

Submission to the Boundary Commission for England second period of consultation: **East of England**

A) SUB REGION 1 – CAMBS/NORFOLK/SUFFOLK

In the submissions commenting on more than one constituency, there is considerable support for most of the Commission proposals.

North Norfolk / Great Yarmouth

We welcome the broad support in the various submissions that support amendments to the Commission proposals. They nearly all recognise that community ties can be better respected by making the changes that we proposed to Stalham and Waterside.

B) SUB REGION 2 – HERTS & BEDS

We note that, in addition to the Commission's own draft proposals, two alternative schemes have been proposed that provide for 16 constituencies in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire:

- (1) the alternative presented by Paul Zukowskyj at the Luton hearing; and
- (2) the alternative presented by Central Bedfordshire Council.

Both alternative schemes reflect the weight of representations received. In particular, they (a) reduce the number of times that the county boundary is crossed, and (b) address the many representations received from the Pottun area of northern Bedfordshire.

For these reasons, we believe that either alternative scheme would be preferable to the commission's own draft proposals and hope that the Commission will amend their proposals in that light.

South West Herts & Watford

In particular, we note the very widespread support - in the many submissions - for making amendments to the Commission proposals in this area. There is a broad consensus that community ties can be better respected by making the changes that we and others proposed.

This would leave the seats almost unaltered compared to their 2010 position and command wide public support and understanding.

St Albans

We note the weight of evidence in favour of linking Bedmond / Primrose Hill ward with Hemel Hempstead rather than St Albans.

C) SUB REGION 3 – ESSEX

We welcome the near-universal support for the Commission's Colchester, Braintree & Witham, North Essex and Harwich & Clacton, which maintain the historic Colchester and restore the latter three seats to long-standing boundaries. There is also widespread support for a single constituency based on the town of Chelmsford.

North West Essex (Saffron Walden)

We note the wide support for renaming North West Essex by its historic name of Saffron Walden.

One of the merits of the Commission's scheme is the reuniting of the Maldon District in one constituency, Essex's smallest District by population. However, the scheme divides the second smallest District by population, Uttlesford, into three constituencies.

We note representation 25761 from Uttlesford District Council (UDC) which addresses this. Their two alternative schemes are an improvement in the coherence of the NW Essex and Billericay constituencies and can be welcomed in that respect.

Under the UDC second option

- (a) The Braintree & Witham seat would become a rather elongated constituency (though not as elongated as the Commission's Billericay) but would unite Braintree District's three largest population centres, and
- (b) Maldon would take in parts of four Districts rather than three under the Commission scheme. However, in terms of local geography this is not a major weakness.

For example, Great Totham (Maldon 4), Tiptree (Colchester 23) and Kelvedon (Braintree 18) are in three separate Districts though they are in fact quite close to each other on the ground and linked by the B1022/1023. Equally, there is a direct and popular direct route from Hatfield Peverel to Maldon, the B1019.

Billericay & Dunmow (and Chelmsford)

Most of the representations here simply state opposition to Galleywood being removed from Chelmsford, without making alternative proposals that could maintain Billericay & Dunmow at the required size.

Many of these representations refer to local government ties, which would be maintained.

A number of the representations state that “Galleywood has been part of Chelmsford for a long time”. This is true in Borough Council terms and that of course will not change. However, Galleywood was not included in the area denoted as “city centre” in the Borough Council’s bid for city status. Additionally, from 1997 to 2010 Galleywood was in fact part of the Maldon and East Chelmsford constituency.

K Pauley (3113) states that “no large-scale building is proposed [in Chelmsford] in the next four years”. This is incorrect. Examination of the adopted Local Development Framework (www.chelmsford.gov.uk/ldf) shows that approaching 10,000 houses will be built in the main urban areas between 2001 and 2021. Chelmsford will therefore grow faster than its neighbours over the next 10 years.

Proposals such as from the Conservative Party and Galleywood Parish Council propose putting the Bicknacre etc ward into Billericay. The northern and southern ends of the B1418 road would then be in Maldon; the central section in Billericay.

At the northern end of Billericay & Dunmow, Takeley ward’s physical links are much more with Dunmow to the east, as proposed by the Commission (along the B1256, old A120) rather than with Harlow, as proposed by the Conservatives.

Rayleigh & Wickford

The Commission’s proposals have the northern boundary of this constituency in fields between Chelmsford wards 1 and 15; the southern boundary in a river and a trunk road, and in the west the unifying feature - from Runwell down to Pitsea - is the A132.

As an alternative, the Conservative party proposals have boundaries which are not clear on the ground.

The northern boundary of their constituency would divide Runwell (with roads such as Carlton Road and Harold Gardens on either side of the boundary), and the southern boundary would divide the Chalvedon area, splitting the Chalvedon school and dividing roads such Carlisle Way. Vange (ward 13) would be almost detached from the rest of the Rayleigh & Wickford constituency: its only direct physical link with Pitsea North West (ward 10) being a footbridge over South Mayne, the busy local distributor road.

Hawkewell and Hockley

The weight of representations from local residents is in favour of Hawkewell and Hockley remaining with Rayleigh. Taken in isolation, one can understand their concerns as there are links. However, these areas are equidistant between Rayleigh and Rochford and are to a degree separate from Rayleigh, having their own parish councils.

The only way it would be possible for them to stay linked to Rayleigh is by splitting the Pitsea community in half.

Castle Point / Southend West

The Commission's proposals have the western boundary of this constituency as the Borough boundary: in a river and along a trunk road; the Conservative party's proposals are the unclear boundary described above.

Admittedly, the eastern boundary of this constituency is more difficult to fix.

The Commission's proposals join Leigh (a parished suburb of Southend Borough with local identity) to Castle Point. This is welcomed in submissions from the Castle Point area. The Conservative party's proposal has a boundary that divides the 8 or 9 roads that straddle the borough boundary.

Epping Forest / Brentwood & Ongar

The Conservative party want to move Lambourne (ward 12) to Brentwood & Ongar. On grounds of community ties this is an arguable point. However, they also want to move Chigwell Row (ward 4). This is part of the civil parish of Chigwell and has always been part of the Chigwell urban area. It looks to the urban parts of Epping Forest rather than the rural parts. For example, its 'catchment' secondary school is Debden Park, in Loughton.

The Conservative party also want to move Lower Nazeing from Harlow into Epping Forest to compensate for the above. Lower Nazeing has long been in the Harlow constituency.