

# Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in Yorkshire and the Humber



# Contents

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>What is the Boundary Commission for England?</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background to the 2018 Review</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Revised proposals for Yorkshire and the Humber</b>	<b>13</b>
	The sub-region split	15
	Humberside	17
	North Yorkshire	22
	South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire	25
<b>4</b>	<b>How to have your say</b>	<b>53</b>
	<b>Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates</b>	<b>55</b>

# 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 Yorkshire and the Humber reducing by four, from 54 to 50. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions<sup>1</sup> – 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 of the comments which 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 Yorkshire and the Humber?

We have revised the composition of 31 of the 50 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining 19. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, eight constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber 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 proposals are based on new sub-regions as shown in the table overleaf.

<sup>1</sup> 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
Humberside (East Riding of Yorkshire, Kingston upon Hull, North Lincolnshire, North East Lincolnshire)	10	9
North Yorkshire (North Yorkshire, City of York)	8	8
South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire	36	33

In our revised proposals, two constituencies cross the county boundary between West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire. This is because it was not possible to create constituencies wholly within each county without crossing the county boundary. However, our revised proposals represent a reduction of two constituencies that cross county boundaries from our initial proposals, in which four constituencies crossed county boundaries.

In Humberside we have made revisions to three of the constituencies in our initial proposals covering Kingston upon Hull. We have made no further revision to the composition of the remaining constituencies within the sub-region but have revised the names of three constituencies.

Our decision to treat North Yorkshire as a sub-region on its own has meant relatively minor revisions to six of the constituencies in our initial proposals. We have made no revisions to the two proposed City of York constituencies. As a result of treating North Yorkshire on its own, three of the eight proposed constituencies are now the same as the existing constituencies.

In West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire, we have revised 22 of the constituencies that we proposed in our initial proposals

while we have made no revisions to the remaining 11. Most of the Leeds constituencies are unchanged from our initial proposals, but we have proposed substantial revisions to the constituencies covering Bradford. In Sheffield, where we have split three wards, all proposed Sheffield constituencies are revised. Our revised proposals mean that, in addition to the further three constituencies in North Yorkshire that are now the same as the existing constituencies, a further two constituencies in West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire are also the same as the existing constituencies.

## 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](http://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.<sup>2</sup>

**1.3** Our consultation website at [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://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](mailto: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

<sup>2</sup> <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 Yorkshire and the Humber.

**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'),<sup>3</sup> 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 proposals strike the best balance

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

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 6% of the existing constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber – 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 (15%) of the existing 54 constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber.

## 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 Yorkshire and the Humber. 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 1,390 unique written representations relating to Yorkshire and the Humber. We also heard more than 85 oral representations at the four public hearings in Yorkshire and the Humber. 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 Yorkshire and the Humber' – 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.

<sup>4</sup> <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 Yorkshire and the Humber

**3.1** In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of two assistant commissioners for Yorkshire and the Humber – John Feavyour and Collette Rawnsley – 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:

- Leeds: 13–14 October 2016
- Sheffield: 17–18 October 2016
- Northallerton: 20–21 October 2016
- Kingston upon Hull: 24–25 October 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** 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](http://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.

**3.6** Yorkshire and the Humber comprises the counties of North Yorkshire (including the City of York), South Yorkshire, and West Yorkshire. These three counties are covered by a mix of district, county, and metropolitan borough councils, and unitary authorities. The region also covers the former metropolitan county of Humberside (East Riding of Yorkshire, Kingston upon Hull, North Lincolnshire, and North East Lincolnshire). In our initial proposals, the number of constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber was reduced from the current 54 constituencies to 50.

**3.7** Our proposals left three of the existing constituencies unchanged. We were able to group the four unitary authorities that were formed from the former metropolitan county of Humberside and considered Humberside as a sub-region. Although we had noted that North Yorkshire did not need to be grouped with a neighbouring county, we had considered that, if we did not do so, it would prove to be extremely challenging to construct constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota without dividing towns elsewhere in Yorkshire. We therefore combined North Yorkshire with South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire as we considered that this would give us more flexibility in constructing constituencies in South Yorkshire.

**3.8** We proposed two constituencies that crossed the county boundary between North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire: Normanton, Castleford and Outwood, and Pontefract. We also proposed two constituencies that crossed the county boundary between South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire: Colne Valley, and Barnsley East and Hemsworth. We did not split any wards between constituencies in our initial proposals.

**3.9** We received a large number of counter-proposals. Among those that covered the whole Yorkshire and the Humber region or specific sub-regions were counter-proposals from the Conservative Party (BCE-30343 and BCE-41089), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379), Michael Barge (BCE-28530),

Aaron Fear (BCE-30692 and BCE-40974), Alan Bewick Wise (BCE-30368), Richard O’Callaghan (BCE-16771), John Bryant (BCE-28379 and BCE-39602), and Jonathan Jordan (BCE-18512, BCE-20003, and BCE-37511).

**3.10** A large number of counter-proposals were also received that addressed issues for a smaller number of constituencies within the sub-regions. Among these were counter-proposals from the Labour Party (BCE-30360 and BCE-41087); Robert Winfield and Leeds City Conservatives (BCE-26228 and BCE-39665); a joint response from Caroline Flint MP, Ed Miliband MP, Dame Rosie Winterton MP (BCE-30225 and BCE-31842); Clive Betts MP (BCE-26358, BCE-27232, and BCE-33071); and Andy Walsh on behalf of the Sandale Community Development Trust (BCE-17254). A substantial number of the counter-proposals received contained proposals that included the splitting of one or more wards.

**3.11** In addition, we received a number of substantial campaigns opposed to our initial proposals. Among these were: ‘Keep Mosborough and Beighton in Sheffield’ (BCE-33233), ‘Keep Bradford Bradford’ (BCE-33245), ‘Keep Wyke in Bradford’ (BCE-33222), ‘Counter-proposals for Calderdale’ (BCE-33243), and ‘Great Grimsby 2gether’ (BCE-33230).

## The sub-region split

**3.12** In developing our initial proposals we decided to divide Yorkshire and the Humber into two sub-regions. These were: Humberside; and North Yorkshire, West Yorkshire, and South Yorkshire. We noted that North Yorkshire did not need to be grouped with a neighbouring county as it could be allocated eight constituencies with an average electorate size of 73,732. However, our view at the time was that the electorates and shapes of local authority wards in the cities of Leeds and Wakefield, and in the Borough of Kirklees made it difficult to create constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota without some considerable division of towns between constituencies. Without evidence at the time of local and community ties, we considered that we would achieve greater flexibility when proposing constituencies in the region if we crossed the North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire county boundary. West Yorkshire's electorate of 1,517,655, if divided equally, gave an allocation of 20.3 constituencies to the county.

**3.13** We noted that the electorate of South Yorkshire indicated an allocation of 12.74 constituencies and we proposed an allocation of 13. We knew it would be challenging to create constituencies in Sheffield due to the large ward electorates and we considered that grouping both West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire would afford us greater flexibility in creating constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota. We therefore proposed that South Yorkshire should be grouped together with West Yorkshire, and since we had already decided that West Yorkshire should be grouped with North Yorkshire, we

decided that there should be a sub-region comprising all three counties. In our initial proposals we constructed two cross-county boundary constituencies between West Yorkshire and North Yorkshire that, we considered, improved our proposals for constituencies in both counties.

**3.14** There was some support for the sub-region grouping in our initial proposals, for example from the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379). The Green Party (BCE-28574) did propose an alternative grouping and considered that our proposals were based on the 'absurdity of rules'. The Conservative Party (BCE-30343) considered that 'minimum disruption will be caused through pairing South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire' but that treating North Yorkshire as a sub-region in its own right could 'retain three seats unchanged and a fourth unchanged after local government ward changes are taken into account.' This was supported by Aaron Fear in his representation submitted during the second consultation (BCE-40974): 'It is clear that it is preferable to form a sub-region of a single whole county, and that it is very undesirable to remove two small wards of a rural district and crossing the county boundary in the fashion the Commission propose.' Although not commenting specifically on the crossing of the North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire boundary, a number of the objections we received to our proposals in North Yorkshire were indirectly as a consequence of our decision to group North Yorkshire with West Yorkshire: for example, the inclusion of the Claro and Boroughbridge wards in our proposed Selby and Ainsty constituency.

**3.15** Our assistant commissioners considered these issues and recognised the merits of the arguments to alter our sub-regional grouping. While it would still be challenging to create constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota in both West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire, it is possible to consider North Yorkshire as a sub-region in its own right. The assistant commissioners considered that this would result in significantly less change in the county than we had suggested in our initial proposals, and recommended to us that we should consider North Yorkshire as a sub-region in its own right – without crossing the county boundary into West Yorkshire – and that we should consider South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire as a separate sub-region. Given the evidence that was presented to us, and in particular the better reflection of the existing constituencies that this would allow, we agree with their assessment and propose that the county of North Yorkshire be considered as a sub-region on its own.

**3.16** In the Humberside sub-region, there were some counter-proposals to cross the regional boundary into the East Midlands region, e.g. Anne Braid (BCE-20550) and George Krawiec (BCE-33011), on day two of the public hearing held in Kingston upon Hull. Mr Krawiec had suggested that the whole of the south-western side of the Humber estuary should be considered together. However, such proposals would result in a ‘ripple effect’ and would require unnecessary changes to adjacent constituencies in Lincolnshire that have either not been changed in this review or changed only to realign ward boundaries.

**3.17** A representation mostly concerning the North East region (Graeme Robertson BCE-20061) suggested crossing the regional boundary into North Yorkshire by including three wards from the North East region (Loftus, Yarm, and Thornton and Stainton) in three separate constituencies in North Yorkshire. This would have consequential effects on the Richmond (Yorks), Thirsk and Malton, and Scarborough and Whitby constituencies. A representation mostly concerning the East Midlands (J Burton BCE-34196) suggested including the Derbyshire town of Dronfield in a constituency with parts of South Sheffield to be called ‘Totley and Dronfield’.

**3.18** Our assistant commissioners considered these proposals to cross regional boundaries, not just from the perspective of constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber, but also the implications that there would inevitably be for constituencies in the North East and East Midlands regions and they recommended to us that we do not accept them, noting that the evidence accompanying the proposals was not persuasive and that they would cause unnecessary disruption to the pattern of constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber, and in the East Midlands region. Our stated policy – which has received strong support – is to use the European regions 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 Yorkshire and the Humber regional boundary should not be crossed with any other region.



**3.19** In the next sections of our report, we consider each sub-region in turn, summarising our initial proposals followed by the responses and counter-proposals received, our assistant commissioners' consideration of the evidence and their recommendations, and our revised proposals on the basis of the evidence received and in accordance with the statutory rules for the 2018 Review.

## Humberside

**3.20** Of the 10 existing constituencies in this sub-region, only two have electorates that are currently within 5% of the electoral quota. Under our initial proposals we proposed to reduce the number of constituencies in this sub-region to nine.

**3.21** We retained the two existing constituencies of Beverley and Holderness and East Yorkshire. Few representations were received regarding these two constituencies and most supported our proposals, for example, Newbald Parish Council (BCE-21213) and Beverley Town Council (BCE-25918). Although some representations suggested that we rename the East Yorkshire constituency Bridlington, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that we should not make any revisions to these two constituencies. We agree with their recommendation.

**3.22** In Kingston upon Hull we had proposed two constituencies made up wholly of wards of the city – Kingston upon Hull East and Kingston upon Hull Central – and another, Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice, which contained four City of Kingston upon Hull wards, and five wards from the District of East Riding of Yorkshire.

**3.23** A number of counter-proposals that were received suggested alternative constituencies, although there was support for our proposals, for example, from John Sharp (BCE-17904) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379), who noted that although the 'big community divide within Hull is the River Hull ... the maximum possible number of electors living east of the river live within the proposed Kingston upon Hull East constituency'. Councillor David McCobb (BCE-32944), who spoke on day one of the public hearing in Kingston upon Hull, stressed the importance of keeping in one constituency the wards which look towards the university – Bricknell, Newland, University, Beverley, and Avenue – as in our initial proposals. A number of further representations drew attention to the River Hull as a natural divide: 'The River Hull is the most defining boundary in the city ... This is more than a physical divide. It is also a defining cultural boundary with a long history' (Diana Johnson, Member of Parliament for Kingston upon Hull North, BCE-28557) and 'The important thing to understand about the River Hull boundary is that in Hull people regard themselves as either West Hull or East Hull ... the East/West divide in Hull is a cultural one' (Kevin Morton, BCE-32966), who spoke on day one of the public hearing held in Kingston upon Hull. However, this view was not unanimous as Alan Bewick Wise (BCE-30368) stated: 'I have always been puzzled by the insistence that the River Hull should always be a dominating factor when determining Hull's constituency boundaries. The river is crossed by several bridges and major roads and in any case no one should have any need to cross the river to vote as the river follows ward boundaries'.

**3.24** The Labour Party (BCE-30360) proposed a different arrangement to the initial proposals ‘to maintain the existing pattern of constituencies’ (BCE-41087). They included the Myton ward within the existing Kingston upon Hull East constituency; a constituency based on the existing Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle constituency that includes the wards of Avenue, Newland, Tranby, and Willerby and Kirk Ella; and a Kingston upon Hull North constituency that includes both Cottingham North and South wards, and which they call Kingston upon Hull North and Cottingham. These proposals were generally well supported, for example by Carl Good (BCE-30069), but the then Member of Parliament for Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle, Alan Johnson (BCE-29462), believed that the Myton ward should remain in Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice. Diana Johnson MP proposed a different configuration that respected the River Hull as a boundary in the south, but separated the Bransholme East and Bransholme West wards between her counter-proposed Kingston upon Hull North West and Kingston upon Hull East constituencies, with a different configuration for the Kingston upon West and Haltemprice constituency.

**3.25** The Conservative Party (BCE-30343) provided a differing counter-proposal, which they argued would better respect local ties in the city. Their proposal took five East Riding of Yorkshire wards – ‘the area known as Haltemprice’, including the Cottingham North and Cottingham South wards – plus four City wards – Newington, Derringham, Bricknell, and Boothferry – to form a Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice constituency. They supported our proposed Kingston upon Hull East constituency (which includes both Bransholme wards) and proposed that the Pickering and St. Andrews wards should form part of the Kingston upon Hull Central constituency, which includes the Myton ward. This, they suggested, keeps every part of west Hull’s dockside area in the Kingston upon Hull constituency.

**3.26** A further counter-proposal was suggested by Aaron Fear (BCE-30692). He proposed that the existing Kingston upon Hull East constituency should remain intact with the addition of the Myton ward; and that the existing Kingston upon Hull North remain intact with the addition of the Derringham ward, both of which ‘therefore comply excellently with the rule on respecting existing constituencies’. The remainder of the existing Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle seat would be combined with five East Riding wards, which he renamed Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice. His counter-proposal also keeps in one constituency the wards identified by Councillor McCobb as looking towards the university.



**3.27** Having considered again our initial proposals, all the counter-proposals and the suggestions for Kingston upon Hull, our assistant commissioners considered that there was a degree of merit in each of them. However, on balance, they have recommended to us that we amend our initial proposals and adopt those suggested by Aaron Fear. They considered that the arguments he presented were persuasive and that his counter-proposals resulted in constituencies which closely resemble the existing pattern of constituencies, particularly so in the east and north of Kingston upon Hull. Given the evidence that was presented to us, we agree with the recommendation of our assistant commissioners that we adopt the counter-proposal from Aaron Fear for the constituencies in Kingston upon Hull.

**3.28** We note that our initial proposals for the remainder of the constituencies in Humberside (with the exception of Grimsby South and Cleethorpes, and Grimsby North and Barton) were largely uncontroversial and supported.

**3.29** In developing our initial proposals, in order to accommodate changes to the Haltemprice and Howden constituency, we included four wards from the District of East Riding of Yorkshire in our proposed Goole constituency with a further three wards south of the River Ouse that comprise the town of Goole, and three Borough of North Lincolnshire wards that include the Isle of Axholme. This proposed constituency was supported by the three main political parties with the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) calling it 'the most logical configuration of the rural communities along the M62 corridor and

around Goole' although there was some limited objection, for example from Andrew Freeman (BCE-18085).

**3.30** Despite the general level of support for our proposed constituency, a number of representations were received which suggested a change of name to reflect the composition of the constituency, for example, David Nolan (BCE-32946), on day one of the public hearing in Kingston upon Hull. Among the representations it was suggested that 'Howden' or 'Howdenshire' should be included in the name, but the general consensus among a number of representations was that the constituency name should at least reflect the inclusion of the Isle of Axholme. Our assistant commissioners considered all of the alternative names for the constituency and recommended to us that we rename the constituency Goole and Axholme, as it was their view that the evidence suggested that this reflects the composition of the constituency and will be well supported. We agree with the assistant commissioners' assessment and propose that the name of the Goole constituency be changed to Goole and Axholme.

**3.31** Our proposed Scunthorpe constituency elicited some comment, both in support, for example Laima Zukauskiene (BCE-18613), and objection, for example from Chris Fletcher (BCE-15972) who considered that Cadney and Howsham are 'incorrectly' allocated to the constituency. Our assistant commissioners weighed up the representations but did not consider there was sufficient evidence to recommend any change to our initial proposals for the constituency. We agree with their recommendation.

**3.32** There was some support for our initial proposals in Grimsby and Cleethorpes, but they were also strongly opposed, with a campaign – Great Grimsby 2gether (BCE-33230) – gathering in excess of 300 signatures. The campaign had three main objections:

- ‘The proposals do not recognise or take into consideration Great Grimsby’s heritage or historic significance and disregard the town’s privileges as a Parliamentary and Municipal Borough;
- ‘The proposal to create two constituencies makes no economic or business sense and will not save costs to the public purse;
- ‘The proposals do not reflect geographic factors, sense of community or local ties.’

**3.33** Great Grimsby Constituency Labour Party (BCE-28187) asked us to look again at our proposals and Melanie Onn, Member of Parliament for Great Grimsby (BCE-24219), while opposing our proposals, stopped short of suggesting an alternative counter-proposal. As we have previously mentioned earlier in this chapter, we have rejected the suggestions to cross the regional boundary with the East Midlands region.

**3.34** In their representation the Labour Party (BCE-30360) said ‘There are clearly no ways in which the seats can be configured to preserve the town of Grimsby in one seat’, and Aaron Fear (BCE-30692), while proposing an alternative to our initial proposals that was the same as the Labour Party, said

‘I am surprised there actually is one [an alternative]’. The Conservative Party (BCE-30343) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) supported the initial proposals for the two constituencies in this area, while the Labour Party alternative included the East Marsh and Yarborough wards in Grimsby South and Cleethorpes, and the Humberston and New Waltham, and Waltham wards in Grimsby North and Barton. The Labour Party counter-proposal was not supported by Cleethorpes Constituency Labour Party (BCE-28301) nor by previous Labour Member of Parliament for Cleethorpes, Shona Mclsaac (BCE-28915), or Martin Vickers, the current Member of Parliament for Cleethorpes, who noted in his second submission (BCE-39112) that these proposals would divide the community of Humberston. These concerns were also expressed by a number of respondents, for example Oliver Freeston (BCE-38505). Ms Mclsaac (BCE-28915 and BCE-40476) and Cleethorpes Constituency Labour Party supported the initial proposals over the official Labour Party counter-proposal.

**3.35** Many of the representations opposing our initial proposals drew our attention to the history of Grimsby. Councillor Karl Wilson (BCE-20887) said, ‘it is quite clear to me that no thought has been given to history, society and community regarding the changes to Great Grimsby’s boundaries ...’ and a representation from Rob Walsh on behalf of North East Lincolnshire Council (BCE-24056) said of the initial proposals that ‘established communities would be split, randomly creating more boundary length along the middle of urban residential streets’.

**3.36** A number of counter-proposals suggested the splitting of the Croft Baker ward. Austin Mitchell (High Steward for North East Lincolnshire and former Member of Parliament for Great Grimsby) and Matthew Kay in their joint response (BCE-26612, proposal two) suggested the splitting of this ward, as did North East Lincolnshire Council. This was also suggested by Matthew Kay (BCE-32987) in his oral submission on day one of the public hearing that was held in Kingston upon Hull. However, our assistant commissioners noted that the splitting of wards was also opposed. Shona McIsaac, in a response during the second consultation stage (BCE-40547), described part of Mr Mitchell's second proposal, which involved splitting the Croft Baker ward, as 'bizarre' and claimed that: 'As with other similar suggestions, Mr Mitchell's proposals would mean Cleethorpes railway station would be in Grimsby. The pier, which is a few metres away from the station, would be in Cleethorpes. Cleethorpes High Street would be divided between two constituencies. Cleethorpes Memorial Hall would be in Grimsby. The beach, seafront, promenade and entertainment and leisure facilities of Cleethorpes would be divided between two constituencies.'

**3.37** Our assistant commissioners considered that there was no perfect solution in Grimsby/Cleethorpes that would address all of the issues raised and would attract widespread support. They did not consider that the case to split a ward was compelling and concluded that, as noted by the Labour Party and Aaron Fear, there are effectively only two realistic solutions. In considering the competing evidence the

assistant commissioners noted the support for our initial proposals. Nelson Hunter (BCE-39303) said: 'I have lived in both the Yarborough Ward of Grimsby and New Waltham Ward of Cleethorpes and I believe the Boundary Commission's original proposal is an acceptable compromise'. Peter Sutherland (BCE-39548) said 'The Commission's current proposals are better for maintaining areas with common interests and historic ties. For that reason it is very difficult to avoid dividing Grimsby.' They also noted the representation from Max Burnett (BCE-39232) who said that the initial proposals have 'gained the most support from residents'.

**3.38** Our assistant commissioners weighed up all the evidence and recommended to us that there should be no alterations to the composition of our proposed constituencies of Grimsby North and Barton, and Grimsby South and Cleethorpes. However, they had noted that the existing Grimsby constituency is called 'Great Grimsby', and had been for a long time. In view of all the evidence they had seen and heard that had drawn attention to Grimsby's historical and cultural heritage, they considered that the name of the constituency should continue to reflect this proud heritage. They therefore recommended to us that the names of the constituencies should be Great Grimsby North and Barton, and Great Grimsby South and Cleethorpes.

**3.39** We agree with their recommendation and we propose to adopt our initial proposals for the composition of two constituencies, but with the amended constituency names.

## North Yorkshire

**3.40** In our initial proposals we included North Yorkshire in a sub-region with West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire and proposed that the two District of Selby wards of Byram & Brotherton, and Whitley be included in the cross-county constituencies of, respectively, Normanton, Castleford and Outwood, and Pontefract. Although we received some support for crossing the county boundary, for example from the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379), our proposals to cross the county boundary were generally not well supported. Palbinder Mann, on behalf of Selby District Council (BCE-22927), opposed the removal of the Whitley, and Bryam & Brotherton wards from the Selby and Ainsty constituency, and Stephen Jackson (BCE-22762) said ‘it would be difficult to conceive of a more unsuitable coalition of both people and place’.

**3.41** In their representation (BCE-30343), the Conservative Party drew attention to the revised proposals at the aborted 2013 review which said that ‘North Yorkshire is quite distinct and different from the former metropolitan counties of South and West Yorkshire, being a largely agricultural and rural county’. At this review they said in their evidence that under the initial proposals ‘two wards of the Selby District are removed to become ‘orphan wards’<sup>5</sup> of seats otherwise in the Wakefield District. This creates a ‘domino effect’ of changes in the south of the county, with the Boroughbridge and Claro wards having to be added to the Selby and Ainsty constituency to bring it within quota, then the Washburn ward having to be added

to the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency to bring it in turn within quota. We believe that these changes are unnecessary and propose alternatives to return these seats to their current composition thus being more compliant with Rule 5 (1) c.’

**3.42** Our assistant commissioners found this evidence to be compelling. As we have detailed at the start of this chapter, we agree with their recommendation not to cross the county boundary here between North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire and to include these two wards in the Selby and Ainsty constituency.

**3.43** The assistant commissioners noted the large number of representations received with regard to the Claro and Boroughbridge wards, which objected to our initial proposals and the removal of the wards from the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency. Boroughbridge Town Council (BCE-29095) said of their objection: ‘This is not a politically biased objection, but one of geographical belonging. We asked ourselves what have we and our community got in common with Selby and Ainsty?’ and Councillor Lionel Archer (BCE-17083) said: ‘Boroughbridge has nothing in common with Selby, to therefore link the two towns for mathematical convenience makes no sense.’ This view was not, however, unanimous. Thomas Kirkwood (BCE-22205) said: ‘The removal of Boroughbridge from the Harrogate and Karakorum constituency is long overdue ... We are a rural area, bolted incongruously onto a large urban constituency: it would be far more logical for us to be part of

<sup>5</sup> ‘Orphan ward’ refers to a clear minority of wards (usually just one ward) from one local authority, in a constituency where the overwhelming majority of wards are from another local authority.

a rural constituency.’ However, this was certainly a minority view and our assistant commissioners found the evidence to include the Claro and Boroughbridge wards in the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency persuasive and have recommended to us that we amend our initial proposals. We agree and propose to include both these wards in the Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency.

**3.44** A consequence of this alteration is that Harrogate and Knaresborough would not now be within 5% of the electoral quota. To resolve this, our assistant commissioners recommended to us the return of the Washburn ward to the Skipton and Ripon constituency. We agree with their recommendation. This would mean that both the Harrogate and Knaresborough, and Skipton and Ripon constituencies would be unchanged from the existing constituencies. With the exclusion of the Claro and Boroughbridge wards from the Selby and Ainsty constituency, and the inclusion of the Byram & Brotherton, and Whitley wards, Selby District would be reunited in a single Selby and Ainsty constituency.

**3.45** In our initial proposals we included the ward of Filey in the Scarborough and Whitby constituency as the electorate of the existing constituency was just outside the lower 5% limit. This, however, meant that another ward would have to be included in Thirsk and Malton to compensate for the loss of the Filey ward.

**3.46** We therefore proposed that the District of Hambleton ward of Great Ayton be transferred from Richmond (Yorks) to the Thirsk and Malton constituency. There was very significant opposition to this

proposal in both the written representations and at the public hearing that was held in Northallerton. Although the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) supported our initial proposals, the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) and local Labour Party branches did not support them, for example, Great Ayton and Stokesley Branch Labour Party (BCE-28392) and Richmond (Yorks) Constituency Labour Party (BCE-28239). In general, the representations suggested that Great Ayton looked west towards the Richmond (Yorks) constituency and was physically separated from the rest of the Thirsk and Malton constituency by the North York moors. Councillor Richard Hudson on day one of the public hearing in Northallerton (BCE-32901) said, ‘Great Ayton has been within the Richmondshire constituency for around one hundred years. This period has allowed Great Ayton to forge deep links with the towns and villages within Richmondshire ... Add in the contour lines and it becomes blatantly obvious why Great Ayton has next to no association with Malton.’

**3.47** Our assistant commissioners considered that the representation of Ann Arkell (BCE-24944) succinctly articulated the key objections: ‘Nearby Stokesley is the local market town which serves Great Ayton, Hutton Rudby, Great Broughton and other smaller villages, all of which are in the Richmond constituency ... Geographically the North York Moors lie between Great Ayton and the Thirsk and Malton Constituency.’ The assistant commissioners found all this evidence compelling and recommended to us that we amend our initial proposals to include the Great Ayton ward in the Richmond (Yorks) constituency. We agree.



**3.48** As a consequence of this amendment, the electorate of the Thirsk and Malton constituency is no longer within 5% of the electoral quota. The Filey ward is a Borough of Scarborough ward and we considered that its inclusion in the Scarborough and Whitby constituency in our initial proposals was logical. Although there was some very limited opposition to this proposal, for example Ruth Brownrigg (BCE-34728), there was also some support, for example, Robert Goodwill, Member of Parliament for Scarborough and Whitby (BCE-35657), who said, 'Including Filey in the Scarborough and Whitby constituency makes logical sense for a variety of reasons.'

**3.49** However, with the transfer of Great Ayton from Thirsk and Malton, it would be necessary to include another ward in the constituency. Our assistant commissioners advised us that Filey's best fit was in the Scarborough and Whitby constituency, but, in order to accommodate the changes they had already recommended to us, they further recommended we amend our proposals to return the Filey ward to Thirsk and Malton, in which it is currently located. We agree with this recommendation. This meant that the Scarborough and Whitby constituency was now below the permitted electorate range and would need the addition of another ward. In proposing that Filey would return to Thirsk and Malton, the assistant commissioners considered that the only candidate for inclusion in Scarborough and Whitby was the District of Ryedale ward of Thornton Dale. They noted that the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) also proposed the inclusion of Thornton Dale in Scarborough and Whitby, in which they drew attention

to its 'good communication links with Scarborough along the A170'. We agree with the recommendation that the Thornton Dale ward should be included in the Scarborough and Whitby constituency.

**3.50** Our proposed York Central and York Outer constituencies generated little by way of representations, although Steven Burkeman (BCE-33700) did not approve of the 'doughnut' shape of the two constituencies and suggested the city 'should instead be two seats divided along a diameter', and Mervyn Hoyland (BCE-14639) suggested the city should be split north to south, perhaps along the line of the River Ouse. Gareth Knight (BCE-18899) did not suggest a reconfiguration of the constituencies but suggested new names of 'York Minster and University' and 'Greater York'. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that the evidence presented, and this very limited opposition, was sufficient to lead them to recommend a change to our initial proposals for the two City of York constituencies. We agree with our assistant commissioners.

**3.51** Our revised proposals would mean that North Yorkshire would be considered as a separate sub-region, without any constituencies crossing the county boundary, and would also mean that three constituencies, Selby and Ainsty, Skipton and Ripon, and Harrogate and Knaresborough, would be unchanged from the existing constituencies, and three constituencies, Richmond (Yorks), York Central, and York Outer would be changed only by re-warding, thereby having better regard to the boundaries of existing constituencies and local ties.

## South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire

**3.52** As we had decided that North Yorkshire could be treated as a sub-region in its own right – without crossing the county boundary into West Yorkshire – we would therefore consider South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire as a separate sub-region, while acknowledging that it would still be challenging to create constituencies within 5% of the electoral quota in both counties.

**3.53** The electorate of South Yorkshire indicated an allocation of 12.74 constituencies and we proposed an allocation of 13. West Yorkshire's electorate of 1,517,655 gave an allocation of 20.3 constituencies to the county.

### South Yorkshire

**3.54** In developing our initial proposals we were very mindful that the large ward electorates in Sheffield and their location within the city made the construction of appropriate constituencies in Sheffield particularly challenging – our proposals had resulted in four constituencies, three of which had crossed the city boundary. The challenge of creating constituencies in Sheffield was also recognised by most of the representations as, among the various and wide variety of counter-proposals we received, some half of the 28 wards of Sheffield were identified as being candidates for splitting.

**3.55** We seek to avoid dividing wards between constituencies wherever possible. As our Guide to the 2018 Review explains, wards are well-defined and well-understood units, which are generally indicative of areas which have a broad community of interest. It is our view that any division of these units between constituencies would be likely to break local ties, disrupt political party organisations, and cause difficulties for Electoral Registration and Returning Officers. Our assistant commissioners considered that the fact that so many of the representations had suggested the splitting of wards, and that the splitting of wards was also proposed by the main political parties, was in itself powerful evidence that there might be 'exceptional and compelling circumstances' which could lead them to recommend, in a very limited number of situations, that one or more wards in Sheffield should be split between constituencies using polling districts. Furthermore, the assistant commissioners also considered that a limited splitting of wards would prevent a disruptive 'domino effect' of change, some of it unnecessary, elsewhere in the county. Only three of the existing constituencies in Yorkshire and the Humber had not been changed in the initial proposals. Our assistant commissioners considered that a splitting of wards would allow for more unchanged constituencies – a total of eight across the region – a general improvement on the initial proposals and a more suitable and appropriate set of constituencies throughout the region that would respect, rather than undermine, local ties.

**3.56** There was significant opposition to our initial proposals for all the constituencies in Sheffield. Among the counter-proposals our assistant commissioners considered were those from Aaron Fear (BCE-30692), Jonathan Harston (BCE-33082 and BCE-38951), and Adrian Bailey (BCE-30233), although they felt that this latter counter-proposal lacked sufficient detail. Michael Barge (BCE-28530) submitted a wide-ranging counter-proposal. However, in his summary he gave approximate electorates for some of his Sheffield constituencies rather than precise figures. Our assistant commissioners also considered that his proposed Sheffield South, and, in particular, Sheffield North and Stocksbridge constituencies resulted in less than satisfactorily shaped constituencies.

**3.57** We received a campaign from Clive Betts, Member of Parliament for Sheffield South East – Keep Mosborough and Beighton in Sheffield (BCE-33233) – that contained almost 2,400 signatures. The aim of the campaign was to register opposition to the exclusion of the Mosborough and Beighton wards from a Sheffield constituency (we had initially proposed that the two wards be included in the Rother Valley constituency). The campaign said that there was ‘no real community connection between Mosborough and Beighton and the Rotherham wards’ and it called upon us to ‘create a proposal where Mosborough and Beighton are contained together in a wholly Sheffield constituency’. The issue of the Mosborough and Beighton wards was also raised at the public hearings in Sheffield. Janis Dare (BCE-33043), on day one of the hearing in Sheffield, said: ‘I have lived in

Sheffield for 35 years. I do not wish to [be] part of Rotherham.’ Sue Eagers, also on day one of the hearing in Sheffield, said, with regard to her address in Mosborough, ‘I feel as if I am being shoved out of Sheffield.’ Concerns about the Sheffield constituencies in general continued on day two of the Sheffield public hearing with evidence from, among others, Jonathan Harston (BCE-33082) and Alan Whitehouse (BCE-33079).

**3.58** The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) said in their representation that the proposals for Sheffield ‘in our view push the limits of the aim to retain whole wards beyond any reasonable reflection of community links, local ties and geographic constraints. This represents the only proposal to split one ward in the entire region.’ The ward they split is the Sheffield City ward of Fulwood, where they would include two polling districts that predominantly contain accommodation for students at Sheffield University in a Sheffield Central constituency. These points were also made by a number of supporters of the Liberal Democrat Party’s counter-proposals in their oral representations at the public hearings held in Sheffield, for example by Andrew Sangar (BCE-33041), Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed (BCE-33056), and Councillor Adam Hanrahan (BCE-33050).

**3.59** Our assistant commissioners had come to a preliminary view that there might be compelling reasons which could lead them to recommend the splitting of wards in Sheffield, and although they considered that the splitting of just one ward in Sheffield was an attractive proposal, they noted that the Liberal Democrat Party’s proposals did not address a number of the



issues identified during the consultation process, in particular the very strong sentiment regarding the Mosborough and Beighton wards, which they would continue to include in the Rother Valley constituency, as proposed by us. The assistant commissioners also noted that the Green Party (BCE-28574), while broadly supporting our proposals (with minor amendments), also did not address the Mosborough and Beighton wards, as also evidenced by Councillor Rob Murphy (BCE-33074) on day two of the public hearing in Sheffield.

**3.60** John Bryant (BCE-28379) submitted a counter-proposal for Sheffield that did not divide any wards and which, he claimed, ‘would significantly improve the arrangement of seats in Sheffield’. However, his representation is largely based on retaining our initial proposals elsewhere in the region without amendment. He did not include the Mosborough and Beighton wards in any Sheffield constituency and two of his proposed Sheffield constituencies – Sheffield Hallam and Penistone, and Sheffield Hillsborough – each contain a Borough of Barnsley ward (respectively, Penistone West and Penistone East) and his proposed Sheffield Attercliffe constituency contains a Borough of Rotherham ward (Brinsworth and Catcliffe, which we had proposed should be included in the Sheffield East constituency). As the assistant commissioners considered that the evidence with regard to the inclusion of the Mosborough and Beighton wards in a Sheffield constituency was both compelling and would be widely supported, albeit with the consequence of the splitting of wards, and that it would

be possible to create five constituencies in Sheffield that contain only Sheffield wards, they recommended that we reject the counter-proposals from the Liberal Democrat Party, Green Party and Mr Bryant. It is clear to us that the evidence to retain Mosborough and Beighton in a Sheffield constituency is compelling and we endorse the assistant commissioners’ recommendation to attempt to address this issue.

**3.61** Both the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) and Clive Betts MP (BCE-26358 and BCE-27232) together with the other Labour Sheffield MPs, Paul Blomfield (Sheffield Central), Louise Haigh (Sheffield, Heeley) and Gill Furniss (Sheffield Brightside and Hillsborough), proposed solutions that included the Mosborough and Beighton wards in a Sheffield constituency, and, in addition to other proposed changes of wards between constituencies, each of these counter-proposals split three wards. Our assistant commissioners considered that both counter-proposals had considered in detail the local ties and either was likely to command a degree of support locally.

**3.62** In the Conservative Party counter-proposals the wards of Shiregreen and Brightside, Broomhill, and Hillsborough are divided, with Shiregreen and Brightside ward polling districts VD, VE, VF, and VG included in a Sheffield Attercliffe constituency, and polling districts VA, VB, and VC included in a Sheffield Hillsborough constituency; Broomhill ward polling districts EA, EC, ED, EE, EF, EG, and EH are included in a Sheffield Central constituency, and polling district EB is included in a Sheffield Hallam constituency; and

Hillsborough ward polling districts QB and QC are included in a Sheffield Central constituency, and polling districts QA, QD, QE, QF, and QG are included in a Sheffield Hillsborough constituency.

**3.63** In Mr Betts' counter-proposal (BCE-26358), the wards of Burngreave, Central, and Crookes are divided with Burngreave ward polling districts FA, FC, FG, FI, and FK included in a Sheffield South East constituency, and polling districts FB, FD, FE, FF, FH, and FJ included in a Sheffield North and Ecclesfield constituency; Central ward polling districts GD, GF, and GI are included in a Sheffield South constituency, and polling districts GA, GB, GC, GE, GG, and GH are included in a Sheffield Central constituency; and Crookes ward polling districts HA, HC, HD, and HG are included in a Sheffield Central constituency, and polling districts HB, HE, and HF are included in a Sheffield Hallam constituency.

**3.64** The Conservative Party (BCE-30343), while noting that a number of counter-proposals suggested split ward options, said their proposals to split 'very few' wards produced 'a far better solution for the region as a whole'. Mr Betts gave a number of reasons why he believed that, in accordance with our Guide, the arguments for the splitting of wards were compelling. These include the large electorates of the wards which 'are so large people are generally more attached to the immediate area in which they live than the ward itself', and that following local government ward reviews, the 'wards which now exist and which reflect community interests at the current time are not the wards

that are being used for the Boundary Commission's purposes'. Furthermore, he drew attention to paragraph 31 of our Guide, in which we said that splitting a ward 'may prevent a significant 'domino effect' of otherwise unnecessary change to a chain of constituencies in order to meet the electorate totals required'. This he maintained 'is precisely what the Boundary Commission proposals for Sheffield do, they change virtually every single constituency because of the need to bring wards in from outside Sheffield to make up the numbers'. He also noted that the Conservative Party in their counter-proposals in Sheffield had made similar points.

**3.65** During the secondary consultation the Labour Party (BCE-41087) supported the counter-proposal made by Mr Betts and his colleagues. They said 'In all three [wards] we believe the actual division of the ward is logical and the boundary would run mainly along open areas and main roads. The result would be that of the five seats wholly within the city 224,994 electors (82.4%) would remain in the main successor constituency compared with 151,182 (55.4%) under the Initial Proposals.' They rejected the Liberal Democrat Party's counter-proposal, but of the Conservative Party counter-proposal they said it had a 'worthwhile purpose' and: 'Crucially this counter proposal does address the issue of Beighton and Mosborough wards and produces reasonably robust constituencies.'

**3.66** In order to gauge for themselves the relative merits of the different wards that had been suggested as candidates for splitting, our assistant commissioners

went to Sheffield and visited all the polling districts that had been identified in the counter-proposals by Clive Betts and the Conservative Party.

**3.67** On visiting the Burngreave ward, the assistant commissioners observed that the south-eastern part of the ward is very industrial and that the polling districts that it was suggested should be in Sheffield South East appeared to be similar in nature to the adjacent Darnall ward, and seemed to follow main road networks. They considered that the advantages of adding polling districts from this ward appeared to be stronger on the ground than they were on paper. On visiting the Shiregreen and Brightside ward, as suggested by the Conservative Party counter-proposal, our assistant commissioners observed that the area of Wincobank was different in nature to other parts of the ward and that the Conservative Party had found a natural boundary between these communities in proposing this area should be in their Sheffield Attercliffe constituency.

**3.68** The assistant commissioners found both counter-proposals regarding these two wards to be evenly balanced. The Conservative Party had identified a clear boundary, but our assistant commissioners considered that the polling districts Mr Betts had suggested did seem to be more industrial and like the city in nature, and had more in common with the rest of his proposed Sheffield South East constituency. Although the Conservative Party proposals seemed better on paper, on the ground our assistant commissioners took the view that Mr Betts' counter-proposals were more convincing with regard to the Burngreave, and Shiregreen

and Brightside wards and seemed to have addressed local factors to a higher degree. Although, overall, the assistant commissioners did not form a strong view either way about which of these two wards would be the most suitable candidate for potential splitting, on balance they considered that Mr Betts' counter-proposal took greater account of local ties. They considered that linking the specific Burngreave polling districts to similar areas in Darnall was more appropriate, as the south-eastern part is very industrial and the polling districts proposed for inclusion in Sheffield South East are similar in nature to the Darnall ward and follow the main road networks. They therefore narrowly favoured Mr Betts' counter-proposals over those of the Conservative Party.

**3.69** Our assistant commissioners visited the Hillsborough ward, which the Conservative Party had suggested should be split with polling districts included in their Sheffield Central constituency. They observed that the River Loxley formed a natural boundary along much of the Hillsborough ward's southern boundary and considered that the Conservative Party's proposals for the ward had the potential to cut across community ties and natural features. Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence and their own observations and concluded that the case for splitting this ward was not sufficiently compelling. With regard to the Crookes ward, which Mr Betts had suggested be split, our assistant commissioners reported that they observed no discernible difference between the polling districts of Crookes ward that Mr Betts had identified, and the Walkley area which was already in the

proposed Sheffield Central constituency. In view of the similarity between these areas, our assistant commissioners considered that there was a strong case for the polling districts of Crookes ward that Mr Betts had identified to be included in a Sheffield Central constituency.

**3.70** With regard to the Broomhill ward, which the Conservative Party had proposed be split, our assistant commissioners noted that just one polling district (EB) would be included in their proposed Sheffield Hallam constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered that on the map this appears as something of an appendix to the rest of the ward, but on the ground they could not see the justification for removing this single polling district from the Broomhill ward. On visiting the Central ward, which Mr Betts had proposed be split, our assistant commissioners considered that the three polling districts it was suggested be included in his proposed Sheffield South constituency were similar in nature to the rest of the north-western part of the proposed constituency and that there was a strong case for their inclusion in the constituency.

**3.71** Following their visit to the area, our assistant commissioners considered the detail of the Conservative Party and Clive Betts' counter-proposals with regard to the statutory factors: geographical considerations, existing local government boundaries, the boundaries of existing constituencies and, in particular, local ties. They found the evidence in the wide range of representations generally, and from their own observations, for the splitting of wards to be compelling and were of the view that either of the Conservative Party

or Mr Betts' counter-proposals would be likely to result in robust constituencies that would also be likely to command a degree of support locally. In the circumstances, they were convinced of the need to split three wards in the City of Sheffield to construct constituencies that would be more reflective of local ties, less disruptive than those we had initially proposed, and would prevent a significant and disruptive 'domino effect' throughout the rest of South Yorkshire. The splitting of wards would also allow for the two wards of Beighton and Mosborough with their large electorates of, respectively, 13,027 and 13,490 to be included in a Sheffield constituency, reflecting the evidence about the breaks in local ties resulting from our initial proposals.

**3.72** The assistant commissioners noted that neither the Conservative Party nor Mr Betts' counter-proposals were able to include the City of Sheffield ward of Stocksbridge and Upper Don in a Sheffield constituency (the ward is currently located in the Penistone and Stocksbridge constituency that contains mostly Borough of Barnsley wards). However, apart from the Stocksbridge and Upper Don ward, the five constituencies of Sheffield would be contained wholly within the city boundary. On the balance of the evidence received in both written and oral representations, and their observations, our assistant commissioners considered that the counter-proposal submitted by Clive Betts and his colleagues for Sheffield, for both the composition of the constituencies and their proposed names, had more to commend it than did the Conservative Party counter-proposal and they recommended to us that we adopt it. We agree with their recommendation.

**3.73** Our assistant commissioners also considered the counter-proposal submitted by Jonathan Jordan (BCE-20003) who, in his preferred option, split only two wards (Shiregreen and Brightside, and Broomhill). However, in splitting the Shiregreen and Brightside ward along Concord Park, his proposed Sheffield Attercliffe constituency was exactly the same as that proposed by the Conservative Party in their counter-proposal. Having already very carefully weighed up all the written and oral evidence in the representations regarding Sheffield, and from their own observations ‘on the ground’, our assistant commissioners had recommended to us that we should not adopt the counter-proposal of the Conservative Party in the city. It therefore followed that, as Mr Jordan had proposed the same Sheffield Attercliffe constituency as the Conservative Party, they decided not to recommend to us Mr Jordan’s counter-proposal.

**3.74** Having decided that we would split the three wards of Burngreave, Crookes, and Central in Sheffield, we were aware that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England had reviewed Sheffield City and that alterations had been made to some of the wards in Sheffield, as specified in the Sheffield (Electoral Changes) Order 2015. In our Guide to the 2018 Review we had said at paragraph 38: ‘...in the limited circumstances (if any) where the BCE has to consider whether it should divide a ward (as it existed on 7 May 2015) between constituencies in order to meet the statutory electoral range, and if so how it should be divided (which it will seek to do on the component polling district boundaries), the BCE is prepared to take into account as appropriate any new

ward boundaries introduced after 7 May 2015.’ In effect, for Sheffield this means the new wards that actually came into being for the local elections in May 2016.

**3.75** In respect of the three wards that we agreed should be split, we noted that – as a result of the Order specified in the previous paragraph – there had been changes to all three wards. However, the changes to the Burngreave ward and the Crookes ward (which was now called Crookes & Crosspool ward) were such that they had no impact on the polling districts we had recommended should be included in the Sheffield South East, and Sheffield Central constituencies respectively. The changes that were made to the Central ward (which was now called City ward), however, did have an impact. Polling districts GD and GI of the former Central ward were now part of the new Nether Edge & Sharrow ward. This did not have any effect on our recommendations, but the new ward boundaries meant that the GF polling district of the former Central ward was itself now split, with a portion of it now included in the new City ward, and the rest of the polling district being included in the Nether Edge & Sharrow ward.

**3.76** In order that we took into account the new ward boundaries where we had recommended that a ward should be split, this portion of the previous polling district would need to be included with the rest of the new City ward in the Sheffield Central constituency, rather than in the Sheffield South constituency. This would affect the electorates of both revised constituencies, with that of Sheffield Central increasing from 72,297 to 72,586, and that of Sheffield



South decreasing from 71,482 to 71,193, both within the permitted range. With this limited revision, our decision to accept the recommendations of our assistant commissioners stands.

**3.77** Our assistant commissioners noted that throughout the Borough of Rotherham our initial proposals had not generated a large number of representations. The Labour Party had made no counter-proposals in Rotherham and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) supported our constituencies in the borough. However, there were some objections, for example Russell Briscoe (BCE-27674) who, with regard to the Rother Valley constituency, asked ‘why can’t it be left as it is?’ and Matthew Eyre (BCE-24815) who considered that the inclusion of the Wingfield ward in our proposed Wentworth and Dearne constituency ‘makes little sense’. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (BCE-27126) objected to our proposals and considered that the changes we had proposed in the borough in our initial proposals were largely as a consequence of having to turn to the borough to allow the construction of constituencies in Sheffield that were within the permitted range. In particular they objected to the inclusion of the Brinsworth and Catcliffe ward in the proposed Sheffield East constituency: ‘The parish of Brinsworth is only two miles from Rotherham town centre and forms an integral part of the Borough, adjoining the central ward of Boston Castle.’ The council also objected to the inclusion of the Keppel ward in the proposed Sheffield North and Ecclesfield constituency: ‘We do not feel that the interests of Keppel would be well met by the ward being in a constituency where 88% of the electorate

would be from Sheffield ... The eastern areas of Kimberworth and Kimberworth Park in particular, are very much parts of Rotherham town.’

**3.78** Our revised proposals to include the Mosborough and Beighton wards in the Sheffield South East constituency meant that changes would have to be made to our proposed Rother Valley constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range. Our assistant commissioners considered the counter-proposal for Rotherham suggested by the Conservative Party (BCE-30343). Although they had recommended to us that we reject the Conservative Party’s proposals for Sheffield, this would not have any impact on the Conservative Party’s counter-proposals elsewhere in South Yorkshire. Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended to us the inclusion of the Rother Vale, Sitwell, and Hellaby wards in the Rother Valley constituency instead of in our proposed Rotherham constituency. This would mean that the recommended Rother Valley constituency would be exactly the same as the existing Rother Valley constituency. Also, by containing all of the City of Sheffield within Sheffield constituencies as a result of our recommendation to split three Sheffield city wards, the Brinsworth and Catcliffe, and Keppel wards could be transferred back to the Rotherham constituency and, in order to bring the constituency within the permitted range, the Wingfield ward would also be included in the constituency. Apart from the addition of the Wickersley ward, which we had placed in Rotherham in our initial proposals, the Rotherham constituency would be the same as the existing constituency. Our assistant commissioners recommended

to us that we adopt these proposals from the Conservative Party. We agree and considered that they would be well-received by the electors of these two constituencies and the Borough Council.

**3.79** However, recommending these two constituencies would mean that the electorate of the Wentworth and Dearne constituency would be too low and would have to be altered with at least one crossing into the boroughs of Barnsley, Doncaster or both. Our assistant commissioners noted that the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) in their counter-proposals for this area had said that the Barnsley ward of Wombwell had ties with both the Hoyland Milton ward and the Rotherham Borough ward of Hoober and that there was continuous residential development between Wombwell and Brampton in the Hoober ward. The assistant commissioners also noted that the town of Hoyland was currently divided between the Hoyland Milton and Rockingham wards. As they did not wish to propose a solution in which the town of Hoyland would be divided, they recommended to us that both the Barnsley Borough wards of Rockingham and Hoyland Milton, and the Barnsley Borough ward of Wombwell be included in the Wentworth and Dearne constituency. We agree with their recommendation.

**3.80** They noted the representation from Edward Keene (BCE-33178) which proposed that Wentworth and Dearne should be renamed. He said ‘Wentworth is a small village of barely a thousand souls. A section of the River Dearne meanwhile forms part of the northern edge of the proposed constituency. Neither name is therefore terribly suitable.’ He

suggested the constituency name should contain the two largest settlements, Wath upon Dearne and Hoyland, and he proposed the new name of Wath and Hoyland for the constituency. Although our assistant commissioners had some sympathy with his comments, in view of the lack of support for name change in the representations, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that we retain the name Wentworth and Dearne and we agree, though we welcome further comment on the name of this constituency during the current consultation.

**3.81** In the Borough of Doncaster, our initial proposals significantly reconfigured the two existing constituencies of Doncaster North and Don Valley, and less so in Doncaster Central. All three constituencies needed to increase their electorates and it was necessary that at least one constituency would have to cross the borough boundary; our proposed Doncaster West constituency included the Barnsley Borough ward of Dearne North.

**3.82** The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) and the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) supported all three of our proposed Doncaster constituencies. With regard to the Doncaster East and Doncaster West constituencies, the Conservatives considered they ‘very sensibly title the two seats outside central Doncaster on an east and west basis. We note the good communication links between the towns of the Doncaster West seat along the A1. We support the addition of only the Barnsley ward of Dearne North to the seat, minimising disruption in Barnsley.’ Support was also received from Councillor James Hart (BCE-15228) who said the initial proposals give ‘balanced

communities for the MPs to represent'. However, there was significant opposition. The Labour Party (BCE-30360) objected to our proposals in Doncaster for 'significantly and we believe possibly unnecessarily' amending the Doncaster North and Don Valley constituencies, although they did not suggest an alternative. Sandra Holland (BCE-27989) said of the proposed constituencies that they did 'not recognise what I see as the important infrastructure and cultural ties which link communities together', and Anthony Sockett (BCE-27044) was opposed to the 'proposed political separation of former mining communities in the north of Doncaster'.

**3.83** A number of counter-proposals were received regarding the Doncaster constituencies. The Revd David Franklin (BCE-27529) suggested two options. He considered that, while both were a 'significant improvement on the Commission's initial proposals', his preference was for his first option, as he considered it created more 'even-sized constituencies' and retained most of the existing pattern. John Bryant (BCE-28379) initially produced a counter-proposal which linked the Borough of Doncaster with the City of Wakefield, by the inclusion of the City of Wakefield ward of South Elmsall and South Kirkby in his proposed Doncaster West constituency. Robert Johnson (BCE-35007) and Rachel Hodson (BCE-30107) produced an identical counter-proposal which they said represented 'minimum change', and a counter-proposal also claiming to represent 'minimum change' was submitted by the three Members of Parliament for Doncaster, Caroline Flint MP, Ed Miliband MP, and

Dame Rosie Winterton MP (BCE-31842). In this counter-proposal the Doncaster Central constituency is the same as in our initial proposals. This counter-proposal was supported by Ros Jones, Mayor of Doncaster (BCE-39680), who said that the initial proposals 'in no way reflect the real geographic divisions between the north and south of Doncaster, which are well established'. The counter-proposal from the three Members of Parliament was also supported by the Labour Party in their response during the secondary consultation (BCE-41087), and also, subsequent to his initial counter-proposal, by John Bryant (BCE-39602) who said, 'having now seen the MPs' superior proposal within Doncaster itself, I no longer advocate the approach for this borough in my proposal'.

**3.84** Our assistant commissioners considered that the counter-proposal from the three Doncaster MPs did indeed closely match the existing pattern of constituencies, with the only difference being the inclusion of the whole of the Thorne & Moorends ward in their Don Valley constituency, the whole of the Stainforth & Barnby Dun ward in Doncaster Central, and the inclusion of the City of Wakefield ward of South Elmsall and South Kirkby in their Doncaster North constituency. Our assistant commissioners thought this counter-proposal had considerable merit and they were minded to accept it, except for the fact that doing so would not address potential difficulties in constructing constituencies in the Borough of Barnsley and in West Yorkshire. To help them to better understand the issues, they visited the South Elmsall and South Kirkby ward. In their observations they considered that there



were two distinct communities and that the ward looked more towards Wakefield than Doncaster.

**3.85** Our assistant commissioners considered a counter-proposal for this area from Aaron Fear (BCE-30692) which was effectively a slight variation on the counter-proposal from the three Doncaster MPs. However, his proposal did not cross the county boundary between South and West Yorkshire here and he retained the South Elmsall and South Kirkby ward in a constituency wholly within the Wakefield local authority area. Following the visit to the area, our assistant commissioners agreed that this ward should, if possible, be retained in a constituency wholly within the Wakefield local authority area.

**3.86** In his slightly modified version of the Doncaster MPs' counter-proposal, in order to bring the Doncaster North constituency within the permitted range, Mr Fear had included the Borough of Doncaster ward of Dearne South in the Doncaster North constituency. Our assistant commissioners noted the comments from Councillor Pauline Phillips (BCE-18423) who said of the Barnsley Borough wards of Dearne North and Dearne South: '... councillors have worked hard to get the Dearne North and South working together for the benefit of our constituents. Goldthorpe is split between Dearne North and Dearne South so we feel that if boundaries have to be changed it would make sense to keep Dearne North and South in the same constituency.' However, although the assistant commissioners did not wish to place the wards of Dearne North and Dearne South in separate constituencies, they noted that the Dearne North ward had been included in the Doncaster West

constituency in our initial proposals and that, although included together, both wards were currently in the cross-borough constituency of Wentworth and Dearne.

**3.87** They visited the area to observe for themselves the connections between the two Dearne wards. Although they had noted the evidence from Councillor Phillips, and had observed that there were indeed community ties, for example Dearne Playhouse which is located in Goldthorpe, in the context of constructing constituencies, they did not consider that it would be essential for the two wards to be included in the same constituency if it meant that they would be better able to recommend to us more appropriate constituencies overall. They considered that it would be appropriate to include the Dearne South ward in Doncaster North to avoid crossing the county boundary between Doncaster and Wakefield at South Elmsall and South Kirkby and to allow for the construction of robust constituencies elsewhere in South and West Yorkshire. They therefore recommended to us the adoption of Aaron Fear's counter-proposals for the Doncaster constituencies and, given the thorough examination of the evidence and the feedback of their visit to the area, we agree with their recommendation.

**3.88** There was a significant degree of opposition to our proposed constituencies that covered the Metropolitan Borough of Barnsley, and in particular from residents in the Penistone West ward that we included in our proposed cross-county constituency of Colne Valley. Typical of these were the Penistone West Branch Labour Party (BCE-24906), Ali Thompson (BCE-19535) who said, 'I am extremely worried that

a tiny portion of South Yorkshire is being put into a proposed constituency made up of West Yorkshire', and Irene Goldring-Spratt (BCE-20266) who said, 'I have never identified myself as being part of Colne Valley'. Barnsley Metropolitan Borough (BCE-22060) strongly opposed our proposals which, they felt, had 'disproportionately disadvantaged' Barnsley. They noted that Barnsley Borough currently forms part of four constituencies and that under the initial proposals the borough is split between six constituencies. They said that 'The town of Barnsley and the surrounding communities that make up the Barnsley Borough have significant historic and cultural ties that make it unsuitable to be split between constituencies in this manner' and note 'little historical or community connection to the areas of Doncaster and Kirklees in particular'. Peter Clark (BCE-33062), Elections and Land Charges Manager of Barnsley Metropolitan Council, on day two of the public hearing in Sheffield reiterated Barnsley Council's opposition to the initial proposals. However, we did not receive a counter-proposal from the borough with alternative proposals.

**3.89** Our assistant commissioners had considerable sympathy with the sentiments expressed in Barnsley, but they felt that the electorate figures throughout South and West Yorkshire were such that a considerable degree of disruption to existing constituencies somewhere in the county was, regrettably, unavoidable. They accepted that their proposals for Barnsley would have to depend heavily on the solutions that they had recommended for constituencies in Sheffield, Rotherham, and Doncaster. While it was their view that their recommendations were a

significant improvement on the initial proposals in South Yorkshire as a whole, they considered that it was not possible to produce a significantly better set of recommendations for Barnsley that was compatible with the improved proposals for the rest of the sub-region.

**3.90** Our assistant commissioners had looked at a number of options, including those which would have included the Royston and/or Darton East wards in a cross-county constituency – effectively a Wakefield constituency. However, this was rejected by them as they did not consider that this would be a satisfactory solution as they had considered that the Royston ward was closer to the centre of Barnsley and would be likely to have close ties with the town, and including the Darton East ward in a cross-county constituency would place it in a different constituency to the Darton West ward. Our assistant commissioners had already recommended to us that the Barnsley Borough ward of Dearne South should be included in the Doncaster North constituency, and the three Barnsley Borough wards of Rockingham, Hoyland Milton, and Wombwell should be included in the Wentworth and Dearne constituency and they wanted to keep further disruption in Barnsley to a minimum. They therefore looked to find a different solution for the rest of the constituencies in Barnsley.

**3.91** They noted that Aaron Fear's counter-proposals (BCE-30692) crossed the county boundary between West and South Yorkshire just once, with the inclusion of the Royston ward in a cross-county constituency, but our assistant commissioners had already rejected this suggestion. They also noted that Mr Fear had not crossed the county boundary with

his proposed Colne Valley constituency and that both Penistone wards would be included in the same constituency. However, the consequence of this proposal meant that the Dewsbury constituency of West Yorkshire, which we had not changed in our initial proposals (apart from re-warding), would now have to be changed. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that the justification for this was compelling. They therefore decided not to recommend to us the adoption of Mr Fear's counter-proposals for Barnsley.

**3.92** The Conservative Party counter-proposal (BCE-30343) supported the principle of continuing to link the Sheffield ward of Stocksbridge and Upper Don with the rural area in the west of the Barnsley borough. Our assistant commissioners agree with them that the population of the ward was concentrated in the north and north-eastern parts of the ward and that most of the electorate would look towards Barnsley rather than Sheffield. The Conservative Party considered that it was inevitable that the wards of Penistone East and Penistone West would have to be divided between constituencies, and in their evidence they noted that 'the town of Penistone lies entirely in Penistone West ward and so few local ties are broken by dividing the two wards' and that Penistone East and Dodworth were part of the Barnsley West and Penistone constituency 'for many years until 2010 and before that Stocksbridge formed part of a Penistone constituency'. They therefore proposed a Barnsley West and Stocksbridge constituency which included Barnsley town centre. They also proposed a Barnsley East and Hemsworth constituency which would cross the county boundary

with West Yorkshire and include the Wakefield City ward of Hemsworth in the constituency. This ward was included in the Barnsley East and Hemsworth constituency in our initial proposals, but the Conservative Party did not also include the ward of Crofton, Rhyhill and Walton, as we had done. They agree with our initial proposals regarding the inclusion of the Penistone West ward in the cross-county Colne Valley constituency.

**3.93** While our assistant commissioners were visiting the two Dearne wards and South Elmsall and South Kirkby, they decided to also observe any links that the City of Wakefield ward of Hemsworth had with the rest of the Conservative Party's proposed Barnsley East and Hemsworth constituency. They considered that there was a discernible gap between the respective wards in terms of physical geography, but also considered that the town of Hemsworth itself was close to the South Yorkshire boundary in the southern part of the ward and that there were good links across the county boundary along the A628 road, the B6273 Southmoor Road, and Barewell Hill which led onto Barnsley Road and to the centre of Hemsworth. They considered that the inclusion of the Hemsworth ward in a Barnsley constituency could be justified in the context of creating constituencies throughout the sub-region.

**3.94** Our assistant commissioners considered the Conservative Party proposals in detail and were of the view that they produced an appropriate solution for the constituencies in Barnsley and recommended to us that these be largely adopted. They noted that Borough of Barnsley wards would continue

to be included in constituencies that included parts of other boroughs. Parts of the borough were currently included across four constituencies, but this had increased to six in the initial proposals. The assistant commissioners considered that their proposals were an improvement on the initial proposals as the number of constituencies in which this was the case was reduced from six to five. We carefully considered our assistant commissioners' recommendation to adopt the Conservative Party counter-proposals for Barnsley and we agree with them that they were not perfect. However, we did not consider that any of the other options were preferable, and we agree with their recommendations, apart from the inclusion of the Dearne South ward in Barnsley East and Hemsworth, which we had included in our recommended Doncaster North constituency.

## West Yorkshire

**3.95** The assistant commissioners noted, and advised us, that there were a number of split-ward proposals put to the Commission in response to our initial proposals for West Yorkshire. As with South Yorkshire, the assistant commissioners had considered carefully the justification provided for the various split ward proposals in West Yorkshire. In reaching their conclusions for this county, they were of the opinion that the constraints on them when recommending revisions for West Yorkshire were not as significant as those for South Yorkshire. With more flexibility in ward sizes and geographic options (the more difficult area being in the centre of the sub-region), they were cognisant of the fact that the proposals to split wards in the

West Yorkshire boroughs relied more on the basis of addressing a localised break of community ties, than allowing for a better pattern of constituencies across the county as a whole and preventing a 'domino effect' of disruption (as was the case in the Sheffield example). They also found, and recommended, a pattern of constituencies that was able to address many, although they accept by no means all, of the local concerns of respondents without splitting wards. At this stage, and based on the responses to the first two rounds of consultation, the assistant commissioners advised us that they did not therefore consider that there are exceptional and compelling circumstances that justify recommending split wards in West Yorkshire. As will become apparent throughout the remainder of this chapter, we agree with them.

**3.96** Our decision to treat North Yorkshire as a sub-region in its own right and not cross the county boundary into West Yorkshire had significant implications for our initial proposals for the Pontefract, and Normanton, Castleford and Outwood constituencies in the City of Wakefield, as they would no longer contain a ward each from the District of Selby and Ainsty. As a result, our assistant commissioners considered that they would now be in the position to amend the Normanton, Castleford and Outwood constituency and recreate the existing constituency of Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford. They noted that this had been proposed in the region-wide counter-proposals that had been submitted by the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) and Aaron Fear (BCE-30692). However, by including the City of Wakefield ward of Hemsworth in our recommended Barnsley East and Hemsworth

constituency, it would not be possible to further adopt Mr Fear's counter-proposals, as he had included the Hemsworth ward in a constituency with City of Wakefield wards and had also included the Borough of Barnsley ward of Royston in this constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered the Conservative Party's counter-proposal further. Having proposed that the Hemsworth ward should be included in a Barnsley East and Hemsworth constituency, that submission then proposed a new constituency in the Wakefield local authority area, to be called Featherstone, which, the counter-proposal said 'would more closely resemble the existing Hemsworth constituency'. The Conservative Party included the towns of Outwood and Osset in a reconfigured Wakefield constituency which they considered was 'coherent'. Under these Conservative Party proposals, the three Wakefield constituencies would be entirely contained within the City of Wakefield local authority area, (although the Wakefield ward of Hemsworth is included in the Barnsley East and Hemsworth constituency).

**3.97** Although our initial proposals in the Wakefield local authority did not generate a large number of representations, our assistant commissioners noted representations both in support of our proposals, such as Sandra Rowland (BCE-19581), Paul Bateson (BCE-15174), and Anthony Kilner (BCE-17721), and objection. Of our proposed Normanton, Castleford and Outwood constituency they noted the evidence of Steven Grant (BCE-17367) who said, 'Outwood has no connection geographically, culturally, politically, or in any way with Normanton or Castleford. It makes no sense to the

people there. Outwood should be part of a Wakefield constituency'. They also noted the evidence of Richard Holland (BCE-28653) who said, 'My new proposed constituency is a horrendously narrow and long area mainly along the M62 corridor, linking villages and towns which are geographically far apart and historically have no real connection.' Donna Johnston, on behalf of Normanton Town Council (BCE-23654), asked for the existing constituency of Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford to remain unchanged.

**3.98** Our assistant commissioners considered the other counter-proposals concerning the local authority of the City of Wakefield. This included the wider counter-proposal from Adrian Bailey (BCE-30233) who split the Pontefract South ward. Our assistant commissioners did not consider there was any justification for splitting wards in Wakefield and rejected the counter-proposal. In their view, none of the counter-proposals were superior to those proposed by the Conservative Party, which also allowed for some of the changes they had recommended elsewhere. They therefore recommended to us that we adopt the Conservative Party's proposals for the constituencies of Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford, Featherstone, and Wakefield, and we agree.

**3.99** In Calderdale, the electorate of the existing Halifax constituency was below the permitted range and it was not possible to create two constituencies that were wholly within Calderdale. In our initial proposals we had included the City of Bradford ward of Royds in our proposed Halifax constituency. We received a campaign – Counter-proposals



for Calderdale – opposed to our initial proposals in Calderdale (BCE-33243) which contained 70 signatures. This suggested a counter-proposal that was identical to that of the Conservative Party for the Calderdale constituencies. The Conservative Party’s counter-proposal (BCE-30343) bore more resemblance to the existing pattern of constituencies than our initial proposals had done. They considered that Royds was the wrong Bradford ward to include in a Calder Valley constituency due to its ties with other Bradford wards.

**3.100** A number of local respondents had also objected to the inclusion of the Royds ward in our proposed Halifax constituency including Josephine Taylor (BCE-18971) who said, ‘the neighbourhoods of the Royds ward, which include Buttershaw, Woodside and Wibsey Slack can in no way be seen as a satellite suburb of any Halifax constituency, they are core and central parts of the City of Bradford’, and Samantha Swinbank (BCE-18949) who said, ‘My area is Bradford South and I wish for it to remain Bradford South not Halifax!’ The Conservative Party suggested that instead of the Royds ward, the Bradford ward of Queensbury be included in one of the Calder Valley constituencies. They said, ‘we note that Queensbury is a separate area to Bradford and that for many years until 1974 Queensbury formed part of the same urban district as Shelf in what is now Calderdale’.

**3.101** The Conservative Party counter-proposals were well supported, for example by Craig Whittaker (Member of Parliament for Calder Valley) on day two of the public hearing in Leeds (BCE-32977) and in written evidence (BCE-28996),

Scott Benton (BCE-31166), and Howard Blagbrough (BCE-32979) on day two of the public hearing held in Leeds. Sophie Whittaker (BCE-29091), in supporting the proposed Upper Calder constituency, said, ‘The towns, villages and hamlets of the Upper Calder Valley include Todmorden, Walsden, Hebden Bridge, Cornholme, Portsmouth, Heptonstall, Mythomroyd and Luddendenfoot to name but a few. Although these are all separate places, they all recognise and form part of an area known locally as the ‘Upper Valley’. These communities need to be retained together in the same constituency which the counter-proposal for an ‘Upper Valley’ constituency does. In addition to this, it also links the area with Halifax.’

**3.102** Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence for and against our initial proposals and the counter-proposals, but concluded that the Conservative Party’s counter-proposals for the Lower Calder and Upper Calder constituencies would be well-supported and should be adopted. We agree with their recommendations.

**3.103** Our assistant commissioners noted that the Conservative Party offered a counter-proposal for the Colne Valley and Huddersfield constituencies that was almost identical to our initial proposals for the two constituencies. The Colne Valley constituency would cross the West Yorkshire–South Yorkshire border and include the ward of Penistone West in a cross-county constituency. As we have acknowledged in our section of this report that dealt with Barnsley, there was some opposition to the inclusion of the Penistone West ward in the Colne Valley constituency. Charles Greaves (BCE-16909) said:

'I do not agree ... Penistone is in South Yorkshire not West Yorkshire.' Suzanne Gannon (BCE-17075), however, supported the proposal to include the ward in the Colne Valley constituency. She said: 'I think including Penistone into Colne Valley makes sense as it is geographically similar, and with road links. We share many of the same rural concerns.' Our assistant commissioners noted that relatively few representations were received regarding the Huddersfield constituency, although there was support, for example from Michael Robinson (BCE-15202), who said, 'a wonderful proposal and well worked out'.

**3.104** The Conservative Party counter-proposal, however, differed from the initial proposals by including the Lindley ward from our proposed Huddersfield constituency in Colne Valley as they considered that it was a distinct area separate from the centre of Huddersfield and had close ties with the Golcar ward. In its place, they included the Crosland Moor and Netherton ward in the Huddersfield constituency. Such a transfer was objected to by Alan Knight (BCE-14648), who, as 'spokesperson' for the Netherton and South Crosland Action Group said, 'local constituents (homes) in the Villages above are 'simply appalled' over any (or future) proposals to take us out of the "Colne Valley" constituency and integrate a 'Rural Village Community' into the township of Huddersfield!'

**3.105** With regard to the Lindley ward, our assistant commissioners noted the counter-proposal from Jeremy Cuss and the Colne Valley Constituency Labour Party (BCE-29416), which provided three solutions in which the Lindley ward would

be split, but their submission went on to say, 'The BCE proposal to move Lindley into Huddersfield and Penistone West into Colne Valley is supported by Colne Valley Labour Party, if a split ward solution is ruled out ... The BCE was correct in choosing to put Lindley ward into the Huddersfield constituency. Lindley's major roads (A640 and A629) link this ward to the centre of the Huddersfield constituency, rather than the Colne Valley constituency. Lindley ward also contains Huddersfield New College and the Huddersfield Royal Infirmary. The alternative (Crosland Moor and Netherton ward - chosen in 2011 by the BCE and in 2016 by the Conservative Party) is a much worse solution. This ward carries the A62 which links it to the Golcar and Colne Valley wards. Crosland Moor and Netherton also connects via the B6108 to Holme Valley North ward. The ward links the Holme and Colne valleys together.' This sentiment was echoed by David Owen (BCE-15855), who said, 'I am pleased that Lindley will be in the Huddersfield constituency rather than Colne Valley. We have more in common with Huddersfield than the villages further south.' However, there was also objection to the inclusion of the Lindley ward in Huddersfield. Michael Andrew Carter (BCE-16250) said, 'Lindley has, in my opinion, a distinctly village-community centred identity and in a semi-rural location in keeping with the other villages and townships of the Colne Valley constituency'.

**3.106** Our assistant commissioners weighed up the conflicting evidence, which they considered was finely balanced. They recommended to us that we should not alter our initial proposals for the Colne Valley and Huddersfield constituencies, and we agree.

**3.107** There was very little by way of local representations regarding the Dewsbury constituency, which we had not changed in our initial proposals apart from re-warding, although there was a proposal from Aaron Fear (BCE-30692) that the constituency should be altered so that the Colne Valley constituency did not cross the county boundary. He suggested that the Denby Dale ward be included in the Colne Valley constituency. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that there was sufficient evidence to alter a constituency that had not otherwise been changed and recommended that it should not be amended. We agree.

**3.108** In the north-west of West Yorkshire, our proposed Keighley constituency was the same as the existing constituency, apart from the inclusion of the Wharfedale ward. This was supported by, among others, the Conservative Party (BCE-30343), who noted its ties with Ilkley, and Aaron Fear (BCE-30692). There was also support from local residents, for example Michael Bonner (BCE-17665) who lives in Menston and who said that he would be ‘delighted to join the Keighley and Ilkley constituency’, and Oxenhope Parish Council (BCE-18517) who ‘are satisfied with the proposed new boundary for our constituency ... it seems to us eminently sensible and desirable to keep the Worth Valley within Keighley’. There was some support for changing the name of the constituency to Keighley and Ilkley, but our assistant commissioners thought the existing name was suitable. In Shipley, there was support for our initial proposals. Edward Ward (BCE-26335) said: ‘I am particularly pleased to see that the proposals keep Shipley as a Parliamentary area as I feel it is important to recognise historical connections with places, towns and cities wherever possible.’

**3.109** However, there was objection, particularly from both Keighley and Shipley Constituency Labour Parties. John Grogan (BCE-32927) and Frank Needham (BCE-32932) gave a joint presentation on day one of the public hearing in Leeds and submitted a joint written representation (BCE-27744), in which they counter-proposed a Keighley and Shipley constituency, and an Airedale and Wharfedale constituency. They said, ‘Putting Keighley and the Worth Valley together with Shipley in a new constituency is much more logical than the current arrangement which has Keighley with Ilkley ... There are much stronger economic, cultural, community and transport links between the two proud Yorkshire towns of Keighley and Shipley than between Keighley and Ilkley.’ Of their proposed Airedale and Wharfedale constituency they said it would ‘bring together Bingley, Baildon, Ilkley, Silsden and Guiseley together with a number of rural villages’.

**3.110** This counter-proposal was supported by a number of individuals, for example Ellen Spence (BCE-21114) and Kate Lynch (BCE-21117). However, the local Labour Party counter-proposals were also opposed. Dan Owens (BCE-26108) said, ‘The Bingley Town and Bingley Rural districts should continue to be included and represented by Shipley constituency. The Labour Party proposal to separate the Bingley Town into Keighley is an unnecessary move impacting a high number of constituents without need or requirement.’ Although not commenting directly on these counter-proposals, Roger L’Amie (BCE-26914) said, ‘The Boundary Commission’s initial proposal to include Guiseley in the Shipley parliamentary constituency do a disservice



to Guiseley people in that they put them in a parliamentary seat which is predominantly in Bradford.’ Under the Keighley and Shipley Labour Party counter-proposals the Guiseley and Rawdon ward is included in their Airedale and Wharfedale constituency.

**3.111** Our assistant commissioners considered that there was strong evidence supporting the positions of both those for and against our initial proposals in this area and were mindful of the well-supported counter-proposals from Keighley and Shipley Constituency Labour Parties. However, they were also mindful that they had to arrive at a solution that went at least some of the way towards addressing the very many of those who were objecting to the reconfiguration of the various Bradford wards, without the splitting of wards. Having weighed the evidence, they recommended to us that there should be no change to our proposed Keighley constituency.

**3.112** There was considerable opposition to our initial proposals for Bradford and, in particular, to the perceived ‘loss’ of the Bradford South constituency. The Green Party (BCE-28574) while not suggesting alternative constituencies in this area said, ‘The view of the Green Party is that the strict application of the 5% strait jacket creates constituencies that run counter to common sense.’ There was particular opposition regarding in which constituency the Bradford City wards of Tong, Wyke, Wibsey, Royds, and Queensbury should be located, with suggestions that they were also linked with the wards of Great Horton and Little Horton.

**3.113** We received a number of differing counter-proposals with alternative suggestions. We also received two campaigns: ‘Keep Bradford Bradford’ (BCE-33245) contained more than 460 signatures, and ‘Keep Wyke ward in Bradford’ (discussed later). The former was submitted by Judith Cummins, Member of Parliament for Bradford South. In her own representation (BCE-25364), Ms Cummins highlights the ‘strong and distinct Bradfordian identity, forged by years of cultural, economic and community ties that are reflected in the infrastructure of the current Bradford South constituency’ and she considers that, among other issues, the initial proposals do not take into account ‘important Bradford cultural and economic assets such as Bradford Bulls and the Euroway industrial park’. We also received a smaller campaign: ‘Keep Wyke ward in Bradford’ (BCE-33222). This proposed a Bradford South West constituency that included the Tong and Wyke wards. Although in this counter-proposal the Bradford South West, and Batley and Spen constituencies are within quota, consequential knock-on effects on other constituencies are not addressed.

**3.114** Many of the counter-proposals, in suggesting various alternatives for constituencies in the area, divided one or more wards. Councillor David Warburton, as Chair of Bradford South Constituency Labour Party (BCE-33701), suggested a counter-proposal that keeps Tong, Wyke, Wibsey, and Royds wards together in a Bradford South West constituency that also includes the Great Horton and Little Horton wards. However, he divides the Queensbury ward between constituencies and also the Windhill and Wrose ward,

as does the counter-proposal from M J Hodgson (BCE-31155). In his later counter-proposal (BCE-40453), Councillor Warburton, while still preferring a split ward solution, offers an alternative that does not split wards. Although this counter-proposal was considered to have merit, it has consequential effects on the surrounding constituencies as it alters Leeds constituencies that have generally been well-received in the initial proposals, includes an additional Bradford ward (Wharfedale) in a Leeds constituency, and divides Keighley between constituencies. Gary Nesbitt (BCE-40275), on behalf of the GMB Bradford Public Service Branch, in a wide-ranging counter-proposal that also covers Leeds constituencies, retains the current Bradford South wards of Royds, Tong, Wibsey, and Wyke in a Bradford South and West constituency, keeps the Batley and Spen constituency unchanged, moves Queensbury ward into a Calderdale constituency and divides the Bingley Rural ward between constituencies.

**3.115** A well-supported counter-proposal was submitted by Andy Walsh (BCE-17254), Chief Executive of the Sandale Community Development Trust, who also spoke on day two of the public hearing held in Leeds (BCE-33007). Again, this counter-proposal divided the Queensbury, and Windhill and Wrose wards between constituencies. He was supported by a number of community groups in the Bradford area including South Bradford Community Network (BCE-40059), The Healthy Living Centre (BCE-39925), Step 2 (BCE-35177), and the Lidget Green Walking Club (BCE-37992), as well as church-based organisations such as from Rev John Bavington (BCE-37569), St. John the Evangelist, Great Horton, and Rev Thierry Guillemin, St. Paul's

Wibsey (BCE-35193). In a later submission, Mr Walsh (BCE-34285) indicated that, were his proposals not to be accepted, he would prefer the Conservative Party proposals. A representation from Jasbir Singh Athwal (BCE-38260), Chairman of Bradford Bulls Rugby League Club, also opposed the initial proposals. He said, 'Bradford Bulls is as Bradford as you can get. It will be a great blow to the city if Odsal was no longer represented by a Bradford MP.'

**3.116** The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) reconfigured the constituencies in their counter-proposals to create Bradford North and Shipley, Bradford Rural and Guiseley, and Bradford Central constituencies and did not split wards. This was supported by Councillor Riaz Ahmed (BCE-29415) but was vigorously opposed by many local politicians and residents. For example, Councillors Adbul Jabar, Joanne Dodds, and Tariq Hussain from Great Horton ward (BCE-37927) who said, 'the Liberal Democrats submission confirm many Bradfordians' opinion that the outside world does not understand or care about our city' and asked us to reject the counter-proposals, and Richard Dunbar (BCE-39953), who said, 'The Liberal Democrat submission in my opinion severely weakens Bradford's position.'

**3.117** Our assistant commissioners considered the counter-proposals that suggested the splitting of one of more wards in Bradford. However, as detailed earlier in this chapter, they were not persuaded that there was a need to split wards. They felt that the evidence suggesting that wards be split, despite being well-supported, was not sufficiently compelling as they considered that a

suitable pattern of constituencies could be created in West Yorkshire that did not split wards.

**3.118** In view of the considerable objection to our initial proposals and the number of counter-proposals offering alternative solutions, our assistant commissioners visited the area for themselves. In particular, they looked at the wards of Tong and Wyke, noting the location of the Euroway Trading Estate and the Bradford Bulls rugby ground. They observed that the A6036 and A6177 roads separated the Tong and Wyke wards from more central Bradford wards, and that access to the Bradford Bulls rugby ground was from the Wyke ward, on the south side of the A6036. It was their view that both the Wyke and Tong wards should be kept together in the same constituency, but that it would not be possible to recreate the existing Bradford South constituency. Our assistant commissioners, faced with what they considered was an exceptionally challenging task in constructing constituencies in Bradford that would be acceptable to local respondents, that did not cause split wards, and did not cause serious consequential 'domino effects' throughout the county, considered that they should suggest a new configuration of wards in this area.

**3.119** Our assistant commissioners also visited wards in the east of Bradford (namely, Idle and Thackley, Eccleshill, and Bradford Moor) as they considered that, in proposing an alternative arrangement of constituencies in Bradford, it would still be necessary to include one of these wards in a Leeds constituency. Following their visit they considered that all three wards looked westwards, with Idle and Thackley looking

particularly towards Shipley and that the ward also had strong links with Eccleshill. They observed that there were poor road communication links between Eccleshill and Leeds and concluded that it would not be appropriate to place either of these wards in a Leeds constituency.

**3.120** Our assistant commissioners considered that they would try, if possible, to group as many of the existing Bradford South constituency wards together, but they accepted that it would not be possible to accommodate all these wards. They therefore proposed a new constituency to be called Bradford South, which would include the wards of Clayton and Fairweather Green, Great Horton, City, Bowling and Barkerend, Little Horton, Wibsey (from the proposed Spen constituency), and Royds (an 'orphan ward' from the proposed Halifax constituency). In their proposed Bradford North constituency would be the wards of Eccleshill, Bolton and Undercliffe, Manningham, Toller, Heaton, Thornton and Allerton, and Bingley Rural. These changes would also necessitate changes to the Shipley constituency as in our initial proposals.

**3.121** To compensate for the inclusion of the Bingley Rural ward in Bradford North, our assistant commissioners recommended the inclusion of the Idle and Thackley ward in the proposed Shipley constituency (which they had visited). They noted that Laura Avery (BCE-16521) had suggested the renaming of Shipley to 'Shipley and Guiseley', but our assistant commissioners considered that Shipley was a suitable name. Our assistant commissioners were unable to include the Tong and Wyke wards in one

of these constituencies. However, they proposed that the Tong ward be removed from the proposed Pudsey constituency (where it was an ‘orphan ward’), and be included with the ward of Wyke in the Spen constituency, although they were mindful of the representations that said that the Bradford wards had little in common with Spen. They recommended that this constituency should now be called Bradford South East and Spen. Our assistant commissioners accepted that these proposals fell short of what a number of the representations and counter-proposals had asked for, but they did consider that they were an improvement on the initial proposals.

**3.122** We considered our assistant commissioners’ recommendations and we acknowledged that there would be no ideal solution with the reduction of a constituency in Bradford, and also in Leeds, but we considered that workable constituencies had been constructed without the splitting of wards. The strength of feeling towards the reduction in constituencies and its consequences for Bradford South under our initial proposals is quite clear to us, but we accept that the assistant commissioners have taken every reasonable step in addressing the concerns of the local community. It is also clear to us that we cannot propose a pattern of constituencies that keeps the existing Bradford constituencies close to their current constitution, given the knock-on effects to other constituencies and counties that would result. The recommendations for the Bradford area are well-founded and based on the evidence received from the local area, taking into account the statutory constraints on the Commission. We therefore

accepted the recommendations of our assistant commissioners for the revised constituencies of Bradford North, Bradford South, Bradford South East and Spen, and Shipley.

**3.123** The Conservative Party (BCE-30343) objected to our proposed Batley and Morley constituency, suggesting that the change was unnecessary and that the existing Batley and Spen constituency should remain unchanged. Although it is one of our aims to retain existing constituencies where we can, due the recommended changes in Bradford and the consequent changes to the proposed Spen constituency, our assistant commissioners recommended that we make no change to our initial proposals for the Batley and Morley constituency. In coming to this conclusion they noted that our initial proposals had not generated a large number of representations and those that were received covered both objection and support for our initial proposals. Craig Looker (BCE-25856), on behalf of Batley and Spen Constituency Labour Party, and Adam Byrne (BCE-40233) suggested the same configuration for Batley and Spen as part of a wider counter-proposal for West Yorkshire, although this did include a split ward in their proposed Keighley, and Shipley and Bradford North constituencies. Tony Oldroyd (BCE-24403) said that Morley and Batley have never been ‘affiliated’ and Daniel Taylor (BCE-27969) was concerned that the constituency would contain parts of two authorities (Kirklees and Leeds). However, there was also support from, for example, Kirstie Sanderson (BCE-29633) who said that the constituency made ‘a lot more sense than the previous boundaries’, and Neil Dawson (BCE-22016), Chair of the Morley and Outwood Constituency Labour

Party, who supported the proposed Batley and Morley constituency. We agree with our assistant commissioners to make no change to our initially proposed Batley and Morley constituency.

**3.124** Most of the local representations in the remainder of West Yorkshire came in two clusters, from Rawdon, and the south-east of the proposed Leeds North West constituency, close to the Headingley area. A number of representations from Rawdon objected to the fact that a Leeds ward was being included in the Shipley constituency and that the community was divided between wards and constituencies. The Guiseley and Rawdon ward (with an electorate of 17,779) had been included in Shipley to increase its electorate. Typical of those objecting to the initial proposals were Rhiannon Brook (BCE-18671) who said, 'I'm very upset about the proposal to split Rawdon into 2 unnatural constituencies. Rawdon is a tight-knit village on the outskirts of Leeds. It should remain this way otherwise you are dividing a strong community'; Robert and Margery Page (BCE-22969 and BCE-22970), who live in the Horsforth ward and said, 'I am pleased that my address falls within the Leeds constituency ... but I am dismayed to find that Rawdon has been split, with a majority of the village residents separated into Shipley constituency'; and Conor Lowry (BCE-20301), who said, 'From the map it looks like we're a part of a 'spur' that takes us away from our surrounding neighbourhood'. However, there was support for our proposals. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) said, 'Given the constraints of the quotas we welcome the Commission's decision to identify Guiseley and Rawdon as the best candidate to form a cross boundary

constituency with wards in Bradford. From a geographic perspective it makes much sense and the communities of Menston (Bradford) and Guiseley (Leeds) are contiguous.'

**3.125** Our assistant commissioners considered that part of Rawdon is indeed located in something of a spur in the Guiseley and Rawdon ward and that it could be argued that the community was divided by the existing ward boundaries of Horsforth, and Guiseley and Rawdon, although they considered that much, if not the majority, of Rawdon was located in the Guiseley and Rawdon ward. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that there was sufficient evidence to warrant the splitting of wards here. It had been necessary to place the whole of the Guiseley and Rawdon ward in the Shipley constituency in our initial proposals, and our assistant commissioners had recommended that the ward be retained in the Shipley constituency. They saw no reason to alter their recommendations with regard to the ward.

**3.126** There had been significant opposition to the inclusion of the Tong ward in our proposed Pudsey constituency, but we had accepted the recommendation of our assistant commissioners to include the Tong ward in the revised proposed Bradford South East and Spen constituency. However, that meant that another Bradford ward would have to be included in the Pudsey constituency. During their tour of the area, our assistant commissioners had travelled along the Leeds Road from Pudsey to the centre of Bradford through the Bradford Moor ward. They observed a continuous built-up area and noted that the boundary



between the cities of Leeds and Bradford was practically indistinguishable, apart from a road sign. They considered that the Bradford Moor ward extended quite close towards Bradford city centre and that, certainly, the western part of the ward looked towards Bradford, but they considered that the ward's links with Leeds were better than those of the Eccleshill, or Idle and Thackley wards and they had fewer concerns about the east of the Bradford Moor ward facing away from Bradford than they did for the rest of the ward. Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended rejection of the counter-proposals that offered different solutions to the Pudsey constituency and recommended that the Bradford Moor ward be included in the Pudsey constituency instead of the Tong ward. On balance, they considered that this was the best available solution when considering West Yorkshire as a whole and we agree with their recommendation.

**3.127** Throughout Leeds generally, our initial proposals did not elicit large numbers of representations (except with regard to the Headingley area) and there was a significant degree of support for our initial proposals for Leeds and our decision not to split wards, for example from G Roderic Parker (BCE-26523). The Labour Party (BCE-30360) were generally supportive and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29379) said, 'We welcome the proposed constituencies within Leeds ... In particular, we welcome the Commission's work to reflect the historic community and geographic ties.' Full support for all the constituencies came from David Hollingsworth (BCE-27774) who welcomed the fact that no wards had been split. He

said, 'As far as possible given the number variation allowed they are as near the present geographic boundaries as possible without splitting wards.' Benedict Chastney (BCE-28505) said, 'Overall I'm pleased the boundary commission has kept as many of the historic constituencies in Leeds. I'm satisfied that they have avoided splitting wards. I hope the commission keeps these proposals for Leeds completely intact.' Peter Andrews (BCE-27685) considered that, 'In general the proposals for Leeds strike the best possible balance between grouping areas with natural affinity and links together in constituencies whilst meeting the population requirements. The constituencies with wards from both Leeds and Bradford are kept to an absolute minimum and those that do exist at least have local connections. In general Leeds has connections along arterial roads from the centre outwards so lends itself to constituencies vaguely based on these main roads which the proposed boundaries do as well as possible.'

**3.128** However, the Conservative Party counter-proposed a number of changes in addition to those already mentioned (BCE-30343). They did not support the proposal to include the Farnley and Wortley ward in Leeds Central, instead adding Ardsley and Robin Hood ward. Their proposals for a Leeds West constituency would be the same as the existing constituency, but with the addition of the Horsforth ward. They agree with our proposals to include the Headingley ward in Leeds North East (which is the current constituency plus the Headingley ward), but they would also add the Weetwood ward, noting that both the Headingley and Weetwood wards have large student populations.



As a consequence, they would exclude the Alwoodley ward from Leeds North East and include it in a constituency that they called Otley in their final submission (having previously called the constituency Leeds North and Idle in their initial response). However, despite their view that this was a ‘well constructed constituency’, the Otley constituency would be outside the permitted electorate range. To bring it within 5% of the electoral quota the Conservative Party would split the Adel and Wharfedale ward and include the AWC polling district in the Leeds North East constituency. This counter-proposal was supported by Robert Winfield (BCE-39665) on behalf of Leeds City Conservatives. The assistant commissioners considered this counter-proposal but were not persuaded of the need to split a ward in Leeds. They acknowledged the level of support for our initial proposals in Leeds and, in dismissing the split-ward aspect of the counter-proposal, our assistant commissioners rejected the Conservative Party counter-proposals for Leeds. We agree as we did not consider that there was sufficient and compelling reason to split a ward in Leeds.

**3.129** With regard to our proposed Leeds North West constituency, we had already noted the representations from those who considered that the community of Rawdon would be divided, but we had decided to include the Guiseley and Rawdon ward in the Shipley constituency. We had noted support from the Liberal Democrat Party and the Labour Party, but we also received a counter-proposal from Alex Sobel (BCE-28115) for the Leeds North West Constituency Labour Party. However, this split the Hyde Park and Woodhouse ward between the Leeds North West and Leeds

Central constituencies. Our assistant commissioners recommended that we reject this counter-proposal for the same reasons they rejected the Conservative Party counter-proposals and we agree.

**3.130** Although a number of respondents objected to the loss of Headingley ward to the Leeds North East constituency, there was considerable support for our proposed Leeds North West constituency, for example, from Greg Mulholland (BCE-29675), the then Member of Parliament for Leeds North West. John Howley (BCE-24300) said, ‘The proposed boundaries to the West and East i.e. the River Aire and the Adel/Alwoodley green corridor are consistent with the arrangement of the communities of Adel, Lawnswood and Horsforth. The segment fanning out from Leeds to Otley served by A65, A660 and A658 provides a coherent road framework for communications within the constituency’; and Benedict Chastney (BCE-28505) said, ‘As a resident of West Park I am pleased the area will now be ‘united’ under one MP. The West Park Residents Association which is very active will now be represented by one MP which I think is a step forward. The West Park business community will be delighted that one rather than 2 MPs will now represent them in Parliament ... The vast majority of Lawnswood School pupils will now be in one constituency.’ In noting the considerable support for our proposed Leeds North West constituency, our assistant commissioners recommended that it not be changed, and we agree with their recommendation.

**3.131** However, there was opposition to our proposed Leeds North East constituency and, in particular, to the inclusion of the Headingley ward. Adam O'Neill (BCE-22373), a former resident of Weetwood ward and a former student of Leeds University, objected to the proposed constituency and said the proposals 'break longstanding ties between communities along the Otley Road radial route'. Mark Holmes in his counter-proposals (BCE-28393) said, 'The Commission has included Headingley ward in an enlarged Leeds North East seat – geographically it is clearly not in North East Leeds and as a primarily student area it has little in common with the leafy suburbs of Alwoodley or Moortown.'

**3.132** Richard Tyler (BCE-16347), in opposing the inclusion of Headingley, said, 'the proposed new constituency would reinforce the arbitrary boundary between Headingley Ward and Weetwood Ward (which includes Far Headingley) ... there is no historic or geographic connection between Headingley Ward and Leeds NE (comprising Chapel Allerton, Roundhay, Alwoodley).' However, our proposals to include Headingley ward in the Leeds North East constituency were also supported, for example by John Clay (BCE-26351), 'a resident in the Leeds NE Constituency for the last 48 years'. John Griffiths (BCE-25872) said, 'The incorporation of Headingley into the Leeds North East constituency would seem to be one of the most logical and least divisive changes that could be made to balance

the constituency population'. Claire Flegg (BCE-26854) cited numerous reasons for her support for the constituency including: 'The boundaries capture the relationships between communities and their key infrastructure such as schools and shopping centres. This will ensure that an MP can represent the interests of each community grouping across the life stage of the residents and their key civic amenities.' Our assistant commissioners considered the conflicting evidence and concluded that there was insufficient reason to amend the Leeds North East constituency and we agree with them.

**3.133** The remaining constituencies of Leeds East and Leeds Central (where we had included the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill ward in Leeds East from Leeds Central and, to compensate, had included the Farnley and Wortley ward in Leeds Central) and also of Elmet and Rothwell (which we had not altered in our initial proposals) elicited very few local representations. We noted that the Conservative Party (BCE-30343) had supported our Leeds East, and Elmet and Rothwell constituencies, but suggested that the Ardsley and Robin Hood ward rather than Farnley and Wortley should be included in Leeds Central. There continued to be general support for our proposals for these three constituencies, although Daniel Hault (BCE-17162) did not support the continued inclusion of the town of Wetherby in the Elmet and Rothwell constituency.

**3.134** There was particular support for the inclusion of the Burmantofts and Richmond Hill ward in Leeds East. Ian MacFayden (BCE-29616) in his comments covering three of the Leeds constituencies said, 'These proposals respect existing the communities and maintain their coherence, by not cutting across communities. Restoring Burmantofts and Richmond Hill to Leeds East remedies a previous move that made little sense and the new arrangement will recognise the natural flow of communities and between communities in that constituency. In Leeds North East the addition of Headingley is also to be welcomed, especially given the natural flows to and from the west of the current constituency. The proposals from Leeds North West recognise and maintain communities and create coherence that is currently lacking in some respects. I consider that Commission has done a

good job in these constituencies and I hope these proposals will be carried through to implementation.' Stephen Sadler (BCE-14893) responded in similar vein, 'I am particularly pleased that my own ward of Burmantofts and Richmond Hill has been moved into the new Leeds East Constituency. The communities in the ward have always considered themselves to be part of the wider area known as 'East Leeds' and their participation in community groups, sports teams and social networking sites has always reflected that fact.' In view of the lack of significant opposition to our proposed Elmet and Rothwell, Leeds East, and Leeds Central constituencies, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that we do not amend our initial proposals with respect to these three constituencies, and we agree with them.

## 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? What do we want views on?

**4.5** We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://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>

**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 authority	Electorate
1. Barnsley East and Hemsworth CC			74,581
	Cudworth	Barnsley	7,730
	Darfield	Barnsley	7,398
	Dearne North	Barnsley	7,367
	Monk Bretton	Barnsley	7,780
	North East	Barnsley	9,423
	Royston	Barnsley	7,928
	St. Helens	Barnsley	7,314
	Stairfoot	Barnsley	8,378
	Hemsworth	Wakefield	11,263
2. Barnsley West and Stocksbridge CC			75,935
	Central	Barnsley	7,231
	Darton East	Barnsley	8,032
	Darton West	Barnsley	7,875
	Dodworth	Barnsley	7,917
	Kingstone	Barnsley	6,792
	Old Town	Barnsley	7,815
	Penistone East	Barnsley	8,963
	Worsbrough	Barnsley	6,981
	Stocksbridge and Upper Don	Sheffield	14,329
3. Batley and Morley BC			74,680
	Batley East	Kirklees	12,092
	Batley West	Kirklees	12,663
	Ardsley and Robin Hood	Leeds	16,851
	Morley North	Leeds	17,137
	Morley South	Leeds	15,937
4. Beverley and Holderness CC			76,641
	Beverley Rural	East Riding of Yorkshire	10,789
	Mid Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	10,973
	Minster and Woodmansey	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,089
	North Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,981
	South East Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,245
	South West Holderness	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,247
	St. Mary's	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,317
5. Bradford North BC			77,609
	Bingley Rural	Bradford	13,576
	Bolton and Undercliffe	Bradford	10,657
	Eccleshill	Bradford	10,949
	Heaton	Bradford	10,364
	Manningham	Bradford	10,002
	Thornton and Allerton	Bradford	11,248
	Toller	Bradford	10,813



Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
6. Bradford South BC			71,479
	Bowling and Barkerend	Bradford	10,773
	City	Bradford	9,418
	Clayton and Fairweather Green	Bradford	10,251
	Great Horton	Bradford	9,911
	Little Horton	Bradford	9,841
	Royds	Bradford	11,258
	Wibsey	Bradford	10,027
7. Bradford South East and Spen BC			71,297
	Tong	Bradford	10,217
	Wyke	Bradford	9,874
	Birstall and Birkenshaw	Kirklees	12,155
	Cleckheaton	Kirklees	12,719
	Heckmondwike	Kirklees	12,803
	Liversedge and Gomersal	Kirklees	13,529
8. Colne Valley CC			74,899
	Penistone West	Barnsley	9,162
	Colne Valley	Kirklees	13,093
	Crosland Moor and Netherton	Kirklees	12,481
	Golcar	Kirklees	13,141
	Holme Valley North	Kirklees	12,677
	Holme Valley South	Kirklees	14,345
9. Dewsbury CC			77,167
	Denby Dale	Kirklees	12,647
	Dewsbury East	Kirklees	12,811
	Dewsbury South	Kirklees	12,662
	Dewsbury West	Kirklees	12,347
	Kirkburton	Kirklees	11,716
	Mirfield	Kirklees	14,984
10. Don Valley CC			74,947
	Conisbrough	Doncaster	11,443
	Edlington & Warmsworth	Doncaster	7,729
	Finningley	Doncaster	12,233
	Hatfield	Doncaster	11,324
	Mexborough	Doncaster	11,263
	Rossington & Bawtry	Doncaster	12,842
	Tickhill & Wadsworth	Doncaster	8,113
11. Doncaster Central BC			72,729
	Armthorpe	Doncaster	10,384
	Balby South	Doncaster	7,028
	Bessacarr	Doncaster	10,961
	Edenthorpe & Kirk Sandall	Doncaster	7,845
	Hexthorpe & Balby North	Doncaster	6,751
	Stainforth & Barnby Dun	Doncaster	7,069
	Town	Doncaster	10,517
	Wheatley Hills & Intake	Doncaster	12,174

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
12. Doncaster North CC			71,786
	Dearne South	Barnsley	8,195
	Adwick le Street & Carcroft	Doncaster	11,142
	Bentley	Doncaster	12,121
	Norton & Askern	Doncaster	10,922
	Roman Ridge	Doncaster	8,390
	Sprotbrough	Doncaster	8,865
	Thorne & Moorends	Doncaster	12,151
13. East Yorkshire CC			77,061
	Bridlington Central and Old Town	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,947
	Bridlington North	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,217
	Bridlington South	East Riding of Yorkshire	10,027
	Driffeld and Rural	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,555
	East Wolds and Coastal	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,727
	Pocklington Provincial	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,648
	Wolds Weighton	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,940
14. Elmet and Rothwell CC			77,287
	Garforth and Swillington	Leeds	15,936
	Harewood	Leeds	14,805
	Kippax and Methley	Leeds	15,910
	Rothwell	Leeds	15,264
	Wetherby	Leeds	15,372
15. Featherstone CC			71,144
	Ackworth, North Elmsall and Upton	Wakefield	12,178
	Crofton, Ryhill and Walton	Wakefield	11,637
	Featherstone	Wakefield	12,120
	South Elmsall and South Kirkby	Wakefield	12,361
	Wakefield Rural	Wakefield	13,088
	Wakefield South	Wakefield	9,760
16. Goole and Axholme CC			75,259
	Dale	East Riding of Yorkshire	12,994
	Goole North	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,623
	Goole South	East Riding of Yorkshire	6,209
	Howden	East Riding of Yorkshire	3,955
	Howdenshire	East Riding of Yorkshire	11,526
	Snaith, Airmyn, Rawcliffe and Marshland	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,535
	South Hunsley	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,983
	Axholme Central	North Lincolnshire	5,618
	Axholme North	North Lincolnshire	6,187
	Axholme South	North Lincolnshire	5,629

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
17. Great Grimsby North and Barton CC			71,470
	East Marsh	North East Lincolnshire	6,268
	Freshney	North East Lincolnshire	7,204
	Immingham	North East Lincolnshire	8,529
	West Marsh	North East Lincolnshire	4,495
	Wolds	North East Lincolnshire	5,791
	Yarborough	North East Lincolnshire	8,521
	Barton	North Lincolnshire	8,430
	Brigg and Wolds	North Lincolnshire	8,632
	Broughton and Appleby	North Lincolnshire	5,017
	Ferry	North Lincolnshire	8,583
18. Great Grimsby South and Cleethorpes BC			71,733
	Croft Baker	North East Lincolnshire	8,502
	Haverstoe	North East Lincolnshire	8,218
	Heneage	North East Lincolnshire	7,717
	Humberston and New Waltham	North East Lincolnshire	8,953
	Park	North East Lincolnshire	8,587
	Scartho	North East Lincolnshire	8,526
	Sidney Sussex	North East Lincolnshire	7,837
	South	North East Lincolnshire	7,679
	Waltham	North East Lincolnshire	5,714
19. Harrogate and Knaresborough CC			74,319
	Bilton	Harrogate	4,219
	Boroughbridge	Harrogate	2,366
	Claro	Harrogate	2,602
	Granby	Harrogate	4,419
	Harlow Moor	Harrogate	3,991
	High Harrogate	Harrogate	4,241
	Hookstone	Harrogate	4,407
	Killinghall	Harrogate	2,315
	Knaresborough East	Harrogate	3,889
	Knaresborough King James	Harrogate	4,044
	Knaresborough Scriven Park	Harrogate	4,082
	Low Harrogate	Harrogate	4,011
	New Park	Harrogate	3,954
	Pannal	Harrogate	4,351
	Rossett	Harrogate	4,753
	Saltergate	Harrogate	4,108
	Starbeck	Harrogate	4,456
	Stray	Harrogate	4,092
	Woodfield	Harrogate	4,019
20. Huddersfield BC			76,540
	Almondbury	Kirklees	13,363
	Ashbrow	Kirklees	12,980
	Dalton	Kirklees	12,034
	Greenhead	Kirklees	12,595
	Lindley	Kirklees	14,175
	Newsome	Kirklees	11,393

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
21. Keighley CC			76,636
	Craven	Bradford	12,773
	Ilkley	Bradford	11,563
	Keighley Central	Bradford	10,408
	Keighley East	Bradford	11,447
	Keighley West	Bradford	10,739
	Wharfedale	Bradford	9,226
	Worth Valley	Bradford	10,480
22. Kingston upon Hull East BC			73,262
	Drypool	Kingston upon Hull	8,898
	Holderness	Kingston upon Hull	9,781
	Ings	Kingston upon Hull	9,255
	Longhill	Kingston upon Hull	8,430
	Marfleet	Kingston upon Hull	8,643
	Myton	Kingston upon Hull	8,292
	Southcoates East	Kingston upon Hull	5,309
	Southcoates West	Kingston upon Hull	5,490
	Sutton	Kingston upon Hull	9,164
23. Kingston upon Hull North BC			71,858
	Avenue	Kingston upon Hull	8,525
	Beverley	Kingston upon Hull	6,321
	Bransholme East	Kingston upon Hull	6,875
	Bransholme West	Kingston upon Hull	5,921
	Bricknell	Kingston upon Hull	6,221
	Derringham	Kingston upon Hull	8,746
	Kings Park	Kingston upon Hull	8,700
	Newland	Kingston upon Hull	5,455
	Orchard Park and Greenwood	Kingston upon Hull	8,834
	University	Kingston upon Hull	6,260
24. Kingston upon Hull West and Haltemprice BC			72,891
	Cottingham North	East Riding of Yorkshire	6,534
	Cottingham South	East Riding of Yorkshire	6,917
	Hessle	East Riding of Yorkshire	10,943
	Tranby	East Riding of Yorkshire	7,475
	Willerby and Kirk Ella	East Riding of Yorkshire	10,720
	Boothferry	Kingston upon Hull	9,463
	Newington	Kingston upon Hull	7,426
	Pickering	Kingston upon Hull	8,725
	St. Andrew's	Kingston upon Hull	4,688
25. Leeds Central BC			77,012
	Beeston and Holbeck	Leeds	13,498
	City and Hunslet	Leeds	16,795
	Farnley and Wortley	Leeds	16,850
	Hyde Park and Woodhouse	Leeds	12,369
	Middleton Park	Leeds	17,500

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
26. Leeds East BC			76,213
	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill	Leeds	13,605
	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	Leeds	17,225
	Gipton and Harehills	Leeds	14,029
	Killingbeck and Seacroft	Leeds	15,666
	Temple Newsam	Leeds	15,688
27. Leeds North East BC			74,883
	Alwoodley	Leeds	17,048
	Chapel Allerton	Leeds	15,798
	Headingley	Leeds	8,948
	Moortown	Leeds	16,642
	Roundhay	Leeds	16,447
28. Leeds North West BC			77,244
	Adel and Wharfedale	Leeds	15,390
	Horsforth	Leeds	16,685
	Kirkstall	Leeds	13,857
	Otley and Yeadon	Leeds	17,018
	Weetwood	Leeds	14,294
29. Lower Calder CC			78,422
	Queensbury	Bradford	11,681
	Brighouse	Calderdale	8,115
	Elland	Calderdale	8,094
	Greetland and Stainland	Calderdale	8,249
	Hipperholme and Lightcliffe	Calderdale	8,670
	Northowram and Shelf	Calderdale	8,800
	Rastrick	Calderdale	8,048
	Ryburn	Calderdale	8,567
	Sowerby Bridge	Calderdale	8,198
30. Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford CC			78,097
	Airedale and Ferry Fryston	Wakefield	10,844
	Altofts and Whitwood	Wakefield	12,245
	Castleford Central and Glasshoughton	Wakefield	11,207
	Knottingley	Wakefield	9,672
	Normanton	Wakefield	11,454
	Pontefract North	Wakefield	11,272
	Pontefract South	Wakefield	11,403
31. Pudsey BC			75,850
	Bradford Moor	Bradford	10,889
	Armley	Leeds	15,459
	Bramley and Stanningley	Leeds	15,342
	Calverley and Farsley	Leeds	17,271
	Pudsey	Leeds	16,889

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
32. Richmond (Yorks) CC			76,649
	Appleton Wiske & Smeatons	Hambleton	2,414
	Bedale	Hambleton	6,755
	Great Ayton	Hambleton	4,520
	Hutton Rudby	Hambleton	2,505
	Morton-on-Swale	Hambleton	2,687
	Northallerton North & Brompton	Hambleton	4,185
	Northallerton South	Hambleton	4,851
	Osmotherley & Swainby	Hambleton	2,393
	Romanby	Hambleton	4,931
	Stokesley	Hambleton	4,707
	Tanfield	Hambleton	2,335
	Addlebrough	Richmondshire	1,054
	Barton	Richmondshire	983
	Bolton Castle	Richmondshire	1,059
	Brompton-on-Swale and Scorton	Richmondshire	2,312
	Catterick	Richmondshire	1,790
	Colburn	Richmondshire	2,814
	Croft	Richmondshire	1,012
	Gilling West	Richmondshire	960
	Hawes and High Abbotside	Richmondshire	1,017
	Hipswell	Richmondshire	1,991
	Hornby Castle	Richmondshire	1,310
	Leyburn	Richmondshire	2,081
	Lower Wensleydale	Richmondshire	1,126
	Melsonby	Richmondshire	1,087
	Middleham	Richmondshire	970
	Middleton Tyas	Richmondshire	934
	Newsham with Eppleby	Richmondshire	1,048
	Penhill	Richmondshire	942
	Reeth and Arkengarthdale	Richmondshire	956
	Richmond Central	Richmondshire	2,192
	Richmond East	Richmondshire	2,056
	Richmond West	Richmondshire	2,128
	Scotton	Richmondshire	1,631
	Swaledale	Richmondshire	913
33. Rother Valley CC			73,511
	Anston and Woodsetts	Rotherham	8,846
	Dinnington	Rotherham	9,477
	Hellaby	Rotherham	9,375
	Holderness	Rotherham	9,509
	Maltby	Rotherham	8,542
	Rother Vale	Rotherham	9,731
	Sitwell	Rotherham	9,403
	Wales	Rotherham	8,628



Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
34. Rotherham BC			71,116
	Boston Castle	Rotherham	8,670
	Brinsworth and Catcliffe	Rotherham	9,260
	Keppel	Rotherham	9,143
	Rotherham East	Rotherham	8,361
	Rotherham West	Rotherham	8,766
	Valley	Rotherham	9,166
	Wickersley	Rotherham	9,099
	Wingfield	Rotherham	8,651
35. Scarborough and Whitby CC			73,324
	Thornton Dale	Ryedale	2,616
	Castle	Scarborough	2,783
	Cayton	Scarborough	3,548
	Central	Scarborough	2,919
	Danby	Scarborough	1,583
	Derwent Valley	Scarborough	3,523
	Eastfield	Scarborough	3,879
	Esk Valley	Scarborough	3,413
	Falsgrave Park	Scarborough	3,410
	Fylingdales	Scarborough	1,635
	Lindhead	Scarborough	1,761
	Mayfield	Scarborough	3,640
	Mulgrave	Scarborough	2,698
	Newby	Scarborough	4,957
	North Bay	Scarborough	3,143
	Northstead	Scarborough	2,965
	Ramshill	Scarborough	2,707
	Scalby, Hackness and Staintondale	Scarborough	3,285
	Seamer	Scarborough	3,596
	Stepney	Scarborough	3,211
	Streonshalh	Scarborough	3,275
	Weaponness	Scarborough	2,749
	Whitby West Cliff	Scarborough	2,945
	Woodlands	Scarborough	3,083
36. Scunthorpe CC			71,820
	Ashby	North Lincolnshire	8,808
	Bottesford	North Lincolnshire	8,835
	Brumby	North Lincolnshire	7,458
	Burringham and Gunness	North Lincolnshire	2,747
	Burton upon Stather and Winterton	North Lincolnshire	8,662
	Crosby and Park	North Lincolnshire	7,726
	Frodingham	North Lincolnshire	5,169
	Kingsway with Lincoln Gardens	North Lincolnshire	7,728
	Ridge	North Lincolnshire	9,947
	Town	North Lincolnshire	4,740

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
37. Selby and Ainsty CC			72,685
	Marston Moor	Harrogate	2,251
	Ouseburn	Harrogate	2,478
	Ribston	Harrogate	2,362
	Spofforth with Lower Wharfedale	Harrogate	2,443
	Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton	Selby	4,422
	Barlby Village	Selby	2,072
	Brayton	Selby	4,721
	Byram & Brotherton	Selby	2,196
	Camblesforth & Carlton	Selby	4,498
	Cawood & Wistow	Selby	2,404
	Derwent	Selby	4,270
	Eggborough	Selby	2,153
	Escrick	Selby	1,903
	Hambleton	Selby	2,090
	Monk Fryston	Selby	2,322
	Riccall	Selby	1,896
	Selby East	Selby	4,450
	Selby West	Selby	6,581
	Sherburn in Elmet	Selby	5,023
	South Milford	Selby	2,045
	Tadcaster	Selby	5,677
	Thorpe Willoughby	Selby	2,188
	Whitley	Selby	2,240
38. Sheffield Central BC			72,586
	Broomhill	Sheffield	13,623
	Part of Central (polling district GA)	Sheffield	539
	Part of Central (polling district GB)	Sheffield	1,871
	Part of Central (polling district GC)	Sheffield	1,657
	Part of Central (polling district GE)	Sheffield	1,336
	Part of Central (part of polling district GF)	Sheffield	289
	Part of Central (polling district GG)	Sheffield	1,553
	Part of Central (polling district GH)	Sheffield	1,489
	Part of Crookes (polling district HA)	Sheffield	3,315
	Part of Crookes (polling district HC)	Sheffield	2,751
	Part of Crookes (polling district HD)	Sheffield	1,841
	Part of Crookes (polling district HG)	Sheffield	1,891
	Hillsborough	Sheffield	13,707
	Manor Castle	Sheffield	12,509
	Walkley	Sheffield	14,215
39. Sheffield Hallam CC			74,117
	Beauchief and Greenhill	Sheffield	13,500
	Part of Crookes (polling district HB)	Sheffield	2,736
	Part of Crookes (polling district HE)	Sheffield	1,052
	Part of Crookes (polling district HF)	Sheffield	1,358
	Dore and Totley	Sheffield	13,381
	Ecclesall	Sheffield	14,723
	Fulwood	Sheffield	12,944
	Stannington	Sheffield	14,423

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
40. Sheffield North and Ecclesfield BC			76,806
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FB)	Sheffield	1,123
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FD)	Sheffield	2,244
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FE)	Sheffield	1,474
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FF)	Sheffield	1,123
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FH)	Sheffield	913
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FJ)	Sheffield	1,328
	East Ecclesfield	Sheffield	14,187
	Firth Park	Sheffield	13,772
	Shiregreen and Brightside	Sheffield	13,576
	Southey	Sheffield	13,045
	West Ecclesfield	Sheffield	14,021
41. Sheffield South BC			71,193
	Arbourthorne	Sheffield	12,436
	Part of Central (polling district GD)	Sheffield	2,080
	Part of Central (part of polling district GF)	Sheffield	1,473
	Part of Central (polling district GI)	Sheffield	1,906
	Gleadless Valley	Sheffield	13,722
	Graves Park	Sheffield	13,160
	Nether Edge	Sheffield	13,377
	Richmond	Sheffield	13,039
42. Sheffield South East BC			72,399
	Beighton	Sheffield	13,027
	Birley	Sheffield	12,591
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FA)	Sheffield	1,551
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FC)	Sheffield	834
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FG)	Sheffield	856
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FI)	Sheffield	948
	Part of Burngreave (polling district FK)	Sheffield	1,223
	Darnall	Sheffield	14,743
	Mosborough	Sheffield	13,490
	Woodhouse	Sheffield	13,136
43. Shipley BC			76,177
	Baildon	Bradford	11,542
	Bingley	Bradford	13,650
	Idle and Thackley	Bradford	11,843
	Shipley	Bradford	10,788
	Windhill and Wrose	Bradford	10,575
	Guiselley and Rawdon	Leeds	17,779
44. Skipton and Ripon CC			74,270
	Aire Valley with Lothersdale	Craven	2,824
	Barden Fell	Craven	1,247
	Bentham	Craven	2,795
	Cowling	Craven	1,707
	Embsay-with-Eastby	Craven	1,479
	Gargrave and Malhamdale	Craven	2,462
	Glusburn	Craven	2,944
	Grassington	Craven	1,201
	Hellifield and Long Preston	Craven	1,709
	Ingleton and Clapham	Craven	3,019

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Penyghent	Craven	1,391
	Settle and Ribblesbanks	Craven	2,920
	Skipton East	Craven	2,665
	Skipton North	Craven	2,731
	Skipton South	Craven	2,505
	Skipton West	Craven	2,724
	Sutton-in-Craven	Craven	2,763
	Upper Wharfedale	Craven	1,506
	West Craven	Craven	1,535
	Bishop Monkton	Harrogate	2,220
	Kirkby Malzeard	Harrogate	2,465
	Lower Nidderdale	Harrogate	2,451
	Mashamshire	Harrogate	1,837
	Newby	Harrogate	2,441
	Nidd Valley	Harrogate	2,172
	Pateley Bridge	Harrogate	2,022
	Ripon Minster	Harrogate	3,871
	Ripon Moorside	Harrogate	3,814
	Ripon Spa	Harrogate	4,081
	Washburn	Harrogate	2,517
	Wathvale	Harrogate	2,252
45. Thirsk and Malton CC			71,244
	Bagby & Thorntons	Hambleton	2,696
	Easingwold	Hambleton	7,423
	Huby	Hambleton	2,726
	Raskelf & White Horse	Hambleton	2,571
	Sowerby & Topcliffe	Hambleton	4,675
	Thirsk	Hambleton	4,919
	Amotherby	Ryedale	1,479
	Ampleforth	Ryedale	1,236
	Cropton	Ryedale	1,253
	Dales	Ryedale	1,062
	Derwent	Ryedale	2,630
	Helmsley	Ryedale	2,369
	Hovingham	Ryedale	1,384
	Kirkbymoorside	Ryedale	2,634
	Malton	Ryedale	3,745
	Norton East	Ryedale	3,060
	Norton West	Ryedale	2,408
	Pickering East	Ryedale	2,747
	Pickering West	Ryedale	2,701
	Rillington	Ryedale	1,332
	Ryedale South West	Ryedale	1,320
	Sherburn	Ryedale	1,505
	Sheriff Hutton	Ryedale	1,345
	Sinnington	Ryedale	1,381
	Wolds	Ryedale	1,461
	Filey	Scarborough	5,255
	Hertford	Scarborough	3,927

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
46. Upper Calder CC			76,123
	Calder	Calderdale	8,906
	Illingworth and Mixenden	Calderdale	8,779
	Luddendenfoot	Calderdale	7,828
	Ovenden	Calderdale	7,855
	Park	Calderdale	8,439
	Skircoat	Calderdale	9,125
	Todmorden	Calderdale	8,582
	Town	Calderdale	8,242
	Warley	Calderdale	8,367
47. Wakefield BC			76,795
	Horbury and South Ossett	Wakefield	11,424
	Ossett	Wakefield	12,147
	Stanley and Outwood East	Wakefield	11,957
	Wakefield East	Wakefield	9,798
	Wakefield North	Wakefield	9,951
	Wakefield West	Wakefield	10,144
	Wrenthorpe and Outwood West	Wakefield	11,374
48. Wentworth and Dearne CC			72,925
	Hoyland Milton	Barnsley	8,811
	Rockingham	Barnsley	8,193
	Wombwell	Barnsley	8,430
	Hoober	Rotherham	9,572
	Rawmarsh	Rotherham	9,262
	Silverwood	Rotherham	9,331
	Swinton	Rotherham	9,009
	Wath	Rotherham	10,317
49. York Central BC			76,146
	Acomb	York	6,413
	Clifton	York	6,358
	Fishergate	York	6,023
	Guildhall	York	8,966
	Heworth	York	9,171
	Holgate	York	9,145
	Hull Road	York	11,697
	Micklegate	York	8,867
	Westfield	York	9,506
50. York Outer CC			71,218
	Bishopthorpe	York	3,236
	Copmanthorpe	York	3,378
	Dringhouses & Woodthorpe	York	8,838
	Fulford & Heslington	York	2,841
	Haxby & Wigginton	York	9,718
	Heworth Without	York	3,357
	Huntington & New Earswick	York	9,663
	Osballdwick & Derwent	York	5,742
	Rawcliffe & Clifton Without	York	8,926
	Rural West York	York	6,106
	Strensall	York	6,198
	Wheldrake	York	3,215