secretariat suggests moving the Shepway District wards of Elham and Stelling Minnis (No.2) and North Downs East (No.19) from Folkestone and Hythe CC to Dover CC. In turn, the Dover District ward of Little Stour and Ashstone (No.7) would be moved from Dover CC and be included in Herne Bay and Minster CC (previously named North Thanet CC). These changes not only improve the electorates but the Secretariat considers that the movement of the Little Stour and Ashstone ward arguably produces a better shape for Herne Bay and Minster CC. The Secretariat further considers that as the constituency now includes parts of three districts (Thanet, Dover and Canterbury), Herne Bay and Minster is a more appropriate name.

28. The effect of these changes are the following electorates:-

Dover CC	80,283
Folkestone and Hythe CC	75,866
Herne Bay and Minster CC	78,999

Other Considerations

29. In addition Members are asked to consider the following constituency names for constituencies that have not changed from the approved draft scheme but which the Secretariat suggests are more appropriate:

- Bexhill CC to Bexhill and Heathfield CC, as this better represents the constituent parts
- Brighton and Hove Central BC to Brighton Pavilion and Hove BC, to recognise Pavilion in the name, as it has been previously
- Gravesham CC to Gravesend CC, as the constituency is not coterminous with the Borough of Gravesham and contains parts of the Borough of Dartford. As Gravesend is the most prominent town in the constituency the Secretariat considers that this is a more appropriate name
- Lewes CC to Brighton East and Lewes CC, to recognise that a number of eastern Brighton wards are contained in the constituency

- The Weald CC to Battle and Cranbrook, to more accurately reflect its composition. The Secretariat considers it is particularly important to recognise the fact that the constituency crosses the county boundary between Kent and East Sussex.

Existing constituency name	Proposed constituency name
Bexhill CC	Bexhill and Heathfield CC
Brighton and Hove Central BC	Brighton Pavilion and Hove BC
Gravesham CC	Gravesend CC
Lewes CC	Brighton East and Lewes CC
North Thanet CC	Herne Bay and Minster CC
The Weald CC	Battle and Cranbrook CC

30. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept scheme 2, which it considers improves the Herne Bay and Minster constituency.

Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Portsmouth, and Southampton

31. In December, Members considered that the important issue was where to cross the Solent. They concluded that by combining the western part of the Isle of Wight with the town of Lymington from the District of New Forest, it would mean less disruption to constituencies in the City of Portsmouth. Therefore, they accepted scheme 2, which also resulted in less disruption to the City of Southampton and to the neighbouring Boroughs of Eastleigh and Fareham.

32. On the 2010 electorates of the 19 existing constituencies, eight had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and only one constituency (Gosport BC) is unchanged in the preferred scheme. Four constituencies (Alton CC, Andover CC, Havant CC and Petersfield CC) contain parts of three districts. One district (Basingstoke and Deane) is divided between four constituencies.

33. Both Basingstoke CC (72,336) and Portsmouth BC (82,042) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target. Separate consideration must now be given to the Isle of Wight and this will mean that nearly 40,000 mainland electors, who were provisionally located in a constituency with part of the Isle of Wight, have to be absorbed into Hampshire constituencies. This will have a consequential affect on all the constituencies in the sub-region.

34. The Secretariat considered that the key to this review area was to respect, as a far as practicable, the boundaries of the district of the City of Winchester. Also, particular problems were experienced in Portsmouth and the New Forest, due to geography and the coastline.

Isle of Wight

35. Rule 6(1) requires that two whole constituencies are allocated to the island. Rule 6(3) confirms that the electorates of the two constituencies do not have to be within the 5% parity target. However, in each scheme, it has been the intention of the Secretariat that the two constituencies should have roughly equal electorates. The Secretariat has prepared three options for the distribution of two constituencies to the island.

Scheme 1 – rejected

36. This scheme divides the island into east and west constituencies, dividing the town of Cowes and respecting the natural division of the River Medina. The eastern constituency extends down the coast from East Cowes to Sandown and Shanklin. The western constituency includes the towns of Ventnor, Newport and Godshill. The electorates of this scheme are the most balanced numerically. The following electorates result:-

Isle of Wight East	55, 022
Isle of Wight West	55, 902

Scheme 2 – rejected

37. Similar to scheme 1, this scheme also divides Cowes along the River Medina and creates eastern and western constituencies. The eastern constituency does not extend as far inland and extends further to the south, including the town of Ventnor. The western constituency includes the town of Newport. The following electorates result:-

Isle of Wight East	54, 698
Isle of Wight West	56, 226

Scheme 3 - accepted

38. This scheme divides the island into north and south constituencies and keeps the two largest towns of Cowes and Newport together. The southern constituency is comparatively rural. The following electorates result:-

Isle of Wight North	56, 253
Isle of Wight South	54, 671

Additional considerations

39. The Secretariat considers that reference to the Isle of Wight should be included in both constituency names. Although compass points do not completely reflect any of the proposed constituencies, they are considered to be the best way of achieving this aim.

40. The Secretariat recommends scheme 3.

Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton

Scheme 1 – rejected

41. As this sub-region required a great deal of change due to the exclusion of the Isle of Wight, the Secretariat decided that its starting position should be the constituencies from the fifth general review, rather than those that were accepted at the November meeting. Therefore, the constituencies to the north and the east of this sub-region are similar in shape to those of the fifth general review.

42. The proposed Winchester constituency is much larger than at the fifth review as it is required to absorb many wards that were included in Meon Valley CC at the last review, which no longer exists.

43. The town of Lymington, which had previously been paired with the Isle of Wight, is now included in a New Forest West Constituency. The geography of the New Forest, bounded in the east by Southampton Water, severely restricts the options in this area. This has made it necessary to include Romsey in an admittedly odd-shaped New Forest East constituency.

44. The electorate of Southampton makes it impossible for the city to be completely contained within two constituencies; it has therefore been divided into north and south with the two most westerly wards of the city being included in a radically reconfigured Eastleigh constituency.

45. The Eastleigh constituency from the fifth general review extends to the south and east of Southampton. However, the proposed Southampton Test and Eastleigh constituency extends to the north of Southampton, and includes the two City of Southampton wards of Coxford (No.6) and Redbridge (No.12). The constituency extends to Braishfield to the north of Southampton but does not extend as far south as Hedge End.

46. A newly created Hedge End and Hamble constituency is suggested comprising eight wards that were previously in the south of the Eastleigh constituency, five wards that were in the Fareham constituency and the City of Southampton ward of Bitterne (No.4).

47. The Fareham constituency is also much changed from the fifth review and includes a number of the City of Winchester District wards that were previously part of the Meon Valley constituency, extending north and north-eastwards to include the town of Horndean.

48. In the 2010 accepted scheme, Portsmouth had been divided into north and south and included the two Borough of Fareham wards of Porchester East and Porchester West (Nos.9 and 10). It was not possible to maintain the north/south divide and instead there is an east/west divide. It has been necessary to include the Borough of Fareham ward of Porchester East (No.9) in Portsmouth West and the Borough of Havant ward of Purbrook (No.10) in Portsmouth East BC. The division of Porchester is regrettable but cannot be avoided.

49. The following electorates result from these changes:-

Aldershot CC	77, 125
Andover CC	79, 745
Basingstoke CC	74, 470
East Hampshire CC	76, 565
Fareham and Horndean CC	74, 163
Gosport CC	78, 528
Havant BC	73, 156
Hedge End and Hamble CC	77, 350
New Forest East and Romsey CC	76, 543
New Forest West CC	80, 464
North East Hampshire CC	79, 530
Portsmouth East BC	79, 609
Portsmouth West BC	80, 290
Southampton North BC	75, 266
Southampton South BC	74, 558
Southampton Test and Eastleigh BC	80, 110
Winchester CC	74, 480

Scheme 2 – accepted, with the adoption of Basingstoke CC, North East Hampshire, and North West Hampshire CC from scheme 1, and some alterations to names and designations

50. This scheme attempts to improve on scheme 1 in the north of Hampshire by reconfiguring the North East Hampshire constituency to avoid Basingstoke being completely surrounded by another constituency.

51. This scheme also offers an alternative configuration of the two Southampton constituencies of Southampton Test and Southampton Itchen by creating constituencies that have a north/south axis. The configuration more closely resembles the constituencies at the fifth general review and they are consequently named as such, although they have a different composition from the existing constituencies of the same name.

52. The treatment of the New Forest and Romsey is the same as in Scheme 1 as it was considered that there was no viable alternative.

53. The proposed Eastleigh constituency is similar to that in scheme one. However, it now includes the City of Southampton ward of Swaythling (No.15) rather than City of Southampton wards of Coxford (No.6), and Redbridge (No.12).

54. The following electorates result from these changes:-

Aldershot CC	77, 125
Andover CC	77, 190
Basingstoke CC	77, 703
East Hampshire CC	76, 565
Eastleigh BC	78, 829
Fareham and Horndean CC	74, 163

Gosport CC	78, 528
Havant BC	73, 156
Hedge End and Hamble CC	76, 515
New Forest East and Romsey CC	76, 543
New Forest West CC	80, 464
North East Hampshire CC	79, 852
Portsmouth East BC	79, 609
Portsmouth West BC	80, 290
Southampton Test BC	77, 399
Southampton Itchen BC	74, 541
Winchester CC	74, 480

55. The Secretariat has a neutral position regarding the relative merits of schemes 1 and 2. However, it is brought to Members' attention that the constituencies in Southampton in scheme 2 are more similar to the current Southampton constituencies.

Surrey and West Sussex

56. Members previously noted that there was no need to cross the county boundary between Surrey and West Sussex and neither scheme proposed such a cross county boundary constituency. Members also noted that both the presented schemes only suggested minimal change to bring all of the constituency electorates within 5% of the EQ. Members preferred scheme 2, but did not like the inclusion of the two Selsey wards in Bognor Regis and Littlehampton CC, instead of Chichester CC because there is no direct transport link between Selsey and Bognor Regis. The Secretariat amended scheme 2 to include Selsey in Chichester CC.

57. Of the 19 existing constituencies, 14 have an electorate within 5% of the EQ and five (East Worthing and Shoreham CC, Epsom and Ewell CC, Esher and Walton CC, Mole Valley CC and South West Surrey CC) are unchanged. Three constituencies (Epsom and Ewell BC, Runnymede and Weybridge CC and Woking CC) contain parts of three districts and one constituency (Arundel and South Downs CC) contains parts of four districts. Two districts (Guildford and Mid Sussex) are divided between four constituencies.

58. On the 2011 electorates, Mole Valley CC (72,568) is now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 – accepted with some alterations to names and designations

59. This scheme includes the Waverley District ward of Ewhurst (No 8) in Mole Valley CC, a transfer from the Guildford constituency. Mole Valley CC now contains part of three districts.

60. The effect of this is the following electorates:-

Mole Valley CC	75,772
Guildford CC	74,008

61. The Secretariat does not consider that any further changes are required.

Scheme 2 – rejected

62. Scheme 2 transfers the Mole Valley District ward of Ashstead Common (No.1) from the Epsom and Ewell constituency into Mole Valley CC. This scheme has the advantage of not further crossing the district boundary but it does divide the town of Ashstead.

63. The effect of this is the following electorates:-

Mole Valley CC	75,772
Epsom and Ewell CC	73,712

64. The Secretariat recommends scheme 1. Although it does cross a further district boundary, it is considered that this is preferable to dividing the town of Ashstead.

South West Region

1. The South West region is currently allocated 55 constituencies. The proposed 2013 Review allocation for the region is 53, a reduction of 2.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010 scheme)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>South West</i>	4,042,475	53 (-2)					
Cornwall and Devon	1,291,913	17(-1)	1	17	100%	3	17%
Dorset and Wiltshire	1,079,249	14 (-1)	1	14	100%	3	20%
			2	11	79%	3	20%
Somerset and Gloucestershire	1,671,313	22 (=)	1	16	73%	5	23%
			2	14	64%	5	23%

Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth and Torbay

2. On visiting the office of the Secretariat in November 2010, Members were presented with three schemes to consider.

3. Members noted that the principal issue was where to cross the county boundary between Cornwall and Devon (and Plymouth). They considered it would be preferable to cross the county boundary in the north, as this would not result in an unacceptable division of Plymouth between constituencies. They also noted that the scheme would result in the creation of a large Dartmoor constituency.

4. The Secretariat had created a third scheme, which was a minor variation of scheme 1, which contained the 'northern cross-boundary' constituency, but which had a Mid Devon CC that only contained parts of four districts instead of parts of five. This was accepted by Members, who preferred the constituencies in Cornwall, which followed the east-west direction of the coastlines, rather than dividing the county on a north-south basis with parts of both coastlines in constituencies.

5. On applying the 2011 electoral data to the Members' preferred 2010 scheme, it was noted that no constituencies had electorates outside the 5% parity target. As the Secretariat considered that there were no improvements to be made to the preferred scheme, the Commission is presented with the one scheme.

Scheme 1 – accepted with some alterations to names

6. This scheme reflects exactly the scheme that the Members approved on visiting the Secretariat in November 2010.

7. Three of the existing 18 constituencies (as created at the 5th review) are unchanged (Exeter BC, North Devon CC and Torbay CC). One constituency (Newton Abbot CC) contains parts of three districts and two (Mid Devon CC and Tavistock and Plympton CC) contain parts of four districts. One district (South Hams) is divided between four constituencies. Five constituencies (Bideford and Bude CC, Plymouth Sutton BC, Tavistock and Plympton CC, Totness CC and Newton Abbot CC) cross county or unitary authority boundaries.

Recommendation

8. The Secretariat recommends that Members approve Scheme 1.

Dorset and Wiltshire

9. On visiting the office of the Secretariat in November 2010, Members were initially presented with two schemes.

10. Members noted that there were limited options to create a constituency across the boundary between Dorset and Wiltshire and that in both schemes the constituency contained the towns of Shaftesbury (Dorset) and Warminster (Wiltshire). Members preferred the division of Swindon in scheme 2, which represented no change, and preferred the division of Bournemouth in scheme 2, but they considered that Christchurch CC suggested in scheme 1 was better than in scheme 2 in which the seat looped round the north of Bournemouth.

11. The Secretariat prepared a composite scheme (scheme 3) to take account of the decisions taken by Members. However, it was noted that the resultant scheme produced a Trowbridge constituency with an electorate of 72,064 - 5 electors below the 5% threshold. The Secretariat then made minor alterations by moving one ward from Devizes CC to Trowbridge CC and one ward from Salisbury CC to Devizes CC. Members were content with this arrangement (scheme 4), but considered that the original solution would be preferable if the 2011 electorates increased to allow it.

12. On the application of 2011 electoral data to the Members' preferred scheme (3), it was noted that one constituency, Salisbury BC, had an electorate of 81,423 and therefore fell outside the 5% electoral parity target. The Secretariat therefore considered the application of the 2011 figures to the composite scheme (4) and noted that no constituencies had electorates outside the 5% electoral parity target.

13. Members are presented with two schemes to consider, one of which reflects the approved scheme (4), while the other seeks to reflect as near as possible the preferences expressed by Members in scheme (3).

Scheme 1 (posted 6) – rejected

14. This scheme reflects exactly the scheme that the Members approved on visiting the Secretariat in November 2010 (scheme 4).

15. Three of the existing 15 constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged (Swindon North CC, Swindon South CC and West Dorset CC). One constituency (South Dorset CC) contains parts of three districts and one constituency (Blandford Forum and Wimborne CC) contains parts of four districts. One district (Wiltshire) is divided between four constituencies. Three constituencies (Warminster and Shaftesbury CC, Bournemouth East BC and Blandford Forum and Wimborne CC) cross county or unitary authority boundaries.

Scheme 2 – accepted with some alterations to names

16. In this scheme the Secretariat have sought to re-unite the Wiltshire wards of Ludgershall and Tidworth to better reflect the preferences expressed by Members when considering the 2010 schemes.

17. It has not, however, proved possible to include both wards in Salisbury CC (as in 2010 scheme 3) due to the geographical and electoral size of wards in the region. Rather, this scheme transfers the Ludgershall ward from Salisbury CC to Devizes CC, and consequently, in order to maintain constituency electorates within the 5% parity target, transfers The Lavingtons and Erlestoke ward from Devizes CC to Warminster and Shaftesbury CC, and the Tisbury ward from Warminster and Shaftesbury CC to Salisbury CC.

18. The effect of these changes results in the following electorates:

Salisbury CC	77,340
Devizes CC	76,830
Warminster and Shaftesbury CC	78,810

19. As in scheme 1, three of the existing 15 constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged (Swindon North CC, Swindon South CC and West Dorset CC). One constituency (South Dorset CC) contains parts of three districts and one constituency (Blandford Forum and Wimborne CC) contains parts of four districts. One district (Wiltshire) is divided between four constituencies. Three constituencies (Warminster and Shaftesbury CC, Bournemouth East BC and Blandford Forum and Wimborne CC) cross county or unitary authority boundaries.

Recommendation

20. While the constituency shapes of scheme 2 are less attractive than those of scheme 1, the Secretariat considers that this disadvantage is outweighed by the advantage of locating both the Ludgershall and Tidworth wards within Devizes CC (which reflects the existing arrangement as created following the 5th Review).

Somerset, Gloucestershire, Bristol and Bath

21. On visiting the office of the Secretariat in November 2010, Members were presented with four schemes to consider.

22. Members noted both that there was no change to constituency boundaries in the City of Bristol and the problems associated with the need to cross the River Severn in order to expand the electorate of the existing Forest of Dean constituency. Members preferred the division of Gloucestershire as suggested in scheme 1, the division of the Borough of Taunton Deane in scheme 4, and the division of central Somerset in scheme 3, whereby the towns of Shepton Mallet and Wells were in the same constituency, and the towns of Glastonbury and Street were not in a constituency that contained parts of the coast.

23. The Secretariat created a fifth scheme which took account of all these requirements, except for the division of the town of Street between Somerton and Glastonbury CC and Wells CC. The Secretariat hoped to resolve this division when the 2011 electoral figures became available.

24. On applying the 2011 electorate data to the Members' preferred scheme, it was noted that one constituency, Bristol West CC, had an electorate of 82,503 and therefore fell outside the 5% parity target. The Secretariat therefore sought to create a scheme which both returned the Bristol West CC electorate to within the 5% parity target and resolved the issue of the divided Street wards.

25. Members are presented with two schemes to consider, both of which resolve the Bristol West CC electorate in the same manner, but with different options for reuniting the divided Street wards.

Scheme 1 – accepted

26. This scheme returns the constituency of Bristol West to within the 5% electoral parity target by transferring the Easton ward from Bristol West BC to Bristol East BC and, in order to restore the constituency of Bristol East to within the electoral parity target, the Staple Hill ward from Bristol East BC to Kingswood and Keynsham CC.

27. The Secretariat considers that the resulting amended constituencies are an improvement on those of the 2010 scheme in that the City of Bristol district boundary is respected. Additionally, the Secretariat noted that a counter-proposal in the 5th review recommended that the Easton ward be included in Bristol East BC, rather than Bristol West BC, though the Assistant Commissioner rejected it at the time.

28. Additionally, the scheme re-unites the Street wards that were previously necessarily divided between Somerton and Glastonbury CC and Wells CC. This is achieved through the transfer of the Street West ward from Wells CC to Somerton and Glastonbury CC, and the Ashwick, Chilcompton & Stratton ward from North East Somerset BC to Wells CC. The consequence is that the scheme is much improved in that all Street wards are contained within Somerton and Glastonbury CC. However, the transfer of the Ashwick, Chilcompton & Stratton ward does produce a narrowing between the north and south of the North East

Somerset constituency at the boundary between the districts of Bath and North East Somerset, and Mendip.

29. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:

Bristol East BC	77,671
Bristol West BC	74,179
Kingswood and Keynsham CC	79,626
Somerton and Glastonbury CC	77,075
Wells CC	75,419

30. Five of the existing 22 constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged (Bristol North West BC, Bristol South BC, Cheltenham BC, North Somerset CC and Weston-Super-Mare CC). Five constituencies (Bridgwater and West Somerset CC, Forest of Dean CC, Tewkesbury CC, The Cotswolds CC and Yate and Tetbury CC) contain parts of three districts. One district (South Gloucestershire) is divided between four constituencies. Four constituencies (Yeate and Tetbury CC, Stroud CC, Kingswood and Keynsham BC and North East Somerset CC) cross county or unitary authority boundaries.

Scheme 2 – rejected

31. In this scheme the constituencies within the City of Bristol reflect exactly those of scheme 1.

32. Additionally, the Street West ward is transferred, as in scheme 1, from Wells CC to Somerton and Glastonbury CC. However, in order to compensate for the impact this move has on the electorate of Wells CC, the Secretariat has transferred the Huntspill and Pawlett ward from Bridgwater and West Somerset CC to Wells CC, and the Milverton and North Deane ward from Taunton Deane to Bridgwater and West Somerset CC.

33. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:

Bridgwater and W Somerset CC	74,947
Bristol East BC	77,671
Bristol West BC	74,179
Kingswood and Keynsham CC	79,626
Somerton and Glastonbury CC	77,075
Taunton Deane CC	78,177
Wells CC	74,762

34. As in scheme 1, five of the existing 22 constituencies (as created at the 5th Review) are unchanged (Bristol North West BC, Bristol South BC, Cheltenham BC, North Somerset CC and Weston-Super-Mare CC). Five constituencies (Bridgwater and West Somerset CC, Forest of Dean CC, Tewkesbury CC, The Cotswolds CC and Yate and Tetbury CC) contain parts of three districts. One district (South Gloucestershire) is divided between four constituencies. Four constituencies (Yeate and Tetbury CC, Stroud CC, Kingswood and Keynsham BC and North East Somerset CC) cross county or unitary authority boundaries.

Recommendation

35. Considering both the improvements to the City of Bristol constituencies that result from returning Bristol West BC to within the electoral parity target, and the reunification of the Street wards, and their containment within Somerton and Glastonbury CC, with minimal disruption to other seats, the Secretariat recommends that Members approve Scheme 1.

West Midlands Region

1. The West Midlands region is currently allocated a total of 59 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 54, a reduction of 5. The electorate of the region is 4,115,668, giving an average electorate per seat of 76,216.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010 scheme)			Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
West Midlands	4,115, 668	54 (-5)						
Herefordshire, Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin, Worcestershire	138,063	12 (-1)	1	12	100%	4	31%	
	228,607		2	10	83%	3	23%	
Staffordshire, Stoke-on-Trent	121,292	11 (-1)	1	9	81%	2	17%	
	436,192							
Warwickshire, West Midlands (less Coventry)	654,692	28 (-3)	1	26	92%	0	0%	
Coventry	224,755	3	1	3	100%	3	100%	
			2	0	0%	0	0%	

Herefordshire, Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin, and Worcestershire

2. Members preferred scheme 1, except for the inclusion of a Wychavon District ward in the Worcester constituency. Members considered that Worcester BC should just contain the City of Worcester. The Secretariat produced an amended version of scheme 1 to take account of this preference.

3. On the 2010 electorates, of the thirteen existing constituencies, seven had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and four (North Shropshire CC, Shrewsbury CC, Worcester BC and Wyre Forest CC) are unchanged. One constituency (Malvern and Ledbury CC) contains parts of three constituencies. One district (Shropshire) is divided between four constituencies.

Scheme 1 – accepted

4. All constituencies in the accepted schemes still have electorates that are within the 5% parity target. No changes are therefore required.

Scheme 2 – rejected

5. Although the Commission is not required to create constituencies that are close to the EQ (except for an adherence to the 5% parity target) the Secretariat has produced an alternative scheme which reduces the disparity between Shrewsbury CC and the EQ, from 2,663 to 266. This has been achieved by moving the Herefordshire ward of Hollington (No.17), from Ludlow and Leominster CC and including it in Shrewsbury CC. The disparity between the electorate of Ludlow and Leominster CC and the EQ is slightly reduced from 1,270 to 1,127.

6. The Secretariat also suggests one name change from Bridgnorth and Telford South CC to Telford South and Bridgnorth CC. The Secretariat considers this to be more consistent with the naming of the Telford North and The Wrekin constituency.

7. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Ludlow and Leominster CC	75,514
Shrewsbury CC	76,375

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent

8. Members preferred scheme 3, which included wards from Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough in the same constituency as wards from the north of the City of Stoke-on-Trent. This was considered preferable to including the town of Stone in a constituency with wards from the south of the City of Stoke-on-Trent. Members also considered that the District of Staffordshire Moorlands should form a constituency on its own. The Secretariat presented a version of scheme 3, which did not divide the town of Penkridge between constituencies and this was accepted by Members.

9. Of the twelve existing constituencies, five had an electorate within 5% of the EQ and two (Burton CC and Cannock Chase CC) are unchanged. One constituency (Lichfield CC) contains parts of three districts. No district is divided between four or more constituencies.

Scheme 1 – accepted

10. In the review area one constituency, Kidsgrove and Tunstall CC (71,933) has a 2011 electorate that is outside of 5% parity target. In order to bring all constituencies electorates within the 5% of the EQ the Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough ward of Madeley (No.13) has been moved from Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stone CC and has been included in Kidsgrove and Tunstall CC.

11. No other changes were considered necessary or desirable. To have done so, would have resulted in more significant changes across the review area altering a number of well established constituencies.

12. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Kidsgrove and Tunstall CC	75,352
Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stone CC	73,517

13. Members noted that the Secretariat had managed to create two alternative schemes that had all constituency electorates within 5%, although one of these schemes crossed the county boundary between Staffordshire and West Midlands. Members rejected the alternative that crossed that boundary and accepted scheme 3, which was confined to the West Midlands. They did consider that Halesowen and Stourbridge CC might be improved by linking Halesowen with Rowley Regis and Stourbridge with Dudley South, but this was not possible given the ward electorates.

14. Of the existing thirty-one constituencies, only nine have an electorate within 5% of the EQ and only three (Coventry North East BC, Coventry North West BC and Coventry South BC) are unchanged. Three constituencies (Kenilworth and Dorridge CC, Meriden CC and Walsall South BC) contain parts of three districts. Two districts (Sandwell and Wolverhampton) are divided between four constituencies, one district (Dudley) is divided between five constituencies, one district (Sandwell) is divided between six constituencies and one district (Birmingham) is divided between thirteen constituencies.

15. Just one constituency in the review area, Warwick and Leamington CC (72,597) now has an electorate that is outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 – *accepted with some alterations to names and designations*

16. The Secretariat has transferred the Stratford on Avon District wards of Snitterfield (No. 19) and Claverdon (No. 7) from Stratford-on-Avon CC to Warwick and Leamington CC. This has resulted in both constituencies being within 5% of the EQ. It was necessary to transfer only the Snitterfield (No.19) ward, but the Secretariat considered that to do so would have created a slightly unsatisfactory shape in the Stratford-on-Avon constituency and that the further inclusion of the Claverdon (No. 7) ward improved this.

17. The name of the Stratford-on-Avon constituency has been changed to Stratford-Upon-Avon. The town is called Stratford-Upon-Avon, but the district name is Stratford-on-Avon. This has caused some confusion in the past and, since the constituency does not contain the whole of district, it is considered that, on balance, Stratford-Upon-Avon is likely to lead to less confusion.

18. The Secretariat considered whether changes could be made to other constituencies, particularly in the West Midlands conurbation, and attempted an alternative distribution of constituencies. However, in view of the very large ward sizes – particularly in Birmingham - this was not possible.

19. The Secretariat suggests that Members might reconsider whether the names of Wolverhampton North East BC and Wolverhampton South West BC should be shortened to Wolverhampton North BC and Wolverhampton South BC, respectively, as suggested in the scheme.

20. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Warwick and Leamington CC	76,171
Stratford-Upon-Avon CC	72,902

Coventry

Scheme 1 – *accepted*

21. No change is required in Coventry as all three constituencies are within the 5% of the 2011 EQ.

Scheme 2 – *rejected*

22. An alternative scheme has been produced. This scheme creates three completely new constituencies, with one constituency across the North and two in the South rather than two in the North and one in the South.

23. The Secretariat considers that it could be argued that this results in a better mixture of rural and urban areas in each of the constituencies compared to the current constituencies. However it has no preference and both schemes are presented to the members for their consideration.

24. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Coventry North BC	74,412
Coventry South East BC	75,848
Coventry South West BC	74,495

Yorkshire and the Humber Region

1. The Yorkshire and the Humber region is currently allocated a total of 54 constituencies. The proposed 2013 allocation for the region is 50, a reduction of 4. The electorate of the region is 3,848,942 giving an average electorate per seat of 76,979.

Review Area	Electorate	Proposed Allocation	Schemes	Unchanged approved seats (2010 Review)		Unchanged existing seats (5 th Review)	
<i>Yorkshire and the Humber</i>	3,848,942	50 (-4)					
East Riding of Yorkshire and Kingston upon Hull	448,306	6 (=)	1	6	100%	0	0%
North East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and South Yorkshire	1,214,835	16 (-2)	1	5	31%	1	6%
			2	4	25%	1	6%
North Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and York	2,185,801	28 (-2)	1	24	86%	1	4%
			2	5	18%	0	0%

East Riding of Yorkshire and Kingston upon Hull

2. The Secretariat had prepared two schemes and Members noted that both of the schemes presented included the town of Goole in a constituency that also included the town of Driffield. Members considered that Goole should be in a constituency with wards along the northern bank of the River Humber. The Secretariat created two additional schemes which met Members requirements. Members accepted scheme 4.

3. On the 2010 electorates, none of the six existing constituencies had an electorate within 5% of the EQ. One district (East Riding of Yorkshire) is divided between five constituencies.

4. All of the constituencies in the selected scheme still have electorates that are within the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 – *accepted with an alteration to a name*

5. There is no change to any of the proposed constituencies as they are all within 5% of the electoral quota.
6. The Secretariat has considered the constituencies and concluded that the 2011 electorates do not provide an opportunity to make further changes that will improve the provisional scheme.
7. The Secretariat recommends the acceptance of scheme 1.

North East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and South Yorkshire

8. The Secretariat had prepared two schemes and Members noted that there was only one division of North East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and Sheffield possible in order to achieve constituencies with electorates within 5% of the EQ. Members preferred the division of Doncaster in scheme 1 and that of Barnsley in Scheme 2. The Secretariat produced an amended scheme that took account of these preferences and two constituencies (Doncaster Central BC and Rother Valley CC) are unchanged. Two constituencies (Barnsley East and Mexborough CC and Barnsley West CC) contain parts of three districts. One district (Doncaster) is divided between four constituencies, one district (Barnsley) is divided between five constituencies, and two districts (Rotherham and Sheffield) are divided between six constituencies.

9. Four of the seventeen existing constituencies in North East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire and South Yorkshire have an electorate within 5% of the EQ.

10. Barnsley Central BC (72,342), Brigg and Immingham CC (72,350), Scunthorpe CC (72,359) and Sheffield Central BC (82,916) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 - *rejected*

Barnsley Central BC

11. In the original scheme, the Barnsley Borough ward of Cudworth (No.2) was included in Barnsley East and Mexborough CC. In order to increase the electorate of Barnsley Central BC, it was necessary to include the Cudworth ward in Barnsley Central BC and the Barnsley Borough ward of Kingstone (No.10) in Barnsley West CC. This meant that changes had to be made to neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

Sheffield Central BC

12. In the original scheme, the Rotherham Borough ward of Brinsworth and Catcliffe (No.3) was included in Sheffield Central BC. In order to reduce the electorate of Sheffield Central BC, it was necessary to include the Brinsworth and Catcliffe ward in Rother Valley CC. This meant that changes had to be made to neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

Scunthorpe CC

13. In the original scheme, the North Lincolnshire Borough ward of Burringham and Gunness (No.10) was included in Don Valley and Axholme CC. In order to increase the electorate of Scunthorpe CC, it was necessary to include the Burringham and Gunness ward in Scunthorpe CC. This meant that changes had to be made to neighbouring constituencies to bring them within the 5% parity target.

Brigg and Immingham CC

14. In the original scheme, the North East Lincolnshire Borough ward of East Marsh (No.2) was included in Grimsby and Cleethorpes BC. In order to increase the electorate of Brigg and Immingham CC, it was necessary to include the East Marsh ward in Brigg and Immingham CC and the North East Lincolnshire Borough ward of Waltham (No.12) in Grimsby and Cleethorpes BC.

15. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Barnsley Central BC	72,861
Barnsley East and Mexborough CC	74,838
Barnsley West CC	73,191
Brigg and Immingham CC	74,064
Don Valley and Axholme CC	80,355
Doncaster North CC	80,006
Grimsby and Cleethorpes BC	73,182
Rother Valley CC	72,896
Rotherham BC	72,812
Scunthorpe CC	75,401
Sheffield Central BC	73,883

Scheme 2 – *accepted with an alteration to a name*

16. The Secretariat has proposed an alternative scheme that better respects borough boundaries in South Yorkshire. No constituencies are divided between more than two districts. Barnsley is divided between four constituencies and Sheffield is divided between six constituencies.

17. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Barnsley North CC	74,668
Barnsley South CC	74,858
Barnsley West and Ecclesfield CC	73,081
Brigg and Immingham CC	77,195
Don Valley CC	75,432
Doncaster Central BC	72,856
Doncaster North CC	78,563
Grimsby and Cleethorpes BC	78,921
Rother Valley CC	73,068
Rotherham and Attercliffe BC	73,631

Scunthorpe CC	77,852
Sheffield Central BC	73,171
Wentworth CC	73,228

18. The Secretariat considers that scheme 2 is an improvement upon scheme 1 in that it respects more borough boundaries, particularly between Barnsley and Rotherham, Barnsley and Doncaster, and Doncaster and Rotherham. The Secretariat is of the view that these advantages outweigh the potential drawbacks of the alteration to the existing Doncaster Central BC and the division of the Isle of Axholme between two constituencies.

North Yorkshire, West Yorkshire and York

19. The Secretariat had prepared three schemes and Members noted that the number of options open to the Secretariat within West Yorkshire was very limited and that constituencies would have to be created that contained part of the City of Leeds with part of the Borough of Harrogate, and part of the City of Wakefield with part of the District of Selby. Members were content with these proposed constituencies. They considered that it was important to keep the towns of Scarborough and Whitby together, that there should be a York Central constituency and that the town of Richmond should be kept with Richmondshire. Members therefore accepted scheme 1.

20. On the 2010 electorates, fourteen of the existing thirty constituencies had an electorate within 5% of the EQ, but only one constituency (Scarborough and Whitby CC) is unchanged. One constituency (Skipton and Ripon CC) contains parts of three districts and one constituency (Malton CC) contains parts of four districts. One district (Wakefield) is divided between six constituencies, one district (Bradford) is divided between seven constituencies and one district (Leeds) is divided between eight constituencies.

21. Two constituencies, Leeds North BC (80,534) and Normanton CC (72,484) have electorates that are now outside the 5% parity target.

Scheme 1 – *accepted with some alterations to names and designations*

Leeds North BC

22. In the original scheme, the Leeds City wards of Moortown (No.24) and Roundhay (No.30) were included in Leeds North BC. It is proposed to include these wards in Leeds North West and Nidderdale CC and the Leeds City wards of Kirkstall (No.22) and Weetwood (No.32) in Leeds North BC.

Normanton CC

23. In the original scheme, the Wakefield City wards of Crofton, Ryhill and Walton (No.5), Wakefield Rural (No.18) and Wakefield South (No.19) are included in Normanton CC. It is proposed to include these wards in a renamed Hemsworth and Wakefield South CC and to include the Wakefield wards of Knottingley (No.9), Pontefract North (No.12) and Pontefract South (No.13) in a renamed Normanton and Pontefract CC. The name of the Wakefield and Dewsbury constituency is changed to Dewsbury and Wakefield West to minimise confusion.

24. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Hemsworth and Wakefield South CC	74,290
Leeds North BC	79,095
Leeds North West and Nidderdale CC	79,439
Normanton and Pontefract CC	77,289

Scheme 2 - *rejected*

25. The Secretariat has proposed an alternative scheme in which no constituencies are left unchanged. Five constituencies contain parts of three districts (Elmet and Rothwell CC, Malton CC, Richmond and Thirsk CC, Selby and Tadcaster CC and Skipton and Ripon CC) Three districts (Harrogate, Kirklees and City of Wakefield) are divided between six constituencies, one district (Bradford) is divided between seven constituencies, and one district (Leeds) is divided between ten constituencies.

26. This scheme removes the only constituency containing parts of four districts (Malton CC), but only at the expense of more poorly shaped constituencies, more crossing of boundaries and more constituencies divided between districts.

27. The effect of the changes results in the following electorates:-

Bradford Central BC	75,694
Bradford West CC	76,942
Calder Valley CC	76,041
Dewsbury BC	75,906
Elmet and Rothwell CC	76,409
Halifax BC	80,225
Harrogate and Knaresborough CC	76,368
Hemsworth CC	76,284
Huddersfield North and Colne Valley CC	80,444
Huddersfield South and Holmfirth CC	79,931
Leeds East BC	79,242
Leeds North and Nidderdale CC	79,618
Leeds North West BC	79,095
Leeds South BC	76,380
Malton CC	73,561
Mirfield CC	79,862
Normanton and Castleford BC	77,470
Pudsey BC	79,790
Richmond and Thirsk CC	78,236
Scarborough and Whitby CC	80,329
Selby and Tadcaster CC	79,213
Skipton and Ripon CC	79,638
York Outer CC	78,236

28. The Secretariat recommends that Members accept scheme 1, which is considered to be the most satisfactory division of Leeds and Wakefield between constituencies, given the size of the ward electorates in these two cities.

The electorates of the 502 English constituencies*

Region	e = electorate size											Seats
	e>105%	105%>e >104%	104%>e >103%	103%>e >102%	102%>e >101%	101%>e >99%	99%>e >98%	98%>e >97%	97%>e >96%	96%>e >95%	95%>e	
Eastern	0	3	6	5	7	13	4	5	7	6	0	56
East Midlands	0	4	3	4	5	7	6	6	5	4	0	44
London	0	14§	7	10	7	12	6	2	5	5	0	68
North East	0	2	1	2	2	3	5	4	0	7	0	26
North West	0	11	12	9	3	12	3	6	5	7#	0	68
South East	0	8	7	5	5	22	12	7	9	6	2~	83
South West	0	3	2	6	5	12	8	5	9	3	0	53
West Midlands	0	2	5	3	5	12	12	3	7	5	0	54
Yorkshire and the Humber	0	6	8	6	6	6	3	5	4	6	0	50
Total	0	53	51	50	45	99	59	43	51	49	2	502
Percentage of total	0.00	10.56	10.16	9.96	8.96	19.72	11.75	8.57	10.16	9.76	0.40	

The electoral quota is 76,641 and the 5% parity targets are 72,810 and 80,473

* based on the options recommended by the Secretariat

§ One constituency has an electorate of 80,473

One constituency has an electorate of 72,810

~ The two Isle of Wight constituencies

1. An extract from the minutes of the meeting 24 May 2010, relating to the decisions taken in respect of the designation and naming of constituencies is set out below for information.

8. THE DESIGNATION AND NAMING OF CONSTITUENCIES (BCE/2010/Paper 14)

8.1 Members considered the policy that is adopted in respect of the designation of constituencies (as county or borough constituencies) and their naming.

Designation of Parliamentary constituencies

8.2 Section 3(4) of the 1986 Act, requires that when a Commission submits a report to the Secretary of State, it should recommend that each constituency be designated as a “Borough” or a “County” constituency. The Act, however, contains no guidance as to how the Commission should determine the designation.

8.3 The reason for the need to give each constituency a designation appears to be Section 24(1) of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (as amended) which stipulates who shall be the Returning Officer in “Borough” and “County” constituencies. Where constituencies contain parts of more than one district, the MoJ decides which district will undertake the Returning Officer duties and arrange for a Statutory Instrument to be made confirming its decision. From the Boundary Commission’s First Periodical Report in 1954, each constituency is referred to as a “County Constituency” (CC) or a “Borough Constituency” (BC). This practice has been adopted in each of the Commission’s four subsequent periodical reports.

8.4 Members noted that, as the 1986 Act contains no guidance as to the circumstances in which a constituency should be designated as a CC or a BC, it is necessary for them to determine how they will allocate a designation. At the second general review, the Commission took the view that it would designate a constituency as a CC where it “...contained more than a token rural electorate...” and this policy was continued at the third general review. For the fourth general review, the Commission altered the policy so that a CC designation would be allocated to a constituency which had “more than a small rural element” and the amended policy was continued at the fifth general review.

8.5 Prior to the fifth general review, the Commission decided that it should not try to adopt any measure of urban/rural density because, whatever level of density was decided upon, it would be fairly arbitrary and it was far from clear that the relevant information (to accurately calculate density) would be available throughout a review.

- 8.6 At the same time, the Commission also decided that it should be free to change the designation of a constituency, even when little or no change was recommended to the external boundary of the constituency, as this would allow it to take account of greater urban development that might have taken place since the preceding review was undertaken. For example, at the second general review the composition of the Spelthorne constituency was not altered, but it was designated a BC, rather than a CC. Conversely, at the fourth general review, the Wigan constituency had one urban ward removed and was designated a CC, rather than a BC.
- 8.7 Members recalled that in November 2007, those Members who completed the fifth general review undertook a review of the 1986 Act. The purpose of the review was to ensure that if the Government undertook a review of the legislation, as had been recommended by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL), new Members would be able to consider their views and draw their own conclusions.
- 8.8 During the review of the 1986 Act, the Members noted that in the evidence given to the CSPL by Professors Butler and MacLean, the two academics submitted that there was no reason to preserve the distinction between borough and county constituencies. Members noted that the term “small rural element” which they had decided on was open to interpretation and debate. They also saw little, useful, purpose in retaining the distinction between borough and county constituencies. However, they recognised that other interested parties might consider that retaining the designations would be useful, given that they currently affected the level of expenses a candidate was allowed to claim and who the Returning Officer at an election should be.
- 8.9 Members at that time considered that if it was decided that the designations should be retained, the legislation should provide clear guidance as to what constitutes a borough or county constituency. The current Members agreed.

Naming of Parliamentary constituencies

- 8.10 Section 3(4) of the 1986 Act requires that when the Commission submits a report to the Secretary of State, it should recommend a name for each constituency. The only statutory criterion that the Commission must fulfil is contained in Rule 3: this requires that the constituency that contains the City of London must include reference to the City in its name.
- 8.11 Prior to the fifth general review, the Commission considered the background to the naming conventions adopted at the fourth general review. From that position, it decided to adopt a policy that was very similar to that of its predecessors:-
- where constituencies remain largely unchanged, we usually recommend retention of the existing names,
 - constituency names are likely to be altered only where there is good reason for change, e.g. where the renaming of a local authority area makes the name no longer appropriate,

- where the boundaries of a constituency have been redrawn to the extent that the existing name is no longer appropriate, or for a new constituency, we normally recommend a name that reflects the name of the district, borough or unitary authority wholly or principally contained in the constituency,
- we adopt compass point names when there is not a more suitable option, and the compass point may form either a prefix or a suffix to the name, depending on which seems more appropriate or euphonious in the circumstances of the particular case,
- where a provisionally recommended name is strongly objected to, we will normally be prepared to publish revised recommendations if there is a suitable alternative which generally commands greater local support, and
- we prefer recommending shorter names than longer ones.

8.12 Members considered that, whilst the policy set out above would be suitable for the sixth general review, some further alteration to the policy may be necessary in light of the requirements of a reducing review. A reducing review could see the electoral size of the constituencies expand from 70,000 to 77,000 and many constituencies may encompass a greater geographical area. Also, it might not be possible to name constituencies after the districts from which the majority might be formed, as it was likely that district boundaries would be crossed far more than had been the case in the past, and the creation of unitary authorities in some areas of the country had rendered districts, and therefore their names, obsolete.

8.13 Experience from the fifth general review suggested that the naming of constituencies is a matter of great importance to all involved and participants will wish to see their town or locality have its identity included in the constituency name. With the greater size of the geographical areas that will be covered by the constituencies created under a reducing review, it is possible that there will be demands for constituency names to reflect the three, four or more towns and localities contained within them.

8.14 Members noted that during the fifth general review in Scotland, the Commission was required to reduce the number of constituencies from 72 to 59. This resulted in many of the more rural constituencies encompassing a far greater geographical area than was previously the case. This, in turn, led the Scottish Commission to recommend constituency names that reflected the areas encompassed, an example of which was Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch and Strathspey CC.

8.15 Members also agreed with the conclusions reached during the review of the 1986 Act in November 2007, that every constituency should be allocated a concise name that is reflective of the area it represents and that the naming of constituencies should be entirely at its discretion.

Order in which the regions will be considered by the Members

Monday 16 May

- 1) South East (Mia Spreadbury/Glenn Reed)
- 2) North East (Mia Spreadbury/Glenn Reed)

Reserve = West Midlands (Mia Spreadbury/Glenn Reed)

Tuesday 17 May

- 1) West Midlands (Mia Spreadbury/Glenn Reed)
- 2) North West (Katy Budge/Sam Hartley)

Reserve = East Midlands (Katy Budge/Sam Hartley)

Wednesday 18 May

- 1) East Midlands (Katy Budge/Sam Hartley)
- 2) South West (Katy Budge/Sam Hartley)

Reserve = Eastern (Gerald Tessier/Sam Hartley)

Thursday 19 May

- 1) London (Gerald Tessier/Sam Hartley)
- 2) Yorkshire and the Humber (Gerald Tessier/Sam Hartley)

Reserve = Eastern (Gerald Tessier)

Friday 20 May

- 1) Eastern (Gerald Tessier/Sam Hartley)