

# Revised proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the **Eastern** region





# Contents

<b>Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
Who we are and what we do – ‘The 2023 Review’	2
What are the revised proposals for the Eastern region?	2
How to have your say	3
<b>1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 Background to the 2023 Review</b>	<b>5</b>
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
<b>3 Revised proposals for the Eastern region</b>	<b>10</b>
Sub-regions	11
Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire	13
Cambridgeshire	19
Essex	27
Norfolk and Suffolk	39
<b>4 How to have your say</b>	<b>50</b>
How can you give us your views?	51
What do we want views on?	51
<b>Appendix: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>81</b>

# Summary

## Who we are and what we do – ‘The 2023 Review’<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup>

## What are the revised proposals for the Eastern region?

We have revised the composition of 28 of the 61 constituencies we proposed in June 2021, and maintained our initial proposals for the remainder. We have revised the name of nine of our initially proposed constituencies. Our revised proposals would leave three of the 58 existing constituencies in the Eastern region wholly unchanged, and 15 unchanged except to realign constituency boundaries with local government ward boundaries.<sup>3</sup>

As 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: Bedfordshire<sup>4</sup> and Hertfordshire

---

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

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

<sup>3</sup> Where the Order to make such wards was made by 1 December 2020.

<sup>4</sup> Comprising the three unitary authorities of Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, and Luton, hereafter together referred to as Bedfordshire.



(allocated 18 constituencies); Cambridgeshire<sup>5</sup> (allocated eight constituencies); Essex<sup>6</sup> (allocated 18 constituencies); and Norfolk and Suffolk (allocated 17 constituencies). 34 constituencies would cross local authority boundaries (one fewer than in our initial proposals).

We propose no revisions to the 18 constituencies initially proposed in the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire sub-region, apart from one name change. We also propose no changes to any of the eight initially proposed constituencies in Cambridgeshire, apart from one name change.

In the initial proposals, we decided to group Essex with Suffolk as a sub-region, and to treat Norfolk on its own. In light of the evidence presented, we now propose that Essex be treated as a stand-alone sub-region, and that Norfolk and Suffolk be included in a sub-region together. We propose a Waveney Valley cross-county boundary constituency, including wards from the South Norfolk, East Suffolk and Mid Suffolk local authorities.

We propose changes to the composition of 28 of the initially proposed constituencies in Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk, seven of which also include name changes. We also propose two split wards: the Pitsea South East ward of the Basildon local authority would be divided between the Castle Point, and South Basildon and East Thurrock constituencies; and the Lexden & Braiswick ward of the Colchester local authority divided between the Colchester, and Harwich and North Essex constituencies.

## 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](http://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](https://facebook.com/BCEReviews).

---

<sup>5</sup> Comprising the county of Cambridgeshire and the unitary authority of Peterborough, hereafter together referred to as Cambridgeshire.

<sup>6</sup> Comprising the county of Essex, and the unitary authorities of Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock, hereafter together referred to as Essex.

# 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](http://www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk), or on our consultation portal at [www.bcereviews.org.uk](http://www.bcereviews.org.uk). You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing [information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk](mailto: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.<sup>7</sup> 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 Eastern region.
- 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 Review,<sup>8</sup> 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 2020, available at [www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2020/25/contents](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2020/25/contents)

<sup>8</sup> Available at [www.bcereviews.org.uk](http://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 Eastern region (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 2% of the existing constituencies in the Eastern region as wholly unchanged, and a further 17% 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 Eastern region. 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 over 3,700 unique written representations relating to the Eastern region. 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 1,400 unique representations relating to the Eastern region. We also hosted between two and five public hearings in each region. We heard more than 110 oral representations at the three public hearings in the Eastern region. 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 Eastern 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 Eastern region

3.1 After the consultation on the initial proposals in 2021, we arranged for the appointment of two Assistant Commissioners for the Eastern region – Jane Kilgannon and David Brown QFSM – 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:

- Cambridge: 17-18 March 2022
- Southend-on-Sea: 21-22 March 2022
- Ipswich: 24-25 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](http://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 the initial proposals, we proposed to divide the Eastern region into four sub-regions: Bedfordshire was paired in a sub-region with the county of Hertfordshire; Cambridgeshire was treated as a standalone sub-region; Essex was paired in a sub-region with the county of Suffolk; and Norfolk was treated as a standalone sub-region.
- 3.7 There was little opposition to the proposed sub-regions of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire, and Cambridgeshire. However, there was some opposition to the sub-regions of Essex and Suffolk, and Norfolk. In formulating the initial proposals, we considered that these sub-regions were the most satisfactory as: they allowed the theoretical entitlement of constituencies to be as evenly distributed as possible; there appeared few obvious places to cross the boundary between Norfolk and Suffolk; and the theoretical entitlement of the number of constituencies for Essex alone is such that it was considered difficult to create a coherent pattern of constituencies across the county without major reconfigurations of existing constituencies.
- 3.8 While there was some support for the proposed sub-regions, including from the Labour Party (BCE-79489 and BCE-95654), many respondents to the consultation contended that joining Norfolk with Suffolk, and having Essex as a standalone sub-region, would have multiple benefits. Respondents such as Councillor Carol Poulter (BCE-73423), proposed that joining Norfolk and Suffolk as a sub-region minimised the change required to existing constituencies, particularly across much of Suffolk, and allowed for a potentially better solution regarding local ties in a number of areas. This change in sub-region also allowed the existing Great Yarmouth constituency to remain wholly unchanged, and the existing Braintree constituency to be significantly less disrupted than in the initial proposals.
- 3.9 The Conservative Party (BCE-85500), the Liberal Democrats (BCE-94333), Councillor Poulter, Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-78259), Councillor Elaine Bryce (BCE-71444), Robert Grimsey (BCE-69217), Stephen Britt (BCE-71343) and BCE-63334 all proposed that Norfolk and Suffolk join as a sub-region, with each proposing a Waveney Valley cross-county boundary constituency between the two counties, with slight variations. These respondents proposed that such a constituency between Norfolk and Suffolk would be a more coherent cross-county boundary constituency than the initially proposed Haverhill and Halstead constituency (between Essex and Suffolk), with established community ties, a shared local identity, and transport links. Respondents stated that the proposed Haverhill and Halstead constituency has weak internal connections, particularly regarding public transport, and that there are few community ties between the two towns.

- 3.10 The Green Party (BCE-96542) supported maintaining the sub-regions used in the initial proposals, although they proposed including the town of Newmarket in the cross-county boundary constituency with wards from the Braintree local authority. This was considered during the initial proposals, but we had concerns with this configuration, as to include the town – which is situated on the Cambridgeshire-Suffolk county boundary – in a cross-county boundary constituency with Norfolk, would potentially cause even more confusion than the existing arrangement, and would, in all likelihood, be unsupported locally. The Green Party also submitted a second counter-proposal ‘should the Commission be minded to consider a Suffolk/Norfolk sub-region’. In this counter-proposal, they proposed a cross-county boundary constituency including the towns of Newmarket and Thetford, as did Jonathan Stansby (BCE-88730) and Ric Brackenbury (BCE-94769). They said that such a constituency would bring more of The Brecks (which crosses the county boundary) together, including Thetford Forest and the closely-linked towns of Brandon and Thetford, and the constituency would cross the county boundary where the river is a less significant boundary than it is nearer the coast.
- 3.11 Counter-proposals such as BCE-79444 and Jonathan Stansby proposed combining Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex together in a single sub-region. This would require an extra, unnecessary cross-county boundary constituency, and as such is considered to be less strongly reflective of the statutory factors than the initial proposals and the other counter-proposals received during the two consultations.
- 3.12 Having considered these issues and reflected on the evidence received, our Assistant Commissioners accepted the rationale and the benefits contained in the counter-proposals for altering the sub-regional grouping to instead join Norfolk and Suffolk as a sub-region, and treat Essex alone. They recommended that there be a Waveney Valley cross-county boundary constituency between the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, having been persuaded of the strong local ties, shared local identity, and good transport links. While they considered that a cross-county boundary constituency including the towns of Newmarket and Thetford had merit, they advised that such a constituency necessitated more disruption to the existing constituencies than a Waveney Valley constituency, and was also unsatisfactory due to it including the Suffolk town of Newmarket, with its close geographical proximity and local ties to Cambridgeshire, in a constituency with areas of Norfolk. We accept the recommendation of the Assistant Commissioners and therefore propose Norfolk and Suffolk be combined to form a sub-region and Essex to form a standalone sub-region. The impacts of the decision to alter the sub-regional groupings on specific constituencies are discussed in detail under the relevant county sub-sections.

- 3.13** In the next sections of our report, we consider each of our now proposed sub-regions in turn, summarising our initial proposals, followed by the responses and counter-proposals received, our Assistant Commissioners' consideration of this evidence and their recommendations, and our revised proposals on the basis of the evidence received, in accordance with the statutory rules for the 2023 Review.

## Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire

### Bedfordshire

- 3.14** More than 100 of the representations received during the two public consultations related to the three proposed constituencies in the south of the county: Luton North, Luton South and South Bedfordshire, and Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard. These representations were largely related to issues in two wards: Eaton Bray and Stopsley. In the initial proposals, the ward of Stopsley was included in the proposed Luton North constituency from the existing Luton South constituency, and a number of representations highlighted the lack of direct road access between the Stopsley ward and the rest of the constituency, due to the 'steep scarp slope of Bradgers Hill' (Sarah Owen, MP for Luton North – BCE-71761). In the initial proposals the Eaton Bray ward was included in the proposed Luton South and South Bedfordshire constituency from the existing South West Bedfordshire constituency, and numerous representations (for example, BCE-81925) highlighted that much of the ward, particularly the village of Billington, is far more closely linked to Leighton Buzzard than it is to Luton in proximity, character and community ties.

- 3.15** A few counter-proposals were received in this area. The Conservative Party (BCE-85500), Jonathan Stansby (BCE-88730), BCE-79444, and Ric Brackenbury (BCE-94769) all proposed that the three wards that comprise the town of Houghton Regis (Houghton Hall, Tithe Farm, and Parkside) be included in the Luton North constituency. This would allow a South West Bedfordshire constituency that included both Eaton Bray and Caddington wards. Similarly, several representations, such as that from Rachel Hopkins, MP for Luton South (BCE-71619), BCE-80868, Mary Walsh (BCE-82843), and Jenny Best (BCE-82489), proposed that only the two wards of Tithe Farm and Parkside be included in the Luton North constituency. Our Assistant Commissioners considered this to be an unsatisfactory solution, as it would divide the town of Houghton Regis between the two constituencies, and we agree. Other counter-proposals included the Green Party proposal (BCE-96542) for a significantly different configuration for each of the two Luton constituencies, and the alternative in BCE-56498 to retain Stopsley ward in the existing Luton South constituency by exchanging two further wards between the Luton constituencies: these were both considered to cause unnecessary disruption to the existing constituencies.
- 3.16** In investigating alternative proposals, our Assistant Commissioners identified that it was possible to divide the ward of Dunstable-Icknield and include the eastern part in the Luton North constituency and the western part in the Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard constituency. While this would allow the Stopsley ward to be retained in a Luton South constituency and Eaton Bray to be retained in a South West Bedfordshire constituency, it would entail a split ward that would join polling districts in one unitary authority with a constituency otherwise wholly within a different unitary authority, and would divide the town of Dunstable between constituencies. For these reasons, they did not recommend this proposal to us.
- 3.17** It is clear that there is unlikely to be a solution for the Luton area that will attract widespread support. Given our Assistant Commissioners considered that the evidence to divide the Dunstable-Icknield ward was not sufficiently compelling, they were of the view that there are effectively only two feasible solutions: the initial proposals, and the Conservative Party counter-proposal to create a Luton North and Houghton Regis constituency. During the Assistant Commissioners' site visit to Luton they observed that, while there are strong transport links between Houghton Regis and Luton, the two areas have distinct and separate characteristics, and they recommended to us that there be no changes to the initially proposed constituencies of Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard, Luton North, and Luton South and South Bedfordshire. On balance, while acknowledging the benefits of the Conservative Party counter-proposal – which retained the Eaton Bray ward in a South West Bedfordshire constituency, and Stopsley ward in a Luton South constituency – we consider that including the closely-linked towns of Houghton Regis and Dunstable in different constituencies (by including Houghton Regis in Luton North) would

disrupt local ties, and unnecessarily result in constituencies that are further away from the existing pattern of constituencies. We therefore agree with our Assistant Commissioners and do not propose any changes to the composition of the initially proposed constituencies of Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard, Luton North, and Luton South and South Bedfordshire.

- 3.18** Some representations, such as the Association of British Counties (BCE-77313) and Lewis Baston (BCE-83029), said the name Luton South should be retained for the proposed constituency of Luton South and South Bedfordshire, claiming that the proposed name is too long, and unnecessary as the change to the boundaries is minimal. While it is acknowledged that the name is lengthy, we consider it appropriate to recognise the geographical extent of the proposed constituency, and in particular the crossing of a unitary authority boundary to include two mostly rural wards: we therefore feel it appropriate to retain South Bedfordshire in the proposed constituency name.
- 3.19** The Conservative Party (BCE-85500) submitted a counter-proposal proposing that the ward of Kempston Rural be included in the Bedford constituency, instead of in the North Bedfordshire constituency as in the initial proposals, in order to include ‘all the Kempston wards together in one constituency’. A substantial majority of representations received were opposed to this approach, with examples including the Labour Party’s representation given at the Cambridge public hearing (BCE-97335), Councillor Dr Ross Purves (BCE-91501) and Bedford Borough Council Labour Group (BCE-73650). These representations said that there is a significant difference in character between the Kempston Rural ward and the rest of the Bedford constituency, with areas like Turvey in particular a significant distance away, and that including the ward would not constitute minimal change. The Assistant Commissioners found the arguments against the Conservative Party’s counter-proposal to be sufficiently compelling, and as such recommended no change to the initially proposed Bedford, and North Bedfordshire constituencies. We agree.

- 3.20 A small number of representations, such as Patrick Hall (BCE-80069), argued for the Bedford constituency to be renamed Bedford and Kempston, stating that many locals already refer to it by this name. However, we determine that the proposed name of Bedford is satisfactory according to our naming policy, particularly as there have only been changes to realign to updated local government ward boundaries, and therefore propose no change to the name. There were few other issues raised during the public consultations regarding the two proposed constituencies of Bedford and North Bedfordshire.
- 3.21 The initially proposed Mid Bedfordshire constituency was relatively uncontentious: the Assistant Commissioners therefore recommended no revisions to it, and we agree.

## Hertfordshire

- 3.22 The proposed constituencies in the county of Hertfordshire received a broadly even mix of supporting and opposing representations. While we did receive counter-proposals in this area, we received comparably fewer than in other parts of the region. It is considered that this is because of the relatively high level of support, and that the electorate figures are so tight around the county that it is difficult to make minor amendments to individual constituencies without creating significant knock-on effects across much of the county. While there have been some contentious areas in the county, most of them cannot be readily addressed, either due to the electorate figures not allowing it, or because they would necessitate far-reaching negative effects across other areas of the county where the initial proposals were supported.
- 3.23 A significant number of representations drew attention to the proposed constituencies of St Albans, and Harpenden and Berkhamsted, regarding the Sandridge ward. The Sandridge ward is included in the existing Hitchin and Harpenden constituency, and was initially proposed to be included in the Harpenden and Berkhamsted constituency. Many respondents, including Sandridge Parish Council (BCE-63969) and Christopher Ford (BCE-78562), said that the ward, and in particular the Jersey Farm neighbourhood within it, should be included in the St Albans constituency, due to its close geographical proximity, shared local services, and community ties. While acknowledging this evidence, including either the whole of the Sandridge ward in the St Albans constituency, or only including the polling district containing Jersey Farm, would bring the Harpenden and Berkhamsted constituency below the permitted electorate range, which would require significant consequential changes elsewhere in the county in order to bring all of the constituencies within the permitted electorate range. As such, our Assistant Commissioners did not propose any changes to the proposed St Albans constituency. We agree.

- 3.24 Other representations regarding the proposed Harpenden and Berkhamsted constituency were evenly divided between those supporting and opposing. Those in opposition, such as Mark Woods (BCE-56601), and Jim Wignall (BCE-74451), stated that the two towns have little in common regarding local ties and transport links, and that the constituency is split into two parts by the M1 motorway. Conversely, those in support, such as Justin Douglas (BCE-78117) and the Labour Party (BCE-79489), stated that there are links between the towns, and that the new configuration would be no worse than the existing Hitchin and Harpenden constituency. While our Assistant Commissioners acknowledged that some aspects of the proposed Harpenden and Berkhamsted constituency are not ideal, the electorate figures are so tight in this area that any attempt to reconfigure the Harpenden and Berkhamsted constituency would have consequential knock-on effects across the county. They therefore recommended no change to the constituency, and we agree.
- 3.25 Representations, including from Grant Shapps, MP for Welwyn Hatfield (BCE-94852), drew attention to the Northaw & Cuffley ward, in particular the village of Newgate Street, which was included in the initially proposed Hertsmere constituency. The area of Newgate Street is in the existing Welwyn Hatfield constituency, but was not included in the constituency in the initial proposals, due to realignment to new local government ward boundaries. Respondents said that it should be retained in the Welwyn Hatfield constituency as in the existing arrangement. As it is not possible to include the whole of the Northaw & Cuffley ward in the Welwyn Hatfield constituency without removing another ward currently included, Grant Shapps MP provided a counter-proposal that proposed splitting the Northaw & Cuffley ward along the existing constituency boundary, in order to retain Newgate Street village in the Welwyn Hatfield constituency. Our Assistant Commissioners did not consider that the rationale for splitting this ward was sufficiently compelling, particularly as they considered dividing the ward would not provide other benefits to the pattern of constituencies in the county. Therefore, they recommended to us that there should not be any revisions to the proposed Welwyn Hatfield and Hertsmere constituencies. We agree with their assessment.

- 3.26** A number of representations received for the proposed Three Rivers constituency, including that of the Labour Party, were in support of the proposed composition. However, a number of respondents, including Michael Bruce (BCE-68454), Gagan Mohindra, MP for South West Hertfordshire (BCE-83467), and BCE-90540, said that the proposed Three Rivers name is inappropriately unspecific, given that there are various organisations around the country that use the name Three Rivers. In addition, respondents said that even in the local area, let alone across the country, people do not know what area Three Rivers refers to, or indeed which three rivers it references. A number of respondents therefore said that the existing South West Hertfordshire name should be retained, with Peter Whitehead (BCE-80297) stating that despite the proposed boundaries being significantly different from the existing boundaries, the existing name would still be appropriate to reflect the geographic area of the constituency and its place within the county. Furthermore, the constituency is not wholly coterminous with the Three Rivers local authority, as it included the Dacorum ward of Kings Langley, and as such the existing name would be a more accurate name than Three Rivers, and would likely resonate more with both locals and those further afield. It has also been highlighted that there is some historical precedent, as the proposed constituency boundaries are similar to those of the South West Hertfordshire constituency that existed from 1950 to 1983. Our Assistant Commissioners found these arguments suitably compelling, and as such recommended that the initially proposed constituency of Three Rivers instead be named South West Hertfordshire. We agree.
- 3.27** While the Hitchin constituency received support during the two public consultations, counter-proposals from BCE-79444 and Oliver Raven (BCE-85205) proposed that the cross-county boundary constituency should instead include the wards that comprise the town of Biggleswade, with wards in the North Hertfordshire and East Hertfordshire local authorities. The Assistant Commissioners considered that these counter-proposals had too many negative knock-on impacts on proposed constituencies that have been generally well supported. We agree with their assessment.
- 3.28** A number of representations, such as that of Alan Borgars (who spoke at the public hearing in Cambridge – BCE-97330) said that as the proposed Hitchin constituency crossed the county boundary, both counties included should have some form of representation in the name, with most proposing that either Stotfold, Shefford, or both be included in the name with Hitchin. On balance, our Assistant Commissioners considered that retaining the proposed name was preferable, as they considered both Stotfold and Shefford too small to be referenced and, while the three Bedfordshire wards included in the constituency are in a different county to Hitchin, many of the electors in these wards would likely see the Hertfordshire towns of Hitchin and Letchworth as their biggest local towns. They therefore considered that the name Hitchin alone is suitably representative: we agree and propose no change.



- 3.29** A number of representations were received regarding the proposed Hertford and Stortford, and Broxbourne constituencies. The majority of these representations were in opposition to the initial proposals, which included the three wards of Hertford Heath, Great Amwell, and Stanstead Abbots in the Broxbourne constituency, and not with the town of Hertford as in the existing Hertford and Stortford constituency. Respondents BCE-58351 and BCE-58911 said that the close proximity of Hertford Heath to the town, as well as shared amenities such as secondary schools, demonstrated the need for the two areas to be included in the same constituency. Although the Assistant Commissioners acknowledged these arguments, due to the tight electorate figures in this area, any attempt to include these wards in the Hertford and Stortford constituency requires a radical reconfiguration across a number of constituencies. For example, the Green Party's counter-proposal (BCE-96542) retained the wards of Hertford Heath, Great Amwell, and Stanstead Abbots in a constituency with the town of Hertford, but this necessitated splitting the towns of Hertford and Bishop's Stortford into two different constituencies, with knock-on impacts to constituencies across much of Hertfordshire. We agree with the recommendations of our Assistant Commissioners and propose no change to the Hertford and Stortford, or Broxbourne constituencies.
- 3.30** The initial proposals for the remainder of the constituencies in Hertfordshire (North East Hertfordshire, Stevenage, Watford, and Hemel Hempstead) did not elicit a large number of representations, and were largely uncontentious and supported. The Assistant Commissioners therefore recommended that they remain as initially proposed, and we agree.

## Cambridgeshire

- 3.31** More than 1,000 representations were received regarding the proposed constituencies of Peterborough and North West Cambridgeshire, making it one of the areas in the region, and also the country as a whole, with the most representations received. In the initial proposals, the only changes to the Peterborough constituency were due to realignment to new local government ward boundaries. There were more substantial changes to the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, with six Huntingdon local authority wards being transferred to the Huntingdon constituency, due to the existing North West Cambridgeshire constituency having a particularly high electorate of 95,684.


- 3.32 A large number of representations were received in response to the Conservative Party's counter-proposal (BCE-85500), which put forward two newly configured Peterborough North and Peterborough South constituencies. This counter-proposal proposed that the three rural Peterborough unitary authority wards that are currently included in the North West Cambridgeshire constituency (Glington & Castor, Barnack, and Wittering) be included in a Peterborough North constituency. Subsequently, it required the urban Peterborough wards of Central and West – that were initially proposed to be included in the Peterborough constituency (as they are in the existing arrangement) – to be included in their proposed Peterborough South constituency.
- 3.33 A significant number of representations supported this counter-proposal. Most of these, including from Paul Bristow, MP for Peterborough (BCE-96275, who also spoke at the Cambridge public hearing – BCE-97324), BCE-96606, and Councillor Ishfaq Hussain (BCE-97342), made similar arguments. They considered that the city of Peterborough 'deserves two MPs', and that the current situation is confusing for residents south of the River Nene, who incorrectly believe they are in the Peterborough constituency (they currently make up a large proportion of the North West Cambridgeshire constituency electorate). Also, Peter Graham (BCE-97323) stated that although the counter-proposal would result in more change than required from the existing constituencies, this is less relevant in this area, as it is already necessary to make significant changes to the North West Cambridgeshire constituency due to the existing high electorate. Furthermore, the Conservative Party during day one of the Cambridge public hearing (BCE-97337) said that due to realignment to new local government ward boundaries, the River Nene is crossed in the initial proposals in the Fletton & Woodston ward, and therefore the fact that their counter-proposal crosses the river is not an issue.
- 3.34 However, the majority of representations received opposed the Conservative Party counter-proposal, with examples including Allan Kempself (BCE-80951), former MP for Peterborough, Lisa Forbes (BCE-90904), and several people who spoke at the Cambridge and Ipswich public hearings, such as the Labour Party (BCE-97335), William Burgess (BCE-97314) and Councillor Dennis Jones (BCE-97416). The main points in opposition to the counter-proposal – and in support of the initial proposals – were threefold. First, it was said that the Central and West wards both form key parts of the city, particularly Central ward, which contains the city centre including the main railway station, Peterborough Cathedral and one of the main mosques, and connections are mostly to other areas north of the River Nene, rather than south of it (Arjumand Rashid, BCE-76537). These representations considered that the river is a clear demarcation between the proposed constituencies, except for a small area with relatively few residents where the ward itself now crosses the river due to realignment to new local government ward boundaries, whereas the counter-proposals would

include two whole wards in a constituency otherwise entirely on the other side of the river. Second, it was said that the three rural wards of Glinton & Castor, Barnack, and Wittering are more similar in character to the rest of the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, and that it would therefore be better for them to remain in a constituency with other large rural areas, rather than be included in a constituency with mostly urban wards (Fitzwilliam Estates – BCE-82914). Finally, these representations pointed out that the city of Peterborough already has representation from two MPs (albeit one of those constituency names did not reference Peterborough), and that dividing the city in such a manner would not only be an unnecessary departure from the existing pattern of constituencies, but would also do little to reduce the confusion for local residents (Lisa Forbes).

- 3.35** There were very few other counter-proposals regarding the Peterborough area. One example (BCE-79444) included the Eye, Thorney & Newborough ward in the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, with Fletton & Woodston ward instead being included in the Peterborough constituency. This would create a more urban and compact Peterborough constituency, but required crossing the River Nene more substantially than the initial proposals, and also moved far more electors from existing constituencies than do the initial proposals. Another example, from Jonathan Stansby (BCE-88730), proposed that the Fletton & Woodston ward be divided to allow the constituency boundary to follow the River Nene. While the electorate figures would allow for this, our Assistant Commissioners did not consider that there were sufficient reasons to justify a divided ward here, and we agree.
- 3.36** In view of the large number of representations and the significantly opposing views, the Assistant Commissioners visited Peterborough to better understand the issues. They considered that both the Peterborough and North West Cambridgeshire constituencies as initially proposed, and the Conservative Party counter-proposal, have merit. However, on balance, they considered that the Conservative Party counter-proposal required unnecessary change to a large number of wards and electors, and that local ties would be broken, particularly between Central and West wards and neighbouring Peterborough wards further north and east. During their site visit to Peterborough, they recognised the importance of Central ward to the rest of the proposed Peterborough wards in the north, and considered that the River Nene does form a clear and definable boundary, and that the areas south of the river have a largely different character to those in the north. As such, they recommended to us that there be no changes to the boundaries of either of the initially proposed constituencies of Peterborough, and North West Cambridgeshire. Having considered their recommendations we agree that there should be no change.

- 3.37** There were also some representations that called for a change of name to the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, even if the boundaries remain the same as initially proposed. Most of these proposed including Peterborough in the name, in order to reflect the fact that a significant proportion of the electors in the constituency live in the city of Peterborough, with North Huntingdonshire and Peterborough West (John Goodier – BCE-74339), and South Peterborough and Ramsey (BCE-66968) being two such examples. While it is acknowledged that the initially proposed name is not ideal, we considered that none of the proposed alternative names for the North West Cambridgeshire constituency were particularly appropriate. We consider that the existing name is geographically accurate, and is consistent with many of the other constituency names across the county that use compass points as a reference.
- 3.38** A small number of respondents, including Shailesh Vara, MP for North West Cambridgeshire (BCE-82901), and a number of those who spoke at the Cambridge public hearing, opposed the separation of the villages of Great Gidding and Little Gidding from those of Steeple Gidding and Hamerton in the initial proposals: the ward of Stilton, Folksworth & Wasingley containing the first two of these villages had been included in the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, while the latter two villages are part of the Alconbury ward included in the Huntingdon constituency. In considering this issue, the Assistant Commissioners noted that including the whole ward of Alconbury in the North West Cambridgeshire constituency would create a particularly unsatisfactory shape to both the North West Cambridgeshire and Huntingdon constituencies. It would likely divide communities in other areas, and would crudely cross the A14 and A1(M) roads. Our Assistant Commissioners noted that it is possible, in terms of electorate figures, to divide the Alconbury ward, so that only the areas of Steeple Gidding and Hamerton are included in the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, as proposed by Jonathan Djanogly, MP for Huntingdon (BCE-96602). However, they considered that the case for a split ward in this instance was not sufficiently compelling, as it affected relatively few electors, and did not result in any further benefits across the wider area. They therefore recommended no changes to the initial proposals for this constituency.

- 3.39** We recognise the community identity evidence received indicates that our initial proposals would divide the villages of the Giddings between constituencies. We considered whether to split the Alconbury ward, but on balance concluded that a persuasive case had not been made for splitting the ward, in the light of our policy and the statutory factors. We noted that the whole of the Alconbury ward could be transferred between constituencies, but had concerns that while this would reflect the community ties of the Giddings villages in the north of the ward, it might not reflect the communities in the southern part of the ward. We also recognised that this change was likely to result in a constituency with an odd shape, which is a statutory factor we must consider when formulating constituencies. Therefore, on balance, we propose that there be no change from the initial proposals, but we would welcome representations on whether including the whole of the Alconbury ward in the North West Cambridgeshire would better reflect community ties.
- 3.40** A substantial number of representations were received regarding the proposed Cambridge constituency. In the initial proposals, it was necessary for a ward currently included in the existing Cambridge constituency to be transferred to the South Cambridgeshire constituency. We proposed initially that this should be the Cherry Hinton ward. We received representations calling for each of Trumpington, Queen Edith's, and Cherry Hinton wards to be included in the Cambridge constituency. While strong arguments have been made to include Queen Edith's ward, with BCE-84325 and Chris Rand (BCE-58838) highlighting community ties (such as Homerton College and Addenbrooke's Hospital), we feel it would be difficult to justify doing so, given that it is the only one of the three wards that is already not included in the existing Cambridge constituency. While we recognise the ward has clear ties to the rest of Cambridge, none of the evidence received during the two public consultations was sufficiently compelling to change this view.
- 3.41** We considered that the decision on which one of the other two wards to retain in the Cambridge constituency was more finely balanced. Numerous representations, including from the Labour Party (BCE-79489), the Liberal Democrats (BCE-94333) and the Chair of Cherry Hinton Ward Labour Party, Lydia Whitehead (BCE-80157), stated that Cherry Hinton has a longer history of being included with Cambridge, that there is a less defined separation between Cherry Hinton and Cambridge than between Trumpington and Cambridge, and that Cherry Hinton is the site of important cultural events such as the Cambridge Folk Festival. Conversely, some representations, including from Anthony Browne, MP for South Cambridgeshire (BCE-90889) and Michael Clegg (BCE-84079) noted that the Trumpington ward is a rapidly developing urban area, with a significant number of tall residential buildings, that the ward 'extends



into the heart of the city', and that Cherry Hinton has closer links and is more similar in character to both Queen Edith's ward and the other areas of the South Cambridgeshire constituency than Trumpington. There have been few other issues in the proposed South Cambridgeshire constituency.

- 3.42** After consideration, the Assistant Commissioners were of the view that none of the evidence received during the public consultations for the inclusion of the Cherry Hinton ward in the Cambridge constituency was sufficiently persuasive to propose a change to the initial proposals. While they acknowledged the clear ties with Cambridge, they considered the 'village' feel of Cherry Hinton to be better suited to the character of the South Cambridgeshire constituency than would the more modern urban feel of Trumpington as it now is. Including the former ward in the South Cambridgeshire constituency also allows the whole of the village of Cherry Hinton to be included in one constituency, as opposed to being split between two, as it is in the existing arrangement, and allows the closely-linked wards of Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith's to be included in the same constituency. By contrast, the Trumpington and Queen Edith's wards appeared not as closely linked, and as Trumpington is becoming more urban in nature (as observed when our Assistant Commissioners visited the area), it would be more suited to the city constituency of Cambridge than the mostly rural constituency of South Cambridgeshire. The Assistant Commissioners therefore recommended no changes to the initial proposals for Cambridge, and we agree.
- 3.43** A very small number of representations also highlighted that the East Cambridgeshire constituency is not wholly contiguous in the west of the constituency, due to a small area of the Milton & Waterbeach ward to the east of the Cambridge North railway station being detached from the rest of the constituency. While we usually attempt to avoid such situations, there is no specific statutory factor regarding contiguous constituencies, and in this area in particular it is less relevant, as the issue is caused by an already non-contiguous ward – as created by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England – which also follows the local authority boundaries. The counter-proposal from BCE-56498 includes the whole of Milton & Waterbeach ward in the Cambridge constituency, at the expense of Trumpington ward. This is considered unsatisfactory, as it would take less account of the existing constituency, and would also double the geographical size of the constituency due to the shape of the Milton & Waterbeach ward. The counter-proposals from Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-78259) and Jonathan Stansby (BCE-88730) proposed splitting the Milton & Waterbeach ward in order to make the East Cambridgeshire constituency wholly contiguous. Our Assistant Commissioners' assessment was that, while the initial proposal is not ideal, a constituency being very slightly non-contiguous as a result of an already non-contiguous ward is not a strong enough justification for the ward to be divided. We agree with the assessment of the Assistant Commissioners on this matter.

- 3.44 Approximately 200 representations were received regarding the proposed St Neots constituency. Some of these were supportive, including from the Labour Party, South Cambridgeshire Conservative Association (BCE-75122), and Jonathan Djanogly MP (BCE-86241), highlighting that St Neots is the largest town in Cambridgeshire (after the cities of Cambridge and Peterborough), and that the A428 road provides a good connection throughout much of the proposed constituency. However, we received a larger number of opposing representations (for example BCE-59154 and BCE-87230). The most frequent issue in opposition was that most of the South Cambridgeshire local authority wards included in the constituency, especially those to the east (such as Histon & Impington, and Girton), have little connection to the town of St Neots, and have a far stronger connection to the city of Cambridge and other areas of South Cambridgeshire. Some said they should therefore either be in a constituency separate to the town of St Neots, or be referenced in the constituency name.
- 3.45 Counter-proposals in this area proposed either a St Ives constituency, with St Neots remaining with Huntingdon (BCE-61413 and Edward Carlsson Browne), or a large reconfiguration in the south of the county. A St Ives constituency appeared to have the benefit that some of the South Cambridgeshire wards that we have been told have little connection to the town of St Neots would have more of a connection to the town of St Ives. However, there would still be many wards with little connection to St Ives, and St Ives is a significantly smaller town than St Neots. Such a proposal would also necessitate disruption to the Huntingdon constituency, which is largely uncontroversial.
- 3.46 Some respondents proposed the division of Cambridge into two constituencies (Malcolm Lynn, BCE-69231), while others proposed a 'doughnut' constituency around Cambridge (BCE-58939, BCE-91406, and Ric Brackenbury - BCE-94769). Counter-proposals from BCE-94644 and Oliver Raven (BCE-85205) proposed significant reconfigurations from the initial proposals across much of Cambridgeshire, and Malcolm Lynn also proposed dividing the Great Staughton ward. Our Assistant Commissioners recognised that any large reconfigurations such as these would require a significant departure from the existing pattern of constituencies, and considered that there was not a sufficiently strong case for dividing the Great Staughton ward. While we acknowledge that parts of the constituency are more closely linked to Cambridge or other towns rather than to St Neots, we do not consider the counter-proposals to be persuasive, as we believe that they fail to create a more coherent constituency, and would unnecessarily and negatively disrupt the surrounding constituencies. As such, we are proposing no changes to the boundaries of the initially proposed St Neots constituency.

- 3.47 We received over 25 different options for an alternative name for the proposed St Neots constituency, highlighting both the demand for renaming, and also the difficulty in choosing a name that is representative of the constituency as a whole and would gain wide acceptance. Most of these representations state that the name St Neots is not wholly representative of a constituency that includes a number of wards from the South Cambridgeshire local authority. As such, most respondents supported either: a compass point name such as Mid Cambridgeshire or West Cambridge (as proposed by BCE-57741 and BCE-57234); or the addition of a Cambridgeshire village or town to the name such as St Neots and Cambourne or St Neots and Papworth (as proposed by BCE-57696 and Tom Mayer – BCE-71976). The Assistant Commissioners considered the request to change the name from just St Neots sufficiently compelling and as such, despite proposing no change to the boundaries, proposed that the constituency be named St Neots and Mid Cambridgeshire, as proposed by Stephen Lees (BCE-68799). They considered that the reference of the compass point accorded with the approach to naming of many of the other Cambridgeshire constituencies, while including St Neots specifically in the name reflects the importance of the biggest town in Cambridgeshire. We agree with their recommendation to modify this constituency name.
- 3.48 The majority of the representations received for the proposed North East Cambridgeshire constituency were in support of the configuration. However, a few respondents, including those from Fenland District Council (BCE-65879), James Brown (BCE-70651), and Councillor Chris Boden (BCE-81507) said that, given the proposed constituency is coterminous with the local authority, it should be renamed Fenland. However, Edward Carlsson Browne contended that the name Fenland is too unspecific and could cause confusion, as the Fens is a generic term and 'the Fens extend well beyond the boundaries of the eponymous district'. The Assistant Commissioners were not persuaded to propose a change to the name of the North East Cambridgeshire constituency, as they considered that the boundaries have only slightly changed from the existing pattern, and the proposed name is consistent with that across much of the county in that it references a compass-point area of Cambridgeshire. Furthermore, they agreed with the view that Fenland would be too unspecific, as the Fens encompass a significantly larger geographical area than the proposed constituency. We agree with the assessment of the Assistant Commissioners on this matter and propose no change to the name.
- 3.49 There were relatively few representations concerning the initial proposals for the proposed Huntingdon constituency. The proposals were largely uncontentious and supported, so the Assistant Commissioners recommended no revisions to them, and we agree.



## Essex

- 3.50** During the initial proposals, it was proposed that Essex be included in a sub-region with Suffolk, with a cross-county boundary constituency of Haverhill and Halstead. As mentioned previously in the ‘Summary’ and ‘Sub-regions’ sections of this report, a number of representations and counter-proposals were received that supported Essex being treated on its own as a sub-region. Our Assistant Commissioners considered that these representations and the views contained within them were sufficiently compelling, and they recommended to us that Essex be treated as a sub-region on its own, rather than be paired with Suffolk, as in the initial proposals. They considered that there are numerous reasons for accepting this sub-regional change, with benefits across much of Essex, Suffolk and Norfolk. As previously outlined, we agree with this recommendation and propose Essex form its own sub-region as part of our revised proposals.
- 3.51** Our Assistant Commissioners recommended that the counter-proposal put forward by BCE-63334 (which is similar to that subsequently put forward by the Liberal Democrats) be adopted for Essex, apart from minor changes in the areas of Colchester and Southend-on-Sea. They recommended this counter-proposal in preference to the Conservative Party counter-proposal (BCE-85500), which also treats Essex as a standalone sub-region, as they considered that it would result in a more coherent scheme across the county. They felt that it would minimise disruption to the existing constituencies, and allow more constituencies to remain either wholly unchanged or changed only to realign to new local government ward boundaries. While we acknowledge that the Conservative Party counter-proposal has its merits, such as the Braintree constituency remaining unchanged except to realign to new local government ward boundaries, we consider there to be significant disadvantages, such as their proposed Witham constituency, which would stretch from the Stanway ward west of Colchester, to the Galleywood ward south of Chelmsford. Counter-proposals that would treat Essex alone were also received from BCE-66878, Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-78259), and Jonathan Stansby (BCE-88730). The Green Party (BCE-96542), while agreeing with the sub-regions used in the initial proposals, also created a counter-proposal with Essex alone. Overall, we agree with the recommendation of the Assistant Commissioners and consider that the counter-proposal from BCE-63334 and the Liberal Democrats takes more account of the statutory factors than these other counter-proposals.

- 3.52 The initially proposed constituencies of Colchester, Harwich and North Essex, and Witham generated over 1,000 representations, making it (along with Peterborough and North West Cambridgeshire) one of the areas in the region, and also the country as a whole, with the most representations received. In the initial proposals the Lexden & Braiswick ward, part of which is included in the existing Harwich and North Essex constituency, was proposed to be wholly included in Harwich and North Essex, to realign with new local government ward boundaries. It was also necessary for one further ward currently included in the existing Colchester constituency to be included in the proposed Harwich and North Essex constituency. We proposed Prettygate, due to its links to the Lexden & Braiswick ward. The majority of representations called for these two wards to be included in the Colchester constituency, as respondents considered that both wards are physically very close to the centre of Colchester, have little to no connection to the coastal town of Harwich (which is on the far side of Colchester), and include numerous important transport and community links, such as a key arterial route into Colchester and numerous schools.
- 3.53 Over 150 representations were also received regarding the ward of Mersea & Pyefleet being included in the proposed Witham constituency, rather than being retained in the Harwich and North Essex constituency (as in the existing arrangement). We included this ward in the Witham constituency in the initial proposals as we considered that it allowed for a more coherent scheme across the county when Essex was paired in a sub-region with Suffolk, and it also removed the anomaly of the ward being disconnected from the rest of its existing constituency by a river with no connecting bridges within the constituency. Many representations, including BCE-73102, John Akker (BCE-83221) and BCE-83304, felt that, while there is no physical connection (due to the River Colne dividing the two areas), the ward is nonetheless more suited to being included in a more coastal constituency like Harwich and North Essex, rather than being included in a more inland rural constituency such as Witham. West Mersea Town Council (BCE-94955) also highlighted that there are poor transport links and community ties between the town of Witham and Mersea Island.
- 3.54 We received a number of counter-proposals relating to the Colchester area. Oliver Raven's counter-proposal (BCE-85205) proposed that the Prettygate ward be retained in the Colchester constituency, with Highwoods ward, which mostly comprises newer housing developments, instead being included in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. The Green Party supported a similar approach, but would also add the Stanway ward into Colchester, and transferred the St. Anne's & St. John's ward to Harwich and North Essex.

3.55 Counter-proposals that treat Essex as a sub-region on its own require the Essex constituencies to have a higher average electorate (approximately 74,900 rather than 73,000 in the initial proposals). One consequence of this is that, in order to create a coherent scheme across the county, it is effectively necessary to include either the Stanway ward or Mersea & Pyefleet ward in the Harwich and North Essex constituency, and for the two wards of The Bentleys & Frating, and The Oakleys & Wix to be included in the Clacton constituency, rather than remaining in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. The Liberal Democrats' counter-proposal (BCE-94333), as well as BCE-66878, Jonathan Stansby, and BCE-79444, proposed the inclusion of the Stanway ward in Harwich and North Essex, bringing three wards containing areas of urban Colchester together (Stanway, Prettygate, and Lexden & Braiswick). The Conservative Party's counter-proposal (BCE-85500) put forward a more radical reconfiguration that would create two Colchester constituencies: one in the north including the town of Harwich; and one in the south including Mersea & Pyefleet ward. There was some support for this proposal, including from Will Quince, MP for Colchester (BCE-94891) and BCE-95098, noting a historical precedent (as Colchester has previously been split into two constituencies in a similar manner), and that this would allow the Mersea & Pyefleet ward to be included in a Colchester constituency. However, there was also opposition to this approach, particularly during the second consultation phase, with respondents – including the Labour Party at the Cambridge public hearing (BCE-97335), BCE-71848, BCE-81280, and Sir Bob Russell, a former MP for Colchester (BCE-97391) – claiming that the last time Colchester was split into two the arrangement was disruptive, confusing and unpopular, and that a single, compact and wholly urban Colchester constituency, as is currently the case, should be retained with minimal change. While not mentioned by any of the respondents to the public consultations, the analysis of our Assistant Commissioners showed that it was possible to divide the ward of Lexden & Braiswick to include the three predominantly urban polling districts (Colchester AQ, AS, and AT), along with the whole of the Prettygate ward, in the Colchester constituency, with the Old Heath & The Hythe ward (currently included in the Colchester constituency) instead being included in the Harwich and North Essex constituency.

- 3.56 We have studied each of these options, and also the analysis of our Assistant Commissioners, who undertook a site visit to look at the areas for themselves. It is clear that this is a finely balanced issue, and that each proposal has strengths and weaknesses. Given our decision to treat Essex as a sub-region on its own, it is not possible for each of these three constituencies to remain the same as in the initial proposals, as the electorate of the rest of the county would be too high to create a coherent scheme; as such, some change is therefore inevitable. We consider that the most suitable way to create a coherent pattern of constituencies across Essex would be for one of either the Stanway or Mersea & Pyefleet wards to be included in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. We note that the River Colne divides the Mersea & Pyefleet ward from the Tendring local authority wards that comprise the rest of the Harwich and North Essex constituency, with no bridge crossing until much further north near Colchester, outside of the ward. However, the Mersea & Pyefleet ward is currently included in the existing Harwich and North Essex constituency, whereas Stanway is included in the existing Witham constituency. Furthermore, representations were clear that the Mersea & Pyefleet ward has poor links west towards the town of Witham, with the ward instead sharing a coastal and maritime character with a number of communities in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. We also note that the River Colne has historically been a navigable river that linked the city of Colchester and its hinterland with the port of Brightlingsea. As such, we believe that retaining the Mersea & Pyefleet ward with Harwich and North Essex most closely fulfils the statutory requirements of maintaining existing constituencies and local ties, despite the geographical considerations in the area.
- 3.57 Regarding the issue of the Lexden & Braiswick, and Prettygate wards, we consider that, after assessing all of the evidence, these two areas appear to be an integral part of Colchester, with strong transport links, close geographical proximity, historical links and community ties regarding schools and other establishments. We also consider, however, that the Lexden & Braiswick ward as a whole is geographically large, is predominantly rural, and as such it would be inappropriate to be wholly included in an urban Colchester constituency. We therefore propose that this ward be split, with the three mostly urban polling districts (Colchester AQ, AS, and AT), which are divided from the rest of the ward by the A12 road and the railway line, being included in the proposed Colchester constituency, and the three rural polling districts (Colchester EJ, ET, and EU) remaining in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. A further benefit of splitting this ward is that it would allow the existing boundary in this area to be retained.

- 3.58 Our Assistant Commissioners also recommended that the entirety of the Prettygate ward be included with Colchester, as it is in the existing arrangement. Given that the whole of the Prettygate ward and part of the Lexden & Braiswick ward are proposed to be included in the Colchester constituency, it is necessary for one ward that was initially proposed to be included in the Colchester constituency to instead be included in the Harwich and North Essex constituency, in order to bring both constituencies within the electorate quota.
- 3.59 This issue was carefully considered by the Assistant Commissioners in their recommendations to us, and it is clear to us that none of the options is without negative consequences. We consider that the Conservative Party's counter-proposal seemingly arbitrarily divided the city of Colchester, including the separation of the closely-linked areas of Lexden and Prettygate, and that it required an unnecessarily large departure from the existing constituency boundaries. We also consider that the counter-proposal submitted by both BCE-63334 and the Liberal Democrats required both the Stanway, and Mersea & Pyefleet wards to be included in different constituencies than they are in the existing arrangement, and that the inclusion of the Prettygate, and Lexden & Braiswick wards in the Harwich and North Essex constituency, is undesirable due to their close links to Colchester.
- 3.60 Based on the recommendations of our Assistant Commissioners, with which we concur, we propose to include the ward of Old Heath & The Hythe in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. We note that a significant portion of this ward, including all of the village of Rowhedge, is currently included in the Harwich and North Essex constituency. Also, as the Mersea & Pyefleet ward is now proposed to remain in the Harwich and North Essex constituency, including the Old Heath & The Hythe ward provides a stronger link between Mersea & Pyefleet and the rest of the constituency, as it contains Fingringhoe Road (which becomes Old Heath Road) and the Colne Causeway bridge – the first bridge crossing the River Colne when driving from Mersea to Harwich. Furthermore, the town of Wivenhoe has links to the village of Rowhedge via the foot ferry. We acknowledge that a significant portion of the Old Heath & The Hythe ward is in the existing Colchester constituency and has close community ties to the city. However, this is true of any of the other options, such as the Greenstead, St. Anne's & St. John's, Highwoods, or Mile End wards; Old Heath & The Hythe is the only ward out of these options that has a significant portion already included in the existing Harwich and North Essex constituency.

- 3.61 In the initial proposals, the only changes to the Clacton constituency were to realign to new local government ward boundaries, and this was wholly uncontentious. However, as mentioned in the previous paragraphs, counter-proposals that proposed a sub-regional change often necessitated a small change to the proposed Clacton constituency. This small change would involve the two wards of The Bentleys & Frating, and The Oakleys & Wix – included in the existing and initially proposed Harwich and North Essex constituency – being included in the Clacton constituency. While this is further from the existing constituency than the initial proposals, and stretches the constituency further north, taking in parts of the A120 road, Assistant Commissioners considered that the significant, wider benefits of the sub-regional change in other areas far outweigh the disadvantages of these changes to the Clacton constituency, and therefore recommended this relatively small change to the constituency. We agree.
- 3.62 The proposed constituencies of Castle Point, Southend West, and Rochford and Southend East generated over 700 representations, most of them opposing the initial proposals. It is necessary for the existing Castle Point constituency to include an additional ward, as it is currently below the permitted electorate range. As such, the initial proposals included the West Leigh ward in the proposed Castle Point constituency, and this, along with the existing Southend West constituency's electorate being below the permitted range, necessitated five wards being transferred between the two Southend constituencies (Eastwood Park, St. Laurence, St. Luke's, Victoria, and Milton).
- 3.63 Separating the West Leigh ward from the Southend West constituency was by far the most significant issue in this area during the consultations, and the vast majority of representations received were regarding this change. These representations, with examples including those from the late Sir David Amess, former MP for Southend West (BCE-85553), Anna Firth, MP for Southend West (BCE-91536), BCE-85805, BCE-85464, BCE-69434, and BCE-67976 said that West Leigh should remain in a Southend constituency. The reasons were numerous, and included that West Leigh is intrinsically linked to both Leigh and the rest of Southend; has little to no connection to much of the Castle Point constituency; and is separated from Castle Point by a natural geographical barrier of the Salvation Army fields to the west.

- 3.64 There are limited options in this area due to the tight electorate figures and the nature of the physical geography. One option proposed by BCE-63334 and highlighted by the Liberal Democrats in their initial response (BCE-83748), was to transfer the Lodge ward from the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency to the Castle Point constituency. While this had the benefit of avoiding splitting the town of Leigh, and giving more flexibility within the two Southend constituencies, we had concerns with this configuration when developing our initial proposals due to clear negative consequences, in that it would divide the town of Rayleigh, and the ward has little to no direct transport links to the Castle Point constituency. Few counter-proposals supporting this option were received, and we received no compelling evidence that has changed our view of this option.
- 3.65 It is not possible to include the whole of the Pitsea South East ward in the Castle Point constituency, as doing so would bring both the Castle Point constituency above the permitted electorate range and the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency below the range, also making the latter a non-contiguous constituency by completely isolating the Pitsea North West ward. However, it is possible to divide the ward so that only the DO polling district, covering the villages of Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet, is included in the Castle Point constituency. This proposal was put forward by both the Conservative Party (BCE-85500) and in the Liberal Democrats' later response (BCE-94333), and was supported by the Labour Party during the second consultation (BCE-95654).
- 3.66 Our Assistant Commissioners visited the area. They considered that West Leigh was an integral part of Leigh-on-Sea (it contains Leigh railway station) and they noted the considerable expanse of marshland and creeks that separate much of the ward from the Castle Point constituency. They also visited the Pitsea South East ward. They noted that while the A130 road lies between the communities of Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet in the ward, and the Castle Point areas to the east, the connecting A13 provides a direct transport link between the two, via the Sadlers Farm roundabout. They also noted a clear physical separation of open land between Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet and the towns of Pitsea and Basildon. They also noted that this approach would bring North Benfleet and South Benfleet into a constituency together. The added benefit of no longer proposing to include West Leigh ward in the Castle Point constituency is that it allowed more flexibility within the two Southend constituencies.

- 3.67 We have considered all of the evidence and agree with the recommendation of our Assistant Commissioners that dividing the Pitsea South East ward allows us to take most account of the statutory factors overall across multiple constituencies in south Essex. Splitting a ward requires a strong justification, particularly when part of a single ward from one local authority is included in a constituency wholly comprising wards from another local authority. However, we believe that in this instance it is the right option in order to increase the electorate of the Castle Point constituency to within the permitted range while also formulating a pattern of constituencies in the surrounding area that overall better reflects the statutory factors. We consider the main alternatives put forward to be more disadvantageous: the initial proposals were strongly opposed by local residents, who demonstrated how they would break local ties; and the Lodge ward option was supported by only a few respondents, has very weak transport connections, and would significantly disrupt local ties in Rayleigh.
- 3.68 In the initial proposals, five wards (Eastwood Park, St. Laurence, St. Luke's, Victoria, and Milton) were exchanged between the constituencies of Southend West, and Rochford and Southend East, in order for both constituencies to be within the permitted electorate range. During the Southend-on-Sea public hearing, and in written representations, there was opposition to the Eastwood Park and St. Laurence wards being separated from the town of Leigh (for example BCE-85464 and Councillor Nigel Folkard – BCE-97366). There were also, however, a number of representations that the city centre wards – generally considered to be Victoria, Milton and Kursaal – should be kept together in one constituency, ideally the more urban Southend West, with the wards of Eastwood Park and St. Laurence remaining as initially proposed in Rochford and Southend East (for example, Shahid Nadeem – BCE-97362, Councillor Aston Line – BCE-97363, and Martin Berry – BCE-97367).
- 3.69 Counter-proposals from Jonathan Stansby, Edward Carlsson Browne, and BCE-79444 each outlined slight variations from the initial proposals to the Southend West, and Rochford and Southend East constituencies, while still including the West Leigh ward in the Castle Point constituency (as in the initial proposals). Counter-proposals that would retain West Leigh ward in a Southend constituency were able to reduce the amount of disruption to the existing arrangement regarding the two Southend constituencies. The Conservative Party (BCE-85500) proposed that the only change to the existing Southend West constituency should be for the St. Luke's ward to be included from the Rochford and Southend East constituency, while the Liberal Democrats (BCE-94333) and Oliver Raven (BCE-85205) called for the Milton ward to be included instead. Both options minimised change to the existing constituencies, but also have some disadvantages: the St. Luke's ward option would create two peculiarly shaped constituencies, limiting access between the city centre and the rest of the constituency; and the Milton ward option divides the city centre wards between two constituencies.



- 3.70** The Assistant Commissioners considered that the option that took most account of the statutory factors would be to adopt the approach that kept the city centre wards together, but in the more urban Southend West constituency. They therefore recommended a constituency comprising the whole of the existing Southend West constituency except the wards of Eastwood Park and St. Laurence (which would be included in the Rochford and Southend East constituency as in the initial proposals), with the additional inclusion of the three wards of Milton, Victoria and Kursaal. While it is possible to minimise change further, along the lines of the Conservative Party's proposal, the Assistant Commissioners considered this was not preferable, given the less optimal shape and accessibility of the constituencies that would result, and the strong ties of the city centre wards to the west that would be broken. In respect of the inclusion of Eastwood Park and St. Laurence in the Rochford and Southend East constituency, they noted evidence that these wards contained the residential parts of Southend-on-Sea closest to the airport, and arguments that there would therefore be value having both the airport and those most likely to be impacted by it represented by the same MP. While noting representations that stated these two areas have connections to Leigh, the Assistant Commissioners during their site visit to the area also felt that the A127 road does form an identifiable and easily understood physical boundary, and that the benefits gained overall from the distribution of wards they had recommended across the rest of the area outweighed the disadvantages.
- 3.71** The Assistant Commissioners recommended that this more compact western Southend constituency be named Southend Central and Leigh, as they considered that this better reflects both the inclusion of the city centre wards and the distinct and strong community identity of Leigh in the west of the city. We agree with their conclusions.
- 3.72** Few representations or counter-proposals were received regarding the proposed South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency, other than the proposal to divide the ward of Pitsea South East mentioned previously, and a further proposal to make a minor adjustment in the south west of the ward near Thurrock. In the initial proposals, the Thurrock constituency was unchanged except for the two wards of Tilbury St. Chads, and Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park, which were included in the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-85500), the Labour Party (BCE-79489) and the Green Party (BCE-96542), along with members of the public Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-78259), BCE-79444, Oliver Raven (BCE-85205), and Jonathan Stansby (BCE-88730), proposed that the two wards of Tilbury St. Chads, and Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park be retained in the Thurrock constituency, as in the existing arrangement, with the Chadwell St. Mary ward instead included in the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency in order to bring the constituencies within the permitted electorate range. This was put forward on the basis that the town of Tilbury and the Tilbury Docks are closely linked to the town of Grays in

the Thurrock constituency, with which they share transport links and community ties. Our Assistant Commissioners were persuaded by these arguments, and as such recommended this change. We agree and include this modification as part of our revised proposals.

- 3.73** In the initial proposals, the Braintree constituency was significantly re-configured from the existing arrangement, due in large part to the proposed Haverhill and Halstead cross-county boundary constituency. Around 100 representations were received on the initially proposed Braintree constituency, almost exclusively in objection, with James Cleverly, MP for Braintree (BCE-91218), and Councillor John McKee (BCE-73221) being examples. Most of these stated that the proposed Braintree constituency is vastly different to the existing constituency, with a peculiar shape, and few links to the Chelmsford local authority wards that are included (namely Writtle, Chelmsford Rural West, Broomfield and The Walthams, and Boreham and The Leighs).
- 3.74** Peter Long, of the Witham & District Branch Co-operative Party (BCE-74106) submitted a counter-proposal that was supported by a number of representations, including several at the Southend-on-Sea public hearing, such as Jack Coleman (BCE-97379). This counter-proposal would establish a constituency comprising the towns of Braintree, Witham and Halstead, and a Mid-Essex Rural constituency that would stretch from areas west of Chelmsford, to Mersea Island south of Colchester. While there are merits in the option of a Braintree, Halstead and Witham constituency, this is dependent on the accompanying proposal for a Great Notley and Haverhill constituency, which would be outside of the permitted electorate range.
- 3.75** Counter-proposals that called for Essex to be considered as a sub-region in its own right generally proposed a Braintree constituency that would be either unchanged from the existing constituency (apart from to realign to new local government ward boundaries), or have minor changes, with The Colnes ward being included in the Witham constituency and The Sampfords, and Felsted & Stebbing wards being included from the Saffron Walden constituency. Our Assistant Commissioners acknowledged that there are merits in the Braintree constituency being unchanged other than to realign to new local government ward boundaries. However, they considered that the proposal put forward by the Liberal Democrats (BCE-94333) and BCE-63334 was preferable, as it would allow for a pattern of constituencies across the rest of Essex that more closely reflect the statutory factors, while still allowing the existing Braintree constituency to be mostly retained, unlike the initial proposals.

- 3.76** The electorate of the existing Saffron Walden constituency is significantly above the permitted electorate range, and as such, substantial change is required. In the initial proposals, Writtle, Chelmsford Rural West, Broomfield and The Walthams, and Boreham and The Leighs wards were included in the proposed Braintree constituency from the existing Saffron Walden constituency, and the Moreton and Fyfield, and High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings wards were included in the proposed Saffron Walden constituency from the existing Brentwood and Ongar constituency. In the initial proposals, the transfer of the Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing ward from the Epping Forest to the Harlow constituency was the only change proposed in those two constituencies. A number of representations were received regarding this change, mostly during the second consultation, and almost exclusively in opposition to the proposals (for example, BCE-88676).
- 3.77** The counter-proposals from BCE-63334 and the Liberal Democrats, which form much of our configuration of constituencies in our proposed Essex sub-region, necessitate a change to the three proposed constituencies of Saffron Walden, Harlow, and Epping Forest. Both respondents proposed retaining the four Chelmsford wards of Writtle, Chelmsford Rural West, Broomfield and The Walthams, and Boreham and The Leighs in the Saffron Walden constituency (as in the current arrangement). While some respondents from these wards stated they have little connection to the town of Saffron Walden, others said they also have little connection to the town of Braintree (with which they were initially proposed to be included), and to include the wards with Saffron Walden at least reduced disruption to the existing arrangement. These counter-proposals also required the Uttlesford local authority to be divided between three constituencies (rather than one as in the existing pattern): The Sampfords, and Felsted & Stebbing wards would be included in an alternatively configured Braintree constituency (as discussed above); and the Hatfield Heath, and Broad Oak & the Hallingburys wards would be transferred to the Harlow constituency from the existing Saffron Walden constituency. In this proposal, therefore, the Harlow constituency would include wards from three different local authorities. Finally, the Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing ward would be retained in the proposed Epping Forest constituency, which would then be wholly unchanged from the existing arrangement. Overall, despite some disadvantages, our Assistant Commissioners accepted these recommended revisions, as they allowed for a significantly better pattern of constituencies across the county overall. We agree with their assessment.


- 3.78** Around 20 representations, mostly in opposition, were received regarding the proposed Brentwood constituency. In the initial proposals, the two wards of Moreton and Fyfield, and High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings, from the existing Brentwood and Ongar constituency, were included in the proposed Saffron Walden constituency in order to bring the latter within the permitted electorate range. Due to this change, a name change was proposed to simply call the constituency Brentwood. It is these changes that the majority of the representations received, such as Jim Padfield (BCE-68075), were concerned about. Reconfiguring the sub-regions, as we are now proposing, means that the Saffron Walden constituency no longer needs to include the two wards of Moreton and Fyfield, and High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings, and therefore they are able to be retained in a Brentwood and Ongar constituency, as numerous counter-proposals put forward. We accept this revision, as it minimises change from the existing Brentwood and Ongar constituency, allowing it to be unchanged except to realign to new local government ward boundaries. Due to there being minimal change, and the village of High Ongar being retained in the constituency, it is also proposed that the existing name of Brentwood and Ongar be retained.
- 3.79** In the initial proposals, the only changes to the existing Maldon constituency were the addition of the Galleywood ward, and the inclusion of the Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon ward in the Braintree constituency. Few representations or counter-proposals were received regarding these changes. However, counter-proposals from the Liberal Democrats, BCE-63334, and BCE-66878, which call for Essex to be a sub-region on its own, proposed that the Maldon constituency retain the ward of Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon. This would minimise disruption from the existing constituency, as every ward in the existing constituency would be retained and there would be the single addition of the Galleywood ward. The Assistant Commissioners found this sufficiently persuasive, and as such we are content to propose the change in our revised proposals.
- 3.80** The Conservative Party, as well as a number of others who also supported Essex as a sub-region on its own, proposed a Maldon constituency that included all of the wards from the Maldon local authority in a single constituency, as well as a number of wards from the Colchester local authority. While our Assistant Commissioners considered there was merit in this proposal, in that it had more regard for the Maldon local authority boundary, they did not find it sufficiently persuasive as it would entail an unnecessarily large departure from the existing arrangement for both the Maldon and Witham constituencies, and they considered that such a change would have negative implications across other areas of the county.

- 3.81** Around 40 representations were received regarding the proposed Chelmsford constituency, split roughly equally between those supporting and opposing the initial proposals. Those supporting said that the Galleywood ward is the most appropriate ward to be included in the Maldon constituency (Councillor Stephen Robinson, BCE-70693), while opposing representations said that it should be retained by dividing the town of Chelmsford into two constituencies (BCE-59220). The latter would be a major departure from the existing constituency, with an impact across much of the county, and as such we do not accept these alternatives and propose no change. Counter-proposals from BCE-79444 and BCE-94644 were the only other two to propose a revision to the initially proposed Chelmsford, with both saying Goat Hall ward should no longer be included. Our Assistant Commissioners did not consider this preferable as it failed to minimise disruption from the existing constituency and was likely to break local ties. We agree.
- 3.82** In the initial proposals, the only change to the existing Basildon and Billericay constituency was the inclusion of the Vange ward from South Basildon and East Thurrock. This change was largely uncontentious, and the Assistant Commissioners accordingly recommended no revisions, which we agree with.
- 3.83** In the initial proposals, the Roche North & Rural ward, which is divided between the existing constituencies of Rayleigh and Wickford, and Rochford and Southend East, was wholly included in the proposed Rochford and Southend East constituency. There were no further changes to the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency. This single change was largely uncontentious, and we propose no changes to the initial proposals.

## Norfolk and Suffolk

### Norfolk

- 3.84** The change in sub-regions (detailed in the sub-region section above) necessitates change across much of Norfolk. This reconfiguration of Norfolk means that changes from the initial proposals are proposed to eight of the nine constituencies in the county.
- 3.85** The issue in Norfolk that received the most representations during the consultations was the proposed transfer of the two North Norfolk wards of Stalham and Hickling to the Great Yarmouth constituency. This arrangement was considered necessary if Norfolk was to be treated as a sub-region on its own, in order to create a coherent pattern of constituencies across the county. The majority of representations, which mostly came from residents of the two wards of Stalham and Hickling, opposed the proposals, stating that the two wards were very different from the rest of the Great Yarmouth constituency, in particular to the town of Great Yarmouth itself. The differences referenced by respondents – such as Duncan Baker, MP for North Norfolk



(BCE-71049), and Hickling Parish Council (BCE-84188) – were that Great Yarmouth has a distinct character, with significantly different issues to North Norfolk. They also highlighted the differences in physical geography between the rural areas of Stalham and Hickling (which include a designated area of outstanding natural beauty) and the mostly urban area of Great Yarmouth. Our Assistant Commissioners noted that the change in sub-region allowed the two wards to be retained in the North Norfolk constituency, while still allowing for a coherent pattern of constituencies across the county, and retaining Stalham and Hickling wards in the North Norfolk constituency allowed the Great Yarmouth constituency to be both wholly unchanged and wholly coterminous with the local authority boundary. We agree with this recommendation and as such we propose the Great Yarmouth constituency be unchanged from the existing arrangement.

- 3.86** In the initial proposals, there was further change to the existing North Norfolk constituency, with the five wards of Lancaster North, Lancaster South, The Raynhams, Stibbard, and Walsingham, which include the town of Fakenham, included from the existing Broadland constituency. This was largely a consequence of Stalham and Hickling wards being included in the proposed Great Yarmouth constituency. Few representations were received regarding this change, although those that were received were largely supportive, including Fakenham Town Council (BCE-96639) and BCE-53555. They said that the town of Fakenham is one of the largest towns in the North Norfolk local authority and should therefore be included in a constituency with most of the rest of the local authority, and that the five wards have little in common with the rest of the existing Broadland constituency they are currently in. Retaining Stalham and Hickling wards in the North Norfolk constituency, as we are now proposing, allows these five wards, which include the town of Fakenham, to be retained in the Broadland constituency. The Assistant Commissioners acknowledged that a small majority of respondents supported the inclusion of these five wards in the North Norfolk constituency, but felt that retaining them in the Broadland constituency would minimise disruption to the existing arrangement for both the North Norfolk and Broadland constituencies. We accept their conclusion and recommendation.
- 3.87** In the initial proposals, further change was made to the Broadland constituency, with the inclusion of the Upper Wensum and Lincoln wards from the existing Mid Norfolk constituency. The Assistant Commissioners recommended that these two wards be retained in the Mid Norfolk constituency under our revised proposals. We agree with this proposal. The only change to the boundaries of the existing Broadland constituency would accordingly be for the wards of Drayton North and Drayton South to be included in the Norwich North constituency (detailed below). However, our Assistant Commissioners were persuaded to propose a change to the constituency name. It was put to us, including by Jerome Mayhew, MP for Broadland, at the Ipswich public hearing (BCE-97392), that the name Broadland is not reflective of the constituency as a whole, and that as Fakenham is an

important town in the area, and one that is in the North Norfolk local authority rather than the Broadland local authority, it should be included in the name. We agree with this, and we therefore propose the constituency name be changed to Broadland and Fakenham.

- 3.88** In the initial proposals, the ward of Thorpe Hamlet would be included in the Norwich North constituency from the existing Norwich South constituency. The Norwich South constituency would be changed further to include the Old Costessey ward from the existing South Norfolk constituency. While there were only a small number of representations regarding the two proposed Norwich constituencies, they presented strong views and evidence. Some representations, particularly those received during the Ipswich public hearing – such as from Councillor Adam Giles (BCE-97388) and Councillor Steve Morphew (BCE-97389) – supported the initial proposals. They said that much of the Thorpe Hamlet ward is north of the river and therefore has more connection to the Norwich North constituency, and that this change therefore meant the boundary between the two constituencies more closely followed the River Wensum. Conversely, opposing representations, including from Chloe Smith, MP for Norwich North, who also spoke at the Ipswich public hearing (BCE-97423), stated that the Thorpe Hamlet ward contains crucial areas of the city centre such as the railway station, the football stadium, one of the cathedrals, and numerous shops, restaurants and other facilities, which are more closely linked to the Norwich South constituency that contains much of the rest of the city centre.
- 3.89** It is difficult to keep the two Norwich constituencies as initially proposed and create a coherent scheme across the county when adopting the sub-regional change. As such, a number of counter-proposals supported the Thorpe Hamlet ward being retained in the Norwich South constituency, and the Old Costessey ward being retained in the South Norfolk constituency, as in the existing arrangement. During a site visit to the area, the Assistant Commissioners agreed that the ward of Thorpe Hamlet did contain a significant portion of the city centre, and that to include it in the Norwich North constituency, as initially proposed, while having some benefits, would divide the city centre between two constituencies, with many city centre landmarks and services being included in a constituency that is more suburban in character than the Norwich South constituency. They recommended that we retain the Thorpe Hamlet ward in the Norwich South constituency, as in the existing arrangement, and we agree with that recommendation.

- 3.90** As the electorate of the existing Norwich North constituency is below the permitted electorate range, additional electors must be included in the constituency, and two options were proposed in the representations. The Conservative Party proposed that the two wards of Drayton North and Drayton South be included in the Norwich North constituency, while the Liberal Democrats and BCE-63334 called, alternatively, for the ward of Spixworth with St. Faiths to be included in Norwich North. On their site visit to the area, the Assistant Commissioners observed that despite the odd shape of the two Drayton wards, there are good transport links to the Norwich North constituency, and a similar suburban character across both areas. The peculiar shape of the two wards is largely due to areas with few or no inhabitants. On the contrary, the Spixworth with St. Faiths ward is almost entirely rural and the A1270 road separates much of the ward from the Norwich North constituency. Furthermore, the Assistant Commissioners noted the historical precedent for the village of Drayton being included in a Norwich North constituency. They therefore recommended that the two Drayton wards be included in the Norwich North constituency. We accept that recommendation, but the decision is a finely balanced one, as we note that the new constituency boundary may be considered to break ties between Drayton and the neighbouring village of Taverham, as well as seemingly dividing the Thorpe Marriott residential area (although it would be coterminous with the boundary of Drayton Parish Council). We also noted that despite the apparent physical barrier of the A1270, there appears to be good direct road access from the main population centre of Spixworth village in the Spixworth and St. Faiths ward into north Norwich by both Buxton Road and North Walsham Road. We therefore particularly welcome further views and evidence – especially from local residents – as to which of these wards is best included in the Norwich North constituency.
- 3.91** There were very few representations received regarding the proposed South West Norfolk, Mid Norfolk, and South Norfolk constituencies. Despite this, the sub-regional change now proposed – and particularly the cross-county constituency with Suffolk – necessitates changes to these constituencies. Following the site visit by our Assistant Commissioners, and the evidence which supported the argument for a cross-county constituency spanning the River Waveney, we accepted their recommendations for a Waveney Valley constituency. This would be configured as proposed by Councillor Carol Poulter (BCE-73423), including six wards from the existing South Norfolk constituency: namely Bressingham & Burston, Diss & Roydon, Beck Vale, Dickleburgh & Scole, Harleston, Bunwell, and Ditchingham & Earsham. The proposed Waveney Valley constituency is discussed in further detail in the section on Suffolk, as the majority of the proposed constituency would be composed of Suffolk wards.



- 3.92** The inclusion of these six Norfolk wards in the Waveney Valley constituency means that the South Norfolk constituency requires additional electors from elsewhere. In accordance with the recommendations of our Assistant Commissioners, we propose that the Old Costessey ward, included in the initially proposed Norwich South constituency, and the Easton ward, included in the initially proposed Mid Norfolk constituency, both be retained in the South Norfolk constituency, as in the existing arrangement. Furthermore, as set out in numerous counter-proposals, we propose that the town of Wymondham (comprising the Central Wymondham, North Wymondham and South Wymondham wards) – part of the existing Mid Norfolk constituency – be included in the South Norfolk constituency. While not currently included in the existing South Norfolk constituency, the town of Wymondham is in the South Norfolk local authority, and while few representations were received regarding this area, there was support for Wymondham being included in a constituency composed exclusively of other South Norfolk local authority wards, for example from Howard Collins (BCE-65020) and BCE-58397. Wymondham is the largest town in the South Norfolk local authority, and is considered to have strong links to other areas in the constituency.
- 3.93** The changes we have proposed to the South Norfolk and Broadland constituencies have a consequential beneficial impact – in terms of the statutory factors – on both the Mid Norfolk and South West Norfolk constituencies. The Mid Norfolk constituency would now retain the wards of Necton, Launditch, Hermitage, Upper Wensum, and Lincoln (which are all in the existing constituency of Mid Norfolk). The wards of Harling & Heathlands, and Guiltcross, would also be retained in the South West Norfolk constituency, as in the existing arrangement. Our revised proposals therefore allow both constituencies to much more closely resemble their existing configurations, with the South West Norfolk constituency only being changed from the existing boundary to realign to new local government ward boundaries.
- 3.94** In the initial proposals, the North West Norfolk constituency was unchanged except to realign its boundaries with new local government ward boundaries. This elicited few representations, was largely uncontentious and mostly supported (for example, BCE-66651). The Assistant Commissioners recommended no revisions, and we therefore propose no change to this constituency as initially proposed.

## Suffolk

- 3.95** The largest issue in Suffolk during the consultations, by number of representations received, was the initially proposed Haverhill and Halstead cross-county boundary constituency between Suffolk and Essex. Almost all of the representations received regarding this constituency opposed it, although the Labour Party (BCE-95654) supported it. Most of these representations, such as that from Halstead Town Council (BCE-65834) and Matt Hancock, MP for West Suffolk (BCE-97354), highlighted the lack of ties between the two towns, and particularly poor public transport links, which it was said are effectively non-existent. Furthermore, the representations stated that many of the West Suffolk local authority wards that were included in the constituency look towards the towns of Newmarket or Bury St Edmunds and not south to Essex, while the Braintree local authority wards included look mostly towards the town of Braintree and not to Suffolk in the north. Some respondents, such as James Cleverly MP (BCE-67477) considered the consequential impacts to both the Braintree and West Suffolk constituencies unnecessarily disruptive, while others, such as Councillor Bobby Bennett (BCE-84242) pointed to the River Stour as a well-defined physical barrier. Due to the mathematical entitlement of Suffolk to 7.60 constituencies, it is necessary to have a cross-county boundary constituency that includes wards from Suffolk with wards from another county.
- 3.96** Those who opposed the Haverhill and Halstead proposal, instead proposed a pairing of Suffolk with Norfolk, generally supported one of two options: either a Waveney Valley constituency or a Newmarket and Thetford constituency. The rationale put forward in support of a Waveney Valley constituency is that there is a shared local character on both sides of the River Waveney, with the river being a uniting factor rather than a division, and that the A143 road provides a strong transport connection east-west across much of the proposed constituency (Robert Grimsey, BCE-69217). Furthermore, Geoffrey Holdcroft (BCE-93742) referenced The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership to highlight the commercial links in the area. The reasons given in support of a Newmarket and Thetford constituency, put forward by the Green Party (BCE-96542) and Ric Brackenbury (BCE-94769) among others, are that it would bring much of The Brecks into a single constituency, including Thetford Forest, and crosses the county boundary where it is less defined than in other areas.

- 3.97 Representations received said that a Waveney Valley constituency would better reflect the statutory factors. Firstly, many considered that creating a Newmarket and Thetford constituency would appear to cause more disruption to existing constituencies across both Norfolk and Suffolk. Secondly, representations (for example, BCE-59012) were received from residents of Newmarket who stated that they should, in fact, be included with Cambridgeshire and not Suffolk, and therefore to include the town in a cross-county boundary constituency with Norfolk instead would go directly against local sentiment and cause even more disruption and confusion than the existing arrangement.
- 3.98 Our Assistant Commissioners decided to see the River Waveney area for themselves during a site visit, and observed that the physical geography and socio-economic characteristics on both sides of the river seemed to be similar, and noted the evidence that had been provided of good and numerous community ties spanning the river. They did not consider that the river and county boundary between Norfolk and Suffolk would therefore be an impediment to a successful cross-county constituency here. They therefore concluded that a cross-county constituency be recommended to us here, and that it be called Waveney Valley, as proposed by a large number of respondents. There were, however, two options for a Waveney Valley constituency received, differing in the detail of their composition: that put forward by the Conservative Party (BCE-85500) and the Liberal Democrats (BCE-94333); or Councillor Carol Poulter's counter-proposal (BCE-73423). While the Conservative Party's counter-proposal would reduce the amount of change from the existing arrangement of constituencies, Councillor Poulter's counter-proposal would result in even less change. One of the reasons for this is that Councillor Poulter's proposal would include the town of Stowmarket in the Bury St Edmunds constituency, as in the existing arrangement, thereby minimising disruption to the existing constituencies and moving significantly fewer electors. Furthermore, Councillor Poulter's proposal allowed for the towns of Wickham Market and Framlingham, two areas with close community ties, to remain in a constituency together. It also proposed a Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency which, despite some changes from the existing arrangement, would be more closely aligned to the existing constituency than either the initial proposals or the Conservative Party's counter-proposal. This would also allow the ward of Kelsale & Yoxford to remain in the Suffolk Coastal constituency, linking it to the town of Saxmundham and to other areas with which it has community ties. Finally, the Risby ward would be retained in a West Suffolk constituency, thereby moving fewer electors from their existing constituency, giving the constituency a better shape, and more coherence than in the Conservative Party's counter-proposal.

- 3.99** Our Assistant Commissioners therefore recommended a cross-county constituency as set out in the counter-proposal submitted by Councillor Poulter. We accept their recommendation, and propose that the constituency should be called Waveney Valley, as we consider that it would be appropriately reflective of the nature of the constituency, with the River Waveney running directly through the centre of the proposed constituency.
- 3.100** In the initial proposals, we proposed a constituency that would include the towns of Bury St Edmunds and Newmarket, along with a number of rural West Suffolk local authority wards. We received a relatively small number of representations regarding this constituency, although they were almost exclusively in opposition. This opposition generally drew attention to the fact that both the existing West Suffolk and Bury St Edmunds constituencies were significantly reconfigured in the initial proposals, with the existing Bury St Edmunds constituency in particular being divided between four proposed constituencies (BCE-74649). Furthermore, the initial proposals resulted in areas like Rougham and Stowmarket being separated from Bury St Edmunds, with which they are said to have strong community ties. Many counter-proposals in favour of a Norfolk-Suffolk sub-region recommended constituencies that are more similar to the existing West Suffolk and Bury St Edmunds constituencies, with only relatively minor changes required. In light of revisions elsewhere, we now propose a West Suffolk constituency that would change only to include the Bardwell, Barningham, Stanton, and Ixworth wards, as well as small changes to realign with updated local government ward boundaries.
- 3.101** Councillor Poulter's proposal would retain the town of Stowmarket in the same constituency as Bury St Edmunds, as in the existing arrangement. Our Assistant Commissioners considered this preferable to other alternatives put forward, as not only would it minimise disruption to the existing constituency, but it would also reflect the views expressed in representations stating that the two towns have much in common. For example, a number of people who spoke at the Ipswich public hearing, such as Katherine West (BCE-97396), were of the view that the two towns have strong community ties and transport links, particularly with new housing developments being built along the A14 road corridor.
- 3.102** Similarly, the North Suffolk constituency, which under the initial proposals would include a large number of rural wards from the West Suffolk, Mid Suffolk, and East Suffolk local authorities, elicited a small number of representations, with the majority being in opposition. While the Ipswich Constituency Labour Party and Ipswich Borough Labour Party (BCE-80893) stated that the constituency would have a cohesive rural character, those in opposition, such as West Suffolk Constituency Labour Party (BCE-67608), said that the constituency would be too vast, with poor internal transport links and no sizable town to act as a focal point. Others, such as Mike Porter (BCE-61706) said that the roads in Suffolk tend to run north-south rather than east-west, and that such a constituency would

be a significant change from the existing constituencies, creating unnecessary disruption. In a number of counter-proposals, and in our revised proposals, the proposed North Suffolk constituency is largely replaced by the Waveney Valley constituency discussed above. Dr Daniel Poulter, MP for Central Suffolk and North Ipswich (BCE-92875) submitted a counter-proposal, which he stated should only be taken into account if the sub-regions were to stay the same as in the initial proposals. While we considered that his proposal had merit, as we are proposing to change the sub-regions, this alternative was not adopted.

- 3.103** The initial proposals included an Ipswich North and Stowmarket constituency, which included the three Ipswich wards of Whitehouse, Castle Hill, and Whitton, and the three East Suffolk wards of Rushmere St. Andrew, Kesgrave, and Carlford & Fynn Valley, each of which are in the existing Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency. Also included were a number of Mid Suffolk wards, including the town of Stowmarket. This proposed constituency received some support, for example from Thérèse Coffey, MP for Suffolk Coastal (BCE-82425), although the majority of respondents were in opposition to the proposals, such as Councillor Elaine Bryce (BCE-71444). The support centred on the connections between the two towns, with the A14 road providing a strong transport link. Those in opposition stated that Stowmarket has more links to the town of Bury St Edmunds, and has little connection to the town of Kesgrave, on the far side of Ipswich. Furthermore, representations said that the communities of Wickham Market and Framlingham have strong ties, and should be retained within the same constituency (for example Sarah Cornick, BCE-97398). The Conservative Party counter-proposal supported the proposed Ipswich North and Stowmarket constituency, but Councillor Poulter's counter-proposal would include Stowmarket with Bury St Edmunds, allowing Wickham Market and Framlingham to be included in a reconfigured Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency that is more similar to the existing arrangement. Our Assistant Commissioners considered that this solution would better reflect the statutory factors of both avoiding breaking local ties, and minimising disruption to existing constituencies. We agree and therefore propose a Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency that includes all of the wards from the existing Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency, except for six wards in the north that are included in the proposed Waveney Valley constituency.

- 3.104** In the initial proposals, the only changes to the existing Suffolk Coastal constituency would be to transfer the Kelsale & Yoxford ward into the North Suffolk constituency, and to realign the constituency with updated local government ward boundaries near the towns of Wickham Market and Halesworth. This proposed constituency received relatively few representations. Thérèse Coffey MP (BCE-82425), and a few other respondents supported the proposals due to there being very little change. However, some said that the village of Wickham Market has more links to Framlingham than to areas of the Suffolk Coastal constituency (both towns are currently included in the existing Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency). Others, such as Julia Ewart (BCE-97395), also stated that the ward of Kelsale & Yoxford has close links to Saxmundham and other wards in the Suffolk Coastal constituency in which they are currently included. Our Assistant Commissioners considered the representations that call for Wickham Market to be included in a Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency, and the Kelsale & Yoxford ward to be included in Suffolk Coastal, sufficiently persuasive, and recommended we adopt these changes as our revised proposals for these constituencies. We agree with their recommendation.
- 3.105** A number of counter-proposals, such as that from Jonathan Stansby (BCE-57513) proposed a more radical reconfiguration, with the Suffolk Coastal constituency being split into two, and the town of Felixstowe forming a constituency with eastern Ipswich, which he felt would be more compact than the proposed narrow Suffolk Coastal constituency. While there is some merit in this proposal, it would require a significant departure from the existing arrangement, would likely break community ties, and would have knock-on implications across much of the county. In accordance with our Assistant Commissioners' recommendations, we have not adopted these counter-proposals.
- 3.106** In the initial proposals, the Ipswich constituency would be wholly unchanged from the existing constituency, and very few representations were received. Some, including Tom Hunt, MP for Ipswich (BCE-97405), supported the initial proposals due to there being no change, although others (such as BCE-56396) opposed them, as they felt Ipswich should be evenly divided between two constituencies. We consider that there are insufficient grounds to alter the Ipswich constituency, as this would represent an unnecessary departure from the existing arrangement, and would likely have negative implications across the county.

**3.107** The constituencies of South Suffolk – which was initially proposed to be unchanged other than to realign it with updated local government ward boundaries – and Lowestoft – the only change to which in the initial proposals would be to transfer out the Bungay & Wainford ward – were both largely uncontentious. Our Assistant Commissioners accordingly recommended no changes to either constituency as initially proposed, and we agree with them.

# 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](http://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](http://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, do 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
<b>Basildon and Billericay BC</b>			<b>76,993</b>
	Billericay East	Basildon	9,370
	Billericay West	Basildon	9,454
	Burstead	Basildon	8,796
	Crouch	Basildon	6,651
	Fryerns	Basildon	10,110
	Laindon Park	Basildon	9,808
	Lee Chapel North	Basildon	9,687
	St. Martin's	Basildon	6,319
	Vange	Basildon	6,798
<b>Bedford BC</b>			<b>70,068</b>
	Brickhill	Bedford	6,190
	Castle	Bedford	5,355
	Cauldwell	Bedford	5,661
	De Parys	Bedford	4,621
	Goldington	Bedford	6,362
	Harpur	Bedford	5,417
	Kempston Central and East	Bedford	4,900
	Kempston North	Bedford	2,806
	Kempston South	Bedford	2,992
	Kempston West	Bedford	3,636
	Kingsbrook	Bedford	5,709
	Newnham	Bedford	5,313
	Putnoe	Bedford	5,749
	Queens Park	Bedford	5,357
<b>Braintree CC</b>			<b>75,662</b>
	Bocking Blackwater	Braintree	7,264
	Bocking North	Braintree	4,129
	Bocking South	Braintree	4,301
	Braintree Central & Beckers Green	Braintree	6,076
	Braintree South	Braintree	4,521
	Braintree West	Braintree	4,632
	Bumpstead	Braintree	2,334

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Gosfield & Greenstead Green	Braintree	2,185
	Great Notley & Black Notley	Braintree	7,371
	Halstead St. Andrew's	Braintree	4,526
	Halstead Trinity	Braintree	4,777
	Hedingham	Braintree	4,494
	Rayne	Braintree	2,239
	Stour Valley North	Braintree	2,312
	Stour Valley South	Braintree	2,496
	Three Fields	Braintree	4,610
	Yeldham	Braintree	2,127
	Felsted & Stebbing	Uttlesford	3,459
	The Sampfords	Uttlesford	1,809
<b>Brentwood and Ongar CC</b>			<b>74,937</b>
	Brentwood North	Brentwood	5,293
	Brentwood South	Brentwood	4,498
	Brentwood West	Brentwood	5,470
	Brizes and Doddinghurst	Brentwood	4,817
	Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon	Brentwood	3,107
	Hutton Central	Brentwood	2,967
	Hutton East	Brentwood	2,997
	Hutton North	Brentwood	3,147
	Hutton South	Brentwood	3,009
	Ingatestone, Fryerning and Mountnessing	Brentwood	5,076
	Pilgrims Hatch	Brentwood	4,579
	Shenfield	Brentwood	4,282
	South Weald	Brentwood	1,481
	Tipps Cross	Brentwood	3,155
	Warley	Brentwood	4,886
	Chipping Ongar, Greensted and Marden Ash	Epping Forest	3,451
	High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings	Epping Forest	1,895
	Lambourne	Epping Forest	1,619
	Moreton and Fyfield	Epping Forest	1,744
	North Weald Bassett	Epping Forest	3,688
	Passingford	Epping Forest	1,919
	Shelley	Epping Forest	1,857
<b>Broadland and Fakenham CC</b>			<b>72,907</b>
	Acle	Broadland	2,324

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Aylsham	Broadland	6,998
	Blofield with South Walsham	Broadland	4,887
	Brundall	Broadland	4,963
	Burlingham	Broadland	2,142
	Buxton	Broadland	2,133
	Coltishall	Broadland	2,120
	Eynesford	Broadland	2,532
	Great Witchingham	Broadland	2,182
	Hevingham	Broadland	2,307
	Horsford and Felthorpe	Broadland	4,072
	Marshes	Broadland	2,527
	Plumstead	Broadland	2,650
	Reepham	Broadland	2,139
	Spixworth with St. Faiths	Broadland	4,463
	Taverham North	Broadland	3,977
	Taverham South	Broadland	3,646
	Wroxham	Broadland	4,280
	Lancaster North	North Norfolk	1,846
	Lancaster South	North Norfolk	4,263
	Stibbard	North Norfolk	2,266
	The Raynhams	North Norfolk	2,142
	Walsingham	North Norfolk	2,048
<b>Broxbourne CC</b>			<b>75,454</b>
	Broxbourne and Hoddesdon South	Broxbourne	7,154
	Cheshunt North	Broxbourne	6,384
	Cheshunt South and Theobalds	Broxbourne	6,297
	Flamstead End	Broxbourne	6,698
	Goffs Oak	Broxbourne	7,233
	Hoddesdon North	Broxbourne	7,119
	Hoddesdon Town and Rye Park	Broxbourne	6,396
	Rosedale and Bury Green	Broxbourne	6,744
	Waltham Cross	Broxbourne	6,890
	Wormley and Turnford	Broxbourne	7,730
	Great Amwell	East Hertfordshire	2,163
	Hertford Heath	East Hertfordshire	2,345
	Stanstead Abbots	East Hertfordshire	2,301

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>Bury St Edmunds CC</b>			<b>75,655</b>
	Chilton	Mid Suffolk	4,579
	Combs Ford	Mid Suffolk	4,705
	Elmswell & Woolpit	Mid Suffolk	4,958
	Onehouse	Mid Suffolk	2,211
	Rattlesden	Mid Suffolk	2,469
	St. Peter's	Mid Suffolk	2,264
	Stow Thorney	Mid Suffolk	4,179
	Thurston	Mid Suffolk	4,622
	Abbeygate	West Suffolk	3,747
	Bardwell	West Suffolk	2,125
	Barningham	West Suffolk	2,237
	Eastgate	West Suffolk	1,718
	Ixworth	West Suffolk	1,720
	Minden	West Suffolk	4,286
	Moreton Hall	West Suffolk	5,597
	Pakenham & Troston	West Suffolk	2,047
	Rougham	West Suffolk	1,930
	Southgate	West Suffolk	3,230
	St. Olaves	West Suffolk	3,236
	Stanton	West Suffolk	2,278
	The Fornhams & Great Barton	West Suffolk	3,380
	Tollgate	West Suffolk	4,228
	Westgate	West Suffolk	3,909
<b>Cambridge BC</b>			<b>72,560</b>
	Abbey	Cambridge	6,629
	Arbury	Cambridge	5,869
	Castle	Cambridge	4,205
	Coleridge	Cambridge	5,959
	East Chesterton	Cambridge	6,042
	King's Hedges	Cambridge	6,051
	Market	Cambridge	6,226
	Newnham	Cambridge	5,962
	Petersfield	Cambridge	6,626
	Romsey	Cambridge	6,350
	Trumpington	Cambridge	6,447
	West Chesterton	Cambridge	6,194

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>Castle Point BC</b>			<b>70,923</b>
	Pitsea South East – part of (polling district DN)	Basildon	1,614
	Appleton	Castle Point	5,333
	Boyce	Castle Point	5,286
	Canvey Island Central	Castle Point	5,076
	Canvey Island East	Castle Point	4,815
	Canvey Island North	Castle Point	5,266
	Canvey Island South	Castle Point	5,093
	Canvey Island West	Castle Point	3,876
	Canvey Island Winter Gardens	Castle Point	4,864
	Cedar Hall	Castle Point	4,982
	St. George's	Castle Point	4,562
	St. James	Castle Point	5,411
	St. Mary's	Castle Point	4,982
	St. Peter's	Castle Point	5,143
	Victoria	Castle Point	4,620
<b>Central Suffolk and North Ipswich CC</b>			<b>71,020</b>
	Carlford & Fynn Valley	East Suffolk	6,719
	Framlingham	East Suffolk	6,760
	Kesgrave	East Suffolk	11,149
	Rushmere St. Andrew	East Suffolk	3,557
	Wickham Market	East Suffolk	3,864
	Castle Hill	Ipswich	5,714
	Whitehouse	Ipswich	5,893
	Whitton	Ipswich	5,781
	Battisford & Ringshall	Mid Suffolk	2,471
	Blakenham	Mid Suffolk	2,653
	Bramford	Mid Suffolk	2,028
	Claydon & Barham	Mid Suffolk	4,683
	Debenham	Mid Suffolk	2,474
	Needham Market	Mid Suffolk	4,908
	Stonham	Mid Suffolk	2,366
<b>Chelmsford BC</b>			<b>76,454</b>
	Chelmer Village and Beaulieu Park	Chelmsford	8,028
	Goat Hall	Chelmsford	4,693
	Great Baddow East	Chelmsford	6,509
	Great Baddow West	Chelmsford	4,710

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Marconi	Chelmsford	5,703
	Moulsham and Central	Chelmsford	4,328
	Moulsham Lodge	Chelmsford	8,823
	Patching Hall	Chelmsford	6,676
	Springfield North	Chelmsford	7,175
	St. Andrews	Chelmsford	6,553
	The Lawns	Chelmsford	4,180
	Trinity	Chelmsford	4,566
	Waterhouse Farm	Chelmsford	4,510
<b>Clacton CC</b>			<b>75,959</b>
	Bluehouse	Tendring	4,114
	Burrsville	Tendring	4,414
	Cann Hall	Tendring	4,731
	Coppins	Tendring	5,222
	Eastcliff	Tendring	2,564
	Frinton	Tendring	5,099
	Homelands	Tendring	2,469
	Kirby Cross	Tendring	2,605
	Kirby-le-Soken & Hamford	Tendring	2,504
	Little Clacton	Tendring	2,508
	Pier	Tendring	1,876
	St. Bartholomew's	Tendring	4,771
	St. James	Tendring	5,103
	St. John's	Tendring	5,065
	St. Osyth	Tendring	4,055
	St. Paul's	Tendring	2,236
	The Bentleys & Frating	Tendring	2,603
	The Oakleys & Wix	Tendring	2,414
	Thorpe, Beaumont & Great Holland	Tendring	2,668
	Walton	Tendring	2,545
	Weeley & Tendring	Tendring	2,237
	West Clacton & Jaywick Sands	Tendring	4,156
<b>Colchester BC</b>			<b>76,843</b>
	Berechurch	Colchester	7,217
	Castle	Colchester	7,337
	Greenstead	Colchester	10,536
	Highwoods	Colchester	7,071

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Lexden & Braiswick – part of (polling districts AQ, AS, and AT)	Colchester	2,950
	Mile End	Colchester	8,554
	New Town & Christ Church	Colchester	9,208
	Prettygate	Colchester	7,955
	Shrub End	Colchester	7,976
	St. Anne's & St. John's	Colchester	8,039
<b>Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard CC</b>			<b>74,069</b>
	Dunstable-Central	Central Bedfordshire	3,375
	Dunstable-Icknield	Central Bedfordshire	5,986
	Dunstable-Manshead	Central Bedfordshire	3,654
	Dunstable-Northfields	Central Bedfordshire	7,244
	Dunstable-Watling	Central Bedfordshire	7,300
	Heath and Reach	Central Bedfordshire	3,619
	Houghton Hall	Central Bedfordshire	6,053
	Leighton Buzzard North	Central Bedfordshire	11,056
	Leighton Buzzard South	Central Bedfordshire	10,462
	Linslade	Central Bedfordshire	9,175
	Parkside	Central Bedfordshire	3,115
	Tithe Farm	Central Bedfordshire	3,030
<b>East Cambridgeshire CC</b>			<b>76,279</b>
	Bottisham	East Cambridgeshire	4,411
	Burwell	East Cambridgeshire	4,961
	Downham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	2,369
	Ely East	East Cambridgeshire	4,330
	Ely North	East Cambridgeshire	3,044
	Ely West	East Cambridgeshire	7,169
	Fordham & Isleham	East Cambridgeshire	4,688
	Haddenham	East Cambridgeshire	2,666
	Littleport	East Cambridgeshire	6,657
	Soham North	East Cambridgeshire	4,600
	Soham South	East Cambridgeshire	4,285
	Stretham	East Cambridgeshire	5,044
	Sutton	East Cambridgeshire	4,282
	Woodditton	East Cambridgeshire	5,010
	Cottenham	South Cambridgeshire	5,012
	Milton & Waterbeach	South Cambridgeshire	7,751



Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>Epping Forest CC</b>			<b>74,553</b>
	Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing	Epping Forest	1,768
	Buckhurst Hill East	Epping Forest	3,503
	Buckhurst Hill West	Epping Forest	5,286
	Chigwell Row	Epping Forest	1,792
	Chigwell Village	Epping Forest	3,469
	Epping Hemnall	Epping Forest	4,936
	Epping Lindsey and Thornwood Common	Epping Forest	5,343
	Grange Hill	Epping Forest	4,906
	Loughton Alderton	Epping Forest	3,253
	Loughton Broadway	Epping Forest	3,312
	Loughton Fairmead	Epping Forest	3,094
	Loughton Forest	Epping Forest	3,407
	Loughton Roding	Epping Forest	3,521
	Loughton St. John's	Epping Forest	3,506
	Loughton St. Mary's	Epping Forest	3,808
	Theydon Bois	Epping Forest	3,323
	Waltham Abbey High Beach	Epping Forest	2,023
	Waltham Abbey Honey Lane	Epping Forest	4,503
	Waltham Abbey North East	Epping Forest	3,182
	Waltham Abbey Paternoster	Epping Forest	3,389
	Waltham Abbey South West	Epping Forest	3,229
<b>Great Yarmouth CC</b>			<b>70,077</b>
	Bradwell North	Great Yarmouth	5,190
	Bradwell South and Hopton	Great Yarmouth	5,785
	Caister North	Great Yarmouth	3,656
	Caister South	Great Yarmouth	3,632
	Central And Northgate	Great Yarmouth	4,709
	Claydon	Great Yarmouth	5,324
	East Flegg	Great Yarmouth	4,022
	Fleggburgh	Great Yarmouth	2,193
	Gorleston	Great Yarmouth	3,995
	Lothingland	Great Yarmouth	4,357
	Magdalen	Great Yarmouth	5,152
	Nelson	Great Yarmouth	4,295
	Ormesby	Great Yarmouth	3,638
	Southtown and Cobholm	Great Yarmouth	3,232
	St. Andrews	Great Yarmouth	3,436

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	West Flegg	Great Yarmouth	4,109
	Yarmouth North	Great Yarmouth	3,352
<b>Harlow CC</b>			<b>73,479</b>
	Hastingwood, Matching and Sheering Village	Epping Forest	1,954
	Lower Nazeing	Epping Forest	3,314
	Lower Sheering	Epping Forest	1,731
	Roydon	Epping Forest	1,741
	Bush Fair	Harlow	5,343
	Church Langley	Harlow	6,324
	Great Parndon	Harlow	4,751
	Harlow Common	Harlow	5,309
	Little Parndon and Hare Street	Harlow	5,888
	Mark Hall	Harlow	5,067
	Netteswell	Harlow	5,345
	Old Harlow	Harlow	6,992
	Staple Tye	Harlow	4,610
	Sumners and Kingsmoor	Harlow	4,955
	Toddbrook	Harlow	5,098
	Broad Oak & the Hallingburys	Uttlesford	3,236
	Hatfield Heath	Uttlesford	1,821
<b>Harpenden and Berkhamsted CC</b>			<b>71,635</b>
	Aldbury and Wigginton	Dacorum	1,910
	Ashridge	Dacorum	2,177
	Berkhamsted Castle	Dacorum	4,655
	Berkhamsted East	Dacorum	4,718
	Berkhamsted West	Dacorum	4,766
	Northchurch	Dacorum	2,266
	Tring Central	Dacorum	3,965
	Tring East	Dacorum	2,337
	Tring West and Rural	Dacorum	4,299
	Watling	Dacorum	4,406
	Harpenden East	St Albans	5,517
	Harpenden North	St Albans	5,660
	Harpenden South	St Albans	5,437
	Harpenden West	St Albans	5,983
	Redbourn	St Albans	4,846
	Sandridge	St Albans	3,734
	Wheathampstead	St Albans	4,959

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>Harwich and North Essex CC</b>			<b>74,838</b>
	Lexden & Braiswick – part of (polling districts EJ, ET, and EU)	Colchester	4,397
	Mersea & Pyefleet	Colchester	8,122
	Old Heath & The Hythe	Colchester	8,582
	Rural North	Colchester	8,553
	Wivenhoe	Colchester	7,548
	Alresford & Elmstead	Tendring	5,329
	Ardleigh & Little Bromley	Tendring	2,165
	Brightlingsea	Tendring	6,746
	Dovercourt All Saints	Tendring	5,202
	Dovercourt Bay	Tendring	2,190
	Dovercourt Tollgate	Tendring	2,385
	Dovercourt Vines & Parkeston	Tendring	2,104
	Harwich & Kingsway	Tendring	2,546
	Lawford, Manningtree & Mistley	Tendring	6,559
	Stour Valley	Tendring	2,410
<b>Hemel Hempstead CC</b>			<b>70,496</b>
	Adeyfield East	Dacorum	3,907
	Adeyfield West	Dacorum	4,110
	Apsley and Corner Hall	Dacorum	6,886
	Bennetts End	Dacorum	4,353
	Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield	Dacorum	6,596
	Boxmoor	Dacorum	6,691
	Chaulden and Warners End	Dacorum	6,566
	Gadebridge	Dacorum	4,020
	Grovehill	Dacorum	5,269
	Hemel Hempstead Town	Dacorum	4,296
	Highfield	Dacorum	3,746
	Leverstock Green	Dacorum	7,032
	Nash Mills	Dacorum	2,759
	Woodhall Farm	Dacorum	4,265
<b>Hertford and Stortford CC</b>			<b>75,396</b>
	Bishop's Stortford All Saints	East Hertfordshire	5,524
	Bishop's Stortford Central	East Hertfordshire	6,659
	Bishop's Stortford Meads	East Hertfordshire	4,188
	Bishop's Stortford Silverleys	East Hertfordshire	4,408
	Bishop's Stortford South	East Hertfordshire	6,697

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Hertford Bengoe	East Hertfordshire	6,025
	Hertford Castle	East Hertfordshire	7,144
	Hertford Kingsmead	East Hertfordshire	4,363
	Hertford Sele	East Hertfordshire	4,084
	Hunsdon	East Hertfordshire	2,623
	Much Hadham	East Hertfordshire	2,295
	Sawbridgeworth	East Hertfordshire	6,744
	Ware Chadwell	East Hertfordshire	2,454
	Ware Christchurch	East Hertfordshire	4,176
	Ware St. Mary's	East Hertfordshire	4,017
	Ware Trinity	East Hertfordshire	3,995
<b>Hertsmere CC</b>			<b>73,256</b>
	Aldenham East	Hertsmere	3,821
	Aldenham West	Hertsmere	3,885
	Bentley Heath & The Royds	Hertsmere	4,396
	Borehamwood Brookmeadow	Hertsmere	5,485
	Borehamwood Cowley Hill	Hertsmere	5,648
	Borehamwood Hillside	Hertsmere	5,123
	Borehamwood Kenilworth	Hertsmere	5,971
	Bushey Heath	Hertsmere	3,617
	Bushey Park	Hertsmere	5,610
	Bushey St. James	Hertsmere	5,265
	Elstree	Hertsmere	3,704
	Potters Bar Furzefield	Hertsmere	4,188
	Potters Bar Oakmere	Hertsmere	4,166
	Potters Bar Parkfield	Hertsmere	3,680
	Shenley	Hertsmere	3,943
	Northaw & Cuffley	Welwyn Hatfield	4,754
<b>Hitchin CC</b>			<b>72,112</b>
	Arlesey	Central Bedfordshire	11,980
	Shefford	Central Bedfordshire	7,923
	Stotfold and Langford	Central Bedfordshire	11,752
	Cadwell	North Hertfordshire	1,829
	Chesfield	North Hertfordshire	5,127
	Hitchin Bearton	North Hertfordshire	6,271
	Hitchin Highbury	North Hertfordshire	6,244
	Hitchin Oughton	North Hertfordshire	3,552
	Hitchin Priory	North Hertfordshire	3,707
	Hitchin Walsworth	North Hertfordshire	6,051
	Hitchwood, Offa and Hoo	North Hertfordshire	5,854

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Kimpton	North Hertfordshire	1,822
<b>Huntingdon CC</b>			<b>75,590</b>
	Alconbury	Huntingdonshire	2,899
	Brampton	Huntingdonshire	5,486
	Buckden	Huntingdonshire	2,628
	Godmanchester & Hemingford Abbots	Huntingdonshire	6,906
	Great Staughton	Huntingdonshire	2,694
	Hemingford Grey & Houghton	Huntingdonshire	4,792
	Holywell-cum-Needingworth	Huntingdonshire	5,500
	Huntingdon East	Huntingdonshire	4,967
	Huntingdon North	Huntingdonshire	6,962
	Kimbolton	Huntingdonshire	2,725
	Sawtry	Huntingdonshire	5,032
	Somersham	Huntingdonshire	2,949
	St. Ives East	Huntingdonshire	4,835
	St. Ives South	Huntingdonshire	5,837
	St. Ives West	Huntingdonshire	2,268
	The Stukeleys	Huntingdonshire	3,427
	Warboys	Huntingdonshire	5,683
<b>Ipswich BC</b>			<b>75,117</b>
	Alexandra	Ipswich	6,429
	Bixley	Ipswich	5,690
	Bridge	Ipswich	5,642
	Gainsborough	Ipswich	5,934
	Gipping	Ipswich	5,618
	Holywells	Ipswich	5,380
	Priory Heath	Ipswich	6,273
	Rushmere	Ipswich	6,177
	Sprites	Ipswich	4,998
	St. John's	Ipswich	6,461
	St. Margaret's	Ipswich	6,263
	Stoke Park	Ipswich	4,987
	Westgate	Ipswich	5,265
<b>Lowestoft CC</b>			<b>73,967</b>
	Beccles & Worlingham	East Suffolk	11,889
	Carlton & Whitton	East Suffolk	7,960
	Carlton Colville	East Suffolk	7,526
	Gunton & St. Margarets	East Suffolk	7,841

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Harbour & Normanston	East Suffolk	11,147
	Kessingland	East Suffolk	3,549
	Kirkley & Pakefield	East Suffolk	10,508
	Lothingland	East Suffolk	2,919
	Oulton Broad	East Suffolk	10,628
<b>Luton North BC</b>			<b>73,266</b>
	Barnfield	Luton	5,603
	Bramingham	Luton	5,399
	Challney	Luton	8,972
	Icknield	Luton	5,792
	Leagrave	Luton	8,140
	Lewsey	Luton	8,507
	Limbury	Luton	5,673
	Northwell	Luton	5,213
	Saints	Luton	9,369
	Stopsley	Luton	5,186
	Sundon Park	Luton	5,412
<b>Luton South and South Bedfordshire CC</b>			<b>70,197</b>
	Caddington	Central Bedfordshire	7,895
	Eaton Bray	Central Bedfordshire	3,377
	Biscot	Luton	9,239
	Crawley	Luton	4,921
	Dallow	Luton	9,056
	Farley	Luton	7,384
	High Town	Luton	4,723
	Round Green	Luton	7,863
	South	Luton	7,783
	Wigmore	Luton	7,956
<b>Maldon CC</b>			<b>76,794</b>
	Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Chelmsford	4,189
	Galleywood	Chelmsford	4,339
	Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Chelmsford	6,593
	Rettendon and Runwell	Chelmsford	4,869
	South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Chelmsford	4,602
	South Woodham-Chetwood and Collingwood	Chelmsford	6,209
	South Woodham-Elmwood and Woodville	Chelmsford	6,113

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Althorne	Maldon	3,546
	Burnham-on-Crouch North	Maldon	3,293
	Burnham-on-Crouch South	Maldon	3,299
	Heybridge East	Maldon	3,291
	Heybridge West	Maldon	3,280
	Maldon East	Maldon	1,889
	Maldon North	Maldon	3,339
	Maldon South	Maldon	3,043
	Maldon West	Maldon	3,200
	Mayland	Maldon	3,539
	Purleigh	Maldon	2,866
	Southminster	Maldon	3,484
	Tillingham	Maldon	1,811
<b>Mid Bedfordshire CC</b>			<b>71,748</b>
	Elstow and Stewartby	Bedford	3,877
	Wilshamstead	Bedford	4,079
	Wootton	Bedford	4,995
	Amphill	Central Bedfordshire	10,674
	Aspley and Woburn	Central Bedfordshire	3,824
	Barton-le-Clay	Central Bedfordshire	4,016
	Cranfield and Marston Moretaine	Central Bedfordshire	11,205
	Flitwick	Central Bedfordshire	10,710
	Houghton Conquest and Haynes	Central Bedfordshire	2,676
	Silsoe and Shillington	Central Bedfordshire	4,359
	Toddington	Central Bedfordshire	7,572
	Westoning, Flitton and Greenfield	Central Bedfordshire	3,761
<b>Mid Norfolk CC</b>			<b>71,060</b>
	All Saints & Wayland	Breckland	5,181
	Attleborough Burgh & Haverscroft	Breckland	3,898
	Attleborough Queens & Besthorpe	Breckland	5,424
	Dereham Neatherd	Breckland	5,720
	Dereham Toftwood	Breckland	4,356
	Dereham Withburga	Breckland	4,206
	Hermitage	Breckland	2,251
	Launditch	Breckland	2,066
	Lincoln	Breckland	4,268

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Mattishall	Breckland	4,466
	Necton	Breckland	2,199
	Saham Toney	Breckland	3,874
	Shipdham-with-Scarning	Breckland	4,287
	The Buckenham & Banham	Breckland	2,585
	Upper Wensum	Breckland	5,037
	Watton	Breckland	5,932
	Hingham & Deopham	South Norfolk	2,555
	Wicklewood	South Norfolk	2,755
<b>North Bedfordshire CC</b>			<b>76,319</b>
	Bromham and Biddenham	Bedford	5,942
	Clapham	Bedford	3,296
	Eastcotts	Bedford	3,353
	Great Barford	Bedford	6,268
	Harrold	Bedford	3,209
	Kempston Rural	Bedford	5,876
	Oakley	Bedford	3,000
	Riseley	Bedford	2,782
	Sharnbrook	Bedford	3,164
	Wyboston	Bedford	3,077
	Biggleswade North	Central Bedfordshire	7,577
	Biggleswade South	Central Bedfordshire	8,612
	Northill	Central Bedfordshire	3,589
	Potton	Central Bedfordshire	6,579
	Sandy	Central Bedfordshire	9,995
<b>North East Cambridgeshire CC</b>			<b>70,806</b>
	Bassenhally	Fenland	4,115
	Benwick, Coates & Eastrea	Fenland	3,574
	Birch	Fenland	2,190
	Clarkson	Fenland	1,205
	Doddington & Wimblington	Fenland	3,682
	Elm & Christchurch	Fenland	3,764
	Kirkgate	Fenland	1,585
	Lattersey	Fenland	2,132
	Manea	Fenland	2,088
	March East	Fenland	5,554
	March North	Fenland	5,354
	March West	Fenland	5,591
	Medworth	Fenland	1,358
	Octavia Hill	Fenland	3,031



Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Parson Drove & Wisbech	Fenland	4,123
	St. Mary		
	Peckover	Fenland	1,632
	Roman Bank	Fenland	5,267
	Slade Lode	Fenland	1,854
	St. Andrews	Fenland	2,037
	Staithe	Fenland	1,716
	Stonald	Fenland	2,245
	The Mills	Fenland	2,150
	Waterlees Village	Fenland	2,858
	Wenneye	Fenland	1,701
<b>North East Hertfordshire CC</b>			<b>76,849</b>
	Braughing	East Hertfordshire	2,207
	Buntingford	East Hertfordshire	5,829
	Hertford Rural North	East Hertfordshire	1,849
	Hertford Rural South	East Hertfordshire	2,087
	Little Hadham	East Hertfordshire	1,970
	Mundens and Cottered	East Hertfordshire	2,017
	Puckeridge	East Hertfordshire	2,193
	Thundridge & Standon	East Hertfordshire	2,495
	Walkern	East Hertfordshire	2,151
	Watton-at-Stone	East Hertfordshire	2,032
	Arbury	North Hertfordshire	2,211
	Baldock East	North Hertfordshire	2,311
	Baldock Town	North Hertfordshire	5,727
	Ermine	North Hertfordshire	2,103
	Letchworth East	North Hertfordshire	4,370
	Letchworth Grange	North Hertfordshire	5,505
	Letchworth South East	North Hertfordshire	5,343
	Letchworth South West	North Hertfordshire	5,945
	Letchworth Wilbury	North Hertfordshire	3,946
	Royston Heath	North Hertfordshire	4,430
	Royston Meridian	North Hertfordshire	4,139
	Royston Palace	North Hertfordshire	4,300
	Weston and Sandon	North Hertfordshire	1,689
<b>North Norfolk CC</b>			<b>70,719</b>
	Bacton	North Norfolk	2,064
	Beeston Regis & The Runtons	North Norfolk	2,207
	Briston	North Norfolk	2,026

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Coastal	North Norfolk	1,992
	Cromer Town	North Norfolk	3,988
	Erpingham	North Norfolk	2,220
	Gresham	North Norfolk	2,009
	Happisburgh	North Norfolk	2,183
	Hickling	North Norfolk	2,196
	Holt	North Norfolk	3,608
	Hoveton & Tunstead	North Norfolk	4,308
	Mundesley	North Norfolk	2,252
	North Walsham East	North Norfolk	3,745
	North Walsham Market Cross	North Norfolk	2,148
	North Walsham West	North Norfolk	4,302
	Poppyland	North Norfolk	2,139
	Priory	North Norfolk	1,909
	Roughton	North Norfolk	2,306
	Sheringham North	North Norfolk	2,038
	Sheringham South	North Norfolk	4,152
	St. Benet's	North Norfolk	2,027
	Stalham	North Norfolk	4,440
	Stody	North Norfolk	1,948
	Suffield Park	North Norfolk	2,215
	Trunch	North Norfolk	2,185
	Wells with Holkham	North Norfolk	1,976
	Worstead	North Norfolk	2,136
<b>North West Cambridgeshire CC</b>			<b>73,556</b>
	Ramsey	Huntingdonshire	7,876
	Stilton, Folksworth & Washingley	Huntingdonshire	5,224
	Yaxley	Huntingdonshire	8,279
	Barnack	Peterborough	2,713
	Fletton & Stanground	Peterborough	6,329
	Fletton & Woodston	Peterborough	6,633
	Glington & Castor	Peterborough	5,297
	Hampton Vale	Peterborough	4,346
	Hargate & Hempsted	Peterborough	4,773
	Orton Longueville	Peterborough	6,528
	Orton Waterville	Peterborough	6,801
	Stanground South	Peterborough	6,273
	Wittering	Peterborough	2,484

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>North West Norfolk CC</b>			<b>75,200</b>
	Bircham with Rudhams	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,240
	Brancaster	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,061
	Burnham Market & Docking	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,108
	Clenchwarton	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,270
	Dersingham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	5,085
	Fairstead	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,696
	Gayton & Grimston	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,756
	Gaywood Chase	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	1,826
	Gaywood Clock	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	1,845
	Gaywood North Bank	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	6,331
	Heacham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,489
	Hunstanton	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,719
	Massingham with Castle Acre	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,417
	North Lynn	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,141
	Snettisham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,244
	South & West Lynn	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,024
	Springwood	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,066
	St. Margaret's with St. Nicholas	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,145
	Terrington	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,621
	The Woottons	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	5,526
	Walsoken, West Walton & Walpole	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,664
	West Winch	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,926

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>Norwich North BC</b>			<b>71,441</b>
	Drayton North	Broadland	2,206
	Drayton South	Broadland	1,969
	Hellesdon North West	Broadland	4,615
	Hellesdon South East	Broadland	4,121
	Old Catton and Sprowston West	Broadland	6,611
	Sprowston Central	Broadland	4,243
	Sprowston East	Broadland	6,971
	Thorpe St. Andrew North West	Broadland	5,950
	Thorpe St. Andrew South East	Broadland	5,477
	Catton Grove	Norwich	7,177
	Crome	Norwich	7,851
	Mile Cross	Norwich	7,034
	Sewell	Norwich	7,216
<b>Norwich South BC</b>			<b>73,301</b>
	Bowthorpe	Norwich	6,463
	Eaton	Norwich	7,715
	Lakenham	Norwich	7,379
	Mancroft	Norwich	6,907
	Nelson	Norwich	8,115
	Thorpe Hamlet	Norwich	6,820
	Town Close	Norwich	7,810
	University	Norwich	9,108
	Wensum	Norwich	7,962
	New Costessey	South Norfolk	5,022
<b>Peterborough CC</b>			<b>72,273</b>
	Bretton	Peterborough	5,698
	Central	Peterborough	6,290
	Dogsthorpe	Peterborough	5,557
	East	Peterborough	5,377
	Eye, Thorney & Newborough	Peterborough	7,222
	Gunthorpe	Peterborough	6,257
	North	Peterborough	5,524
	Park	Peterborough	5,692
	Paston & Walton	Peterborough	6,440
	Ravensthorpe	Peterborough	6,442
	Werrington	Peterborough	7,736

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	West	Peterborough	4,038
<b>Rayleigh and Wickford CC</b>			<b>76,422</b>
	Wickford Castledon	Basildon	6,439
	Wickford North	Basildon	10,472
	Wickford Park	Basildon	7,446
	Downhall & Rawreth	Rochford	5,157
	Hawkwell East	Rochford	4,848
	Hawkwell West	Rochford	5,154
	Hockley	Rochford	5,177
	Hockley & Ashingdon	Rochford	5,290
	Hullbridge	Rochford	5,500
	Lodge	Rochford	5,295
	Sweyne Park & Grange	Rochford	5,059
	Trinity	Rochford	5,495
	Wheatley	Rochford	5,090
<b>Rochford and Southend East CC</b>			<b>70,281</b>
	Foulness & The Wakerings	Rochford	5,557
	Roche North & Rural	Rochford	5,132
	Roche South	Rochford	4,538
	Eastwood Park	Southend-on-Sea	7,639
	Shoeburyness	Southend-on-Sea	8,743
	Southchurch	Southend-on-Sea	7,571
	St. Laurence	Southend-on-Sea	8,033
	St. Luke's	Southend-on-Sea	8,046
	Thorpe	Southend-on-Sea	7,493
	West Shoebury	Southend-on-Sea	7,529
<b>Saffron Walden CC</b>			<b>76,280</b>
	Boreham and The Leighs	Chelmsford	4,800
	Broomfield and The Walthams	Chelmsford	7,336
	Chelmsford Rural West	Chelmsford	2,369
	Writtle	Chelmsford	4,164
	Ashdon	Uttlesford	1,625
	Clavering	Uttlesford	1,864
	Debden & Wimbish	Uttlesford	1,743
	Elsenham & Henham	Uttlesford	3,616
	Flitch Green & Little Dunmow	Uttlesford	1,893
	Great Dunmow North	Uttlesford	3,657
	Great Dunmow South & Barnston	Uttlesford	4,985

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	High Easter & the Rodings	Uttlesford	1,973
	Littlebury, Chesterford & Wenden Lofts	Uttlesford	3,473
	Newport	Uttlesford	3,062
	Saffron Walden Audley	Uttlesford	3,488
	Saffron Walden Castle	Uttlesford	3,448
	Saffron Walden Shire	Uttlesford	5,343
	Stansted North	Uttlesford	3,524
	Stansted South & Birchanger	Uttlesford	3,305
	Stort Valley	Uttlesford	1,622
	Takeley	Uttlesford	4,936
	Thaxted & the Eastons	Uttlesford	4,054
<b>South Basildon and East Thurrock CC</b>			<b>73,322</b>
	Langdon Hills	Basildon	6,949
	Nethermayne	Basildon	9,766
	Pitsea North West	Basildon	9,140
	Pitsea South East – part of (polling district DO, DP, DQ, and DR)	Basildon	7,339
	Chadwell St. Mary	Thurrock	7,045
	Corringham and Fobbing	Thurrock	4,496
	East Tilbury	Thurrock	5,061
	Orsett	Thurrock	4,983
	Stanford East and Corringham Town	Thurrock	6,535
	Stanford-le-Hope West	Thurrock	5,428
	The Homesteads	Thurrock	6,580
<b>South Cambridgeshire CC</b>			<b>75,484</b>
	Cherry Hinton	Cambridge	5,966
	Queen Edith's	Cambridge	6,429
	Balsham	South Cambridgeshire	2,972
	Barrington	South Cambridgeshire	2,618
	Bassingbourn	South Cambridgeshire	2,992
	Duxford	South Cambridgeshire	2,767
	Fen Ditton & Fulbourn	South Cambridgeshire	7,685
	Foxton	South Cambridgeshire	2,729

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Gamlingay	South Cambridgeshire	2,969
	Hardwick	South Cambridgeshire	2,474
	Harston & Comberton	South Cambridgeshire	7,661
	Linton	South Cambridgeshire	5,676
	Melbourn	South Cambridgeshire	6,274
	Sawston	South Cambridgeshire	5,331
	Shelford	South Cambridgeshire	5,595
	The Mordens	South Cambridgeshire	2,705
	Whittlesford	South Cambridgeshire	2,641
<b>South Norfolk CC</b>			<b>69,837</b>
	Brooke	South Norfolk	2,695
	Central Wymondham	South Norfolk	4,838
	Cringleford	South Norfolk	3,754
	Easton	South Norfolk	1,577
	Fornsett	South Norfolk	2,750
	Hempnall	South Norfolk	2,631
	Hethersett	South Norfolk	6,459
	Loddon & Chedgrave	South Norfolk	4,634
	Mulbarton & Stoke Holy Cross	South Norfolk	7,321
	Newton Flotman	South Norfolk	2,516
	North Wymondham	South Norfolk	4,456
	Old Costessey	South Norfolk	7,034
	Poringland, Framinghams & Trowse	South Norfolk	6,118
	Rockland	South Norfolk	2,782
	South Wymondham	South Norfolk	4,193
	Stratton	South Norfolk	3,417
	Thurlton	South Norfolk	2,662
<b>South Suffolk CC</b>			<b>71,070</b>
	Assington	Babergh	2,188
	Box Vale	Babergh	2,258
	Brantham	Babergh	2,066
	Brett Vale	Babergh	2,540

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Bures St. Mary & Nayland	Babergh	2,265
	Capel St. Mary	Babergh	2,419
	Chadacre	Babergh	4,869
	Copdock & Washbrook	Babergh	2,605
	East Bergholt	Babergh	2,315
	Ganges	Babergh	1,920
	Great Cornard	Babergh	7,017
	Hadleigh North	Babergh	2,055
	Hadleigh South	Babergh	4,470
	Lavenham	Babergh	4,176
	Long Melford	Babergh	4,665
	North West Cosford	Babergh	2,203
	Orwell	Babergh	2,073
	South East Cosford	Babergh	2,114
	Sproughton & Pinewood	Babergh	4,263
	Stour	Babergh	2,375
	Sudbury North East	Babergh	1,972
	Sudbury North West	Babergh	4,093
	Sudbury South East	Babergh	1,927
	Sudbury South West	Babergh	2,222
<b>South West Hertfordshire CC</b>			<b>71,552</b>
	Kings Langley	Dacorum	4,052
	Abbots Langley & Bedmond	Three Rivers	4,973
	Carpenders Park	Three Rivers	5,056
	Chorleywood North & Sarratt	Three Rivers	5,841
	Chorleywood South & Maple Cross	Three Rivers	5,793
	Dickinsons	Three Rivers	5,103
	Durrants	Three Rivers	5,041
	Gade Valley	Three Rivers	5,058
	Leavesden	Three Rivers	5,708
	Moor Park & Eastbury	Three Rivers	4,613
	Oxhey Hall & Hayling	Three Rivers	4,972
	Penn & Mill End	Three Rivers	5,129
	Rickmansworth Town	Three Rivers	5,553
	South Oxhey	Three Rivers	4,660
<b>South West Norfolk CC</b>			<b>72,496</b>
	Ashill	Breckland	2,219
	Bedingfeld	Breckland	2,412
	Forest	Breckland	2,196



Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Guiltcross	Breckland	2,502
	Harling & Heathlands	Breckland	2,584
	Nar Valley	Breckland	2,252
	Swaffham	Breckland	6,358
	Thetford Boudica	Breckland	3,121
	Thetford Burrell	Breckland	3,453
	Thetford Castle	Breckland	3,486
	Thetford Priory	Breckland	3,950
	Airfield	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,148
	Denver	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,020
	Downham Old Town	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,189
	East Downham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,056
	Emneth & Outwell	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	3,959
	Feltwell	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,081
	Methwold	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,029
	North Downham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,120
	South Downham	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,034
	Tilney, Mershe Lande & Wiggenhall	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,003
	Upwell & Delph	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	4,969
	Watlington	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,190
	Wissey	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	2,165
<b>Southend Central and Leigh BC</b>			<b>76,637</b>
	Belfairs	Southend-on-Sea	7,565
	Blenheim Park	Southend-on-Sea	8,201
	Chalkwell	Southend-on-Sea	7,214
	Kursaal	Southend-on-Sea	7,606
	Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,628
	Milton	Southend-on-Sea	7,822
	Prittlewell	Southend-on-Sea	7,787
	Victoria	Southend-on-Sea	8,103

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	West Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,260
	Westborough	Southend-on-Sea	7,451
<b>St Albans CC</b>			<b>70,881</b>
	Ashley	St Albans	5,783
	Batchwood	St Albans	5,351
	Clarence	St Albans	5,192
	Colney Heath	St Albans	4,542
	Cunningham	St Albans	4,704
	London Colney	St Albans	6,938
	Marshalswick North	St Albans	4,955
	Marshalswick South	St Albans	5,483
	Park Street	St Albans	5,673
	Sopwell	St Albans	5,207
	St. Peters	St Albans	6,144
	St. Stephen	St Albans	5,380
	Verulam	St Albans	5,529
<b>St Neots and Mid Cambridgeshire CC</b>			<b>74,699</b>
	Fenstanton	Huntingdonshire	2,970
	Great Paxton	Huntingdonshire	2,571
	St. Neots East	Huntingdonshire	2,261
	St. Neots Eatons	Huntingdonshire	8,354
	St. Neots Eynesbury	Huntingdonshire	8,658
	St. Neots Priory Park & Little Paxton	Huntingdonshire	7,801
	Bar Hill	South Cambridgeshire	2,789
	Caldecote	South Cambridgeshire	2,732
	Cambourne	South Cambridgeshire	7,029
	Caxton & Papworth	South Cambridgeshire	4,761
	Girton	South Cambridgeshire	4,052
	Histon & Impington	South Cambridgeshire	8,212
	Longstanton	South Cambridgeshire	4,272
	Over & Willingham	South Cambridgeshire	5,537
	Swavesey	South Cambridgeshire	2,700

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
<b>Stevenage CC</b>			<b>70,370</b>
	Datchworth & Aston	East Hertfordshire	1,973
	Codicote	North Hertfordshire	2,150
	Knebworth	North Hertfordshire	4,176
	Bandley Hill	Stevenage	4,905
	Bedwell	Stevenage	5,147
	Chells	Stevenage	4,761
	Longmeadow	Stevenage	4,326
	Manor	Stevenage	4,929
	Martins Wood	Stevenage	4,461
	Old Town	Stevenage	6,148
	Pin Green	Stevenage	4,581
	Roebuck	Stevenage	4,857
	Shephall	Stevenage	4,345
	St. Nicholas	Stevenage	5,141
	Symonds Green	Stevenage	4,349
	Woodfield	Stevenage	4,121
<b>Suffolk Coastal CC</b>			<b>72,663</b>
	Aldeburgh & Leiston	East Suffolk	9,511
	Deben	East Suffolk	3,661
	Eastern Felixstowe	East Suffolk	10,168
	Kelsale & Yoxford	East Suffolk	3,257
	Martlesham & Purdis Farm	East Suffolk	6,215
	Melton	East Suffolk	3,489
	Orwell & Villages	East Suffolk	7,713
	Rendlesham & Orford	East Suffolk	3,887
	Saxmundham	East Suffolk	3,344
	Southwold	East Suffolk	3,212
	Western Felixstowe	East Suffolk	8,392
	Woodbridge	East Suffolk	6,358
	Wrentham, Wangford & Westleton	East Suffolk	3,456
<b>Thurrock BC</b>			<b>73,347</b>
	Aveley and Uplands	Thurrock	7,056
	Belhus	Thurrock	6,847
	Chafford and North Stifford	Thurrock	5,264
	Grays Riverside	Thurrock	6,557
	Grays Thurrock	Thurrock	6,032
	Little Thurrock Blackshots	Thurrock	5,029
	Little Thurrock Rectory	Thurrock	4,309

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Ockendon	Thurrock	7,483
	South Chafford	Thurrock	4,559
	Stifford Clays	Thurrock	5,049
	Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park	Thurrock	4,329
	Tilbury St. Chads	Thurrock	4,040
	West Thurrock and South Stifford	Thurrock	6,793
<b>Watford BC</b>			<b>70,576</b>
	Bushey North	Hertsmere	5,612
	Callowland	Watford	4,868
	Central	Watford	5,160
	Holywell	Watford	5,829
	Leggatts	Watford	5,377
	Meriden	Watford	5,431
	Nascot	Watford	6,315
	Oxhey	Watford	5,141
	Park	Watford	6,129
	Stanborough	Watford	5,470
	Tudor	Watford	4,942
	Vicarage	Watford	4,764
	Woodside	Watford	5,538
<b>Waveney Valley CC</b>			<b>70,540</b>
	Bungay & Wainford	East Suffolk	6,881
	Halesworth & Blything	East Suffolk	6,605
	Bacton	Mid Suffolk	2,293
	Eye	Mid Suffolk	2,250
	Fressingfield	Mid Suffolk	2,355
	Gislingham	Mid Suffolk	2,582
	Haughley, Stowupland & Wetherden	Mid Suffolk	4,424
	Hoxne & Worlingworth	Mid Suffolk	2,292
	Mendlesham	Mid Suffolk	2,425
	Palgrave	Mid Suffolk	2,264
	Rickingham	Mid Suffolk	2,362
	Stradbroke & Laxfield	Mid Suffolk	2,495
	Walsham-le-Willows	Mid Suffolk	2,572
	Beck Vale, Dickleburgh & Scole	South Norfolk	5,257
	Bressingham & Burston	South Norfolk	2,756
	Bunwell	South Norfolk	2,507

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Diss & Roydon	South Norfolk	8,181
	Ditchingham & Earsham	South Norfolk	5,265
	Harleston	South Norfolk	4,774
<b>Welwyn Hatfield CC</b>			<b>74,535</b>
	Brookmans Park & Little Heath	Welwyn Hatfield	5,102
	Haldens	Welwyn Hatfield	4,852
	Handside	Welwyn Hatfield	5,359
	Hatfield Central	Welwyn Hatfield	4,767
	Hatfield East	Welwyn Hatfield	5,063
	Hatfield South West	Welwyn Hatfield	5,248
	Hatfield Villages	Welwyn Hatfield	5,471
	Hollybush	Welwyn Hatfield	4,748
	Howlands	Welwyn Hatfield	5,208
	Panshanger	Welwyn Hatfield	4,388
	Peartree	Welwyn Hatfield	4,768
	Sherrards	Welwyn Hatfield	4,434
	Welham Green & Hatfield South	Welwyn Hatfield	5,125
	Welwyn East	Welwyn Hatfield	5,069
	Welwyn West	Welwyn Hatfield	4,933
<b>West Suffolk CC</b>			<b>76,243</b>
	Barrow	West Suffolk	1,992
	Brandon Central	West Suffolk	2,062
	Brandon East	West Suffolk	2,133
	Brandon West	West Suffolk	2,163
	Chedburgh & Chevington	West Suffolk	2,209
	Clare, Hundon & Kedington	West Suffolk	6,227
	Exning	West Suffolk	1,682
	Haverhill Central	West Suffolk	2,264
	Haverhill East	West Suffolk	2,602
	Haverhill North	West Suffolk	3,150
	Haverhill South	West Suffolk	4,032
	Haverhill South East	West Suffolk	1,874
	Haverhill West	West Suffolk	4,128
	Horringer	West Suffolk	2,040
	Iceni	West Suffolk	3,293
	Kentford & Moulton	West Suffolk	2,192
	Lakenheath	West Suffolk	4,019
	Manor	West Suffolk	1,982

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Mildenhall Great Heath	West Suffolk	1,959
	Mildenhall Kingsway & Market	West Suffolk	2,096
	Mildenhall Queensway	West Suffolk	1,653
	Newmarket East	West Suffolk	3,711
	Newmarket North	West Suffolk	3,223
	Newmarket West	West Suffolk	3,625
	Risby	West Suffolk	2,332
	The Rows	West Suffolk	3,599
	Whepstead & Wickhambrook	West Suffolk	2,075
	Withersfield	West Suffolk	1,926
<b>Witham CC</b>			<b>75,064</b>
	Coggeshall	Braintree	4,602
	Hatfield Peverel & Terling	Braintree	4,659
	Kelvedon & Feering	Braintree	4,361
	Silver End & Cressing	Braintree	4,714
	The Colnes	Braintree	4,477
	Witham Central	Braintree	4,459
	Witham North	Braintree	5,088
	Witham South	Braintree	4,556
	Witham West	Braintree	4,889
	Marks Tey & Layer	Colchester	7,967
	Stanway	Colchester	6,915
	Tiptree	Colchester	7,283
	Great Totham	Maldon	3,019
	Tollesbury	Maldon	1,630
	Tolleshunt D'arcy	Maldon	3,442
	Wickham Bishops and Woodham	Maldon	3,003

# 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.		







