

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Kingston-upon-Hull

December 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)
Peter Brokenshire
Kru Desai
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, and the number of councillors and ward names.

© Crown Copyright 2000

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|-----------|
| SUMMARY | <i>v</i> |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | <i>1</i> |
| 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS | <i>5</i> |
| 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED | <i>9</i> |
| 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS | <i>11</i> |
| 5 NEXT STEPS | <i>27</i> |
| APPENDICES | |
| A Proposed Electoral Arrangements | <i>29</i> |
| Kingston upon Hull City Council D Harris W Harris | |
| B The Statutory Provisions | <i>35</i> |

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Kingston upon Hull is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Kingston upon Hull on 16 May 2000.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Kingston upon Hull:

- **in nine of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and two wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2005 this unequal representation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in nine wards and by more than 20 per cent in three wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 83-84) are that:

- **Kingston upon Hull Council should have 59 councillors, one less than at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards, instead of 20 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of two, and no wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each district councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In 21 of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2005.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 12 December 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 19 February 2001:

**Review Manager
Kingston upon Hull Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Constituent areas |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 1 Avenue | 3 | Avenue ward; Myton ward (part) |
| 2 Beverley North | 2 | Beverley ward (part) |
| 3 Boothferry | 3 | Boothferry ward; Derringham ward (part) |
| 4 Bransholme | 3 | Stoneferry ward (part); Noddle Hill (part); Sutton (part) |
| 5 Derringham | 3 | Derringham ward (part) |
| 6 Drypool | 3 | Drypool ward (part) |
| 7 Holderness | 3 | Drypool ward (part); Holderness ward (part) Stoneferry ward (part); Sutton ward (part) |
| 8 Ings | 3 | Ings ward; Sutton ward (part) |
| 9 Kingswood | 3 | Stoneferry (part); Noddle Hill (part) |
| 10 Longhill | 3 | Longhill ward; Ings ward (part) |
| 11 Marfleet | 3 | Marfleet ward; Southcoates ward (part); Holderness ward (part) Ings ward; (part) |
| 12 Myton | 3 | Myton ward; Newington ward (part); St Andrew's ward (part) |
| 13 Newland | 2 | Newland ward; University ward (part) |
| 14 North Southcoates | 2 | Holderness ward (part); Southcoates ward (part); Drypool ward (part) |
| 15 Newington | 3 | Newington ward (part) |
| 16 Orchard Park | 3 | Orchard Park ward; University ward (part) |
| 17 Pickering | 3 | Pickering ward (part) |
| 18 St Andrew's | 2 | St Andrew's ward; Pickering ward (part) |
| 19 Sculcoates | 2 | Newland ward (part); Beverley ward (part) |
| 20 South Southcoates | 2 | Southcoates ward (part) |
| 21 Sutton | 3 | Sutton ward (part); Noddle Hill ward (part) |
| 22 University | 2 | University ward |

Note: Map 2 and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Kingston-upon-Hull

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Avenue | 3 | 10,066 | 3,355 | 6 | 9,747 | 3,249 | 3 |
| 2 Beverley North | 2 | 5,962 | 2,981 | -6 | 5,762 | 2,881 | -9 |
| 3 Boothferry | 3 | 9,699 | 3,233 | 2 | 9,594 | 3,198 | 1 |
| 4 Bransholme | 3 | 10,012 | 3,337 | 6 | 9,678 | 3,226 | 2 |
| 5 Derringham | 3 | 9,143 | 3,048 | -3 | 8,853 | 2,951 | -7 |
| 6 Drypool | 3 | 9,282 | 3,094 | -2 | 9,434 | 3,145 | -1 |
| 7 Holderness | 3 | 9,779 | 3,260 | 3 | 9,520 | 3,173 | 0 |
| 8 Ings | 3 | 9,314 | 3,105 | -2 | 9,067 | 3,022 | -4 |
| 9 Kingswood | 3 | 7,483 | 2,494 | -21 | 9,767 | 3,256 | 3 |
| 10 Longhill | 3 | 9,238 | 3,079 | -2 | 9,154 | 3,051 | -3 |
| 11 Marfleet | 3 | 9,517 | 3,172 | 0 | 9,561 | 3,187 | 1 |
| 12 Myton | 3 | 9,851 | 3,284 | 4 | 9,932 | 3,311 | 5 |
| 13 Newland | 2 | 6,808 | 3,404 | 8 | 6,704 | 3,352 | 6 |
| 14 North Southcoates | 2 | 6,422 | 3,211 | 2 | 6,382 | 3,191 | 1 |
| 15 Newington | 3 | 9,016 | 3,005 | -5 | 9,500 | 3,167 | 0 |
| 16 Orchard Park | 3 | 9,888 | 3,296 | 4 | 9,556 | 3,185 | 1 |
| 17 Pickering | 3 | 8,854 | 2,951 | -7 | 8,985 | 2,995 | -5 |
| 18 St Andrew's | 2 | 6,171 | 3,086 | -2 | 5,990 | 2,995 | 5 |
| 19 Sculcoates | 2 | 6,668 | 3,334 | 6 | 6,506 | 3,253 | -3 |
| 20 South Southcoates | 2 | 6,734 | 3,367 | 7 | 6,563 | 3,282 | 4 |
| 21 Sutton | 3 | 9,835 | 3,278 | 4 | 9,747 | 3,249 | 3 |
| 22 University | 2 | 6,772 | 3,386 | 7 | 6,523 | 3,262 | 3 |
| Totals | 59 | 186,514 | - | - | 186,525 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 3,160 | - | - | 3,161 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Kingston-upon-Hull City Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Note: The total electorate figures in 2005 differ marginally from Figure 4: however we consider that this has a negligible effect on electoral variances

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the city of Kingston upon Hull on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the new unitary authorities of East Riding, Kingston-upon-Hull, North East Lincolnshire and North Lincolnshire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of the new unitary authority of Kingston upon Hull. The last review of the City of Kingston-upon-Hull was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1979, (Report No318) The electoral arrangements of the new unitary authority, which came into existence on 1 April 1996, were put into place as part of the Structural Change Order which abolished the county of Humberside and its County Council.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix B).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the City Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances

of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that district but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a district’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a district council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

| Stage | Description |
|-------|---|
| One | Submission of proposals to the Commission |
| Two | The Commission’s analysis and deliberation |
| Three | Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them |
| Four | Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State |

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, ie in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 2000/2001 PER programme, including the Humberside Unitary authorities, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities’ electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas, and our present *Guidance*.

12 Stage One began on 16 May 2000, when we wrote to Kingston upon Hull Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Humberside Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city the Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 21 August 2000.

13 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

14 Stage Three began on 12 December 2000 and will end on 19 February 2001. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an Order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The City of Kingston-upon-Hull lies to the north of the Humber Estuary near its mouth with the North Sea and covers an area of 7,145 hectares. It is bounded on all remaining sides by East Riding Unitary Council and is accessible by motorway from the west and via the Humber Bridge from the South. Hull is a major international freight and passenger port and part of the docks area of the city is undergoing a process of regeneration. The city contains no civil parishes.

17 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the district average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

18 The electorate of the district is 186,514 (February 2000). The Council presently has 60 members who are elected from 20 wards, all of which are relatively urban, and represented by three members each. The council is elected by thirds.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been a decrease in the electorate in Hull city, with around 9 per cent less electors than two decades ago.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,109 electors, which the City Council forecasts will not change by the year 2005 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in nine of the 20 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the City average, three wards by more than 20 per cent and one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Sutton ward where each councillor represents 34 per cent more electors than the city average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Kingston upon Hull

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Avenue | 3 | 9,342 | 3,114 | 0 | 9,047 | 3,016 | -3 |
| 2 Beverley | 3 | 10,193 | 3,398 | 9 | 9,913 | 3,304 | 6 |
| 3 Boothferry | 3 | 9,768 | 3,256 | 5 | 9,661 | 3,220 | 4 |
| 4 Derringham | 3 | 10,221 | 3,407 | 10 | 9,895 | 3,298 | 6 |
| 5 Drypool | 3 | 11,587 | 3,862 | 24 | 11,662 | 3,887 | 25 |
| 6 Holderness | 3 | 9,673 | 3,224 | 4 | 9,557 | 3,186 | 2 |
| 7 Ings | 3 | 9,100 | 3,033 | -2 | 8,796 | 2,932 | -6 |
| 8 Longhill | 3 | 8,251 | 2,750 | -12 | 8,141 | 2,714 | -13 |
| 9 Marfleet | 3 | 7,756 | 2,585 | -17 | 7,859 | 2,620 | -16 |
| 10 Myton | 3 | 8,875 | 2,958 | -5 | 8,989 | 2,996 | -4 |
| 11 Newington | 3 | 9,034 | 3,011 | -3 | 9,517 | 3,172 | 2 |
| 12 Newland | 3 | 8,782 | 2,927 | -6 | 8,581 | 2,860 | -8 |
| 13 Noddle Hill | 3 | 8,326 | 2,775 | -11 | 8,253 | 2,751 | -12 |
| 14 Orchard Park | 3 | 8,861 | 2,954 | -5 | 8,573 | 2,858 | -8 |
| 15 Pickering | 3 | 7,707 | 2,569 | -17 | 7,876 | 2,625 | -16 |
| 16 St Andrew's | 3 | 7,853 | 2,618 | -16 | 7,616 | 2,539 | -18 |
| 17 Stoneferry | 3 | 11,208 | 3,736 | 20 | 13,368 | 4,456 | 43 |
| 18 Southcoates | 3 | 9,201 | 3,067 | -1 | 8,947 | 2,982 | -4 |
| 19 Sutton | 3 | 12,514 | 4,171 | 34 | 12,285 | 4,095 | 31 |
| 20 University | 3 | 8,262 | 2,754 | -11 | 7,984 | 2,661 | -14 |
| Totals | 60 | 186,514 | - | - | 186,520 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 3,109 | - | - | 3,109 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Kingston upon Hull City Council

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2000, electors in Pickering ward were relatively over-represented by 17 per cent, while electors in Sutton ward were relatively under-represented by 34 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

21 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Kingston upon Hull City Council.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received eleven representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council and two local residents, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission.

Kingston upon Hull City Council

23 The City Council proposed a council of 60 members, the same as at present, serving 22 wards, compared to the existing 20. Thirty-two members were allocated to the west side of the River Hull, and 28 members to the east side, with 16 three-member wards and six two-member wards. Under the proposed scheme, 21 of the 22 wards would have variances of less than 10 per cent initially, decreasing to 20 out of 22 wards in 2005. The worst variances would be in University ward, with 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, and Kingswood ward with 35 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average by 2005.

24 A significant part of the City Council's submission dealt with the external boundaries of the authority, which the Commission is unable to consider as part of a PER. The Council's proposal is summarised at Appendix A.

Other Representations

25 We received a further ten representations from local political parties and local residents. Two local residents submitted differing city-wide schemes. Mr D Harris proposed a 60-member council, with a uniform pattern of three-member wards, one of which spanned the River Hull. He also proposed an extension of the city's external boundaries. Mr W Harris proposed a 59-member scheme, with 32 members on the west side of the River Hull and 27 members on the east side. He proposed that the council size should be increased to 60 following an extension to the external boundaries of the city.

26 St Andrew's Ward Labour Party ("the Labour Party") objected to the City Council's proposal to move Hessle Road from St Andrew's ward to Myton ward. Instead they proposed that the remainder of Thornton Street Estate be transferred from Myton ward to St Andrew's ward, and that part of Beverley ward is transferred to Myton ward. They also put forward an alternative scheme for the west side of the River Hull.

27 Hull West and Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats ("the Liberal Democrats") commented on the western part only, supporting the City Council's scheme for the six wards in the western part of Hull, but suggesting alternative names for the Council's proposed Boothferry and Derringham wards.

28 A local resident made comments on the management of Hull City Council, which are outside the scope of this review. He also made detailed comments on Southcoates and Holderness wards. Another resident of Hessle in East Yorkshire objected to the extension of the external boundaries of Hull, but made no comments on the PER. In contrast, another resident urged a review of the external boundaries of the city but did not make any comments on the PER.

29 A local resident enclosed a petition of 476 signatures objecting to the City Council's proposals to move Hessle Road into Myton ward, on the grounds that this would split the Hessle Road community. Another resident suggested that there should be a 60-member council, with 10 three-member wards either side of the River Hull. He further suggested that the wards should align with the Parliamentary constituencies and that there should be whole-council elections instead of the present system of election by the thirds.

30 A local resident suggested alternative names for the council's proposed Beverley North and Sculcoates wards.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

31 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Kingston upon Hull is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

32 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

33 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

34 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates.

Electorate Forecasts

35 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting negligible growth in the electorate of just six electors from 186,514 to 186,520 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. There are, however, expected to be areas of growth and the council expects most of the growth to be in the north-eastern part of the city. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

36 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the City Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

Council Size

37 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case. Kingston-upon-Hull City Council presently has 60 members. In its submission the City Council proposed retaining the present council size of 60 members. We also received two city-wide proposals based on a 60 member council.

38 In considering each of the city-wide proposals, we noted that schemes based on both 59 and 60 member councils would lead to improvements in electoral equality. In looking at the city we have noted that it is divided into two parts, with the River Hull forming a strong boundary between East and West Hull. We then found that if, as near as possible the same council size is to be retained, and taking into account the number of electors either side of the river, the correct allocation of West Hull would be 31 councillors and the correct allocation for East Hull would be 28 councillors, leading to a total of 59 members.

39 Under the Council's proposed 60-member scheme, 32 councillors were allocated to the west side of the city, while 28 members were allocated to the east side, leading to the west side being relatively over-represented, and the east side being relatively under-represented under a 60-member council. In contrast, Mr D Harris, who also proposed a 60-member council, overcame the problem by putting forward a ward which straddled the River Hull, which we consider undesirable

40 Therefore, in view of the improvement to the balance of representation and the fact that the two parts of the city would be represented by the appropriate number of councillors, and having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 59 members.

Electoral Arrangements

41 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the city-wide scheme from the City Council and those from Mr D Harris and Mr W Harris. From these representations some considerations have emerged which have assisted us in preparing our draft recommendations.

42 We have considered each of the city-wide proposals which we received. In looking at the representation across the two parts of the city, we found that the correct allocation for the west of the River Hull is 31 councillors and in east Hull it would be 28 councillors, given the relative electorate sizes, which leads to a council size of 59 and provides for a pattern of two-and three-member wards rather than a uniform pattern of three-member wards. Given that we received proposals for both 60 and 59 member councils, we found that the ward pattern and individual boundaries proposed differed significantly between the schemes throughout the city. However, we do not consider that any one scheme proposes ward boundaries which best meet the objectives of the review. Therefore, having carefully considered all the submissions received, we propose adopting a mixture of the proposed ward boundaries from the City Council, W Harris and

proposals of our own where we have found that they provide the best balance between providing improvements in electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria. Additionally, in a number of areas our proposals bear a broad similarity to those of D Harris and aspects of his scheme are also discussed in the following paragraphs.

43 Specifically we consider that the Council's scheme provides good electoral equality and reflects community identity in the south-west of the city but we propose drawing on the proposals of W Harris for our draft recommendations in other parts of the city, in order to ensure the correct warding arrangements which provide the correct allocation of councillors across the city and proposals of our own elsewhere where none of the locally generated schemes provide, in our opinion, the best solution currently available.

44 For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

Western Hull

- (a) Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards
- (b) Avenue, Beverley, Myton and St Andrew's wards
- (c) Newland, Orchard Park and University wards

Eastern Hull

- (e) Stoneferry, Noddle Hill, and Sutton wards
- (f) Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards
- (g) Drypool, Southcoates and Marfleet wards

Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Western Hull

Boothferry, Derringham, Newington, and Pickering wards

45 These four three-member wards are situated in the south-western part of the city. Boothferry and Derringham wards currently have 5 per cent more and 10 per cent more electors per councillor respectively (4 per cent more and 6 per cent more than the average by 2005). Newington and Pickering wards currently have 3 per cent less and 17 per cent less electors per councillor respectively (2 per cent more and 16 per cent less than the average by 2005).

46 The City Council proposed that all four wards should be represented by three councillors and that each should be subject to minor boundary alterations. It proposed that the boundary between Boothferry and Derringham ward should be changed by transferring the area to the south of County Road South and the east of Ainthorpe Grove from Derringham ward to Boothferry ward. It argued that this would achieve better electoral equality in both wards and unite areas with community ties, stating that, in the case of the proposed Derringham ward, the proposals would "leave a ward of mainly inter-war private housing with similar problems and aspirations" and in the case of Boothferry ward, "the ward has the focus around the Spring Bank West Shopping

facilities.” The City Council proposed a further change which would include parts of Boothferry ward in Pickering ward. It stated that the proposed Pickering ward would “unite a Council estate within this three-member ward, and give a better electoral balance within this part of the city”. It also proposed that Newington ward remain unchanged apart from a small area in the east of the ward which would be transferred to Myton ward. Under the Council’s proposals Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards would have 4 per cent more, 2 per less, 3 per less and 5 per cent less electors than the city average respectively (3 per cent more, 5 per cent less, 2 per cent more and 4 per cent less respectively in 2005).

47 Mr W Harris proposed creating two new wards and altering the boundaries of three existing wards in this area. He proposed creating a single-member ward called Anlaby Park, consisting of the south-west part of Boothferry ward, and a two-member ward called East Ella, consisting of the north-east part of Boothferry ward. He also proposed minor alterations to the boundaries of Derringham ward, transferring parts of Derringham ward into the new East Ella ward. Finally he proposed that the boundaries of Newington ward should be altered to take in parts of Pickering and St Andrew’s wards. His proposed Anlaby Park, East Ella, Derringham and Newington wards would have 6 per cent more, equal to, 4 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors than the city average.(1 per cent more, 5 per cent less, 1 per cent less and 2 per cent more in 2005).

48 Mr D Harris proposed boundary alterations to the four existing wards in this part of the city together with changing the name of Boothferry ward to East Ella ward. He proposed including a small part of the existing Derringham ward in the new East Ella ward and proposed that the boundary of the existing Newington ward should be altered to take in parts of Pickering and St Andrew’s ward. His proposed Derringham, East Ella, Newington and Pickering wards would have 4 per cent more, 2 per cent more, 3 per cent more and equal to electors than the city average.(5 per cent less, 3 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 6 per cent more in 2005).

49 The Liberal Democrats supported the City Council’s proposals in this area of the city, but suggested the alternative name of East Ella for Boothferry ward together with three alternative names for Derringham ward; Willerby, Wold or Priory.

50 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One. We have decided to adopt the Council’s proposals without amendment in this area of the city as part of our draft recommendations. We note the proposals from Mr D Harris and Mr W Harris and, while we consider there is some merit in both these schemes, we consider that the Council’s proposals would best reflect community ties and provide significant improvements in electoral equality. We have also noted the Liberal Democrats’ proposals for alternative names for the Council’s proposed East Ella and Derringham wards, but we do not feel that they have provided sufficient evidence of local support for the proposed name changes. However, we would welcome views on the issue of ward names in this area at Stage Three. Our proposed Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards would have 2 per cent more, 3 per cent less, 5 per cent less and 7 per cent less electors than the city average respectively (1 per cent more, 7 per cent less, equal to and 5 per cent less respectively in 2005). Our draft recommendations are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Avenue, Beverley, Myton and St Andrew's wards

51 Those four three-member wards are also situated in the south-western part of the city. Avenue ward currently has equal to the city average number of electors per councillor, but in 2005 is forecast to have 3 per cent less than the average. Beverley and Myton wards currently have 9 per cent more and 5 per cent less electors than the city average respectively (6 per cent more and 4 per cent less respectively by 2005). St Andrew's ward currently has 16 per cent less electors than the average and is forecast to have 18 per cent less than the city average in 2005.

52 The City Council proposed a modified Avenue ward which would include part of Myton ward. It argued that this would unite all of Park Road in the proposed Avenue ward and stated that it was "possible to do this because the former railway line at this juncture is a cycle/pedestrian walkway". It also proposed creating two new two-member wards called Beverley North, in the north of the existing Beverley ward, and Sculcoates, in the southern part of the existing Beverley ward. It argued that the area in the north of the existing Beverley ward is a distinct community and stated that it "has always had very little in common with that section of the ward to the south of the Cottingham Road". It also stated that its proposals for Sculcoates ward would "ensure that the major inner ring road of Cottingham Road/Clough Road (which is a major community boundary), is the northern boundary to this ward" and create "a new two member ward" containing a homogeneous community". The council also proposed that the western boundary of Myton ward should be altered, arguing that this would mean that "there is a more natural western boundary, along Rawlings Way" and stated that, under its proposals, "Thornton Estate is now totally united within" Myton ward. It also proposed altering the boundaries of St Andrew's ward by including an area bounded by Rawlings Way to the west, Anlaby Road to the north and a boundary running northwards from Albert Dock along St James Street, and north along Walker Street to Myton ward, and including an area bounded to the west by the railway line, to the north by Hessle Road and to the east by West Dock Road in Pickering ward. Under its proposals Avenue, Beverley North, Myton, St Andrew's and Sculcoates wards would have 8 per cent more, 4 percent less, 6 per cent more, 1 per cent less, and 7 per cent more electors than the city average (5 per cent more, 7 per cent less, 6 per cent more, 4 per cent less, and 5 per cent more in 2005).

53 W Harris proposed retaining the existing boundaries for two of the wards in this area but renaming Beverley as Bankside ward. Specifically he proposed keeping the existing boundaries for Avenue and Beverley wards. He also proposed creating a new ward called Brunswick comprising the northern part of Myton ward together with a new ward called Riverside comprising the eastern part of St Andrew's ward and the southern part of Myton ward. Under his proposals Avenue ward would have the same amount of electors per councillor as the city average in initially (5 per cent less in 2005). Brunswick ward and Riverside wards would both have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (1 per cent less, 6 per cent less respectively in 2005).

54 In his submission D Harris proposed retaining the existing boundary of Avenue ward. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Beverley ward to include part of Drypool ward on the eastern side of the River Hull. He proposed creating a new ward which would include parts of St Andrews ward to be called Paragon ward, together with altering the boundaries of Myton

ward to include part of Drypool ward, also on the eastern side of the River Hull. Under his proposals Avenue ward would have the same number of electors per councillor as the city average, Paragon ward would have 1 per cent more electors than the city average and Myton ward would have 2 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average. In 2005 Avenue ward would have 3 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average, Paragon ward would have 1 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average and Myton ward would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average.

55 The Labour Party proposed a number of boundary changes in this area of the city. They proposed moving the boundary of St Andrew's ward eastwards to include part of Myton ward. They argued that this would unite the Thornton Street Estate in St Andrew's ward and stated that it would fit "in with the recommendations of the Hull City Council Officers". They also proposed including part of Beverley ward in Myton ward, arguing that it would reduce the number of electors in Beverley ward while enabling the majority of the ward to remain intact. They stated that their proposals would "keep all three of these communities together and not split up Beverley ward and also prevent the destruction of our (St Andrew's Community)".

56 Having carefully considered the representations received we consider that the Council's proposals would best reflect community ties while achieving a reasonable level of electoral equality. We have noted the improvements to electoral equality under the proposals of both Mr D Harris and Mr W Harris, but we do not consider that they provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria as a whole. We also note the concerns of St Andrew's Labour Party and the local community in the Hessle area of the city and consider on balance that the City council is right to include the Thornton Road estate in its proposed Myton ward and that Rawlings Way is a more identifiable boundary for Myton ward. Additionally, in the case of the residents' concerns, it is not clear where they consider the boundaries of "the Hessle area" to be. We would welcome further details and evidence at Stage Three. Under our draft recommendations Avenue, Beverley North, Myton, St Andrew's and Sculcoates wards would have 6 per cent more, 6 per cent less, 4 per cent more and 2 per cent less and 6 per cent more electors respectively than the city average.(3 per cent more, 9 per cent less,5 per cent more and 5 per cent less and 3 per cent more respectively in 2005).

Newland, Orchard Park and University wards

57 These three three-member wards are situated in the north-western part of the city. Newland ward currently has 6 per cent less electors than the city average and is forecast to have 8 per cent less in 2005. Orchard Park ward currently has 5 per cent less electors than the city average and is forecast to have 8 per cent less than the city average in 2005. University ward currently has 11 per cent less electors than the city average and is forecast to have 14 per cent less in 2005.

58 In its Stage One Submission the City Council proposed transferring part of Newland ward to a new two-member Sculcoates ward. It argued that the ward would be very socially homogeneous. It also proposed that University ward should be a three-member ward stating that "the council believes that a vigorous electoral registration campaign could result in as many as over 1,000 student voters being placed on the register in this area." The council proposed no change to the boundary of Orchard Park ward. Under its proposals Newland, Orchard Park and

University wards would have 2 per cent, 5 per cent less and 11 per cent less electors than the city average (equal to, 8 per cent less and 14 per cent less in 2005).

59 W Harris and D Harris proposed similar arrangements in this part of the city. They proposed that the existing boundaries of two of the wards in the area should be altered while retaining the existing boundary for Newland ward. Specifically both proposed that the boundary of Orchard Park ward should be altered to include the part of University ward bounded by Endike Lane in the south, the Drain in the west and the Beverley Road in the east. They also proposed that the boundary of University ward should be altered to include the part of Beverley ward bounded by Cottingham Road to the north, the railway line to the south, Newland Avenue to the south and Beverley Road to the east. Their proposed Newland, Orchard Park and University wards would have 6 per cent less, 2 per cent more, and 1 per cent less electors than the city average respectively (10 per cent less, 2 per cent less and 4 per cent less in 2005).

60 We have considered the representations received at Stage One in relation to these three wards. We propose making boundary alterations to all three wards and reducing the number of councillors representing University ward to two. Under the Council's proposed council size of 60, University ward would have 14 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average in 2005. However, we have ascertained that, to achieve the correct allocation of councillors either side of the River Hull, there should be a council size of 59. Given that even under a council size of 60, University ward is substantially over-represented, it is appropriate to reduce its representation in order to ensure the correct allocation of councillors to West Hull. We are not convinced by the Council's assertion that a voter registration scheme taking place in this ward would substantially improve the numbers of registered students given that we found no evidence to support this statement in the material or the 2005 figures supplied by the Council. We therefore propose reducing the representation in University ward from three to two councillors together with proposing a number of boundary alterations in order to transfer electors from University ward to the two neighbouring wards of Newland and Orchard Park in order to further improve electoral equality while providing a good reflection of the statutory criteria. Specifically we propose that an area bounded by Inglemire Lane to the north, Hall Road to the east and the city boundary to the west should be transferred from University ward to Newland ward and that the following two areas should be transferred from University ward to Orchard Park ward: an area bounded by Ellerburn Avenue to the east and Endike Lane to the south and an area bounded to the east by Hall Road and to the south by Inglemire Lane. Under our draft recommendation the proposed two-member University ward, three-member Newland ward and three-member Orchard Park ward would have 7 per cent more, 8 per cent more, and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (3 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 1 per cent more respectively in 2005). Our draft recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

Eastern Hull

Stoneferry, Noddle Hill and Sutton wards

61 These three three-member wards are situated in the north-east of the city. Noddle Hill currently has 11 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average and is forecast to have

9 per cent less than the city average in 2005. Stoneferry ward currently has 20 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average and is forecast to have 43 per cent more in 2005. Sutton ward currently has 34 per cent more electors per councillors than the city average and is forecast to have 31 per cent more in 2005.

62 At Stage One the City Council proposed creating a new three-member ward called Kingswood from parts of Stoneferry ward and a new three-member ward called Bransholme from parts of Noddle Hill and Sutton wards. It proposed altering the boundaries of Noddle Hill ward by transferring the area bounded by Wawne Road to the east and Holwell Road to the west to the new Bransholme ward. It also proposed altering the boundary of Sutton ward by transferring an area bounded to the east by Leads Road, to the north-east by Wawne Road, and to the north-west by Holwell Road and Barnstaple Road, to its proposed Bransholme ward. It argued that under its proposals the Bransholme estate, which has distinct needs of its own, would be covered by two wards but is separated from areas of private housing with which it does not share a community identity. The Council also stated that “separating the privately owned areas from the current Bransholme ward, means that these dwellings can be placed in a new Kingswood ward” in a ward separate from the Bransholme estate, which again has a separate community identity. It also argued that under its proposals Sutton Village and surrounding areas of similar social profile are represented in one ward, stating, “the new Sutton ward sheds all its ties with part of the Bransholme Council estate, and is now centred on the predominantly private owned/rented housing in Sutton Village and adjoining semi-detached private housing areas.” Under the city council’s proposals Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would have 1 per cent more, 3 per cent less and 2 per cent more than the city average respectively. (3 per cent less, 35 per cent more and 1 per cent more in 2005).

63 D Harris proposed creating two new three-member wards and altering the existing boundaries of Sutton ward in this area of the city. Specifically he proposed that a new three-member ward called Kingswood and a new three-member ward called Bransholme should be created from parts of Stoneferry and Noddle Hill wards. He also proposed that the boundaries of Sutton ward should be altered so that the area to the east of Howdale Road, including Balham Avenue should be included in the new wards. Under his proposals Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would have 1 per cent more, 3 per cent less and 2 per cent more than the city average respectively. (3 per cent less, 35 per cent more and 1 per cent more in 2005).

Harris in this area of the city. In particular we have noted that the Council's proposals for this area of the city result in a ward, Kingswood, with 34 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average. The City Council failed to provide any evidence to justify this high level of electoral inequality. Additionally we are not aware of any significant evidence supporting their argument that future growth in the area could improve electoral equality before 2005. The City Council themselves stated that they were "unsure these optimistic targets will be realised". We also consider that, despite the fact that the Council's proposals for Sutton ward achieve good electoral equality, in order to achieve good electoral equality across the eastern part of Hull as a whole the boundaries of Sutton ward need to be altered. We therefore looked at the alternatives and consider that, although Mr W Harris's proposals are not supported by detailed argumentation, they provide a good starting point for the formation of electoral arrangements in east Hull, ensuring that the area has the correct allocation of councillors, under a council size of 59, together with a ward pattern which would resolve the high electoral inequality in Kingswood ward.

66 In detail we propose creating a new three-member ward, Kingswood, from the part of the existing Stonferry ward bounded to the south by Ennerdale and Bude Road and part of the existing Noddle Hill ward bounded to the south by a boundary running eastwards to the rear of the Cumbrian Way to the city boundary and an area bounded to the east by Wawne Road and to the south by Honiton Road. We propose creating a new three-member Bransholme ward from part of the existing Stoneferry ward, bounded by Ennerdale Road and Bude Road to the north and Holwell Road to the east and part of the existing Noddle Hill ward bounded by Honiton Road and Wawne Road to the north-west, by a boundary running eastwards to the rear of the Cumbrian Way to the City boundary to the north and to the south by a boundary running eastwards along Biggin Avenue and eastwards to the city boundary and from part of the existing Sutton ward bounded by Wawne Road, Windermere Road and the Cricket Ground. We also propose altering the boundaries of the existing Sutton ward by transferring an area bounded to the west by an undefined boundary running to the back of properties on Yiewsley Close and then along Howdale Road and Danby Close and following the existing polling district boundary to the city boundary, to our proposed Ings ward detailed below. We also propose transferring an area of the existing Sutton ward bounded by Ings Road, Leads Road, Tween Dykes Road and Sutton Road to our proposed Holderness ward. Finally we propose including a part of the existing Noddle Hill ward to the east of Wawne Road and to the south of a boundary running eastwards along Biggin Avenue and to the City boundary in our Sutton ward. Under our draft recommendations our proposed Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would have 6 per cent more, 21 per cent less and 4 per cent more electors per councillor respectively than the city average (2 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 3 per cent more respectively in 2005). Our draft recommendations are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards

67 These three three-member wards are situated in the east of the city. Holderness ward currently has 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average and is forecast to have 2 per cent more electors in 2005. Ings ward currently has 2 per cent less electors than the city average and is forecast to have 6 per cent less in 2005. Longhill ward currently has 12 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average and is forecast to have 13 per cent less in 2005.

68 The City Council proposed creating a new three-member ward and altering the existing boundaries of two three-member wards in the area. Specifically it proposed creating a new three-member ward called East Park containing parts of the existing Holderness, Stoneferry and Southcoates wards. It further proposed altering the boundaries of Ings ward by transferring part of the existing Sutton ward bounded to the south by Salthouse Road to Ings ward. It also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Longhill ward by transferring the area bounded to the north-east by Amethyst Road and Diadem Grove, to the south by Barham Road and to the west by a boundary running to the rear of the properties on Larne and Milne Road from the existing Ings ward to the proposed Longhill ward. Its proposed East Park, Ings and Longhill wards would have 4 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 1 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2 per cent more, 1 per cent less and 2 per cent less than the city average respectively in 2005).

69 D Harris proposed altering the boundaries of the three three-member wards in this area of the city. Specifically he proposed adding an area of the existing Stoneferry ward, bounded to the west by the River Hull, to the north by Sutton Road and to the east by Leads Road, to Holderness ward. He also proposed transferring an area to the south of Holderness Road from Holderness ward to his proposed Southcoates ward. Additionally he proposed altering the existing boundaries of Ings ward by transferring areas of the ward to the existing Longhill ward. Under his proposals, Holderness, and Bellfield wards would have 3 per cent less and 1 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average respectively. His proposed Longhill ward would have equal the city average amount of electors per councillor. (Holderness and Bellfield wards would have 4 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors than the city average in 2005. Longhill ward would have 1 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average in 2005).

70 W Harris proposed altering the boundaries of three three-member wards in this area of the city. He proposed the same alterations to Holderness and Southcoates ward as Mr D Harris (detailed above). He also proposed transferring part of the existing Sutton ward, north of Salthouse Road, to his proposed Ings ward. Additionally, he proposed transferring an area bounded by Staveley Road to the west, Barham Road to the north and Amethyst Road to the east from his existing Ings ward to his proposed Marfleet ward (detailed below). His proposed Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards would have 6 per cent more, 5 per cent more and equal to the city average amount of electors per councillor (2 per cent more, 1 per cent less and 3 per cent more in 2005).

71 In light of the Stage One representations received in relation to this area of the city we propose drawing on certain elements of the City Council's scheme together with elements of W Harris' proposals. We consider that the Council's proposals for the Holderness ward, although achieving good electoral equality, are not the best reflection of community ties within the area. We consider that the Council's proposal to link the area to the south-east of the Holderness Road, as detailed in para 68, to an area to the south of Chamberlain Road and the north of the railway line is not the best reflection of community ties. However, we consider that W Harris, proposals utilise a strong boundary by using the Holderness Road and propose adopting it for part of the boundary between Holderness and North Southcoates ward. However, we are proposing a significant reconfiguration of wards in this area involving seven significant boundary changes together with some minor modifications as we consider that they would provide a better reflection

of the statutory criteria. Specifically, we propose transferring an area of the existing Sutton ward, as described earlier in relation to our proposed Holderness ward. We also propose transferring an area to the south-east of Holderness Road from Holderness ward to our proposed two-member ward of North Southcoates ward. We further propose transferring an area of the existing Stoneferry ward to the west of a boundary running northwards from Chamberlaine Road to the rear of the properties on Lamorna Avenue and Joscelyn Avenue, along Leads Road to its junction with Sutton Road and bounded to the west by the River Hull, to our proposed Holderness ward. We also propose transferring an area of the existing Drypool ward to the north of a boundary running to the rear of properties on Pavillion Close and Reckitts Recreation Ground to the north of the properties on Dunscombe Park, to the rear of properties on Brackley Close and the railway line as far as the River Hull to our proposed Holderness ward. We also propose that another part of the existing Drypool ward, to the north of a boundary running to the rear of the properties on Dornoch Drive, should be transferred to our proposed Holderness ward.

72 Additionally, we propose broadly adopting the Council's scheme for Ings ward with some boundary modifications to improve electoral equality for this ward and across the eastern part of Hull. In particular we are persuaded by the Council's argument that community ties stretch across the Salthouse Road and we propose transferring an area of the existing Sutton ward to the north of Salthouse Road, the west of Bellfield Road and to the east of a boundary described earlier (in Paragraph 64) to our proposed Ings ward. We also propose transferring an area of the existing Ings ward, bounded by Barham Road to the north, Stavely Road to the west and Amesthyst Road to the east, to our proposed Marfleet ward.

73 However, in the area of the existing Longhill ward we propose broadly adopting the City Council's proposals. We consider that the Council's ward utilises strong boundaries while achieving good electoral equality and reflecting community identity. We are persuaded by the Council's argument that the area to be transferred from the existing Ings ward to its proposed Longhill ward shares community ties with the rest of Longhill ward. Under our draft recommendations the proposed Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards would have 3 per cent more, 2 per cent less and 2 per cent less electors than the city average respectively. (equal to, 4 per cent less and 3 per cent less respectively in 2005). Our draft recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

Drypool, Marfleet and Southcoates

74 These three three-member wards are situated in the south-east of the city. Drypool ward currently has 24 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (25 per cent more electors in 2005). Marfleet ward currently has 17 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average and is forecast to have 16 per cent less electors than the city average in 2005. Southcoates ward currently has 1 per cent less electors per councillor than the city average and is forecast have 4 per cent less in 2005.

75 The City Council proposed that the existing boundaries of the three wards in this area of the city should be altered. It proposed that the existing boundaries of Drypool ward should be altered so that two areas to the north of the ward would be transferred to the Council's proposed East Park ward. The Council argued that its proposed Drypool ward ensures that a number of distinct

communities are contained within one ward; it stated that Drypool “remains a ward comprising two major communities...the Victoria Dock development and the Garden Village”. It also stated that, “between these two communities are many smaller areas of residential dwellings” and the proposed Drypool ward ensures that “these communities are united around the Holderness Road axis and have a clear distinction in their own right”. It proposed that the existing boundaries of Marfleet ward should be altered so that it would include part of the existing Ings ward bounded to the west by a boundary running to the rear of the properties on Anson Road, to the east by Amethyst Road, to the south by Hopewell Road and to the north by Barham Road. It argued that the inclusion of this area, which is part of the Bilton Grange Estate, meets the statutory criteria as it is adjacent to the current Marfleet ward. It also proposed altering the existing boundary of Southcoates ward so that an area of the existing Holderness ward bounded to the east by Marfleet Lane, to the north by Portobello Street, and to the west by Southcoates Lane is transferred to its proposed Southcoates ward. In support of its proposals the Council argued that its Southcoates ward ensures that all of the Preston Road Estate, “subject of a New Deal for Communities initiative” is contained within one ward. Under its proposals Drypool, Marfleet and Southcoates wards would have equal to, 2 per cent less and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (equal to, 2 per cent less and 2 per cent more by 2005).

76 D Harris proposed that there should be three wards broadly covering this area. He proposed creating a three-member ward called Alexandra from part of the existing Drypool ward bounded to the west by Mount Pleasant Way, to the north-west by James Reckitt Avenue and to the north-east and east by Laburnum Avenue and Southcoates Lane. He also proposed transferring part of the existing Drypool ward into his proposed Myton ward (see paragraph 53). He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Marfleet ward by moving the boundary northwards to include part of the existing Ings ward, south of a boundary running along Barham Road, Amethyst Road and east to the City boundary. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Southcoates ward so that an area bounded to the north and east by Southcoates Lane, to the west by New Bridge Road and to the south by the railway line, is transferred to his proposed three-member ward, called Alexandra. He also proposed that a part of the existing Holderness ward to the south-east of the Holderness Road should be included in his proposed Southcoates ward. Under his proposals Alexandra, Marfleet, Myton and Southcoates wards would have 3 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 2 per cent less and 2 per cent more electors per councillors respectively than the city average. (3 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 2 per cent less and 7 per cent less respectively in 2005).

77 W Harris proposed altering the existing boundaries of Drypool ward so that the area bounded by Laburnum Avenue to the west, Holderness Road to the south, Summergangs Road to the east and James Reckitt Avenue to the north-west is transferred to his proposed Holderness ward. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Southcoates ward to include an area of the existing Holderness ward bounded to the north by Holderness Road and to the south by Preston Road. Under his proposals Drypool, Marfleet and Southcoates wards would have 3 per cent less, equal to, and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (3 per cent less, 4 per cent more and 8 per cent more respectively in 2005).

78 We also received a proposal from a local resident concerning the existing Southcoates ward. Specifically he argued that the City Council’s proposals would divide the community of

Southcoates, and that under his proposals the whole of the community of Southcoates would be contained in one ward and consequently a new ward, “comprising the area subject to the Preston Road Regeneration initiative “ would be created.

79 Having considered the representations received at Stage One we have decided to adopt some of the City Council’s proposals and to use some of our own proposals in this area of the city. We agree with the Council’s arguments concerning Drypool ward and consider that it is a good reflection of the statutory criteria. We are therefore adopting their proposal for this ward without amendments. We also broadly agree with the Council’s proposal for Marfleet and propose adopting it as part of our draft recommendations subject to one minor boundary modification which would result in an area bounded by Stavely Road to the east, Barham Road to the north and the Holderness Drain to the west remaining in Ings ward. We consider that this would provide better electoral equality across the eastern part of Hull as a whole and better reflect the statutory criteria.

80 However, in the remainder of this area, we propose creating two new two-member wards in the Southcoates area. In order to achieve a better balance of electoral equality across the western part of Hull while reflecting the statutory criteria, we consider that the Southcoates area should be divided into two two-member wards. We propose creating a new North Southcoates ward from the part of Holderness ward to the south-east of Holderness Road and the north-west of the Holderness Drain, the part of the existing Southcoates ward bounded to the south by Southcoates Lane, to the east by Southcoates Avenue and to the north by Holderness Road and part of the existing Drypool ward bounded to the east by Summergangs Road, to the north by a boundary running to the rear of the properties on Dornoch Drive and to the west by a boundary running to the rear of the properties on Laburnum Avenue. We also propose creating a ward called South Southcoates from that part of the existing Southcoates ward bounded to the north by Preston Road and Southcoates Lane and to the south by the railway line running from the centre of Hull to the eastern dock area. Under our draft recommendations the proposed Drypool, Marfleet, North and South Southcoates wards would have 2 per cent less, equal to, 2 per cent more and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (1 per cent less, 1 per cent more, 1 per cent more and 4 per cent more respectively in 2005). Our draft recommendations are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

81 We received two representations regarding the City Council’s electoral cycle. The City council supported its present system of elections by thirds, but highlighted the issue of the synchronisation of the Council’s electoral cycle with that of other Unitary Authorities in the area. It stated that the issue is one which should be debated at a future date. A resident of the city also argued that the recent adoption of a cabinet style of local government by Hull City Council necessitates a move to elections every four years.

82 We have considered carefully all representations. At present, we do not consider that there is sufficient support or evidence for a change to the present electoral cycle and we therefore propose no change to the current electoral cycle of elections by thirds for the City Council.

Conclusions

83 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 60 to 59;
- there should be 22 wards;
- the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of two wards;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

84 Our draft recommendations would involve modifications to all of the existing wards in Kingston-upon-Hull, as summarised below:

- we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for the wards of Avenue, Beverley North, Boothferry, Derringham, Drypool, Longhill, Myton, Newington, Pickering, Sculcoates and St Andrew's;
- our proposed Bransholme, Holderness, and Kingswood wards are broadly based on the proposals of Mr W Harris, but with a number of our own boundary amendments;
- our proposed Ings and Marfleet wards are broadly based on the proposals of the City Council, but with a number of our own boundary amendments;
- we have put forward our own proposals for North Southcoates, South Southcoates, Sutton, Orchard Park, University and Newland wards.

85 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2005.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

| | 2000 electorate | | 2005 forecast electorate | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Current arrangements | Draft recommendations | Current arrangements | Draft recommendations |
| Number of councillors | 60 | 59 | 60 | 59 |
| Number of wards | 20 | 22 | 20 | 22 |
| Average number of electors per councillor | 3,109 | 3,161 | 3,109 | 3,161 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 9 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

86 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Kingston-upon-Hull Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from ten to one. By 2005 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city.

Draft Recommendation
 Kingston-upon-Hull city council should comprise 59 councillors serving 22 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

87 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Kingston-upon-Hull City council and welcome comments from the City Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Map 2: The Commission’s Draft Recommendations for Kingston-upon-Hull City Council

5 NEXT STEPS

88 We are putting forward draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for consultation. We will take fully into account all representations received by 19 February 2001. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the City Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

89 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Kingston-upon-Hull Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7430 8429

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

www.lgce.gov.uk

90 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not they agree* with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Kingston upon Hull City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the City Council in 11 wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure B1: Kingston upon Hull Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

| Ward name | Constituent areas |
|--------------|---|
| Bransholme | Noddle Hill ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part); Sutton ward (part) |
| East Park | Drypool ward (part); Holderness ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part) |
| Ings | Ings ward; Holderness ward (part); Sutton ward (part); |
| Kingswood | Stoneferry ward |
| Marfleet | Longhill ward (part); Marfleet ward |
| Noddle Hill | Noddle Hill ward |
| Newland | Newland ward |
| Orchard Park | Orchard Park ward |
| Southcoates | Holderness ward (part); Southcoates ward |
| Sutton | Sutton ward (part); Holderness ward (part) |
| University | University ward |

Figure B2: Kingston upon Hull City Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Bransholme | 3 | 9,374 | 3,125 | 1 | 9,074 | 3,025 | -3 |
| East Park | 3 | 9,661 | 3,220 | 4 | 9,476 | 3,159 | 2 |
| Ings | 3 | 9,576 | 3,192 | 3 | 9,265 | 3,088 | -1 |
| Kingswood | 2 | 6,056 | 3,028 | -3 | 8,375 | 4,188 | 35 |
| Marfleet | 3 | 9,103 | 3,034 | -2 | 9,102 | 3,034 | -2 |
| Noddle Hill | 2 | 6,222 | 3,154 | 0 | 6,199 | 3,100 | 0 |
| Newland | 2 | 6,345 | 3,173 | 2 | 6,226 | 3113 | 0 |

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Orchard Park | 3 | 8,861 | 2,954 | -5 | 8,573 | 2,858 | -8 |
| Southcoates | 3 | 9,554 | 3,185 | 2 | 9,494 | 3,165 | 2 |
| Sutton | 3 | 9,550 | 3,183 | 2 | 9,444 | 3,148 | 1 |
| University | 3 | 8,262 | 2,754 | -11 | 7,984 | 2,661 | -14 |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Kingston upon Hull City Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Mr D Harris' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by Mr D Harris in all wards, where Mr Harris' proposals were as follows:

Figure B3: Mr D Harris' Proposal: Constituent Areas

| Ward name | Constituent areas |
|------------------|--|
| Alexandra | Drypool ward (part); Southcoates ward (part) |
| Avenues | Avenue ward (part) |
| Bankside | Beverley ward (part) |
| Bellfield | Holderness ward (part); Ings ward (part); Sutton ward (part) |
| Bransholme | Noddle Hill ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part) |
| Derringham | Derringham ward (part); |
| EastElla | Boothferry ward (part); Pickering ward (part) |
| Holderness | Holderness ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part) |
| Kingswood | Noddle Hill ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part) |
| Longhill | Ings ward (part); Longhill ward (part) |
| Marfleet | Ings ward (part); Marfleet ward (part) |
| Myton | Drypool ward (part); Myton ward (part) |
| Newington | Newington ward (part); Pickering ward (part) St Andrew's ward (part) |
| Newland | Newland ward (part) |
| Orchard Park | Orchard Park ward; University ward (part) |
| Paragon | Myton ward (part); Pickering ward (part); St Andrew's ward (part) |
| Pickering | Pickering ward (part) |
| Southcoates | Drypool ward (part) Holderness ward (part); Ings ward (part); |
| Sutton | Sutton ward (part) |
| University | University ward; Beverley ward (part) |

Figure B4: Mr D Harris' Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Alexandra | 3 | 9,583 | 3,194 | 3 | 9,629 | 3,209 | 3 |
| Avenues | 3 | 9,342 | 3114 | 0 | 9,047 | 3016 | -3 |
| Bankside | 3 | 9,219 | 3073 | -1 | 8,952 | 2984 | -4 |
| Bellfield | 3 | 9,213 | 3071 | -1 | 9,601 | 3200 | 3 |
| Bransholme | 3 | 9,662 | 3,221 | 4 | 9,548 | 3183 | 2 |
| Derringham | 3 | 9,737 | 3,246 | 4 | 8,853 | 2951 | -5 |
| EastElla | 3 | 9,487 | 3,162 | 2 | 9594 | 3198 | 3 |
| Holderness | 3 | 9,051 | 3,017 | -3 | 9,716 | 3239 | 4 |
| Kingswood | 3 | 8,655 | 2,885 | -7 | 9,776 | 3255 | 5 |
| Longhill | 3 | 9,331 | 3,110 | 0 | 9,217 | 3072 | -1 |
| Marfleet | 3 | 9,589 | 3,196 | 3 | 9,926 | 3308 | 6 |
| Myton | 3 | 9,144 | 3,048 | -2 | 9,612 | 3204 | 3 |
| Newington | 3 | 9,598 | 3,199 | 3 | 9,623 | 3208 | 3 |
| Newland | 3 | 8,782 | 2,927 | -6 | 8,581 | 2860 | -8 |
| Orchard Park | 3 | 9,495 | 3,165 | 2 | 9,166 | 3055 | -2 |
| Paragon | 3 | 9,433 | 3,144 | 1 | 9,200 | 3067 | -1 |
| Pickering | 3 | 9,340 | 3,113 | 0 | 9,905 | 3302 | 6 |
| Southcoates | 3 | 9,476 | 3159 | 2 | 8,702 | 2,900 | -7 |
| Sutton | 3 | 9,254 | 3084 | -1 | 9,102 | 3034 | -2 |
| University | 3 | 9,201 | 3067 | -1 | 8,933 | 2978 | -4 |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Mr D Harris' submission. Mr Harris' figures give 78 more electors than the City Council in 2000, and 189 more electors than the City Council's projections in 2005.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Mr W Harris' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by Mr W Harris in all wards, where Mr Harris' proposals were as follows:

Figure B5: Mr W Harris' Proposal: Constituent Areas

| Ward name | Constituent areas |
|------------------|---|
| Anlaby Park | Boothferry ward (part) |
| Avenues | Avenue ward (part) |
| Bankside | Beverley ward |
| Bransholme | Noddle Hill ward; Stoneferry ward |
| Brunswick | Myton ward (part) |
| Derringham | Derringham ward (part) |
| Drypool | Drypool ward (part) |
| Eastella | Boothferry ward (part) |
| Holderness | Drypool ward (part); Holderness ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part) |
| Ings | Ings ward (part); Sutton ward (part) |
| Kingswood | Noddle Hill ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part) |
| Longhill | Longhill ward; Sutton ward (part) |
| Marfleet | Marfleet ward; Holderness ward (part); Southcoates ward (part) |
| Newington | Newington ward (part); Pickering (part); St Andrew's (part) |
| Newland | Newland ward (part) |
| Orchard Park | Orchard Park ward; University ward (part) |
| Pickering | Pickering ward |
| Riverside | Myton ward (part); St Andrew's (part) |
| Southcoates | Holderness ward (part); Southcoates (part) |
| Sutton | Sutton ward (part) |
| University | Beverley ward (part) University ward |

Figure B6: Mr W Harris' Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Anlaby Park | 1 | 3,318 | 3,318 | 6 | 3,207 | 3,207 | 1 |
| Avenues | 3 | 9,342 | 3,114 | 0 | 9,047 | 3,015 | -5 |
| Bankside | 3 | 8,560 | 2,833 | -9 | 8,701 | 2,900 | -9 |
| Bransholme | 3 | 9,662 | 3,220 | 3 | 9,545 | 3,181 | 0 |
| Brunswick | 2 | 6,308 | 3,154 | 1 | 6,306 | 3,153 | -1 |
| Derringham | 3 | 9,743 | 3,247 | 4 | 9,445 | 3,148 | -1 |
| Drypool | 3 | 9,128 | 3,042 | -3 | 9,285 | 3,095 | -3 |
| Eastella | 2 | 6,278 | 3,139 | 0 | 6,054 | 3,027 | -5 |
| Holderness | 3 | 9,979 | 3,326 | 6 | 9,716 | 3,239 | 2 |
| Ings | 3 | 9,868 | 3,289 | 5 | 9,458 | 3,153 | -1 |
| Kingswood | 3 | 8,665 | 2,853 | -9 | 9,766 | 3,255 | 2 |
| Longhill | 3 | 9,315 | 3,105 | 0 | 9,862 | 3,287 | 3 |
| Marfleet | 3 | 9,395 | 3,132 | 0 | 9,926 | 3,308 | 4 |
| Newington | 3 | 9,630 | 3,210 | 3 | 9,728 | 3,242 | 2 |
| Newland | 3 | 8,782 | 2,927 | -6 | 8,581 | 2,860 | -10 |
| Orchard Park | 3 | 9,475 | 3,158 | 1 | 9,166 | 3,055 | -4 |
| Pickering | 3 | 9,502 | 3,167 | 5 | 9,914 | 3,304 | 4 |
| Riverside | 3 | 9,042 | 3,014 | 1 | 8,984 | 2,983 | -6 |
| Southcoates | 3 | 9,773 | 3,258 | 4 | 10,313 | 3,437 | 8 |
| Sutton | 3 | 9,513 | 3,171 | 1 | 10,102 | 3,367 | 6 |
| University | 3 | 9,201 | 3,067 | -2 | 9,746 | 3,248 | 2 |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Mr W Harris' submission. Mr Harris' figures give 2045 fewer electors than the City Council in 2000, and 1296 more electors than the City Council's projections in 2005.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish

¹ The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.