

Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the East Midlands



Contents

	Summary	3
1	What is the Boundary Commission for England?	5
2	Background to the 2018 Review	7
3	Revised proposals for the East Midlands	13
	The sub-region split	14
	Lincolnshire	15
	Derbyshire and Derby	19
	Leicestershire, Leicester, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Nottingham, and Rutland	25
4	How to have your say	43
	Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	45

Summary

Who we are and what we do

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

The 2018 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 501), resulting in the number of constituencies in the East Midlands reducing by two to 44. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions¹ – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

How did we conduct the 2018 Review?

We published our initial proposals for new boundaries in September 2016 and consulted on them. We received written comments and oral submissions at public hearings held in each region. We published all the comments we received and we held a second consultation exercise in relation to them in March 2017. We are very grateful for all the comments that these two consultation exercises have generated. We have now completed the next stage of the review process and we are now publishing our revised proposals. For each region, the revised proposals report sets out our analysis of all the responses to our

initial proposals in the first and second consultations, and the conclusions we have reached as to how those proposals should be revised as a result. The annex to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency in our revised proposals for the relevant region; maps to illustrate these constituencies can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

What are the revised proposals for the East Midlands?

We have revised the composition of 18 of the 44 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining 26. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, eight constituencies in the East Midlands would be the same as they are under the existing arrangements.

As it was not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, our initial proposals grouped some local authority areas into sub-regions. It was also necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposal sub-regions remain unchanged from those initial proposals, as shown in the table overleaf.

¹ The specified exemptions in England to the rules on constituency size are the two constituencies in the Isle of Wight.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
Lincolnshire	7	7
Derbyshire and Derby	11	10
Leicestershire, Leicester, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Nottingham, and Rutland	28	27

Northamptonshire's entitlement to 6.6 constituencies means that there has to be a constituency that crosses the county boundary with Leicestershire due to Northamptonshire's geographical position in the south of the region. However, a further consequence of this is that the county boundary between Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire is also crossed. In Lincolnshire and Derbyshire, it was possible to allocate a whole number of constituencies to each county.

In our revised proposals, we have not proposed any changes to our initial proposals in Lincolnshire.

In Derbyshire, we have continued to treat the county on its own, but have proposed changes to seven of our initial proposals within the county. We propose no further revisions to the remaining three proposed constituencies in Derbyshire.

In Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, and Northamptonshire, we have reconfigured several constituencies in the sub-region but, as previously mentioned, continue to propose two constituencies that cross county boundaries – one between Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire, and one between Northamptonshire and Leicestershire. Our revised proposals for Leicestershire retain one more existing constituency than our initial proposals.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us. The best way to respond to our revised proposals is through our consultation website: www.bce2018.org.uk.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

1.1 The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required by Parliament to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every five years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries. We also make recommendations for any changes in the names of individual constituencies.

1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners take decisions on what recommendations to make for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 21 assistant commissioners (two or three allocated to each of the nine regions of England). Further information about the Commissioners and assistant commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our corporate website.²

1.3 Our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

The Secretary to the Commission
Boundary Commission for England
35 Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BQ

² <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us>

2 Background to the 2018 Review

2.1 There are four Boundary Commissions covering the UK with separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 states that they must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, every five years. Under the current review, we must report in September 2018. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the East Midlands.

2.2 Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. If our recommendations are accepted, they would be used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.

2.3 The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 501. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our Guide to the 2018 Review of Parliamentary constituencies ('the Guide'),³ published in the summer of 2016, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 71,031 and 78,507 electors.

2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, the largest constituency currently has around twice as many electors as the smallest. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant scale of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

2.5 If implemented, the recommendations that we will make in September 2018 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 will, where possible, try to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors. Under the Act, we have a challenging job to do in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in a pattern of constituencies that is unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless the review has been one that we have conducted in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

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, the careful consideration of our assistant commissioners and the best judgement of the three Boundary Commissioners. We are confident that these revised

³ Available at <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/2018-review>.

proposals strike the best balance between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There may be particular 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 looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many 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. However, we will not be assisted by 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 conscious that very often a change in one constituency necessarily requires an alteration in another and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.

2.7 The Guide contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the Guide, to enable greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

The rules in the legislation

2.8 The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 74,769. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- special geographical considerations, including the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency
- local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015
- boundaries of existing constituencies
- any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

2.9 It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2015, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. The Guide outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries that have been amended since 2015.

2.10 In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 15% of the existing constituencies in the East Midlands – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

2.11 Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to balance all the factors. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain eight (17%) of the existing 46 constituencies in the East Midlands.

The use of the regions used for European elections

2.12 Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the East Midlands. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the 2018 Review we decided, in agreement with all the main political parties, to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in the Guide and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

2.13 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, continues to use the regional boundaries as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for the review

Stage one – initial proposals

2.14 We began this review in February 2016 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the data pages of our corporate website.⁴ The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2016.

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

2.15 We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2016 to 5 December 2016. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received more than 18,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including more than 1,532 unique written representations relating to the East Midlands. We also heard more than 100 oral representations at the three public hearings in the East Midlands. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

2.16 The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to send us comments on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 28 February 2017 and invited comments on them until 27 March 2017. We received more than 7,500 unique written representations across the country as a whole during those four weeks.

Stage four – publication of revised proposals

2.17 As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation), on 17 October 2017, we are publishing this report – Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the East Midlands – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 11 December 2017. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

⁴ <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/data-and-resources>

Stage five – final recommendations

2.18 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 11 December 2017, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this during September 2018. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in the Guide.

2.19 At the launch of each stage of consultation, we have taken – and are continuing to take – all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

3 Revised proposals for the East Midlands

3.1 In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of two assistant commissioners for the East Midlands – Scott Handley and Ashraf Khan – 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:

- Derby: 27–28 October 2016
- Northampton:
31 October–1 November 2016
- Lincoln: 3–4 November 2016.

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 incredibly 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 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
- our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.

3.4 During the initial consultation period, Northampton Borough Council informed us that, due to an administrative error, they had wrongly reported their 2015 electorate figures for the St. James and Sunnyside wards. The correct figures for these wards are 2,699 and 2,900 respectively. The corrected figures do not change the total England or UK electorate, nor affect the electoral quota or permitted electorate range. They also left both the initially proposed Northampton constituencies still within the permitted electorate range. Having considered the Council’s evidence, and consulted the political parties on whether to amend this error, we are content to agree with this correction and have used the corrected figures when formulating our revised constituencies. A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears at Annex A to this report.

3.5 Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent’s response we also include the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345. This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at www.bce2018.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.

The sub-region split

3.6 In formulating our initial proposals, we noted that Lincolnshire's electorate of just over 521,000 resulted in an allocation of 6.97 constituencies. We therefore decided to allocate the county seven constituencies and treated it as a sub-region. Similarly, we noted that Derbyshire and the City of Derby had a combined electorate of 756,550, which resulted in an allocation of 10.11 constituencies. We therefore decided to allocate 10 constituencies to Derbyshire, a reduction of one, and treat it as a sub-region.

3.7 The combined electorate of Nottinghamshire and the City of Nottingham is just over 769,000, which results in the area being entitled to 10.28 constituencies, a reduction of one. Given our decision to treat Derbyshire as a sub-region, we decided to include Nottinghamshire in a sub-region with Leicestershire. The combined electorate of Leicestershire, City of Leicester and Rutland is nearly 735,000, giving an entitlement of 9.82 constituencies. In formulating our initial proposals, we decided to continue to include Rutland in a constituency with parts of Leicestershire rather than including it in a constituency with parts of Northamptonshire.

3.8 The electorate of Northamptonshire is nearly 494,000 which results in an entitlement of 6.60 constituencies. We noted that this entitlement of constituencies meant that it was not

possible to propose a sub-region of Northamptonshire and that it would be necessary to propose a constituency that crossed county boundaries. Given the location of Northamptonshire in the East Midlands, we considered that it could only possibly be linked with Leicestershire. We therefore proposed a sub-region of Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire (including Rutland), and Northamptonshire. This sub-region was allocated 27 constituencies.

3.9 The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) and Conservative Party (BCE-30422) both supported the sub-regions used in formulating the initial proposals. The Labour Party (BCE-31225) did not propose alternative sub-regions, but did note that including Derbyshire in a sub-region with Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Northamptonshire would result in the average electorate of that group having constituencies very close to the electoral quota.

3.10 We received a proposal from Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) which suggested that Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire be grouped into one sub-region; and that Northamptonshire and Rutland be grouped into another. Our assistant commissioners advised us that they did not receive persuasive evidence supporting this sub-regional arrangement.

3.11 We also received proposals from some respondents, such as Anne Braid (BCE-20550) and George Krawiec (BCE-33011), that proposed crossing the regional boundary between Yorkshire and the Humber, and the East Midlands. These proposals largely focused on reconfiguring the constituencies in

Grimsby and would result in changes to the constituencies in Lincolnshire which were either wholly or largely unchanged from the existing constituencies.

A counter-proposal was also received from Adrian Bailey (BCE-30317) which proposed a constituency that crossed the boundary between the South East region and the East Midlands region. This proposal was predominantly focused on reconfiguring the constituencies in the Milton Keynes area.

3.12 Our assistant commissioners considered that crossing the regional boundary was disruptive and did not enable a better pattern of constituencies to be created within the East Midlands. Our stated policy – which has received strong support – is to use the regions used for European elections as a basis for our recommendations, and only depart from that policy in light of very compelling reasons to do so. We agree with our assistant commissioners’ recommendations that such reasons do not exist here, and we have therefore decided that the East Midlands regional boundary should not be crossed with any other region.

3.13 Furthermore, the assistant commissioners did not consider that persuasive evidence had been received to formulate revised proposals on alternative sub-regions. We have therefore decided to retain the sub-regions used in formulating our initial proposals. Therefore, the sub-regions we propose as part of the revised proposals are:

- Lincolnshire
- Derbyshire and Derby
- Leicestershire, Leicester, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Nottingham, and Rutland.

Lincolnshire

3.14 Of the seven existing constituencies in Lincolnshire, four are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals, we retained two existing constituencies: Gainsborough, and South Holland and The Deepings. Additionally, we retained the existing constituencies of Grantham and Stamford, and Louth and Horncastle, with minor modifications to reflect changes to local government ward boundaries.

3.15 The existing constituencies of Lincoln (67,115) and Boston and Skegness (66,250) both fall below the permitted electorate range and the existing constituency of Sleaford and North Hykeham (86,652) is above the permitted electorate range. To bring the Lincoln constituency within the permitted electorate range, we included the five wards comprising the town of North Hykeham and the Waddington West ward (all six are part of the North Kesteven district) in this constituency under our initial proposals. We also proposed the transfer of the Bracebridge Heath and Waddington East ward from the existing Lincoln constituency to our proposed Sleaford constituency. These changes brought the Lincoln constituency within the permitted electorate range.

3.16 As the existing Boston and Skegness constituency falls below the permitted electorate range, we proposed including the wards of Heckington Rural, and Kirkby la Thorpe and South Kyme (both North Kesteven district wards) in this constituency from the Sleaford and North Hykeham constituency. This change brought the Boston and Skegness constituency within the permitted electorate range. Consequently these changes resulted in the proposed Sleaford constituency being within the permitted electorate range.

3.17 Our initial proposals for the constituencies of Gainsborough, Louth and Horncastle, Grantham and Stamford, South Holland and The Deepings, and Boston and Skegness were largely supported. The main focus of opposition was to our proposed Lincoln and Sleaford constituencies, with representations focusing on which wards should be included in the Lincoln constituency.

3.18 We did receive a counter-proposal for the entire county from Edward Barkham (BCE-27869). Mr Barkham proposed changes to five of the seven constituencies in the county. He did not propose any changes to the constituencies of South Holland and The Deepings, and Grantham and Stamford. Rather than include the wards of Kirkby la Thorpe and South Kyme, and Heckington Rural in the Boston and Skegness constituency, he suggested this constituency should include the wards of Halton Holegate and Chapel St. Leonards. Including these wards in the Boston and Skegness constituency would consequently result in the Louth and Horncastle constituency being below the permitted electorate range. Mr Barkham

suggested this constituency could include the Wragby ward from the Gainsborough constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range. He also proposed changes between the proposed constituencies of Lincoln and Sleaford. He proposed that the ward of Bracebridge Heath and Waddington East be included in the Lincoln constituency and that the ward of Skellingthorpe be included in the Sleaford constituency.

3.19 Mr Barkham outlined a number of reasons why he considered that his proposals better reflected the statutory criteria. These included: a Boston and Skegness constituency consisting of wards from two districts rather than three; the wards of East Lindsey district being included in two constituencies rather than three; the wards of South Kesteven being included in two constituencies rather than three; a Gainsborough constituency contiguous with the boundaries of West Lindsey district; and that his proposals would avoid creating an orphan ward. Mr Barkham's counter-proposal would result in changes to the constituencies of Gainsborough, and Louth and Horncastle. These constituencies do not need to change (in the case of Louth and Horncastle to only reflect local government ward boundary changes) as they are both within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals, we would retain both of these existing constituencies.

3.20 We did receive some representations supporting the retention of the existing Gainsborough, and Louth and Horncastle constituencies. Patrick McNeill (BCE-21736) and Guy Grainger (BCE-21164) both supported retaining the existing Gainsborough constituency,

while Dulcie Atkins (BCE-19091) supported the proposed Louth and Horncastle constituency. We also received support for these constituencies from three political parties, which is detailed below.

3.21 The Labour Party (BCE-31225) supported five of the seven proposed constituencies for Lincolnshire. In the case of the Lincoln and Sleaford constituencies, they supported the inclusion of the North Hykeham area in the Lincoln constituency but proposed that the Waddington West ward should be included in the Sleaford constituency rather than the Lincoln constituency. They indicated the links between the wards of Waddington West, and Bracebridge Heath and Waddington East and considered that this proposal would unite the parish of Waddington.

3.22 The Conservative Party (BCE-30422) also supported five of the proposed constituencies for Lincolnshire and put forward a counter-proposal for the constituencies of Lincoln and Sleaford. They suggested that the existing Lincoln constituency should be retained but with the inclusion of the wards of Waddington West, and Heighington and Washingborough to bring it within the permitted electorate range. They considered that this proposal was less disruptive as it transferred fewer wards between constituencies and they suggested that North Hykeham was a separate community.

3.23 The Labour Party did not support the counter-proposal suggested by the Conservative Party. They recognised that the counter-proposal united the Waddington wards, but they could not see the benefits of not including

the urban area of North Hykeham in a Lincoln constituency. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) supported the initial proposals for Lincolnshire in full. They opposed the counter-proposals suggested by the Conservative Party and Labour Party.

3.24 The former MP for Lincoln, Karl McCartney (BCE-31108, BCE-32352 and BCE-40125), supported the counter-proposal suggested by the Conservative Party. He considered that the initial proposals were disruptive and that the Conservative Party counter-proposals were simpler. Mr McCartney also highlighted that this alternative had been supported, for example the representation from Paul Matthews (BCE-33234), which included a petition signed by 58 people, supporting this counter-proposal.

3.25 We did receive some support for the inclusion of the North Hykeham area in the Lincoln constituency. Ian Grundy (BCE-23390) said ‘adding North Hykeham to Lincoln makes perfect sense.’ Heather Jolliff (BCE-24610) indicated the community links shared between North Hykeham and Lincoln: ‘We work in Lincoln, we go to church in Lincoln, I used to go to school in Lincoln, our medical practice and our bank are in Lincoln.’ Similar views were stated by Claire Mellusco (BCE-17067) who voiced frustration with the illogicality of North Hykeham being linked to a rural constituency with Sleaford at its heart rather than the city of which it is a suburb: ‘I don’t have a say in the city I live in, work in, shop in and use the hospital in.’

3.26 We also received some representations opposing the inclusion of North Hykeham in a Lincoln constituency. South Hykeham Parish Council (BCE-20256) highlighted links it shares with North Hykeham Town Council, for example ‘North Hykeham Town and South Hykeham Parish Council has recently adopted a joint Neighbourhood Plan and has a joint planning committee.’ The Parish Council supported the two areas being in the same constituency. Under our initial proposals North Hykeham Town Council would be included in the Lincoln constituency and South Hykeham Parish Council in the Sleaford constituency. They would both be included in the same constituency under the Conservative Party counter-proposal.

3.27 Some representations did not support the Conservative Party counter-proposal to include the Heighington and Washingborough ward in a Lincoln constituency. Heighington Parish Council (BCE-22108) and Canwick Parish Council (BCE-28786), which are both part of the Heighington and Washingborough ward, opposed being included in a Lincoln constituency. Canwick Parish Council cited ‘Our village and others like it have very different challenges to those of the city and we strongly feel that the interests of our residents are best served by remaining a part of the more rural Sleaford based constituency.’ Under the Conservative Party counter-proposal, both of these parishes would be included in a Lincoln constituency.

3.28 Our assistant commissioners presented to us the evidence that had been received. They did not recommend the suggested changes proposed by Mr Barkham. They reflected that, although

his proposals had some merit in places, they were not persuaded by the argument to modify two existing constituencies that could otherwise be retained. They therefore considered that changes should not be made to the proposed constituencies of Gainsborough, Louth and Horncastle, Boston and Skegness, Grantham and Stamford, and South Holland and The Deepings.

3.29 Given the contrasting and conflicting arguments about which wards to add to the existing Lincoln constituency, our assistant commissioners visited the area, and observed that North Hykeham has close links to Lincoln. They were not persuaded by the evidence received to modify the proposed Lincoln constituency by including the Waddington West ward in the Sleaford constituency. Having visited the area, they observed that this also appeared to divide the Bracebridge Heath and Waddington areas in the northern part of the ward. They noted the evidence that Waddington West and Waddington East should be included in the same constituency but observed during the visit of the area the difference in character between the two areas.

3.30 Having considered the evidence presented, we agree with the recommendation of our assistant commissioners to retain the proposed constituencies in Lincolnshire. The decision about which wards to add to the existing Lincoln constituency is a balanced one, and one the Commission faced at the same point five years ago in the discontinued 2013 Review. We can see both sides of the argument but are persuaded by the assistant commissioners’ recommendations not

to revise the initial proposals in this area. We note that the evidence they have accepted about the relative nature of both areas – and their conclusion that the North Hykeham area was a more appropriate addition than the alternative areas to the east – was reinforced by their tour of the area. Therefore we accept their recommendations for Lincolnshire.

Derbyshire and Derby

3.31 Of the existing 11 constituencies in Derbyshire, three are currently within the permitted electorate range. High Peak, Chesterfield, and South Derbyshire. The other eight existing constituencies all fall below the permitted electorate range.

3.32 Under our initial proposals, we retained the existing constituency of High Peak completely unchanged and noted that it was coterminous with High Peak Borough. The proposed Chesterfield constituency was changed by the inclusion of one further Chesterfield Borough ward, that of Barrow Hill and New Whittington. Similarly, our proposed Erewash constituency was only modified to include one further Erewash Borough ward, that of Ockbrook & Borrowash.

3.33 The initial proposals suggested more significant changes to the other existing constituencies in Derbyshire. Under our initial proposals North East Derbyshire district was divided between three constituencies. Five of the district wards, including Dronfield Woodhouse, were included in a Derbyshire Dales constituency; 11 wards, including the other parts of Dronfield, Eckington and Killamarsh, were included in our proposed Bolsover and Dronfield constituency; and

the remaining wards, including the town of Clay Cross, were included in our proposed Alfreton and Clay Cross constituency. We also proposed that Bolsover District be divided between two constituencies, with four of the district wards, including the town of South Normanton, included in our Alfreton and Clay Cross constituency. The remaining wards were proposed to be in the Bolsover and Dronfield constituency.

3.34 The Borough of Amber Valley was also divided between three constituencies under our initial proposals. As under the existing constituency, three wards were included in the Derbyshire Dales constituency, seven wards including the town of Ripley were included in the Alfreton and Clay Cross constituency, and the remaining wards including the towns of Belper and Heanor were included in a Amber Valley constituency with two wards from Erewash Borough.

3.35 At present the City of Derby is divided between three constituencies. Our initial proposals divided the city between four constituencies. The ward of Allestree, which is currently within the Mid Derbyshire constituency, was proposed to be included in the Amber Valley constituency, and the ward of Mickleover was included in our South Derbyshire constituency. The remaining City of Derby wards were included in the proposed constituencies of Derby North and Derby South. Under our initial proposals we included the South Derbyshire District ward of Aston in our proposed Derby South constituency. Apart from this change and that to include the ward of Mickleover we suggested no other changes to the South Derbyshire constituency.

3.36 In response to the consultation on the initial proposals, the Labour Party (BCE-31225 and BCE-40905) broadly supported the pattern of constituencies, specifically High Peak, Derbyshire Dales, Bolsover, and Chesterfield. They supported the inclusion of the Derby City ward of Allestree in the Amber Valley constituency, stating ‘Allestree is a discrete community within Derby and has strong ties along the A6 with these towns [Belper and Duffield] in the Mid Derbyshire constituency.’ They objected to the proposed names of the Derby North and Derby South constituencies, suggesting that East and West was a better reflection of the configuration of these proposed constituencies. They also considered that the inclusion of the South Derbyshire District ward of Aston in a Derby South constituency was an anomaly, although it did not submit an alternative.

3.37 The Conservative Party (BCE-30422 and BCE-40904) supported the proposed constituencies of Chesterfield, Erewash, and South Derbyshire. They opposed the other seven constituencies and made counter-proposals. They were concerned that the proposed constituencies of Alfreton and Clay Cross, Bolsover and Dronfield, and Derbyshire Dales all contained parts of three local authorities. They suggested a North East Derbyshire constituency that would be coterminous with North East Derbyshire District and a Bolsover constituency that included all of Bolsover District and the Chesterfield Borough ward of Lowgates and Woodthorpe together with the town of Alfreton. To the south of Bolsover they proposed an Amber Valley constituency

that included the majority of the wards of Amber Valley Borough, the Derby City ward of Allestree and the Erewash Borough wards of Little Eaton & Stanley, and West Hallam & Dale Abbey.

3.38 Under the Conservative Party counter-proposal the Amber Valley Borough wards covering the town of Belper were included in the Derbyshire Dales constituency. They also suggested changes to the High Peak constituency, proposing that it should also include the Derbyshire Dales District wards of Bradwell, Hathersage and Eyam, and Tideswell. They considered that these wards form part of the Hope Valley which is split between the Derbyshire Dales and High Peak constituencies. The Conservative Party also proposed changes to the constituencies in Derby, which is detailed later in this chapter.

3.39 The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) put forward a similar counter-proposal to that of the Conservative Party. They proposed an identical pattern of constituencies for North East Derbyshire and Chesterfield. They proposed a very similar Bolsover constituency to that of the Conservative Party, the only difference being that it also included the Amber Valley Borough ward of Swanwick in order to have all of the Alfreton County Division in one constituency. Rather than including the market town of Belper in the Derbyshire Dales constituency, they proposed it be included in the Amber Valley constituency. Instead it suggested that the City of Derby ward of Allestree be included in the Derbyshire Dales constituency.

They considered that, ‘the town of Belper and village of Duffield should be in the same constituency. They are only eight miles apart and are directly linked by the A6 and the railway line.’ The Liberal Democrat Party opposed the Conservative Party’s suggested changes to the existing constituency of High Peak. The Liberal Democrat Party also made a counter-proposal for constituencies in Derby, which is detailed later in this chapter.

3.40 We received a number of representations that opposed our division of Dronfield between constituencies. The Dronfield Civic Society (BCE-23426) stated that ‘the proposal splits off Dronfield Woodhouse ward from Dronfield North and South wards, which are all part of the Dronfield Town Council area.’ Dronfield Town Council (BCE-18667), Harold Barnes, a former Member of Parliament for North East Derbyshire (BCE-19237), Councillor Roger Hall (BCE-25895), Councillor Stuart Ellis (BCE-28193), North East Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party (BCE-28595), Councillor Angelique Foster (BCE-29147), Councillor Alex Dale (BCE-29264) and North Derbyshire Conservative Association (BCE-29516) all opposed the division of Dronfield between constituencies. We noted that under both the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrat Party counter-proposals the town of Dronfield would not be divided between constituencies. We received one representation from Chris Thornton (BCE-33360) who did not oppose the split of Dronfield, stating that ‘it will have no substantive effect on how the town operates.’

3.41 We also received opposition to the division of Bolsover District between two constituencies. Under our initial proposals we included the Bolsover District wards of Blackwell, South Normanton East, South Normanton West and Pinxton in our Alfreton and Clay Cross constituency. Gary Ransford (BCE-24882), Andrew Burrows (BCE-14884) and Ian Robert Cockayne (BCE-27805) all opposed the initial proposals. Further opposition was received to our initial proposals for an Alfreton and Clay Cross constituency from the towns of Swanwick and Ripley. Rex Hawkins (BCE-24903) stated that he has ‘no affinity with Clay Cross whatsoever’ and that ‘Ripley and Swanwick should be incorporated into the new Amber Valley constituency.’ On day two of the Derby public hearing, Nigel Mills, MP for Amber Valley (BCE-32062), raised a number of concerns about our proposed Amber Valley constituency. He was concerned that the proposed constituencies divided Ripley Town Council between constituencies, and he highlighted the links between Ripley and Heanor, such as the Ripley and Heanor News. Mr Mills supported the counter-proposal of the Conservative Party which would include the town of Belper in a Derbyshire Dales constituency. Councillor Paul Hillier (BCE-23402) also supported the inclusion of Belper in the Derbyshire Dales constituency. He highlighted that Belper had previously been part of a West Derbyshire constituency up until 2010 and said ‘Belper is part of the UNESCO Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site which follows the course of the River Derwent from Derby before finishing in the village of Cromford. At present, a large

section of this heritage site already lies within Derbyshire Dales and we believe that the security of the World Heritage status would be greatly enhanced by moving Belper into Derbyshire Dales.'

3.42 North East Derbyshire District Council and Bolsover District Council (BCE-25158) made a joint submission opposing the initial proposals. Both local authorities supported all North East Derbyshire district wards being included in a North East Derbyshire constituency and those of Bolsover District being included in a Bolsover constituency. They submitted a counter-proposal for the surrounding area which suggested the inclusion of three South Derbyshire District wards of Hatton, Hilton, and Etwall in the Derbyshire Dales constituency. They also proposed that two Erewash Borough wards, those of Ockbrook & Borrowash, and Sawley be included in the South Derbyshire constituency. We noted that under this proposal these two wards would be detached from the South Derbyshire constituency.

3.43 Under our initial proposals the constituency of High Peak was unchanged from the existing constituency. The Liberal Democrats supported our proposal whereas the Conservative Party considered that the Derbyshire Dales District wards of Bradwell, Hathersage and Eyam, and Tideswell should be included in the High Peak constituency. This counter-proposal was supported by some respondents. Andrew Bingham, former MP for High Peak (BCE-26924 and BCE-32179), highlighted that these wards shared community interests with others in the Hope Valley area of High Peak. He noted that links existed such as

schooling, leisure facilities, local media, transport and mountain rescue services. In response to the secondary consultation, the Labour Party (BCE-40905) objected to the Conservative Party counter-proposal for High Peak as it saw 'no reason within the rules to make changes to it unless they were required in order to facilitate desirable proposals elsewhere in the county.'

3.44 Our assistant commissioners noted the objection to our initial proposals in this part of Derbyshire and investigated the alternatives. They noted the similarities of the counter-proposals from the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties. They considered that the evidence received supports a North East Derbyshire constituency that is coterminous with the district. This would result in the town of Dronfield not being divided between constituencies. This pattern of constituencies would require an alternative configuration for the Derbyshire Dales constituency. The Conservative Party proposed the town of Belper be included in the constituency whereas the Liberal Democrat Party considered the Derby City ward of Allestree be included in the constituency. Our assistant commissioners visited the area to observe both proposals.

3.45 They observed that the Allestree ward is on the urban fringe of Derby City, and includes the main campus of the University of Derby, and that the A38 provides a clear boundary with the rest of the city. They noted that Allestree has poor road links going west into the Derbyshire Dales constituency and that it is very different in character from the other parts in the Derbyshire Dales constituency. They observed that Belper has good road links in all directions and

a railway line that has regular services to Matlock. They noted its similarities to other mill towns located along the A6 and River Derwent. While they considered that the best option would be to include Allestree in a Derby constituency, a view that was reflected in the very small number of representations received from the ward, they also noted that the ward is not currently located in a City of Derby constituency. Placing it with other City of Derby wards would require a number of major changes to the constituencies within the city. Therefore, they considered that it was suitable for Allestree to be included in the Amber Valley constituency. They noted that at present it was included in a Mid Derbyshire constituency and that it has good road links going north. They proposed that the four wards covering the town of Belper be included in the Derbyshire Dales constituency. They were particularly persuaded by the evidence of Councillor Hillier (BCE-23402) and from their observations of the area.

3.46 Our assistant commissioners were not persuaded to recommend any changes to the proposed High Peak constituency, which is unchanged from the existing constituency, and coterminous with High Peak Borough. They noted that the Hope Valley is currently divided between local authorities and constituencies. Given the broad level of support for the proposed Erewash and Chesterfield constituencies they also recommended the initial proposals be retained, and we agree.

3.47 Our assistant commissioners considered that the evidence to revise our North East Derbyshire constituency, such that it is coterminous with the district of the same name, is compelling, and noted

that doing so also reunites the town of Dronfield – thus restoring local ties. They also noted that this also limited the amount of change from the existing pattern of constituencies. While a certain amount of change is necessary in the south of the county given the loss of one constituency, the assistant commissioners suggested that these recommendations reflect the evidence presented to them during the consultation stages. Therefore, they proposed revised constituencies of North East Derbyshire, Bolsover, Derbyshire Dales, and Amber Valley. We agree.

3.48 In the City of Derby we proposed constituencies of Derby North and Derby South. The names of these constituencies were particularly objected to as some respondents considered that the names of Derby East and Derby West better reflected the orientation of the initial proposals. The Conservative Party and Liberal Democrat Party both submitted identical counter-proposals for the constituencies in Derby. They proposed that the Derwent ward be included in a Derby East constituency and the Sinfin ward be included in the Derby West constituency. Both political parties considered that including the Derwent ward in the Derby East constituency united the community of Chaddesden. They also considered that the Sinfin ward had better links to its west over the railway line with the wards of Blagreaves and Normanton than it did with Alvaston to the north.

3.49 Amanda Solloway, former MP for Derby North (BCE-28246 and BCE-32035), Adrian Pegg (BCE-32033), Councillor Steven Hassall (BCE-32040) and Councillor Richard Hudson (BCE-32065) all supported the inclusion of Derwent in a constituency with Chaddesden. Councillor Hassall said

‘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.’

3.50 Dame Margaret Beckett, MP for Derby South (BCE-31998), highlighted on day one of the Derby public hearing the shared links between the areas of Sinfen, Arboretum, Normanton and Osmaston. She stated ‘Although over the years ward boundaries and ward names have varied, to me the core part of Derby South has always been in the inner city areas, which in today’s constituency are mostly reflected in the wards called Arboretum, Normanton and Osmaston and Sinfen, which now nearly everybody now calls just Sinfen but does contain the old Osmaston ward.’

3.51 We received some objection to the inclusion of the South Derbyshire District ward of Aston in the Derby South constituency. Representations from residents of the Aston ward highlighted that it was predominantly rural in nature and was separated from Derby by the A50. These representations included two letter writing campaigns (BCE-34261 and BCE-41166). We noted that the Conservative Party, Labour Party and Liberal Democrat Party largely supported our proposed South Derbyshire constituency which did not include the Aston ward. We received a counter-proposal from Aaron Fear (BCE-41049) that included Aston ward in a Derbyshire South constituency, as part of a proposal that reconfigures much of the southern half of Derbyshire.

3.52 Our assistant commissioners were persuaded by the counter-proposal made by the Conservative Party, Liberal Democrat Party and others to create constituencies of Derby East and Derby West. They considered that the Derwent ward be included in the Derby East constituency, given the evidence provided indicating its close links with the Chaddesden area. They were also persuaded by the evidence that the Sinfen ward be included in the Derby West constituency where the railway line was more easily crossed via the A5111. They were not able to address the concerns of Aston ward as doing so would result in significant reconfigurations to constituencies in Derbyshire. Therefore, they recommended no changes to the proposed South Derbyshire constituency, and we agree.

3.53 Given the strong evidence received regarding the city constituencies, and the limits of the county boundary towards the south, and loss of a constituency in the centre of the county, the assistant commissioners were persuaded by the arguments received and proposed changes to the constituencies of Derby East and Derby West as part of our revised proposals. They also recommended that the South Derbyshire constituency as put forward in the initial proposals should remain, and we agree with their recommendations.

Leicestershire, Leicester, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Nottingham, and Rutland

3.54 Under the initial proposals, we proposed two cross-county constituencies: a Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituency which crossed the boundaries of Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire, and a Daventry and Lutterworth constituency which crossed the boundaries of Northamptonshire and Leicestershire.

3.55 As previously detailed in this chapter, we are not minded to propose different sub-regions in formulating our revised proposals. Therefore, we continue to propose two constituencies that cross county boundaries. The Conservative Party supported the constituencies of Loughborough and Rushcliffe South, and Daventry and Lutterworth, subject to a constituency name change. The Labour Party proposed an alternative to the Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituency and the Liberal Democrat Party proposed changes to both constituencies. We did receive some further opposition to these proposals which is detailed later in this report.

3.56 Of the existing 11 constituencies in Nottinghamshire, six are currently within 5% of the electoral quota: Ashfield; Bassetlaw; Mansfield; Newark; Rushcliffe; and Sherwood. The other five existing constituencies all fall below the permitted electorate range.

3.57 Under our initial proposals, we retained the existing constituency of Mansfield completely unchanged and noted that it was coterminous with Mansfield District. We also retained the existing constituency of Bassetlaw completely unchanged. The proposed Ashfield constituency was only changed to reflect new local government ward boundaries. Our proposed Newark constituency had also been changed to reflect local government ward boundaries and to include the wards of Ollerton and Boughton from the existing Sherwood constituency, to which we transferred the wards of Lowdham and Dover Beck. We also included the Gedling Borough wards covering the town of Arnold in the proposed Sherwood constituency.

3.58 In formulating the initial proposals, we noted that the existing Nottingham constituencies were all significantly below the permitted electorate range. We therefore decided to expand these constituencies to bring them within the permitted electorate range while trying to respect the River Trent as a physical boundary. We proposed extending the existing Nottingham South constituency south-westwards to include seven wards, including the town of Beeston in a Nottingham South and Beeston constituency. Our Nottingham East and Carlton constituency was based on an expanded Nottingham East constituency to include eight wards from the existing Gedling constituency, including the town of Carlton. We proposed a Nottingham North constituency which included the

Nottingham City wards of Sherwood and Berridge but did not include the Nottingham City ward of Bilborough which we had included in the proposed Broxtowe and Hucknall constituency. We also included the Ashfield Borough wards covering the town of Hucknall in the Broxtowe and Hucknall constituency.

3.59 In the south of the county, we proposed that the existing Rushcliffe constituency be divided. We proposed a West Bridgford constituency that included the town itself, parts of Rushcliffe borough to its east and the Nottingham City wards of Clifton North and Clifton South. The south-western wards of Rushcliffe, such as Gotham and Keyworth & Wolds were included in the cross-county constituency of Loughborough and Rushcliffe South.

3.60 In response to the consultation on the initial proposals, the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) supported the proposed constituencies of Bassetlaw, Mansfield, Ashfield, Newark, and West Bridgford, although they did consider this constituency should be renamed. They submitted a counter-proposal for the remaining constituencies.

3.61 The Labour Party (BCE-31225, and BCE-40905) proposed an alternative configuration for the constituencies of Newark, Nottingham East and Carlton, and Sherwood. They supported the constituencies of Bassetlaw, Mansfield and Ashfield. They provided some general support for the other constituencies.

3.62 The Conservative Party (BCE-30422 and BCE-40904) supported the constituencies of Mansfield, Ashfield, Sherwood,

Nottingham North, Nottingham East and Carlton, and West Bridgford. They submitted a counter-proposal for the remaining constituencies.

3.63 Our proposal to retain the existing Mansfield constituency was supported by all the political parties. It was also supported by Mansfield District Council (BCE-15766) which stated ‘By retaining the existing constituency boundary and maintaining coterminosity with the District of Mansfield boundary, this will facilitate the administration of elections and also enable the public to identify with the constituency.’ Our assistant commissioners recommended no changes to this constituency and, given the general consensus in supporting the initial proposals, we agree.

3.64 The Conservative Party proposed modifying the existing constituency of Bassetlaw which we proposed be unchanged under the initial proposals. They suggested that the ward of Sturton be included in the Newark constituency to reflect its ties with Rampton. This proposal was supported by Rod Pickford (BCE-24347), Secretary of the Nottinghamshire & Derbyshire Community Union. He noted: ‘The three remaining coal powered power stations are currently split, two, Staythorpe and Cottam in the Newark constituency, which also houses the now defunct High Marnham power station. The other West Burton is in the Bassetlaw constituency and the Sturton ward ... I would therefore suggest there is huge industrial synergy between these local parishes and that it makes great sense to transfer the Sturton ward to Newark constituency, in order to concentrate the three local economies with their

unique relationship to the river Trent for water extraction.’ Both the Labour Party and Liberal Democrat Party opposed this counter-proposal. Our assistant commissioners were not persuaded that there should be modifications to the existing Bassetlaw constituency, having regard to the potential knock-on effects. We agree.

3.65 We received some opposition to our proposed constituencies of Newark and Sherwood. Opposition was generally received to the inclusion of the wards of Ollerton and Boughton in the Newark constituency rather than Sherwood, and the exclusion of East Bridgford from the Newark constituency. The Labour Party’s counter-proposal suggested that the wards of Ollerton and Boughton be included in the Sherwood constituency. They noted that ‘these wards include villages with a coal mining tradition and have ties to similar communities such as Edwinstowe, Bilsthorpe, Rainworth and Rufford.’ Neal Mitchell (BCE-24701), Councillor Mike Pringle (BCE-23832), Robert Murray (BCE-25203) and Steven Willis (BCE-24236) all made similar arguments. Mr Willis stated that ‘we have no sense of belonging to Newark, but we do very much identify with Sherwood. Our mining history, our ancient woodland, our health and education services, our entertainment and our leisure all shout for an identity that is Sherwood.’ Richard Holloway (BCE-22177) also shared this view, stating ‘We have very few links with Newark, to which there is only an occasional bus service and no rail link. We do not shop there and nor do most of those living in these wards. The main bus service is to Mansfield via Edwinstowe and Clipstone, and our FE College is in Mansfield.

Many Edwinstowe children come to our secondary school, The Dukeries Academy.’ In his counter-proposal, he suggested that the Dover Beck ward, which is currently divided between the Sherwood and Newark constituencies, and the Lowdham ward be transferred in their entirety to Newark. He further suggested that the Farnsfield ward, which is currently in the Sherwood constituency, also be transferred to Newark, which would allow the Ollerton and Boughton wards to remain in Sherwood. This counter-proposal was also put forward by Margaret Staples (BCE-23998) who argued that the Farnsfield ward ‘has much stronger links with Newark.’ We received a letter-writing campaign (BCE-33209), including 150 signatories, supporting Ollerton and Boughton being included in a Sherwood constituency.

3.66 We did receive some support for the inclusion of Ollerton in the Newark constituency. Donald Brown (BCE-29617) considered that Ollerton had close links with Tuxford, particularly in terms of schooling. He also disputed some of the mining links with Sherwood and considered that the River Maun divided Ollerton from Edwinstowe. On day one of the Lincoln public hearing, Mark Spencer, MP for Sherwood (BCE-32302) provided details on links between Ollerton and Newark. He stated that ‘people do commute on a regular basis from Ollerton to the Newark area. In fact, the Ollerton and District Economic Forum has now set up a minibus service to move people from Ollerton to large employers in the Newark area because of that regular commute. It is also worth saying that a number of pupils from the Ollerton area also travel to the Tuxford school and vice versa,

coming backwards and forwards, despite there being a secondary school within Ollerton itself.'

3.67 As noted above, we also received some opposition to the proposed inclusion of East Bridgford in the West Bridgford constituency rather than Newark. The majority of respondents from East Bridgford considered that they had no links with West Bridgford and that their area was more rural in nature and more aligned with Newark and Bingham. Ian Seel (BCE-24890) stated 'East Bridgford is a small rural community which has little in common with the two major suburban areas in the proposed constituency, namely Clifton and West Bridgford. The nearest town is Bingham (3 miles) where the local secondary school is situated and where local shops and services are located ... Newark is the closest major town, within just 15 minutes travelling time.' Similar arguments were made by other respondents from East Bridgford. We also received a petition (BCE-29078) signed by over 300 people, supporting the inclusion of the East Bridgford ward in a Newark constituency.

3.68 In light of the evidence received, our assistant commissioners investigated alternative proposals. They considered that persuasive evidence had been received to include Ollerton and Boughton in the Sherwood constituency and East Bridgford in the Newark constituency. However, they noted that including Ollerton and Boughton in the Sherwood constituency would result in it being above the permitted electorate range. They noted that some support had been received for the transfer of the Farnsfield ward to the Newark

constituency. Janet Ford (BCE-17475) stated 'It is absolute nonsense that the boundary should fall between villages of Edingley and Farnsfield. These villages are just about joined in inhabitants and issues faced. Children from Farnsfield go to school in Southwell and the boundary isolates Farnsfield from issues that concern the village.' Our assistant commissioners noted that including the Farnsfield ward in the Newark constituency would create an apparent geographic 'bottleneck' in the Sherwood constituency in the town of Rainworth. They visited the area and concluded that the apparent issues were not supported on the ground, and that good road links were retained within the Sherwood constituency.

3.69 However, even without the Farnsfield ward the Sherwood constituency would be above the permitted range. Our assistant commissioners recommended that the wards of Dover Beck and Lowdham be included in the Newark constituency, as suggested by Richard Holloway and Margaret Staples. They further recommended that the East Bridgford ward, proposed to be transferred to the West Bridgford constituency under the initial proposals, be included in the Newark constituency. They noted that at present all of the Lowdham ward and most of the Dover Beck ward are included in the Newark constituency. They noted that some evidence had been received supporting the inclusion of Dover Beck in the Sherwood constituency. However, given the persuasive evidence in relation to the ties between East Bridgford and the Newark constituency, and Ollerton and Boughton to the Sherwood constituency, they recommended these

constituencies be reconfigured. We accept their recommendations for revised constituencies of Newark and Sherwood.

3.70 In the area of Nottingham City we received significant opposition to the inclusion of the Nottingham City ward of Bilborough in the Broxtowe and Hucknall constituency. We received a letter writing campaign (BCE-23002) from residents opposing the initial proposals and supporting the inclusion of Bilborough in the Nottingham North constituency, as well as many individual representations expressing objections to the proposals. Many of those responding, such as Karen Shaw (BCE-24268), highlighted that residents in Bilborough ‘benefit from projects in Nottingham North such as early intervention, regenerating the outer estates.’

3.71 The Conservative Party proposed that Bilborough be included in a Nottingham South and Beeston constituency. They were concerned that, under the initial proposals, the Nottingham City Council area was divided between five constituencies. Instead they proposed that the wards of Toton & Chilwell Meadows, and Chilwell West be included in a Broxtowe and Hucknall constituency. The Liberal Democrat Party proposed that Bilborough be included in a Nottingham North constituency, and objected to the Conservative Party proposal, which they considered divided the area of Chilwell between constituencies. In addition, the Liberal Democrat Party proposed further changes to constituencies across Nottinghamshire which would require reconfiguring the proposed constituencies of Broxtowe and Hucknall, and Sherwood. The Labour Party did not make a

counter-proposal for the Bilborough ward. They considered that the alternative proposed by the Conservative Party divided the Chilwell area and the Liberal Democrat counter-proposal divided the Nuthall area.

3.72 We also received a counter-proposal from Nottingham City Council (BCE-30420), which also felt that too many constituencies had bisected the Nottingham City council area in the initial proposals. Under its proposals, the number of constituencies included in this area was reduced to three, but the remainder of the county has been significantly reconfigured.

3.73 We did receive some opposition to our initial proposals that included the areas of Beeston, Chilwell, and Attenborough in a Nottingham South and Beeston constituency. Michael Taylor (BCE-16634) stated ‘I do not think that the population and the issues concerning Beeston, Chilwell and Attenborough are the same as those in South Nottingham, with which it is proposed to combine us. I think the two areas have a different character, needs and identity.’ This view was shared by other respondents such as Pam Price (BCE-19372) and Andrew Barker (BCE-21551). We noted that some support was also received for the inclusion of the Beeston area in a constituency with Nottingham South. James Jacobs (BCE-22295) considered ‘Most people in Beeston have a greater connection with people living in places like Wollaton, Dunkirk, Lenton and the City Centre than they do with people living in the North of the current Broxtowe constituency.’ Andrew Winter (BCE-18623) provided a similar response.

3.74 Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence and recommended that the Bilborough ward be included in a Nottingham South and Beeston constituency. Consequently they proposed that the wards of Toton & Chilwell Meadows and Chilwell West be included in the Broxtowe and Hucknall constituency. They noted the comments from the Liberal Democrat Party that this would divide the Chilwell community but considered that the initial proposals caused far more division in splitting Bilborough from Nottingham and dividing Nottingham City between five constituencies. They did not consider that persuasive evidence had been received to propose wider changes to constituencies across the Nottinghamshire area. We agree. The assistant commissioners also recommended no change to the proposed Ashfield constituency, and we agree.

3.75 To the south of Nottingham, in our initial proposals we proposed a West Bridgford constituency that included the Nottingham City wards of Clifton South and Clifton North. Sharon Smith (BCE-26205) supported this proposal, noting that ‘logistically and economically this makes complete sense as we are already closely linked with West Bridgford and indeed most residents use West Bridgford centre for shopping and leisure rather than cross the River Trent to Nottingham.’ However, a number of residents in the Clifton area and Rushcliffe Borough Council (BCE-29294) opposed the proposal. Allen Graham, the Council Chief Executive, noted ‘Whilst I accept on a map there is logic to including these two wards within a constituency with West

Bridgford due to the line of the River Trent, this link does not exist in reality. Access in and out of Clifton is connected through the A453 into the City rather than into West Bridgford or alternatively to Ruddington to the south of West Bridgford. Clifton has public transport links to the City with the recently installed Tram line extension to Clifton into the city which provides direct access from Clifton into the city of Nottingham and bypasses West Bridgford.’

3.76 The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) supported our initial proposals for West Bridgford, although did propose the constituency be called Rushcliffe. The Conservative Party (BCE-30422 and BCE-40904) also supported the configuration of the constituency but proposed it be renamed North Rushcliffe. The Labour Party accepted the proposal but noted ‘we do not accept that using the River Trent as a boundary is necessarily an important matter of principle.’

3.77 Our assistant commissioners recommended no further changes to the West Bridgford constituency (apart from in relation to East Bridgford detailed earlier in the chapter). They noted the opposition regarding the Clifton area being included in a West Bridgford constituency but considered that persuasive evidence had not been received to modify the proposals, particularly as it would require consequential changes to constituencies across parts of Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire. They were, however, inclined to agree with the proposal of the Conservative Party (BCE-30422 and BCE-40904) that the constituency be called North Rushcliffe,

to recognise the local authority area, and considered that the name would be more inclusive to communities outside the town of West Bridgford. We accept their recommendations.

Leicestershire, Leicester, and Rutland

3.78 At present, Leicestershire (including the City of Leicester and Rutland) has 10 constituencies. Of these, nine are within the permitted electorate range, and Leicester West has an electorate more than 5% below the electoral quota, with 62,793 electors. Under our initial proposals we suggested changes to the existing constituencies of North West Leicestershire, Bosworth, Charnwood, South Leicestershire, Harborough, Rutland and Melton, Loughborough, and Leicester West. As part of our initial proposals we also suggested retaining the existing constituencies of Leicester South and Leicester East.

3.79 Our proposal to retain the existing constituencies of Leicester South and Leicester East was largely supported. The Labour Party (BCE-31225 and BCE-40905), Conservative Party (BCE-30422 and BCE-40904) and Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) all supported retaining these two existing constituencies. Additionally, they also supported our proposed Leicester West constituency. Under our initial proposals this constituency included the Blaby District wards of Millfield, Ravenhurst and Fosse, and Winstanley. The Conservative Party considered that, 'These areas have close ties with Leicester. The city boundary at this point cuts through continuous residential development.' The Labour Party

considered our proposal was 'the obvious option' and the Liberal Democrat Party stated 'The three Blaby wards added make up the communities of Braunstone Town and Thorpe Astley which have strong links with the neighbourhoods of Braunstone and Braunstone Frith.'

3.80 Our proposed North West Leicestershire constituency included the two wards covering the town of Shepshed but did not include the five wards along the southern edge of North West Leicestershire district. We included these five wards in our proposed Bosworth constituency. In response to the consultation, we have received submissions from the Labour Party and Liberal Democrat Party suggesting that the existing North West Leicestershire constituency be retained unchanged. This would result in the Shepshed area being included in another constituency and the five wards along the southern boundary of North West Leicestershire being reunited in a constituency that would be contiguous with the local authority boundary.

3.81 The North West Leicestershire Conservative Association (BCE-16980), John Searle (BCE-20008), Packington Parish Council (BCE-20391), Ashby de la Zouch Town Council (BCE-21143), Measham Parish Council (BCE-22307), the MP for North West Leicestershire, Andrew Bridgen (BCE-25984) and North West Leicestershire Labour Party (BCE-27067) all supported the existing constituency of North West Leicestershire being retained. North West Leicestershire Labour Party stated that 'The current arrangement works well for North West Leicestershire with the constituency being coterminous with the

local authority. The villages of Ibstock and Ellistown have much greater local ties with Coalville than either Market Bosworth or Hinckley. Similarly, Shepshed has greater local ties with Loughborough.'

3.82 In its response to the initial consultation, the Conservative Party outlined their support for our proposed North West Leicestershire constituency. They indicated that 'Shepshed has ties and road links with Coalville and we note that Shepshed was previously part of the North West Leicestershire constituency.' During the secondary consultation, the Conservative Party recognised that opposition had been received to the initial proposals in North West Leicestershire. They considered that if the existing North West Leicestershire constituency was retained then the Liberal Democrat counter-proposal for reconfiguring neighbouring constituencies was a better way of achieving this than the Labour Party proposal.

3.83 As outlined in representations, retaining the existing constituency of North West Leicestershire would require consequential changes to be made to the constituencies in the area of Bosworth, Charnwood, and Loughborough and Rushcliffe South. The Liberal Democrat Party and Labour Party proposed alternative configurations for how these constituencies could be reconfigured.

3.84 The Liberal Democrat Party suggested changes to only the existing constituencies of Bosworth, Charnwood, and Loughborough and Rushcliffe South. They proposed including the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough ward of Ratby, Bagworth

and Thornton in the Bosworth constituency. They also suggested that the two wards covering Shepshed be included in a Loughborough and Keyworth constituency along with The Wolds ward, and proposed including the Barrow and Sileby West, and Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle wards in the Charnwood constituency. They considered that advantages of this counter-proposal were that the Mountsorrel area would not be divided between constituencies and that the cross-county constituency would have increased road crossings across the county boundary. This counter-proposal was also suggested by Andrew Bridgen MP.

3.85 The Labour Party (BCE-31225 and BCE-40905) proposed changes to the constituencies of Bosworth, Charnwood, Loughborough and Rushcliffe South, South Leicestershire, Harborough, Rutland and Melton, and the cross-county constituency of Daventry and Lutterworth. They proposed that the North West Leicestershire constituency remain unchanged from the existing arrangement, and that the Bosworth constituency include the Blaby District wards of Normanton, Croft Hill, and Stanton and Flamville. They further proposed that the cross-county constituency of Daventry and Lutterworth include the wards of Ullesthorpe, Dunton, and Peatling, rather than the wards of Fleckney and Lubenham, which they proposed be included in a Harborough constituency. They suggested a Blaby constituency which included 12 Blaby District wards covering the towns of Blaby, Countesthorpe, Cosby, Narborough and Glenfield, four wards from Harborough District covering the town of Broughton Astley and three Hinckley

and Bosworth borough wards covering the towns of Ratby, Groby and Stanton. They considered that this constituency 'would be united by comprising similar communities in the M1 corridor.'

3.86 In the constituencies of Charnwood, and Loughborough and Rushcliffe South, the Labour Party proposed different configurations. They suggested a Loughborough constituency which included the towns of Loughborough, Sileby and Shepshed. They also proposed an alternative cross-county constituency which it called Charnwood and Keyworth. This constituency would include 13 Charnwood District wards that cover the towns of Anstey, Mountsorrel, Thurmaston, Birstall, and Syson and five Rushcliffe borough wards that include the towns of Keyworth and East Leake. As a result of their counter-proposals in Leicestershire, the Labour Party proposed retaining the existing constituency of Rutland and Melton.

3.87 The North West Leicestershire Labour Party (BCE-27067) proposed a counter-proposal similar to that of the Labour Party but it only focused on the constituencies of North West Leicestershire, Bosworth, Charnwood, and Loughborough and Rushcliffe South. The differences were that the cross-county constituency of Charnwood and Keyworth did not include the Queniborough ward and the Bosworth constituency included the wards of Ratby, Bagworth and Thornton, and Markfield, Stanton and Fieldhead, thereby retaining the existing constituency.

3.88 Jonathan Stansby (BCE-16223) put forward a counter-proposal for all of Leicestershire. The investigations of this proposal identified that it reconfigured the cross-county constituency in a way that reduced road communication links between Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire. Aaron Fear (BCE-31214 and BCE-41049) also proposed a counter-proposal for Leicestershire. Mr Fear proposed retaining the existing constituencies of Rutland and Melton, and Harborough. He proposed constituencies of Bosworth and North West Leicestershire which were identical to those proposed by the Liberal Democrat Party. Aaron Fear suggested that the constituency of Harborough include the wards of Ullesthorpe, Dunton, Peatling, and the four wards covering the town of Broughton Astley. He proposed changes to the Leicester West constituency; he suggested it include the two wards covering Birstall rather than the wards of Winstanley, Millfield, and Ravenhurst and Fosse which he included in a Blaby constituency. Consequently, he proposed changes to the Charnwood, and Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituencies. He suggested the two wards covering Shepshed be included in a Loughborough constituency and the Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle, Barrow and Sileby West, The Wolds, and Queniborough wards be included in a Charnwood constituency.

3.89 We have received representations opposing our initial proposals in Leicestershire and supporting some of the counter-proposals suggested. We received representations indicating that Shepshed and Loughborough share close ties. Stephen Hughes (BCE-25215) was

concerned at the loss of Shepshed from a Loughborough constituency. He said 'Many people in Shepshed work, shop and use their leisure time in Loughborough. There is synergy between the two towns in relation to both transport and education.' Rosemary Blake (BCE-17535) made similar points: 'Shepshed looks to Loughborough for shopping and social life as it is a short bus ride away.' She also highlighted that Shepshed and Loughborough had a shared history of 'textiles and hosiery.' Under all the counter-proposals outlined above the Shepshed area would be included in a constituency with Loughborough.

3.90 Representations have been received opposing a cross-county constituency that includes parts of Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire. As outlined, different configurations of this constituency have been proposed. The Liberal Democrat Party proposal suggested that The Wolds ward be included in the Loughborough and Keyworth constituency. Lesley Blount (BCE-28075) supported the inclusion of this ward in this constituency, stating that 'our main service centres are in Loughborough, Barrow upon Soar and East Leake for shopping, schools, doctors, dentists and social events and entertainment.' She also indicated that the public transport links from The Wolds ward are with Nottingham and Loughborough and not with Leicester. The MP for Loughborough, Nicky Morgan (BCE-29340 and BCE-41040), also highlighted community ties between The Wolds and Loughborough: 'Wolds residents shop in Loughborough send their children to secondary school in Loughborough ... Limehurst Academy in the heart of Loughborough is now considered the catchment school for families in The Wolds villages of Cotes and

Hoton.' She also stated that 'residents of Loughborough use The Wolds for cycling, walking, horse riding and other rural leisure activities.'

3.91 Under our initial proposals we included the Barrow and Sileby West, and Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle wards in the Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituency. Under the counter-proposals outlined these wards have either been included in the Charnwood constituency or the Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituency. Peter Knott (BCE-29963) stated 'Historically Quorn is part of Charnwood.' This view was supported by Councillor Richard Shepherd (BCE-26267) who considered that these two wards be included in a Loughborough constituency along with the ward of Sileby. Sileby Parish Council (BCE-23990) wanted 'all of Sileby to be in the new Loughborough and Rushcliffe constituency as we have an affinity to Loughborough, and this will keep all of Sileby together and not split.' Councillor Hilary Fryer (BCE-15727) put forward a different view 'Sileby West should remain with Sileby in either the Loughborough constituency or Charnwood ... Mountsorrel Castle is in a similar position as Sileby West and should be included with Mountsorrel and be in the Charnwood constituency.'

3.92 Similarly, we received different views on which wards should be included in the constituencies of South Leicestershire, Harborough, and the cross-county constituency of Daventry and Lutterworth. Opposition was received to including the town of Lutterworth in a constituency with Daventry. At the public hearing held in Northampton, David Gair (BCE-32271) outlined that 'we [Lutterworth] have no

social, economic, political or transport links with Daventry.’ This view was shared by other residents of Lutterworth, including Geraldine Robinson (BCE-18878) who indicated that ‘there is no public transport from Lutterworth to Daventry.’ Opposition to the proposed constituency was also received from respondents who would remain in the South Leicestershire constituency. Maggie Pankhurst (BCE-19826) considered that the initial proposals would ‘leave villages such as Ullesthorpe, Bitteswell etc adrift from their anchor point which is Lutterworth.’ Opposition was also received from residents of the Fleckney and Lubenham wards; Emily Marriott (BCE-29620) stated that ‘everybody in Fleckney has the most links with the Harborough area – our local high schools are in the area, that’s our Guiding and Scouting district, it’s where most of our buses go.’ Respondents in these areas supported being included in a constituency with Market Harborough.

3.93 We also received representations that opposed counter-proposals to include more wards from the existing South Leicestershire constituency in the Daventry and Lutterworth constituency. Ullesthorpe Parish Council (BCE-26963) objected to the counter-proposal, which would include the parish in the Daventry and Lutterworth constituency. Claybrooke Magna Parish Council (BCE-26281) had a similar view and also stated it supported the initial proposals. Opposition was also received to counter-proposals that included the wards of Stanton and Flamville, Croft Hill, and Normanton in the Bosworth constituency. Thurlaston Parish Council (BCE-28205), Croft Parish Council (BCE-28249) and Sharnford Parish Council (BCE-27697) all opposed being included in a Bosworth

constituency. They all supported being included in a South Leicestershire constituency, citing community ties such as the Fosse Villages Neighbourhood Plan.

3.94 Our assistant commissioners presented to us the evidence that had been received. Their view was that the evidence received supported retaining the existing constituency of North West Leicestershire. They noted that this had largely been proposed in all counter-proposals received and had been supported locally, highlighting the representations of The North West Leicestershire Conservative Association (BCE-16980), John Searle (BCE-20008), Packington Parish Council (BCE-20391), Ashby de la Zouch Town Council (BCE-21143), Measham Parish Council (BCE-22307), the MP for North West Leicestershire, Andrew Bridgen (BCE-25984) and North West Leicestershire Labour Party (BCE-27067).

3.95 The assistant commissioners recognised that including this constituency in the revised proposals would require changes to the constituencies of Bosworth, Charnwood, and Loughborough and Rushcliffe South. They presented to us the different counter-proposals received and had considered whether modifications to other constituencies should also be included in any revised proposals. They noted the opposition that had been received to the cross-county constituency of Daventry and Lutterworth and had investigated the other counter-proposals received in this area. They did not consider that compelling evidence had been received to modify the Daventry and Lutterworth, Harborough, South Leicestershire, and Rutland and Melton constituencies.

3.96 They acknowledged the opposition to the inclusion of Lutterworth with Daventry in a constituency and did not consider that compelling evidence had been received to include further wards from Harborough district in this constituency. They noted that some support had been received for the proposed South Leicestershire constituency including from Claybrooke Magna Parish Council (BCE-26281) which supported the initial proposals and opposed being included in a Daventry and Lutterworth constituency. Furthermore, they considered that some support for the proposed South Leicestershire constituency had been received, such as representations from Thurlaston Parish Council (BCE-28205), Croft Parish Council (BCE-28249) and Sharnford Parish Council (BCE-27697).

3.97 In the north of the county, the assistant commissioners also outlined to us the counter-proposals that had been received for the constituencies of Loughborough and Rushcliffe South, and Charnwood. As a result of retaining the existing constituency of North West Leicestershire, they presented that the Shepshed area would need to be included with Loughborough in a constituency. Furthermore, they considered that evidence had been received (such as representations from Nicky Morgan MP) which had provided community evidence that The Wolds ward should also be included in a constituency with Loughborough and Rushcliffe South.

3.98 The assistant commissioners were not persuaded by a representation from the Labour Party, which proposed a constituency that linked parts of Rushcliffe with several wards to the south of Loughborough, called Charnwood and Keyworth. While under this proposal the existing constituency is retained unchanged, they considered that the consequential changes to constituencies in Leicestershire would affect Harborough, South Leicestershire, Daventry and Lutterworth, and Bosworth, and create an irregularly shaped Blaby constituency.

3.99 Our assistant commissioners further considered that other counter-proposals, such as that of Aaron Fear, who proposes changes to many constituencies in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire, and Jonathan Stansby, who had submitted a counter-proposal that contained a Blaby constituency, did not better reflect the statutory factors.

3.100 They recommended to us that the Liberal Democrat proposal for this area should be adopted. Under this proposal the two wards covering the town of Shepshed and The Wolds ward would be included in a Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituency. Additionally, this proposal would mean the wards of Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle, and Barrow and Sileby West would be included in the Charnwood constituency. They recognised that representations suggested that both these wards had community ties with the neighbouring wards of Mountsorrel and Sileby and that the preference was for all four wards to be included in a Loughborough constituency. The investigations of our assistant commissioners indicated that it

is not possible to include all these wards in a Loughborough constituency, with also The Wolds ward and the two Shepshed wards. Under this proposal both the Loughborough and Rushcliffe South, and Charnwood constituencies would fall outside the permitted electorate range.

3.101 The assistant commissioners concluded that the Liberal Democrat Party counter-proposal for Leicestershire strikes the best balance between the criteria we work to. The retention of an additional existing constituency unchanged in North West Leicestershire, which is also coterminous with its local authority of the same name, and the restoring of ties between the wards of Shepshed East, Shepshed West, and The Wolds to the town of Loughborough; the creation of a Bosworth constituency wholly contained within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough; and the unification of the villages of Mountsorrel and Sileby into a single constituency were advantages of the counter-proposal. In keeping consistent with the titling of the North Rushcliffe constituency, and in accordance with the Commission's policy on the naming of constituencies, our assistant commissioners recommended that the Loughborough and Rushcliffe South constituency be called Loughborough and South Rushcliffe, as suggested by the Conservative Party. The assistant commissioners did not propose changes to our initial proposals for the constituencies of Leicester West, Leicester East, Leicester South, Harborough, South Leicestershire, and Rutland and Melton. We accept their recommendations.

Northamptonshire

3.102 Of the existing seven constituencies in Northamptonshire, two are currently within 5% of the electoral quota: Daventry and Wellingborough. The existing constituencies of Northampton South, Northampton North, and Kettering fall below the permitted electorate range, and South Northamptonshire and Corby are above the permitted electorate range.

3.103 Under our initial proposals we proposed changes to all of the existing constituencies in Northamptonshire. As the existing Corby constituency is above 5% of the electoral quota, we transferred the Irthlingborough Waterloo, and Irthlingborough John Pyel wards to a Wellingborough constituency. We proposed transferring the Wellingborough borough ward of Finedon to a Kettering constituency and the Wellingborough borough wards of Wollaston and Bozeat to a Northampton South constituency. These changes resulted in both the Kettering and Northampton South constituencies being within the permitted electorate range. To bring the Northampton North constituency within the electorate quota we included the Northampton Borough wards of Park, Riverside, and Billing. We proposed including two Daventry district wards, Woodford and Weedon, in a South Northamptonshire constituency and all other Daventry District wards in the Daventry and Lutterworth constituency.

3.104 We received significant opposition to our proposed Wellingborough constituency. Respondents particularly opposed the existing Wellingborough constituency not being retained, without change, and objected to the wards of Finedon, Wollaston, Bozeat, and Harrowden & Sywell being included in different constituencies.

3.105 Peter Bone, MP for Wellingborough, Philip Hollobone, MP for Kettering, and Tom Pursglove, MP for Corby, made a joint representation (BCE-30421), in which they outlined a counter-proposal for the constituencies of Wellingborough, Kettering, and Corby. They proposed that the existing Wellingborough constituency be retained, which would result in the ward of Harrowden & Sywell being split between constituencies because of local government boundary changes in the area. As a result of the proposals for Wellingborough, the two Wellingborough wards would be retained in a Corby constituency. To bring the Corby and Kettering constituencies within the permitted range, they suggested including the Corby Borough wards of Rural West, and Stanion & Corby Village in the Kettering constituency. Mr Pursglove made a further representation (BCE-30602) in which he outlined that the Stanion & Corby Village ward could be split between constituencies, with the areas of Stanion and Little Stanion included in a Kettering constituency and Corby Village included in a Corby constituency.

3.106 David Wilson (BCE-18656) outlined why he considered the wards of Wollaston and Bozeat should be included in a Wellingborough constituency: 'Wollaston and Bozeat are very much joined communities and both have strong

links with Wellingborough through work, schools, amenities, sport, business and shopping.' Similar representations were made from residents in the Wollaston and Bozeat wards. At the Northampton public hearing Councillor Michael Clarke (BCE-32128) suggested that the residents of these wards 'do not look naturally towards Northampton for their services or for shopping, or for their schooling. The residents of these communities look essentially northwards, eastwards in the direction of Wellingborough ... many of the residents locally send their children to Wrenn school in Wellingborough.' Peter Bone MP made a similar point at the Northampton public hearing (BCE-32084), saying 'Wollaston has a particular link with the seat of Wellingborough because most of the children that go to Wollaston secondary school, a big secondary school, in fact come from the Wellingborough area, the link with Irchester – I mean, there is a footpath between the two large villages.' Some respondents were also concerned that under the initial proposals the county division of Irchester would be divided between constituencies.

3.107 Representations were also received supporting Finedon being included in a Wellingborough constituency. At the Northampton public hearing, Councillor Andrew Weatherill, representing Finedon Parish Council (BCE-32159), highlighted links between Finedon and Wellingborough, stating that 'the largest landlord in Finedon is social housing provider Wellingborough Homes ... the Finedon and Wellingborough schools are linked in the Wellingborough district.' He also raised concerns that the initial proposals divided the county division of Finedon.

3.108 We also received representations supporting the inclusion of part of the Harrowden & Sywell ward in the Wellingborough constituency. Hardwick Parish Meeting (BCE-26681 and BCE-35624), Little Harrowden Parish Council (BCE-18181), Councillor Jennie Bone (BCE-32096) and Councillor Mike Hallam (BCE-32156) all supported this proposal.

3.109 The Conservative Party put forward a similar pattern to that proposed by Mr Bone, Mr Pursglove and Mr Hollobone. In their representations (BCE-30422 and BCE-40904) the Conservative Party did not suggest that the Harrowden & Sywell ward be divided between constituencies. They considered that a benefit of its counter-proposal was that Wellingborough borough would be divided between two constituencies rather than four as it had been under our initial proposals. This was a concern raised by Wellingborough Borough Council (BCE-24530 and BCE-30390): 'The BCE should reconsider its decision to split one historical borough across four parliamentary constituencies; this would have a divisive impact and cause considerable confusion amongst the electorate.'

3.110 The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28248) and Labour Party (BCE-31225 and BCE-40905) both supported our proposed Wellingborough, Corby, and Kettering constituencies. The Labour Party considered that the inclusion of Irthlingborough in a Wellingborough constituency was 'justified as it has ties to Higham Ferrers and Rushden.' Edmund Worthy (BCE-16094) considered the addition of Irthlingborough was 'logical' and he also supported the inclusion

of Finedon in the same constituency. Mark Pacan (BCE-18062) supported the proposal and stated that 'Irthlingborough has much more in common with nearby Wellingborough and Rushden than it does with Corby, 17 miles distant.' A similar view was shared by Matthew Bailey, (BCE-20288) who commented 'we have nothing in common with Corby', and Sarah Arrowsmith, (BCE-28717) who stated 'we are nowhere near Corby we would be better off being under Wellingborough or Kettering.'

3.111 The Liberal Democrat Party and Labour Party both opposed the inclusion of Corby Borough wards in the Kettering constituency, and therefore opposed the counter-proposals from the Conservative Party and the joint submission from Mr Bone, Mr Pursglove and Mr Hollobone. The Labour Party considered that the counter-proposal would result in 'a constituency boundary running through the centre of the town of Corby along the railway line, dividing the town centre.' The Liberal Democrat Party considered the counter-proposal for Corby 'splits the town, dividing its historic centre.' Our proposed Corby constituency was also supported by Corby Borough Council (BCE-20348).

3.112 The counter-proposal by the Conservative Party for Wellingborough would require changes to the constituency of Northampton South. We noted that counter-proposals for Northampton South were proposed by the Liberal Democrat Party, Labour Party and Conservative Party. The counter-proposal from the Labour Party suggested changes between the Northampton North and Northampton South constituencies. They proposed that the wards of Castle, Kings Heath,

Semilong, and Spencer be included in the Northampton North constituency and the wards of Billing, Park, and Riverside be included in the Northampton South constituency. The Liberal Democrat Party suggested changes to these two constituencies and also the South Northamptonshire, and Daventry and Lutterworth constituencies. As part of the changes, they proposed that the Northampton North constituency include the wards of Harrowden & Sywell, and Earls Barton and that all Daventry district wards be included in the Daventry and Lutterworth constituency.

3.113 The Conservative Party counter-proposal also changed the constituencies of Northampton South and South Northamptonshire. They proposed that the South Northamptonshire district wards of Grange Park, and Harpole and Grange be included in the Northampton South constituency and the wards of Hackleton, and Brafield and Yardley be included in the South Northamptonshire constituency. This counter-proposal was also suggested by David Mackintosh (BCE-26528), former MP for Northampton South. He considered that the wards of Grange Park, and Harpole and Grange ‘lay directly on the edge of Northampton and form a natural continuation of the growth of the town. Although these wards do not currently reside within the Northampton Borough Council local government boundary, their proximity to the town means that residents in these areas use facilities and infrastructure in Northampton South, and therefore identify as being part of the town and have strong ties with it.’

3.114 We received some support for our proposed Northampton North constituency. Rob Bennett (BCE-31145 and BCE-37876) considered that ‘the railway line acts as a natural border on the west of the constituency.’ He also commented on the Labour Party counter-proposal, saying ‘there were one or two suggestions that Billing, Riverside, and Park ward should not be included in the Northampton North constituency – I disagree with that. It does seem to me to be a natural fit for them to be in Northampton North given that these areas are focused around the Weston Favell hub, which is already rooted in Northampton North. Furthermore, I agree with the point that the A45 would act as a south-eastern border, and the argument that people will generally stay one side or the other makes sense.’ A similar view was shared by Michael Ellis (BCE-36863), MP for Northampton North.

3.115 Similarly, we received some support and opposition to our proposed South Northamptonshire, and Daventry and Lutterworth constituencies. South Northamptonshire Council (BCE-28953 and BCE-40210) supported our proposed South Northamptonshire constituency, as did Ann Leask (BCE-21776) and Bernard Rapson (BCE-26367). Edgar Mobbs (BCE-21236), Judith Allnatt (BCE-19249), Bruce Nichols (BCE-19604), John Aistrup (BCE-20665) and David Mustoe (BCE-19161) all opposed our proposed South Northamptonshire constituency, specifically the fact that it included the Daventry district wards of Woodford and Weedon. Respondents highlighted that they were geographically closer to Daventry, that Daventry provided

the local services and that the public transport links were with Daventry. Having considered the evidence, our assistant commissioners recommended no changes to the proposed Daventry and Lutterworth constituency. We agree.

3.116 Our assistant commissioners outlined to us the different counter-proposals received for Northamptonshire. They acknowledged that the proposed Wellingborough constituency had been opposed and considered that this constituency should be modified. However, they were concerned that the counter-proposals to retain the existing Wellingborough constituency appeared to divide the town of Corby. They noted the proposal to divide the ward of Stanion & Corby Village between constituencies, but considered that there was not an exceptional and compelling case to divide this ward and so did not recommend this to us. We agree.

3.117 They recognised that evidence had been received to modify the proposed Wellingborough constituency and had investigated alternatives. They noted that it was not possible to include the wards of Wollaston, Bozeat, and Finedon in the Wellingborough constituency without consequential changes to other constituencies. As detailed above, they did not consider that evidence had been received to include Corby Borough wards in a Kettering constituency. Our assistant commissioners recognised the opposition to including the Finedon ward in a Kettering constituency but did not consider that any of the counter-proposals in this area would better reflect the statutory factors, given the knock-on effect that would result.

3.118 Our assistant commissioners had also investigated the proposal to include part of the Harrowden & Sywell ward in the Wellingborough constituency in order to maintain the existing constituency. They noted that dividing this ward would result in the Daventry and Lutterworth constituency falling below the permitted electorate range and that further changes would be required to this constituency. They did not consider that exceptional and compelling evidence had been received to divide this ward. As detailed earlier in this chapter, we agree.

3.119 Our assistant commissioners acknowledged the concerns of Wellingborough Borough Council about the local authority being divided between four constituencies. They considered that the wards of Wollaston and Bozeat could be included in the Wellingborough constituency and that evidence had been received to modify the constituencies of Northampton South and South Northamptonshire.

3.120 Our assistant commissioners advised us that persuasive evidence had been received to support the proposed Northampton North constituency. They did not see merit in expanding the northern boundary of this constituency or for including the wards of Park, Riverside, and Billing in another constituency. They noted the support for this proposal, particularly that it did not divide the Abington area.

3.121 Our assistant commissioners suggested that the wards of Harpole and Grange, and Grange Park be included in the Northampton South constituency and that the Hackleton, and Brafield and Yardley wards be included in the

South Northamptonshire constituency, as proposed by the Conservative Party. They considered that this pattern of constituencies better reflected the more urban nature of the Harpole and Grange, and Grange Park wards. They noted that other counter-proposals, such as those of Oliver Raven in his original submission (BCE-30076) and Aaron Fear (BCE-31214 and BCE-41049), propose an identical Northampton South constituency, but propose alternative configurations for the other constituencies in Northamptonshire. We agree with the recommendations.

3.122 The county, being at the extreme south of the region, provides a challenge in setting a pattern of constituencies that meet the statutory range. Our assistant commissioners acknowledged the counter-proposals that suggest splitting wards as part of our revised proposals, in light of the fact that we are able to make revisions that satisfy a number of the points of opposition we agree with the assistant commissioners that there are not exceptional and compelling circumstances to merit these ward splits. We consider that the recommendations put to us by the assistant commissioners – and specified in the preceding paragraphs – best reflect the evidence received during the consultation periods.

4 How to have your say

4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Government.

4.2 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 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 that 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 responding, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament and the decisions we have taken regarding adoption of a regional approach and use of local government wards discussed in chapter 2 and in the Guide. Most importantly:

- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight).
- We are obliged by law to use the Parliamentary electorate figures as they were in the statutory electoral register published by local electoral registration officers between December 2015 and February 2016. We therefore cannot base our proposals for this constituency review on any subsequent electorate figures.
- We are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (at May 2015) as the building blocks of constituencies. Exceptional and compelling evidence needs to be provided to persuade us that splitting a ward across two constituencies is necessary or appropriate.
- We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Particularly compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

4.4 These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a representation on a specific area to bear in mind the knock-on effects of their counter-proposals. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

How can you give us your views?

4.5 We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, www.bce2018.org.uk, when contributing to our consultation. That website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can instantly and directly submit to us your views on our revised proposals. If you are unable to access our consultation website for any reason, you can still write to us at 35 Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3BQ.

4.6 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available in our Data Protection and Privacy Policy, at

<http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/freedom-of-information-and-data-protection>

What do we want views on?

4.7 We would like particularly to ask two things of those considering responding on the revised proposals we have set out. First, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so, as well as telling us where you object to them. Past experience suggests that too often people who agree with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals. Second, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, do please use the resources available on our website and at the places of deposit (maps and electorate figures) to put forward counter-proposals which are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.

4.8 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in September 2018.

Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
1. Amber Valley CC			74,164
	Codnor and Waingroves	Amber Valley	3,599
	Duffield	Amber Valley	3,753
	Heage and Ambergate	Amber Valley	3,753
	Heanor and Loscoe	Amber Valley	3,790
	Heanor East	Amber Valley	4,249
	Heanor West	Amber Valley	4,312
	Ironville and Riddings	Amber Valley	4,154
	Kilburn, Denby and Holbrook	Amber Valley	5,944
	Langley Mill and Aldercar	Amber Valley	3,698
	Ripley	Amber Valley	6,553
	Ripley and Marehay	Amber Valley	4,288
	Shipley Park, Horsley and Horsley Woodhouse	Amber Valley	4,407
	Wingfield	Amber Valley	1,792
	Allestree	Derby	11,220
	Little Eaton & Stanley	Erewash	3,523
	West Hallam & Dale Abbey	Erewash	5,129
2. Ashfield CC			76,418
	Abbey Hill	Ashfield	2,305
	Annesley & Kirkby Woodhouse	Ashfield	5,673
	Ashfields	Ashfield	2,869
	Carsic	Ashfield	2,761
	Central & New Cross	Ashfield	4,949
	Huthwaite & Brierley	Ashfield	5,513
	Jacksdale	Ashfield	2,611
	Kingsway	Ashfield	2,391
	Kirkby Cross & Portland	Ashfield	2,984
	Larwood	Ashfield	2,619
	Leamington	Ashfield	2,647
	Selston	Ashfield	5,063
	Skegby	Ashfield	5,261
	St. Mary's	Ashfield	2,814
	Stanton Hill & Teversal	Ashfield	2,333
	Summit	Ashfield	5,061
	Sutton Junction & Harlow Wood	Ashfield	2,698
	The Dales	Ashfield	2,381
	Underwood	Ashfield	2,615
	Brinsley	Broxtowe	1,845
	Eastwood Hall	Broxtowe	1,907
	Eastwood Hilltop	Broxtowe	3,857
	Eastwood St. Mary's	Broxtowe	3,261
3. Bassetlaw CC			76,764
	Beckingham	Bassetlaw	1,863
	Blyth	Bassetlaw	1,817
	Carlton	Bassetlaw	4,437
	Clayworth	Bassetlaw	1,505
	East Retford East	Bassetlaw	5,273
	East Retford North	Bassetlaw	4,887
	East Retford South	Bassetlaw	3,515
	East Retford West	Bassetlaw	3,483
	Everton	Bassetlaw	1,898

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Harworth	Bassetlaw	5,726
	Langold	Bassetlaw	1,910
	Misterton	Bassetlaw	2,008
	Ranskill	Bassetlaw	1,846
	Sturton	Bassetlaw	1,816
	Sutton	Bassetlaw	1,656
	Welbeck	Bassetlaw	1,533
	Worksop East	Bassetlaw	4,760
	Worksop North	Bassetlaw	6,476
	Worksop North East	Bassetlaw	4,836
	Worksop North West	Bassetlaw	5,300
	Worksop South	Bassetlaw	5,132
	Worksop South East	Bassetlaw	5,087
4. Bolsover CC			73,875
	Alfreton	Amber Valley	5,630
	Somercotes	Amber Valley	4,187
	Swanwick	Amber Valley	4,172
	Barlborough	Bolsover	2,452
	Blackwell	Bolsover	3,459
	Bolsover North West	Bolsover	2,889
	Bolsover South	Bolsover	2,948
	Bolsover West	Bolsover	2,819
	Clowne North	Bolsover	2,955
	Clowne South	Bolsover	2,958
	Elmton-with-Creswell	Bolsover	4,498
	Pinxton	Bolsover	3,254
	Pleasley	Bolsover	2,977
	Scarcliffe	Bolsover	3,100
	Shirebrook East	Bolsover	999
	Shirebrook Langwith	Bolsover	1,609
	Shirebrook North West	Bolsover	1,592
	Shirebrook South East	Bolsover	1,403
	Shirebrook South West	Bolsover	1,831
	South Normanton East	Bolsover	3,370
	South Normanton West	Bolsover	4,618
	Tibshelf	Bolsover	3,806
	Whitwell	Bolsover	2,996
	Lowgates and Woodthorpe	Chesterfield	3,353
5. Boston and Skegness CC			71,989
	Coastal	Boston	2,839
	Fenside	Boston	1,998
	Fishtoft	Boston	4,806
	Five Village	Boston	2,892
	Kirton and Frampton	Boston	4,512
	Old Leake and Wrangle	Boston	2,559
	Skirbeck	Boston	3,541
	St. Thomas'	Boston	1,432
	Staniland	Boston	2,294
	Station	Boston	840
	Swineshead and Holland Fen	Boston	2,765
	Trinity	Boston	2,703
	West	Boston	1,397
	Witham	Boston	2,262
	Wyberton	Boston	2,994
	Burgh le Marsh	East Lindsey	1,984
	Croft	East Lindsey	1,802
	Friskney	East Lindsey	1,698
	Ingoldmells	East Lindsey	1,476
	Scarbrough & Seacroft	East Lindsey	5,924
	Sibsey & Stickney	East Lindsey	3,992

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	St. Clement's	East Lindsey	3,398
	Wainfleet	East Lindsey	1,841
	Winthorpe	East Lindsey	3,896
	Heckington Rural	North Kesteven	4,269
	Kirkby la Thorpe and South Kyme	North Kesteven	1,875
6. Bosworth CC			73,537
	Ambien	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,763
	Barlestone, Nailstone and Osbaston	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,572
	Barwell	Hinckley and Bosworth	6,803
	Burbage Sketchley and Stretton	Hinckley and Bosworth	4,605
	Burbage St. Catherines and Lash Hill	Hinckley and Bosworth	7,322
	Cadeby, Carlton and Market Bosworth with Shackerstone	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,924
	Earl Shilton	Hinckley and Bosworth	7,687
	Hinckley Castle	Hinckley and Bosworth	4,510
	Hinckley Clarendon	Hinckley and Bosworth	6,662
	Hinckley De Montfort	Hinckley and Bosworth	7,900
	Hinckley Trinity	Hinckley and Bosworth	5,237
	Newbold Verdon with Desford and Peckleton	Hinckley and Bosworth	6,606
	Ratby, Bagworth and Thornton	Hinckley and Bosworth	5,471
	Twycross and Witherley with Sheepy	Hinckley and Bosworth	2,475
7. Broxtowe and Hucknall CC			74,732
	Hucknall Central	Ashfield	5,183
	Hucknall North	Ashfield	7,490
	Hucknall South	Ashfield	5,321
	Hucknall West	Ashfield	6,931
	Awsworth, Cossall & Trowell	Broxtowe	4,050
	Bramcote	Broxtowe	5,671
	Chilwell West	Broxtowe	5,468
	Greasley	Broxtowe	5,228
	Kimberley	Broxtowe	5,030
	Nuthall East & Strelley	Broxtowe	3,833
	Stapleford North	Broxtowe	3,282
	Stapleford South East	Broxtowe	3,687
	Stapleford South West	Broxtowe	3,827
	Toton & Chilwell Meadows	Broxtowe	6,181
	Watnall & Nuthall West	Broxtowe	3,550
8. Charnwood CC			75,023
	Anstey	Charnwood	5,213
	Barrow and Sileby West	Charnwood	5,223
	Birstall Wanlip	Charnwood	5,250
	Birstall Watermead	Charnwood	5,108
	Forest Bradgate	Charnwood	2,484
	Mountsorrel	Charnwood	5,247
	Quorn and Mountsorrel Castle	Charnwood	5,463
	Rothley and Thurgaston	Charnwood	5,292
	Sileby	Charnwood	5,615
	Syston East	Charnwood	5,223
	Syston West	Charnwood	4,985
	Thurmaston	Charnwood	7,414
	Wreake Villages	Charnwood	2,415
	Groby	Hinckley and Bosworth	5,440
	Markfield, Stanton and Fieldhead	Hinckley and Bosworth	4,651
9. Chesterfield BC			75,675
	Barrow Hill and New Whittington	Chesterfield	4,378
	Brimington North	Chesterfield	2,956
	Brimington South	Chesterfield	4,827
	Brockwell	Chesterfield	4,936
	Dunston	Chesterfield	4,664
	Hasland	Chesterfield	5,004

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Hollingwood and Inkersall	Chesterfield	5,885
	Holmebrook	Chesterfield	3,142
	Linacre	Chesterfield	3,255
	Loundsley Green	Chesterfield	2,963
	Middlecroft and Poolsbrook	Chesterfield	3,433
	Moor	Chesterfield	3,234
	Old Whittington	Chesterfield	3,133
	Rother	Chesterfield	4,656
	St. Helen's	Chesterfield	3,440
	St. Leonard's	Chesterfield	6,011
	Walton	Chesterfield	4,720
	West	Chesterfield	5,038
10. Corby and East Northamptonshire CC			73,718
	Beanfield	Corby	5,043
	Central	Corby	3,092
	Danesholme	Corby	3,079
	Kingswood & Hazel Leys	Corby	4,230
	Lloyds	Corby	4,645
	Lodge Park	Corby	4,969
	Oakley North	Corby	2,600
	Oakley South	Corby	4,872
	Rowlett	Corby	3,596
	Rural West	Corby	1,439
	Stanion & Corby Village	Corby	2,550
	Weldon & Gretton	Corby	3,166
	Barnwell	East Northamptonshire	1,568
	Fineshade	East Northamptonshire	1,626
	King's Forest	East Northamptonshire	1,710
	Lower Nene	East Northamptonshire	1,613
	Lyveden	East Northamptonshire	1,573
	Oundle	East Northamptonshire	4,540
	Prebendal	East Northamptonshire	1,736
	Raunds Saxon	East Northamptonshire	3,328
	Raunds Windmill	East Northamptonshire	3,026
	Stanwick	East Northamptonshire	1,675
	Thrapston Lakes	East Northamptonshire	3,372
	Thrapston Market	East Northamptonshire	2,999
	Woodford	East Northamptonshire	1,671
11. Daventry and Lutterworth CC			71,580
	Abbey North	Daventry	4,731
	Abbey South	Daventry	4,624
	Barby and Kilsby	Daventry	3,559
	Braunston and Welton	Daventry	1,936
	Brixworth	Daventry	5,262
	Drayton	Daventry	4,120
	Hill	Daventry	3,942
	Long Buckby	Daventry	5,046
	Moulton	Daventry	3,722
	Ravensthorpe	Daventry	1,905
	Spratton	Daventry	3,027
	Walgrave	Daventry	1,594
	Welford	Daventry	3,253
	Yelvertoft	Daventry	1,523
	Bosworth	Harborough	1,847
	Fleckney	Harborough	3,621
	Lubenham	Harborough	1,596
	Lutterworth Brookfield	Harborough	1,811
	Lutterworth Orchard	Harborough	1,622
	Lutterworth Springs	Harborough	1,642
	Lutterworth Swift	Harborough	1,792

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Misterton	Harborough	1,955
	Earls Barton	Wellingborough	4,119
	Harrowden & Sywell	Wellingborough	3,331
12. Derby East CC			76,691
	Alvaston	Derby	10,911
	Boulton	Derby	9,810
	Chaddesden	Derby	10,015
	Chellaston	Derby	11,355
	Derwent	Derby	9,243
	Oakwood	Derby	10,018
	Spondon	Derby	10,016
	Aston	South Derbyshire	5,323
13. Derby West BC			76,405
	Abbey	Derby	8,996
	Arboretum	Derby	9,408
	Blagreaves	Derby	9,799
	Darley	Derby	9,931
	Littleover	Derby	10,645
	Mackworth	Derby	9,174
	Normanton	Derby	9,100
	Sinfin	Derby	9,352
14. Derbyshire Dales CC			77,461
	Alport	Amber Valley	2,002
	Belper Central	Amber Valley	4,138
	Belper East	Amber Valley	4,483
	Belper North	Amber Valley	3,767
	Belper South	Amber Valley	4,164
	Crich	Amber Valley	1,892
	South West Parishes	Amber Valley	2,113
	Ashbourne North	Derbyshire Dales	2,880
	Ashbourne South	Derbyshire Dales	3,486
	Bakewell	Derbyshire Dales	3,650
	Bradwell	Derbyshire Dales	1,467
	Brailsford	Derbyshire Dales	1,328
	Calver	Derbyshire Dales	1,488
	Carsington Water	Derbyshire Dales	1,491
	Chatsworth	Derbyshire Dales	1,324
	Clifton and Bradley	Derbyshire Dales	1,441
	Darley Dale	Derbyshire Dales	4,448
	Dovedale and Parwich	Derbyshire Dales	1,321
	Doveridge and Sudbury	Derbyshire Dales	1,528
	Hartington and Taddington	Derbyshire Dales	1,357
	Hathersage and Eyam	Derbyshire Dales	2,994
	Hulland	Derbyshire Dales	1,483
	Lathkill and Bradford	Derbyshire Dales	1,246
	Litton and Longstone	Derbyshire Dales	1,325
	Masson	Derbyshire Dales	2,332
	Matlock All Saints	Derbyshire Dales	4,189
	Matlock St. Giles	Derbyshire Dales	4,144
	Norbury	Derbyshire Dales	1,357
	Stanton	Derbyshire Dales	1,405
	Tideswell	Derbyshire Dales	1,354
	Winster and South Darley	Derbyshire Dales	1,371
	Wirksworth	Derbyshire Dales	4,493
15. Erewash CC			75,973
	Awsworth Road	Erewash	3,431
	Breaston	Erewash	3,706
	Cotmanhay	Erewash	3,531
	Derby Road East	Erewash	3,587

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Derby Road West	Erewash	5,583
	Draycott & Risley	Erewash	3,232
	Hallam Fields	Erewash	3,502
	Kirk Hallam & Stanton-by-Dale	Erewash	4,975
	Larklands	Erewash	5,867
	Little Hallam	Erewash	3,437
	Long Eaton Central	Erewash	5,180
	Nottingham Road	Erewash	3,658
	Ockbrook & Borrowash	Erewash	5,674
	Sandiacre	Erewash	5,922
	Sawley	Erewash	5,097
	Shipley View	Erewash	3,807
	Wilsthorpe	Erewash	5,784
16. Gainsborough CC			74,332
	Wragby	East Lindsey	1,931
	Bardney	West Lindsey	2,053
	Caistor and Yarborough	West Lindsey	4,438
	Cherry Willingham	West Lindsey	6,089
	Dunholme and Welton	West Lindsey	6,517
	Gainsborough East	West Lindsey	5,140
	Gainsborough North	West Lindsey	5,029
	Gainsborough South-West	West Lindsey	3,657
	Hemswell	West Lindsey	2,182
	Kelsey Wold	West Lindsey	2,189
	Lea	West Lindsey	1,813
	Market Rasen	West Lindsey	6,776
	Nettleham	West Lindsey	3,314
	Saxilby	West Lindsey	4,398
	Scampton	West Lindsey	2,132
	Scotter and Blyton	West Lindsey	6,098
	Stow	West Lindsey	1,963
	Sudbrooke	West Lindsey	2,150
	Torksey	West Lindsey	2,372
	Waddingham and Spital	West Lindsey	2,002
	Wold View	West Lindsey	2,089
17. Grantham and Stamford CC			77,156
	Aveland	South Kesteven	1,994
	Belmont	South Kesteven	3,392
	Bourne Austerby	South Kesteven	4,430
	Bourne East	South Kesteven	3,415
	Bourne West	South Kesteven	3,987
	Casewick	South Kesteven	4,059
	Castle	South Kesteven	1,913
	Dole Wood	South Kesteven	1,938
	Glen	South Kesteven	1,847
	Grantham Arnoldfield	South Kesteven	3,363
	Grantham Barrowby Gate	South Kesteven	3,807
	Grantham Earlesfield	South Kesteven	3,393
	Grantham Harrowby	South Kesteven	3,534
	Grantham Springfield	South Kesteven	3,247
	Grantham St. Vincent's	South Kesteven	4,560
	Grantham St. Wulfram's	South Kesteven	3,928
	Isaac Newton	South Kesteven	3,672
	Lincrest	South Kesteven	1,942
	Morton	South Kesteven	1,890
	Stamford All Saints	South Kesteven	3,825
	Stamford St. George's	South Kesteven	3,744
	Stamford St. John's	South Kesteven	3,786
	Stamford St. Mary's	South Kesteven	3,488
	Toller	South Kesteven	2,002

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
18. Harborough CC			73,071
	Glen	Harborough	3,437
	Kibworth	Harborough	5,501
	Market Harborough-Great Bowden and Arden	Harborough	5,047
	Market Harborough-Little Bowden	Harborough	4,114
	Market Harborough-Logan	Harborough	3,120
	Market Harborough-Welland	Harborough	5,064
	Thurnby and Houghton	Harborough	5,168
	Oadby Brocks Hill	Oadby and Wigston	3,047
	Oadby Grange	Oadby and Wigston	4,267
	Oadby St. Peter's	Oadby and Wigston	3,186
	Oadby Uplands	Oadby and Wigston	3,247
	Oadby Woodlands	Oadby and Wigston	3,425
	South Wigston	Oadby and Wigston	5,644
	Wigston All Saints	Oadby and Wigston	4,584
	Wigston Fields	Oadby and Wigston	4,817
	Wigston Meadowcourt	Oadby and Wigston	4,475
	Wigston St. Wolstan's	Oadby and Wigston	4,928
19. High Peak CC			71,130
	Barms	High Peak	1,380
	Blackbrook	High Peak	3,127
	Burbage	High Peak	1,594
	Buxton Central	High Peak	2,949
	Chapel East	High Peak	1,744
	Chapel West	High Peak	3,472
	Corbar	High Peak	3,203
	Cote Heath	High Peak	3,181
	Dinting	High Peak	1,644
	Gamesley	High Peak	1,674
	Hadfield North	High Peak	1,736
	Hadfield South	High Peak	3,399
	Hayfield	High Peak	1,625
	Hope Valley	High Peak	3,183
	Howard Town	High Peak	3,408
	Limestone Peak	High Peak	1,675
	New Mills East	High Peak	3,034
	New Mills West	High Peak	3,415
	Old Glossop	High Peak	3,689
	Padfield	High Peak	1,814
	Sett	High Peak	1,654
	Simmondley	High Peak	3,500
	St. John's	High Peak	1,488
	Stone Bench	High Peak	3,157
	Temple	High Peak	1,801
	Tintwistle	High Peak	1,627
	Whaley Bridge	High Peak	5,217
	Whitfield	High Peak	1,740
20. Kettering CC			71,489
	All Saints	Kettering	5,060
	Avondale Grange	Kettering	3,534
	Barton	Kettering	4,145
	Brambleside	Kettering	3,517
	Burton Latimer	Kettering	6,329
	Desborough Loatland	Kettering	4,230
	Desborough St. Giles	Kettering	3,865
	Ise Lodge	Kettering	5,376
	Northfield	Kettering	1,785
	Pipers Hill	Kettering	3,830
	Queen Eleanor and Buccleuch	Kettering	1,972
	Rothwell	Kettering	5,939

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Slade	Kettering	4,519
	St. Michael's and Wicksteed	Kettering	5,137
	St. Peter's	Kettering	3,478
	Welland	Kettering	2,174
	William Knibb	Kettering	3,389
	Finedon	Wellingborough	3,210
21. Leicester East BC			75,755
	Belgrave	Leicester	11,199
	Evington	Leicester	12,158
	Humberstone & Hamilton	Leicester	12,388
	North Evington	Leicester	11,328
	Rushey Mead	Leicester	12,248
	Thurncourt	Leicester	7,980
	Troon	Leicester	8,454
22. Leicester South BC			72,227
	Aylestone	Leicester	8,136
	Castle	Leicester	9,148
	Eyres Monsell	Leicester	7,780
	Knighton	Leicester	12,263
	Saffron	Leicester	6,578
	Spinney Hills	Leicester	8,542
	Stoneygate	Leicester	11,842
	Wycliffe	Leicester	7,938
23. Leicester West BC			74,743
	Millfield	Blaby	1,915
	Ravenhurst and Fosse	Blaby	5,142
	Winstanley	Blaby	4,893
	Abbey	Leicester	11,923
	Beaumont Leys	Leicester	11,412
	Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields	Leicester	12,260
	Fosse	Leicester	7,366
	Westcotes	Leicester	6,724
	Western	Leicester	13,108
24. Lincoln BC			73,889
	Abbey	Lincoln	5,644
	Birchwood	Lincoln	5,559
	Boultham	Lincoln	5,230
	Bracebridge	Lincoln	5,524
	Carholme	Lincoln	5,897
	Castle	Lincoln	5,353
	Glebe	Lincoln	4,987
	Hartsholme	Lincoln	4,834
	Minster	Lincoln	5,353
	Moorland	Lincoln	5,294
	Park	Lincoln	4,030
	North Hykeham Forum	North Kesteven	1,809
	North Hykeham Memorial	North Kesteven	2,195
	North Hykeham Mill	North Kesteven	3,702
	North Hykeham Moor	North Kesteven	1,854
	North Hykeham Witham	North Kesteven	1,919
	Skellingthorpe	North Kesteven	2,818
	Waddington West	North Kesteven	1,887
25. Loughborough and South Rushcliffe CC			75,386
	Loughborough Ashby	Charnwood	5,056
	Loughborough Dishley and Hathern	Charnwood	4,864
	Loughborough Garendon	Charnwood	4,482
	Loughborough Hastings	Charnwood	4,085
	Loughborough Lemington	Charnwood	4,239

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Loughborough Nanpantan	Charnwood	3,975
	Loughborough Outwoods	Charnwood	4,500
	Loughborough Shelthorpe	Charnwood	5,499
	Loughborough Southfields	Charnwood	4,046
	Loughborough Storer	Charnwood	4,024
	Shepshed East	Charnwood	5,094
	Shepshed West	Charnwood	5,418
	The Wolds	Charnwood	2,486
	Bunny	Rushcliffe	1,935
	Gotham	Rushcliffe	1,996
	Keyworth & Wolds	Rushcliffe	6,509
	Leake	Rushcliffe	5,704
	Sutton Bonington	Rushcliffe	1,474
26. Louth and Horncastle CC			75,022
	Alford	East Lindsey	3,625
	Binbrook	East Lindsey	1,982
	Chapel St. Leonards	East Lindsey	3,785
	Coningsby & Mareham	East Lindsey	6,065
	Fulstow	East Lindsey	1,874
	Grimoldby	East Lindsey	1,734
	Hagworthingham	East Lindsey	1,828
	Halton Holegate	East Lindsey	2,042
	Holton-le-Clay & North Thoresby	East Lindsey	3,953
	Horncastle	East Lindsey	5,505
	Legbourne	East Lindsey	1,775
	Mablethorpe	East Lindsey	6,028
	Marshchapel & Somercotes	East Lindsey	3,540
	North Holme	East Lindsey	1,781
	Priory & St. James'	East Lindsey	3,545
	Roughton	East Lindsey	1,908
	Spilsby	East Lindsey	2,108
	St. Margaret's	East Lindsey	1,822
	St. Mary's	East Lindsey	1,806
	St. Michael's	East Lindsey	1,668
	Sutton on Sea	East Lindsey	3,735
	Tetford & Donington	East Lindsey	1,942
	Tetney	East Lindsey	1,824
	Trinity	East Lindsey	1,681
	Willoughby with Sloothby	East Lindsey	1,986
	Withern & Theddlethorpe	East Lindsey	1,945
	Woodhall Spa	East Lindsey	3,535
27. Mansfield CC			74,066
	Abbott	Mansfield	2,043
	Berry Hill	Mansfield	2,182
	Brick Kiln	Mansfield	2,166
	Broomhill	Mansfield	1,759
	Bull Farm and Pleasley Hill	Mansfield	2,219
	Carr Bank	Mansfield	1,777
	Eakring	Mansfield	2,117
	Grange Farm	Mansfield	2,286
	Holly	Mansfield	2,344
	Hornby	Mansfield	2,022
	Kings Walk	Mansfield	2,015
	Kingsway	Mansfield	2,041
	Ladybrook	Mansfield	1,951
	Lindhurst	Mansfield	2,073
	Ling Forest	Mansfield	2,113
	Manor	Mansfield	2,245
	Market Warsop	Mansfield	2,258
	Maun Valley	Mansfield	2,452

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Meden	Mansfield	2,076
	Netherfield	Mansfield	2,089
	Newgate	Mansfield	1,681
	Newlands	Mansfield	2,369
	Oak Tree	Mansfield	1,836
	Oakham	Mansfield	1,821
	Park Hall	Mansfield	2,294
	Peafields	Mansfield	2,219
	Penniment	Mansfield	2,010
	Portland	Mansfield	1,302
	Racecourse	Mansfield	1,932
	Ransom Wood	Mansfield	1,989
	Sandhurst	Mansfield	1,939
	Sherwood	Mansfield	1,827
	Warsop Carrs	Mansfield	2,470
	Woodhouse	Mansfield	2,187
	Woodlands	Mansfield	1,565
	Yeoman Hill	Mansfield	2,397
28. Newark CC			76,047
	East Markham	Bassetlaw	1,929
	Rampton	Bassetlaw	1,595
	Tuxford and Trent	Bassetlaw	3,395
	Balderton North & Coddington	Newark and Sherwood	5,015
	Balderton South	Newark and Sherwood	3,663
	Beacon	Newark and Sherwood	5,714
	Bridge	Newark and Sherwood	3,953
	Castle	Newark and Sherwood	2,115
	Collingham	Newark and Sherwood	4,262
	Devon	Newark and Sherwood	6,061
	Dover Beck	Newark and Sherwood	2,357
	Farndon & Fernwood	Newark and Sherwood	4,631
	Farnsfield	Newark and Sherwood	2,133
	Lowdham	Newark and Sherwood	2,218
	Muskham	Newark and Sherwood	2,285
	Southwell	Newark and Sherwood	6,542
	Sutton-on-Trent	Newark and Sherwood	2,433
	Trent	Newark and Sherwood	2,263
	Bingham East	Rushcliffe	3,841
	Bingham West	Rushcliffe	3,523
	Cranmer	Rushcliffe	1,845
	East Bridgford	Rushcliffe	2,255
	Thoroton	Rushcliffe	2,019
29. North East Derbyshire CC			77,256
	Ashover	North East Derbyshire	1,563
	Barlow and Holmesfield	North East Derbyshire	1,553
	Brampton and Walton	North East Derbyshire	2,998
	Clay Cross North	North East Derbyshire	4,579
	Clay Cross South	North East Derbyshire	2,818
	Coal Aston	North East Derbyshire	2,699
	Dronfield North	North East Derbyshire	3,189
	Dronfield South	North East Derbyshire	4,149
	Dronfield Woodhouse	North East Derbyshire	2,797
	Eckington North	North East Derbyshire	2,810
	Eckington South	North East Derbyshire	2,802
	Gosforth Valley	North East Derbyshire	4,133
	Grassmoor	North East Derbyshire	3,074
	Holmewood and Heath	North East Derbyshire	2,702
	Killamarsh East	North East Derbyshire	2,959
	Killamarsh West	North East Derbyshire	4,286
	North Wingfield Central	North East Derbyshire	4,290

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Pilsley and Morton	North East Derbyshire	4,159
	Renishaw	North East Derbyshire	1,916
	Ridgeway and Marsh Lane	North East Derbyshire	1,369
	Shirland	North East Derbyshire	4,368
	Sutton	North East Derbyshire	3,118
	Tupton	North East Derbyshire	2,972
	Unstone	North East Derbyshire	1,449
	Wingerworth	North East Derbyshire	4,504
30. North Rushcliffe CC			72,839
	Clifton North	Nottingham	9,537
	Clifton South	Nottingham	10,154
	Abbey	Rushcliffe	4,091
	Compton Acres	Rushcliffe	3,844
	Cotgrave	Rushcliffe	5,397
	Cropwell	Rushcliffe	2,048
	Edwalton	Rushcliffe	2,973
	Gamston North	Rushcliffe	1,871
	Gamston South	Rushcliffe	1,859
	Lady Bay	Rushcliffe	3,712
	Lutterell	Rushcliffe	3,862
	Musters	Rushcliffe	3,400
	Nevile & Langar	Rushcliffe	2,186
	Radcliffe on Trent	Rushcliffe	6,464
	Ruddington	Rushcliffe	5,540
	Tollerton	Rushcliffe	1,963
	Trent Bridge	Rushcliffe	3,938
31. North West Leicestershire CC			71,377
	Appleby	North West Leicestershire	1,731
	Ashby Castle	North West Leicestershire	2,101
	Ashby Holywell	North West Leicestershire	1,995
	Ashby Ivanhoe	North West Leicestershire	1,941
	Ashby Money Hill	North West Leicestershire	1,951
	Ashby Willesley	North West Leicestershire	1,977
	Ashby Woulds	North West Leicestershire	1,866
	Bardon	North West Leicestershire	1,724
	Blackfordby	North West Leicestershire	1,987
	Broom Leys	North West Leicestershire	2,056
	Castle Donington Castle	North West Leicestershire	2,013
	Castle Donington Central	North West Leicestershire	1,905
	Castle Donington Park	North West Leicestershire	1,236
	Castle Rock	North West Leicestershire	1,767
	Coalville East	North West Leicestershire	2,026
	Coalville West	North West Leicestershire	1,720
	Daleacre Hill	North West Leicestershire	1,666
	Ellistown & Battleflat	North West Leicestershire	1,906
	Greenhill	North West Leicestershire	1,994
	Hermitage	North West Leicestershire	1,767
	Holly Hayes	North West Leicestershire	1,986
	Hugglescote St. John's	North West Leicestershire	1,385
	Hugglescote St. Mary's	North West Leicestershire	1,901
	Ibstock East	North West Leicestershire	1,866
	Ibstock West	North West Leicestershire	1,801
	Kegworth	North West Leicestershire	1,709
	Long Whatton & Diseworth	North West Leicestershire	2,017
	Measham North	North West Leicestershire	1,852
	Measham South	North West Leicestershire	1,829
	Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe	North West Leicestershire	1,943
	Ravenstone & Packington	North West Leicestershire	1,936
	Sence Valley	North West Leicestershire	2,191
	Snibston North	North West Leicestershire	1,673

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Snibston South	North West Leicestershire	1,705
	Thornborough	North West Leicestershire	1,996
	Thringstone	North West Leicestershire	1,884
	Valley	North West Leicestershire	2,123
	Worthington & Breedon	North West Leicestershire	2,251
32. Northampton North BC			71,716
	Abington	Northampton	5,876
	Billing	Northampton	6,024
	Boothville	Northampton	3,262
	Brookside	Northampton	3,167
	Eastfield	Northampton	3,037
	Headlands	Northampton	3,267
	Kingsley	Northampton	3,453
	Kingsthorpe	Northampton	3,546
	Obelisk	Northampton	2,065
	Park	Northampton	3,553
	Parklands	Northampton	3,501
	Phippsville	Northampton	2,828
	Rectory Farm	Northampton	3,291
	Riverside	Northampton	3,069
	Spring Park	Northampton	3,605
	St. David's	Northampton	2,877
	Sunnyside*	Northampton	2,900
	Talavera	Northampton	6,540
	Trinity	Northampton	2,484
	Westone	Northampton	3,371
33. Northampton South BC			72,932
	Castle	Northampton	6,670
	Delapre and Briar Hill	Northampton	8,406
	East Hunsbury	Northampton	7,180
	Kings Heath	Northampton	2,809
	Nene Valley	Northampton	7,771
	New Duston	Northampton	7,395
	Old Duston	Northampton	6,208
	Rushmills	Northampton	3,144
	Semilong	Northampton	2,662
	Spencer	Northampton	3,203
	St. James*	Northampton	2,699
	Upton	Northampton	4,623
	West Hunsbury	Northampton	3,301
	Grange Park	South Northamptonshire	3,036
	Harpole and Grange	South Northamptonshire	3,825
34. Nottingham East and Carlton BC			71,152
	Carlton	Gedling	4,072
	Carlton Hill	Gedling	5,934
	Cavendish	Gedling	4,082
	Colwick	Gedling	2,015
	Gedling	Gedling	4,415
	Netherfield	Gedling	3,867
	Phoenix	Gedling	4,131
	Porchester	Gedling	6,225
	Arboretum	Nottingham	6,187
	Dales	Nottingham	10,035
	Mapperley	Nottingham	9,964
	St. Ann's	Nottingham	10,225
35. Nottingham North BC			73,828
	Aspley	Nottingham	9,855
	Basford	Nottingham	10,921
	Berridge	Nottingham	10,694

*Figures corrected by Northampton Borough Council; see paragraph 3.4 of this report.

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Bestwood	Nottingham	11,216
	Bulwell	Nottingham	10,988
	Bulwell Forest	Nottingham	10,127
	Sherwood	Nottingham	10,027
36. Nottingham South and Beeston BC			77,405
	Attenborough & Chilwell East	Broxtowe	5,538
	Beeston Central	Broxtowe	3,431
	Beeston North	Broxtowe	3,790
	Beeston Rylands	Broxtowe	3,432
	Beeston West	Broxtowe	3,773
	Bilborough	Nottingham	11,620
	Bridge	Nottingham	8,188
	Dunkirk and Lenton	Nottingham	5,005
	Leen Valley	Nottingham	7,038
	Radford and Park	Nottingham	10,339
	Wollaton East and Lenton Abbey	Nottingham	4,488
	Wollaton West	Nottingham	10,763
37. Rutland and Melton CC			73,653
	East Goscote	Charnwood	2,287
	Queniborough	Charnwood	2,539
	Billesdon	Harborough	1,403
	Nevill	Harborough	1,703
	Tilton	Harborough	1,546
	Asfordby	Melton	2,536
	Bottesford	Melton	2,833
	Croxton Kerrial	Melton	1,455
	Frisby-on-the-Wreake	Melton	1,409
	Gaddesby	Melton	1,336
	Long Clawson and Stathern	Melton	3,153
	Melton Craven	Melton	2,595
	Melton Dorian	Melton	3,767
	Melton Egerton	Melton	2,608
	Melton Newport	Melton	3,656
	Melton Sysonby	Melton	3,816
	Melton Warwick	Melton	2,383
	Old Dalby	Melton	1,482
	Somerby	Melton	1,374
	Waltham-on-the-Wolds	Melton	1,269
	Wymondham	Melton	1,148
	Braunston and Belton	Rutland	1,043
	Cottesmore	Rutland	2,109
	Exton	Rutland	1,133
	Greetham	Rutland	983
	Ketton	Rutland	2,165
	Langham	Rutland	1,092
	Lyddington	Rutland	1,092
	Martinsthorpe	Rutland	887
	Normanton	Rutland	2,341
	Oakham North East	Rutland	1,916
	Oakham North West	Rutland	2,894
	Oakham South East	Rutland	1,936
	Oakham South West	Rutland	1,748
	Ryhall and Casterton	Rutland	2,193
	Uppingham	Rutland	2,829
	Whissendine	Rutland	994
38. Sherwood CC			78,152
	Bestwood St. Albans	Gedling	3,852
	Calverton	Gedling	5,712
	Coppice	Gedling	4,501

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Daybrook	Gedling	4,173
	Dumbles	Gedling	2,294
	Ernehale	Gedling	4,526
	Newstead Abbey	Gedling	6,362
	Plains	Gedling	6,454
	Redhill	Gedling	4,695
	Trent Valley	Gedling	4,136
	Woodthorpe	Gedling	4,379
	Bilsthorpe	Newark and Sherwood	2,322
	Boughton	Newark and Sherwood	2,259
	Edwinstowe & Clipstone	Newark and Sherwood	7,426
	Ollerton	Newark and Sherwood	6,303
	Rainworth North & Rufford	Newark and Sherwood	4,906
	Rainworth South & Blidworth	Newark and Sherwood	3,852
39. Sleaford CC			74,561
	Ashby de la Launde and Cranwell	North Kesteven	3,893
	Bassingham and Brant Broughton	North Kesteven	3,884
	Billinghay, Martin and North Kyme	North Kesteven	4,009
	Bracebridge Heath and Waddington East	North Kesteven	6,592
	Branston	North Kesteven	3,889
	Cliff Villages	North Kesteven	4,215
	Eagle, Swinderby and Witham St. Hughs	North Kesteven	4,140
	Heighington and Washingborough	North Kesteven	5,417
	Leasingham and Rauceby	North Kesteven	1,736
	Metheringham	North Kesteven	4,142
	Osournby	North Kesteven	1,861
	Ruskington	North Kesteven	4,329
	Sleaford Castle	North Kesteven	1,789
	Sleaford Holdingham	North Kesteven	1,929
	Sleaford Navigation	North Kesteven	1,817
	Sleaford Quarrington and Mareham	North Kesteven	5,296
	Sleaford Westholme	North Kesteven	1,793
	Belvoir	South Kesteven	3,896
	Loveden Heath	South Kesteven	2,057
	Peascliffe & Ridgeway	South Kesteven	3,889
	Viking	South Kesteven	3,988
40. South Derbyshire CC			77,920
	Mickleover	Derby	11,666
	Church Gresley	South Derbyshire	5,858
	Etwall	South Derbyshire	4,246
	Hatton	South Derbyshire	1,934
	Hilton	South Derbyshire	6,589
	Linton	South Derbyshire	3,923
	Melbourne	South Derbyshire	4,175
	Midway	South Derbyshire	6,031
	Newhall and Stanton	South Derbyshire	6,169
	Repton	South Derbyshire	3,886
	Seales	South Derbyshire	4,111
	Stenson	South Derbyshire	3,394
	Swadlincote	South Derbyshire	5,876
	Willington and Findern	South Derbyshire	3,635
	Woodville	South Derbyshire	6,427
41. South Holland and The Deepings CC			74,332
	Crowland and Deeping St. Nicholas	South Holland	4,596
	Donington, Quadring and Gosberton	South Holland	5,503
	Fleet	South Holland	1,745
	Gedney	South Holland	1,828
	Holbeach Hurn	South Holland	1,679
	Holbeach Town	South Holland	5,480

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Long Sutton	South Holland	5,831
	Moulton, Weston and Cowbit	South Holland	5,232
	Pinchbeck and Surfleet	South Holland	5,193
	Spalding Castle	South Holland	1,547
	Spalding Monks House	South Holland	3,406
	Spalding St. John's	South Holland	3,362
	Spalding St. Mary's	South Holland	3,226
	Spalding St. Paul's	South Holland	2,990
	Spalding Wygate	South Holland	3,502
	Sutton Bridge	South Holland	3,173
	The Saints	South Holland	1,975
	Whaplode and Holbeach St. John's	South Holland	3,368
	Deeping St. James	South Kesteven	5,561
	Market & West Deeping	South Kesteven	5,135
42. South Leicestershire CC			71,583
	Blaby South	Blaby	3,672
	Cosby with South Whetstone	Blaby	3,720
	Countesthorpe	Blaby	5,933
	Croft Hill	Blaby	1,733
	Ellis	Blaby	4,030
	Enderby and St. John's	Blaby	3,574
	Fairestone	Blaby	3,713
	Forest	Blaby	5,324
	Muxloe	Blaby	3,362
	Narborough and Littlethorpe	Blaby	3,945
	Normanton	Blaby	2,030
	North Whetstone	Blaby	3,817
	Pastures	Blaby	3,755
	Saxondale	Blaby	5,494
	Stanton and Flamville	Blaby	6,021
	Broughton Astley-Astley	Harborough	1,546
	Broughton Astley-Broughton	Harborough	2,051
	Broughton Astley-Primethorpe	Harborough	1,299
	Broughton Astley-Sutton	Harborough	1,448
	Dunton	Harborough	1,688
	Peatling	Harborough	1,826
	Ullesthorpe	Harborough	1,602
43. South Northamptonshire CC			71,822
	Weedon	Daventry	4,947
	Woodford	Daventry	5,201
	Astwell	South Northamptonshire	1,598
	Blakesley and Cote	South Northamptonshire	2,895
	Blisworth and Roade	South Northamptonshire	3,534
	Brackley East	South Northamptonshire	3,439
	Brackley South	South Northamptonshire	3,259
	Brackley West	South Northamptonshire	3,373
	Brafield and Yardley	South Northamptonshire	3,389
	Cosgrove and Grafton	South Northamptonshire	1,607
	Danvers and Wardoun	South Northamptonshire	2,942
	Deanshanger	South Northamptonshire	3,206
	Hackleton	South Northamptonshire	1,851
	Heyfords and Bugbrooke	South Northamptonshire	3,649
	Kings Sutton	South Northamptonshire	1,731
	Kingthorn	South Northamptonshire	1,493
	Little Brook	South Northamptonshire	1,667
	Middleton Cheney	South Northamptonshire	3,238
	Old Stratford	South Northamptonshire	1,557
	Salcey	South Northamptonshire	1,855
	Silverstone	South Northamptonshire	1,816
	Steane	South Northamptonshire	1,591

Constituency	Ward	Local authorities	Electorate
	Tove	South Northamptonshire	1,534
	Towcester Brook	South Northamptonshire	4,388
	Towcester Mill	South Northamptonshire	2,817
	Washington	South Northamptonshire	1,485
	Whittlewood	South Northamptonshire	1,760
44. Wellingborough CC			76,200
	Higham Ferrers Chichele	East Northamptonshire	2,940
	Higham Ferrers Lancaster	East Northamptonshire	3,463
	Irthlingborough John Pyel	East Northamptonshire	3,119
	Irthlingborough Waterloo	East Northamptonshire	3,212
	Rushden Bates	East Northamptonshire	3,581
	Rushden Hayden	East Northamptonshire	5,306
	Rushden Pemberton	East Northamptonshire	4,834
	Rushden Sartoris	East Northamptonshire	3,100
	Rushden Spencer	East Northamptonshire	4,739
	Bozeat	Wellingborough	1,646
	Brickhill	Wellingborough	2,977
	Croyland	Wellingborough	4,423
	Great Doddington & Wilby	Wellingborough	1,503
	Hatton	Wellingborough	2,954
	Irchester	Wellingborough	4,371
	Isebrook	Wellingborough	1,111
	Queensway	Wellingborough	4,257
	Redwell	Wellingborough	4,898
	Rixon	Wellingborough	4,397
	Swanspool	Wellingborough	2,858
	Victoria	Wellingborough	3,458
	Wollaston	Wellingborough	3,053