



16 March 2011

Dear 

**Our ref: 05/11**

Thank you for your request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, dated 12 March 2011, received by the Commission on 15 March 2011.

Please see our response to each of your requests below. Your request for information relates to the York City electoral review which was conducted in 2000 by the Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) which was one of our predecessors.

**“1. When the study of York City Council review was undertaken, the Commission created a blanket area covering Haxby-Wigginton in contravention of parish council wards (internal) may be altered, but external boundaries may not.”**

**Confirm or deny.**

The LGCE had no power to alter the external boundaries of parished areas as part of an electoral review. In the case of the review of York, the Commission made no recommendations for any changes to external boundaries of either Haxby or Wigginton Parish Councils. It did, however, make recommendations for a new City Council ward encompassing both parishes, and made consequential recommendations for new parish electoral arrangements as required by Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972. That Act provided that, so far as practicable, parish wards should not be divided between wards of the City Council.

**“2. Only residents of a ward can vote for the councillor who will represent that ward.”**

**Confirm or deny.**

Only registered local government electors in a ward may vote for candidates standing for election to the local authority of which that ward is part for the purposes of the election of councillors.

**“3. In introducing the changes of 2001, was your offices aware of the political implications of your actions, ie political parties contesting three-seat wards, are guaranteed to win those seats. Because of the three votes per elector (3 times 3 equals nine votes).”**

**Confirm or deny.**

The LGCE was an independent, apolitical body and took no account of the local political implications of its recommendations.

**“4. In the 2001 report, I get the impression that the Lib-Dems seemed to be prominent in opinions, etc. Were they responsible for the removal of the internal wards?”**

**Confirm or deny.**

The recommendation for a three-member Haxby-Wigginton ward was the Commission's, and the Commission's alone. However, as can be seen from paragraph 150 of the report, the Commission's recommendation ward was based on a proposal received from York City Council.

Subsequent paragraphs outline the support received for this proposal from other interested parties, including Haxby Parish Council, Wigginton Parish Council, the Haxby-Wigginton Branch Liberal Democrats and the Conservative Constituency Association.

**“5. Enclosed list of results show the results of Haxby-Wigginton election, that should the results of the Liberals be divided by 3. The winner could be Hogg, Carr and Robert Shaw. So who's idea was it to introduce this system.”**

**Confirm or deny.**

The Local Government Act 1972 sets out the basis of local authority electoral arrangements in England. No limit was set on the number of councillors that could be elected from any ward. However, the LGCE concluded that the maximum number of councillors that should be elected should not exceed three, on the grounds that any higher number could reduce councillor's accountability to electors. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) subscribes to that policy.

Recent changes introduced by the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 provide that in making recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements, the LGBCE must have regard to the desirability of providing for the number of councillors to be returned from each ward to reflect the electoral cycle of the local authority concerned. This means that for local authorities that elect on a cycle three

years out of four, the LGBCE should provide for three councillors to be elected from each ward. For local authorities that elect by halves, in two years out of four, it should provide for two councillors per ward.

I hope that you are satisfied with this response. If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me, quoting the reference number above in any correspondence.

If you wish to request a review of our decision, you should write to:

Bolanle Ojoye  
Freedom of Information Officer  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76-86 Turnmill Street  
London  
EC1M 5LG

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint or review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision; Details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.

Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England which, as you are aware, you have. Your complaint has also been considered by the Parliamentary Ombudsman

Yours sincerely

**Bolanle Ojoye**  
**Legal and Implementation Officer**  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
3rd Floor, Layden House  
76-86 Turnmill Street  
London  
EC1M 5LG  
[Bolanye.Ojoye@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:Bolanle.Ojoye@lgbce.org.uk)  
0207-664 8520

6-3-11.

TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
LONDON.

RECEIVED L & B COMMISSION 09 MAR 2011	RECEIVED 09 MAR 2011
---	-------------------------

SIR OR MADAM.

HAVING BEEN IN CONTACT WITH YOU  
AND THE EMBASSY OFFICES FOR SOME TIME, BUT TO  
NO AVAIL. I HAVE NO OPTION BUT TO PUT TO  
YOU FOR DIRECT RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWING  
QUESTIONS UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.  
YOUR TERMS OF REFERENCE WAS TO REDUCE THE  
NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS FOR YORK CITY FROM 53  
TO 47. AND TO DO THIS REDEFINE AREAS.

TO THIS END I WILL CONFINE MY COMMENTS TO  
HAXBY-WIGGINTON, AND STATEMENTS FROM THE  
L & B ELECTIONAL REVIEWS APRIL 2010 HAND BOOK.

1. ONLY RESIDENTS OF A WARD OR DIVISION CAN  
VOTE FOR THE CANDIDATE WHO WILL REPRESENT  
THAT WARD OR DIVISION, PAGE 19. (YOU HAVE CREATED  
A DIVISION TO BLANKET HAXBY-WIGGINTON AND IN  
EFFECT REMOVING THE BOUNDARY, YOUR BOOKLET  
PAGE 3 STATES PARISH COUNCIL WARDS MAY BE  
ALTERED BUT EXTERNAL BOUNDRIES OF PARISHES  
(HAXBY) MAY NOT. IT WAS A SIMPLE THING TO  
REMOVE ONE OF THE COUNCILLORS FROM HAXBY  
WITHOUT UNDOING STRESS SINCE HAXBY HAD 3 WARDS  
(NOW NONE) WHERE IT SHOULD BE 2 NOW.

2. PAGE 17. IS WITHOUT DOUBT VERY CLEAR,  
LEGISLATION TO WHICH YOU WORK, A PARISH  
MUST NOT BE DIVIDED, BUT INTERNAL WARDS  
CAN. IT IS CLEAR, YOU CANNOT MAKE  
CHANGES TO EXTERNAL BOUNDRIES OF PARISHES  
AS PART OF AN ELECTIONAL REVIEW. BY GIVING  
A NUMBER OF VOTES TO THE WIGGINTON CANDIDATE

TO ENSURE HE HAD AN EQUAL SHARE OF VOTERS  
YOU ALLOWED BOUNDARY CROSSING, "NOT ALLOWED"

3) I HAVE REPEATEDLY STATED THAT BY PRODUCING  
A 3 SEAT WARD WITHOUT AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY  
FOR THE COUNCILLORS ELECTED, YOU HAVE IN  
FACT CREATED AN AREA WHERE POLITICAL  
PARTIES ARE GUARANTEED TO GAIN ALL 3 SEATS.  
(THIS WILL DEPEND ON THE STRONG PARTY FOLLOWING.)

4) I AM OBLIGED TO ASK THIS QUESTION.  
HAS THIS SYSTEM BEEN ENGINEERED TO ENSURE  
INDIVIDUALS SUCH AS INDEPENDENTS, UKIP, BNP,  
GREEN PARTIES ARE EXCLUDED, BECAUSE FIGURES  
PROVE THIS TO BE SO. AND WILL LEAVE YOU  
OPEN TO THE HUMAN RIGHTS - EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES LAW!

SO SIR OR MADAM, I TRUST YOU WILL RETURN  
YOUR ANSWERS ASAP. PERHAPS WITHIN  
7 DAYS (NOT THE USUAL 3 WEEKS AS TIME IS  
VERY SHORT WITH MAY ELECTIONS DUE.)

COPY TO

MR JOHN STURDY M.P.

THE SEC OF STATE

DEPT ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND RECORDS

LONDON

12-3-11

TO BOLANLE OJOYE LEGAL & IMPLEMENTATION OFFICER  
L & B COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND.  
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION. REF. 05/11.

NADAM,

IT WOULD SEEM MY LETTER APPEARS TOO VAGUE FOR YOUR OFFICES TO TRANSLATE INTO INFORMATION SO I WILL SAY,

1/ WHEN THE STUDY OF YORK CITY COUNCIL REVIEW WAS UNDERTAKEN. THE COMMISSION CREATED A BLANKET AREA COVERING HARRY-WICKINGTON IN CONVENTION OF PARISH COUNCIL WARDS, (INTERNAL) MAY BE ALTERED, BUT EXTERNAL BOUNDARIES MAY NOT. CONFIRM OR DENY.

2/ ONLY RESIDENTS OF A WARD CAN VOTE FOR THE COUNCILLOR WHO WILL REPRESENT THAT WARD.  
CONFIRM OR DENY.

3/ BY INTRODUCING THE CHANGES OF 2001, WAS YOUR OFFICES AWARE OF THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF YOUR ACTIONS, IE, POLITICAL PARTIES CONTESTING 3 SEAT WARDS ARE COMPULSED TO WIN THOSE SEATS. BECAUSE OF THE 3 VOTES FOR ELCTOR. (3x3=9 VOTES)  
CONFIRM OR DENY.

4/ IN THE 2001 REPORT, I GET THE IMPRESSION THAT THE LIB-DEMS SEEMED TO BE PROMINENT IN OPINIONS ETC, WERE THEY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE INTERNAL WARDS. CONFIRM OR DENY.

5/ ENCLOSED LIST OF RESULTS SHOW THE RESULTS OF HARRY-WICKINGTON ELECTION, THAT SHOULD THE RESULTS OF THE LIB-DEMS BE DIVIDED BY 3, THE WINNERS COULD BE, HOGG, CARA, AND ROBERTSHAW.

SO WAS INEA WAS IT TO INTRODUCE THIS

SYSTEM - CONFIRM,

TOTAL AND PERCENTAGES YORK PRESS 5 MAY. 07.

	ELECTORATE	TURDOUT	ACTUAL VOTERS	NUMBER OF VOTES CAST	SEATS		
ACOMB.	6323	44.6%	2820	5223	2		
BISHOPTHORPE.	3185	54.5%	1730	1730	1		
CLIFTON.	9464	33.5%	3170	8512	3		
DERWENT.	2951	53.5%	1580	1582	1		
DRINGHOUSE WOODTHORPE	8663	45.2%	3916	11023	3	←	LD
FISHERGATE.	6156	44.9%	2782	5232	2		
FULFORD	2888	51.6%	1130	1134	1		
GUILDHALL	5580	31.2%	1741	3258	2		
HAXBY WIGGINTON	10203	44.3%	4520	12161	3	←	LD
HESLINGTON.	3085	37.2%	1145	1135	1		
HEWORTH	9241	37.5%	3465	9065	3		
HEWORTH WITHOUT	3171	54.1%	1716	1697	1		
HOLGATE	9300	43.2%	4018	10680	3	←	LD
HULL ROAD	6705	35.8%	2401	4485	2		
HORNINGTON-NEASWICK	9728	37.2%	3620	9649	3		
NICKLEGATE	9014	42.8%	3858	11587	3	←	LD
OSBALDWICK	2687	42.5%	1142	1128	1		
ROYAL WEST YORK.	8440	56.6%	4280	11714	3	←	C
STATION ROAD CLIFTON	10209	38.9%	3972	10525	3	←	LD-C.
STRENSALL	6158	38.9%	2396	4479	2		
WESTFIELD	10028	38.9%	3900	9244	3		
WHELDRAKE.	3218	51.9%	1674	1638	1		

ELECTORATE HAXBY 7346. 44.3% = 2938 } POLLING 12161 VOTES.

ELECTORATE WIGGINTON 3051. 44.3% = 1351 }

① - HOGG 1887 ÷ 3 = 629 ①

② - FIRTH 1740 ÷ 3 = 580

③ - WATSON 1649 ÷ 3 = 549

— CARL BNP 620 ②

— ROBERTS HAN. C. AGENT. 595. ③