

BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

PROCEEDINGS

AT THE

2018 REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN ENGLAND

HELD AT

CATHEDRAL QUARTER HOTEL, 16 SAINT MARY'S GATE
DERBY DE1 3JR

ON

FRIDAY 28 OCTOBER 2016
DAY TWO

Before:

Mr Scott Handley, The Lead Assistant Commissioner

Transcribed from audio by W B Gurney & Sons LLP
83 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0HW
Telephone Number: 0203 585 4721/22

Time Noted: 9.00 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the second day of the public hearing on the Boundary Commission for England's initial proposals for the East Midlands. My name is Scott Handley. I am an Assistant Commissioner for the Boundary Commission. I am responsible for chairing the hearing today and we plan to run from 9 am through to 5 pm. I am assisted by Gerald Tessier here from the Commission.

Our first appointment booked is at 9.40, so after Gerald has spoken to you we will adjourn for a short time and then we will go through with the booked appointments as we did yesterday.

MR TESSIER: Thank you Scott. Yes, my name is Gerald Tessier. I am from the Boundary Commission. I am leading the team from the Boundary Commission Secretariat here today. I just need to remind everyone here that we are filming the proceedings and if you wish to read a copy of our data protection policy, it is pinned to the board at the back there or available from the reception desk. Also a couple of items of housekeeping: toilets are downstairs and if there is a fire alarm then we do need to evacuate the building as quickly as possible. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: On that basis we will adjourn the hearing until 9.40 for the first attendee.

After a short break

Time Noted: 9.40 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning once again. We have a speaker who has attended now. I would like to call Mr Chris Leslie. If you could give your full name and address before you start to speak please.

MR LESLIE: (MP for Nottingham East Labour) Good morning everybody. My name is Chris Leslie. I am the Member of Parliament for Nottingham East. My constituency office address is 12 Regent Street, Nottingham NG1 5BQ. I have got a copy of a submission if I could pass that to you. (Same handed) I am afraid I do not have sufficient copies for everybody. I will try to be as comprehensive as I can in articulating my submission.

Obviously withstanding the fact that I believe that within my existing constituency of Nottingham East there are many more residents than are in fact on the electoral roll, I accept that the legislation dictates that we need to enlarge the size of those constituencies from 2018 onwards, but I do not agree with the existing proposal which would split the current Nottingham East constituency in quite a significant way. It would

take at present two of the six wards - and they are all quite large local authority wards - into the new Nottingham North constituency. That division is something that already locally is causing some concern for a couple of reasons, so it would take Sherwood and Berridge wards into Nottingham North and it would leave four of the existing six in the new Nottingham East and Carlton constituency.

My contention is that there are alternative configurations of wards in the vicinity of Nottingham East that could provide a better solution and meet the legislative requirements. I think that the initial Commission proposals - and I notice that of course the River Trent and various other issues do make this quite a tricky issue to resolve - offer a quite considerable degree of disruption and change, and indeed the Commission proposals acknowledge that, but, I think, more so than is necessary for the communities that are involved.

I just want to quickly go through some of the historical and community ties which I hope could persuade the Commission to retain the existing six Nottingham East local authority wards in the new parliamentary constituency.

First of all on this question of disruption, the initial Commission proposal would have a lot of upheaval and it does not necessarily follow the logic that an alternative might offer because of this sub-division. There is a natural coherence to the existing constituency. It has an integrity of characters that has worked well for decades. It is a diverse community, but it is largely an urban community comprising neighbourhoods to the north and east of the city centre, which are of a fairly similar mix and demographic, easily within reach and representing territory that does have a feel and an affinity for the area of the City of Nottingham. I think it would be preferable to retain those wards and preserve that integrity.

Just to summarise what the existing proposals from the Commission would do, of course they would, as I say, move those two wards Sherwood and Berridge into Nottingham North. The Gedling constituency would disappear, which is split broadly evenly between the Sherwood constituency and the Nottingham East and Carlton constituency. Obviously there is quite a change to Nottingham South with gaining Chilwell and Beeston wards at the expense of Bilborough and Clifton wards and Sherwood constituency loses Ollerton and Boughton in the North to Newark, while gaining Lowdham and Dover Beck from Newark. I have put a table in my submission which sort of, I think, illustrates the degree of change which obviously the Commission will be aware of, but it was just to show that there is quite a degree of disruption.

Just to mention the historic ties between Sherwood and Berridge and the rest of the Nottingham East constituency, principally the two wards, that they abut: Arboretum and Mapperley. There are very long-standing historic reasons to see Berridge ward as quite distinct from the Basford ward, which would be to its north, the one it would effectively be joining with in Nottingham North, going right back to medieval times. The old town

wall was a distinction between Nottingham and Basford. Today the Forest Fields recreation ground serves the communities of Forest Fields in Berridge ward and those neighbourhoods around Arboretum ward and it is a natural focal area. Local residents use the park and its facilities and I feel it will be quite peculiar to separate the neighbourhood known as Forest Fields from the recreation ground carrying the same name with a sort of artificial parliamentary boundary. As a Member of Parliament, and my predecessors we have long taken up cases involving sporting activities, safety in the recreation ground and so forth for that whole community surrounding it, so there is an integrity there that I think ought to be preserved.

The linkages between Sherwood and Berridge, Mapperley and Arboretum are quite obvious when you look at the map, and you can see a lot of the roads coming together around what is known as the Goose Fair Roundabout at the junction of Mansfield Road and Gregory Boulevard, around which the neighbourhoods of Mapperley Park Carrington, Sherwood Rise and Forest Fields all come together, and there is a sort of rotation there. That existing Nottingham East constituency does have that natural urban City centre facing feel to it, whereas Basford has been a long-standing separate community and indeed had its own and distinct industrial village status in its own right.

When it comes to Arboretum and Berridge, Hyson Green market, which has been in place for more than 30 years now, serves the neighbourhood of Hyson Green in Berridge ward and much of the Radford Road area in Arboretum, which is a really important community focal point linking those two communities. That would be adversely affected if you had an artificial parliamentary boundary bisecting that shopping centre. The Radford Road/Hyson Green area is the busiest shopping street in Nottingham outside the City centre and there is a natural community. It really should not be divided into separate parliamentary constituencies.

Similarly, the Sherwood shopping area on Mansfield Road, as with the Carrington shopping area, both serve those communities naturally from the joint Sherwood and Mapperley ward areas. Going through a little bit of history on this. The Borough Extension Act of 1877 was one of the big changes in local authority mapping of its time. It expanded Nottingham's borders out into the wards of St Ann's and then Forest ward, Mapperley ward and neighbouring Carrington and Sherwood wards. After the Act, the boundary ran from Woodborough Road down Woodthorpe Drive, encompassing what are now the two wards of Mapperley and Sherwood. I only mention that because it illustrates the ties that are there between those two local communities in strong local governance terms.

Perhaps more relevantly for today, if you look at some of the public service issues in the community, I would point to the fact that the local secondary schools in the area fit better with the population catchments in the existing Nottingham East constituency, and I have attached at annex 1, two maps that show this; so Djanogly Academy has a catchment covering Berridge and Arboretum wards, which again would be divided if a

new parliamentary boundary came in the proposal initially from the Commission, and Nottingham Free School, yes, a more recent school but again it illustrates quite neatly the fact that there is a catchment that covers the Sherwood and the Mapperley wards together as an illustration really of the fact that those are a natural community facing each other. Again, I think the integrity of those would be divided if we had separation. So schooling reasons and public transport links have always been strong between Sherwood and Mapperley wards ever since the City centre tram route came out at the turn of the 20th century stopping in Carrington. Berridge and Arboretum wards share again many close connections; the MG7 post code on health terms, the Mary Potter Health Centre serving both those communities. Those are just reasons I would say, in practical terms, why there are problems with separating Sherwood and Berridge from the rest of that Nottingham East constituency, particularly Arboretum and Mapperley.

On page 4 of the submission I just wanted to highlight some alternatives that the Commission might want to think about. I would favour what I call - it is difficult to give these names - a moderate change option to Nottingham, option A, because it would, I think, deal with these issues, trying to minimise disruption and also trying to retain some of the history and community character that I think are quite important. It would maintain the existing boundaries as far as possible, and I have set out in a table the local authority wards that I think could comprise those and also the populations, how they would meet. Essentially, for Nottingham East, you would retain those six wards and take obviously fewer wards from the existing Gedling Borough in order to make up those numbers. You could adjust that by some of the wards from Gedling entering into the Nottingham North constituency to make up the numbers there because that is a sort of sizing issue in particular there.

I think it offers significantly less disruption to the current boundaries than the initial proposals. Crucially there are a number of wards that would have changed under the current proposals that would not need to. For example, I don't think that it is necessary for Ollerton and Boughton to move out of Sherwood. I think they could be retained in Sherwood. Similarly Lowdham and Dover Beck could be retained in Newark and Sherwood and Berridge could be retained in Nottingham East. Moving fewer wards between the new constituencies would provide for more continuity and stability with less of a need for residents to feel as though they have changed constituencies. Of course they are not moving, the boundaries are, but I think there is sometimes a confusion effect in terms of democratic representation.

So I would see much of the existing Newark and Sherwood constituencies unaltered from the current arrangements, which would obviously have an advantage to those communities. Because I think the Commission is looking at the smaller wards within Gedling, those have obviously been, in numerical terms, simpler to reallocate around, but that is the nature of the local government status in those district areas. I think that the size of the wards in Nottingham has created a problem in terms of the initial proposals because it feels as though the Commission, quite naturally, was reluctant to

get into the business of dividing existing local authority wards. My option here, I hope would again avoid the need for that.

I am also though tabling a second option. It is not one that I would personally prefer.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: On the first option, are all the wards that you have included in these revisions the same wards that are in the initial proposals?

MR LESLIE: Yes, I have managed within the moderate change option to simply reallocate within only those four constituencies, so trying to minimise that because there is a danger of ending up in a grand rotation across the outskirts of Nottingham with the river as a stopping point that prevents that from going all the way around. I know that that is a very difficult judgment for the Commission to make, but I have tried to minimise that while trying to aim for less disruption and retaining some of those community links, so it is a proposal that I hope stacks up, and certainly meets the numbers that are required.

I did not want to miss this opportunity today without just tabling a second option. It is not one that I am as in favour of, but it is just if you were looking for other ways to make up the numbers across that wider Nottinghamshire area. There are those locally who have been in discussion about the borough of Gedling and concerned about retaining the borough of Gedling, which obviously because of those smaller wards might have been fractured more readily in the reconfiguration.

However, if the Commission was concerned to find a solution that minimised change to Gedling and to try to retain some integrity for that, I have also suggested in table 3 how you could also retain the Gedling constituency and look at the numbers so that they added up sufficiently there. I just wanted to put that on the record there, so it was available for you because obviously at this early stage it is important that you have got all options that people might want to look at. I put the annexes in in terms of the catchment areas for the schools and also I have tried my best to do a map of that principal proposal, which is the moderate change option to Nottingham. It is difficult to see but I have tried to draw it up to show that the integrity of those communities can be kept. That is my proposal at this stage.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are there any queries? If you could just give your name and details again please before you speak.

MR PRATT: Thank you very much indeed. Roger Pratt, representing the Conservative Party. You have obviously given the details to the Assistant Commissioner, I wonder if on your moderate A proposal you could actually list the ward changes?

MR LESLIE: Yes, so, in Nottingham East and Carlton that would retain Berridge, Sherwood, St Ann's, Mapperley, Dales and Arboretum wards, as is currently the case in

Nottingham East and the suggestion is that it could meet the number, in this case 77,102 electors, with the addition of Carlton, Carlton Hill, Cavendish, Colwick and Netherfield wards from Gedling. Nottingham North would be made up of Aspley, Basford, Bestwood, Bulwell, Bulwell Forest, but also Bestwood St Albans, Daybrook, Redhill, Ernehale and Coppice. The Sherwood constituency change, as I mentioned, would really just be those changes of Ollerton and Boughton from Newark and the converse, Dover Beck and Lowdham should be retained in Newark from Sherwood in the proposals.

MR PRATT: In terms of Gedling, you have also done a swap presumably of some Gedling wards because the Gedling wards that would not now be in the Nottingham East and Carlton constituency, as proposed, where would they go?

MR LESLIE: They would be more into the Nottingham North constituency because obviously Nottingham North would not be taking in those great big wards of Sherwood and Berridge, so in order to make up the numbers in Nottingham North some of those Gedling wards it is proposed in my alternative option would go into the Nottingham North constituency from Gedling.

MR PRATT: They cannot clearly be the ones that are not within the Nottingham East and Carlton constituency, can they?

MR LESLIE: Some of them are the ones that would have been proposed into Nottingham East and Carlton by the Commission's initial proposals, but there are others that would be going in to make up those numbers to the size that Nottingham North would need to be from Gedling.

MR PRATT: From which constituency?

MR LESLIE: From the proposed Sherwood constituency.

MR PRATT: So from the proposed Sherwood constituency you would take some of the wards. Then the wards that you are not including in Nottingham East and Carlton, which I think are Gedling, Phoenix, Cavendish and Porchester, where would they go?

MR LESLIE: They would be retained in the Sherwood constituency.

MR PRATT: So there is a swap in the Sherwood constituency.

MR LESLIE: Yes.

MR PRATT: I am with you. Okay, fine. Am I right in saying that makes no constituency in Nottingham that is entirely within the city boundary?

MR LESLIE: It would depend obviously on what you decided to do with Bilborough on the west and obviously there are other proposals that look to change those. But it would certainly mean that the representative for Nottingham East and Carlton would fully represent that part of East Nottingham, but, no, you have to bust out of the existing city boundaries of Nottingham. I think that is very difficult to avoid, given the legislation.

MR PRATT: So your proposal on moderate A would have no constituency entirely in Nottingham.

MR LESLIE: Yes.

MR PRATT: Okay, I am grateful. Thank you very much.

MR FOX: Alan Fox from the Liberal Democrats. I do not know if you have seen then submission that was made yesterday by Greg Cook on behalf of the Labour Party.

MR LESLIE: Yes.

MR FOX: In his submission Mr Cook said that they were pleased that Carlton had not been divided and that Arnold had not been divided, although they had been divided from each other. It would appear in your modest proposal that you intend to divide both Carlton and Arnold.

MR LESLIE: I am trying; it is very difficult to achieve the full numbers reconciliation between constituencies without having some change at the margins, but principally much of the Carlton area would be within the Nottingham East and Carlton proposal that I am making. By and large, I think you have managed to find ways of keeping some of the integrity of the northern parts of Gedling to go within the Nottingham North constituency, but, yes, there are difficulties there. That is one of the reasons why I have also tabled the other option that has been floating around about how to preserve Gedling if that was an objective for the Commission, and the constituency in Gedling. So it is not an easy situation, but I think that you are weighing up different objectives and, from my own view, I think there are real problems in the division within the Nottingham East constituency between Sherwood and Berridge wards from Arboretum and Mapperley. Those have obviously been my focus, but, yes, I accept that there are difficulties that ripple around given the requirements to fitting those particular numbers.

MR FOX: Can I follow up? Given that, could you tell us what your less modest proposal that does not involve splitting Gedling is, because if you have given the table on that to the Assistant Commissioner I think it would be useful for us to know.

MR LESLIE: Yes, so, as I say, it is not one that I would personally prefer because it obviously involves changes to the existing Nottingham East constituency, but essentially would retain Gedling as a constituency of 77,640 with the wards of Carlton, Carlton Hill,

Cavendish, Colwick, Coppice, Daybrook and Gedling, Netherfield, Phoenix, Plains, Porchester, Redhill, Trent Valley and Woodthorpe and Dales ward. Obviously I would be reluctant to see Dales ward lost from Nottingham East, but I just wanted to, for the sake of completeness, table that in front of the Commission because I did not want to simply come here and make a suggestion, as you have pointed out, that would adversely perhaps affect some of the communities in Carlton and Arnold without at least positing the fact that you have to reflect they also may wish to look at being retained in their own way. That is not my principal preferred proposal.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think we will leave it at that.

MR FOX: It is just that there is a difficulty surely if the proposal that Mr Leslie has just made has knock-on effects in Nottingham and in Sherwood.

MR LESLIE: I think it is fair to say that any proposal that is being made here is likely to have knock-on effects to other wards and other boundaries in the area and it is our position to take on board all this information and try to come up with some recommendations that meet the best range that we can. We understand obviously that if one area is to be kept together there are implications for others.

MR PRATT: Will it be possible - I do not know if the Commission have printing facilities - to supply us with a copy of Mr Leslie's proposals? That would be very helpful.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We will get that done, Roger.

MR PRATT: Thank you.

MR LESLIE: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We will move on now to Cllr Steve Hassall. If I could ask you to give your full name and address before you start to speak.

CLLR HASSALL: (Councillor, Allestree, Derby) Good morning. My name is Steve Hassall. I am a Derby City councillor first off and also a resident of Chaddesden in Derby. That is 1 Limerick Road in Chaddesden Derby. Do you need a postcode?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If you want to give it, yes please.

CLLR HASSALL: I can do. It is DE21 6TP.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

CLLR HASSALL: I am here to speak very briefly about the Derby North and South proposals, which overall personally I am very happy with, but with a couple of minor

alterations that I would like to suggest. First of all, I think the renaming of the two constituencies to an East and a West would make more logical sense from a geographical point of view because they are actually literally East and West rather than North and South. Also I think it would help with regards to the changes that are happening for residents to understand; that they are now in a new constituency potentially with a different representative and MP.

From that I would also like to suggest that Derwent ward is brought into the Derby South proposed constituency. As a Chaddesden resident - I have lived there for over 20 years - it is clear that Derwent as a ward does not physically exist on a map. It is an electoral area; it is not a physical area that exists on any normal map, but it is also an area that has a shared place of community. If you ask a resident of Derwent where they live they will probably say Chaddesden. There are also shared services like doctors, dentists, but also school catchment areas. The two kind of interlock. I think it would be easier and more logical for the two to be kept together.

Also in a case for East and West, I think it is the train line that bisects the two and this would make it a very clear divide between the two. In addition to that, I think also to keep the numbers right with the legislation is to have Sinfyn moved back into Derby South. This area shares a sense of place and community with the adjacent Normanton wards and Osmaston wards and again we have situation where they share services and shopping precincts. Much like Chaddesden where people from Derwent will come into Chad to shop because that has more of a shopping centre. Also I think it is quite clear, even the local press don't recognise Derwent as an area, they still call it Chaddesden. That would be my proposals there.

In addition to that, slightly unconnected as an Allestree councillor for the City, I would just like to say I am quite happy for Allestree to go into Amber Valley with its links with Duffield. That is it. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just on the Derwent-Chaddesden link, it is an issue that has been raised by a number of speakers and there is obviously a strong connection. Can you expand on that just a little bit more?

CLLR HASSALL: As I said, it is a shared sense of place and communities that stands out for me, the two are one area. They are only divided by electoral boundaries, as you might say. I think historically it was Chaddesden anyway or at least great parts of it. We have shared schools; we have shared doctors; we have shared shopping centres; and, like I say, it is a shared sense of place and community that stands out strongest for me.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any queries? Yes. If you could just give your name.

MR JARVIS: Brian Jarvis, Fifth Avenue, Edwinstowe, Nottinghamshire. Could you give us some details in terms of what those local facilities are, in terms of where people shop and the schools, which I think would help in terms of explaining what that community is?

CLLR HASSALL: In Chaddesden itself you have got the main centre on Nottingham Road that has a precinct, if you want to call it that, or an area of shopping, that is easily accessible for those from Chaddesden and Derwent. It is a central point. I can point it out on the map if you wish, but also you have got schools like the da Vinci School, which is a secondary school, which is in Derwent ward, but obviously has got people from Chaddesden going to that because it is a very nearby boundary. I live near both Meadow Farm and Cherry Tree School and both these catchment areas cover Derwent and Chaddesden, so obviously you have got children and parents coming into both areas. I mean it goes both ways. You have got children going into Derwent ward as much as you have got children coming into Chaddesden ward.

The doctors' surgery services people from across Chaddesden as well as Derwent, very much so. Also, I think on a more light note, Chaddesden has got a variety of pubs and leisure facilities that people from Derwent come and use such as the Toby Carvery. Likewise there is the Paddock pub in Derwent that people use, but I think that Derwent has got more of an established centre that people use locally.

MR JARVIS: Okay thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you very much. We will move forward now to hear from Mr Christopher Smith. If you could give your name and address please.

MR CHRIS SMITH: Right, Chris Smith. I am from Ashby-de-la-Zouch in North West Leicestershire. The reason I wanted to come along today really was ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry, we actually need your full address please.

MR CHRIS SMITH: Okay, 28 Windsor Road, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, North West Leicestershire. The reason I wanted to come along today really was, actually it was prompted by some comments from our local MP in the press, Andrew Bridgen, who expressed some concerns about North West Leicestershire being split across the district and felt that this was inappropriate.

Being interested in these things, I thought I would see if I could find a way where we could avoid splitting North West Leicestershire across a number of authorities. The first instinct really was to see if we could minimise any change in the area. Just to explain, the initial proposals for North West Leicestershire essentially take a bit off the bottom of

the North West Leicestershire district constituency and put it into the Bosworth constituency as proposed. To balance that Shepshed would be taken out of the existing Loughborough constituency, which is also in the Charnwood district, and put into North West Leicestershire. To try to simplify that is to look at a way where we could avoid doing that. Currently the North West Leicestershire constituency is the same as the district. Bosworth constituency is currently wholly within the Hinckley and Bosworth district and Loughborough constituency is wholly within the Charnwood district. I had a look at it and the North West Leicestershire numbers are within the range. At least that box was ticked.

Essentially what I am suggesting and what that document says is to retain North West Leicestershire as it is now and to retain Bosworth as it is now, because that is also within the numbers, and to retain Loughborough as it is now apart from The Wolds ward, which is a ward to the east and actually quite separate from the Loughborough constituency. The advantage of that is that it maintains Shepshed with Loughborough, which has a much closer link than Shepshed and North West Leicestershire. It maintains those coterminous boundaries which kind of simplifies things and people better understand what it is about.

The consequence of that is to create - based on the initial proposals for Charnwood constituency - a constituency covering the Charnwood area and what was called South Rushcliffe, I think. Charnwood and Keyworth is being suggested as a name as well. That constituency would be formed based on the Charnwood initial proposals constituency, although obviously slightly extended. In my document that structure is what I have called proposal A. I think a more extensive proposal was actually suggested yesterday, which made subsequent changes all around Leicester and Leicestershire, changing Bosworth, impacting Daventry and Lutterworth and Harborough and so forth. Those changes - in my document I have put them in there as proposal B, which achieved the same aims but in a slightly different way.

In terms of my specific interest, North West Leicestershire, it does not make any difference at all. The difference really locally is it impacts on this Charnwood and Keyworth constituency, which is slightly modified between the two proposals, which you know clearly has merits but I am not saying particularly which is the favourable consequential options as far as I am concerned. My main interest is obviously where I live and the surrounding areas.

Both proposals significantly reduce, in the area and North West Leicestershire, the number of changes and the number of changes for individual electors. Actually the proposed Charnwood and Keyworth constituency is better linked than the initial proposed Charnwood constituency because it has essentially got the A46 running all up its eastern side, whereas in the Charnwood constituency you are running from places across Markfield and Stanton and places like that, right the way around Loughborough. It has actually much further and more rural connections if you like, so I would argue that

the proposed Charnwood and Keyworth constituency in either proposal is a better connected constituency than in the initial proposals. Those are what I see as the two advantages of what I am suggesting to reduce the number of changes, to improve the alignment between constituencies and local authorities, and better connectivity within this new constituency, whether it is Charnwood or Charnwood and Keyworth. That is all I wanted to say. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, are there any points on that?

MR FOX: Alan Fox from the Liberal Democrats. Where does the ward of Groby go in our option A?

MR CHRIS SMITH: In my option A - if I can just refresh my memory - it goes into the Charnwood and Keyworth constituency I think. Yes, it does, which keeps the numbers right. It is much more the western extremities of the initial proposals that Charnwood constituency go into the Bosworth constituency, which is where they are now because the Bosworth constituency would stay the same. It is looking to minimise change and not make change if it is not necessary.

MR FOX: So Groby would be with Charnwood and Keyworth. Can you just name the other wards in your Charnwood and Keyworth?

MR CHRIS SMITH: Do you want me to give you--- I have a copy of the list.

MR FOX: That would be extremely helpful and then I just want to check something. (Same handed) Okay, that is extremely helpful. Thank you very much indeed.

MR CHRIS SMITH: I have put some maps in that document as well, though without wards, but just to illustrate the point.

MR FOX: Can I ask you, in your submission where the Queniborough ward, which is a Charnwood ward, is placed?

MR CHRIS SMITH: That would go into Rutland and Melton.

MR FOX: So that is a further change. Without that, the numbers do not work and that is why. I see, so that would be a further change in terms of Rutland and Melton. What would happen to Rutland and Melton?

MR CHRIS SMITH: Sorry, what would happen to?

MR FOX: So how does that change from the current proposed Rutland and Melton?

MR CHRIS SMITH: It would increase its size. Have I got the number?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Is this Queniborough we are looking at? That is already there, is it not? That is in Rutland and Melton I think - proposed initial, is it not?

MR FOX: Yes, in the proposals it is in Rutland and Melton. That is correct. So you do not in fact change that, you just take one ward out of Rutland and Melton - East Goscote.

MR CHRIS SMITH: That is the difference between what I have called the proposal A, which is the more limited one and the proposal B, which, as I said, I think was presented yesterday.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay fine. Okay I am with you. I now understand how it is done. Okay, thank you. If you give your name again.

MR FOX: Alan Fox. Would it be possible Mr Assistant Commissioner for us to have copies of this?

MR CHRIS SMITH: Sorry, do you want them now?

MR FOX: Yes please. (Same handed)

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you very much. Our next booked speaker is at 11 o'clock so we will adjourn until 11 o'clock.

After a short break

Time Noted: 11.00 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning once again. We will hear from Mr Mark Tittley. If you could give your name and address before you start to speak.

MR TITTLEY: Thank you Chair. My name is Mark Tittley of 30 Chestnut Avenue, Chellaston, Derby. Do you want the postcode, Chair?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes please.

MR TITTLEY: DE73 6RW. The reason I asked to speak today is that I am very concerned about the proposals that are put forward. I think it is worth pulling back from the point. I actually think the Commission, with respect, should be adopting the proposals that were put forward some years ago of going to a Derby East and a Derby West constituency, which actually would give a balance, both in terms of size and socio-

economic profile, between the two constituencies and would truly reflect Derby more closely as it is today.

If I turn my attention to the proposals in hand, specifically I have several things here. First of all, I think that Chaddesden ward and Derwent ward should remain in Derby North because actually in terms of size - and I speak now as a former city councillor and cabinet member on Derby City, in terms of size it would give the balance, particularly if Sinfen remained in the South and Derby North contained Derwent and Chaddesden together because they are seen as an area.

It is rather like Alvaston. People who live in Alvaston, even though their abode might be in Boulton it is still Alvaston. The school, the catchment areas, the size of the area, the sense of place, whether you live in Derwent or Chaddesden, it is the same. I suspect I might not be the only one saying that but what you may not have heard so far is that I think it is quite right, whichever proposal you adopt, if you go to a Derby South model, or, as I would hope, a Derby East model, I think it is quite appropriate that Aston division be incorporated into the constituency boundary.

The reason for that is quite clear in my mind. There have been many housing developments in Chellaston, and in that area I have lived most of my life over the last 20 years. Some of them have been within the existing City boundary, but the one for instance that is being put forward for about 270 further houses on top of the 800 we have seen built in Chellaston over the last 20 years, really should be in the City because geographically it is contiguous. You will be walking down the street, one moment you will be in the City and the next moment you will be in South Derbyshire. So I think there is a synergy there because people won't really actually be in South Derbyshire, they will be in Derby City and that ought to be reflected in the constituency boundaries for Parliament.

If you will indulge me, I think by extension in future years I imagine that the City boundaries will be rebounded and I would want to see that reflected in any re-boundaring there because at the moment people who live in South Derbyshire on the border of the City get all the facilities, schools, shops, etcetera, road infrastructure and their council tax goes to South Derbyshire, which to me does not seem in anyway fair or equitable.

In summary, my proposal is that we should have a Derby East and a Derby West. Chaddesden and Derwent should be one constituency, whether that is in Derby North, as you are proposing and as is currently the case for Derby East. Sinfen, to keep your numbers right, should actually stay in Derby South or Derby West and actually they see themselves as very much part of Derby South if you were to retain that model. They have done; they always have done. So, simplistically and straightforwardly, they are my proposals. I am happy to take any questions or points of clarification Chair.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any points? It is an issue, as you rightly pointed out, on a number of occasions, particularly in regard to Derwent and Chaddesden, so yes.

MR TITTLE: I think the issue of Aston division needs consideration with respect as well, Chair.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Aston ward?

MR TITTLE: Well, Aston division in terms of bringing it into the City. I think it is in the Derby South proposal. Even if you went to what I will, with respect, loosely call my model of having a Derby East or the other alternative model that you put forward some years ago, Aston division should still be in Derby City for the purposes of parliamentary elections, and, I do think, in future years also within the City boundaries for local council elections, for reasons of taxation and size and synergy.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is a separate issue of cause. Okay, thank you very much, Sir.

MR TITTLE: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We will move forward now and hear from Ms Elaine Cresswell. If I could ask you to give your name and address before you start to speak please.

MS CRESSWELL: Hello I am Elaine Cresswell from 66 Hallows Rise in Dronfield in North East Derbyshire. My postcode is S18 1YB. I am here today to speak about the proposal to split the Dronfield community into two separate parliamentary constituencies by putting Dronfield Woodhouse, Holmesfield and Barlow into the Derbyshire Dales with the remaining former constituency with Bolsover. That is where I live there. (Indicating)

I also wish to bring to your attention the major regeneration projects taking place in the former coal fields and industrial sites of North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield, which will result in thousands of new homes, new schools and hundreds of new jobs across these areas of Derbyshire. Old Dronfield has been a community since before the Domesday Book of 1086. Modern day Dronfield is a close-knit community comprising Dronfield, Dronfield Woodhouse, Gosforth Valley and the surrounding villages of Coal Aston, Unstone, Holmesfield and Barlow.

I grew up in Dronfield. I remember Dronfield Woodhouse being built and just think of this area as part of Dronfield. All the junior schools, including Barlow C of E, Penny Acres in Holmesfield and William Levick in Dronfield Woodhouse, feed into the same one outstanding secondary school, Dronfield Henry Fanshawe, established in 1579 which is a community of over 1,800 pupils. Dronfield and district scout, guide and

armed service cadet groups have members from across the school catchment area. The Dronfield Directory lists over 150 many and varied social and community groups, which work together to support the community by caring for the young and the elderly, organising galas and music festivals, staging plays, looking after guests from our twin town of Sindelfingen in Germany and running events like the Dronfield 10K, supported by thousands of Dronfield residents, which includes all of them.

Living in Dronfield is more like living in a village than a town. This is not just my view but that of our mayor and MP. This is taken from the Dronfield Directory. Our health needs are met by the four GP practices of Dronfield, Gosforth Valley, Coal Aston and Dronfield Woodhouse, which work together as Dronfield 2gether, supported by the NHS. Churches Together in Dronfield and District is formed from the 14 churches across Dronfield, Dronfield Woodhouse, Apperknowle, Coal Aston, Cowley, Unstone and Holmesfield, to support youth work, lunch clubs and environmental initiatives across the district. We have one well-used library, one major supermarket, one sports centre, one civic centre, one railway station, one fire station, one police station, one Dronfield Eye and, currently, one outstanding MP who is well known and respected throughout the community.

I am not aware of any tradition of community or economic ties with the villages of Hathersage, Grindleford or Baslow in Derbyshire Dales which lie over eight miles to the West of Dronfield Woodhouse, separated by over 35,000 acres of high heather moorland, home to red deer and grouse.

I hope I have been able to convince you that the Dronfield Woodhouse, Baslow and Holmesfield are very much part of the Dronfield community and have no place alone in the constituency of Derbyshire Dales. Dividing our community between two very different Parliament constituencies would break local ties and make it difficult for local people living across the road from each other to seek support from their respective MPs over issues affecting our one community. We need one MP not two.

I now turn to the multi-million pound regeneration projects taking place in North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfields districts supported by Derbyshire County Council and the D2N2 local enterprise partnership, which plans to deliver thousands of new homes, new schools and hundreds of new jobs across these areas of Derbyshire within the coming months and years.

This is a picture of the Markham Vale, a new junction 29A off the M1 has just been completed to serve the 200-acre business and distribution park of Markham Vale between Bolsover and Chesterfield. Known housing developments to date include, in the Bolsover area, four large residential developments totalling 2,375 family dwellings which have received approval. There are planned homes, a potential new school and community facilities at the former Coalite site, which falls within the catchment area of both Bolsover district and North East Derbyshire. In the North East Derbyshire area,

the first phase of the redevelopment of the former coking plant near Wingerworth has begun to deliver 469 new homes, a primary school and community facilities. I could see the roofs going on the houses on my way on the train this morning.

Within Chesterfield houses are going up at the Chesterfield Waterside development, currently the 47th largest regeneration project in the UK, set to create a new community with 1,500 modern houses and apartments. Smaller projects, such as the former Newbold School site in Chesterfield, are set to build 56, two, three, four and five-bedroomed homes. That is some things going on about the investment in Derbyshire.

This brings the total number of houses currently planned or in progress in large developments across North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield to approximately 4,400 homes, with a conservative estimate of an increase in the population by 17,600, giving an additional 8,800 electors based on two adults per household. Smaller proposed developments within these districts are not included in this number and there are outline plans for a further 1,000 homes in Bolsover District Council alone. With a total electorate across these existing constituencies of 212,817, an additional 8,800 electors would give each of these three constituencies an average of nearly 74,000 electors, comfortably within the boundaries set by your rules. I propose therefore that you keep Dronfield as one community, that you reconsider abolishing the constituency of North East Derbyshire and that you broadly retain the existing electoral boundaries of North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield whilst the ongoing regeneration projects are in such an active phase.

Alternative plans: I have not had time to thoroughly consider an alternative, but my suggestion is to seek changes in an area where the chance of major regeneration projects are remote, such as in the Peak District. This may be achieved by dividing the Derbyshire Dales constituency between two or three other constituencies; for example, combining part of it with High Peak along the Hope Valley and the A6 to the north of Bakewell as there are existing links with the community of Buxton for shopping, post-16 education, and the Peak Park Planning Authority and the remaining wards, with the authorities in the South of Derbyshire, near Ambergate and Duffield, and the trans-Peak bus service travels hourly through the Buxton, Bakewell, Matlock and Ambergate communities to Derby providing an existing transport link along the A6 between these areas. If nothing else I hope today to convince you that the community of Dronfield is one and should not be divided between two parliamentary constituencies. I also hope that you will consider the impact of the significant regeneration projects of the former coal field and industrial sites of North East Derbyshire, Bolsover and Chesterfield and the population in these areas and reconsider abolishing the constituency of North East Derbyshire. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any queries? Just to be clear your ---

MS CRESSWELL: I am just a resident.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: --- submission is that Dronfield Woodhouse and Barlow and Holmesfield remain.

MS CRESSWELL: With the rest of Dronfield, because otherwise we would be split up and one half would be over there and one half would be over there. These are people that live across the road from each other and go to the same schools and are served by the same health services.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you very much. Our next booked speaker is not until 12.50, so we will adjourn until 12.50.

After a short break

Time noted: 12.50 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon. We will hear now from Ms Sarah Bolton. She has just popped outside. (After a pause) Would you come up to the front, please, and could you give your name and address before you start to speak, please.

MS BOLTON: Good afternoon. I am Sarah Bolton. I live at 5 Wood Croft, Littleover, Derby, but I am the councillor for Chaddesden ward on Derby City Council. Thank you for enabling me to speak this afternoon. This is an issue that is of concern to the Labour Group and the Labour Party in Derby.

First of all, as an observation, I agree with the East and West split of constituencies; I think that is logical. I want to recognise that the Boundary Commission has been placed in a difficult position due to the constraints given, ie the reduction of MPs, and bearing in mind the large wards that we have here in Derby City.

Obviously, I understand that Derwent and Chaddesden are very close. There are obvious links in the community and the neighbourhood that I find as a local councillor, but the railway boundary, in my view, is not essential for the north nor for the south. However, Darley and Derwent have a long historical association and they have always been placed in the same constituency, ie Derby North, and they have been represented by the same Member of Parliament for many years, certainly while I have been in Derby since 1967, so I think they should be kept together.

As regards the railway line, I do not think that is a logical boundary. Obviously, there are observations regarding Sinfin, which is presently in the south, and Derwent, in the north, so I would suggest there are some discrepancies there, but, as I said in my opening remarks, I think making the constituencies for Derby East and West is a logical

one, bearing in mind the wards and the large numbers of constituents that each ward has to take ownership of.

I just think you have a really difficult situation to deal with and I wish you all the best with that, but I just wanted to make it clear that, clearly, as a Chaddesden councillor and working in the city for many years, the strategic links and the neighbourhood links that we are used to working with are something that we would like to continue in the vein that I have expressed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any queries? (No response) That is great. Thank you very much for your submission.

Is Ms Cox here, Ms Celia Cox? I notice that you are booked to speak later, but, if you are prepared to speak now, that would be fine. We will go ahead with that then. Again, could you give your name and address, please.

MS COX: I am Celia Cox. My address is 1 Calladine Close, Heanor, DE75 7EW. I live in Heanor and, therefore, I am part of the Amber Valley constituency.

Just to give you a bit of history, from 1950 until 1983, most of the present Amber Valley constituency was in the Ilkeston constituency, which comprised Ilkeston, Alfreton, Heanor and Ripley and the parish of Shipley. The electorate in 1983 was 75,305. In 1983, Amber Valley constituency was formed, which comprised Alfreton, Heanor, Ripley, Breadsall and Morley, Little Eaton and Stanley, with an electorate of 66,720.

In 2010, Amber Valley was changed again to Alfreton, Heanor and Ridley only with an electorate of 70,171. Now, Amber Valley Borough Council has those three towns plus Belper with the surrounding villages, and the total electorate is in excess of 96,000, so we cannot have a coterminous constituency, unfortunately.

Over the years, there have been many alterations in the area. Amber Valley is known and is advertised as 'the heart of Derbyshire' and, being the heart of Derbyshire, it sits in a position where it is difficult to find a solution to the numbers problem which will suit everyone. I do believe though that the public generally have recognised the changes over the years, or the alterations to the boundaries, but I also believe that they identify more, and have more connection, with the local council.

You heard yesterday from a resident of Belper that there is more connection with Ripley than Matlock because there are better public transport links. I also believe that Ripley does not look towards Heanor, but more towards Alfreton for shopping, and Alfreton definitely has a catchment area for its retail which stretches into Bolsover.

To conclude, there is no perfect solution, but I would support the Commission's proposals.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any points anyone would like to raise? (No response) Thank you very much for your submission. We will now adjourn for lunch until two o'clock. Thank you.

After the luncheon adjournment

Time noted: 2.00 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon. We will continue the hearing now and if I could ask for Mr Nigel Mills to come forward and make his presentation. If you could give your name and address before you start to speak please.

MR MILLS: (MP for Amber Valley) Nigel Mills, MP for Amber Valley. My office address is Unicorn House, Wellington Street in Ripley. I thank you for the opportunity to come and make some observations on the proposed changes. I know that there are lots of constraints the Boundary Commission have to work on so we cannot get ideal boundaries that perhaps naturally fit communities, but I would say, I guess if you let me draw my own, my preference would be to keep the Amber Valley constituency as it is and then add in some of the other bits from the Amber Valley Council area that are currently in two different parliamentary seats to make the numbers work, but I sense, having looked at the numbers quite hard that that is not a possible thing to do. I think we have to accept that Alfreton and some of the areas around it will have to go into the Bolsover area to make the numbers work up there. I cannot see any other option but for the remaining bits of Erewash to be added to the existing Amber Valley seat. There is no obvious place for them to go.

I can see that Derby needs to lose wards. There is a pretty strong logic in Allestree being one of the wards that comes out. It has good links into Duffield and through into Amber Valley; so I can see there is some logic in what the Boundary Commission have tried to do there. However, I think for Amber Valley, there is one pretty fundamental flaw. That is the fact that in these proposals, unlike the ones five years ago, the main centre of the town of Ripley has been added into an Alfreton and Clay Cross seat, which I think can be avoided and I think would be far better if it could be avoided. Those proposals break up the Ripley Town Council area, which also includes the village of Waingroves and the whole ward of Heage and Ambergate, so you end up with a town council split across two parliamentary seats, which does not seem to be a very attractive situation. It breaks up parishes; it would, I think, break up those communities to a certain extent. I think if that could be avoided that would be a far better situation. I think that is why the Conservative Party's proposals that we have put forward, which actually do move Ripley, Swanwick and Wingfield back into the proposed Amber Valley seat and then move Belper back where it used to be in what is now the Derbyshire Dales seat, which used to be the West Derbyshire seat, would be a far better fit community-wise.

Of the four towns in Amber Valley, the two that have the closest links would be Ripley and Heanor. They have historically been in the same parliamentary seat. There are other links. The local newspaper is the *Ripley and Heanor News*; so I think from a coverage of political news, keeping those two towns in the same constituency would have some logic from that. The main Ripley bus route to Nottingham runs straight through Heanor as well. I have mentioned the town council situation.

There are other issues, the Ripley Academy, the secondary school has recently formed a joint sixth form with the John Flamsteed School down towards Denby. It will make sense for those two schools to stay in the same parliamentary street. Job centre services to people of Ripley are provided from Heanor as well. I think there are lots of well-established links, both transport and community-wise, between those two towns and the surrounding villages, which I think would make a far better and logical fit for those two towns to be the towns that are paired in the new parliamentary seats rather than Ripley and Alfreton, which is the Boundary Commission's proposals. There are not that many links between those two towns directly. I don't know see many people from either town going to the other one for shopping or any other purposes. I accept that Swanwick borders Alfreton and Ripley to a certain extent so you can argue that there is some linkage there, but I think the most natural links for Swanwick and the Wingfield wards would be into Ripley and then the more rural villages of Wingfield merge pretty closely with the villages of Heage and Ambergate ward, and that is being split as well.

There has been a historic divide of the parish of Crich and Wingfield. I think five years ago I said that perhaps the most logical place for the ward of Wingfield to be would either be back with Crich, unifying a parish, or certainly the rural villages of the Wingfield ward have a pretty strong connection with the rural villages of the Heage and Ambergate ward. Especially when you get down to areas like Fritchley and Buckland Hollow, it is quite hard to see where the ward boundaries are, so I think there is a logic for the Wingfield ward to be moved that way. In fact, even if the Boundary Commission were to stay with its current proposals, I think I would suggest moving the Wingfield ward into the proposed Amber Valley seat rather than leaving it where it is. So, overall, I think the Conservative Party's proposals are a better fit for Derbyshire.

Having a unified North East Derbyshire which is coterminous with its council areas seems to me the main objectives of matching communities. It saves having yet more seats covering more council areas than they need to and yet more MPs with more and more council areas to deal with. I accept that the proposed Amber Valley on anybody's proposals will have Erewash, Amber Valley and Derby City Council to deal with, but I do not see any need to try and replicate that situation in any more seats. That is why I think the proposal my party has come up with to have a coterminous North East Derbyshire, to move the two Ripley wards, Swanwick and Wingfield, back into the Amber Valley seat where they naturally fit and the consequential knock-on of Belper moving back into the Derbyshire Dales seat where it has long been and has links out

into those rural wards as well, which are already in that Derbyshire Dales constituency, reuniting the Ripley Town Council area and the surrounding villages and keeping the links between Ripley and Heanor, is a far more logical proposal based on the existing community links, transport links and infrastructure. I think that that would be a far more natural fit and seems to be less invasive and involve less change than the Boundary Commission have proposed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any queries on that submission? No. Okay. Thank you very much for attending.

MR MILLS: Thank you. We will move forward now and call Cllr Richard Hudson: Again if you could give your full name and address.

CLLR HUDSON: Good afternoon, I am Cllr Richard Hudson for the Derwent ward. I will point out when I am speaking now I have lived in that ward---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could you give us your address please?

CLLR HUDSON: 51 Coniston Crescent, Breadsall Hilltop. I have lived in that ward all of my life. It is full of my family and friends and I don't actually believe I would be a councillor right now for that ward if that was not the case. In my time in Derwent I have never heard anybody actually say "I live in Derwent". They will either say "I live in Breadsall Estate" or "Chaddesden". About 70 per cent of that ward naturally say "I live in Chaddesden" and there is a green which separates the Breadsall Hilltop area. This is at a point now where most of my casework goes to Cllr Jonathan Smale, who is the councillor for the Chaddesden ward, because if they look us up on the internet they just presume that he is their councillor. The word Derwent does not actually mean anything to anybody.

Over the last couple of years I have pointed out that the correct name for that ward is actually Breadsall Hilltop and West Chaddesden, so to separate these two areas out into two parliamentary constituencies does not make any sense whatsoever because you could end up with two MPs from two different parties with 70 per cent of the Derwent ward thinking that another MP is actually their MP. If you end up with two different parties that would naturally cause a problem because if casework gets sent through to them there is no guarantee that would be passed on. Does that make sense?

The main point I wanted to make is that I have never heard anybody actually say Derwent, it is 70 per cent Chaddesden and Breadsall Hilltop. If people don't associate, why would you split the two up? That road between the two does not actually mean anything to anybody. If I was to actually say to somebody "Where is this boundary between the two?" nobody could actually point it out and it is completely irrelevant to their day-to-day lives? That is all I wanted to actually point out.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just while you are on, you mentioned Derwent and Chaddesden. Oakwood is attached to that as well. Is there not a similar feeling with Oakwood?

CLLR HUDSON: There is a distinct line between Oakwood and the Breadsall Hilltop area.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right, thank you.

CLLR HUDSON: Although it is probably more in common with OK1 and DW1, but that is a separate issue altogether.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Are there any queries following that? No, okay. Thank you very much for speaking. I will call Cllr Martin Repton. If you could give your full name and address please.

CLLR REPTON: Cllr Martin Repton, 11 Queen Mary Court, Derby DE22 1BB. I have studied the proposals in some detail and I don't think there is an absolutely perfect solution, but having given this a considerable amount of examination and talking to my constituents and talking to colleagues, I believe the Boundary Commission proposals are the most robust that we can have in ensuring the people of the whole of the City ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just sorry, just so we get the recording.

CLLR REPTON: Sure okay, I thought I had a loud enough voice as it was but I am quite happy to use this to project it.

Having spoken to a variety of people, both in my ward, family members who live in the area and colleagues, while there is not a perfect solution I believe this comes as close to it I believe as is possible. Looking at the south of the City, there are undoubted links from Sinfin towards Osmaston and towards Allenton, so I am curious as to why anyone would want to remove Sinfin from Derby East and yet, strangely add Derwent ward.

I have been a councillor for 30 years. I have represented both Derwent ward, Chaddesden and Darley ward. There is synergy between Derwent, Darley and Abbey and I am glad in terms of the Boundary Commission's proposals that reflects that. In terms of Chaddesden having represented that for a number of years, there are differences between Chaddesden and Derwent and I think the Boundary Commission's proposals would not run counter to that. So I think really, and quite simply, I am in support of the Boundary Commission's proposals. I believe they are logical; they are fair; and certainly I think they will meet the needs of my constituents both current and the ones that I had previously. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just to clarify, are you saying that you do not see a link between Derwent and Chaddesden?

CLLR REPTON: I don't see a particular link between Derwent and Chaddesden if you compare it to any other ward, no.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Right. This is a point that numerous representations have included, so it is obviously something that is felt fairly strongly at least in some areas, but it is not something you have identified.

CLLR REPTON: That is why I say I have been a councillor for 30 years so I am curious as to why they would want to put that case.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Are there any queries on that submission? No, okay, thank you very much.

CLLR REPTON: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We will move on now to Mr Graham Smith.

MR GRAHAM SMITH: Thank you Mr Chairman. My name is Graham Smith. I am the Conservative Consultant Agent and Secretary of Nottingham Conservatives and I operate from King Edward Court, King Edward Street in the centre of Nottingham, NG1 1EW. I have held this post since 2009. My Chairman, Janet Scott, was here yesterday. I apologise for repeating some of the things that she said, but I think it is important.

It all refers to the new Broxstowe and Hucknall seat. Under the Commission's proposals, moving Bilborough ward to the new seat of Broxstowe and Hucknall will mean that Bilborough ward will become an orphan ward in the City of Nottingham. Nottingham Conservatives wish to propose that Bilborough ward be kept in the City and placed in the new seat of Nottingham South and Beeston, thereby keeping Bilborough ward's long-established ties with the City of Nottingham.

Janet Scott said yesterday that Nottingham Conservatives wished to propose that the wards of Chilwell West and Toton and Chilwell Meadows be moved back to the new seat of Broxstowe and Hucknall from Nottingham South and Beeston, thereby restoring the ties between those wards and the current seat of Broxstowe. The electoral figures for these proposed changes fit in with the Commission's requirement, with Bilborough's electorate of 11,620 just 29 fewer to that of the combined electorate of Chilwell West and Toton and Chilwell Meadows.

If Bilborough is moved to the new seat of Broxstowe and Hucknall, the new Member of Parliament would have to deal with four councils; namely Broxstowe Borough Council, Ashfield District Council, Nottingham City Council and Nottinghamshire County Council

rather than three if Bilborough remained in the City. In addition, Nottingham City would only have to deal with four Members of Parliament rather than five under the Commission's proposals. A fair question might be, Mr Chairman, why are you seeking to bring Bilborough ward back into the City and not the Clifton wards designated to go into the new West Bridgford seat? The figures do not make sense to make such a change. The two Clifton wards are not only south of the River Trent but have a total electorate of 19,691. Clifton also has three distinctive areas - Silverdale, Wilford Village and the Clifton Estate, which are all somewhat geographically removed from the City, unlike Bilborough, which is an integral part of the city.

I would also like to endorse my Chairman's and our Federation's proposal that Nottingham South and Beeston be renamed Nottingham West and Beeston as I too believe this far better describes the proposed new constituency. Mr Chairman, with your permission I would like to refer to the South Leicestershire seat if I may. I explain that I am also a former Conservative Agent in Blaby and I was agent for Nigel Lawson, the then MP, who lived in Stoney Stanton which we believe is a natural part of the Blaby district, linking in well to Narborough, as do the villages of Huncote, Thurlesdone and Croft. I therefore endorse your proposals for South Leicestershire, which ensures that the vast majority of Blaby district is kept together in one constituency, save for the three wards that are added to the Leicester West constituency. Thank you Mr Chairman.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Again, are there any queries? Yes. Could you give your name for the record?

MR FOX: Alan Fox for the Liberal Democrats. Your proposed change of switching the two Broxstowe wards into the proposed Broxstowe and Hucknall constituency means that you move two of the Chilwell wards, leaving the third Chilwell ward in your proposed Nottingham West and Beeston. Given that the Boundary Commission's proposals already cut through an urban area in the boundary between Beeston North and Bramcote, you are creating a further cut through the settlement of Chilwell in the boundary between the Attenborough and Chilwell East and the Chilwell West wards.

MR GRAHAM SMITH: I am not sure that I totally understand the question. I do apologise for that, but what I do know is that if I have read the Commission's report correctly or, or what the Commission is aiming to achieve, it is the figures. You have to try and balance, get the figures right. It seems to me that if you put Chilwell West, Toton and Chilwell Meadows, keep them, put them into the Broxstowe and Hucknall seat and you take out Bilborough, as I say, there is only a difference of 29 votes. That is what we see. I stress again Bilborough is, and always has been, an integral part of the City. Absolutely.

MR FOX: Can I come back?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, I think you can but what I hear is that Bilborough is the issue in this and we are looking to find some other ward.

MR GRAHAM SMITH: I am not talking about any other constituencies.

MR FOX: When you are talking about switching wards between two constituencies, the wards that you are switching matter as much on either side.

MR GRAHAM SMITH: They do, but from the point of view of the representation process.

MR FOX: I do think that it is not just the numbers because rule 5 does speak about the breaking of local ties.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR GRAHAM SMITH: Right. Thank you sir.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: At present we have one more booked witness at 3.20. We understand that he may be running slightly late but should be here by 3.30. The plan will be to hear that representation and then take a break with a view, if there are no further attenders to closing the hearing at four o'clock. For the moment we will adjourn until 3.20.

After a short break

Time Noted: 3.20 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon. We have one more speaker that is pre-booked to speak. That is Cllr Dhinsa, who is the Police and Crime Commissioner for Derby. If you could give your name and address before you start to speak please.

CLLR DHINDSA: Good afternoon. The name is Hardyal Dhinsa. I am the Police and Crime Commissioner for Derbyshire. I am also a councillor for Normanton ward in one of the constituencies which has been identified. I have been a councillor since 1993 in Derby. I know the areas of Boulton, Sinfin, Normanton, Arboretum the Blagreaves and the Abbey ward areas. I think it has probably been a difficult task for the Boundary Commission to try to apportion all the different constituencies to be as equal as possible. Looking at the proposals that are here, I think you have done the best job you can in terms of making sure we balance out what is happening.

One of the things that makes it more convincing is that in the Normanton area there is a clear physical boundary between Normanton ward and Sinfin ward, which if you walk

that, which I have done quite often in terms of boundary, the physical barrier is very stark. Crossings across it are very few, if any. There is only probably one area where you can cross over, which is a natural barrier, which also has communities in terms of which way they look in terms of social, cultural and economic activity. That is all towards Normanton, Arboretum; and when you talk about Normanton ward, and Normanton, you are talking about Normanton, Arboretum and Abbey. So there is a natural affinity, and to break that up in any shape or form would actually have an impact in terms of how people relate and affiliate themselves. That is something that needs to be borne in mind. Whether you had that rationale when you devised the constituency boundaries or not, that is a strong case to making sure that Normanton, and Arboretum in particular, do not get separated. If you walk the area, Abbey ward in particular, Arboretum and Normanton are really one community and to separate them out would be I think not be helpful or constructive.

Of course a similar argument could be made at the top in terms of Derwent where the railway line has a boundary which can separate it, but if you live in Derby, as I have done since 1967, you can cross over from Derwent into Chaddesden and into even the west of the City and not notice the railway line as a physical barrier. It just does not exist in the same way, but it is physically a barrier between Normanton and Sinfin. On that basis I think it is important to take that into account. For that reason I would want to continue to support your difficult task as a Boundary Commission to find natural boundaries whilst also trying to maintain that balance of getting the right numbers in each constituency.

The heart of the community, in terms of the boundary that you have created with Normanton, Arboretum, Abbey and Blagreaves is a natural community which has been established for many years and grown as well as more people have moved out from the Arboretum and the Normanton areas. They have settled mostly in the Littleover, Mickleover, Blaby's areas, so there is a natural boundary; so I would support maintaining the boundaries as proposed by the Boundary Commission rather than any alternatives.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any queries on that summation? No. In that case thank you for attending and making a submission.

CLLR DHINDSA: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We are going to adjourn until four o'clock now and if nobody has attended by that point we will close the hearing at four o'clock.

After a short break

Time Noted: 4.00 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It is four o'clock as we said. Nobody else has attended to make representation, so I would like to thank everyone for attending and we will close the hearing at this point. Thank you.

The hearing adjourned at 4 pm

B

BOLTON, 19

C

MS COX, 20
MS CRESSWELL, 16, 19

D

CLLR DHINDSA, 27, 28

F

MR FOX, 8, 9, 13, 14, 26, 27

H

CLLR HASSALL, 9, 10, 11
CLLR HUDSON, 23, 24

J

MR JARVIS, 11

L

MR CHRIS LESLIE MP, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9

M

MR NIGEL MILLS MP, 21, 23

P

MR PRATT, 6, 7, 8, 9

S

MR CHRIS SMITH, 11, 13, 14
MR GRAHAM SMITH, 25, 26, 27

CLLR REPTON, 24, 25

T

MR TESSIER, 2
THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29
MR TITTLE, 14, 16