

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.293

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 293

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton GCB KBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Professor Michael Chisholm

Mr R R Thornton CB LL

Mr D P Harrison

To the Rt Hon Marlyn Rees, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE
DISTRICT OF HAMBLETON IN THE COUNTY OF NORTH YORKSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of Hambleton in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 21 April 1975 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Hambleton District Council, copies of which were circulated to North Yorkshire County Council, parish councils and parish meetings in the district, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.
3. Hambleton District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account views expressed to them following their consultations with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The Council have not passed a resolution under section 7(4) of the Local Government Act 1972. The provisions of section 7(6) will therefore apply and the elections of all district councillors will be held simultaneously.

5. On 4 November 1975 the District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area of the district into 35 wards each returning one, two or three councillors to form a total council of 48.

6. We received no comment on the draft scheme.

7. We considered the draft scheme submitted by the District Council. We noted that the scheme generally complied with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and with our own guidelines but that, taken together, the wards in the northeastern part of the district were over-represented. In order to achieve a more even standard of representation in this area, we decided to re-group the parishes in the Council's proposed Broughton and Greenhow, Rudby, Stokesley, and Swainby wards as follows:-

| <u>Ward</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>No of Councillors</u> |
|------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| RUDBY | The parishes of Potto, Sexhow, Hutton Rudby, Skutterskelfe, Rudby, Crathorne, Middleton-on-Leven, Seamer, Newby and Picton. | 2 |
| STOKESLEY | The parishes of Stokesley and Kirkby. | 3 |
| SWAINBY | The parishes of Ingleby Arncliffe, Whorlton, Faceby, Carlton, Little Busby and Great Busby. | 1 |
| BROUGHTON AND GREENHOW | The parishes of Kildale, Easby, Bilsdale Midcable, Little Ayton, Ingleby Greenhow, and Great and Little Broughton. | 1 |

8. Subject to these modifications, which reduced the proposed size of the council to 47 members, we adopted the Council's draft scheme as our draft proposals.

9. On 16 March 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who

had received our consultation letter. The Council were asked to make the draft proposals and the accompanying map, which illustrated the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that comments should reach us by 11 May 1976.

10. The District Council opposed the modifications we had made to their draft scheme and pressed for the reinstatement of their own proposals which, they said, respected local ties. In support of this view, we received representations from 6 Parish Councils and 2 individuals, all seeking the reinstatement of the arrangements proposed in the Council's draft scheme. Other representations requested that the parish of Little Ayton, in our proposed Broughton and Greenhow ward, should be transferred to the proposed Great Ayton ward, and suggested modifications to the proposed Helperby and Tollerton wards and to the proposed Appleton Wiske and The Cowtons wards.

11. In view of these comments we considered that we needed further information to enable us to formulate our final proposals. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the 1972 Act, and at our request, Mr R A Pearson was appointed an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

12. Notice of the local meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally.

13. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting at the Council's offices in Stokesley on 11 January 1977 and visited the areas which were the subject of comment. A copy of his report is attached at Schedule 1.

14. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area the Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed subject to the following modifications:-

- i. that the parish of Little Ayton should be transferred from the Broughton and Greenhow ward to the Great Ayton ward;
- ii. that the parishes of Newby and Seamer should be transferred from the Rudby ward to the Stokesley ward;
- iii. that the parish of Kirkby should be transferred from the Stokesley ward to the Broughton and Greenhow ward which should be represented by 2 councillors instead of 1, thereby increasing the size of the council to 48 members.

15. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We noted that the modifications recommended by the Assistant Commissioner produced an overall standard of representation which was numerically inferior to that in our draft proposals and, in particular, that the modified Broughton and Greenhow ward, would be over-represented with 2 councillors. Taking into consideration the fact that his recommendations were based on local discussion and an inspection of the area, we decided to accept the modified wards recommended by the Assistant Commissioner but not the additional councillor for the Broughton and Greenhow ward. We formulated our final proposals accordingly.

16. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. The boundaries of the new wards are illustrated on the map. A detailed description of the proposed wards, as shown on the map, is set out in Schedule 3.

PUBLICATION

17. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Hambleton District Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's

main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed:

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

D P HARRISON

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

NEIL DIGNEY
Secretary

15 December 1977

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 SECTION 60ELECTORAL REVIEW - LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION'S
DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR THE HAMBLETON DISTRICTREPORT of Mr. R. A. Pearson, Assistant Commissioner

I was appointed by the Secretary of State for the Home Office to hold a meeting to hear representations relating to the proposed future electoral arrangements for the Hambleton District at the Council Offices, Stokesley on the 11th January 1977. A list of the persons attending the meeting is attached (Appendix 'A')

1. PREAMBLE

The Hambleton District Council serves an electorate of 51,157 and at the present time is divided into 31 Wards with 48 Councillors. Twenty-two of these Wards have one Councillor, five have two Councillors, two have three Councillors, one has four and one has six Councillors. The average electorate per Councillor at present is 1066 and the electorate per Councillor varies between 770 and 1380.

The District Council formulated a scheme to retain 48 Councillors, their proposals providing for 35 Wards, two with three Councillors, nine with two Councillors, and twenty-four with one Councillor each. The average electorate per Councillor would be 1066, as at present, the electorate per Councillor ranging from 770 to 1380.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England have accepted the District Council's Scheme so far as relates to 30 Wards with 40 Councillors. For the remaining Wards covering the major area of the north-eastern portion of the District, the Commission have proposed that there should be four Wards with seven Councillors compared with five Wards with eight Councillors suggested by the District Council. Under this Scheme the average electorate per Councillor is 1083 and the electorate per Councillor varies from 924 to 1380. A statement of the Commission's proposals with details of the 1975

and projected 1980 Electorates is annexed as Appendix 'B'. This draft scheme is indicated on a Map on the scale 1-100,000 which for ease of reference and convenience has been marked as Map 1.

Observations and representations on the Commission's proposals were made in writing by the following :-

(a) Hambleton District Council - The District Council felt that their original scheme satisfied the provisions of the 11th Schedule to the Local Government Act 1972 in which regard is required to be had to any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary, and suggested that this had been disregarded by the Commission. They further maintained a strong preference for their original proposals, and saw no single advantage in the Commission's proposals which would break down the many local ties to which the Council had regard in formulating their proposals.

(b) Rudby Parish Council - pointing out that the Parishes of Newby and Seamer had a great affinity with Stokesley from the point of view of social amenities, education, shopping facilities etc. and that no public transport system connected these parishes with Hutton Rudby.

(c) Newby Parish Council - objecting to the proposal to group the Parish with the suggested Rudby Ward, stating that they had much more in common with Stokesley.

(d) Seamer Parish Council - supporting the District Council's proposals that the Parish should be grouped with Stokesley, which would make a compact geographical area, whilst there were very many more links with Stokesley and Newby than the parishes in the proposed Rudby Ward.

(e) Kildale Parish Council - suggesting that as Great and Little Broughton was almost a suburb of Stokesley it would be wrong to group that Parish with a predominately rural area. They pointed out that the area of the proposed Ward would be about 900 square miles and would be extremely difficult for one Councillor to cover.

(f) Mr. D. H. Thomas, District Councillor of Great Broughton - suggesting that Great Broughton and Kirby should remain together with the possible inclusion of Great and Little Busby. Great Broughton and Kirby were served by one church, one chapel, a new school, and they had the same youth organization and interests. He stated there were no apparent links between Kirby and Stokesley, or Great Broughton with Kildale and Ingleby Greenhow, but would not object to the Parish of Bilsdale Midcable being added to the Broughton Ward suggested by the District Council.

(g) Mrs. A. Ward-Thompson of Great Ayton, Chairman of the District Council - urging that the Commission's proposals in the Stokesley area should be resisted and supporting the District Council's Scheme. She stressed the close links between Great Broughton and Kirkby, pointing out that Seamer and Newby had similar links with Stokesley and not with Hutton Rudby.

(h) Potto Parish Council - supporting the District Council's Scheme, expressing preference to being included in the Swainby Ward with which the Parish was already joined for education, religious, and social purposes.

(j) Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council - unanimously supporting the proposed Greenhow Ward put forward by the District Council.

(k) Great Ayton Conservative Branch, Little Ayton Parish Meeting, Mr. D.J. Kitching, Mr. H.E. Kitching, Mr. D.C. Petch, Mr. P.E. Southall and J.R. Southall, all objecting to the proposed separation of the Parishes of Great Ayton and Little Ayton.

(m) Smeaton-with-Hornby Parish Meeting - suggesting that the Parish had no links with East and South Cowton and would prefer to be joined with Appleton Parish, with which there were much closer associations. The Parish Council pointed out that a by-pass road to be constructed would further separate the Parishes.

(n) Tholthorpe Parish Meeting - urging that the Parish should be included in the Tollerton Ward and not the Helperby Ward, as proposed, since the Parish

had very close educational, religious and social ties with the Parish of Alne within the Tollerton Ward.

(o) Great Ayton Parish Council - objecting to the proposed inclusion of Little Ayton in the Commission's scheme, and urging that the Parish should be included with Great Ayton, on the ground that there is no boundary between the two Parishes and that Little Ayton is quite remote from the other Parishes forming the suggested Broughton and Greenhow Ward.

With the exception of the objection from Tholthorpe Parish, the whole of the objections and representations relate to the northern and north-eastern portions of the District.

2. THE HEARING

The Meeting was attended by representatives of all the bodies or persons who had submitted representations together with a number of existing District Councillors whose areas were the subject of proposed alterations. For purposes of convenience the report of the proceedings has been sectionalised under the headings of the respective Wards proposed by the Boundary Commission, the first-named Ward being that proposed and the second being the Ward to which the Parish or Parishes are proposed to be transferred.

(a) Helperby and Tollerton Wards - Parish of Tholthorpe

(i) Mr. G.A. Wood, Chairman of the Tholthorpe Parish Meeting, in amplification of the objection already submitted, stated that the entire electorate of the Parish would like to be included in the proposed Tollerton Ward. Historically they were part of the ecclesiastical Parish of Alne, the children all went to Alne, and for most of their activities the residents tended to look to the Tollerton side on the east, rather than on the Helperby side.

(ii) Councillor J. Corner, representing the existing Ward covering Helperby, pointed out that the proposed transfer would upset the balance of the electorate, whilst the existing Ward boundaries had worked well

since the Ward was first constituted in 1974.

(iii) Councillor F. Wade, representing the existing Tollerton Ward, supported the representation, suggesting that the transfer of the electorate of Tholthorpe, some 110, would not unduly affect the balance between the respective Wards.

(iv) Mr. D. Parkin, Chief Executive Hambleton District Council, referred to the rules laid down for determining Ward boundaries, in particular to the provisions that the ratio of the number of electors to the number of Councillors should, as nearly as possible, be the same in every Ward, and that regard should be had to any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary. The present division, which had been in operation since the formation of the Council, had appeared to work well, and the District Council had not suggested any change. The transfer would create some sort of imbalance but this would be well within the proposed range, and it seemed that the District Council would have no strong feelings, whatever action was decided upon.

(b) Rudby and Stokesley Wards - Parishes of Newby and Seamer

(i) Councillor Mrs. A. Ward-Thompson, Chairman of the District Council, had represented that the District Council's proposed grouping of Newby and Seamer with Stokesley was right, and that they should not be grouped with the Hutton Rudby group of Parishes.

(ii) Councillor C.H. Thompson, representing the Stokesley Ward, supported the grouping of Newby and Seamer with Stokesley, as at present, and the transfer of Kirkby to Great and Little Broughton, thus retaining the natural boundary, the River Tame.

(iii) Mr. R.F. Hastings, a member of the Rudby Parish Council, supported his Council's representation that the Parishes of Newby and Seamer should form part of the proposed Stokesley Ward.

(iv) Mr. D. Parkin reiterated the District Council's views that their original proposals, to retain the grouping of Newby and Seamer with Stokesley to form the Stokesley Ward, were preferable to the Commission's proposals in every way.

(c) Stokesley and Broughton and Greenhow Wards - Parish of Kirkby

(i) Councillor Mrs. Ward-Thompson, Chairman of the District Council, had objected to the inclusion of the Parish of Kirkby in the proposed Stokesley Ward, urging that the Parish should be with Great and Little Broughton with which it was closely linked for all purposes.

(ii) Councillor D.H. Thomas, District Councillor for Great Broughton, stated Kirkby and Broughton were contiguous and should remain together, and that Kirkby should not go with Stokesley, as the two Parishes had one church, one chapel, one School, and all village activities were joint, and he supported the District Council's original proposals for the Stokesley Ward.

(d) Rudby and Swainby Wards - Parish of Potto

(i) Mr. J.H. Cousans, Chairman of the Potto Parish Council, in support of his Council's representation, stated that the Parish was joined to Swainby in the Parish of Whorlton for ecclesiastical purposes, and an application had been made for an Order in Council to include further Parishes, amongst which was Carlton. Under both the District Council and the Boundary Commission's proposals Potto was included in the Rudby Ward, but Potto and Swainby had similar interests and should be together. It was stated, however, that the Parish had been well represented by the existing Councillors on the District Council.

(ii) Councillor F.E. Beaumont, one of the existing District Councillors for the Ward, opposed the proposed transfer of Potto Parish. He stated that the existing boundary was the main A.172 road, a very good and clearly defined line, and it did not seem to be in the best interests to change. He suggested that it was not certain that other parishes would

be joined with Potto and Swainby for ecclesiastical purposes. He urged that, whatever changes were envisaged, Carlton and Great and Little Busby should be together, as the two Busbys had no affinity with Kirkby, but were very closely linked with Carlton.

(iii) Mr. D. Parkin, on behalf of the District Council, pointed out that should Seamer and Newby be transferred from the Rudby Ward, any further erosion could materially affect the Councillor/electorate ratio. His Council's proposals were to continue to include Potto in the Rudby Ward, as were those of the Commission, and very little would be achieved by any change.

(e) Broughton and Greenhow and Great Ayton Wards - Parish of Little Ayton

(i) Councillor R.M. Turton, District Councillor for the Greenhow area, drew attention to the difficulties in servicing the vast but sparsely populated area within the National Park, particularly in the planning sphere. Little Ayton was on the edge of this area and he felt it would be better to make it a special case and ensure representation by having a separate Ward as suggested by the District Council.

(ii) Mr. J.N. Southall, on his own behalf and that of other residents of Little Ayton, stated that the whole of the residents would prefer to be with Great Ayton. Residential development in one Parish continued into the next, and Little Ayton was really part of Great Ayton.

(iii) Mr. W. Cardwell, Chairman of the Great Ayton Parish Council, supported Mr. Southall in his views.

(iv) Councillor Mrs. J. Imeson, District Councillor and Parish Councillor for Great Ayton, stressed that Great and Little Ayton should form one Ward, with three members, and stated that Little Ayton had always looked towards Great Ayton for all purposes.

(v) Mr. H.E. Kitching, of Little Ayton, expressed full agreement with

the joining of the two Aytons for Ward purposes

(vi) Mr. D. Parkin, on behalf of the District Council, explained some of the reasons which led his Council to include Little Ayton in their proposed Greenhow Ward - it would help to produce a viable electorate to justify a separate Ward, unless it could be treated as a special case, the difficulties put forward by Councillor Turton were real ones, and although the affinity between Great and Little Ayton were appreciated, the other factors appeared to warrant their action.

(f) Broughton and Greenhow Ward

(i) Councillor R.M. Turton, residing in Greenhow, in dealing with Little Ayton (see (e)(i) above) drew attention to the particular difficulties experienced in dealing with matters arising out of the National Park, and urging that the District Council's proposals for a separate Ward should be accepted as a special case. If this were not possible, he felt that one solution might be for the proposed Broughton and Greenhow Ward with Kirkby, and possibly less Little Ayton, to be a two member Ward.

(ii) Councillor D.H. Thomas, in dealing with Kirkby Parish in relation to the proposed Stokesley Ward, had suggested that Kirkby and Broughton should be together, with the addition of Great and Little Busby and possibly Bilsdale Midcable, intimating that Broughton had little in common with the three Parishes to the east within the National Park.

(iii) Mr. D. Parkin, on behalf of the District Council, drew attention to his Council's difficulties in dealing with the Greenhow portion of the proposed Ward (see (e)(vi) in relation to Little Ayton). His Council had endeavoured to maintain representation of the vast rural area in their proposed Ward of Greenhow, and even if its electorate fell slightly below that of other Wards they felt that it was a special case. The Ward proposed by the Commission had the largest Councillor/electorate ratio in the whole of the District (1406 against Brompton Ward of 1380, a semi-urban Parish). but the vast area of the proposed Ward did not make it comparable.

The District Council felt that their original proposals were reasonable, and were strongly opposed to the Commission's proposals.

(iv) During the course of a general discussion of the matter, when it was agreed that the boundaries and representation of this proposed Ward constituted the major problem before the meeting, it appeared clear that one reasonable solution might be the Ward as put forward by the Commission, with the possible substitution of Kirkby for Little Ayton, with an additional member, and although this alternative had not been considered by the District Council, the Councillors present were of the opinion that this would be a reasonable compromise.

(g) The Cowtons and Appleton Wiske Wards - Parishes of Great Smeaton, Little Smeaton and Hornby.

(i) The Smeaton with Hornby Parish Council, in their written representation, had felt that socially, geographically and ecclesiastically the Parishes were separated from East and South Cowton and would prefer to be joined to Appleton Wiske, with which they had much closer associations, and was of a more comparable size. They also pointed out that a by-pass was to be constructed separating the Parishes from the Cowtons.

(ii) Mrs. B.M. Hunt, Vice-Chairman of the Smeaton with Hornby Parish Council and a churchwarden, supported the views of the Parish Council and stressed the ecclesiastical ties with Appleton Wiske, stating that although they had separate schools, they joined together in social and ecclesiastical activities, but they had nothing in common with the Cowtons. The Parish Council now suggested that the Parishes of Over Dinsdale, Cirsby, Hornby Great Smeaton, Little Smeaton and Deighton should be transferred to the Appleton Wiske Ward with an additional Councillor.

(iii) Mr. D.H. Marshall, a member of the East Cowton Parish Council, disagreed with the proposed transfer. He stated that the existing Ward had worked satisfactorily since re-organisation, and urged that no alteration be made.

(iv) Mr. T.S. Cosey, a member of the East Cowton Parish Council, expressed support for the views put forward by Mr. D.H. Marshall.

(v) Councillor J.C. Hugill, representing the existing Ward, opposed the transfer of Parishes suggested, and stated that the by-pass was unlikely for some considerable time.

(vi) Councillor D.T. Walker, County and District Councillor, suggested that as Great Smeaton had affinity with Appleton Wiske, then if it could be done, it appeared reasonable. He stated that East Cowton would shortly have a new school, which would eliminate education difficulties in the area and a few children in the Cowtons area would not have to go to school at Great Smeaton.

(vii) Mr. D. Parkin, on behalf of the District Council, agreed that the connections between the Smeatons and Cowtons areas were somewhat tenuous. They undoubtedly had separate communities. He pointed out, however, that the electorate of Appleton Wiske Ward was 1052, that of The Cowtons Ward was 1027, and that of Morton-on-Swale was 1059, all comparable. To transfer some 431 electorate, as suggested, would not necessarily give the Appleton Wiske Ward an additional Councillor, and the remainder of the proposed Cowtons Ward, with an electorate of just under 600, would probably result in the loss of a Councillor. The whole Ward system would have to be re-drawn and he could not point to any special features which would indicate that a special case could be made out for an extended Appleton Wiske Ward as put forward by the Parish Council.

3. ACCOUNT OF INSPECTIONS MADE BY ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

Your Assistant Commissioner made a tour of the area where representations had been made, this being mainly in the north-eastern portion of the District. The National Park area is extremely remote and very sparsely populated, and outside this area the more highly populated parishes are greatly influenced by the industrial areas to the north, aided by good communications.

4. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE WEIGHT OF ARGUMENTS ADVANCED,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Helperby and Tollerton Wards - Parish of Tholthorpe

Great stress was made on the ecclesiastical ties between the Parishes of Tholthorpe and Alne. They are, however, separate civil Parishes, Tholthorpe with a Parish Meeting and Alne with a Parish Council. The electorate of the Helperby Ward is 994 and that of the Tollerton Ward 1069, and the loss of the Tholthorpe electorate of 110 would not only cause a substantial imbalance in the Councillor/electorate ratios for both Wards, but would also interfere with what appear to be reasonably compact areas.

I therefore RECOMMEND - that no alteration be made to the boundaries of the Helperby and Tollerton Wards.

(b) Rudby and Stokesley Wards - Parishes of Newby and Seamer.

From the information given and the representations made, not only by the Newby, Seamer and Stokesley representatives, but also from the Rudby Parish Council, and supported by my inspection of the Parishes in the vicinity, it is apparent that the two Parishes have closer ties with Stokesley than with the Rudby area. The transfer of Newby and Seamer to Stokesley would not appear to create any serious imbalance in the Councillor/electorate ratios for either the proposed Rudby or Stokesley Wards.

I therefore RECOMMEND - that the Parishes of Newby and Seamer be transferred to the proposed Stokesley Ward from the proposed Ruddy Ward.

(c) Stokesley and Broughton and Greenhow Wards - Parish of Kirkby

The information given by the objectors, confirmed by an inspection of the Parishes concerned, gives clear indications that Kirkby Parish and that of Great and Little Broughton are closely connected in every way, and that the logical boundary of the Stokesley Ward is the River Tame. The transfer of Kirby, with an electorate of 220, from Stokesley Ward as extended by the recommendation in (b) above, would not create any imbalance in either the Stokesley or Broughton and Greenhow Wards, as proposed.

I therefore RECOMMEND - that the Parish of Kirkby be transferred to the proposed Broughton and Greenhow Ward from the proposed Stokesley Ward, subject to (b) above.

(d) Ruddy and Swainby Wards - Parish of Potto

The principal grounds for advocating the transfer of the Parish of Potto from the Ruddy to the Swainby Ward were ecclesiastical. Both Potto and Whorlton have Parish Councils. There is no evidence of the likelihood of substantial growth of the proposed Ruddy Ward which would justify any further reduction in the electorate of that Ward, whilst the present electorate of the Swainby Ward is just right.

I therefore RECOMMEND - that no alteration be made in the boundaries between the proposed Ruddy Ward, subject to (b) above, and the proposed Swainby Ward.

(e) Broughton and Greenhow and Great Ayton Wards - Parish of Little Ayton

The case for grouping Little Ayton with Great Ayton is extremely strong. It was admitted by the District Council that the suggested inclusion of Little Ayton within their proposed Greenhow Ward was mainly

in order to raise the electorate of that Ward to justify the allocation of one Councillor for the area. The small electorate of the Parish can readily be absorbed into the Great Ayton Ward without unduly increasing the Councillor/electorate ratio, and would meet the wishes of all concerned.

I therefore RECOMMEND - that the Parish of Little Ayton be transferred to the Great Ayton Ward, as proposed, from the proposed Broughton and Greenhow Ward.

(f) Broughton and Greenhow Ward

The representations made by the Parishes concerned and the District Council urged that the area, comprising the Parishes of Bilsdale Midcable, Ingleby Greenhow, Easby and Kildale were worthy of consideration as a special case. The major parts of these Parishes lie within the National Park and comprise a vast, sparsely populated area. However, it was generally appreciated that an electorate of some 672 would hardly be likely to qualify for a separate Councillor under the Councillor/electorate ratio. These Parishes are surrounded on three sides by other District Council areas. Because of this it was recognised that, although they were not keen on the idea, they would have to go in with the Parishes of Great and Little Broughton, together with Kirkby from the proposed Stokesley Ward. With the possible loss of Little Ayton (see (e) above) the Councillor/electorate ratio would be 1538 which would give an 'entitlement' of 1.41 Councillors on a 47 Councillor basis, or 1.44 Councillors on a 48 Councillor basis. The representatives were hopeful that, in all the circumstances, the Commission would feel that a two-member Ward would be appropriate in this instance.

Having visited the remote village and hamlets in the area in extremely inclement conditions and after hearing the representations, the reasons for the request were clearly understood.

In considering this area as a whole I do not consider that 11 Councillors instead of 10 is unreasonable. Whilst appreciating the imbalance in the Broughton and Greenhow Ward this is countered almost completely by the greater the average electorates of the Great Ayton and Swainby Wards. At the enquiry it was manifestly clear that Great Ayton and Little Ayton wished to be joined and when one looked at the situation on the ground this was more than obvious. The same remarks apply in connection with Broughton and Greenhow Ward because, whilst this is a beautiful area, it is extremely rugged and in the winter time there is no doubt that two representatives would be more than justified.

I therefore RECOMMEND - that the boundaries of the proposed Broughton and Greenhow Ward be amended by the transfer of the Parish of Little Ayton to the Great Ayton Ward, and the Parish of Kirkby from the proposed Stokesley Ward, and that the number of Councillors for the proposed Ward, as altered, be increased from one to two.

- (g) The Cowtons and Appleton Wiske Wards - Parishes of Over Dinsdale, Girsby, Hornby, Great Smeaton, Little Smeaton and Deighton

The original suggestion that the Parishes of Great Smeaton, Little Smeaton and Hornby forming the area of the Smeaton-with-Hornby Parish Council should be transferred from the Cowtons Ward to the Appleton Wiske Ward was on social, geographical and ecclesiastical grounds. When the case for the Parish Council presented by their Vice-Chairman was heard, greater emphasis was paid to the ecclesiastical side, and the addition of Over Dinsdale and Girsby was apparently requested when it was realized that these two Parishes would be cut off from the rest of the Ward if the original request were to be granted, and Deighton was also included to round off the area. The group of Parishes forming the Parish Council are each Civil Parishes, with Parish Meetings as well as the grouped Parish Council.

It seemed quite apparent that there had been no prior consultation with the Parishes of Over Dinsdale, Girsby and Deighton, nor were the views of the representative bodies of these Parishes available to me. Furthermore, the impression was given that the Parish Council did not wish to be a slightly junior partner in the Cowtons Ward, but, with Appleton Wiske, would rather form the senior group with the possibility of an extra Councillor.

The Parish of Great Smeaton is adjacent to the main Northallerton-Darlington Road, with the Cowtons to the west, Little Smeaton, Birkby and Hutton Bonville to the south, Hornby and Deighton to the east, with Girsby and Over Dinsdale running northwards from Hornby. It would seem,

therefore, that geographically the proposed Ward has Great Smeaton as its focal point, although the Parish with the largest electorate is East Cowton.

I concur with the view expressed by the District Council's representative that any alteration on the lines of that suggested on behalf of the Parish Council would involve a re-appraisal of the wardings of a considerable area of the District and feel that any transfer would not be justified.

I accordingly RECOMMEND - that no alteration be made in the boundary of the proposed Cowtons Ward.

5. GENERAL

I would wish to express my appreciation of the assistance and co-operation afforded by officers of the Hambleton District Council in connection with the meeting.

It will be noted that the effect of the recommendations would be to increase the number of Councillors from 47 to 48, as at present. An analysis of the electorate of the wards in the north-eastern area i.e. from Rudby and Swainby Wards eastwards, indicates that the electorate is some 11313, giving a Councillor/electorate ratio of 1028, which, in the circumstances, does not appear to be unreasonable.

Appendix 'C' shows the comparative figures which would result from your Assistant Commissioner's recommendations.

LIST OF PERSONS ATTENDING MEETING

| <u>Name and Address</u> | <u>Representing</u> |
|--|---|
| Mr. F. Wade - The Firs, Tollerton, York | Ward Rep. Tollerton |
| Mr. J.C. Hugill - 16 Lees Lane, Romanby | Ward 8 - Cowtons |
| Mr. J. Corner - Rising Sun Farm, Aldworth | Helperby Ward |
| Mr. G.A. Wood - High Farm, Tholthorpe, York | Chairman, Tholthorpe Parish Meeting |
| Mr. D. Parkin - The Old Vicarage, Northallerton | Chief Executive, Hambleton District Council |
| Mr. J.N. Southall - Ayton Firs, Great Ayton (Little Ayton Parish) | Parishioners Little Ayton |
| Mr. D.C. Petch - Grange Farm, Little Ayton | ditto |
| Mrs. J. Imeson - 28 Rosehill, Great Ayton | Hambleton District Councillor |
| Mrs. A. Ward-Thompson - Rodel, 6 Easby Lane, Great Ayton | Chairman, Hambleton District Council |
| Mr. W. Cardwell - Hawthorne, Great Ayton | Chairman, Great Ayton Parish Council |
| Mr. E. Brown - 16/18 Arthur St. Great Ayton | Clerk, Great Ayton Parish Council |
| Mr. H.E. Kitchen - Little Ayton | |
| Mr. J.H. Cousans - Farthing House, Potto | Chairman, Potto Parish Council |
| Mrs. A. Dwyer - 12 Coupe Close, Potto | Clerk, Potto Parish Council |
| Mr. R. Marriott - 132 High St. Northallerton | Richmond Conservative Association |
| Mr. R.M. Turton - Kildale Hall, West Yorks | District Councillor |
| Mr. C.A. Thompson - Stokesley | ditto |
| Mr. D.H. Thomas - Great Broughton | ditto |
| Mr. G. Thornley Walker - Osmotherley | ditto |
| Mr. F.K. Beaumont | ditto (Appleton Wiske area) |
| Mr. E.J. Benton - 64 West Green Stokesley | Parish Councillor, Stokesley |
| Mr. D.H. Marshall - Main Street, East Cowton | Parish Councillor |
| Mr. T.S. Cosey - East Cowton | ditto |
| Mrs. B. Hunt - Hornby, Great Smeaton | Smeaton with Hornby Parish Council |
| Mr. R.P. Hastings - 11 North Side, Hutton Rudby | Rudby Parish Council |
| Mrs. Frances Alder - The Glebe, Kirby | Chairman Kirby/Cleveland Parish Council |
| Mr. G. Marsay - Stokesley | District Councillor |
| Mr. P. Newby | Middlesborough Evening Gazette |

DISTRICT OF HAMBLETON : NAMES OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

| <u>NAME OF WARD</u> | <u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Appleton Wiske | 1 |
| Bedale | 2 |
| Brompton | 1 |
| Broughton and Greenhow | 1 |
| Carlton Miniott | 1 |
| The Cowtons | 1 |
| Crakehall | 1 |
| Crayke | 1 |
| Easingwold | 2 |
| Great Ayton | 3 |
| Helperby | 1 |
| Hillside | 1 |
| Huby-Sutton | 1 |
| Leeming | 1 |
| Leeming Bar | 1 |
| Morton-on-Swale | 1 |
| Northallerton North East | 2 |
| Northallerton South East | 2 |
| Northallerton West | 2 |
| Osmotherley | 1 |
| Romanby | 2 |
| Romanby Broomfield | 1 |
| Rudby | 2 |
| Shipton | 1 |
| Sowerby | 2 |
| Stillington | 1 |
| Stokesley | 3 |
| Swainby | 1 |
| Tanfield | 1 |
| Thirsk | 2 |
| The Thorntons | 1 |
| Tollerton | 1 |
| Topcliffe | 1 |
| Whitstonecliffe | 1 |

HAMBLETON DISTRICT - DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARDS

APPLETON WISKE WARD

The parishes of Appleton Wiske
 East Harlsey
 East Rounton
 High Worsall
 Low Worsall
 Welbury
 West Rounton

BEDALE WARD

The parish of Bedale
 and the Aiskew Ward of the parish of Aiskew.

BROMPTON WARD

The parish of Brompton

BROUGHTON AND GREENHOW WARD

The parishes of Bilsdale Midcable
 Easby
 Great and Little Broughton
 Ingleby Greenhow
 Kildale
 Kirkby

CARLTON MINIOTT WARD

The parishes of

- Ainderby Quernhow
- Carlton Miniott
- Holme
- Howe
- Pickhill with Roxby
- Sandhutton
- Sinderby
- Skipton-on-Swale

CRAKEHALL WARD

The parishes of

- Anderby Mires with Holtby
- Burril with Cowling
- Clifton-on-Yore
- Crakehall
- Firby
- Hackforth
- Langthorne
- Rand Grange
- Rockwith
- Snape with Thorp
- Thirn
- Thornton Watlass

CRAYKE WARD

The parishes of

- Coxwold
- Crayke
- Husthwaite
- Newburgh
- Oulston

Thornton-on-the-Hill
Yearsley

EASINGWOLD WARD

The parish of Easingwold

GREAT AYTON WARD

The parishes of Great Ayton
Little Ayton

HELPERBY WARD

The parishes of Birdforth
Brafferton
Fawdington
Helperby
Myton-on-Swale
Raskelf
Tholthorpe
Thormanby

HILLSIDE WARD

The parishes of Boltby
Borrowby
Covesby
Felixkirk
Kirby Knowle
Knayton with Brawith
Leake
North Kilvington
South Kilvington

Thornborough

Upsall

HUBY-SUTTON WARD

The parishes of Huby
 Sutton-on-the-Forest

LEEMING WARD

The parishes of Burneston
 Exelby, Leeming and Newton
 Gatenby
 Swainby with Allerthorpe
 Theakston

LEEMING BAR WARD

The parishes of Killerby
 Kirkby Fleethem with Fencote
 Scruton

and the Leeming Bar Ward of the parish of Aiskew.

MORTON-ON-SWALE WARD

The parishes of Ainderby Steeple
 Danby Wiske
 Great Langton
 Kiplin
 Lazenby
 Little Langton
 Morton-on-Swale

North Otterington

Thrintoft

Warlaby

Whitwell

Yafforth

NORTHALLERTON NORTH EAST WARD

The North East Ward of the parish of Northallerton

NORTHALLERTON SOUTH EAST WARD

The South East Ward of the parish of Northallerton

NORTHALLERTON WEST WARD

The West Ward of the parish of Northallerton

OSMOTHERLEY WARD

The parishes of

Ellerbeck

Kepwick

Kirby Sigston

Landmoth-cum-Catto

Nether Silton

Osmotherley

Over Silton

Sowerby-under-Cotcliffe

Thimbleby

West Harlsey

Winton, Stank and Hallikeld

ROMANBY WARD

The Romanby Ward of the parish of Romanby.

ROMANBY BROOMFIELD WARD

The Romanby (Broomfield) Ward of the parish of Romanby.

RUDBY WARD

The parishes of

| |
|--------------------|
| Crathorne |
| Hutton Rudby |
| Middleton-on-Leven |
| Picton |
| Potto |
| Rudby |
| Sexhow |
| Skutterskelfe |

SHIPTON WARD

The parishes of

| |
|----------------|
| Beningbrough |
| Linton-on-Ouse |
| Newton-on-Ouse |
| Shipton |
| Overton |

SOWERBY WARD

The parish of

| |
|---------|
| Sowerby |
|---------|

STILLINGTON WARD

The parishes of Brandsby-cum-Stearsby
 Dalby-cum-Skewsby
 Farlington
 Marton-cum-Moxby
 Stillington
 Whenby

STOKESLEY WARD

The parishes of Newby
 Seamer
 Stokesley

SWAINBY WARD

The parishes of Carlton
 Faceby
 Great Busby
 Ingleby Arncliffe
 Little Busby
 Whorlton

TANFIELD WARD

The parishes of Carthorpe
 East Tanfield
 Howgrave
 Kirklington-cum-Upsland
 Sutton with Howgrave
 Well
 West Tanfield

THE COWTONS WARD

The parishes of

- Birkby
- Deighton
- East Cowton
- Girsby
- Great Smeaton
- Hornby
- Hutton Bonville
- Little Smeaton
- Over Dinsdale
- South Cowton

THE THORNTONS WARD

The parishes of

- Cotcliffe
- Crosby
- Kirkby Wiske
- Maunby
- Newby Wiske
- Newsham with Breckenbrough
- South Otterington
- Thornton-le-Beans
- Thornton-le-Moor
- Thornton-le-Street

THIRSK WARD

The parish of

- Thirsk

TOLLERTON WARD

The parishes of Aldwark

Alne

Flawith

Tollerton

Youlton

TOPCLIFFE WARD

The parishes of Catton

Dalton

Eldmire with Crakehill

Hutton Sessay

Sessay

Topcliffe

WHITESTONECLIFFE WARD

The parishes of Angram Grange

Bagby

Balk

Calton Husthwaite

Hood Grange

Kilburn High and Low

Sutton-under-Whitestonecliffe

Thirkleby High and Low with Osgodby

Thirlby

Wildon Grange

