

Revised proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the **East Midlands** region



Contents

Summary	2
Who we are and what we do – ‘The 2023 Review’	2
What are the revised proposals for the East Midlands region?	2
How to have your say	3
1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?	4
2 Background to the 2023 Review	5
The rules in the legislation	6
Timetable for our review	8
Stage one – development of initial proposals	8
Stage two – consultation on initial proposals	8
Stage three – consultation on representations received	8
Stage four – development and publication of revised proposals	9
Stage five – development and publication of the final report and recommendations	9
3 Revised proposals for the East Midlands	10
Sub-regions	11
Derbyshire	13
Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Rutland	15
Northamptonshire	30
Nottinghamshire	37
4 How to have your say	48
How can you give us your views?	49
What do we want views on?	49
Appendix: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	50
Glossary	75

Summary

Who we are and what we do – ‘The 2023 Review’¹

The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for periodically reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

We are currently conducting a review on the basis of legal rules most recently updated by Parliament in 2020, which will conclude with a final report and recommendations from us by 1 July 2023. The rules require there to still be 650 constituencies across the UK, but more equally distributed across the four parts of the UK, which will see the number of constituencies in England increase to 543. Each (apart from five ‘protected’ constituencies) must also contain a number of electors that is no smaller than 69,724 and no larger than 77,062 (as at the fixed date of 2 March 2020).

We published our initial proposals for the new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England on 8 June 2021 and there have been two rounds of statutory consultation relating to those to which we received over 45,000 responses. We have considered all of the comments received and taken them into account in developing our revised proposals, which we are now publishing for final consultation. For each region, a full report sets out a summary of the responses received to previous consultation on our initial proposals, our analysis of those, and the conclusions we have reached as to how the proposals should be revised as a result. The Appendix to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency we are now proposing, and maps to illustrate these can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit.²

What are the revised proposals for the East Midlands region?

We have revised the composition of 19 of the 47 constituencies we proposed in June 2021, and maintained our initial proposals for the remainder. We have revised the name of seven of our initially proposed constituencies. Our revised proposals would leave six existing constituencies in the East Midlands region wholly unchanged, and seven unchanged except to realign constituency boundaries with local government ward boundaries.³

As it is not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties or unitary authorities, we sometimes group these into sub-regions, meaning some constituencies cross county or unitary authority boundaries. After consideration of the responses to the sub-regions in our initial proposals, our revised proposals are based on amended sub-regions, as follows: Derbyshire⁴ (allocated 11 constituencies); Leicestershire⁵, Lincolnshire and Rutland (allocated 18 constituencies);

¹ Further details about the BCE and 2023 Review are published on our website: <https://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/>

² A list of places of deposit is published on our website (as above).

³ Where the Order to make such wards was made by 1 December 2020.

⁴ Including the City of Derby.

⁵ Including the City of Leicester.

Northamptonshire⁶ (allocated seven constituencies); and Nottinghamshire⁷ (allocated 11 constituencies). One constituency would cross county boundaries (the same number as our initial proposals): it would contain parts of more than two counties.

We have decided to propose one constituency that would contain electors from Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Rutland, combining the entirety of the Rutland unitary authority with three wards from Harborough District and nine wards from South Kesteven District (including the town of Stamford).

We have made no revisions to the composition of any of the 11 constituencies in Derbyshire; however, we have revised the name of one constituency. In Northamptonshire, we have revised the composition of five of the seven constituencies in this sub-region, we have also revised the name of one of these constituencies. We have decided to split four wards in Northamptonshire with two being the same as proposed in the initial proposals. In Nottinghamshire we have revised the composition of two of the 11 constituencies, with one ward split between these revised constituencies. We have also revised the name of an additional two constituencies in Nottinghamshire.

We have combined our initially proposed Leicestershire and Lincolnshire and Rutland sub-regions. There are relatively minor changes to the composition of the initial proposals in Lincolnshire with revisions to four constituencies, and revision to the name of one of these constituencies. There are larger changes to the initial proposals in Leicestershire, especially in the Blaby District and Harborough District. We have revised the composition of eight constituencies. We have revised the name of two of these constituencies. We have decided to split one ward in Leicester.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for a four-week period, from 8 November 2022 to 5 December 2022. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make our final recommendations and report to Parliament. Our consultation portal at www.bcereviews.org.uk has more information about our revised proposals and how to give us your views. You can also follow us on Twitter [@BCEReviews](https://twitter.com/BCEReviews) or at facebook.com/BCEReviews.

⁶ Incorporating the new unitary authorities of North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire.

⁷ Including the City of Nottingham.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

- 1.1 As already mentioned, BCE is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We must conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every eight years. Our role is to make recommendations for new constituency boundaries, which are then made by Statutory Instrument and used at the next General Election.
- 1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but – as an MP themselves – by convention they do not actively participate in the work of the Commission. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners determine its policies within the legislative framework, oversee the progression of a Review, and take decisions on the actual proposals and recommendations for new constituency boundaries. Further information about the Commissioners can be found on our regular website.

You can find further information on our regular website at www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk, or on our consultation portal at www.bcereviews.org.uk. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, or by calling 020 7276 1102.

2 Background to the 2023 Review

- 2.1 We are currently conducting a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries on the basis of rules most recently updated by Parliament in 2020.⁸ These rules require us to make the number of electors in each constituency more equal. This report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England (there are separate Commissions for Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales) and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the East Midlands.
- 2.2 Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. When our recommendations are accepted, they are then used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.
- 2.3 The legislation states that there will be 650 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – the same as the current number, but a statutory formula now distributes that total proportionately across the four parts of the UK. England has therefore been allocated 543 constituencies for the 2023 Review, ten more than there are currently. There are also other rules that the Commission has regard to when conducting the review – a full set of the rules can be found in our Guide to the 2023 Review⁹, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules require every constituency we recommend to contain no fewer than 69,724 electors and no more than 77,062.
- 2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, in which achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim, but there was no statutory fixed minimum and maximum number of electors. This, together with the passage of time since constituencies were last updated (based on data from 2000), means that in England, existing constituencies currently range from 53,210 to 109,246 electors. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the increase in the total allocation of constituencies, means that a significant amount of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.
- 2.5 When implemented, the final recommendations that we will make will be the first set of boundaries to be defined under the new rules. While there has to be a significant amount of change across the country, we have, where practicable, attempted to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors and the need to create the best possible pattern for constituencies as a whole. Under the legislation, we have a challenging job in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in constituencies that are unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless, we have conducted the review in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

⁸ The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 2020, available at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2020/25/contents

⁹ Available at www.bcereviews.org.uk

- 2.6 The revised proposals that we set out in this report, and in the reports for the other eight regions across England, are made on the basis of the evidence we received during two consultation exercises relating to our initial proposals, the careful consideration of that evidence by the Secretariat and our Assistant Commissioners, and the best judgement of the three Commissioners. We are confident that these revised proposals strike the best balance between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a final pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There are areas across the country where our judgement has been a balanced and marginal one between competing alternatives, and in such cases we have made clear that we are particularly looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many other areas we are persuaded by the evidence we have received thus far, and we would therefore require new and significantly stronger arguments to make us depart from our revised proposals. If it exists, such new and compelling evidence would be welcome, but we will not be assisted by a repetition of arguments that have already been made, and which we have already considered. The requirement to keep constituencies within the permitted range of electors is strict, but otherwise we have sought to balance often conflicting considerations. Our proposals must also be comprehensive. We are acutely aware that very often a change that may seem obvious to make in one constituency necessarily requires far less attractive alterations in one or more neighbouring constituencies, and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.
- 2.7 Our Guide to the 2023 Review contains further detailed background information, and explains all of the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review. We encourage anyone wishing to respond to the review to read this document, which will give them a greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals and/or make their own counter-proposals.

The rules in the legislation

- 2.8 As well as the primary rule that constituencies must have no fewer than 69,724 electors and no more than 77,062, the legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may take into account:
- special geographical considerations, including in particular the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency;
 - local government boundaries which existed, or were prospective, on 1 December 2020;
 - boundaries of existing constituencies;
 - any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies; and
 - the inconveniences attendant on such changes.

- 2.9** In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that for a given area, where we choose to take account of local government boundaries, if there are prospective boundaries (as at 1 December 2020), it is those, rather than existing boundaries, of which account may be taken. This is a significant change to the former legislation, which referred only to the local government boundaries as they actually existed on the relevant date.
- 2.10** Our initial proposals for the East Midlands (and the accompanying maps) were therefore based on local government boundaries that existed, or – where relevant – were prospective, on 1 December 2020. Our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. Our Guide to the 2023 Review outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries. We have used the existing and prospective wards as at 1 December 2020 of unitary authorities, and borough and district councils (in areas where there is also a county council) as the basic building blocks for our proposals.
- 2.11** In a number of existing constituencies, changes to local government wards since constituencies were last updated (in 2010) have resulted in the new ward effectively being split, between the constituency the old ward was wholly a part of, and at least one other existing constituency. As part of our proposals, we will by default seek to realign the boundaries of constituencies with up-to-date ward boundaries, thus reuniting wards that are currently divided between existing constituencies. In places where there has been only a minor change to a ward, this may see an existing constituency boundary change only very slightly, to realign with the new ward. However, where wards in an area have been changed more significantly, this may result in the area covered by the new ward becoming part of a different constituency than the one much of that area was in previously.
- 2.12** Although the 2023 Review of Parliamentary constituencies will inevitably result in significant change, we have also taken into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we can. We tried to retain existing constituencies as part of our initial proposals wherever possible, as long as the other factors could also be satisfied. This, however, proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 11% of the existing constituencies in the East Midlands as wholly unchanged, and a further 13% changed only to realign with changed boundaries of their component wards.
- 2.13** Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents might put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, the legislation does not give any of these precedence over another, and the Commission therefore considers that its task is to seek to strike the best balance of all the factors in each area, within the numerical constraints.

- 2.14 Our proposals are based on the nine English regions as defined in the legislation; a description of the extent of each region also appears in the Guide to the 2023 Review. This report relates to the East Midlands. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the 2023 Review we decided, in agreement with all the qualifying political parties, to use these regions as discrete areas within which to undertake our work. You can find more details in our Guide to the 2023 Review and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, very compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.
- 2.15 In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence across the country to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report, and all other regional reports, continue to use the regional boundaries as the basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for our review

Stage one – development of initial proposals

- 2.16 We began this review in January 2021. We published electorate data from 2 March 2020 (the relevant date specified by the legislation) for each local government ward in England, including – where relevant – wards that were prospective on 1 December 2020. The electorate data was provided by individual local electoral registration officers and the Office for National Statistics. These figures are available on our website. The Commission then considered the statutory factors outlined above and drew up the initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 8 June 2021.

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

- 2.17 We consulted on our initial proposals for eight weeks, from 8 June 2021 until 2 August 2021. We received over 34,000 discrete written representations across the country as a whole, including nearly 2,500 unique written representations relating to the East Midlands. We are grateful to all those who took the time and effort to read and respond to our initial proposals.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

- 2.18 The legislation required us to publish all the responses we received on our initial proposals. We published the representations on 7 February 2022 ahead of a six-week 'secondary consultation' period, which took place from 22 February 2022 until 4 April 2022. The purpose of the secondary consultation was for people to

see what others said in response to our initial proposals, and to make comments on those views, for example by countering an argument, or by supporting and reinforcing what others said. We received over 10,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including almost 900 unique representations relating to the East Midlands. We also hosted between two and five public hearings in each region. We heard more than 120 oral representations at the three public hearings in the East Midlands. We are grateful to all those who attended and spoke at our public hearings.

Stage four – development and publication of revised proposals

- 2.19 As we detail in chapter 3 below, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do under the legislation, on 8 November 2022, we are publishing this report – *Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the East Midlands region* – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory four-week period, which closes on 5 December 2022. Unlike the secondary consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period. It should be noted that this will be the final opportunity for people to contribute their views during the 2023 Review.

Stage five – development and publication of the final report and recommendations

- 2.20 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 5 December 2022, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before determining our final recommendations. The recommendations will be set out in a report to the Speaker of the House of Commons, who will lay it before Parliament, at which time we will also publish the report. The legislation states that we should submit that report to the Speaker by 1 July 2023. Further details about what the Government must then do with our recommendations in order to implement them are contained in our Guide to the 2023 Review.
- 2.21 Throughout each consultation period, we have taken – and are continuing to take – all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

3 Revised proposals for the East Midlands

- 3.1 After the consultation on the initial proposals in 2021, we arranged for the appointment of two Assistant Commissioners for the East Midlands – Peter Fish CB and Alison Blom-Cooper – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. This included chairing public hearings held in the region to collect oral evidence, as follows:
- Nottingham: 7–8 March 2022
 - Leicester: 10–11 March 2022
 - Northampton: 14–15 March 2022
- 3.2 We asked the Assistant Commissioners to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of evidence provided in the representations. It is important to stress that the Assistant Commissioners had no involvement in developing – and therefore no vested interest in supporting – our initial proposals. Accordingly, they came to the analysis with an independent mind, open to viable alternative proposals supported by evidence. We are very grateful for the thorough and methodical approach the Assistant Commissioners have taken to their work.
- 3.3 What follows in this chapter is:
- a brief recap of our initial proposals;
 - a description of the views and counter-proposals put forward during the consultations;
 - the Assistant Commissioners’ analysis of the strength of the arguments for adoption of any of those counter-proposals; and
 - our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.
- 3.4 A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears in the Appendix to this report.
- 3.5 Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent’s response, we do so by using the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345 (we only include an individual’s name if they gave permission for it to be published). This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at www.bcereviews.org.uk. All representations received in response to the first two consultations are publicly available on this website. The representations received in response to these revised proposals will be published at the end of the review.

Sub-regions

- 3.6 In formulating the initial proposals, Derbyshire¹⁰, Northamptonshire¹¹ and Nottinghamshire¹² each had electorates that allowed them to have a whole number of constituencies within the permitted range, and were therefore treated each as a separate sub-region.
- 3.7 We noted that Lincolnshire had an electorate that was too large for seven whole constituencies, and too small for eight; therefore, it was necessary to pair Lincolnshire with another county. Rutland's electorate was far too small for it to be considered as a constituency in its own right, meaning it too needed to be paired with another county. We noted Rutland and Lincolnshire had a combined electorate resulting in a near whole mathematical entitlement of 7.93 constituencies. We therefore allocated eight whole constituencies to a sub-region consisting of Lincolnshire and Rutland, one more than the existing number of constituencies in Lincolnshire alone.
- 3.8 We acknowledged that pairing Rutland with Lincolnshire was a deviation from the established pairing of Rutland with Leicestershire. However, the retention of this latter pairing would require linking Lincolnshire either with Leicestershire or Nottinghamshire, and we felt that there were few justifiable options for a county boundary crossing either of these with Lincolnshire. We noted the combined electorate of Leicestershire and the City of Leicester¹³ allowed it to be allocated ten whole constituencies, and we therefore proposed Leicestershire as a sub-region on its own with ten constituencies (the same number as the existing sub-region of Leicestershire and Rutland).
- 3.9 The Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) and Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542) supported the sub-regions used in formulating the initial proposals. The Green Party's response to the initial consultation (BCE-81984) expressed reservations about the pairing of Lincolnshire and Rutland; however, the party's representation at the Nottingham public hearing (BCE-97544) supported the pairing.

¹⁰ Including the City of Derby.

¹¹ Incorporating the new unitary authorities of North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire.

¹² Including the City of Nottingham.

¹³ Hereafter referred to as Leicestershire.

- 3.10** The Labour Party (BCE-79476, BCE-95649 and BCE-97545) supported the proposed sub-regions of Derbyshire, Northamptonshire, and Nottinghamshire; however, they proposed combining Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, and Rutland into one sub-region. They proposed a constituency comprising Rutland, nine South Kesteven (Lincolnshire) wards and three Harborough (Leicestershire) wards. The Labour Party argued that this proposal would better reflect the statutory factors, even though a proposed Rutland and Stamford constituency would contain parts of three counties. This proposal would permit minimum change to the existing constituencies in Lincolnshire, and revert closer to the existing pattern of constituencies across Leicestershire.
- 3.11** As all other counties in the region are mathematically entitled to whole numbers of constituencies, counter-proposals that put forward alternative sub-region configurations naturally focused on Lincolnshire and Rutland. We received one counter-proposal that would combine this sub-region with the Northamptonshire and Leicestershire sub-regions (BCE-79456) and two more that would combine Lincolnshire and Rutland with Northamptonshire only (BCE-55438 and Jonathan Stansby – BCE-87423). We also received a counter-proposal from Daniel Henderson (BCE-88542) that combined Lincolnshire and Rutland with Nottinghamshire.
- 3.12** Our Assistant Commissioners considered the evidence of these counter-proposals and other representations received. They noted the significant number of representations, including from Alicia Kearns, MP for Rutland and Melton (BCE-84062, BCE-96679 and BCE-97476), that demonstrated the significant local ties between Leicestershire and Rutland. They also noted that the theoretical entitlement of Leicestershire to 7.28 constituencies means that it is challenging to develop a pattern of constituencies for the county that adheres to the statutory factors, and that mathematical constraints necessitated a constituency that crossed the boundary between the City of Leicester and Leicestershire in the initial proposals. The Assistant Commissioners felt that combining the Leicestershire, and Lincolnshire and Rutland sub-regions facilitates a pattern of constituencies for all three that improves on the initial proposals with respect to the statutory factors, and we agree with their recommendation. In particular, we are persuaded that there is no viable solution that treats Leicestershire and Rutland as a sub-region without including a third county: with a combined theoretical entitlement of 7.69, such a sub-region would be as mathematically constrained for eight constituencies as Leicestershire alone is for seven.
- 3.13** We received two proposals (BCE-56943 and BCE-75245) that said Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire should be grouped into one sub-region. BCE-56943 primarily focused on preventing the division of part of Mansfield town between the proposed Ashfield and Mansfield constituencies. BCE-75245 argued that the

initial proposals divide communities and combine them with unsuitable areas in Nottingham. Our Assistant Commissioners took the view that neither of these counter-proposals improved on the initial proposals for Nottinghamshire to such an extent that disrupting the largely unchanged pattern of constituencies in Derbyshire would be justified. We accept their recommendation that Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire should be separate sub-regions, as in the initial proposals.

Derbyshire

- 3.14** Of the 11 existing constituencies in Derbyshire, eight have electorates within the permitted range (two fall below and one above). Our initial proposals made only very minor adjustments, and all qualifying political parties supported our proposed boundaries, although all four objected to our proposed name for the Ilkeston and Long Eaton constituency.
- 3.15** The electorate of the Chesterfield, Derby North, Derby South, Erewash, and High Peak constituencies were such that they could remain wholly unchanged. We proposed no changes to these constituencies in our initial proposals; however, we did propose renaming the Erewash constituency to Ilkeston and Long Eaton, to reflect the main population centres of the constituency. Our initial proposals for the boundaries of these constituencies attracted very few representations, but those that we received were largely supportive.
- 3.16** We received one counter-proposal (BCE-79456) that proposed the Arboretum ward be included in a Derby North constituency and Chaddesden ward in a Derby South constituency. They also proposed the Sutton ward be included in a Chesterfield constituency. Our Assistant Commissioners felt that it was unclear what the benefits of this counter-proposal, affecting wholly unchanged constituencies, would be. Therefore, we do not propose any changes from the initial proposals for the Chesterfield, Derby North and Derby South constituencies.
- 3.17** The MP for High Peak, Robert Langan, put forward an alternative arrangement for the Derbyshire Dales and High Peak constituencies (BCE-82042 and BCE-97513). This counter-proposal would include the Bradwell ward from the Derbyshire Dales constituency in a High Peak constituency. Robert Langan MP argued that 'Bradwell has very strong local links with the rest of High Peak for shopping, recreation, education, and other community facilities'. The Assistant Commissioners did not recommend these changes. Their view is that there would need to be compelling reasons to recommend changes, given that the proposed constituency is both unchanged and coterminous with the High Peak local authority boundary. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and do not propose any change to the High Peak constituency.

- 3.18** As previously mentioned, our initial proposals for the boundaries of the Ilkeston and Long Eaton constituency, which are unchanged from the existing Erewash constituency, were mostly supported, but we received a significant number of representations opposing our proposal to change the name of this constituency. The MP for Erewash, Maggie Throup, strongly opposed the change of name and argued that the name Erewash should be retained (BCE-73287 and BCE-96998). Representations received argued that the name Erewash ‘is steeped in history. This name is now an intrinsic part of our heritage’ (BCE-73208) and ‘supports our feeling of inclusiveness and all being together and of equal importance’ (Councillor Christopher Corbett – BCE-71616). Retaining the Erewash name was also supported by Erewash Borough Council (BCE-85854) and Derbyshire County Council (BCE-83979). Given the overwhelming public response, the Assistant Commissioners recommended retaining the existing constituency name. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and, considering our policy on the naming of constituencies allows for a name that commands strong local support, we propose that the constituency should retain the existing name of Erewash.
- 3.19** In designing the initial proposals for the Amber Valley, Bolsover, and North East Derbyshire constituencies, we proposed some realignment to ensure the constituency boundaries reflected changes to local government ward boundaries, but otherwise we proposed no changes to these constituencies. Similar to the wholly unchanged constituencies, we received very few representations concerning these constituencies, but those that were received were broadly supportive. Nothing in the evidence presented to the Assistant Commissioners persuaded them that there would be any benefit in altering these proposals. Therefore, we agree with our Assistant Commissioners’ recommendation that the initial proposals for the Amber Valley, Bolsover, and North East Derbyshire constituencies are retained.
- 3.20** The electorates of the existing Derbyshire Dales and Mid Derbyshire constituencies are currently below the permitted electorate range, and the electorate of the existing South Derbyshire constituency is currently above the permitted electorate range. We therefore proposed including the Hatton and Hilton wards in an extended Derbyshire Dales constituency, which would bring the electorate of the South Derbyshire constituency to within the permitted range. We also proposed to transfer the South West Parishes ward into the Mid Derbyshire constituency, to bring both the Derbyshire Dales and Mid Derbyshire constituencies within the permitted range.
- 3.21** We did receive some opposition to the proposed changes to the Derbyshire Dales constituency. BCE-55438 proposed changes to five of the 11 constituencies in Derbyshire, focusing on retaining Hatton and Hilton with Etwell. This counter-proposal included Belper and Duffield within a Derbyshire Dales constituency. It proposed six Derbyshire Dales wards, four South

Derbyshire wards, one Amber Valley ward, two City of Derby wards, and three Erewash wards in a South West Derbyshire constituency, and also proposed a South Derbyshire constituency that would include the Chellaston ward from the City of Derby.

- 3.22 We also received some opposition to the proposed Mid Derbyshire constituency on the grounds of weak community ties within the constituency; however, many of the comments received indicated that this is an issue in the existing constituency, rather than local ties that would be broken by our proposals. In particular, Adrian Brown (BCE-55490) argued there is a lack of community ties between Belper and the villages Duffield and Quarndon. BCE-88120 also argued for the lack of community ties in the Mid Derbyshire constituency between the more urban areas of Allestree and Oakwood within the City of Derby and the rural communities.
- 3.23 The Assistant Commissioners considered the evidence and counter-proposals submitted for the Derbyshire Dales, Mid Derbyshire, and South Derbyshire constituencies. Their view was that the minimal change recommended in the initial proposals is most compatible with the statutory factors and they therefore did not recommend the changes proposed in BCE-55438. We agree that the initial proposals for the Derbyshire Dales, Mid Derbyshire, and South Derbyshire constituencies should be retained.

Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Rutland

Leicestershire

- 3.24 In formulating the initial proposals, we considered that, although the City of Leicester had a theoretical entitlement to exactly three constituencies, the theoretical entitlement of the rest of Leicestershire to 7.28 constituencies was too high for us to be able to propose seven constituencies without crossing the boundary with the City, while still properly reflecting the statutory factors.
- 3.25 We therefore proposed one constituency that crossed the City of Leicester unitary authority boundary in the initial proposals. Our proposed Leicester West and Glenfield constituency crossed the City of Leicester unitary authority boundary to include two Blaby District wards of Ellis and Fairstone, as both these wards covered the Glenfield area. We also proposed that this constituency extend eastwards to include the Belgrave ward. We proposed a Leicester East constituency that includes the Spinney Hills ward. Finally, we proposed the Leicester South constituency extend westwards to include the Westcotes ward.

- 3.26 We received some support for our three initially-proposed Leicester constituencies from the Green Party (BCE-97544) and Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542); however, we received significantly more opposition. The comments focused on the inclusion of Glenfield in a city constituency, and the proposal to transfer the Belgrave, Spinney Hills, and Westcotes wards from their existing constituencies.
- 3.27 Neill Ransom (BCE-97480) and BCE-55163 argued that Glenfield should be included within a county-based constituency, as it does not share community ties with Leicester. Similarly, Councillor Roy Denney (BCE-93587) outlined the community ties which Glenfield has with the neighbouring villages in the Blaby local authority of Leicester Forest East and Kirby Muxloe. Councillor Denney argued that these villages 'are on the edge of the National Forest and Charnwood Forest so the residents look outwards into these areas for much of their recreation and leisure activities rather than travel into Leicester City' (BCE-93587). Similarly, Edward Argar, the MP for Charnwood (BCE-84793 and BCE-97481) argued that Glenfield is a more rural community that looks towards the county area for transport, shopping, and education.
- 3.28 In addition to representations that specifically opposed including Glenfield in a constituency with Leicester, we also received representations expressing the general view that the City of Leicester should retain three constituencies wholly within the city boundary. Lord Willy Bach (BCE-97529) argued that the city is entitled to three seats, and that therefore respecting the City of Leicester unitary authority boundary would be the best reflection of the statutory factors. Crossing the City of Leicester boundary was also opposed by the Labour Party (BCE-79476, BCE-95649 and BCE-97545) and Leicester City Council (BCE-74892 and BCE-97450).
- 3.29 We received widespread opposition to our initial proposals to include the Belgrave ward in a Leicester West and Glenfield constituency. Respondents argued strongly that this ward forms the 'heart' of a coherent Leicester East community, for example Keith Vaz, former MP for Leicester East (BCE-86415, BCE-97028, and BCE-97495). Representations also outlined the Belgrave ward as the centre for many community and religious groups that serve the neighbouring North Evington, Rushey Mead, and Troon wards; including Sri Jeya Durga Temple (BCE-61690) and Shree Sanatan Mandir & Community Centre (BCE-85963). These sentiments were reinforced during the Leicester public hearing, where numerous respondents presented evidence of the strength of community ties between Belgrave and Leicester East, particularly concerning the 'Golden Mile' and the movement of residents from the Belgrave ward eastwards into the neighbouring wards; for example Baljit Singh, Dharmesh Lakhani, Karan Modha, and Councillor Rita Patel (BCE-97537, BCE-97444, BCE-97488, BCE-97482 respectively). Claudia Webbe, the MP for Leicester East

(BCE-96371) outlined further community ties and religious organisations that operate between the Belgrave ward and the rest of the existing Leicester East constituency. We also received a petition opposing our initial proposals, which attracted 2,569 signatories; the largest petition received for any single issue in the region (BCE-86576).

- 3.30** Similarly, we received substantial opposition to our proposal to include the Spinney Hills ward in Leicester East. Jonathan Ashworth, MP for Leicester South (BCE-73649 and BCE-97472), argued that the Spinney Hills ward is part of the Highfields community with the neighbouring wards Wycliffe and Stoneygate: 'The heart of the area is Spinney Hill Park which often hosts community events including a communal Eid Prayer every year attracting thousands of worshippers from across Spinney, Wycliffe, and Stoneygate Wards', highlighting the religious and community ties between these wards. BCE-67392 and BCE-85760 among others provided evidence that the Spinney Hills ward is an intrinsic part of the Highfields community, and like Belgrave, Spinney Hills is the centre for community and religious groups. These comments were supported by the Leicester East Labour Party (BCE-96678), who stated that residents of the ward 'see themselves as being an integral part of the South constituency. It is a hub for members of one community to come and worship', further demonstrating the community relations in this area.
- 3.31** We received some opposition to the proposal to include the Westcotes ward in a Leicester South constituency. BCE-90669 argued that the Westcotes ward is the 'urban core' for the Leicester West constituency. Liz Kendall, MP for Leicester West, submitted a counter-proposal during the secondary consultation (BCE-96666 and BCE-97451). This submission provided evidence for a lack of community ties between the Glenfield wards and the City of Leicester, as well as the strength of community that exists between the Westcotes ward and Leicester West. Liz Kendall MP proposed splitting the Belgrave ward, including the area west of the Belgrave road (A607) within a Leicester West constituency and the remainder of the ward in a Leicester East constituency; resulting in no further changes being required to the existing constituencies in Leicester. This proposal would not cross the City of Leicester unitary authority boundary, and was also submitted by the Leicester West Labour Party (BCE-75229).

- 3.32 In addition to the above, we received a number of counter-proposals that contained three constituencies wholly within the City of Leicester boundary. John Bryant (BCE-94367) and BCE-56943 set out an alternative ward rotation, proposing to include the Aylestone ward in Leicester West, the Evington ward in Leicester South, and the Wycliffe ward in Leicester East. Edward Barkham (BCE-75591) put forward a very similar proposal, but would include the Spinney Hills ward in a Leicester East constituency instead of the Wycliffe ward. Baroness Sandip Verma (BCE-84476), amongst others, proposed the Aylestone and Eyres Monsell wards be included in a Leicester West constituency, the Belgrave and Westcotes wards in a Leicester South constituency, and the Spinney Hills ward in a Leicester East constituency.
- 3.33 The Labour Party counter-proposal (BCE-95649) submitted during the secondary consultation proposed that the Belgrave, Spinney Hills, and Westcotes wards should remain in their current constituencies without crossing the city boundary. This would be achieved through transferring the Aylestone ward to Leicester West and splitting either the Evington or North Evington wards, with one polling district being included in a Leicester South constituency. In their representations they gave the example of including one polling district from North Evington in a Leicester South constituency. Jonathan Ashworth MP (BCE-97472) supported the Labour Party proposal, and in particular the inclusion of the Aylestone ward into the Leicester West constituency, arguing there is a shared community between the Aylestone, and Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields wards, focused on Aylestone Meadows.
- 3.34 We also received some counter-proposals that proposed alternative crossings of the City of Leicester unitary authority boundary. The Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) proposed a revised Leicester East constituency including two Oadby wards (Oadby Grange and Oadby Uplands) that would allow Glenfield to remain in a county-based constituency and the Westcotes ward in Leicester West. Jonathan Stansby (BCE-87423) proposed two constituencies that would cross the city boundary at Braunstone Town and Eyres Monsell; however, it would retain Glenfield in a county-based constituency. Similarly, BCE-79456 proposed including two of the three Braunstone Town wards in a Leicester West constituency.
- 3.35 The Assistant Commissioners acknowledged the opposition to crossing the City of Leicester boundary in the initial proposals, and recognised that it would be desirable if the city could be considered separately from the county to respect the distinct urban and rural communities. They noted the strength of feeling from residents of Glenfield evident in the representations received and, having visited the area, observed that despite its proximity to Leicester, the area has a character

distinct from the city. The Assistant Commissioners further noted that several alternative crossings of the city boundary were proposed (as noted above), but were unpersuaded that any of these would be any more desirable than crossing the city boundary at Glenfield.

- 3.36** The Assistant Commissioners also noted the strength of feeling within the City of Leicester concerning community ties between the Belgrave ward and the North Evington, Troon and Rushey Mead wards in Leicester East, and the Spinney Hills ward and the Stoneygate and Wycliffe wards in Leicester South. Having visited the area, they agreed that each of these two groups of wards share strong internal cultural and community ties and the whole of each group should therefore be included in the same constituency. Of the counter-proposals received, the Assistant Commissioners noted that the Labour Party counter-proposal would return both wards to their existing constituencies without crossing the City of Leicester boundary, but that this required splitting a ward. Either the North Evington or Evington wards were proposed by representatives of national and local Labour groups, and having visited these wards, the Assistant Commissioners' view was that there is no clear separation between the polling districts in the North Evington ward, but that there seems to be a natural break between the southernmost polling district of Evington and the rest of the ward. Therefore, they recommended adopting the Labour Party counter-proposal for Leicester, splitting the Evington ward.
- 3.37** We agree with the Assistant Commissioners, and therefore propose three constituencies wholly contained within the city boundary. We propose: a Leicester South constituency that would include Spinney Hills and polling district EVF from the Evington ward; a Leicester East constituency that would include the Belgrave ward and the remainder of the Evington ward, and a Leicester West constituency that would include the Aylestone and Westcotes wards.
- 3.38** The existing Bosworth and North West Leicestershire constituencies are both above the permitted electorate range; therefore, we proposed transferring the Appleby and Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe wards from North West Leicestershire into the Hinckley and Bosworth constituency. The initial proposals for these constituencies were largely uncontentious and we received few representations for these constituencies. There was some opposition to including the Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe ward in the Hinckley and Bosworth constituency. Chris Smith (BCE-74256, BCE-92630 and BCE-97447) proposed retaining the Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe ward in North West Leicestershire by splitting the Sence Valley ward between the Hinckley and Bosworth, and North West Leicestershire constituencies.

- 3.39 The Assistant Commissioners noted that there was general support for the proposed Hinckley and Bosworth, and North West Leicestershire constituencies, not least from all four qualifying parties. They acknowledged the opposition to the Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe ward being included in the proposed Hinckley and Bosworth constituency, but noted that this ward cannot be retained in the North West Leicestershire constituency without transferring another out, or splitting a ward, for which they felt there was insufficient justification. Therefore, they recommended that the initial proposals be retained for these constituencies. We agree with these recommendations and do not propose any changes to the initial proposals for either of these constituencies.
- 3.40 As our initial proposals considered Rutland separately from Leicestershire, we proposed a Melton and Syston constituency, to include all the Melton local authority wards plus eight Charnwood local authority wards extending to the River Soar, which would form its western boundary. To bring the existing Loughborough constituency electorate down to within the permitted range, we proposed that the River Soar mostly form its boundary to the east, only crossing to include the Barrow and Sileby West ward, with the proposed constituency also extending southwards to include the Mountsorrel ward.
- 3.41 As well as opposition to the separation of the Melton and Rutland local authorities, we also received opposition to joining the Melton local authority area with Syston. Alicia Kearns, MP for Rutland and Melton (BCE-84062, BCE-96679 and BCE-97476), provided evidence that Melton shares extensive community ties with Rutland, commenting they are ‘heavily rural, agricultural areas with market towns and a high number of villages’ while arguing that this differs from the suburban area of Syston. These sentiments were supported by many representations, including the Melton Borough Council (BCE-78673 and BCE-97438) and Rutland County Council (BCE-97445). Alyson Culmer (BCE-87498) and BCE-81940, among others, argued that there are weak community ties between the rural Melton local authority and the more urban Syston area. They highlighted that the community needs differ between these areas, with the Melton local authority having ‘rural issues such as farming, access to services, poor public transport’ and that this was very different to that of a suburban area (BCE-81940).
- 3.42 We also received opposition to including The Wolds ward in our proposed Melton and Syston constituency. Councillor Jenny Bokor (BCE-79986) argued that The Wolds ward’s ‘historical identity is with Loughborough’; sharing education, healthcare and leisure facilities. BCE-85850, among others, commented on the lack of transport connections between The Wolds ward and Melton Mowbray, arguing there are strong natural links to Loughborough along the A60. Jane Hunt, MP for Loughborough (BCE-85971 and BCE-97459) opposed the

initial proposals for The Wolds ward, highlighting that the residents ‘look entirely to Loughborough’, and wished for it to remain in the constituency. Apart from the representations concerning The Wolds ward, the Loughborough constituency was largely well received.

- 3.43** We also received a counter-proposal from Jonathan Stansby (BCE-87423) that proposed a constituency comprising the Melton local authority and rural wards from the Harborough district, including Market Harborough itself. This counter-proposal would establish a pattern of constituencies that would more closely resemble the existing constituencies in Leicestershire, but would require two constituencies to cross the city boundary at Braunstone Town and Eyres Monsell (albeit retaining Glenfield in a county-based constituency). John Bryant (BCE-94367) also proposed a constituency that would combine the Melton local authority with Market Harborough, as well as: a constituency coterminous with the Blaby local authority; a South Leicestershire constituency that would include Oadby and Wigston; and retaining The Wolds in Loughborough. This proposal would not cross the City of Leicester boundary, but at the expense of disrupting the proposed Loughborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, and North West Leicestershire constituencies. Edward Barkham (BCE-75591) proposed a similar pattern of constituencies in Leicestershire to John Bryant’s counter-proposal, but would be more disruptive to local authority boundaries.
- 3.44** The Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) proposed three Harborough local authority wards (Billesdon & Tilton, Nevill, and Thurnby & Houghton) be included in the Melton and Syston constituency, with The Wolds ward retained in a Loughborough constituency, and the Mountsorrel and Thurmaston wards included in a Mid Leicestershire constituency. This proposal was supported by Edward Argar, MP for Charnwood (BCE-84793), and Jane Hunt, MP for Loughborough (BCE-85971). The Labour Party (BCE-79476, BCE-95649 and BCE-97545) supported our initial proposal for the Melton and Syston constituency; but they proposed that the Mountsorrel ward be retained in a Charnwood constituency. The Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542) proposed The Wolds and Sileby wards be included in a Loughborough constituency, the Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle, and Mountsorrel wards in a Mid Leicestershire constituency, and the Birstall Wanlip, and Birstall Watermead wards in a Melton and Syston constituency.

- 3.45 The Assistant Commissioners noted that the Loughborough constituency was broadly well received, except for the decision to transfer The Wolds ward to the Melton and Syston constituency, which drew opposition. They felt that the Liberal Democrat counter-proposal (BCE-80959 and BCE-94369), while it would retain the Sileby and The Wolds wards in a Loughborough constituency, also proposed the Melton and Syston constituency to extend further into the existing Charnwood constituency to include the two Birstall wards. They therefore felt that this proposal did not sufficiently address the issues raised in the wider Leicestershire sub-region; the most disruptive aspects of the initial proposals.
- 3.46 The Assistant Commissioners were persuaded by the evidence received concerning the ties of The Wolds. They therefore recommended that the Conservative Party counter-proposal be adopted for Loughborough. The Assistant Commissioners noted that this would divide Quorn from Mountsorrel, our initially proposed pairing, which was favourably commented on in representations; however, they felt as their recommendations would restore an existing constituency boundary between the two, this decision can be justified given its benefits both in Loughborough and elsewhere in the county. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and therefore propose that the initially proposed Loughborough constituency should be revised to include The Wolds ward instead of the Mountsorrel ward.
- 3.47 The Assistant Commissioners noted the force of local opinion regarding the initially proposed division of Rutland from Leicestershire; they therefore considered whether this existing pairing could be retained. The Assistant Commissioners noted that no valid counter-proposals were received that proposed Rutland and Melton Mowbray in the same constituency, and that the general principle of a Lincolnshire and Rutland sub-region was supported by all qualifying political parties.
- 3.48 Nonetheless, the Assistant Commissioners acknowledged opposition to including the Melton local authority with Syston. They considered the counter-proposals that paired the Melton local authority with Market Harborough (Edward Barkham – BCE-75591, Jonathan Stansby – BCE-87423, and John Bryant – BCE-94367), but noted that these proposals would be disruptive to existing constituencies, and separate areas with established community ties. The Assistant Commissioners also felt that insufficient evidence had been received to demonstrate that the Melton Mowbray and Market Harborough pairing would be an improvement on the initial proposals, as the proposals were not widely commented on during consultation.

- 3.49** When visiting the area, the Assistant Commissioners observed some differences between Melton Mowbray and Syston, but overall felt that both are small towns with a rural hinterland, and that they are well connected along the A607. As such, they recommended retaining the initial proposals for Melton and Syston, subject to removing The Wolds ward as discussed above. We agree with this recommendation and propose only this minor change to the initially proposed Melton and Syston constituency.
- 3.50** In the initial proposals, we proposed a Harborough constituency that would be coterminous with the District of Harborough local authority. Our proposed Blaby, Oadby and Wigston constituency included all ten Oadby and Wigston local authority wards and seven Blaby local authority wards, including Blaby and Stoney Stanton. The proposed Mid Leicestershire constituency consisted of five Charnwood local authority wards, three Hinckley and Bosworth local authority wards, and nine Blaby local authority wards. This proposed constituency used the River Soar as a geographic boundary to the north-east, wrapping around Leicester to the area surrounding Enderby in the south of the constituency.
- 3.51** We received some support for our initial proposals for the Blaby, Oadby and Wigston, Harborough, and Mid Leicestershire constituencies; notably from the local (BCE-92603) and national Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959 and BCE-94369). BCE-90662 argued that a coterminous Harborough constituency has a clear identity, as it is a rural area focusing on two market towns. Similarly, BCE-72854 supported the principle of a Blaby, Oadby and Wigston constituency comprising principally suburban areas.

- 3.52** Overall, however, we received a significantly larger number of representations opposing the initial proposals for these three constituencies. BCE-63428 opposed the Blaby, Oadby and Wigston, and Harborough constituencies, providing evidence concerning the major transport routes in the area, which are orientated north-south, connecting Oadby and Wigston to Market Harborough along the A6. Respondents also opposed including the Billesdon & Tilton, Nevill, and Thurnby & Houghton wards in the Harborough constituency; they argued these wards are more rural in nature and look to the Melton and Rutland local authorities, for example Caroline Jack (BCE-57753) and Councillor Michael Rickman (BCE-73854). Councillor Leslie Phillimore (BCE-64084) argued that there is ‘no commonality between the Blaby District area and the Oadby & Wigston area’, outlining that the initial proposal joins together two areas which do not share community ties. These representations argued that the existing South Leicestershire constituency shared strong socio-economic and socio-cultural ties; this argument was common among representations made at the Leicester public hearing. Councillor Roy Denney (BCE-93587) opposed the Mid Leicestershire constituency and argued it does not reflect communities in this area, asserting that the proposed constituency would be split into two parts that wrap around Leicester with little in common. These sentiments were supported by Alberto Costa, the MP for South Leicestershire (BCE-92016, BCE-97460, and BCE-63663 in a joint submission with seven Conservative MPs), who argued that the initial proposals were unnecessarily disruptive, and that these constituencies ought to be closer aligned to the existing boundaries.
- 3.53** We received counter-proposals for Leicestershire which would make constituencies that would align more closely to the existing configuration. As previously mentioned, the Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) proposed a crossing of the city boundary, including two Oadby wards in a revised Leicester East constituency. The remaining Oadby and Wigston wards would be included with Market Harborough; they proposed a revived South Leicestershire constituency that would include Blaby and Lutterworth; and would retain Glenfield in a Mid Leicestershire constituency. This proposal also included the three Harborough local authority wards with Melton and Syston. This proposal was supported by the seven Conservative Leicestershire and Rutland MPs in a joint submission (BCE-63565 and associated responses).
- 3.54** We also received counter-proposals that better represented the existing constituencies in Leicestershire while avoiding crossing the City of Leicester boundary. BCE-56943 proposed a Melton and Syston constituency that included the three Harborough wards, similar to the Conservative Party. It proposed Charnwood, South Leicestershire, and Wigston and Market Harborough constituencies that aligned to the existing constituencies, but at the expense of greater disruption to the existing Bosworth, Loughborough and North West Leicestershire constituencies.

- 3.55 The Labour Party counter-proposal recommended retaining Glenfield in a Charnwood constituency, which would extend southwards to include Braunstone Town. Similar to the Conservative Party and BCE-56943, they proposed substantial reconfiguration of the proposed Harborough, and Blaby, Oadby and Wigston constituencies in order to better reflect the existing constituencies. They proposed a Harborough constituency that would be realigned to reflect changes to local government ward boundaries, and a South Leicestershire constituency that would no longer include Braunstone Town. This would be facilitated by a Rutland and Stamford constituency that would include three Harborough wards (Billesdon & Tilton, Nevill, and Thurnby & Houghton) retaining them in a constituency with the Rutland local authority, albeit establishing a constituency that would comprise wards from three counties.
- 3.56 The Assistant Commissioners noted that the orientation of the initially proposed Harborough constituency would be very different from the existing Harborough constituency, and that this caused further disruption to the existing South Leicestershire and Charnwood constituencies. Although recognising the support of the Liberal Democrats, among others, for such a configuration, the Assistant Commissioners acknowledged that the majority of representations indicated that the initial proposals for this part of the county were unnecessarily disruptive.
- 3.57 The Assistant Commissioners felt that this level of disruption to the existing constituencies would not reflect the statutory factors well, and thus recommended reverting to a configuration that would more closely resemble the existing pattern of constituencies. The Assistant Commissioners particularly noted the counter-proposal BCE-56943, which proposed Harborough, Mid Leicestershire, and South Leicestershire constituencies that closely resembled the existing constituencies, but felt unable to recommend it, as this would be achieved at the cost of significant disruption to the Hinckley and Bosworth, and North West Leicestershire constituencies. They also noted the Conservative Party proposal, but did not consider that the crossing of the city boundary best reflected the statutory factors.
- 3.58 The Assistant Commissioners noted that the Labour Party counter-proposal would result in a Harborough constituency that would only change from the existing one to realign with new local government ward boundaries, and a South Leicestershire constituency that would be very similar to the existing constituency.

- 3.59 On balance, the view of the Assistant Commissioners was that the Labour Party counter-proposal for Harborough, South Leicestershire, and Charnwood best reflected the statutory factors and addressed the objections raised in consultation, and therefore recommended that it be adopted. They did, however, believe that the initially proposed Mid Leicestershire name would better reflect the composition of the constituency, and therefore recommended this constituency name be retained. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and therefore propose: a Harborough constituency that is only realigned to reflect changes to local government ward boundaries; a South Leicestershire constituency comprising 11 Blaby local authority wards and nine Harborough local authority wards; and a Mid Leicestershire constituency that includes the Glenfield area and the Mountsorrel ward.

Lincolnshire and Rutland

- 3.60 In formulating initial proposals in the East Midlands, we proposed a Lincolnshire and Rutland sub-region that was allocated eight constituencies; an increase of one from the existing allocation to Lincolnshire alone. Four of the existing constituencies are within the permitted electorate range, the remaining three are above.
- 3.61 In the initial proposals, we proposed a Rutland and Stamford constituency that would comprise the entirety of the Rutland unitary authority and 11 South Kesteven wards; including the towns of Stamford and Market Deeping, and the wards of Isaac Newton, Castle, and Glen. We received a mixture of support and opposition to this proposal. The Rutland Liberal Democrats (BCE-93201) and BCE-74919 argued that Rutland and Stamford share services and have strong community ties, commenting that Rutland has a 'greater affiliation with Stamford' (BCE-74919). BCE-68437 also argued that Rutland shared a community with Stamford, 'Most of the eastern half of Rutland look to Stamford as a community hub for health and social care, shopping and entertainment', and also highlighted that the existing Grantham and Stamford constituency does not share these close community ties. Overall, however, we received a greater number of representations opposing our initial proposals, arguing Rutland looks to Melton Mowbray and Leicestershire, for example BCE-66270 and BCE-86849 (see also Leicestershire, above). Christopher Clark (BCE-81449) and Anthony Peowrie (BCE-87296) argued that Rutland has no community or transport connections with Market Deeping, commenting that villages along the A15 look north and identify with Bourne instead of Stamford.

- 3.62 Edward Barkham (BCE-74499) proposed a Rutland and Stamford constituency that would include Bourne. This would enable an unchanged South Holland and The Deepings constituency, but is dependent on a proposed Grantham and Sleaford constituency, a Lincoln constituency that would include two orphan wards, and a Gainsborough constituency that would also include an orphan ward.
- 3.63 A consequence of accepting the Labour Party's counter-proposal for Harborough is that the three Harborough wards of Billesdon & Tilton, Nevill, and Thurnby & Houghton, which representations often referred to collectively as 'the Harborough villages' cannot be included in a constituency wholly within Leicestershire. The Labour Party's counter-proposal set out that the Harborough villages should be included in a revised Rutland and Stamford constituency.
- 3.64 Our Assistant Commissioners considered whether it would be compliant with the statutory factors to propose a constituency containing parts of three counties. They noted that, although significant change to the existing Rutland and Melton constituency is inevitable, the Harborough villages are part of that existing constituency with Rutland, and noted the considerable evidence for local ties between Rutland and Leicestershire that would otherwise be broken (Councillor Michael Rickman – BCE-73854 and Lord Willy Bach – BCE-97529). They also noted that representations from these three Leicestershire wards broadly supported retaining their existing link to Rutland, and shared common rural characteristics. On balance, the Assistant Commissioners deemed the advantages of this proposal to outweigh the difficulties posed by a constituency including parts of three counties. Therefore, they recommended the Harborough villages be included within a Rutland and Stamford constituency. While noting that a single constituency incorporating parts of three counties should very much be the exception, we also note the very small size of Rutland is itself exceptional, and accordingly agree with the view of the Assistant Commissioners and propose a revised Rutland and Stamford constituency as set out in the Labour Party counter-proposal.
- 3.65 As the two wards comprising Market Deeping were transferred to our proposed Rutland and Stamford constituency in our initial proposals, we proposed a South Lincolnshire constituency that included the Five Village, and Swineshead and Holland Fen wards. We proposed expanding the existing Boston and Skegness constituency to include the Chapel St. Leonards, Halton Hologate, and Willoughby with Sloothby wards. We also proposed including the Wragby ward in a Louth and Horncastle constituency, aligning the constituency with the northern boundary of the East Lindsey local authority boundary.

- 3.66** Our initial proposals for the Boston and Skegness, and Louth and Horncastle constituencies were largely uncontentious, attracting very few representations. We received some opposition to our proposed South Lincolnshire constituency: Dudley Bryant (BCE-60976) argued that the two Boston local authority wards are connected to Boston ‘for all their services including local government, education, health, retail including twice weekly markets, social and leisure’, and these sentiments were supported by Swineshead Parish Council (BCE-90142). We also received opposition to the name South Lincolnshire, with representations proposing many different options, for example Sir John Hayes, MP for South Holland and The Deepings (BCE-81659) and BCE-85615; however, there was no one clearly preferred name in the representations.
- 3.67** While the main benefits of the Labour Party counter-proposal would be in Leicestershire, the Assistant Commissioners noted that it also has positive knock-on impacts for Lincolnshire in terms of the statutory factors. It enables retention of: the existing South Holland and The Deepings constituency unchanged; the Five Village, and Swineshead and Holland Fen wards in the Boston and Skegness constituency; and the Halton Holegate ward in the Louth and Horncastle constituency. The Assistant Commissioners considered that retaining Market Deeping in an unchanged South Holland and The Deepings constituency had merit, which also addressed some of the opposition to the proposed Rutland and Stamford constituency, by removing Market Deeping from it. They felt that this approach better reflected the statutory factors for the Boston and Skegness, and Louth and Horncastle constituencies too, as they more closely aligned to the existing constituency boundaries. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and propose that: Market Deeping be retained in a South Holland and The Deepings constituency unchanged from its current composition; the initially proposed Boston and Skegness constituency be realigned to the southern boundary of the Boston local authority; and the proposed Louth and Horncastle constituency be revised to include the entire Halton Holegate ward.
- 3.68** The existing Gainsborough and Lincoln constituencies are within the permitted electorate range. We proposed no change to the Lincoln constituency except to realign its boundary to reflect changes to local government ward boundaries, and we aligned the Gainsborough constituency to be coterminous with the West Lindsey local authority boundary. We proposed that the Grantham constituency should include the remaining South Kesteven local authority wards and the Heckington Rural and Osbournby wards. The proposed Sleaford and North Hykeham constituency included the remaining North Kesteven local authority wards.

- 3.69 Our initial proposals for the Gainsborough, and Lincoln constituencies were broadly supported. We did receive some representations that argued that some wards on the northern edge of the City of Lincoln boundary should be included within the Lincoln constituency, for example Karl McCartney, MP for Lincoln (BCE-88399). We also received some representations arguing that there are strong community ties between North Hykeham and Lincoln, which should therefore be included within the same constituency, for example BCE-56530 and the Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542). However, despite this being raised as a possible alternative in the initial proposals report, there was little support for alterations to an otherwise unchanged Lincoln constituency.
- 3.70 We received some opposition to including the Heckington Rural and Osbournby wards in our proposed Grantham constituency. David Turgoose (BCE-93834) and BCE-72115 argued the natural community and transport connections are with Sleaford, and opposed being included in the Grantham constituency. BCE-90960 opposed the constituency name Grantham, with representations wishing to rename it Grantham and Bourne to better represent the spread of the proposed constituency; this was also supported by the Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543), Green Party (BCE-97544) and Gareth Davies, MP for Grantham and Stamford (BCE-80771).
- 3.71 The Labour Party's submission supported the initial proposals for Gainsborough, Grantham, Lincoln, and Sleaford and North Hykeham. The Assistant Commissioners noted that the proposed Gainsborough constituency was well-received in the consultation periods, and given that it is highly compliant with the statutory factors they recommended no change to this constituency. The Assistant Commissioners considered the comments outlining the different community ties within the Grantham, Lincoln, and Sleaford and North Hykeham constituencies; however, they felt that none of the counter-proposals received reflected the statutory factors better than the initial proposals across the overall area covered by these constituencies. Therefore, the Assistant Commissioners did not recommend any changes to these constituencies as initially proposed. They considered the name Grantham and Bourne, but did not recommend this change, as they were unpersuaded that there was sufficient evidence that this name would have broad local support. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and propose no changes to the Gainsborough, Grantham, Lincoln, and Sleaford and North Hykeham constituencies as initially proposed.

Northamptonshire

- 3.72 Although the Northamptonshire sub-region was allocated seven whole constituencies in the initial proposals, the same as the existing allocation, as only one of the existing constituencies is within the permitted electorate range (two fall below and four above) we proposed changes to every constituency.
- 3.73 As recently established unitary authorities, both North and West Northamptonshire are temporarily using the county electoral divisions (hereafter referred to as wards) of the former Northamptonshire County Council, until the Local Government Boundary Commission's reviews of ward boundaries in the two new authorities concludes in the latter half of 2023. The consequence of this is that the wards used for this Parliamentary boundary review are unusually large for a primarily rural area, both geographically and in terms of electorate size. Our choices were therefore constrained by the difficulties posed by these large wards, including the inability to prevent division of some communities without an unreasonable number of ward splits or geographically expansive constituencies that do not reflect local ties. Unwieldy ward sizes, relatively close clustering of distinct communities, and the proximity to the regional boundary, led us to propose three split wards in the initial proposals.
- 3.74 We received some counter-proposals that opposed the number of split wards we proposed in Northamptonshire, and argued that a satisfactory scheme could be achieved within the county with fewer.
- 3.75 The Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542) proposed changes to six constituencies in Northamptonshire, and only one split ward. They proposed: a Daventry constituency that would include Brackley; a Rushden and Towcester constituency; and a Wellingborough constituency that would expand north west to include three West Northamptonshire wards. The Labour Party (BCE-95649) 'have considerable sympathy for the Liberal Democrats' ambition to minimise the number of split wards'; however, they ultimately opposed the counter-proposal, due to a lack of coherence in the proposed Rushden and Towcester constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-96664) also commented on the disruptive nature of the Liberal Democrats' proposals.
- 3.76 John Bryant (BCE-94367) and BCE-94201 both proposed alternative arrangements for all seven constituencies in Northamptonshire. BCE-94201 argued that it is possible to reduce the number of split wards in Northamptonshire. This counter-proposal would include: a similar Daventry constituency to the Liberal Democrats; a Towcester and Mid Northamptonshire constituency that would encircle Northampton; a Kettering constituency that would include Raunds; and a Wellingborough constituency that would contain

the entire Irchester ward. John Bryant (BCE-94367) supported this proposal, although they noted that the entire Earls Barton ward could be included in the Towcester and Mid Northamptonshire constituency, thereby reducing the number of ward splits to one.

- 3.77** The Assistant Commissioners considered the benefits of reducing the number of split wards; however, they did not recommend any of these counter-proposals, noting that the counter-proposals mentioned above would all disrupt the existing constituencies to a far greater extent than the initial proposals. We feel that these counter-proposals aptly demonstrate the value of split wards specifically in Northamptonshire, allowing us to respect local ties and existing constituencies to a far greater extent than would otherwise be possible. We are therefore satisfied that the approach taken by the Assistant Commissioners towards splitting wards in Northamptonshire, which will be temporary in nature, is appropriate with regard to both the statutory factors and the Commission's own policy.
- 3.78** Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-84681) supported our approach to split wards in Northamptonshire; however, they proposed changes to six of the seven proposed constituencies. This proposal would: include the entire Irchester ward with the majority of the Earls Barton ward in a proposed Daventry constituency, thus preventing a proposed South Northamptonshire constituency crossing the unitary authority boundary; include the entire Finedon ward and part of a split Irthlingborough ward in the proposed Wellingborough constituency; include the remaining part of the Irthlingborough ward in a Corby and East Northamptonshire constituency that would also retain Raunds; and split the Thrapston ward between the proposed Corby and East Northamptonshire, and Kettering constituencies. The Assistant Commissioners considered this proposal, but believed that it did not better reflect the statutory factors, specifically in relation to community ties, when compared to the initial proposals for the Irchester ward. Therefore, they did not recommend this proposal.
- 3.79** The electorates of the existing Northampton North and Northampton South constituencies are below the permitted electorate range. Therefore, we proposed to expand both constituencies southwards, covering the entirety of the area of the former Northampton Borough Council.

- 3.80 The initial proposals for the proposed Northampton North and Northampton South constituencies were supported by the Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) and the Green Party (BCE-97544). The initial proposals were also supported by Michael Ellis, MP for Northampton North (BCE-66867 and BCE-97500) who argued that the A45 acts as a good boundary for the constituency, for example 'residents living in Billing will often remain north of the A45 for their services such as schools and shops'. Councillor Michael Hallam (BCE-97510) spoke at the Northampton public hearing and argued that the proposed Northampton North constituency has strong community ties, with the Weston Favell Shopping Centre acting as a community hub for the Billing and Rectory Farm, and Riverside Park wards.
- 3.81 Conversely, we received a counter-proposal from the Labour Party (BCE-79476, BCE-95649 and BCE-97545) that proposed an alternative arrangement for the Northampton North and Northampton South constituencies. They proposed the Abington and Phippsville, Castle, and Dallington Spencer wards be included in a Northampton North constituency and the Billing and Rectory Farm, and Riverside Park wards in a Northampton South constituency, on the grounds that this configuration would more closely reflect the existing constituencies (BCE-79476). The Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542) proposed almost exactly the same configuration as the Labour Party, adding only a single polling district from the Hackleton and Grange Park ward to the Northampton South constituency.
- 3.82 We received numerous representations supporting the arguments put forward in the Labour Party counter-proposal. BCE-80291 outlined the community ties between the Abington and Phippsville ward and the Kingsthorpe area of Northampton North, stating that residents of the ward shop and use leisure facilities in Kingsthorpe; similar arguments were made by BCE-83291. During the public hearings, numerous attendees gave evidence on the connections between Abington and Phippsville, Castle, and Dallington Spencer wards and the existing Northampton North constituency. Councillor Danielle Stone (BCE-97504) and Mike Reader (BCE-97509) commented on the community ties between these areas through religious and community groups that operate throughout the urban core of Northampton, centred in and to the north of the Castle ward. Councillor Zoe Smith (BCE-97507) demonstrated the strength of community ties between the Abington and Phippsville, and Headlands wards, which are both currently included in the existing Northampton North constituency.

- 3.83 The Assistant Commissioners considered the evidence and counter-proposals submitted for the Northampton North and Northampton South constituencies. When visiting the area they observed that the wards mentioned in the previous paragraph shared strong community ties, and that the Labour counter-proposal created a clear boundary between Northampton North and Northampton South. They were persuaded by the evidence in favour of reverting to an arrangement that more closely resembled the current constituencies, and therefore recommended the changes set out in the Labour Party's counter-proposal. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and believe that the evidence in favour of uniting the urban core of Northampton in the Northampton North constituency has merit. Therefore, we propose a revision of our initial proposals, such that the Abington and Phippsville, Castle, and Dallington Spencer wards would be included in a Northampton North constituency, and the Billing and Rectory Farm, and Riverside Park wards in a Northampton South constituency.
- 3.84 The electorate of the existing Daventry and South Northamptonshire constituencies are both above the permitted electorate range. We proposed that the Silverstone ward be split between these two constituencies, and that the Irchester ward be split between the proposed South Northamptonshire, and Wellingborough and Raunds constituencies. The proposed Daventry constituency was also extended eastwards to include entirety of the Earls Barton ward. Both the proposed Daventry and South Northamptonshire constituencies would cross the boundary between the two unitary authorities in Northamptonshire.
- 3.85 We received some counter-proposals that argued it was unnecessary to have two constituencies crossing the unitary authority boundary. BCE-52555 and BCE-56943 both proposed only one constituency to cross the unitary authority boundary: the former including part of a split Earls Barton ward and the entirety of the Irchester ward in a South Northamptonshire constituency; and the latter including the southern part of the split Irchester ward with Earls Barton in a Daventry constituency.
- 3.86 We received some opposition to our initial proposals for the proposed Daventry constituency, with the majority of the representations opposed to the inclusion of the Earls Barton ward. Kenneth Jones (BCE-91142), BCE-52249 and BCE-83496 all argued that the distance between Daventry and Earls Barton ward is too great and the area shares closer links with Northampton or Wellingborough. BCE-83496 states 'The close proximity of our village to decision makers impacting on our daily lives is important as we can communicate better about local issues with an MP like Peter Bone, than with an MP who is 43 miles away and based in a town with which our village have no business what so ever', which highlighted the concerns about a lack of community ties within this proposed constituency.

- 3.87 We also received substantial opposition to including part of the split Irchester ward in a South Northamptonshire constituency. The Bozeat Parish Council (BCE-73436 and BCE-96677) opposed our initial proposals, on the grounds that Bozeat is separated from the rest of the constituency by Yardley Chase and Salcey Forest, historic hunting grounds, which makes access very difficult, especially by public transport. They state that the A509 acts as the major transport route for Bozeat, connecting it to Milton Keynes, Olney and Wellingborough for culture, community and work; these sentiments were also highlighted to the Assistant Commissioners during the Northampton public hearing (BCE-97503). This lack of connection is also highlighted in representations from residents of Bozeat, for example 'The connections of our villages are all made along the A509 which was the coaching road to London. Historically, Yardley Chase and Salcey Forest were hunting grounds and so crossings were prevented. This has fed down into the modern road network and has largely isolated our villages from the rest of the South Northamptonshire constituency and instead made Wellingborough our natural urban and cultural centre' (BCE-79196). Both the Bozeat Parish Council and BCE-79196 stated that if we are unable to include Bozeat in a constituency with Wellingborough, we should look to include it within a constituency with Newport Pagnell in the South East region.
- 3.88 Splitting the Irchester ward and including the southern part in a South Northamptonshire constituency was also opposed by the Green Party (BCE-97544); however, they did not propose a specific alternative. The Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542) proposed keeping the whole of the Irchester ward in one constituency (their proposed Rushden and Towcester), but this would still separate Bozeat from Wellingborough. The Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) and the Labour Party (BCE-79476, BCE-95649 and BCE-97545) supported our initial proposals.
- 3.89 We acknowledge the evidence that community ties between Wellingborough and Bozeat would be broken by the initial proposals; however, we agree with the Assistant Commissioners that no counter-proposal that returns the entirety of the Irchester ward to a Wellingborough constituency provides a persuasive pattern of constituencies for the county as a whole. We note that such alternatives either include additional county crossings (Jonathan Stansby – BCE-87423, BCE-55438, and BCE-79456) or disrupt the existing constituencies to an unnecessary degree (John Bryant – BCE-94367, and BCE-94201). While noting the proposal of including Bozeat within a constituency with Newport Pagnell, we do not feel that the case in favour of this is sufficiently compelling for us to depart from our policy of respecting regional boundaries. We therefore agree with the recommendation of the Assistant Commissioners that the Daventry, and South Northamptonshire constituencies are retained unchanged from the initial proposals.

- 3.90** The electorate of the existing Kettering constituency is within the permitted electorate range, but we did not propose an unchanged constituency, as the existing Corby and Wellingborough constituencies are both above the permitted electorate range. We proposed that the Finedon ward be split between the Kettering, and the proposed Wellingborough and Raunds constituencies. We also proposed splitting the Irchester ward between the South Northamptonshire, and Wellingborough and Raunds constituencies, as mentioned above. The proposed Wellingborough and Raunds constituency would also be extended eastwards to include the Raunds ward.
- 3.91** We received significant opposition to all three of these proposed constituencies. The major theme of the opposition concerned which parts of the area surrounding Wellingborough should or should not be included in the Wellingborough constituency. As previously mentioned we received opposition to excluding the Earls Barton ward and part of the Irchester ward. Similarly, we received opposition to including part of the Finedon ward in our proposed Kettering constituency. Gill Mercer (BCE-92191 and BCE-97516) and Wellingborough Town Council (BCE-84203) opposed the initial proposals, on the basis that they would break long-standing historical links between Finedon and Wellingborough. They also outlined how the proposed boundary would cut through the new Stanton Cross development, which is a significant urban extension of Wellingborough connecting the town with both Finedon and Irthlingborough.
- 3.92** Wellingborough Town Council (BCE-84203) also provided evidence of community ties between Irthlingborough and Wellingborough, particularly the Rushden Lakes area – this was also highlighted by Gill Mercer and Andy Mercer (BCE-92191, BCE-97516 and BCE-97517). BCE-57232, a resident from Irthlingborough, stated that Irthlingborough is remote from Corby, with no direct public transport links and the closest community amenities being located at Rushden Lakes. The strength of these transport connections is outlined in BCE-69602, for example ‘via the A6/A45 to the East or the B571 and Ditchford Lane’ to Rushden or ‘with direct access only a few miles on the B571 road’ to Wellingborough, passing through the Stanton Cross development.
- 3.93** We also received opposition to including the Raunds ward in our proposed Wellingborough and Raunds constituency. Councillor Cameron Clarke (BCE-64100) outlined how Raunds and Stanwick have community ties to Thrapston and Oundle, part of the former East Northamptonshire local authority. These community ties were also highlighted by Hargrave Parish Council (BCE-64787), who argued ‘Hargrave as a rural parish has more similarities with Corby and the East Northamptonshire area than the conurbations of Wellingborough and Rushden/Higham Ferrers’. Raunds Town Council (BCE-63311) also argued that Raunds has no geographic, historic or social connections to Wellingborough, with the A6 acting as a natural boundary.

- 3.94** We received a counter-proposal for these constituencies submitted by the Conservative Party (BCE-85837) and as a joint submission (BCE-73119) from Peter Bone (MP for Wellingborough), Philip Hollobone (MP for Kettering), and Tom Pursglove (MP for Corby). This proposal would retain the entirety of the Finedon ward in a Wellingborough and Rushden constituency along with part of the Irthlingborough ward, using the A6 as the boundary with a proposed Corby and East Northamptonshire constituency. Under this configuration, the Corby and East Northamptonshire constituency would include the Raunds ward and the remaining rural polling districts of the Irthlingborough ward to the north east of the A6. Consequently, to ensure the Corby and East Northamptonshire constituency is within the permitted electorate range, the Corby Rural ward would be split, including the parts containing Cottingham, East Carlton, and Middleton to the north west of Corby, and Little Stanion, and Stanion to the south of Corby, in the Kettering constituency. An identical proposal was submitted by the North Northamptonshire Council (BCE-74691) and by various individual representations, for example Gill Mercer (BCE-92191 and BCE-97516).
- 3.95** During our secondary consultation period we did receive some opposition to this proposal; particularly focused on the division of the Corby Rural ward. Chris Stanbra (BCE-94793 and BCE-97512) argued that the villages proposed to be included in a Kettering constituency all ‘look to Corby for facilities, shopping, leisure and services’ and are geographically linked to the town. Martyn Reuby (BCE-97514) also opposed the Conservative Party counter-proposal, commenting during the Northampton public hearing on the strength of community ties between Cottingham and Corby. The Conservative Party counter-proposal was also opposed by the Labour Party (BCE-95649), and Liberal Democrats (BCE-94369).
- 3.96** The Assistant Commissioners felt that there was considerable evidence to include the Finedon and Irthlingborough communities within Wellingborough, and the Raunds ward with Corby and East Northamptonshire. When visiting the area, the Assistant Commissioners noted that the Finedon ward had very strong community ties with Wellingborough, with the Stanton Cross development divided by the initial proposals. They also acknowledged that the A6 provides a clear boundary separating Irthlingborough itself from the more rural parts of the Irthlingborough ward, and that the town is closely tied to Wellingborough. The Assistant Commissioners noted that to facilitate these changes, the Corby Rural ward would also need to be split. While acknowledging that this ward clearly has strong community ties with Corby, they considered that Middleton, Cottingham and Stanion, the parishes proposed to be included in the Kettering constituency, were of a consistent character with other rural villages in the adjacent Desborough, Rothwell and Mawsley, and Ise wards. Therefore, the Assistant Commissioners recommended adopting the Conservative Party counter-proposal for the Corby and East Northamptonshire, Kettering, and Wellingborough constituencies.

- 3.97** We agree with the judgement reached by the Assistant Commissioners, including their recommendation that the existing Wellingborough name is sufficiently descriptive, as opposed to the Wellingborough and Rushden proposed by the Conservative Party. Therefore, we propose: a Corby and East Northamptonshire constituency to include the Raunds ward and six polling districts (RA, RB, RR, SG, SZ, and UQ) from the Irthlingborough ward north of the A6; a Kettering constituency to include six polling districts (CRWB, CRWC, CRWD, CRWE, CSCB and CSCC) from the Corby Rural ward; and a Wellingborough constituency to include the whole of the Finedon ward and the remaining two polling districts (SD and SF), covering Irthlingborough itself, from the Irthlingborough ward.

Nottinghamshire

- 3.98** Of the 11 existing constituencies in Nottinghamshire, three are within the permitted electorate range, two fall below, and six are above. The Nottinghamshire sub-region was allocated 11 constituencies, the same as at present. In formulating the initial proposals, we noted that the City of Nottingham unitary authority had a mathematical entitlement of 2.90 constituencies and the Nottinghamshire County Council area had a mathematical entitlement of 8.32 constituencies. As in the Leicestershire sub-region, we decided that a hard boundary between city and county would artificially restrict our ability to reflect the other statutory factors. Therefore, we decided to propose a constituency that included part of the Broxtowe local authority with City of Nottingham wards.
- 3.99** The electorate of the existing Gedling and Newark constituencies are within the permitted electorate range; however, we proposed changes to both, as the neighbouring constituencies are above the permitted electorate range. We proposed the Gedling constituency to include the Dumbles ward, and the Newark constituency to expand northwards to include the Bassetlaw local authority wards of Clayworth and Sturton. We proposed the Rushcliffe constituency to be unchanged apart from minor realignment with new ward boundaries. We also proposed to rename the Bassetlaw constituency to Worksop and Retford, to reflect the main population centres, and that a substantial minority of the Bassetlaw local authority is no longer included in the constituency.
- 3.100** The initial proposals for the Rushcliffe constituency drew little comment, reflecting the minimal change to the boundaries of the constituency. Although we received a small number of objections from the areas removed from this constituency as a consequence of changes to local government boundaries, we agree with the Assistant Commissioners that no persuasive evidence to depart from the initial proposals has been presented. Therefore, we propose no change to the initial proposals for Rushcliffe.

- 3.101** We received some opposition to our initial proposals for the Gedling constituency. BCE-72832 and BCE-91314 both argued that there is a lack of community ties and disparities in the requirements between the rural areas of Lambley and Woodborough, and the urban area of Gedling. We received one counter-proposal (BCE-56943) that sought to include the Dumbles ward within a Sherwood constituency, but this was not possible without widespread disruption to the constituencies in Nottinghamshire. Therefore, the Assistant Commissioners recommended no changes to the initial proposals for the Gedling constituency, and we agree.
- 3.102** We also received some opposition to our proposed Newark constituency on the grounds of breaking community ties to the north and the south. The West Stockwith Parish Council (BCE-79448), Ruth Edwards (BCE-85224), and Daniel Henderson (BCE-88542) all argued that the Clayworth and Sturton wards have very few community ties with Newark and look towards Retford and Worksop as their principal towns. Alan Harvey (BCE-86809) and BCE-86745 outlined similar issues to the south of the proposed Newark constituency; they argued that Bingham and the surrounding villages share service provision and community ties to the west with the rest of the Rushcliffe local authority.
- 3.103** We received one counter-proposal (BCE-55438) that would retain the Clayworth ward in a proposed Bassetlaw constituency, and include Bingham in an alternative Newark constituency that would extend further south into the Rushcliffe local authority to include Keyworth and Radcliffe on Trent. This would, however, be achieved through alterations to eight other proposed constituencies in Nottinghamshire, including two constituencies crossing the City of Nottingham unitary authority boundary, and one constituency comprising wards from four local authorities.
- 3.104** We also received a more localised counter-proposal for the Newark, and Worksop and Retford constituencies. BCE-81811 proposed including the Beckingham ward in a Newark constituency and the Clayworth ward in a Bassetlaw constituency. This counter-proposal argued that the Beckingham ward has more in common with Newark than the Clayworth ward, due to the economic and transport connections from the River Trent.
- 3.105** The Assistant Commissioners considered the counter-proposals and evidence outlining the different community ties in the Newark constituency. They noted that the arrangements proposed in BCE-55438 would be very disruptive to the existing constituencies and local authority boundaries throughout Nottinghamshire, and that including the Beckingham ward in Newark (as in BCE-81811) would leave the Misterton ward almost completely detached

from the rest of the Bassetlaw constituency. Their view was that the initial proposals reflect the statutory factors better than any counter-proposal received. They therefore recommended no changes to the initially proposed Newark constituency, and we agree.

- 3.106** Our initial proposals for the boundaries of the Worksop and Retford constituency were largely supported, apart from some opposition to including more wards from the Bassetlaw local authority in a Newark constituency; however, we received a significant number of representations opposing the name of Worksop and Retford. The MP for Bassetlaw, Brendan Clarke-Smith (BCE-85855), opposed the change of name and argued that the name Bassetlaw should be retained. Chris Ball (BCE-63702) and BCE-63830 both argued that Bassetlaw is a significant historical name that has existed for 130 years and that it 'encompasses the whole area'. BCE-55805 and BCE-87251 also expressed how the name covers all the communities within this constituency and does not exclude the smaller rural villages, as could be the case for Worksop and Retford. The four qualifying political parties all supported retention of the name Bassetlaw. Considering the evidence, the Assistant Commissioners recommended retaining the constituency name Bassetlaw. In light of the strong local support for retention of the Bassetlaw constituency name, we accept this recommendation.
- 3.107** As previously mentioned, we proposed one constituency that would cross the City of Nottingham unitary authority boundary at initial proposals to aid the development of constituencies in Nottinghamshire. We proposed a Nottingham North and Kimberley constituency that would include the Broxtowe wards of Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley, and Watnall & Nuthall West. Our proposed Broxtowe constituency would consequently expand northwards to include Eastwood, and all the remaining Broxtowe local authority wards. The proposed inclusion of the Eastwood area in a Broxtowe constituency received general support.
- 3.108** We received a mixture of representations expressing support and opposition to our proposal to cross the City of Nottingham boundary. During the first consultation we received substantial opposition from the Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley, and Watnall & Nuthall West wards. Councillor Jill Owen (BCE-58544) and BCE-52733 argued that the Broxtowe wards contain established parish councils and there is a great difference between these communities and the City of Nottingham. Councillor Philip Owen (BCE-57923) also highlighted these differences: 'There is a clear demarcation, not only physically between these two communities and the City but, also in outlook'. The Greasley Parish Council (BCE-68861) and Nuthall Parish Council (BCE-63889) argued that the green belt provides the rural nature of the area and separates it from Nottingham. Glynn Lowth (BCE-70110) also outlined how the M1 acts as a significant boundary drawing the focus of residents away from the city and towards Eastwood.

- 3.109** Broxtowe Borough Council (BCE-72949) supported our initial proposals during the first consultation and outlined that Beeston, Kimberley, and Nuthall are distinct communities with defined boundaries. They considered alternatives to the initial proposals, but deemed it was preferable for entire communities to be included in the same constituency. BCE-65952 also supported the initial proposals and argued that there is a geographical, educational, employment, and cultural connection between Kimberley and Nuthall, and Nottingham.
- 3.110** We did receive some alternative proposals for the location of the City of Nottingham crossing. The Conservative Party (BCE-85837) proposed that the Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley, and Watnall & Nuthall West wards should be retained in a Broxtowe constituency, instead including the Beeston Central, Beeston North and Beeston Rylands wards in a Nottingham South constituency. This proposal gained widespread support from residents of Kimberley, Nuthall, and Watnall, for example BCE-69932. Darren Henry, MP for Broxtowe (BCE-71122), and local Conservative Party groups (BCE-73926 and BCE-76223) also made submissions on this topic; these representations argued that Beeston has much more connection to Nottingham through education, employment and transport. BCE-81173 also argued there are strong community ties between Beeston and Nottingham, again focusing on education and employment connections.
- 3.111** Andrew Mansfield (BCE-93005 and BCE-95825) proposed that the Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley, and Watnall & Nuthall West wards should be retained in a Broxtowe constituency, instead including the Beeston North and Bramcote wards into a Nottingham based constituency; however, the counter proposal did not specify which constituency these two wards should be included in.
- 3.112** Finally, counter-proposal BCE-58332 proposed retaining the Kimberley ward in a Broxtowe constituency through retaining the Brinsley ward in an Ashfield constituency, and a second constituency crossing the city boundary, with Nottingham North including the Bestwood St. Albans ward. The aim of the counter-proposal was to retain Kimberley in a county-based constituency and align the Bestwood St. Albans ward with areas it shares community ties with.
- 3.113** During the second consultation, we received a substantial number of representations in support of the initial proposals, mainly from residents in Beeston who opposed the Conservative Party counter-proposal. Jane Marshall (BCE-97037) highlighted that the Conservative Party counter-proposal would split the Beeston town centre between constituencies. BCE-89228 argued that 'Beeston is a very cohesive and engaged local community with a very proud and clear community identity.' Graham Hickman (BCE-93924) supported these sentiments, arguing 'This would impose an artificial, unnecessary and harmful division on the community. Woodside road and university boulevard are natural boundaries between Broxtowe and the city and should be used as such.'

- 3.114** We did also receive further opposition to our initial proposals during the secondary consultation. Councillor Robert Flatley (BCE-97008) and Kashmir Purewal (BCE-97026) spoke at the Nottingham public hearing and gave evidence on the community ties between Beeston and Nottingham, focusing on the university for education and Boots as an employer. Kashmir Purewal also outlined that the M1 creates a significant boundary between the Kimberley, Nuthall East & Strelley, and Watnall & Nuthall West wards, and Nottingham. Bradley Bell (BCE-97041) highlighted the strength of the transport links, via the trams and buses, connecting Beeston and Nottingham and how this creates strong community ties between the two.
- 3.115** The initial proposals for Broxtowe, and Nottingham North and Kimberley were supported by the Labour Party (BCE-79476, BCE-95649 and BCE-97545) and the Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959, BCE-94369 and BCE-97542). The Green Party (BCE-97544) expressed the view that the Commission should look further into this issue, but acknowledged that there might be no simple solution.
- 3.116** The electorate of the existing Nottingham East is below the permitted range; we proposed expanding the constituency to include the entirety of the Castle ward and to make minor changes to realign with new local government wards. The Nottingham South constituency was expanded further north to include the Bilborough ward. We received general support for both constituencies, including from Lillian Greenwood, MP for Nottingham South (BCE-94463 and BCE-96991), who outlined the community ties within the proposed Nottingham South constituency.

- 3.117 The Assistant Commissioners considered all the evidence and counter-proposals, noting in particular that the Conservative Party counter-proposal had attracted substantial support, but also an even larger amount of opposition. The Assistant Commissioners visited the area and noted that there are good road connections between Beeston and the City of Nottingham, but there was also a substantial clear separation, due to the University of Nottingham campus and Highfields Park. Furthermore, they noted that the proposed constituency boundary would run along the pedestrianised high street and the wider town centre of Beeston, dividing it between two constituencies, as outlined in the representations. When also visiting the Kimberley, Nuthall, and Watnall areas the Assistant Commissioners observed that the M1 forms a significant boundary with Nottingham; however, the Assistant Commissioners felt that while this configuration combines these areas with the City, with which there are not strong local ties, it would be preferable to the counter proposal, which would entail dividing an area where community ties are present. The Assistant Commissioners considered that it would be more detrimental to split a community between two constituencies than combine in one constituency two distinct areas without strong links to each other. Accordingly, they did not recommend any changes to the initial proposals for the Broxtowe, and Nottingham North and Kimberley constituencies. Acknowledging the broad support for both constituencies, they also recommended no change to the Nottingham East, and Nottingham South constituencies.
- 3.118 We agree with the Assistant Commissioners and are not proposing changes to the initial proposals for the Broxtowe, Nottingham East, Nottingham North and Kimberley, and Nottingham South constituencies. While we acknowledge that there may be weak community ties within the Nottingham North and Kimberley constituency, we were particularly persuaded by the arguments made to prevent the alternative of a division of Beeston, as it is a single unified community.
- 3.119 The existing Mansfield constituency is slightly above the permitted electorate range, with an electorate of 77,409, meaning some electors need to be transferred out of Mansfield constituency. Conversely, as the changes to the existing Broxtowe constituency would align it to its northern local authority boundary, the partly reconfigured Ashfield constituency required an increase in electorate to meet the permitted range. The proposed Bassetlaw and Sherwood constituencies only required minimal change. Therefore, we decided to propose an Ashfield constituency that would include two wards (Brick Kiln and Grange Farm) from the Mansfield local authority. We decided to include these wards as they are centred on two clear and direct road links connecting Mansfield to Sutton-in-Ashfield: the A38 (Sutton Road) and the B6014 (Skegby Lane). We acknowledged these proposals would divide the Mansfield community and we actively sought views in our initial proposals report on whether there was any better alternative approach.

- 3.120** We received a significant number of representations expressing opposition to our proposals to include the Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards in an Ashfield constituency. Ben Bradley, MP for Mansfield (BCE-97001), outlined the general opposition his constituents had expressed to our initial proposals. A key theme in the representations was opposition to the division of communities we had ourselves identified. Specifically, residents commented that these wards form part of the wider Ladybrook Estate, which has a strong local identity and extends into the centre of Mansfield. These respondents argued that the Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards ‘constitute a very major and integral part of the Town of Mansfield’ (BCE-85930) and have ‘no affinity towards Sutton (Ashfield)’ (BCE-92291). Representations also outline the division between these wards and the Ashfield local authority, for example one respondent (BCE-77363) said ‘A bird’s eye view of the urban areas of Sutton-in-Ashfield and Mansfield reveals a clear natural border which ought to form the parliamentary boundary between Mansfield and Ashfield. This is the main road known locally as the Mansfield and Ashfield Regeneration Route (MARR), specifically the Beck Lane, Kings Mill Road East, and Sherwood Way South sections. The proposal of putting Grange Farm ward area and Brick Kiln ward area on the Ashfield side of the border would completely disrupt the natural border of the two towns.’
- 3.121** We received alternative proposals for our proposed Ashfield and Mansfield constituencies. Andy Abrahams, the Executive Mayor of Mansfield (BCE-97431), Mansfield District Council (BCE-81832) and various other responses argued that the initial proposals would separate well established communities in Mansfield, which are disconnected from Ashfield by the A38, the Kings Mill Hospital complex, Kings Mill Reservoir, and areas of agricultural land. They proposed instead that the Brick Kiln, and Grange Farm wards should be retained in Mansfield and either part of the Ransom Wood ward or the village of Pleasley Hill be removed from the Mansfield constituency. During the secondary consultation period Mansfield District Council (BCE-96668) submitted an amended counter-proposal that continued to support their general initial proposal, but also proposed that the Lindhurst development to the southern end of the Berry Hill ward could be transferred to the Ashfield constituency. They argued that this very recent development is its own distinct community that has not yet formed close connections with the Mansfield constituency.

- 3.122** Councillor Jason Zadrozny, the Leader of Ashfield District Council (BCE-97033) and Ashfield District Council (BCE-75735 and BCE-81737) submitted a counter-proposal during the first consultation period that retained the Brick Kiln, and Grange Farm wards in a Mansfield constituency. They proposed instead that one polling district of the Ransom Wood ward be included in a Sherwood constituency. They argued that the proposal would ensure the entirety of Rainworth is within one Parliamentary constituency, as the village is currently divided between the Newark and Sherwood, and Mansfield local authorities. Although this would decrease the Mansfield constituency electorate sufficiently to bring it within the permitted range, this alone would leave the Ashfield constituency too small, so they also proposed including the Hucknall West ward in an Ashfield constituency. They argued that the A611 – which follows the majority of the boundary between the Hucknall West ward and the remaining three Hucknall wards – is a natural and strong boundary. During the secondary consultation period, Councillor Zadrozny submitted a supplementary representation (BCE-95699), supporting the same counter-proposal as Mansfield District Council outlined above.
- 3.123** Councillor June Stendall (BCE-72853 and BCE-97031), a district councillor for the Grange Farm ward, also proposed multiple alternatives for the Mansfield constituency. Councillor Stendall argued that the Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards have strong community ties with Mansfield and are separated from Ashfield by the Sutton Reservoir, Kings Mill Hospital, industrial complexes, railway line, and the A38. Similar to the response of Ashfield District Council, Councillor Stendall proposed including parts of the Ransom Wood ward in a Sherwood constituency and in turn either the Hucknall West ward – or part of the Newstead Abbey ward around Newstead Village – into an Ashfield constituency. This representation contained further alternatives, such as transferring parts of the Berry Hill, Bull Farm and Pleasley Hill, or Penniment wards, into an Ashfield constituency. Councillor Stendall also submitted a supplementary representation during the secondary consultation (BCE-93955), putting forward a number of alternatives, again including the same counter-proposal as Mansfield District Council. Regarding this proposal, Councillor Stendall argued for a lack of community ties between the Lindhurst development and the Mansfield constituency, and highlighted that this option would result in no knock-on impacts for the neighbouring Sherwood constituency.

- 3.124** The four qualifying political parties all supported our initial proposals for the Ashfield and Mansfield constituencies. The Labour Party (BCE-79476 and BCE-95649) expressed regret for the end of a coterminous Mansfield constituency, and sympathised with representations objecting to the transfer of the Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards. The Liberal Democrats (BCE-80959 and BCE-94369) similarly disliked the proposed Ashfield constituency, but accepted it as 'the least worst choice'. Both the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats, however, opposed the counter-proposal, proposing instead to include part of the Ransom Wood ward in a Sherwood constituency, and Hucknall West in an Ashfield constituency.
- 3.125** Mark Spencer, MP for Sherwood (BCE-81132 and BCE-97469), opposed the counter-proposals that would divide Hucknall West from the other three Hucknall wards, arguing that it would create confusion for residents and see the town split in two. Councillor Lauren Mitchell (BCE-85320) submitted a petition opposing the division of Hucknall named 'Keep Hucknall Together', which attracted over 400 signatories.
- 3.126** Our initial proposals for the Sherwood constituency – which only proposed minor changes to expand it eastwards to include the villages of Lowdham and Thurgarton – were largely uncontroversial, and we received very few representations on this composition. We did, however, receive a number of representations wishing the name of the constituency to be Sherwood Forest, for example Mark Spencer MP argued that there was confusion with the existing name of Sherwood, as it is also the name of a City of Nottingham council ward. Respondents also argued that the constituency comprises wards from the Ashfield and Gedling local authorities, with the majority of electors actually located outside the Newark and Sherwood local authority. They proposed the name Sherwood Forest would 'reflect the immense history and heritage of the area' (BCE-81132). The Conservative Party (BCE-85837, BCE-96664 and BCE-97543) and Green Party (BCE-97544) supported the name Sherwood Forest.

- 3.127** The Assistant Commissioners noted that the initial proposals for Ashfield and Mansfield received the largest number of critical representations in Nottinghamshire. They considered the counter-proposals and noted particularly that any alternative that does not directly transfer electors from the Mansfield constituency to Ashfield would result in disruption to other proposed constituencies in Nottinghamshire, which had been generally well received. They noted that the first counter-proposal from Councillor Jason Zadrozny, Councillor June Stendall, and Ashfield District Council would divide the community of Hucknall, and include parts of four local authorities in a Sherwood constituency, including an orphan polling district. They considered this would not better reflect the statutory factors relative to the initial proposals, noting opposition from residents of the Hucknall West ward, and therefore did not recommend this approach.
- 3.128** In considering the second counter-proposal from Mayor Andy Abrahams, Councillor Jason Zadrozny, Councillor June Stendall, Ashfield District Council, and Mansfield District Council the Assistant Commissioners visited the area and were persuaded that the Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards were intrinsic parts of the Mansfield community, stretching into the urban centre. They noted that these wards are particularly connected to the neighbouring Ladybrook and Penniment wards that collectively make up the Ladybrook Estate. During this visit, the Assistant Commissioners noted the Pleasley Hill and Bull Farm ward was more rural in character and did not extend into the centre of Mansfield. They also noted that the part of the Berry Hill ward that is proposed to be included in the Ashfield constituency is a new housing estate, as yet without direct road links to the rest of the ward. The Assistant Commissioners considered whether an entire ward could be transferred into the Ashfield constituency, but believed this would cause similar issues to the initial proposals, as the Berry Hill and Oakham wards both extend towards the centre of Mansfield, and the Penniment ward forms part of the wider Ladybrook Estate. Therefore, they recommended adopting the counter-proposal to include the Pleasley Hill and Bull Farm ward and the Lindhurst development of the Berry Hill ward (polling district BHC) in the Ashfield constituency, returning Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards to the Mansfield constituency. The Assistant Commissioners recommended no change to the boundary of the Sherwood constituency, but endorsed the request that it be named Sherwood Forest.
- 3.129** We agree it would be appropriate to limit the crossing of the Mansfield local authority boundary to Ashfield, in order to prevent disruption to the other constituencies in Nottinghamshire. When assessing the information presented by the Assistant Commissioners and the representations received, we considered whether alternative whole wards could be included in the Ashfield constituency. We agreed that the Penniment ward forms part of the Ladybrook Estate, and the Berry Hill, and Oakham wards extend into the centre of Mansfield in a manner

similar to that of Brick Kiln and Grange Farm ward. We acknowledge that the ties of the Pleasley Hill and Bull Farm ward and the Lindhurst development are stronger with Mansfield than Ashfield, but the evidence received indicates that these ties are weaker than those of the Brick Kiln and Grange Farm wards. Given that some part of the Mansfield local authority must be removed from the constituency, we feel that this option disrupts local ties the least across the district as a whole. We therefore agree to revise the proposed Ashfield and Mansfield constituencies as recommended by the Assistant Commissioners.

- 3.130** We agree with the recommendations by the Assistant Commissioners for the existing Sherwood constituency, proposing no changes to the boundary, but a change of name to Sherwood Forest.

4 How to have your say

- 4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for a four-week period, from 8 November to 5 December 2022 inclusive. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear and the more local information that is provided, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Parliament.
- 4.2 While people are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies which we have revised since our initial proposals. While we will consider representations that comment again on the initial proposals that we have not revised, it is likely that particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to depart, at this late stage in the review, from those of our initial proposals, which have withstood intensive scrutiny of objections in the process of consultation and review to which they have already been subject. Representations relating to initial proposals that we have not revised and which simply repeat evidence or arguments that have already been raised in either of the previous two consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.
- 4.3 When making comments on our revised proposals, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament, discussed in chapter 2 and in our Guide to the 2023 Review. Most importantly:
- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that contain more than 77,062 or fewer than 69,724 electors
 - We are basing our proposals on local government ward boundaries (existing or – where relevant – prospective) as at 1 December 2020 as the building blocks of constituencies – although where there is strong justification for doing so, we will consider dividing a ward between constituencies (see the Guide to the 2023 Review for more detailed information)
 - We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries – very compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.
- 4.4 These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a comment about their local area to bear in mind there may be consequential effects for neighbouring areas that might result from their suggestions. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). What may be a better solution for one location may have undesirable consequences for others. We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to be aware that their counter-proposals may have an impact on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

How can you give us your views?

- 4.5 Views on our revised proposals should be given to the Commission in writing. We encourage everyone who wishes to comment on our proposals in writing to do so through our interactive consultation website at www.bcereviews.org.uk – you will find all the details you need and can comment directly through the website. The website allows you to explore the map of our proposals and obtain further data, including the electorate sizes of every ward. You can also upload text or data files you may have previously prepared setting out your views.
- 4.6 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to protecting and using your personal details (available at www.bcereviews.org.uk). As these consultations are very much concerned with a respondent's sense of place and community, when publishing responses, we will associate the response with the general locality (e.g. town or village) of the respondent's address, but we will not publish a respondent's name or detailed address with their response, unless they specifically ask us to do so.
- 4.7 It is important to stress that all representations, whether they have been made through our website or sent to us in writing, will be given equal consideration by the Commission.

What do we want views on?

- 4.8 We would particularly like to ask two things of people responding to our consultation. Firstly, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so. Past experience suggests that too often people who are happy with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points. That can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to our proposals. Secondly, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, please use the resources (such as maps and electorate figures) available on our website and at the places of deposit to put forward counter-proposals that are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.
- 4.9 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations that we present in 2023.

Appendix: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Amber Valley CC			70,625
	Alfreton	Amber Valley	6,383
	Codnor and Waingroves	Amber Valley	4,025
	Heage and Ambergate	Amber Valley	4,031
	Heanor and Loscoe	Amber Valley	4,095
	Heanor East	Amber Valley	4,492
	Heanor West	Amber Valley	4,793
	Ironville and Riddings	Amber Valley	4,638
	Kilburn, Denby and Holbrook	Amber Valley	6,321
	Langley Mill and Aldercar	Amber Valley	4,273
	Ripley	Amber Valley	7,263
	Ripley and Marehay	Amber Valley	4,466
	Shipley Park, Horsley and Horsley Woodhouse	Amber Valley	5,124
	Somercotes	Amber Valley	4,480
	Swanwick	Amber Valley	4,336
	Wingfield	Amber Valley	1,905
Ashfield CC			69,819
	Abbey Hill	Ashfield	2,332
	Annesley & Kirkby Woodhouse	Ashfield	5,848
	Ashfields	Ashfield	2,946
	Carsic	Ashfield	2,706
	Central & New Cross	Ashfield	5,339
	Huthwaite & Brierley	Ashfield	5,579
	Jacksdale	Ashfield	2,595
	Kingsway	Ashfield	2,434
	Kirkby Cross & Portland	Ashfield	3,132
	Larwood	Ashfield	3,001
	Leamington	Ashfield	2,754
	Selston	Ashfield	5,024
	Skegby	Ashfield	5,217
	St. Mary's	Ashfield	2,836
	Stanton Hill & Teversal	Ashfield	2,470

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Summit	Ashfield	5,073
	Sutton Junction & Harlow Wood	Ashfield	2,750
	The Dales	Ashfield	2,364
	Underwood	Ashfield	2,690
	Berry Hill – part of (polling district BHC)	Mansfield	271
	Bull Farm and Pleasley Hill	Mansfield	2,458
Bassetlaw CC			75,773
	Beckingham	Bassetlaw	1,923
	Blyth	Bassetlaw	1,882
	Carlton	Bassetlaw	4,365
	East Retford East	Bassetlaw	5,361
	East Retford North	Bassetlaw	5,043
	East Retford South	Bassetlaw	3,875
	East Retford West	Bassetlaw	3,789
	Everton	Bassetlaw	2,045
	Harworth	Bassetlaw	6,209
	Langold	Bassetlaw	1,963
	Misterton	Bassetlaw	2,035
	Ranskill	Bassetlaw	1,900
	Sutton	Bassetlaw	1,675
	Welbeck	Bassetlaw	1,502
	Worksop East	Bassetlaw	4,738
	Worksop North	Bassetlaw	6,876
	Worksop North East	Bassetlaw	4,846
	Worksop North West	Bassetlaw	5,496
	Worksop South	Bassetlaw	5,388
	Worksop South East	Bassetlaw	4,862
Bolsover CC			74,680
	Ault Hucknall	Bolsover	4,860
	Barlborough	Bolsover	3,349
	Blackwell	Bolsover	3,447
	Bolsover East	Bolsover	3,326
	Bolsover North & Shuttlewood	Bolsover	2,607
	Bolsover South	Bolsover	3,302
	Clowne East	Bolsover	4,482
	Clowne West	Bolsover	1,670
	Elmton-with-Creswell	Bolsover	4,713

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Langwith	Bolsover	3,323
	Pinxton	Bolsover	3,320
	Shirebrook North	Bolsover	3,342
	Shirebrook South	Bolsover	2,742
	South Normanton East	Bolsover	3,511
	South Normanton West	Bolsover	5,057
	Tibshelf	Bolsover	3,252
	Whitwell	Bolsover	3,000
	Holmewood & Heath	North East Derbyshire	3,106
	Pilsley & Morton	North East Derbyshire	4,314
	Shirland	North East Derbyshire	4,701
	Sutton	North East Derbyshire	3,256
Boston and Skegness CC			75,806
	Coastal	Boston	2,895
	Fenside	Boston	1,919
	Fishtoft	Boston	4,768
	Five Village	Boston	3,156
	Kirton and Frampton	Boston	4,801
	Old Leake and Wrangle	Boston	2,739
	Skirbeck	Boston	3,651
	St. Thomas'	Boston	1,510
	Staniland	Boston	2,224
	Station	Boston	747
	Swineshead and Holland Fen	Boston	3,138
	Trinity	Boston	2,674
	West	Boston	1,621
	Witham	Boston	2,224
	Wyberton	Boston	3,192
	Burgh le Marsh	East Lindsey	2,038
	Chapel St. Leonards	East Lindsey	3,999
	Croft	East Lindsey	1,930
	Friskney	East Lindsey	1,777
	Ingoldmells	East Lindsey	1,668
	Scarbrough & Seacroft	East Lindsey	6,747
	Sibsey & Stickney	East Lindsey	4,121
	St. Clement's	East Lindsey	3,891
	Wainfleet	East Lindsey	1,997

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Willoughby with Sloothby	East Lindsey	2,038
	Winthorpe	East Lindsey	4,341
Broxtowe CC			72,461
	Attenborough & Chilwell East	Broxtowe	5,711
	Awsorth, Cossall & Trowell	Broxtowe	4,151
	Beeston Central	Broxtowe	4,271
	Beeston North	Broxtowe	4,315
	Beeston Rylands	Broxtowe	3,538
	Beeston West	Broxtowe	4,154
	Bramcote	Broxtowe	5,838
	Brinsley	Broxtowe	1,909
	Chilwell West	Broxtowe	5,783
	Eastwood Hall	Broxtowe	1,972
	Eastwood Hilltop	Broxtowe	3,967
	Eastwood St. Mary's	Broxtowe	3,494
	Greasley	Broxtowe	5,449
	Stapleford North	Broxtowe	3,557
	Stapleford South East	Broxtowe	3,968
	Stapleford South West	Broxtowe	4,035
	Toton & Chilwell Meadows	Broxtowe	6,349
Chesterfield BC			70,722
	Brimington North	Chesterfield	3,097
	Brimington South	Chesterfield	4,846
	Brockwell	Chesterfield	5,155
	Dunston	Chesterfield	4,646
	Hasland	Chesterfield	4,860
	Hollingwood and Inkersall	Chesterfield	5,728
	Holmebrook	Chesterfield	3,039
	Linacre	Chesterfield	3,176
	Loundsley Green	Chesterfield	2,880
	Middlecroft and Poolsbrook	Chesterfield	3,417
	Moor	Chesterfield	3,259
	Old Whittington	Chesterfield	3,099
	Rother	Chesterfield	4,487
	St. Helen's	Chesterfield	3,431
	St. Leonard's	Chesterfield	6,023
	Walton	Chesterfield	4,566
	West	Chesterfield	5,013

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Corby and East Northamptonshire CC			76,748
	Corby Rural – part of (polling districts CRWA, CSCA, CWGA, CWGB and CWGC)	North Northamptonshire	6,109
	Corby West	North Northamptonshire	9,087
	Irthlingborough – part of (polling districts RA, RB, RR, SG, SZ and UQ)	North Northamptonshire	4,038
	Kingswood	North Northamptonshire	8,599
	Lloyds	North Northamptonshire	9,521
	Oakley	North Northamptonshire	9,081
	Oundle	North Northamptonshire	10,073
	Raunds	North Northamptonshire	9,240
	Thrapston	North Northamptonshire	11,000
Daventry CC			76,539
	Earls Barton	North Northamptonshire	10,791
	Braunston and Crick	West Northamptonshire	9,900
	Brixworth	West Northamptonshire	9,637
	Daventry East	West Northamptonshire	7,594
	Daventry West	West Northamptonshire	8,313
	Long Buckby	West Northamptonshire	9,015
	Moulton	West Northamptonshire	10,392
	Silverstone – part of (polling districts SAG, SAP, SAQ, SBJ, and SCL)	West Northamptonshire	1,724
	Woodford and Weedon	West Northamptonshire	9,173
Derby North BC			71,876
	Abbey	Derby	9,241
	Chaddesden	Derby	9,906
	Darley	Derby	10,778

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Derwent	Derby	9,528
	Littleover	Derby	11,047
	Mackworth	Derby	9,938
	Mickleover	Derby	11,438
Derby South BC			72,067
	Alvaston	Derby	11,175
	Arboretum	Derby	10,789
	Blagreaves	Derby	9,669
	Boulton	Derby	9,867
	Chellaston	Derby	11,761
	Normanton	Derby	9,489
	Sinfin	Derby	9,317
Derbyshire Dales CC			71,435
	Alport	Amber Valley	2,187
	Crich	Amber Valley	2,181
	Ashbourne North	Derbyshire Dales	2,942
	Ashbourne South	Derbyshire Dales	4,127
	Bakewell	Derbyshire Dales	3,619
	Bradwell	Derbyshire Dales	1,503
	Brailsford	Derbyshire Dales	1,528
	Calver	Derbyshire Dales	1,496
	Carsington Water	Derbyshire Dales	1,576
	Chatsworth	Derbyshire Dales	1,374
	Clifton and Bradley	Derbyshire Dales	1,478
	Darley Dale	Derbyshire Dales	4,716
	Dovedale and Parwich	Derbyshire Dales	1,360
	Doveridge and Sudbury	Derbyshire Dales	1,627
	Hartington and Taddington	Derbyshire Dales	1,382
	Hathersage and Eyam	Derbyshire Dales	3,185
	Hulland	Derbyshire Dales	1,516
	Lathkill and Bradford	Derbyshire Dales	1,288
	Litton and Longstone	Derbyshire Dales	1,327
	Masson	Derbyshire Dales	2,418
	Matlock All Saints	Derbyshire Dales	4,396
	Matlock St. Giles	Derbyshire Dales	4,426
	Norbury	Derbyshire Dales	1,438
	Stanton	Derbyshire Dales	1,452
	Tideswell	Derbyshire Dales	1,397
	Winster and South Darley	Derbyshire Dales	1,359
	Wirksworth	Derbyshire Dales	4,824

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Hatton	South Derbyshire	2,056
	Hilton	South Derbyshire	7,257
Erewash CC			71,986
	Awsorth Road	Erewash	3,535
	Breaston	Erewash	3,639
	Cotmanhay	Erewash	3,609
	Derby Road East	Erewash	3,772
	Derby Road West	Erewash	5,625
	Draycott & Risley	Erewash	3,302
	Hallam Fields	Erewash	3,834
	Kirk Hallam & Stanton-by-Dale	Erewash	4,983
	Larklands	Erewash	6,110
	Little Hallam	Erewash	3,558
	Long Eaton Central	Erewash	5,444
	Nottingham Road	Erewash	3,722
	Sandiacre	Erewash	6,155
	Sawley	Erewash	5,071
	Shipley View	Erewash	3,776
	Wilsthorne	Erewash	5,851
Gainsborough CC			74,750
	Bardney	West Lindsey	2,139
	Caistor and Yarborough	West Lindsey	4,572
	Cherry Willingham	West Lindsey	6,270
	Dunholme and Welton	West Lindsey	6,769
	Gainsborough East	West Lindsey	5,266
	Gainsborough North	West Lindsey	5,384
	Gainsborough South-West	West Lindsey	3,873
	Hemswell	West Lindsey	2,161
	Kelsey Wold	West Lindsey	2,250
	Lea	West Lindsey	1,833
	Market Rasen	West Lindsey	6,893
	Nettleham	West Lindsey	3,564
	Saxilby	West Lindsey	4,615
	Scampton	West Lindsey	2,183
	Scotter and Blyton	West Lindsey	6,231
	Stow	West Lindsey	1,993
	Sudbrooke	West Lindsey	2,152
	Torksey	West Lindsey	2,455
	Waddingham and Spital	West Lindsey	2,054

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Wold View	West Lindsey	2,093
Gedling CC			75,795
	Bestwood St. Albans	Gedling	3,967
	Carlton	Gedling	4,218
	Carlton Hill	Gedling	6,198
	Cavendish	Gedling	4,198
	Colwick	Gedling	2,003
	Coppice	Gedling	4,550
	Daybrook	Gedling	4,328
	Dumbles	Gedling	2,313
	Ernehale	Gedling	4,558
	Gedling	Gedling	4,655
	Netherfield	Gedling	3,912
	Phoenix	Gedling	4,110
	Plains	Gedling	6,749
	Porchester	Gedling	6,435
	Redhill	Gedling	4,858
	Trent Valley	Gedling	4,286
	Woodthorpe	Gedling	4,457
Grantham CC			72,071
	Heckington Rural	North Kesteven	4,587
	Osournby	North Kesteven	2,009
	Aveland	South Kesteven	2,042
	Belmont	South Kesteven	3,479
	Belvoir	South Kesteven	3,978
	Bourne Austerby	South Kesteven	5,508
	Bourne East	South Kesteven	3,513
	Bourne West	South Kesteven	4,007
	Grantham Arnoldfield	South Kesteven	3,990
	Grantham Barrowby Gate	South Kesteven	3,746
	Grantham Earlesfield	South Kesteven	3,362
	Grantham Harrowby	South Kesteven	3,478
	Grantham Springfield	South Kesteven	3,471
	Grantham St. Vincent's	South Kesteven	4,852
	Grantham St. Wulfram's	South Kesteven	3,818
	Lincrest	South Kesteven	2,020
	Loveden Heath	South Kesteven	2,122
	Morton	South Kesteven	1,960
	Peascliffe & Ridgeway	South Kesteven	3,965
	Toller	South Kesteven	2,057

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Viking	South Kesteven	4,107
Harborough CC			74,810
	Glen	Harborough	4,339
	Kibworths	Harborough	6,297
	Lubenham	Harborough	1,698
	Market Harborough-Great Bowden & Arden	Harborough	4,283
	Market Harborough-Little Bowden	Harborough	4,257
	Market Harborough-Logan	Harborough	6,075
	Market Harborough-Welland	Harborough	4,546
	Oadby Brocks Hill	Oadby and Wigston	3,099
	Oadby Grange	Oadby and Wigston	4,278
	Oadby St. Peter's	Oadby and Wigston	3,342
	Oadby Uplands	Oadby and Wigston	3,364
	Oadby Woodlands	Oadby and Wigston	3,494
	South Wigston	Oadby and Wigston	5,975
	Wigston All Saints	Oadby and Wigston	4,775
	Wigston Fields	Oadby and Wigston	5,108
	Wigston Meadowcourt	Oadby and Wigston	4,814
	Wigston St. Wolstan's	Oadby and Wigston	5,066
High Peak CC			73,960
	Barms	High Peak	1,414
	Blackbrook	High Peak	3,627
	Burbage	High Peak	1,640
	Buxton Central	High Peak	3,040
	Chapel East	High Peak	1,737
	Chapel West	High Peak	3,987
	Corbar	High Peak	3,267
	Cote Heath	High Peak	3,140
	Dinting	High Peak	1,932
	Gamesley	High Peak	1,755
	Hadfield North	High Peak	1,760
	Hadfield South	High Peak	3,408
	Hayfield	High Peak	1,711
	Hope Valley	High Peak	3,244
	Howard Town	High Peak	3,645
	Limestone Peak	High Peak	1,739
	New Mills East	High Peak	3,175
	New Mills West	High Peak	3,478

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Old Glossop	High Peak	3,835
	Padfield	High Peak	1,876
	Sett	High Peak	1,641
	Simmondley	High Peak	3,489
	St. John's	High Peak	1,595
	Stone Bench	High Peak	3,208
	Temple	High Peak	1,859
	Tintwistle	High Peak	1,639
	Whaley Bridge	High Peak	5,331
	Whitfield	High Peak	1,788
Hinckley and Bosworth CC			75,683
	Ambien	Hinckley and Bosworth	3,005
	Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,634
	Barwell	Hinckley and Bosworth	6,917
	Burbage Sketchley and Stretton	Hinckley and Bosworth	8,148
	Burbage St. Catherines and Lash Hill	Hinckley and Bosworth	4,733
	Cadeby, Carlton and Market Bosworth with Shackerstone	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,973
	Earl Shilton	Hinckley and Bosworth	7,917
	Hinckley Castle	Hinckley and Bosworth	4,957
	Hinckley Clarendon	Hinckley and Bosworth	6,972
	Hinckley De Montfort	Hinckley and Bosworth	8,148
	Hinckley Trinity	Hinckley and Bosworth	5,419
	Newbold Verdon with Desford and Peckleton	Hinckley and Bosworth	7,033
	Twycross and Witherley with Sheepy	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,649
	Appleby	North West Leicestershire	2,008
	Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe	North West Leicestershire	2,170
Kettering CC			76,163
	Burton and Broughton	North Northamptonshire	9,431

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Clover Hill	North Northamptonshire	8,176
	Corby Rural – part of (polling districts CRWB, CRWC, CRWD, CRWE, CSCB and CSCC)	North Northamptonshire	3,386
	Desborough	North Northamptonshire	10,556
	Ise	North Northamptonshire	8,376
	Northall	North Northamptonshire	9,188
	Rothwell and Mawsley	North Northamptonshire	9,420
	Wicksteed	North Northamptonshire	9,657
	Windmill	North Northamptonshire	7,973
Leicester East BC			76,465
	Belgrave	Leicester	11,349
	Evington – part of (polling districts EVA, EVB, EVC, EVD and EVE)	Leicester	10,044
	Humberstone & Hamilton	Leicester	13,856
	North Evington	Leicester	11,849
	Rushey Mead	Leicester	12,003
	Thurncourt	Leicester	8,217
	Troon	Leicester	9,147
Leicester South BC			71,007
	Castle	Leicester	11,372
	Evington – part of (polling district EVF)	Leicester	2,289
	Eyres Monsell	Leicester	7,805
	Knighton	Leicester	12,503
	Saffron	Leicester	7,492
	Spinney Hills	Leicester	8,565
	Stoneygate	Leicester	12,617
	Wycliffe	Leicester	8,364
Leicester West BC			72,848
	Abbey	Leicester	12,595
	Aylestone	Leicester	8,294
	Beaumont Leys	Leicester	11,676

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields	Leicester	12,491
	Fosse	Leicester	7,384
	Westcotes	Leicester	7,106
	Western	Leicester	13,302
Lincoln BC			74,128
	Abbey	Lincoln	5,772
	Birchwood	Lincoln	5,790
	Boultham	Lincoln	6,289
	Carholme	Lincoln	6,879
	Castle	Lincoln	5,286
	Glebe	Lincoln	5,470
	Hartsholme	Lincoln	6,154
	Minster	Lincoln	5,279
	Moorland	Lincoln	5,396
	Park	Lincoln	5,696
	Witham	Lincoln	5,928
	Bracebridge Heath and Waddington East	North Kesteven	7,272
	Skellingthorpe	North Kesteven	2,917
Loughborough CC			73,902
	Barrow and Sileby West	Charnwood	5,736
	Loughborough Ashby	Charnwood	5,178
	Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	Charnwood	5,004
	Loughborough Garendon	Charnwood	4,447
	Loughborough Hastings	Charnwood	4,321
	Loughborough Lemyngton	Charnwood	4,588
	Loughborough Nanpantan	Charnwood	3,965
	Loughborough Outwoods	Charnwood	4,628
	Loughborough Shelthorpe	Charnwood	6,434
	Loughborough Southfields	Charnwood	5,417
	Loughborough Storer	Charnwood	4,787
	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	Charnwood	5,702
	Shepshed East	Charnwood	5,209
	Shepshed West	Charnwood	5,885
	The Wolds	Charnwood	2,601
Louth and Horncastle CC			75,959
	Alford	East Lindsey	3,775

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Binbrook	East Lindsey	2,036
	Coningsby & Mareham	East Lindsey	6,766
	Fulstow	East Lindsey	2,062
	Grimoldby	East Lindsey	1,833
	Hagworthingham	East Lindsey	1,952
	Halton Holegate	East Lindsey	2,168
	Holton-le-Clay & North Thoresby	East Lindsey	4,115
	Horncastle	East Lindsey	5,997
	Legbourne	East Lindsey	1,926
	Mablethorpe	East Lindsey	6,597
	Marshchapel & Somercotes	East Lindsey	3,729
	North Holme	East Lindsey	1,856
	Priory & St. James'	East Lindsey	3,735
	Roughton	East Lindsey	1,946
	Spilsby	East Lindsey	2,291
	St. Margaret's	East Lindsey	2,044
	St. Mary's	East Lindsey	1,882
	St. Michael's	East Lindsey	1,756
	Sutton on Sea	East Lindsey	3,933
	Tetford & Donington	East Lindsey	2,039
	Tetney	East Lindsey	1,896
	Trinity	East Lindsey	1,765
	Withern & Theddlethorpe	East Lindsey	2,085
	Woodhall Spa	East Lindsey	3,724
	Wragby	East Lindsey	2,051
Mansfield CC			74,680
	Abbott	Mansfield	2,043
	Berry Hill – part of (polling districts BHA and BHB)	Mansfield	2,303
	Brick Kiln	Mansfield	2,228
	Broomhill	Mansfield	1,742
	Carr Bank	Mansfield	1,931
	Eakring	Mansfield	2,125
	Grange Farm	Mansfield	2,385
	Holly	Mansfield	2,458
	Hornby	Mansfield	2,064
	Kings Walk	Mansfield	2,148
	Kingsway	Mansfield	2,058
	Ladybrook	Mansfield	1,938

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Lindhurst	Mansfield	2,169
	Ling Forest	Mansfield	2,151
	Manor	Mansfield	2,249
	Market Warsop	Mansfield	2,358
	Maun Valley	Mansfield	2,693
	Meden	Mansfield	2,130
	Netherfield	Mansfield	2,120
	Newgate	Mansfield	1,676
	Newlands	Mansfield	2,469
	Oak Tree	Mansfield	1,852
	Oakham	Mansfield	1,970
	Park Hall	Mansfield	2,609
	Peafields	Mansfield	2,259
	Penniment	Mansfield	2,091
	Portland	Mansfield	1,441
	Racecourse	Mansfield	1,964
	Ransom Wood	Mansfield	1,973
	Sandhurst	Mansfield	1,946
	Sherwood	Mansfield	1,980
	Warsop Carrs	Mansfield	2,754
	Woodhouse	Mansfield	2,292
	Woodlands	Mansfield	1,675
	Yeoman Hill	Mansfield	2,436
Melton and Syston CC			71,615
	East Goscote	Charnwood	2,307
	Queniborough	Charnwood	3,476
	Sileby	Charnwood	6,171
	Syston East	Charnwood	5,471
	Syston West	Charnwood	5,031
	Thurmaston	Charnwood	7,491
	Wreake Villages	Charnwood	2,409
	Asfordby	Melton	2,672
	Bottesford	Melton	2,946
	Croxtan Kerrial	Melton	1,496
	Frisby-on-the-Wreake	Melton	1,486
	Gaddesby	Melton	1,417
	Long Clawson and Stathern	Melton	3,370
	Melton Craven	Melton	2,719
	Melton Dorian	Melton	3,966
	Melton Egerton	Melton	2,806

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Melton Newport	Melton	4,105
	Melton Sysonby	Melton	3,991
	Melton Warwick	Melton	2,648
	Old Dalby	Melton	1,568
	Somerby	Melton	1,485
	Waltham-on-the-Wolds	Melton	1,305
	Wymondham	Melton	1,279
Mid Derbyshire CC			70,085
	Belper Central	Amber Valley	4,414
	Belper East	Amber Valley	4,742
	Belper North	Amber Valley	3,986
	Belper South	Amber Valley	4,425
	Duffield	Amber Valley	3,995
	South West Parishes	Amber Valley	3,118
	Allestree	Derby	11,008
	Oakwood	Derby	10,084
	Spondon	Derby	9,938
	Little Eaton & Stanley	Erewash	3,547
	Ockbrook & Borrowash	Erewash	5,701
	West Hallam & Dale Abbey	Erewash	5,127
Mid Leicestershire CC			76,173
	Ellis	Blaby	4,444
	Fairestone	Blaby	3,751
	Forest	Blaby	5,869
	Millfield	Blaby	1,925
	Muxloe	Blaby	3,357
	Ravenhurst and Fosse	Blaby	4,915
	Winstanley	Blaby	4,817
	Anstey	Charnwood	5,734
	Birstall Wanlip	Charnwood	5,733
	Birstall Watermead	Charnwood	5,148
	Forest Bradgate	Charnwood	2,780
	Mountsorrel	Charnwood	5,402
	Rothley and Thurgaston	Charnwood	6,261
	Groby	Hinckley and Bosworth	5,444
	Markfield, Stanton and Fieldhead	Hinckley and Bosworth	4,890
	Ratby, Bagworth and Thornton	Hinckley and Bosworth	5,703

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Newark CC			76,478
	Clayworth	Bassetlaw	1,538
	East Markham	Bassetlaw	2,020
	Rampton	Bassetlaw	1,691
	Sturton	Bassetlaw	1,853
	Tuxford and Trent	Bassetlaw	3,500
	Balderton North & Coddington	Newark and Sherwood	5,223
	Balderton South	Newark and Sherwood	3,854
	Beacon	Newark and Sherwood	6,211
	Bridge	Newark and Sherwood	4,208
	Castle	Newark and Sherwood	2,429
	Collingham	Newark and Sherwood	4,662
	Devon	Newark and Sherwood	6,120
	Farndon & Fernwood	Newark and Sherwood	5,037
	Muskham	Newark and Sherwood	2,413
	Southwell	Newark and Sherwood	6,960
	Sutton-on-Trent	Newark and Sherwood	2,498
	Trent	Newark and Sherwood	2,343
	Bingham East	Rushcliffe	3,855
	Bingham West	Rushcliffe	3,628
	Cranmer	Rushcliffe	2,006
	East Bridgford	Rushcliffe	2,305
	Thoroton	Rushcliffe	2,124
North East Derbyshire CC			72,344
	Barrow Hill and New Whittington	Chesterfield	4,314
	Lowgates and Woodthorpe	Chesterfield	3,435
	Ashover	North East Derbyshire	1,632
	Barlow & Holmesfield	North East Derbyshire	1,607

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Brampton & Walton	North East Derbyshire	2,833
	Clay Cross North	North East Derbyshire	4,881
	Clay Cross South	North East Derbyshire	2,835
	Coal Aston	North East Derbyshire	3,029
	Dronfield North	North East Derbyshire	2,877
	Dronfield South	North East Derbyshire	4,937
	Dronfield Woodhouse	North East Derbyshire	1,521
	Eckington North	North East Derbyshire	3,089
	Eckington South & Renishaw	North East Derbyshire	4,688
	Gosforth Valley	North East Derbyshire	4,726
	Grassmoor	North East Derbyshire	2,930
	Killamarsh East	North East Derbyshire	2,998
	Killamarsh West	North East Derbyshire	4,301
	North Wingfield Central	North East Derbyshire	4,614
	Ridgeway & Marsh Lane	North East Derbyshire	1,434
	Tupton	North East Derbyshire	3,997
	Unstone	North East Derbyshire	1,445
	Wingerworth	North East Derbyshire	4,221
North West Leicestershire CC			75,373
	Ashby Castle	North West Leicestershire	2,509
	Ashby Holywell	North West Leicestershire	2,151
	Ashby Ivanhoe	North West Leicestershire	2,456
	Ashby Money Hill	North West Leicestershire	2,207

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Ashby Willesley	North West Leicestershire	2,136
	Ashby Woulds	North West Leicestershire	2,130
	Bardon	North West Leicestershire	2,223
	Blackfordby	North West Leicestershire	2,314
	Broom Leys	North West Leicestershire	2,108
	Castle Donington Castle	North West Leicestershire	2,114
	Castle Donington Central	North West Leicestershire	1,981
	Castle Donington Park	North West Leicestershire	1,521
	Castle Rock	North West Leicestershire	2,060
	Coalville East	North West Leicestershire	2,107
	Coalville West	North West Leicestershire	1,816
	Daleacre Hill	North West Leicestershire	1,885
	Ellistown & Battleflat	North West Leicestershire	2,083
	Greenhill	North West Leicestershire	2,086
	Hermitage	North West Leicestershire	1,845
	Holly Hayes	North West Leicestershire	2,009
	Hugglescote St. John's	North West Leicestershire	1,673
	Hugglescote St. Mary's	North West Leicestershire	2,322
	Ibstock East	North West Leicestershire	1,954
	Ibstock West	North West Leicestershire	2,277
	Kegworth	North West Leicestershire	1,843
	Long Whatton & Diseworth	North West Leicestershire	2,166
	Measham North	North West Leicestershire	1,986

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Measham South	North West Leicestershire	1,997
	Ravenstone & Packington	North West Leicestershire	2,390
	Sence Valley	North West Leicestershire	2,386
	Snibston North	North West Leicestershire	1,965
	Snibston South	North West Leicestershire	1,790
	Thornborough	North West Leicestershire	2,078
	Thringstone	North West Leicestershire	2,064
	Valley	North West Leicestershire	2,315
	Worthington & Breedon	North West Leicestershire	2,426
Northampton North BC			75,713
	Abington and Phippsville	West Northamptonshire	8,349
	Boothville and Parklands	West Northamptonshire	8,567
	Castle	West Northamptonshire	8,116
	Dallington Spencer	West Northamptonshire	7,432
	Headlands	West Northamptonshire	9,547
	Kingsthorpe North	West Northamptonshire	9,697
	Kingsthorpe South	West Northamptonshire	8,294
	St. George	West Northamptonshire	7,388
	Talavera	West Northamptonshire	8,323
Northampton South BC			71,512
	Billing and Rectory Farm	West Northamptonshire	9,834
	Delapre and Rushmere	West Northamptonshire	8,180
	Duston East	West Northamptonshire	9,013
	Duston West and St. Crispin	West Northamptonshire	7,482

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	East Hunsbury and Shelfleys	West Northamptonshire	8,664
	Nene Valley	West Northamptonshire	8,736
	Riverside Park	West Northamptonshire	9,564
	Sixfields	West Northamptonshire	10,039
Nottingham East BC			75,327
	Berridge	Nottingham	10,115
	Castle	Nottingham	7,085
	Dales	Nottingham	10,720
	Hyson Green & Arboretum	Nottingham	13,302
	Mapperley	Nottingham	10,767
	Sherwood	Nottingham	11,074
	St. Ann's	Nottingham	12,264
Nottingham North and Kimberley BC			74,515
	Kimberley	Broxtowe	5,299
	Nuthall East & Strelley	Broxtowe	4,082
	Watnall & Nuthall West	Broxtowe	3,660
	Aspley	Nottingham	10,759
	Basford	Nottingham	11,200
	Bestwood	Nottingham	11,554
	Bulwell	Nottingham	11,106
	Bulwell Forest	Nottingham	10,329
	Leen Valley	Nottingham	6,526
Nottingham South BC			76,076
	Bilborough	Nottingham	11,941
	Clifton East	Nottingham	12,225
	Clifton West	Nottingham	7,899
	Lenton & Wollaton East	Nottingham	16,041
	Meadows	Nottingham	6,485
	Radford	Nottingham	10,332
	Wollaton West	Nottingham	11,153
Rushcliffe CC			76,171
	Abbey	Rushcliffe	4,249
	Bunny	Rushcliffe	2,002
	Compton Acres	Rushcliffe	4,175
	Cotgrave	Rushcliffe	6,207
	Cropwell	Rushcliffe	2,055

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Edwalton	Rushcliffe	3,690
	Gamston North	Rushcliffe	1,937
	Gamston South	Rushcliffe	1,956
	Gotham	Rushcliffe	2,027
	Keyworth & Wolds	Rushcliffe	6,539
	Lady Bay	Rushcliffe	3,964
	Leake	Rushcliffe	6,884
	Lutterell	Rushcliffe	4,247
	Musters	Rushcliffe	3,504
	Nevile & Langar	Rushcliffe	2,286
	Radcliffe on Trent	Rushcliffe	6,499
	Ruddington	Rushcliffe	5,873
	Sutton Bonington	Rushcliffe	1,498
	Tollerton	Rushcliffe	2,031
	Trent Bridge	Rushcliffe	4,548
Rutland and Stamford CC			70,864
	Billesdon & Tilton	Harborough	2,079
	Nevill	Harborough	2,284
	Thurnby & Houghton	Harborough	6,676
	Barleythorpe	Rutland	1,671
	Braunston & Martinsthorpe	Rutland	2,092
	Cottesmore	Rutland	2,077
	Exton	Rutland	1,198
	Greetham	Rutland	1,159
	Ketton	Rutland	2,243
	Langham	Rutland	1,187
	Lyddington	Rutland	1,141
	Normanton	Rutland	2,321
	Oakham North East	Rutland	2,183
	Oakham North West	Rutland	2,524
	Oakham South	Rutland	3,758
	Ryhall & Casterton	Rutland	2,314
	Uppingham	Rutland	3,176
	Whissendine	Rutland	1,110
	Casewick	South Kesteven	4,551
	Castle	South Kesteven	1,997
	Dole Wood	South Kesteven	2,029
	Glen	South Kesteven	1,949
	Isaac Newton	South Kesteven	3,732
	Stamford All Saints	South Kesteven	3,746

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Stamford St. George's	South Kesteven	3,774
	Stamford St. John's	South Kesteven	4,183
	Stamford St. Mary's	South Kesteven	3,710
Sherwood Forest CC			76,543
	Hucknall Central	Ashfield	5,631
	Hucknall North	Ashfield	8,028
	Hucknall South	Ashfield	5,577
	Hucknall West	Ashfield	7,604
	Calverton	Gedling	5,952
	Newstead Abbey	Gedling	6,683
	Bilsthorpe	Newark and Sherwood	2,621
	Boughton	Newark and Sherwood	2,331
	Dover Beck	Newark and Sherwood	2,488
	Edwinstowe & Clipstone	Newark and Sherwood	8,209
	Farnsfield	Newark and Sherwood	2,577
	Lowdham	Newark and Sherwood	2,269
	Ollerton	Newark and Sherwood	7,005
	Rainworth North & Rufford	Newark and Sherwood	5,155
	Rainworth South & Blidworth	Newark and Sherwood	4,413
Sleaford and North Hykeham CC			73,380
	Ashby de la Launde and Cranwell	North Kesteven	4,083
	Bassingham and Brant Broughton	North Kesteven	4,151
	Billingham, Martin and North Kyme	North Kesteven	4,199
	Branston	North Kesteven	4,157
	Cliff Villages	North Kesteven	4,429
	Eagle, Swinderby and Witham St. Hughs	North Kesteven	4,822
	Heighington and Washingborough	North Kesteven	5,777
	Kirkby la Thorpe and South Kyme	North Kesteven	1,956
	Leasingham and Rauceby	North Kesteven	1,741

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Metheringham	North Kesteven	4,365
	North Hykeham Forum	North Kesteven	1,811
	North Hykeham Memorial	North Kesteven	2,701
	North Hykeham Mill	North Kesteven	4,562
	North Hykeham Moor	North Kesteven	1,897
	North Hykeham Witham	North Kesteven	1,906
	Ruskington	North Kesteven	4,533
	Sleaford Castle	North Kesteven	2,103
	Sleaford Holdingham	North Kesteven	2,451
	Sleaford Navigation	North Kesteven	1,950
	Sleaford Quarrington and Mareham	North Kesteven	5,885
	Sleaford Westholme	North Kesteven	1,815
	Waddington West	North Kesteven	2,086
South Derbyshire CC			71,202
	Aston	South Derbyshire	6,846
	Church Gresley	South Derbyshire	6,568
	Etwall	South Derbyshire	5,031
	Linton	South Derbyshire	4,612
	Melbourne	South Derbyshire	4,463
	Midway	South Derbyshire	6,238
	Newhall and Stanton	South Derbyshire	6,223
	Repton	South Derbyshire	4,469
	Seales	South Derbyshire	4,343
	Stenson	South Derbyshire	4,052
	Swadlincote	South Derbyshire	6,327
	Willington and Findern	South Derbyshire	5,217
	Woodville	South Derbyshire	6,813
South Holland and The Deepings CC			76,139
	Crowland and Deeping St. Nicholas	South Holland	4,951
	Donington, Quadring and Gosberton	South Holland	5,642
	Fleet	South Holland	1,836
	Gedney	South Holland	1,806
	Holbeach Hurn	South Holland	1,796
	Holbeach Town	South Holland	5,665
	Long Sutton	South Holland	5,995
	Moulton, Weston and Cowbit	South Holland	5,506
	Pinchbeck and Surfleet	South Holland	5,335

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Spalding Castle	South Holland	1,532
	Spalding Monks House	South Holland	3,299
	Spalding St. John's	South Holland	3,199
	Spalding St. Mary's	South Holland	3,175
	Spalding St. Paul's	South Holland	2,905
	Spalding Wygate	South Holland	3,706
	Sutton Bridge	South Holland	3,243
	The Saints	South Holland	2,038
	Whaplode and Holbeach St. John's	South Holland	3,440
	Deeping St. James	South Kesteven	5,741
	Market & West Deeping	South Kesteven	5,329
South Leicestershire CC			75,634
	Blaby South	Blaby	3,987
	Cosby with South Whetstone	Blaby	4,185
	Countesthorpe	Blaby	6,145
	Croft Hill	Blaby	1,928
	Enderby and St. John's	Blaby	4,244
	Narborough and Littlethorpe	Blaby	4,046
	Normanton	Blaby	2,185
	North Whetstone	Blaby	4,048
	Pastures	Blaby	3,777
	Saxondale	Blaby	5,601
	Stanton and Flamville	Blaby	6,832
	Bosworth	Harborough	2,442
	Broughton Astley South & Leire	Harborough	3,666
	Broughton Astley-Primethorpe & Sutton	Harborough	4,011
	Dunton	Harborough	2,095
	Fleckney	Harborough	4,415
	Lutterworth East	Harborough	3,844
	Lutterworth West	Harborough	3,825
	Misterton	Harborough	2,097
	Ullesthorpe	Harborough	2,261
South Northamptonshire CC			76,555
	Irchester – part of (polling districts WAA, WAB, WPA, WPB, and WPC)	North Northamptonshire	5,010
	Brackley	West Northamptonshire	11,808

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Bugbrooke	West Northamptonshire	10,303
	Deanshanger	West Northamptonshire	9,824
	Hackleton and Grange Park	West Northamptonshire	10,323
	Middleton Cheney	West Northamptonshire	9,285
	Silverstone – part of (polling districts SAA, SAB, SAN, SAT, SBP, SBX, SCV, SDG, SDW, SDZ, SEF, SEW, SFE, SFF, SFN, SFO, SFR, SFW, SGD, SGF, and SGK)	West Northamptonshire	8,542
	Towcester and Roade	West Northamptonshire	11,460
Wellingborough CC			76,669
	Brickhill and Queensway	North Northamptonshire	8,845
	Croyland and Swanspool	North Northamptonshire	8,875
	Finedon	North Northamptonshire	9,167
	Hatton Park	North Northamptonshire	9,975
	Higham Ferrers	North Northamptonshire	9,670
	Irchester – part of (polling districts WIA, and WIB)	North Northamptonshire	3,827
	Irthlingborough – part of (polling districts SD and SF)	North Northamptonshire	5,812
	Rushden Pemberton West	North Northamptonshire	9,303
	Rushden South	North Northamptonshire	11,195

Glossary

Assistant Commissioner	Independent person appointed at the request of the BCE to assist it with the discharge of its functions.	Public hearing	Formal opportunity during the secondary consultation period for people to make oral representations, chaired by an Assistant Commissioner.
Borough constituency (abbreviated to BC)	The designation for a Parliamentary constituency containing a predominantly urban area.	Representations	The views provided by an individual, group or organisation to the BCE on its initial or revised proposals (or on the representations of others), either for or against, including counter-proposals and petitions.
County constituency (abbreviated to CC)	The designation for a Parliamentary constituency containing more than a small rural element.	Review date	The ‘effective date’ at which electorate and local government boundary data is fixed so that we can then work with it on a stable basis. Defined by the 2020 Act for the 2023 Review as 2 March 2020 for the electorate numbers, and 1 December 2020 for local government boundaries.
Designation	Official classification as either a borough constituency or a county constituency. The designation of a constituency guides the determination of who the returning officer will be, and determines how much candidates can spend, in any election for that constituency.	Revised proposals	The initial proposals as subsequently revised.
Electorate	The number of registered Parliamentary electors in a given area.	Rules	The statutory criteria for Parliamentary constituencies recommended by a Parliamentary Boundary Commission, as set out in Schedule 2 to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended by Acts up to and including the 2020 Act).
(Statutory/ Permitted) Electorate range	The statutory rule that requires the electorate of every recommended constituency to be – for the 2023 Review – between 69,724 and 77,062.	UK electoral quota	The average number of electors in a constituency, found by dividing the total electorate of the UK (less that of the five specific ‘protected’ constituencies in the UK) by 645.
Final recommendations	The recommendations submitted in a formal final report to Parliament at the end of a review. They may – or may not – have been amended since the earlier proposals in any given area.	Unitary authority	An area where there is only one tier of ‘principal area’ local council (above any parish or town council). Contrasted with those ‘shire district’ areas that have two tiers (i.e. both a non-metropolitan county council and a district/borough/ city council).
Initial proposals	First formal proposals published by the BCE during the review for public consultation.		
Periodical report	Report to Parliament following a general review of Parliamentary constituencies.		
Places of deposit	In each proposed constituency the Commission will make available hard copies of its revised proposals (including report and maps). The places of deposit where the public may inspect the proposals are usually the offices of the relevant local authority, although other public places such as libraries may be used. The Commission will publish a full list of places of deposit on its website.		

