



# Initial proposals - East Midlands

## Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Allocation of constituencies</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Sub-regions</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Headline numbers and summary of schemes</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Breakdown of schemes by sub-region/county</b>	<b>8</b>
Preferred Scheme	8
Alternative Scheme 1	11
Alternative Scheme 2	13
<b>Names of constituencies (preferred scheme)</b>	<b>15</b>

## 2023 Review

Electoral Quota = 73,393

Electorate range = 69,724 - 77,062

## Allocation of constituencies

**Table 1: Allocation of constituencies by ceremonial/metropolitan county**

<b>County</b>	<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Mathematical Constituency entitlement</b>
Derbyshire (including City of Derby) <sup>1</sup>	790,982	10.78
Leicestershire (including City of Leicester) <sup>2</sup>	754,549	10.28
Lincolnshire	551,904	7.52
Northamptonshire (comprising the two unitary authorities of North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire) <sup>3</sup>	529,899	7.22
Nottinghamshire (including City of Nottingham) <sup>4</sup>	823,638	11.22
Rutland	30,154	0.41
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,481,126</b>	<b>47.43</b>

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to as Derbyshire

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter referred to as Leicestershire

<sup>3</sup> Hereafter referred to as Northamptonshire

<sup>4</sup> Hereafter referred to as Nottinghamshire

## Sub-regions

**Table 2: Headline numbers by sub-region**

Sub-region	Electorate	Mathematical Constituency entitlement	Existing constituencies	Proposed constituencies	Average constituency size of proposed sub-region
Preferred sub-regions					
Derbyshire	790,982	10.78	11	11	71,907
Leicestershire	754,549	10.28	10*	10	75,455
Lincolnshire and Rutland	582,058	7.93	7**	8	72,757
Northamptonshire	529,899	7.22	7	7	75,700
Nottinghamshire	823,638	11.22	11	11	74,876
Alternative scheme 1 (no changes)					
Alternative scheme 2 (changes only)					
Derbyshire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire	2,166,524	29.52	29	29	74,708
Leicestershire and Rutland	784,703	10.69	10	11	71,337
<b>Region Totals</b>	<b>3,481,126</b>	<b>47.43</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>74,067</b>

\*The existing sub-region is Leicestershire and Rutland

\*\*The existing sub-region is Lincolnshire only

The sub-regions are the same in two of the schemes presented but differs in the third. In the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1, Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire are all considered on their own. The mathematical constituency entitlement is 0.41 in Rutland and 7.52 in Lincolnshire - this means that both counties will have to contain a constituency that crosses their respective county boundaries. In the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1, Rutland and Lincolnshire are treated together as a sub-region, to avoid more than one constituency that crosses a county boundary. This arrangement is strongly preferable to other alternatives, such as pairing Lincolnshire with Nottinghamshire or Leicestershire, in terms of respecting the statutory factors.

In the alternative scheme 2 only Northamptonshire is treated on its own. Leicestershire and Rutland are treated as a sub-region, with one constituency that crosses the county boundary. Although not required by the electorates in Leicestershire, this better reflects the existing arrangement of Rutland with Melton. As Lincolnshire cannot be a self-contained sub-region, it forms a sub-region with Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. Although the electorates do not require Derbyshire to be included in this sub-region, including Derbyshire reduces the average constituency size from 76,419 in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire to 74,708 in the sub-region. This avoids unnecessary split wards in Nottinghamshire; however, this scheme still results in seriously detrimental consequences for the arrangement of constituencies in Derbyshire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, and was largely designed to illustrate the justification of the decision to deviate from the existing Leicestershire-Rutland pairing. The Secretariat has resolved as a general rule to prioritise schemes which cross county boundaries as little as possible, which favours the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1.

## Headline numbers and summary of schemes

**Table 3: Headline numbers for schemes**

Schemes	Constituencies - ward changes				Districts in constituencies incl. Unitary Authorities			Constituencies crossing more than one ceremonial/ metropolitan county	Split wards	Orphan wards	Const. names retained
	Number wholly unchanged	Number changed by rewarding only	Minor substantive changes (1-2 wards)	Major substantive changes (3+ wards)	One	Two	Three or more				
Preferred Scheme	7	4	12	24	28	14	5	1	1	0	35
Alternative Scheme 1	6	3	12	26	24	18	5	1	3	4	34
Alternative Scheme 2	3	2	8	34	23	17	7	3	3	7	29

Names of wards to be split:

- **Preferred Scheme:** Irthlingborough (North Northamptonshire)
- **Alternative Scheme 1:** Finedon (North Northamptonshire), Irchester (North Northamptonshire), Silverstone (West Northamptonshire)
- **Alternative Scheme 2:** Billesdon and Tilton (Harborough), Irthlingborough (North Northamptonshire), Ravenstone and Packington (North West Leicestershire)

The Secretariat's aim has been to try to minimise changes to constituencies and to retain as many unchanged as is practicable, having regard to the other statutory factors.

In Derbyshire the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1 are the same with six wholly unchanged constituencies, two are changed by rewording only, and the remaining three are able to be reconfigured using a minimum of three wards. In alternative scheme 2 due to a cross-county boundary constituency between the Erewash and Broxtowe local authorities, there is more widespread disruption to existing constituencies in Derbyshire, with only two existing constituencies able to remain wholly unchanged.

In the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1, the existing pairing of Leicestershire and Rutland is not continued, meaning there is inevitable disruption to the existing constituencies throughout Leicestershire. There is a similar configuration of constituencies in the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1, with four constituencies remaining the same. In the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1, there is a crossing of the unitary boundary between Leicester and Glenfield. It is possible to eliminate this crossing; however, it does allow a coterminous Harborough constituency, and avoids an unnecessary split ward within the sub-region. In alternative scheme 2, Rutland is considered with Leicestershire, which provides enough flexibility to avoid crossing the City of Leicester unitary authority boundary. While this arrangement better reflects the existing sub-region, it is not recommended, as no existing constituencies can be retained in Leicestershire, and there are detrimental consequences to the other sub-regions.

As Lincolnshire cannot be considered on its own, it is considered with Rutland in the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1, with a Rutland and Stamford cross-county boundary constituency. The Spalding, Boston and Skegness, Louth and Horncastle, and Gainsborough constituencies are identical in the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1. The preferred scheme has a Rutland and Stamford constituency that does not include Bourne, allowing the Lincoln constituency to remain wholly unchanged. The alternative scheme 1 includes Bourne in a Rutland and Stamford constituency, which necessitates changes to the Lincoln constituency which could otherwise be wholly unchanged, and causes more disruption to the existing Grantham, and Sleaford and North Hykeham constituencies. In alternative scheme 2, Rutland is considered with Leicestershire, so Lincolnshire is considered with Nottinghamshire. Consequently, there is a Gainsborough and Retford cross-county boundary constituency required to ensure

all constituencies are within the electoral range. This disrupts much of the existing pattern for Lincolnshire (and indeed Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire); however, it does allow a wholly unchanged South Holland and the Deepings constituency.

In all schemes Northamptonshire is considered on its own; however, changes to local government boundaries means there is widespread disruption to the existing constituencies with ward-splitting required in a minimum of one constituency. The preferred scheme and alternative scheme 2 for Northamptonshire are the same, with one constituency crossing the unitary boundary between the respective North and West Northamptonshire unitary authorities, and a split of the Irthlingborough ward in the Kettering constituency. This allows the Wellingborough constituency to be changed by rewarding only, and avoids dividing the urban area of Wellingborough or Corby between constituencies. These schemes require two rural constituencies that include urban wards of Northampton, while alternative scheme 1 configures the Northampton urban areas into North and South constituencies. This arrangement better represents the existing constituencies, however the scheme requires a minimum of three split wards and two orphan wards throughout the sub-region.<sup>5</sup>

In Nottinghamshire there are differing arrangements in each of the proposed schemes. The preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1 consider Nottinghamshire on its own, while alternative scheme 2 requires two cross-county boundary constituencies with Lincolnshire and Derbyshire. All schemes have one constituency that crosses the Nottingham unitary authority boundary. In the preferred scheme and alternative scheme 1 there is a Nottingham North and Kimberley constituency and in alternative scheme 2 a Nottingham South and Beeston constituency. The preferred scheme is the least disruptive to the existing constituencies and favoured over alternative scheme 1, as it avoids splitting both the Mansfield and Ashfield local authorities between constituencies. Alternative scheme 2 is the most disruptive and contains two cross-county boundary constituencies. This option is not favoured as the Secretariat has resolved as a general rule to prioritise schemes which limit the crossing of county boundaries.

---

<sup>5</sup> Orphan ward refers to a ward from one local authority, in a constituency where the remaining wards are from at least one other local authority.

## Breakdown of schemes by sub-region/county

### Preferred Scheme

**Table 4A: Preferred Scheme - sub-region/county breakdown**

Sub-region/ county	Constituencies - ward changes				Districts in constituencies incl. Unitary Authorities			Constituencies crossing more than one ceremonial/ metropolitan county	Split wards	Orphan wards	Const. names retained
	Number wholly unchanged	Number changed by rewarding only	Minor substantive changes (1-2 wards)	Major substantive changes (3+ wards)	One	Two	Three or more				
Derbyshire	6	2	2	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	11
Leicestershire	0	0	3	7	5	4	1	0	0	0	6
Lincolnshire and Rutland	1	0	1	6	3	5	0	1	0	0	6
Northamptonshire	0	1	1	5	6	1	0	0	1	0	2
Nottinghamshire	0	1	5	5	7	2	2	0	0	0	10
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>

### Derbyshire



Six constituencies are wholly unchanged and two are changed due to rewording only. Three wards have been reconfigured between the remaining three constituencies (Derbyshire Dales, Mid Derbyshire, and South Derbyshire).

### **Leicestershire**

There are substantial changes in Leicestershire as it is not considered with Rutland; however, this is offset by the benefits of not crossing more than one county boundary. One constituency crosses the unitary authority boundary from Leicester to Glenfield, allowing a coterminous Harborough constituency and avoidance of ward-splitting in the sub-region. As a result of a coterminous Harborough constituency, the proposed Blaby, Oadby and Wigston constituency has an east-west orientation, combining built up areas of the Leicester suburbs with rural Stony Stanton; however, this avoids otherwise dividing the Narborough and Enderby community, and reconfiguring six of the preferred scheme constituencies. A proposed Mid Leicestershire constituency crosses three local authorities covering the suburban area to the north and west of Leicester; however, this is a partly reconfigured existing constituency which crosses the same three local authority boundaries.

### **Lincolnshire and Rutland**

Lincolnshire and Rutland both cannot be considered on their own, so to avoid more than one cross-county boundary constituency they are considered together, resulting in a Rutland and Stamford constituency. There is additional disruption within the respective North and South Kesteven local authorities due to the cross-county boundary constituency, however, reconfigured Grantham, and Sleaford and North Hykeham constituencies remain. The Gainsborough constituency is now coterminous with the West Lindsey local authority and the Lincoln constituency is wholly unchanged. There is an option to reconfigure the Lincoln constituency to include the suburban area of North Hykeham, and Sleaford to include the Bracebridge Heath and Waddington West, and Skellingthorpe wards; this has no further impacts on the scheme, but causes more disruption to the existing constituencies. The remaining constituencies have all been reconfigured by four or five wards.

### **Northamptonshire**

In Northamptonshire, changes to the local government boundaries causes disruption to the existing constituencies throughout the county. The Wellingborough constituency is changed by rewording only and the proposed Corby and East Northamptonshire constituency by one ward, the others have all changed by three or more wards. A ward split is proposed in the Irthlingborough ward, allowing the Wellingborough constituency to take more urban area without cutting off Raunds from the rest of the Corby

constituency. This split avoids the need to include an urban Corby ward in the Kettering constituency or break local ties and transport connections around Wellingborough.

### **Nottinghamshire**

In Nottinghamshire there is a relatively small amount of change, with six constituencies each changed by fewer than two wards. The Nottingham unitary authority boundary between Nottingham and Kimberley is crossed by one constituency, preventing the need to divide the Eastwood community between two constituencies. The existing coterminous Mansfield constituency is over the permitted electorate range by 347 electors, meaning there is a requirement for that constituency to cross the local authority boundary. It is bordered by the Sherwood and Bassetlaw constituencies, both of which are changed by two wards, and a reconfigured Ashfield constituency, which is below the permitted electorate range by 2,634 electors. To avoid widespread disruption to the existing constituencies, cutting off Hucknall from the Sherwood constituency, or a constituency crossing four local authorities, we have proposed a crossing between Ashfield and Mansfield. The proposed Ashfield constituency would accordingly include two wards from the Mansfield local authority that are centred on the two main transport connections between Ashfield and Mansfield, as there are no easily identifiable geographic or community boundaries. The Secretariat believes this may be the most contentious issue in Nottinghamshire and will openly invite representations on this issue.

## Alternative Scheme 1

**Table 4B: Alternative Scheme 1 - sub-region/county breakdown**

Sub-region/ county	Constituencies - ward changes				Districts in constituencies incl. Unitary Authorities			Constituencies crossing more than one ceremonial/ metropolitan county	Split wards	Orphan wards	Const. names retained
	Number wholly unchanged	Number changed by rewarding only	Minor substantive changes (1-2 wards)	Major substantive changes (3+ wards)	One	Two	Three or more				
Derbyshire	6	2	2	1	7	2	2	0	0	0	11
Leicestershire	0	0	2	8	4	5	1	0	0	0	6
Lincolnshire and Rutland	0	0	2	6	2	6	0	1	0	1	4
Northamptonshire	0	0	3	4	5	2	0	0	3	2	5
Nottinghamshire	0	1	3	7	6	3	2	0	0	1	8
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>34</b>

### Derbyshire

Derbyshire is the same as in the preferred scheme.

### Leicestershire

In Leicestershire there is little variation to the preferred scheme, with four constituencies remaining the same. An effort has been made to improve transport connections in the Blaby, Oadby and Wigston constituency, but this divides the Enderby community and reduces the transport connections in the Mid Leicestershire constituency.

### **Lincolnshire and Rutland**

There is no change in the east and north of the sub-region with four constituencies remaining the same as the preferred scheme. There is a reconfigured Rutland and Stamford constituency that includes Bourne, which arguably better preserves community ties in the area; however, this prevents the existing Lincoln constituency being wholly unchanged, it means the option of a Lincoln and North Hykeham constituency is not possible, and results in additional disruption to the Grantham and Sleaford constituency.

### **Northamptonshire**

In Northamptonshire there is less disruption to the existing constituencies than in the preferred scheme, however there is more crossing of the local authority boundaries. The former Northampton local authority is contained to two entirely urban constituencies, and the Kettering and Corby constituencies are improved relative to the preferred scheme as they better reflect the existing constituencies; however, the potential benefits are offset by the need for three split wards (two of which being likely contentious splits surrounding Wellingborough) and two orphan wards.

### **Nottinghamshire**

In this scheme there is more change to the existing constituencies than the preferred scheme, with seven constituencies changed by three or more wards. The Nottingham, Rushcliffe and Broxtowe constituencies are the same as in the preferred scheme and the Gedling constituency differs by one ward. The Mansfield local authority is now divided into two constituencies, being paired with Sutton-in-Ashfield to the south and Bassetlaw to the north. While this allows for more condensed Newark and Sherwood constituencies, and improved transport and community links, this scheme is not recommended, as dividing the Mansfield community is likely to be deeply unpopular and there is greater disruption to the existing constituencies throughout the sub-region.

## Alternative Scheme 2

**Table 4C: Alternative Scheme 2 - sub-region/county breakdown**

Sub-region/ county	Constituencies - ward changes				Districts in constituencies incl. Unitary Authorities			Constituencies crossing more than one ceremonial/ metropolitan county	Split wards	Orphan wards	Const. names retained
	Number wholly unchanged	Number changed by rewording only	Minor substantive changes (1-2 wards)	Major substantive changes (3+ wards)	One	Two	Three or more				
Derbyshire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire	3	1	7	18	12	11	6	2	0	6	19
Leicestershire and Rutland	0	0	0	11	5	5	1	1	2	1	8
Northamptonshire	0	1	1	5	6	1	0	0	1	0	2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>29</b>

### Leicestershire and Rutland

Rutland cannot be considered on its own, so in this scheme it is considered in a sub-region with Leicestershire. This eliminates the constituency crossing the unitary boundary between Leicester and Glenfield, but requires two split wards, with one being an orphan split ward. Even considering Rutland with Leicestershire, all 11 constituencies are changed by three or more wards, compared to seven in the preferred scheme, and thus there is no benefit to this option with regard to preserving existing constituencies. There are more compact Mid Leicestershire and Blaby, Oadby and Wigston constituencies that only cross two local authority boundaries; however, the benefits from this configuration are outweighed by the knock on impacts in Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.

### **Derbyshire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire**

In this sub-region a cross-county boundary constituency is required between Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, and a second crossing between Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire has been included to avoid the need to split wards. There is more disruption to the existing constituencies in each county when compared to the preferred scheme, with only South Holland and the Deepings, Derby North, and Derby South constituencies wholly unchanged. The configuration of constituencies in Derbyshire is considerably weaker than the preferred scheme, as only two rather than six constituencies are wholly retained, and the Heanor and Alfreton communities are divided. This configuration avoids transferring two urban Mansfield wards into an Ashfield constituency; however, this renders it impossible to retain all but two of the preferred scheme constituencies. The three coastal constituencies in Lincolnshire are arguably stronger in this configuration; however, the severe disruption to the remaining constituencies outweighs any benefit.

### **Northamptonshire**

Northamptonshire is the same as the preferred scheme.

## Names of constituencies (preferred scheme)

**Table 5: Constituency names and designations**

Constituency name and designation	Name unchanged?	Designation unchanged?
Amber Valley CC	✓	✓
Ashfield CC	✓	✓
Bassetlaw CC	✓	✓
Blaby, Oadby and Wigston CC		
Bolsover CC	✓	✓
Boston and Skegness CC	✓	✓
Bosworth CC	✓	✓
Broxtowe CC	✓	✓
Chesterfield BC	✓	✓
Corby and East Northamptonshire CC		✓
Daventry and Brackley CC		
Derby North BC	✓	✓

Derby South BC	✓	✓
Derbyshire Dales CC	✓	✓
Erewash CC	✓	✓
Gainsborough CC	✓	✓
Gedling CC	✓	✓
Grantham CC	✓	✓
Harborough CC	✓	✓
High Peak CC	✓	✓
Kettering CC	✓	✓
Leicester East BC	✓	✓
Leicester South BC	✓	✓
Leicester West and Glenfield BC		✓
Lincoln BC	✓	✓
Loughborough CC	✓	✓
Louth and Horncastle CC	✓	✓
Mansfield CC	✓	✓



Melton and Syston CC		
Mid Derbyshire CC	✓	✓
Mid Leicestershire CC		
Newark CC	✓	✓
North East Derbyshire CC	✓	✓
North West Leicestershire CC	✓	✓
Northampton Central BC		✓
Northampton North and Desborough CC		
Northampton South and Towcester CC		
Nottingham East BC	✓	✓
Nottingham North and Kimberley BC		✓
Nottingham South BC	✓	✓
Rushcliffe CC	✓	✓
Rutland and Stamford CC		
Sherwood CC	✓	✓
Sleaford and North Hykeham CC	✓	✓

South Derbyshire CC	✓	✓
Spalding CC		✓
Wellingborough CC	✓	✓