

From: [BCE Reviews](#)
To: [BCE Yorkshire](#)
Subject: FW: Official Liberal Democrat submissions for the second consultation
Date: 19 April 2012 11:24:18
Attachments: [Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - east mids.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - east of england.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - London.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - north east.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - north west.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - south east.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - south west.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - west mids.pdf](#)
[Lib Dems - 2nd consultation - yorkshire.pdf](#)

Mark Cooper | Review Team Officer
Boundary Commission for England | 35 Great Smith Street | London SW1P 3BQ
T: 020 7276 0549 | E: mark.cooper@bcommengland.x.gsi.gov.uk
<http://www.consultation.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk> Twitter [@BCE2013](#)



Think of the environment...please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: 03 April 2012 11:12
To: BCE Reviews
Cc: James Simon - Boundary Commission for England; Hartley Sam - Boundary Commission for England
Subject: Official Liberal Democrat submissions for the second consultation

Simon, Sam

Please find attached submissions for the second period of consultation from the Liberal Democrats. Again, we have produced one submission per region.

If you could confirm these have been received I would appreciate that.

All the best

Head of Strategic Research, Liberal Democrats
020 7340 4916 / 07771 766502
[redacted] / LDHQ, 8-10 Great George Street, London SW1P 3AE

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.

Submission to the Boundary Commission for England second period of consultation: **Yorkshire & The Humber**

1) INTRODUCTION

The Liberal Democrats feel it is important for the commission to remember that we have already substantially altered our original submission in the light of submissions we became aware of at the hearings. These changes cover the entire area to the east of Leeds and between Leeds and Sheffield and were submitted before the deadline for phase one of this exercise.

Comments below therefore are limited to the areas not already addressed and mainly cover the issues involving Leeds and Bradford.

2) LEEDS

Leeds North West & Nidderdale

Public Submissions

The proposal for Leeds North West and Nidderdale which includes the Leeds City Council ward of Adel & Wharfedale but not Otley & Yeadon has provoked many comments from members of the public who wish to see the two wards remain together within a single parliamentary constituency. We strongly support the views expressed by 13 individual members of the public¹ who have written in opposition to the separation of the villages of Pool-in-Wharfedale, Arthington and Bramhope from the market town of Otley, breaking strong and long established medical, educational, community, social and cultural links.

1

BCE URN	Name
624	Keir Carver
7036	Margaret Wright
8842	William Barr
11113	John Nicholson
11241	Colin Campbell
	Fred Archenbold
12973	Sandy Lay
14417	Diana Jakeways
17339	David Pilbeam
	Lawrence Ross
18411	Ray Georgeson MBE
19545	Lesley Swales
19597	Steven Brady

As has been pointed out by members of the public in their responses², including Adel & Wharfedale but not Weetwood ward within this constituency introduces a boundary through the community of Cookridge / Holt Park / Adel / LS16, creating a barrier to current long established and successful representational structures in this part of Leeds. We concur with their views and feel that it would be quite wrong therefore to have a seat that does not unite Cookridge/Holt Park/Adel/LS16.

The suggestion of having Adel & Wharfedale in separate wards (opposed by nearly all submissions, apart from the Conservatives) also completely ignores the fact that the A660 is the main line of communication in that 'corridor' of Leeds, between Otley into Leeds and binds these largely suburban communities together.

The Labour Party submission

Acknowledged the existence of numerous broken ties and shortcomings but offered no alternative solution. Our submission retains the links between these two wards and between Adel & Wharfedale and Weetwood.

The Conservative submission

Opposes any combination of North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire wards in parliamentary constituencies but suggests that combinations that cross the borders of predominantly urban authorities are more appropriate. We do not share this view and believe that cross boundary arrangements, whilst not ideal, should be determined on a case by case basis

The Harrogate and Craven districts of North Yorkshire were part of the West Riding until the 1973 local government reorganisation and therefore have strong historic ties to the south. Pre-existing links between small rural communities in Wharfedale means that there are common features between the North Yorkshire wards and rural areas within Leeds City Council's boundaries.

We do believe however that if there are to be any cross county seats, then the rural North Yorkshire wards included in the Leeds North West & Nidderdale proposed seat would be far more appropriately attached to a constituency which includes Otley since it is the historic market town serving this area.

Guiseley & Yeadon

Public Submissions

There is widespread public opposition to the proposed arrangement which would damage many existing successful close links between Otley and Leeds which have grown up around the A660 corridor running through the existing Leeds North West

2

BCE URN	Name
11632	William Hunt
17743	John Griffiths

constituency. We agree with this and believe that it is totally inappropriate to be suggesting that Otley & Yeadon ward goes into a constituency that includes part of Bradford.

Otley's ties are with Leeds, not Bradford; Otley is a town in the Leeds Metropolitan district and it is vital that Otley remains linked to inner Leeds, via the A660 corridor, which is the dominant line of communication in this corridor. It is clear from the numerous comments made by members of the public that they see both difficulties of access³ in the proposed Guiseley & Yeadon constituency and potential conflicts of interest inevitably arising in a constituency which includes areas of two very different cities⁴. These same problems would be there following the Conservative's solution, which still includes Otley with part of Bradford as well as ignoring the A660 corridor, the main line of communication.

A number of respondents⁵ have commented that the rural North Yorkshire wards proposed as part of the Leeds North West & Nidderdale constituency would more appropriately be joined with Otley as these rural communities have strong historic ties to Otley as the market town. We share this view and believe if there has to be a seat that crosses the county boundary, that these communities could only be with a seat including Otley and also be linked to the A660 corridor.

Leeds North

Public Submissions

We do not agree with the submission by Steven Clapcote in favour of a Leeds North constituency which includes most of the student population of Leeds within its area.

3

BCE URN	Name
624	Keir Carver
11241	Colin Campbell
13789	Katherine Whelan
	Lawrence Ross
18411	Ray Georgeson MBE

4

1579	Beatrice Rogers
7036	Margaret Wright
8842	William Barr
11113	John Nicholson
12973	Sandy Lay
14417	Diana Jakeways
18411	Ray Georgeson MBE

5

BCE URN	Name
4477	Richard Davies
17743	John Griffiths
19545	Lesley Swales

We agree that the proposed constituency would concentrate student problems in one area but it would also have the effect of further marginalising the interests of long-term residents. The submission by Douglas Kemp (015663), who represents the views of long-term residents in Weetwood Ward sums up the concerns with this arrangement. Again, the clear linkage of the communities in the A660 corridor is crucial and Cookridge / Holt Park / Adel / LS16 are not split arbitrarily, which means keeping the communities from Otley, Bramhope, Adel, Cookridge, Holt Park, Weetwood and Far Headingley in the same parliamentary seat.

3) BRADFORD

Conservative Submission

The Conservative proposal results in combining Bolton, Bowling, Bradford Moor & Eccleshill with Calverley and Horsforth (page 22). It also puts Idle in Otley, and Windhill and Baildon in Shipley (page 25).

These proposals make a mockery of maintaining community links. The resulting constituency would stretch from Bradford city centre through some of the most deprived areas in the city and beyond the district in to some of the most affluent suburbs in Leeds. There are no historic ties between the two areas in order to make this constituency work.

The Conservatives will be breaking many well-established ties across north east Bradford. Both Idle and Wrose share very strong links with Eccleshill and Bolton, they share a number of services and amenities from school catchment areas to neighbourhood policing teams.

It would be near impossible for any MP to satisfy the needs of all the communities outlined in this proposal crossing in substantial proportions across two Local Authorities.

Mark Holmes Submission

This is a comprehensive response, which results in suggesting Baildon, Idle and Windhill being put in Shipley with Great Horton and Little Horton in Bradford East instead (URN 019396).

Bradford historically and today has been divided into an Eastern and Western side. Many people in the city very rarely venture beyond the city centre. There are no real community ties between Great and Little Horton and the rest of East Bradford would create a seat stretched across the city and would artificially divide the city.

Idle, Bolton and Wrose have a far stronger link as outlined in the Liberal Democrat submission with the communities in Eccleshill and the city of Bradford has no natural affinity with the Aire Valley.

4) HULL

Conservative Submission

The suggestion of dividing Hull between north and south defies the natural divide between East and West created by the River Hull. The communities fall naturally and historically therefore into Hull North with Cottingham, and Hull West with Haltemprice. There is no need to go against this natural community divide.