

Conservative Campaign Headquarters
30 Millbank
London
SW1P 4DP

3rd April 2012

Boundary Commission for England
35 Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BQ

Dear Sirs,

Second consultation period – Eastern Region

We have much pleasure in enclosing our response to the representations received during the first consultation period on the initial proposals for the Eastern Region.

Yours sincerely,

Roger Pratt CBE
Boundary Review Manager

From: [REDACTED]
To: [BCE Eastern](#)
Cc: [Pratt, Roger](#)
Subject: Conservative Party response - second stage - Eastern region
Date: 03 April 2012 11:16:36
Attachments: [Conservative Party - cover letter - Eastern.pdf](#)
[Conservative Party - second stage response - Eastern.pdf](#)

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached the Conservative Party's response to the second consultation stage for the Eastern region, sent on behalf of Roger Pratt CBE, the Party's Boundary Review Manager.

Yours sincerely,
Craig Aston

Craig Aston
Boundary Review Assistant
Conservative Campaign Headquarters, 30 Millbank, London SW1P 4DP

[REDACTED]

This email and any attachments to it (the "Email") are intended for a specific recipient(s) and its contents may be confidential, privileged and/or otherwise protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this Email in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or email, and delete it from your records. You must not disclose, distribute, copy or otherwise use this Email. Please note that email is not a secure form of communication and that the Conservative Party ("the Party") is not responsible for loss arising from viruses contained in this Email nor any loss arising from its receipt or use. Any opinion expressed in this Email is not necessarily that of the Party and may be personal to the sender.

Find out about Boris Johnson's 9 point plan for London:

www.backboris2012.com/9pointplan

Join us and help turn Britain around
www.conservatives.com/join/

Promoted by Alan Mabbutt on behalf of the Conservative Party, both at 30 Millbank, London, SW1P 4DP

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

EASTERN REGION

Submission of the Conservative Party regarding the responses to the initial proposals for the Eastern Region

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 We note there are a reasonable number of responses to the initial proposals and that there are quite a number of these in favour of the proposals.
- 1.2 We note that broadly speaking the county linkings proposed by the Commission have been accepted and although there are some suggestions of alterations these are few and far between.
- 1.3 There are a number of specific concerns in relation to the initial proposals and we will deal with these in detail.
- 1.4 Broadly speaking we are supportive of the Commission's proposals but have made specific proposals in Essex and Hertfordshire to better reflect local government boundaries, to be less disruptive to the current pattern of Parliamentary representation and to break fewer local ties.
- 1.5 We believe our proposals better meet the requirements of Rule 5 of the Rules for Redistribution of Seats – Schedule 2 to the Act in particular Rule 5 (1) b, c and d.
- 1.6 We will now look in detail at the responses and comment on them in their geographical area.

2. ESSEX

- 2.1 We note that although there are a few suggestions that Essex is linked with Hertfordshire by and large there is acceptance that Essex is reviewed separately with the reduction of one seat.
- 2.2 We along with the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats agree that Essex should be reviewed alone.
- 2.3 We note that when a reference is made to Essex it is actually Essex, Thurrock and Southend-on-Sea as the two unitary authorities have county status.
- 2.4 We note that the Commission have proposed four cross-county constituencies, two between Essex and Southend-on-Sea and two between Essex and Thurrock.
- 2.5 We have proposed reducing this to two, one between each unitary authority and Essex. This is much more compliant with Rule 5 (1) b.
- 2.6 We also believe the proposals are too disruptive in Essex and too many local ties are broken therefore we propose changes to improve the position under Rule 5 (1) c and d.
- 2.7 We note there is some considerable concern about the proposals in South Essex and that many individuals and organizations would support our alternatives.
- 2.8 In respect of Colchester and Thurrock we note there is little opposition to the Commission's proposals for no change. We believe this is right and will suggest a further constituency for no change, Chelmsford, where we note there is considerable concern about the changes.
- 2.9 We note there is little concern and quite a lot of support for Harwich and Clacton, North East Essex and Braintree and Witham and we support this.

- 2.10 In terms of North East Essex we note there are some suggestions of a name change to North Essex if the proposed North West Essex becomes Saffron Walden for which there is a lot of support. We would have no objection to North Essex in this case.
- 2.11 We note there is very considerable concern about the proposal to remove the two wards of Leigh and West Leigh from Southend West and include them in Castle Point.
- 2.12 We share this concern and believe they should be included as they are now in Southend West.
- 2.13 We note the evidence given by the Member of Parliament for Southend West, David Amess (Day Two, Colchester hearing, 11.04am, Pages 9-13 and Representation 022125) and the Councillor for West Leigh, Cllr. John Lamb (Day Two, Colchester hearing, 11.24am, Pages 13-15).
- 2.14 We also note the submission of the Marine Estate Residents Association in Leigh-on-Sea (Representation 17626) and the very considerable number of representations from residents in Leigh-on-Sea. For just some examples see Representations 015178, 016232, 018397 and 018903.
- 2.15 Our proposal would restore ties between the Leigh-on-Sea and other wards in Southend West noting that the Leigh-on-Sea area is greater than just the two wards. It also means that fewer electors move from their existing constituency. There is one less crossing point between Southend-on-Sea unitary authority and Essex. Southend-on-Sea Council would consist of two constituencies as at present under our proposal rather than three under the Commission's proposals.

- 2.16 Our proposals for Southend-on-Sea are therefore better under Rules 5 (1) b, c and d.
- 2.17 We would consequently be less disruptive in terms of Rochford and Southend East and note the evidence here of the Member of Parliament James Dudderidge (Day One, Norwich hearing, 12.46pm, Pages 12-14 and Representation 015130).
- 2.18 We also note there are considerable concerns in Hockley and Hullbridge about the proposal to move them from Rayleigh where they are currently included.
- 2.19 We note that both Hockley Parish Council (Representation 010538) and Hullbridge Parish Council (Representation 20838) want to remain with Rayleigh.
- 2.20 We note that Rayleigh Town Council (Representation 024393) also supports this change.
- 2.21 We note the support for the Conservative proposal from Rochford Council (Representation 016916).
- 2.22 We also note the support from a number of local organisations such as Rochford and Rayleigh CAB (Representation 013224), the Chairman of Rayleigh and Rochford Association for Voluntary Service (Representation 018828) the Up River Yacht Club in Hullbridge (Representation 023458), the Chairman of Rayleigh Football Club (Representation 024387) and a support group for families and carers (Representation 022864).
- 2.23 We particularly note the evidence of the Headteacher from Riverside Primary School where pupils go on to Secondary School in Rayleigh (Representation 022029).

- 2.24 We would also cite the evidence of the Member of Parliament for Rayleigh and Wickford Mark Francois (Day One, Cambridge hearing, 11.12am, Pages 4-8 and Representation 022013).
- 2.25 We think there is a very clear case under Rule 5 (1) c and d for Hockley and Hullbridge to be retained in the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency.
- 2.26 We have noted the considerable opposition to the inclusion of the Leigh wards in Castle Point. We would include the Pitsea South East ward instead. We note some support for this proposal for example from Mr. Peter Smyth who has done comprehensive counter-proposals for most of England (Representation 019602).
- 2.27 We note there is opposition to the inclusion of the Orsett ward in Brentwood and Ongar rather than retaining it in Basildon and East Thurrock.
- 2.28 We note this concern comes from both Brentwood and Ongar and Basildon and East Thurrock and the evidence given regarding the Orsett ward at the Colchester public hearing and in Representation 000730.
- 2.29 We cite the evidence of both Members of Parliament, Eric Pickles (Representation 023573) and Stephen Metcalfe (Day One, Cambridge hearing, 2.47pm, Pages 33-35 and Representation 010150).
- 2.30 We note that Brentwood Council unanimously agreed that Orsett should not be included in Brentwood and Ongar and that instead Brentwood and Ongar should retain Lambourne ward and include Chipping Ongar.
- 2.31 Although Brentwood is a Conservative-controlled council it was agreed unanimously and the Council includes Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independent members.

- 2.32 We note the considerable concern at the exclusion of the Lambourne ward from Brentwood and Ongar.
- 2.33 We note the evidence of Mr. John Filby as a Parish Councillor from Lambourne (Day One, Colchester hearing, 12.02pm, Pages 24-25) and the petition presented by Eric Pickles MP (Representation 023573).
- 2.34 We think therefore there is a very strong case for Orsett to stay in Basildon and East Thurrock and Lambourne to stay in Brentwood and Ongar.
- 2.35 This means that Brentwood and Ongar would consist of two local authorities rather than three and Thurrock district would include two constituencies rather than three and there would only be one seat crossing the Essex and Thurrock Unitary Authority boundary rather than two.
- 2.36 Therefore this proposal is more compliant with Rule 5 (1) b, c and d.
- 2.37 In respect of the Chelmsford Borough we note that if Hullbridge and Hockley are included in Rayleigh and Wickford then it does not need to include one Chelmsford ward of Rettendon and Runwell.
- 2.38 This means that the number of constituencies within Chelmsford Borough can be reduced from four to three and that Rayleigh and Wickford can comprise of two local authorities rather than three. This therefore is an improvement in terms of Rule 5 (1) b.
- 2.39 We note very considerable concern has been expressed about the Galleywood ward being excluded from Chelmsford where it currently resides.
- 2.40 We note that Galleywood Parish Council objects most strongly to its exclusion from Chelmsford (Representation 010095).

- 2.41 We also note the evidence of Mr. Richard Huggins at the Colchester hearing (Day One, 2.22pm, Pages 40-42).
- 2.42 Mr. Huggins is a member of the public from Essex who takes a considerable interest in boundaries. He addressed the previous inquiry (Day Two, Chelmsford Public Inquiry, 16 December 2003, Pages 46-49). As a result the Assistant Commissioner was persuaded that Galleywood should be included with Chelmsford.
- 2.43 Mr. Huggins suggested the ward of Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield could then be included in Billericay and Great Dunmow rather than Maldon. This suggestion was also made by Galleywood Parish Council.
- 2.44 This would have the advantage of uniting the Hanningfields in one constituency.
- 2.45 Although you could do this change in isolation we would do it as part of a wider scheme.
- 2.46 In respect of Galleywood we cite the evidence of Simon Burns the Member of Parliament for Chelmsford (Representation 012045) and the many representations from residents of the ward. For just some examples see Representations 002859, 010360 and 018242. We also note that the Labour Party although supporting the Boundary Commission acknowledge the ties between Galleywood and Chelmsford.
- 2.47 We appreciate there is some concern about the Billericay and Great Dunmow seat but we agree with the Commission that it is probably the least worst option. We would however make it more coherent in the southern Chelmsford part and would include one less Uttlesford ward.

- 2.48 We make minor consequential changes to Harlow and Epping Forest uniting Nazeing in one constituency and restoring the ties between Takeley and the Canfields with Broad Oak and the Hallingburys and The Rodings.
- 2.49 We respect the views of Uttlesford council but believe the proposed North West Essex constituency to be the best combination of wards.
- 2.50 We note it has the support of Labour and the Liberal Democrats as well as ourselves.
- 2.51 Where we do agree with Uttlesford Council is that the name of North West Essex should be changed to the historic name of Saffron Walden.
- 2.52 We note this has widespread support from Mr. Huggins, from the Liberal Democrats and from the Labour Party.
- 2.53 We believe that overall our proposals for Essex have considerable support and they are better under Rule 5 (1) b, c and d.
- 2.54 45,151 fewer electors move constituency and one other constituency Chelmsford is unchanged thus being more compliant with Rule 5 (1) c.
- 2.55 Local ties in Leigh-on-Sea, in Hullbridge and Hockley, in Orsett, in Lambourne and in Galleywood are restored being more compliant with Rule 5 (1) d.
- 2.56 Our local authority links are particularly improved being more compliant with Rule 5 (1) b. We show this in the two tables below.

Number of district and unitary local authorities a constituency comprises of

	One	Two	Three	Total
Commission proposals	7	5	5	17
Conservative proposals	7	7	3	17

Number of constituencies within a local authority, i.e. how many MPs a local authority would have to deal with

	One	Two	Three	Four	Total
Commission proposals	4	3	6	1	14
Conservative proposals	4	5	4	1	14

Number of constituencies crossing between Essex, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock

	Total
Commission proposals	4
Conservative proposals	2

2.57 We therefore believe the evidence shows that the Commission should amend its initial proposals in respect of Essex.

3. BEDFORDSHIRE AND HERTFORDSHIRE

- 3.1 We note there is general agreement that these two counties should be reviewed together.
- 3.2 We note that although there is general agreement about the linking there is some concern about the need to cross the county border on three occasions.
- 3.3 Although we support the Commission in that we believe the proposal may be the least worst option and that other solutions are likely to be more disruptive we do have sympathy for the view that one crossing of the county border would be preferable to three.
- 3.4 We note that there are two comprehensive counter proposals that address the issue and provide for just one county crossing. These are from Central Bedfordshire Council (Representation 022041) and from Paul Zukowskyj and Matthew Bedford (Day Two, Luton hearing, 9.13am, Pages 5-9 and Representation 006099)
- 3.5 We agree with a number of aspects of their counter proposals which we will refer to as appropriate. We note in some respects there are similarities between them.
- 3.6 In terms of cross border seats if the Commission is minded to have one cross border seat we believe Harpenden is better linked to Luton than in a large unwieldy seat stretching right up into the middle of Bedfordshire. We note that an individual who has done comprehensive counter-proposals for England has suggested one county crossing and a seat linking Luton and Harpenden (Peter Smyth, Representation 019602).

- 3.7 On balance we support the solution of the Commission but we ask that consideration is given to the Central Bedfordshire proposals which does seem to have considerable support from Parish Councils within Bedfordshire.
- 3.8 We support the proposal for the Bedford constituency. We note this has generated a large number of representations, the vast majority of which are in favour of the proposal giving just a few examples Representations 002269, 012697, 014865 and 017731.
- 3.9 We also note the evidence given at the hearing in Cambridge that Biddenham Upper School is in the Queens Park ward and Representation 018371 which shows that Biddenham within the Bromham ward is part of urban Bedford.
- 3.10 We also note that Representation 019235 from the Vice-Chairman of the Queens Park Urban Community Council agreeing that Bromham and Biddenham should be included within Bedford. We also note that the Councillor for Bromham and Biddenham fully supports the proposal to place the ward in Bedford (Representation 008716).
- 3.11 We note the three comprehensive alternative submissions for one link between Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire all support the Commission's proposed Bedford constituency.
- 3.12 We cite the evidence of the Member of Parliament for Bedford given at the Cambridge hearing (Day One, 2.35pm, Page 30-32) and Robert Mackay at the Luton hearing (Day Two, 12.33pm, Pages 17-19).
- 3.13 We note in respect of North Bedfordshire and South West Bedfordshire there are relatively few representations.

- 3.14 We note that in respect of Luton whilst there is some support there are a lot of residents in Dunstable who have concerns about the proposed Luton North and Dunstable constituency.
- 3.15 Although on balance we support these constituencies the Central Bedfordshire proposal and the one from Mr. Peter Smyth which continue to link Dunstable with South West Bedfordshire are worth considering.
- 3.16 In Hertfordshire we note the considerable body of opinion that retains South West Hertfordshire as an unchanged constituency. This includes as well as ourselves all three of the counter-proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire cited above.
- 3.17 We would cite the evidence of David Gauke the Member of Parliament for South West Hertfordshire (Representation 023626).
- 3.18 South West Hertfordshire can remain unchanged because there is an unnecessary swap of wards between there and Watford.
- 3.19 We believe as do many representations that Watford should be the existing constituency just minus the one ward of Carpenders Park which is included with Hertsmere.
- 3.20 We note the very considerable body of opinion that wishes to retain the wards of Langleybury, Abbots Langley and Leavesden in the existing constituency of Watford.
- 3.21 We note that this includes Cllr. Giles-Medhurst Chairman of Abbots Langley Parish Council at the Luton hearing (Day Two, 2.02pm, Pages 23-26). There is also a representation from Abbots Langley Parish Council which covers all three wards asking to be retained in Watford (Representation 020876).

- 3.22 We note that in addition to the three counter-proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire referred to above which support the same alteration as we do, the Liberal Democrats do so, as does Three Rivers District Council which covers the wards concerned (Representation 010533).
- 3.23 We would also cite the evidence of the Member of Parliament for Watford, Richard Harrington at the Cambridge hearing (Day One, 3.42pm, Pages 39-40).
- 3.24 What is made absolutely clear by Abbots Langley Parish Council and others is that the three wards of Abbots Langley, Leavesden and Langleybury cannot be separated.
- 3.25 Therefore the worst possible solution is that proposed by the Labour Party where Leavesden would be separated from Abbots Langley.
- 3.26 Although they mention this minimises the number of electors transferring between constituencies this can be done much better by transferring all three wards to Watford and retaining South West Hertfordshire unchanged.
- 3.27 We also propose that the Ashridge ward in Dacorum should be retained in Hemel Hempstead rather than being transferred to South West Hertfordshire.
- 3.28 We note the considerable degree of support for this proposal including from the three counter-proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire referred to above.
- 3.29 We note the support of Ashridge Parish Council (Representation 014993) and Nash Mills Parish Council (Representation 017328) for this proposal.
- 3.30 We cite the evidence of Hemel Hempstead Conservative Association in respect of this change (Representation 020123).

- 3.31 We note very little concern about the proposals for the St Albans, Hertsmere, Broxbourne and Hertford and Stortford constituencies.
- 3.32 We note there is both support and opposition to the proposals for the Hitchin and Harpenden constituency.
- 3.33 We also note there is some concern about the proposed Letchworth constituency, this is particularly evident in Pottton in Bedfordshire.
- 3.34 We note most of this concern relates to the linking of both these constituencies to Bedfordshire and that the proposals from Central Bedfordshire Council could address some of these concerns.
- 3.35 We note the very considerable support for the Welwyn Hatfield constituency. We expect this is about the principle of the constituency as some press reports prior to the proposals being published said it may be abolished.
- 3.36 We strongly support the principle of a Welwyn Hatfield constituency although we would not include the ward of Watton-At-Stone in the constituency.
- 3.37 We would include Watton-At-Stone in Stevenage and note the evidence of the Member of Parliament for North East Hertfordshire, Oliver Heald, at the Cambridge hearing (Day One, 11.39am, Pages 11-13). He currently represents the ward and cited the links that ward has to Stevenage.
- 3.38 We note that all three Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire counter-proposals referred to above include Watton-At-Stone in the Stevenage constituency.
- 3.39 We also note that two of these proposals above include the Mundens and Cottered ward and we would have no objection to this ward's inclusion if the Commission so decided.

- 3.40 We strongly support the inclusion of the Walkern ward in the Stevenage constituency. We note this has some support and very little opposition. We note Representation 019261 from a resident within this ward approving of the change.
- 3.41 We note that all three Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire counter proposals referred to above include this ward in Stevenage as do the Liberal Democrats and ourselves.
- 3.42 We note the support of Oliver Heald and Stephen McPartland speaking at the Cambridge hearing in favour of the ward's inclusion in Stevenage.
- 3.43 We therefore would support the Commission's proposal to include the ward in the Stevenage constituency where it was up until 2010.
- 3.44 We therefore broadly support the Commission's proposals for Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire making changes to reduce the disruption, moving 26,290 electors back to their existing constituencies and breaking fewer local ties. We also leave a further constituency unchanged. Our proposals are therefore more compliant with Rule 5 (1) c and d.
- 3.45 If the Commission is minded to change Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire so there is only one cross county border constituency then we would suggest the Central Bedfordshire Council submission is used as a basis for that change. The submission links into all our changes in Hertfordshire that are referred to above.

4. NORFOLK, SUFFOLK AND CAMBRIDGESHIRE

- 4.1 We agree with the Commission that these three counties should be combined and reviewed together.
- 4.2 We note that the combination is supported by the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats.
- 4.3 We note that there is limited opposition to either of the cross county constituencies of Newmarket and Ely and Wisbech and Downham Market.
- 4.4 We support in full the composition of all the constituencies in this grouping although we would not be averse to some name changes.
- 4.5 We note that linking Newmarket with Cambridgeshire enables five of the seven Suffolk constituencies to remain unchanged.
- 4.6 We note very little opposition to the proposed constituencies of Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, Ipswich, South Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal and Waveney which we fully support as unchanged constituencies.
- 4.7 We note little concern about the changes to the Bury St Edmonds and West Suffolk constituencies.
- 4.8 We note that there are some concerns from Mid Suffolk Council but their proposals would cause change to some of the unchanged Suffolk constituencies and this does not appear to have much support.
- 4.9 Although there are some counter proposals to review Suffolk separately and not to combine Newmarket with Cambridgeshire we note this view is not coming from Newmarket.

- 4.10 There is surprisingly little concern about the cross county seat with as much support for Newmarket and Ely as there is opposition.
- 4.11 We note in particular that the District Council covering Newmarket, Forest Heath District Council have written in support of the proposals (Representation 023678).
- 4.12 We note the support for the constituency including Haddenham Parish Council (Representation 008340) and the City of Ely Council (Representation 002990).
- 4.13 A particular feature of the proposals which has been especially welcomed is the ability to keep all of East Cambridgeshire District in one constituency.
- 4.14 We note that some representations want the name the other way round and we would be satisfied whichever way round the Commission decides on.
- 4.15 We note there are very few representations regarding the South Cambridgeshire and Huntingdon constituencies.
- 4.16 In respect of the St Neots constituency we note there is more support than objection to this constituency.
- 4.17 We note in particular the unanimous support of St Neots Town Council for this constituency (Representation 013068).
- 4.18 We note various alternative names have been suggested. We have no strong view regarding any alternative.
- 4.19 We note there is support for no change to the Cambridge constituency.
- 4.20 In respect of the two Peterborough constituencies we note there has been both support and opposition.
- 4.21 In respect of Peterborough North there has been more support than opposition and generally the concept of a constituency North of the Nene entirely within the

Peterborough Unitary Authority is welcomed. For an example of some of the Representations 001948, 002010, 003210 and 003213.

- 4.22 Although there is some concern about Peterborough South mainly from Whittlesey we believe it is a coherent constituency with most of it South of the Nene.
- 4.23 We would not be averse to the name Peterborough South and Whittlesey or Peterborough South and the Fens if these names better reflected the nature of the constituency.
- 4.24 The Peterborough constituencies have the support of both the Liberal Democrats and ourselves and we would cite evidence of Stewart Jackson MP (Day One, Cambridge hearing, 11.27am, Pages 8-11 and Representation 0001916) and Shailesh Vara MP (Representation 016515)
- 4.25 We note the Labour Party would make major changes to the proposals in Cambridgeshire. We reject these for a number of reasons.
- 4.26 Their proposal to cross the Nene and include Fletton in a Peterborough seat breaks ties between Fletton and Stanground Central and the Orton wards which are all urban wards in Peterborough south of the Nene. We also note some support for Fletton and Woodston to be included in the Peterborough South constituency. See for an example Representations 008521, 022204 and from the Councillor for the ward, Representation 016804.
- 4.27 We particularly reject the Labour Party proposals as they are considerably worse in terms of local authority links than the Commission's.
- 4.28 They propose one constituency comprising of four local authorities, North East Cambridgeshire.

- 4.29 The Commission do not propose any constituencies in Eastern Region comprising of four local authorities and there are currently only two constituencies in the whole of England comprising of four local authorities. We believe this should be avoided wherever possible.
- 4.30 In addition they have two constituencies comprising of three local authorities: Newmarket which is the cross-county constituency so it includes two counties as well, and South Cambridgeshire.
- 4.31 In contrast to this the Commission have only one constituency in Cambridgeshire comprising three local authorities.
- 4.32 In addition Huntingdonshire is divided between four constituencies under the Labour proposals and three under the Commission's proposals. South Cambridgeshire is divided between three constituencies under Labour's plans and two under the Commission's proposals.
- 4.33 An advantage of the Commission's proposals is that East Cambridgeshire is all in one seat as opposed to two under the Commission's proposals.
- 4.34 Overall the Labour proposals are much worse in terms of Local Authority links than the Commission's proposals so under Rule 5 (1) b the Commission is much more compliant.
- 4.35 We note there is about equal support and opposition to the cross-county seat of Wisbech and Downham Market.
- 4.36 We think this is the right place to combine the counties and note the support of the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties for this constituency.

- 4.37 We note there is little opposition to the Thetford and Swaffham seat although a number of people have suggested name changes which we would not be averse to.
- 4.38 We note that there is very little opposition to the King's Lynn constituency although there is some support for retaining the name of North West Norfolk which we support.
- 4.39 We note very little opposition and a greater level of support for South Norfolk, Norwich North, Norwich South and Broadland and Dereham and we support these constituencies in full.
- 4.40 In respect of Great Yarmouth and North Norfolk we note that while there is some support for the principle of combining the two Districts to produce two constituencies there is considerable opposition to the three wards proposed to be included from North Norfolk in Great Yarmouth.
- 4.41 Although we respect the views of the residents in these three wards, on balance we support the proposals of the Boundary Commission.
- 4.42 Under the Liberal Democrat proposals just one North Norfolk ward would be included with Great Yarmouth. This could lead to a greater degree of isolation for this one ward which has ties to Waxham and Stalham and Sutton which would be broken by this counter-proposal.
- 4.43 There would also be an odd shape to both constituencies with a finger coming down from North Norfolk to the Great Yarmouth boundary.
- 4.44 In order to help the three wards form a part of the constituency we would support a name of Great Yarmouth and Stalham to reflect the largest centre of population in the three wards.

- 4.45 We note the Labour Party propose other changes but this would cause knock-on effects including Broadland and Dereham consisting of parts of three local authorities rather than two under the Commission's proposals.
- 4.46 We therefore support in full the composition of all the constituencies in Suffolk, Norfolk and Cambridgeshire but would be happy with some name changes to better reflect the make-up of constituencies.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 We believe that overall the Commission have done a good job in Eastern Region.
- 5.2 We make minor changes to the Commission's proposals to better comply with Rules 5 (1) b, c and d of the Rules for Redistribution of Seats – Schedule 2 to the Act.
- 5.3 Our links with Local Authorities are much better in Essex than the Commission's, as opposed to those in Cambridgeshire from the Labour Party which are much worse than the Commission's, so we are better under Rule 5 (1) b.
- 5.4 We move 71,141 fewer electors and increase from nine to eleven the number of unchanged constituencies. Labour and the Liberal Democrats both remain at nine although others make suggestions which do make South West Hertfordshire and Chelmsford unchanged. Consequently we are better under Rule 5 (1) c.
- 5.5 As we break fewer local ties in Essex and Hertfordshire we improve the position under Rule 5 (1) d.
- 5.6 We hope the Commission will look favourably on our alternatives which we commend to them as the best overall proposals for Eastern Region as outlined in our final submission (Representation 025304).