

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
North East Lincolnshire

*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. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the district.

© 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>13</i> |
| 5 NEXT STEPS  | <i>31</i> |
| <br>  |           |
| APPENDICES  |           |
| A Proposed Electoral Arrangements from:                         | <i>33</i> |
| – North East Lincolnshire Council                               |           |
| – North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group            |           |
| – North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group                  |           |
| – North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party         |           |
| – Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors |           |
| B The Statutory Provisions                                      | <i>43</i> |

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for the towns of Cleethorpes and Grimsby is inserted inside the back cover of the report.



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for North East Lincolnshire 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 North East Lincolnshire:

- **in six of the 14 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 seven 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 114 - 115) are that:

- **North East Lincolnshire Council should have 42 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 15 wards, an increase of one;**
- **the boundaries of 12 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should take place by thirds, instead of every four years, as at present.**

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

- **In 13 of the proposed 15 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **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 ten 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  
North East Lincolnshire 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](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

|    | <b>Ward name</b>                    | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>   | <b>Map reference</b>   |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 1  | Alexandra<br>(Grimsby town)         | 2                            | Marsh ward (part)  | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 2  | Croft Baker<br>(Cleethorpes town)   | 3                            | Croft Baker ward (part); Haverstoe ward (part)   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 3  | Freshney<br>(Grimsby town)          | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Freshney ward)   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 4  | Haverstoe<br>(Cleethorpes town)     | 3                            | Haverstoe ward (part); Humberston ward (part)  | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 5  | Heneage<br>(Grimsby town)           | 3                            | Heneage ward (part)  | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 6  | Humberston &<br>New Waltham         | 3                            | Humberston ward (part – Humberston parish and<br>New Waltham parish)   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 7  | Immingham                           | 3                            | <i>Unchanged</i> (Habrough, Immingham and<br>Stallingborough parishes)   | Map 2                  |
| 8  | New Clee<br>(Grimsby town)          | 3                            | Heneage ward (part); Marsh ward (part); North<br>East ward   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 9  | Park<br>(Grimsby town)              | 3                            | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward<br>(part); Yarborough ward (part)   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 10 | Scartho<br>(Grimsby town)           | 3                            | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward<br>(part)   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 11 | Sidney Sussex<br>(Cleethorpes town) | 3                            | Croft Baker ward (part); Park (Cleethorpes) ward   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 12 | South<br>(Grimsby town)             | 3                            | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward<br>(part); Yarborough ward (part)   | Map 2 and<br>Large map |
| 13 | Waltham                             | 2                            | Wold Parishes ward (part – Ashby-cum-Fenby<br>parish, Brigsley parish and Waltham parish)  | Map 2                  |
| 14 | Wolds                               | 2                            | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of<br>Aylesby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Beelsby, Bradley,<br>East Ravendale, Hatcliffe, Hawerby-cum-Beesby,<br>Healing, Irby-upon-Humber, Laceby, West<br>Ravendale and Wold Newton) | Map 2                  |
| 15 | Yarborough<br>(Grimsby town)        | 3                            | South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  | Map 2 and<br>Large map |

Notes: 1 The towns of Cleethorpes and Grimsby are unparished and comprise the 11 wards indicated above.

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

3 We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for North East Lincolnshire

| 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 Alexandra (Grimsby town)          | 2                     | 5,595             | 2,798                             | -1                      | 5,466             | 2,733                             | -3                      |
| 2 Croft Baker (Cleethorpes town)    | 3                     | 8,706             | 2,902                             | 3                       | 8,503             | 2,834                             | 0                       |
| 3 Freshney (Grimsby town)           | 3                     | 7,791             | 2,597                             | -8                      | 7,766             | 2,589                             | -8                      |
| 4 Haverstoe (Cleethorpes town)      | 3                     | 8,746             | 2,915                             | 3                       | 8,828             | 2,943                             | 4                       |
| 5 Heneage (Grimsby town)            | 3                     | 8,332             | 2,777                             | -2                      | 8,227             | 2,742                             | -3                      |
| 6 Humberston & New Waltham          | 3                     | 8,088             | 2,696                             | -5                      | 8,231             | 2,744                             | -3                      |
| 7 Immingham                         | 3                     | 8,943             | 2,981                             | 5                       | 8,778             | 2,926                             | 3                       |
| 8 New Clee (Grimsby town)           | 3                     | 8,530             | 2,843                             | 1                       | 8,219             | 2,740                             | -3                      |
| 9 Park (Grimsby town)               | 3                     | 9,156             | 3,052                             | 8                       | 8,909             | 2,970                             | 5                       |
| 10 Scartho (Grimsby town)           | 3                     | 7,356             | 2,452                             | -13                     | 9,028             | 3,009                             | 6                       |
| 11 Sidney Sussex (Cleethorpes town) | 3                     | 9,015             | 3,005                             | 6                       | 8,808             | 2,936                             | 4                       |
| 12 South (Grimsby town)             | 3                     | 8,979             | 2,993                             | 6                       | 8,987             | 2,996                             | 6                       |
| 13 Waltham                          | 2                     | 5,557             | 2,779                             | -2                      | 5,454             | 2,727                             | -4                      |
| 14 Wolds                            | 2                     | 4,984             | 2,492                             | -12                     | 5,401             | 2,701                             | -5                      |
| 15 Yarborough (Grimsby town)        | 3                     | 9,022             | 3,007                             | 6                       | 8,822             | 2,941                             | 4                       |
| <b>Totals</b>                       | <b>42</b>             | <b>118,800</b>    | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                | <b>119,427</b>    | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                |
| <b>Averages</b>                     | <b>-</b>              | <b>-</b>          | <b>2,829</b>                      | <b>-</b>                | <b>-</b>          | <b>2,844</b>                      | <b>-</b>                |

Source: Electorate figures are based on North East Lincolnshire 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.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of North East Lincolnshire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the new unitary authorities of East Riding of Yorkshire, 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 North East Lincolnshire. The last such reviews of the former Cleethorpes District Council and Great Grimsby District Council were undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in December 1975 on Cleethorpes District Council (Report No. 127) and August 1978 on Great Grimsby District Council (Report No. 288). The electoral arrangements of the new unitary authority, which came into existence on 1 April 1996, were put in 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 Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

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*

| <b>Stage</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|--------------|---|
| 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. Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/2000 PER programme, including North East Lincolnshire Council, 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, and our present *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 16 May 2000, when we wrote to North East Lincolnshire Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Humberside Police Authority, East Riding & Northern Lincolnshire Local Council’s Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire & Humber Region, and the headquarters

of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 21 August 2000.

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

13 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.**

14 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 district of North East Lincolnshire is situated on the south bank of the Humber Estuary. The area is served by the A180/M180, the Humber Bridge and Humberside International Airport. The district covers some 19,227 hectares and has a population density of approximately 8 persons per hectare. Over the last four years there has been a small, but steady, decline in the electorate which may indicate falling population. The majority of the population is situated in the adjoining towns of Cleethorpes and Grimsby, these two towns are surrounded by 20 parishes covering the town of Immingham and the rural area of the Lincolnshire Wolds.

17 The electorate of the district is 118,800 (February 2000). Cleethorpes and Grimsby towns are unparished and comprise approximately 29 per cent and 55 per cent respectively of the district's total electorate. The Council has 42 members at present, who are elected from 14 wards, all of which are three-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

18 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'.

19 Since the last electoral reviews of Cleethorpes and Great Grimsby there has been an increase in the electorate in the area covered by North East Lincolnshire district, with around 3 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Freshney and Humberston wards.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,829 electors, which the Council forecasts will increase to 2,844 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 six of the 14 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average and two wards by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalances are in Humberston and Wold Parishes wards where the councillors represent 24 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in North East Lincolnshire*

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 Croft Baker           | 3                     | 7,250             | 2,417                             | -15                     | 7,081             | 2,360                             | -17                     |
| 2 Freshney              | 3                     | 7,791             | 2,597                             | -8                      | 7,766             | 2,589                             | -9                      |
| 3 Haverstoe             | 3                     | 8,561             | 2,854                             | 1                       | 8,355             | 2,785                             | -2                      |
| 4 Heneage               | 3                     | 8,421             | 2,807                             | -1                      | 8,316             | 2,772                             | -3                      |
| 5 Humberston            | 3                     | 10,564            | 3,521                             | 24                      | 10,942            | 3,647                             | 28                      |
| 6 Immingham             | 3                     | 8,943             | 2,981                             | 5                       | 8,778             | 2,926                             | 5                       |
| 7 Marsh                 | 3                     | 6,756             | 2,252                             | -20                     | 6,590             | 2,197                             | -23                     |
| 8 North East            | 3                     | 7,280             | 2,427                             | -14                     | 7,006             | 2,335                             | -18                     |
| 9 Park (Cleethorpes)    | 3                     | 8,180             | 2,727                             | -4                      | 7,992             | 2,664                             | -6                      |
| 10 Park (Great Grimsby) | 3                     | 8,737             | 2,912                             | 3                       | 8,503             | 2,834                             | 0                       |
| 11 Scartho              | 3                     | 7,882             | 2,627                             | -7                      | 9,538             | 3,179                             | 12                      |
| 12 South                | 3                     | 7,894             | 2,631                             | -7                      | 7,928             | 2,643                             | -7                      |
| 13 Wold Parishes        | 3                     | 10,541            | 3,514                             | 24                      | 10,855            | 3,618                             | 27                      |
| 14 Yarborough           | 3                     | 10,000            | 3,333                             | 18                      | 9,777             | 3,259                             | 15                      |
| <b>Totals</b>           | <b>42</b>             | <b>118,800</b>    | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                | <b>119,427</b>    | <b>-</b>                          | <b>-</b>                |
| <b>Averages</b>         | <b>-</b>              | <b>-</b>          | <b>2,829</b>                      | <b>-</b>                | <b>-</b>          | <b>2,844</b>                      | <b>-</b>                |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by North East Lincolnshire 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 Marsh ward were relatively over-represented by 20 per cent, while electors in Humberston ward were relatively under-represented by 24 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 North East Lincolnshire Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 113 representations during Stage One, including three district-wide schemes, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Council and the Commission.

#### **North East Lincolnshire Council**

23 The Council submitted a district-wide scheme which proposed a council size of 42 members, as at present, serving 15 wards, an increase of one. It proposed three two-member wards and 12 three-member wards. The Council proposed the introduction of elections by thirds to replace the current system of whole council elections.

24 It proposed that the electoral arrangements of Heneage and Immingham wards should remain unchanged while all other existing wards should be subject to modifications. The Council proposed that a new ward be created, by dividing the existing Wold Parishes ward into two. It also proposed that the village of Great Coates, currently situated in Freshney ward, be transferred into a new ward with parishes from the existing Wold Parishes ward. The Council proposed that Marsh ward should be represented by two councillors, a reduction of one. It made proposals for changes to the boundaries of all other wards. The Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

#### **Conservative Groups**

25 North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group proposed a council size of 42 members, representing 15 wards with three two-member wards and 12 three-member wards and supported the proposal for elections by thirds. It supported North East Lincolnshire Council's proposals for the wards of Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Heneage, Humberston, North East and Park (Cleethorpes). It put forward two options for Freshney ward: Option A would involve the village of Great Coates being included in a ward with some of the Wold parishes while Option B would involve the village remaining in Freshney ward. It proposed that Immingham ward should be represented by two councillors, a reduction of one, and that the ward be coterminous with the parish boundaries. The Conservative Group also proposed alternative boundaries for the wards of Marsh, Park (Great Grimsby), Scartho, South and Yarborough. The Conservative Group's proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

26 Cleethorpes Conservative Association supported the proposals put forward by North East Lincolnshire Council with the exception of Immingham and Wold Parishes wards. It stated that the ward of Immingham should comprise only the parish of Immingham and should be represented by two councillors. The parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough would then be included in a Wold Parishes ward.

27 Great Grimsby Conservative Association supported the proposals put forward by the North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group.

## **Labour Groups**

28 North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group submitted a district-wide scheme, proposing a council size of 42 members, representing 15 wards with three two-member wards and 12 three-member wards. It supported North East Lincolnshire Council's proposals for the wards of Humberston and Immingham. It stated that the wards of Marsh and Park (Great Grimsby) should each be represented by two councillors, a reduction of one in both wards. It proposed that the village of Great Coates and the Wibers Wood and The Willows housing estates currently in Freshney ward, be included in a ward with some of the Wold parishes. The Labour Group also put forward boundary modifications to all other wards. Labour Group's proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

29 North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party submitted a district-wide scheme which proposed a council size of 42 members, representing 15 wards with three two-member wards and 12 three-member wards. It supported the proposals for elections by thirds. It supported the Labour Group's proposals for the wards of Freshney, Humberston, Immingham, Scartho and South, and North East Lincolnshire Council's proposal for the ward of Heneage, and it agreed with the Labour Group that Marsh and Park (Great Grimsby) wards should each return two councillors. However, it put forward alternative boundaries for Marsh and Park (Great Grimsby) wards. The Local Government Labour Party also put forward boundary modifications to all other wards. The Labour Party's proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

## **Liberal Democrat Group**

30 The Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors proposed a council size of 43 members, representing 15 wards, with two two-member wards and 13 three-member wards. It supported North East Lincolnshire Council's proposals for the wards of Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Heneage, Humberston, Immingham, North East and Park (Cleethorpes). It proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards covering the unparished area of Cleethorpes and Grimsby with the existing Wold Parishes ward being divided into two two-member wards. It proposed that the village of Great Coates remain in Freshney ward. The Liberal Democrat Group also proposed alternative boundaries for the wards of Marsh, Park (Great Grimsby), Scartho, South, Wold Parishes and Yarborough. The Liberal Democrats' proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

31 We received representations from eight parish and town councils and from the North East Lincolnshire Alliance of Parish Councils. The parish councils of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Irby upon Humber and Waltham all stated that the existing boundaries of Wold Parishes ward should remain unchanged with the ward returning four councillors, an increase of one. Healing Parish Council and North East Lincolnshire Alliance of Parish Councils also stated Wold Parishes ward should return four councillors and that the boundaries should remain unchanged, with the exception of the possible inclusion of the village of Great Coates, currently in Freshney

ward. Laceby Parish Council stated that it would like to see the existing Wold Parishes ward divided into two two-member wards with Laceby parish being placed in a ward with other small parishes. Immingham Town Council recommended that the electoral arrangements of Immingham ward should remain unchanged. Habrough Parish Council did not make specific comments on warding arrangements.

## **Other Representations**

32 We received a further 96 representations from individual councillors, local residents and a local organisation. Scartho Preservation Society put forward new boundaries for Scartho ward which would see the new development of Scartho Top transferred out of the ward but the northern boundary of the ward extended to include additional electors in Scartho Road, arguing that this proposal “retains the Edge Avenue Estate in Scartho ward”. It also supported the introduction of elections by thirds. Councillor Vickers, member for Scartho ward, supported the proposals put forward by the Scartho Preservation Society for Scartho ward.

33 Councillor Barker, member for Marsh ward, put forward boundary modifications for Marsh ward and commented on the schemes put forward by the Conservatives, Labour and the Liberal Democrats.

34 We received 81 proforma letters from residents of Cleethorpes proposing new boundaries for Croft Baker ward. We received three representations from residents of Scartho, opposing any plans to remove the Edge Avenue Estate from Scartho ward. Two Grimsby residents made representations stating that the electors north of, and including, Cromwell Road and Dudley Street, currently in Yarborough ward, should be transferred into Marsh ward. Two residents of Cleethorpes opposed the proposal to transfer electors currently in Humberston ward into Haverstoe ward. A resident of Habrough parish opposed the Conservative groups’ proposals for Immingham ward. A resident of Great Coates stated his opposition to any proposals to remove the village from Freshney ward and place it in a rural Wolds ward.

35 We received a submission from a Cleethorpes resident commenting on the proposals put forward by North East Lincolnshire Council, the Labour Group and the Liberal Democrats. A resident of Grimsby recommended the “return to the old Grimsby and Cleethorpes Districts Council wards”. He also proposed elections for a quarter of the council every year. A resident of Cleethorpes proposed that Cleethorpes town should be parished. Two residents of Cleethorpes made comments on the management structure of North East Lincolnshire Council and the establishment of the Unitary Authority respectively, issues which are not covered by the remit of a periodic electoral review.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

36 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for North East Lincolnshire 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”.

37 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.

38 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.

39 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**

40 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting an increase in the electorate of 0.5 per cent from 118,800 to 119,427 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expects most of the growth to be in Scartho ward, although a significant amount is also expected in Humberston ward. 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 Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained. The three political groups on the Council agreed with its electorate forecasts. However, the North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party projected an increase in the electorate of 1 per cent, to 120,116, by 2005, but did not provide details outlining where its projections differed to those of the Council.

41 We sought clarification from North East Lincolnshire Council in light of these alternative electorate projections and, having received further assurances, we have not been persuaded to move away from the Council’s electorate forecast. We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. However, we would welcome further evidence on electorate projections during Stage Three.

## **Council Size**

42 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.

43 North East Lincolnshire Council currently has 42 members. The Council's scheme proposed a council of 42 members, as at present, which received support from the North East Lincolnshire Conservative groups and the North East Lincolnshire Labour groups. However the Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors proposed an increase in council size of one, from 42 to 43. It argued that "three member wards are now well established in North East Lincolnshire and with the exception of the Wold Parishes ... all other wards in North East Lincolnshire should have three members".

44 We have given consideration to the proposals based on both a 42- and a 43-member council. As already explained, the Commission's starting point in a PER is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government. In the absence of any argumentation to demonstrate why the current council size is no longer appropriate, or that effective and convenient local government cannot be provided in Cleethorpes and Grimsby on a non-uniform pattern of three-, two- or single-member wards we do not consider that a sufficiently strong case has been made for a change to council size. Further, given that we received a number of schemes, based on a council size of 42 members, which would result in some improvements to electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria, we propose no change to the current council size.

45 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 42 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

46 We have carefully considered all representations received, including the district-wide schemes from North East Lincolnshire Council, North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group and North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party, as well as the proposals from the North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group, Cleethorpes Conservative Association, Great Grimsby Conservative Association and the Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors. All of these proposals would result in some improvements in electoral equality.

47 In analysing the scheme from the North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group we identified a number of discrepancies in some areas between its electorate figures for proposed wards and the mapping provided. In these areas we have been unable to compare the electoral variances of its proposed wards. However, we have still outlined its proposals in Appendix A and carefully considered the boundaries it put forward. We would welcome clarification on the Labour Group's electorate figures during Stage Three.

48 A resident of Cleethorpes proposed a “return to the old Grimsby and Cleethorpes districts Council wards”, which would result in a pattern of single-member wards across the district. However, he did not provide details of proposed ward boundaries or argumentation to support a change to a uniform pattern of single-member wards. Another resident of Cleethorpes proposed that the town be parished. However, the Commission does not have the power to propose the creation of new parish councils as part of a periodic electoral review. Any queries relating to this issue should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, or to North East Lincolnshire Council.

49 We have decided to adopt parts of the schemes submitted by the Council, the Labour Group and the Liberal Democrat Group. We have also put forward our own proposals for boundaries in two wards.

50 We consider that our proposals would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Freshney, Heneage, Marsh and North East wards;
- (b) Park (Great Grimsby), Scartho, South and Yarborough wards;
- (c) Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston and Park (Cleethorpes) wards;
- (d) Immingham and Wold Parishes wards.

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

### **Freshney, Heneage, Marsh and North East wards**

52 These four wards are situated in the north and east of Grimsby town which itself lies in the north of the district. The wards of Freshney, Heneage, Marsh and North East are all over-represented by 8 per cent, 1 per cent, 20 per cent and 14 per cent respectively (9 per cent, 3 per cent, 23 per cent and 18 per cent by 2005).

53 North East Lincolnshire Council proposed no change to Heneage ward. It proposed that the village of Great Coates, currently situated in Freshney ward, be transferred into a ward with part of Wold Parishes ward. To provide good electoral equality in a modified Freshney ward, no longer including the village of Great Coates it proposed transferring the electors of Yarborough ward, situated to the north of Yarrow Road and west of Yarborough Road, into Freshney ward. The Council also proposed a modification to the boundary between the wards of Marsh and North East. It proposed that the railway line and the eastern edge of the Royal Dock to the Humber should be used as the boundary, with electors being transferred from Marsh ward into North East ward. It stated that this would provide a clearly defined boundary while improving electoral equality in both wards. The Council proposed no further modifications to the boundaries of North East ward. It proposed that Marsh ward should be represented by two councillors. It also put forward new names for the existing wards of Marsh and North East, proposing Alexandra and New Clee respectively.

54 Under the Council's proposals the wards of Alexandra, Heneage and New Clee would all have a councillor:elector ratio 1 per cent below the district average (4 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent respectively by 2005). Freshney ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 2 per cent above the district average (equal to the district average by 2005).

55 The North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group supported the Council's proposals for the wards of Heneage and North East. However, it put forward two options for Freshney ward, noting that "opinion in Great Coates is divided": Option A, which would remove Great Coates village from the ward and reduce the level of representation to two councillors; and Option B which would retain the existing boundaries and the level of representation. The Conservative Group supported the Council's proposed boundary between Marsh ward and North East ward; however, it proposed that the remainder of Marsh ward should be included in a ward with electors from Yarborough ward, polling district YA2 and most of YA1 (situated in the north of the existing ward) it proposed that this ward should be named Alexandra. These proposals were supported by the Great Grimsby Conservative Association.

56 Under the Conservative Group's proposals the wards of Heneage and New Clee would have the same electoral variances as the Council's scheme. Alexandra ward would have an electoral variance of 2 per cent (4 per cent by 2005). Under the Conservative Group's Option A and B, Freshney ward would have electoral variances of 20 per cent and 8 per cent respectively (19 per cent and 9 per cent by 2005).

57 The Cleethorpes Conservative Association also proposed that Great Coates village should be transferred out of Freshney ward and included in a rural Wolds ward. It agreed with the Council's proposals for the wards of Marsh, Heneage and Yarborough.

58 North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group proposed modifications to the boundaries of all four of these wards. It supported the Council's proposal to transfer the village of Great Coates out of Freshney ward. However, it proposed that the rest of polling district FR2 (west of Oakwood Drive and Wybers Wood First School) should also be transferred out of Freshney ward into a ward with part of Wold Parishes ward. It stated that the village of Great Coates had "recently shown itself to be a distinct and different community to the rest of the ward". The Labour Group also proposed that the electors currently in Marsh ward, polling districts MA3 and MA4 (east of Haycroft Street and the West Marsh Industrial estate), should be transferred into Freshney ward as "this would keep all of the industrial areas together in one ward". The Labour Group put forward major boundary modifications to Marsh ward. It proposed that polling districts MA1 and MA2 (which make up the remainder of the existing ward) and the electors to the west of the railway line in MA5 should be included in a revised ward with electors in the north of Park (Great Grimsby) ward (polling district PG1 and part of PG2) and electors from Yarborough ward, generally east of Marshall Avenue and Clifton Road. The Labour Group supported the Council's proposal to use the railway line as the boundary between Marsh ward and North East ward. However, it proposed a minor modification to the Council's proposed boundary between the wards of Heneage and North East. It proposed transferring 56 electors on the north side of Columbia Road, currently in North East ward, into Heneage ward. The Labour Group proposed no further modifications to the boundaries of Heneage and North East wards. It proposed that Marsh ward should be represented by two members, while Freshney, Heneage and North East

wards continue to return three councillors each. It also supported the Council's proposal to rename North East ward, New Clee and that Marsh ward be renamed, suggesting St James as the new ward name.

59 North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party put forward the same proposals as the Labour Group for Freshney ward and similar proposals for Marsh ward, although it proposed a greater number of electors to be transferred into Marsh ward from both Park (Great Grimsby) and Yarborough wards. Its proposals were identical to the Council's proposals for Heneage and North East wards.

60 The Liberal Democrat Group argued for a pattern of three-member wards across the urban area. It supported the Council's proposals for Heneage ward and North East ward. However, it put forward alternative proposals for Freshney and Marsh wards. It proposed that the existing electoral arrangements for Freshney ward be retained with Great Coates village remaining within the ward, "as it clearly has nothing in common with the Wold Parishes". The Liberal Democrats supported the Council's proposed boundary between Marsh ward and North East ward. However, it proposed that the remainder of Marsh ward should be included in a ward with electors from Yarborough ward, polling district YA2 and most of YA1 (situated in the north of the existing ward). It proposed that this ward should be named Alexandra.

61 Under the Liberal Democrat Group's 43-member scheme the wards of Alexandra, Freshney, Heneage and New Clee would have electoral variances of 1 per cent, 6 per cent, 2 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (2 per cent, 7 per cent, equal to the district average and 2 per cent by 2005). The electoral variances would be higher in these proposed wards under a 42-member scheme, both now and in 2005.

62 Healing Parish Council stated that it would "welcome the inclusion of Great Coates into Wold Parishes ward if [the electors of Great Coates] so wish". North East Lincolnshire Alliance of Parish Councils stated that it would accept the inclusion of Great Coates village in a ward with the Wold parishes.

63 Councillor Barker, member for Marsh ward, put forward detailed arguments for modifications to Marsh ward. He supported the Council's proposed boundary between Marsh ward and North East ward, which would involve most of polling district MA5 (east of the railway line) being transferred into North East ward. However, he did not support the proposal to reduce the number of councillors representing Marsh ward from three members to two members. Instead, Councillor Barker proposed that the railway line should be crossed to include electors from Park or Yarborough ward in order to keep the level of representation for Marsh ward at three members.

64 We received four further submissions from local residents. A resident of Great Coates opposed any proposal that involved transferring the village of Great Coates into a rural ward and including "a totally detached residential area east of the Freshney river ... in Freshney ward". He stated that the electoral arrangements of Freshney ward should remain unchanged. A resident of Cleethorpes stated that "Freshney [ward] should be retained within its current boundaries" as Great Coates village has stronger links to Freshney ward than to Wold Parishes ward. The same resident also commented on the Council's proposals for Marsh ward, stating that it should retain

three members and that the southern boundary should be extended to include electors from the existing Yarborough ward. Two residents of Grimsby proposed that Cromwell Road and Dudley Street should be used as the boundary between Marsh ward and Yarborough ward.

65 We have carefully considered all representations received regarding these four wards. We looked carefully at the proposals to transfer the village of Great Coates out of Freshney ward into a ward with part of the rural Wold Parishes ward. We recognised the arguments that Great Coates has a strong community identity of its own. However, having visited the area, we consider that the electors of Great Coates have stronger community links with the electors of Freshney ward than they do with electors in the parishes of Wold Parishes ward, from whom they are separated by a considerable geographical distance. We have also considered the subsequent need to include electors from Marsh or Yarborough ward, if Great Coates village no longer forms part of Freshney ward. We have concluded that the electors of Freshney ward have stronger community links with the electors of Great Coates than they do with electors of Marsh ward or Yarborough ward, from which they are separated by the South Humberside Industrial Estate and the River Freshney respectively. We have concluded that the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals for Freshney ward offer effective and convenient local government to the electors of Freshney ward, while retaining strong community identity in the area. We therefore agreed with the arguments from the Liberal Democrat Group and the resident of Great Coates, that the existing electoral arrangements of Freshney ward should be retained. We would welcome further comments on this issue during Stage Three.

66 Under a council size of 42 members, the urban, unparished area of Grimsby and Cleethorpes (including Great Coates village) is entitled to 32 councillors. It is therefore impossible to retain a pattern of three-member wards across the unparished area, as requested by the Liberal Democrats. Having visited the area we concluded that the Council's proposed two-member Marsh ward represents the most appropriate balance between achieving electoral equality and the statutory criteria. The proposed ward uses the Scunthorpe to Cleethorpes railway line as a boundary, providing a strong, clear and easily definable boundary and would result in the number of electors per councillor being 1 per cent below the district average (3 per cent by 2005). We also propose adopting the Council's suggested ward name of Alexandra. We noted the arguments put forward by the Conservative groups, the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Barker and three local residents that the railway line could be crossed to include electors from Yarborough ward in a revised Marsh ward. However, we do not believe that such a proposal would best reflect community identity in the area. We also consider, having looked at the urban area as a whole, that the Council's proposed Alexandra ward would provide the most suitable two-member ward because of the good level of electoral equality and strong, clear boundaries.

67 The proposed wards of Heneage and New Clee were agreed on in all submissions except for a minor adjustment, put forward by the Labour Group to unite the electors on the south side of Columbia Road in Heneage ward. We concur with the Labour Group that this boundary anomaly needs to be addressed. However, we propose that the boundary between these wards should be amended to run along the northern edge of Hardy Recreation Ground and then north along the middle of Humberston Road. This would transfer electors currently in Heneage ward into New Clee ward as illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report. We consider that our proposal will provide effective and convenient local government for these electors, while

providing marginally improved electoral equality. We propose adopting all other boundaries proposed, which were agreed on in all submissions received, for the wards of Heneage and New Clee.

68 Under our proposals the ward of New Clee would have a councillor:elector ratio 1 per cent above the district average (3 per cent below by 2005). Alexandra, Freshney and Heneage wards would have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent, 8 per cent and 2 per cent below the district average respectively (3 per cent, 8 per cent and 3 per cent by 2005). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

### **Park (Great Grimsby), Scartho, South and Yarborough wards**

69 These four wards are situated in the centre and south of Grimsby town which lies in the north of the district. The wards of Scartho and South both currently have councillor:elector ratios 7 per cent below the district average (12 per cent above and 7 per cent below respectively, by 2005). Park (Great Grimsby) and Yarborough wards currently have councillor:elector ratios 3 per cent and 18 per cent above the district average respectively (equal to and 15 per cent above the district average by 2005).

70 North East Lincolnshire Council proposed that these four wards should each continue to be represented by three councillors. The Council proposed transferring the electors north of Yarrow Road and west of Yarborough Road into Freshney ward. It proposed transferring those electors in the Stephen Crescent area, currently in Yarborough ward to the east of Bradley Road, into South ward. It proposed that the electors north of Cambridge Road, currently in South ward, be transferred into Yarborough ward as this would “create a better southern boundary”. It also proposed that Scartho Road should be used as the boundary between Park (Great Grimsby) ward and South ward, with the electors to the west of Scartho Road, currently in Park (Great Grimsby) ward, being transferred into South ward as “this will bring all of the Nunsthorpe estate into one ward”. The Council proposed that the electors to the east of Chelmsford Avenue and north of Laceby Road, be transferred into Park (Great Grimsby) ward. It proposed that the existing boundary between Park (Great Grimsby) ward and the wards of Heneage, Marsh and Yarborough be retained. However, it proposed that polling district SC2 (the Edge Avenue estate) currently in Scartho ward, be included in Park (Great Grimsby) ward. It stated that Scartho ward would be under-represented by 2005 and consequently proposed that the electors of Scartho Top currently in Park (Great Grimsby) ward, be transferred into Scartho ward. The Council proposed that Park (Great Grimsby) ward should be renamed Park, this proposed ward name was supported by the Conservative groups, the Labour Group and the Liberal Democrat Group. The proposals for these four wards were supported by the Cleethorpes Conservative Association.

71 Under the Council’s proposals the wards of Park, Scartho and South would have a councillor:elector ratio 2 per cent, 13 per cent and 3 per cent below the district average respectively (5 per cent below, 6 per cent above and 3 per cent below by 2005). Yarborough ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 4 per cent above the district average (1 per cent by 2005).

72 The Conservative Group supported transferring the electors in polling district YA2 and most of YA1 (situated to the north of the existing ward), out of Yarborough ward and into Marsh ward.

It proposed transferring the electors in the South ward polling district SO3 (west of Carnforth Crescent) into Yarborough ward and parts of polling districts SO5 and SO6 (north of Carnforth Crescent and east of Chelmsford Avenue) into Park (Great Grimsby) ward. It put forward the transfer of the polling district PG6 (which covers the south of the existing ward), currently in Park (Great Grimsby) ward, into South ward, with the exception of the electors in 142 to 198 Scartho Road, who would be included in Scartho ward. It proposed no other changes to the boundaries of Scartho ward. It noted that this proposal would result in a high electoral variance. However, it put forward community identity arguments, stating that the Scartho area covers all of the existing Scartho ward and arguably part of Park (Great Grimsby) ward. It stated that “there is no doubting at all that residents [of the Edge Avenue Estate] regard themselves as Scartho residents”. It also stated a preference for a four-member Scartho ward. However, it proposed a three-member ward as “an interim arrangement”. These proposals were supported by Great Grimsby Conservative Association.

73 Under the Conservative Group’s proposals the wards of Park, Scartho, South and Yarborough would have electoral variances of 3 per cent, 6 per cent, 16 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (7 per cent, 13 per cent, 15 per cent and 3 per cent by 2005).

74 The North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group proposed that the electors south of Laceby Road, currently in Yarborough ward, should be transferred into a rural ward with the parishes of Bradley and Laceby. It proposed transferring those electors currently in Yarborough ward, east of Clifton Road and Marshall Avenue, into its proposed St James ward. It proposed that South ward should comprise the existing ward with the addition of electors from the Stephen Crescent area, currently in Yarborough ward, and those electors to the west of Scartho Road and north of Sutcliffe Avenue, currently in Park (Great Grimsby) ward. It proposed that Park (Great Grimsby) ward polling districts PG1 and part of PG2 (which cover the north of the existing ward) should be transferred into Marsh ward and that Scartho ward polling district SC2 (the Edge Avenue Estate) should be included in Park (Great Grimsby) ward. The Labour Group proposed no further modifications to the boundaries of Scartho ward. It proposed that Scartho, South and Yarborough wards continue to return three councillors each, however Park ward should be represented by two councillors, a reduction of one.

75 North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party supported the proposals of North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group for Scartho and South wards. Its proposals for Park (Great Grimsby) ward were similar to those put forward by the Labour Group. However, it proposed that a greater number of electors from polling district PG2 (in the north east of the existing ward) in Park (Great Grimsby) ward be transferred into Marsh ward. It also proposed similar boundaries to those put forward by the Labour Group for Yarborough ward, although it proposed transferring more electors from polling district YA2 (in the north east of the existing ward) into Marsh ward.

76 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed that the Yarborough ward polling district YA2 and most of YA1 (situated in the north of the existing ward) be transferred into Marsh ward. It also proposed that the South ward polling district of SO3 (west of Carnforth Crescent) be included in the revised Yarborough ward. It proposed transferring polling district SO5 and part of SO6 (north of Carnforth Crescent and east of Chelmsford Avenue) from South ward into Park ward. The

Group proposed that the remainder of South ward be included in a ward with the whole of polling districts PG6 (which covers the south of the existing ward) from Park (Great Grimsby) ward and SC2 (the Edge Avenue Estate) from Scartho ward. It stated that this would unite the Nunsthorpe estate in one ward and improve electoral equality. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed no further modifications to the boundaries of Scartho ward.

77 Under the Liberal Democrat Group's 43-member scheme, its proposals for the wards of Park, Scartho, South and Yarborough would result in electoral variances of 1 per cent, 13 per cent, 4 per cent and 2 per cent respectively (4 per cent, 6 per cent, 5 per cent and 1 per cent by 2005). The electoral variances would be higher in the proposed wards of Park, South and Yarborough under a 42-member scheme, in 2005. However, the electoral variance would be lower in Scartho ward.

78 Scartho Preservation Society opposed any proposal to transfer the Edge Avenue estate out of Scartho ward, stating that the estate "is very much a part of the local community". It argued that the people of this estate look towards the village of Scartho. The Society recognised that the current ward boundaries would result in high levels of electoral inequality by 2005 given the large development planned at Scartho Top and that it would therefore be necessary to transfer some electors out of the ward. It therefore proposed that the new housing development of Scartho Top should be included in a neighbouring ward, with the Edge Avenue Estate remaining as part of Scartho ward. It also proposed that the electors south of Sutcliffe Avenue currently in Park (Great Grimsby) ward, excluding the electors of Scartho Top, should be included in Scartho ward. Councillor Vickers, member for Scartho ward, supported Scartho Preservation Society's proposal.

79 We received three further submissions from local residents regarding Scartho ward. All three residents of Scartho proposed that the Scartho Top development should be transferred out of Scartho ward as opposed to the Edge Avenue Estate, which they argued was an established part of Scartho.

80 We carefully considered all representations received regarding these four wards. We propose adopting the Council's modified Scartho ward as part of our draft recommendations. We have carefully considered the arguments for transferring the Scartho Top development into a revised South ward. However, having visited the area, we noted the boundary between the Scartho Top development and the rear of the properties on the Nunsthorpe Estate, currently in South ward, is very strong and that there was no access road linking the properties, giving the electors of Scartho Top no direct access to South ward. We consider that this would not facilitate effective and convenient local government. We also considered creating two two-member wards to cover the existing Scartho ward and the whole of Park ward polling district PG6 (which covers the south of the existing ward). However, there are too few electors in this area to merit four councillors and we consider that including more electors from surrounding areas would not then meet the objective of trying to accurately reflect the community of Scartho. Consequently, we concluded that the electors of the Edge Avenue Estate should be included in a modified Park (Great Grimsby) ward in order to provide good electoral equality in this area as a whole. We consider that the Council's proposal for Scartho ward provides the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. However, we have made one minor modification to the Council's proposed Scartho ward, we propose running the boundary from the southern end of Heimpal Road along Scartho Park to meet Scartho Road. This modification ensures that the boundary adheres to ground detail, it does not affect any electors.

81 We are basing our draft recommendations for South ward on the Labour Group's proposals, albeit with one minor modification. We agreed with the proposals to unite the Nunsthorpe estate in one ward as we consider this will enhance and support the community identity of electors in this area. However, we propose aligning the boundary to the rear of the properties 16 to 30 Laceby Road, including them in South ward. This boundary modification will unite properties on both sides of Laceby Road in this area. We propose adopting the remainder of the Labour Group's boundary modifications for South ward as they would provide strong boundaries, high levels of electoral equality and reflect community identity. We are also adopting the Labour Group's proposal for the eastern boundary of Yarborough ward, with two minor modifications, we consider that running the boundary along the rear of the properties on the eastern side of Clifton Road will provide higher levels of electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria. We have proposed a new boundary, which would run along the south and east sides of the Waterworks, this proposal does not affect any electors. We propose that all other existing boundaries of Yarborough ward should be retained as they are well established, easily identifiable and provide good levels of electoral equality.

82 We are putting forward our own proposals for Park (Great Grimsby) ward. We have concluded that the ward should comprise the remainder of the existing ward and the electors of polling district SC2 (the Edge Avenue Estate) currently in Scartho ward, and the electors east of Marshall Avenue and Clifton Road, currently in Yarborough ward. This proposal retains the majority of the existing ward whilst uniting communities in Park ward and neighbouring wards. We have adopted the proposal to rename Park (Great Grimsby) ward, Park. We consider that all four of these wards should each be represented by three councillors. All of the boundaries we are putting forward in this area have been locally derived and we consider that our proposals offer high levels of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria.

83 Under our proposals Scartho ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 13 per cent below the district average (6 per cent above by 2005). The wards of Park, South and Yarborough would have councillor:elector ratios 8 per cent, 6 per cent and 6 per cent above the district average respectively (5 per cent, 6 per cent and 4 per cent by 2005). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

### **Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston and Park (Cleethorpes) wards**

84 These four wards are situated in Cleethorpes town which lies in the north-east of the district. The wards of Croft Baker and Park (Cleethorpes) currently have councillor:elector ratios 15 per cent and 4 per cent below the district average respectively (17 per cent and 6 per cent by 2005). Haverstoe and Humberston wards have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent and 24 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent below and 28 per cent above by 2005).

85 North East Lincolnshire Council proposed that all four of these wards should retain three councillors each. It proposed transferring the electors north of the Humberston parish boundary, polling district HU1, from Humberston ward into Haverstoe ward. Humberston ward would consequently comprise the parishes of Humberston and New Waltham in their entirety. The Council proposed that, polling districts HA3 and HA4 (north of Taylors Avenue and west of Trinity Road) currently in Haverstoe ward be transferred into Croft Baker ward to improve

electoral equality and to provide a stronger boundary – Taylors Avenue. It also proposed transferring polling district CB1 (north of Clee Road, High Street and Isaacs Hill) currently in Croft Baker ward, into Park (Cleethorpes) ward to improve electoral equality. The Council proposed no further boundary modifications to the boundaries of Park (Cleethorpes) ward. It proposed that Humberston ward be renamed Humberston & New Waltham, reflecting the two parishes within the ward boundaries, and Park (Cleethorpes) ward, be renamed Sidney Sussex “to reflect a local connection and to avoid any confusion with the Park ward in Grimsby”.

86 Under the Council’s proposals the wards of Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston & New Waltham and Sidney Sussex would all have councillor:elector ratios 3 per cent, 3 per cent, 5 per cent and 6 per cent above the district average respectively (equal to the district average, 3 per cent, 5 per cent and 3 per cent by 2005).

87 The North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group, Cleethorpes Conservative Association, Great Grimsby Conservative Association and the Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors supported in full North East Lincolnshire Council’s proposals for these four wards.

88 Under the Liberal Democrat’s 43-member scheme these four wards would have different electoral variances to those provided under the Council’s 42-member scheme. Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston & New Waltham and Sidney Sussex wards would have electoral variances of 5 per cent, 6 per cent, 5 per cent and 9 per cent respectively (2 per cent, 6 per cent, 5 per cent and 6 per cent by 2005).

89 North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group supported the Council’s proposals for Humberston ward. However, it put forward a different boundary between Croft Baker ward and Haverstoe ward, transferring polling district HA5 and part of HA4 (north of Queen’s Parade and Taylors Avenue and east of The Lindsey School), currently in Haverstoe ward, into Croft Baker ward. It stated that this would provide an easily recognisable boundary while including the central part of Cleethorpes in Croft Baker ward. The Labour Group proposed that part of polling district CB1, north of Princes Road, currently in Croft Baker ward, should be included in Park (Cleethorpes) ward to improve electoral equality. The Labour Group proposed that each of these four wards should return three councillors. It supported the proposal to rename Humberston ward and Park (Cleethorpes) ward, Humberston & New Waltham and Sidney Sussex respectively.

90 Under the Labour Group’s proposals Haverstoe ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the district average both initially and in 2005. The wards of Croft Baker and Sidney Sussex would have councillor:elector ratios 8 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (5 per cent and 1 per cent by 2005). Humberston & New Waltham ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent below the district average (4 per cent by 2005).

91 The North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party supported the Council’s proposal for Humberston ward and the Labour Group’s proposal for Park (Cleethorpes) ward. It proposed an alternative boundary between Croft Baker and Haverstoe wards, proposing that polling district HA5 (west of Trinity Road) and part of HA3 (situated to the west of Haverstoe

ward) should be transferred from Haverstoe ward into Croft Baker ward which, it stated, would reunite the “older parts of the town”. It proposed that these four wards should be represented by three councillors each.

92 We received 81 proforma letters from residents of Cleethorpes proposing modifications to Croft Baker ward, similar in nature to those put forward by the North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group. They proposed that the electors to the east of Thrunsoe Road and north of Queen’s Parade should be transferred from Haverstoe ward into Croft Baker ward. They also proposed that the electors north of Princes Road be transferred from Croft Baker ward into Park (Cleethorpes) ward. They stated that this proposal would join “old Cleethorpes into one cohesive identity by re-uniting both parts of the old town”, and argued that this proposal would provide a “clearly defined boundary”. Under these proposals the ward of Croft Baker would have an electoral variance of 9 per cent (11 per cent by 2005).

93 We received one further representation from two residents of Humberston stating their opposition to any proposal that transfers part of the existing Humberston ward into Haverstoe ward, as put forward in all other submissions received.

94 Having carefully considered all representations received, we propose adopting North East Lincolnshire Council’s proposals for all four of these wards. The proposal for a modified Humberston & New Waltham ward received support from all submissions, with the exception of two residents in Humberston. We consider that adopting the existing parish boundary of Humberston parish as the new district ward boundary between Haverstoe and Humberston & New Waltham wards offers a strong, recognisable boundary while improving electoral equality.

95 We note that the Council’s and Labour Group’s proposals for the boundary between Croft Baker and Haverstoe wards would offer similar levels of electoral equality. However, we concluded that Taylors Avenue, which was put forward by the Council, provides a stronger boundary than Brian Avenue, the Labour Group’s proposed boundary. We further noted that the Council’s proposed Croft Baker ward unites the electors in Brian Avenue and Sandringham Road in the same ward. Given the comparatively lower levels of electoral equality in the wards of Croft Baker and Haverstoe, 9 per cent and 17 per cent respectively (11 per cent and 17 per cent by 2005), we are not adopting the proposals put forward from residents of Cleethorpes. Having decided to adopt the Council’s proposed southern boundary for Croft Baker ward we are also adopting its proposals for the northern boundary, as this would provide higher levels of electoral equality than the boundary put forward by the Labour Group. We are also endorsing the proposal to rename Park (Cleethorpes) ward, Sidney Sussex.

96 Under our proposals Croft Baker, Haverstoe and Sidney Sussex wards would have councillor:elector ratios 3 per cent, 3 per cent and 6 per cent above the district average respectively (equal to the district average, 4 per cent above and 4 per cent above by 2005). Humberston & New Waltham ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent below the district average (3 per cent by 2005). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

## **Immingham and Wold Parishes wards**

97 The ward of Immingham is situated in the north-west of the district and covers the rural parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough and the more urban parish of Immingham. Wold Parishes ward covers over 50 per cent of the area of the district and is made up of 15 parishes of the rural Lincolnshire Wolds. Immingham and Wold Parishes wards currently have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent and 24 per cent above the district average respectively (5 per cent and 27 per cent by 2005).

98 North East Lincolnshire Council proposed retaining the existing electoral arrangements of Immingham ward. It proposed that the parishes of Aylesby, Beelsby, Bradley, Hatcliffe, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby, currently part of Wold Parishes ward be included in a new two-member Wolds ward with the village of Great Coates, currently in Freshney ward. The parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Brigsley, East Ravendale, Waltham, West Ravendale and Wold Newton would then form a new two-member Waltham ward.

99 Under the Council's proposals the wards of Immingham and Waltham would have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent and 6 per cent above the district average respectively (3 per cent in both wards by 2005). Wolds ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent below the district average (6 per cent above by 2005).

100 North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group proposed that the parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough, currently in Immingham ward, should be transferred into a ward with part of Wold Parishes ward. This would create an Immingham ward with boundaries that were coterminous with the parish of Immingham. It proposed that the parishes of Aylesby, Beelsby, Bradley, Hatcliffe, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby, currently in Wold Parishes ward, be included in a revised three-member Wold Parishes ward with the parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough, currently in Immingham ward. Under the Conservative Group's Option A, the village of Great Coates would be included in this ward; Option B would involve Great Coates village remaining in Freshney ward and Wold Parishes ward returning two councillors. The remaining parishes of the existing Wold Parishes ward would form a new ward to be renamed Waltham ward and represented by two councillors. This submission was supported by Great Grimsby Conservative Association. Cleethorpes Conservative Association supported Option A of the Conservative Group's scheme.

101 Under the Conservative Group's Option A the wards of Immingham, Waltham and Wolds would have electoral variances of 32 per cent, 6 per cent and 17 per cent respectively (29 per cent, 3 per cent and 13 per cent by 2005). Under Option B the electoral variances would be 32 per cent, 6 per cent and 7 per cent respectively (29 per cent, 3 per cent and 13 per cent by 2005).

102 North East Lincolnshire Labour Group supported the Council's proposal to retain the existing arrangements in Immingham ward. It proposed that the parishes of Aylesby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Beelsby, Bradley, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby should form a new three-member North Wold ward with electors of polling district FR2 (Great Coates village and the north west of Wybers Wood housing estate), currently situated in Freshney ward, and the electors currently in Yarborough ward, south of Laceby Road. It proposed that the remaining parishes of

Wold Parishes ward should be included in a ward represented by two councillors. It stated that these two wards would divide the more rural parishes in the south from the parishes which contain “dormer villages” in the north of the existing ward.

103 Under the Labour Group’s proposals Immingham ward would provide the same levels of electoral equality as under the Council’s proposals. North Wold ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 19 per cent below the district average (13 per cent by 2005) and Wold Parishes ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent above the district average (equal to the district average by 2005).

104 North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party put forward proposals for Wold Parishes ward similar to those of the Labour Group, although the Labour Party proposed that Beelsby parish should be included in a ward with the southern parishes rather than the northern parishes as proposed by the Labour Group.

105 The Liberal Democrat Group supported the Council’s proposal to retain the existing arrangements of Immingham ward. It proposed dividing the existing Wold Parishes ward into two two-member wards. It put forward a ward containing the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Brigsley and Waltham to be called Waltham ward. The remainder of the existing Wold Parishes ward would comprise a new Wolds ward.

106 Under the Liberal Democrat Group’s proposals for a 43-member council size, Immingham and Waltham wards would have councillor:elector ratios 8 per cent and 5 per cent above the district average respectively (5 per cent and 2 per cent by 2005), Wolds ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 14 per cent below the district average (7 per cent by 2005). The electoral variances would be lower in the proposed wards of Immingham and Waltham under a 42-member scheme, both now and in 2005, but higher in the proposed Wolds ward.

107 The parish councils of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Irby-upon-Humber and Waltham stated that the boundaries of Wold Parishes ward should remain unchanged and that the ward should return four councillors, an increase of one. Healing Parish Council and the North East Lincolnshire Alliance of Parish Councils also proposed that Wold Parishes ward should be represented by four councillors, but indicated that they would accept the inclusion of Great Coates village in Wold Parishes ward, although there should be no other alterations to the ward boundaries. Laceby Parish Council proposed dividing Wold Parishes ward into two two-member wards, stating that it “would like to see Laceby along with several other small parishes continue [in a] Wold Parish ward”. Immingham Town Council stated that the ward of Immingham should retain its existing electoral arrangements as they currently provide a high level of electoral equality. Habrough Parish Council stated that they had no comments to make as they understood the electoral arrangements of Immingham ward would not be changed.

108 A resident of Cleethorpes stated that “due to under-representation in Wold Parishes [ward] there should be two two-member wards created”. A resident of Habrough stated that she opposed the Conservative Group’s proposal to include the parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough in a Wold Parishes ward, stating that the existing arrangements should be retained.

109 Having carefully considered all representations received we propose retaining the existing arrangements for Immingham ward, as put forward in all submissions with the exception of the Conservative groups. The Conservative groups' proposals would provide very high levels of electoral inequality while creating a 'detached ward', made up of two geographically separate areas, with Habrough parish being isolated from the other parishes in the proposed Wold Parishes ward. The Commission will not normally recommend detached wards to the Secretary of State as they lend themselves to the creation of electoral areas which can lack community identity. In light of the strength of local support for retaining the existing electoral arrangements of Immingham ward and the good levels of electoral equality which exists now and in 2005 we are recommending no change in Immingham ward.

110 Having decided to retain the village of Great Coates in Freshney ward as stated earlier in the chapter. We have noted that the existing Wold Parishes ward is entitled to four councillors; however, the Commission believes that wards with a number of councillors in excess of three could result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate. We have therefore concluded that the electors of Wold Parishes ward would best be represented by two two-member wards covering the existing ward, as proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group, Laceby Parish Council and a resident of Cleethorpes. We have based our recommendations on the Liberal Democrat's proposal. However, we propose including Barnoldby-le-Beck parish in the proposed Wolds ward rather than Waltham ward. This modification provides higher levels of electoral equality in both Waltham and Wolds wards.

111 Under our proposals Immingham ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent above the district average (3 per cent by 2005). The wards of Waltham and Wolds would have councillor:elector ratios 2 per cent and 12 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent and 5 per cent by 2005). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

## **Electoral Cycle**

112 We received six representations regarding the Council's electoral cycle. The Council itself proposed that elections should be held by thirds as opposed to the current system of whole council elections. It stated that this would enable "the electorate to participate in the democratic process on a more regular basis". It also stated that this would make councillors more accountable to the public whilst ensuring stability and minimum "disruption to council policy". This proposal was supported by North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group, North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party, Cleethorpes Conservative Association, Great Grimsby Conservative Association and Scartho Preservation Society. During Stage One we have received no representations proposing the retention of whole council elections.

113 We have considered carefully all representations received during Stage One. At present, there appears to be a majority view that the electoral cycle of North East Lincolnshire Council should be changed and we therefore propose the introduction of elections by thirds. We welcome further comments on the electoral cycle during Stage Three.

## Conclusions

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

- a council of 42 members should be retained;
- there should be 15 wards;
- the boundaries of 12 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one ward;
- elections should be held by thirds as opposed to the current system of whole council elections.

115 Our draft recommendations would involve modifications to all but two of the existing wards in North East Lincolnshire district, as summarised below:

- in Freshney ward we propose adopting the Liberal Democrat's proposal to retain the village of Great Coates within the existing ward;
- we propose that the Council's recommendations should be adopted for Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston, Immingham, Marsh and Park (Cleethorpes) wards. We are broadly endorsing the Council's proposal for Scartho ward with one minor modification;
- in the wards of Heneage, North East, South and Yarborough we propose broadly endorsing North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group's proposals, with minor modifications to improve electoral equality and provide strong, clear boundaries;
- we propose modifications to the wards of Park (Great Grimsby) and Wold Parishes, to facilitate electoral equality.

116 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  | 42                   | 42                    | 42                       | 42                    |
| Number of wards  | 14                   | 15                    | 14                       | 15                    |
| Average number of electors per councillor                              | 2,829                | 2,829                 | 2,844                    | 2,844                 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 6                    | 2                     | 7                        | 0                     |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 2                    | 0                     | 3                        | 0                     |

117 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for North East Lincolnshire Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from six to two. By 2005 no ward is forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

**Draft Recommendation**

North East Lincolnshire Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 15 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover. The Council should hold elections by thirds.

**118 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for North East Lincolnshire and welcome comments from the Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. 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 North East Lincolnshire*

## 5 NEXT STEPS

119 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 Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

120 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
North East Lincolnshire 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](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

121 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

### North East Lincolnshire Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

*Figure A1: North East Lincolnshire Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

| Ward name  | Constituent areas   |
|------------|---|
| Freshney   | Freshney ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| Heneage    | <i>Unchanged</i>  |
| New Clew   | Marsh ward (part); North East ward  |
| Park       | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward (part); South ward (part)  |
| South      | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)   |
| Waltham    | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Brigsley, East Ravendale, Hawerby-cum-Beesby, Waltham, West Ravendale and Wold Newton) |
| Wolds      | Freshney ward (part); Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Aylesby, Beelsby, Bradley, Hatcliffe, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby)                          |
| Yarborough | South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)   |

*Figure A2: North East Lincolnshire 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 % |
|------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Freshney   | 3                     | 8,680             | 2,893                             | 2                       | 8,499             | 2,833                             | 0                       |
| Heneage    | 3                     | 8,421             | 2,807                             | -1                      | 8,316             | 2,772                             | -3                      |
| New Clew   | 3                     | 8,441             | 2,814                             | -1                      | 8,130             | 2,710                             | -5                      |
| Park       | 3                     | 8,307             | 2,769                             | -2                      | 8,083             | 2,694                             | -5                      |
| South      | 3                     | 8,250             | 2,750                             | -3                      | 8,265             | 2,755                             | -3                      |
| Waltham    | 2                     | 5,972             | 2,986                             | 6                       | 5,859             | 2,930                             | 3                       |
| Wolds      | 2                     | 5,460             | 2,730                             | -3                      | 6,002             | 3,001                             | 6                       |
| Yarborough | 3                     | 8,820             | 2,940                             | 4                       | 8,631             | 2,877                             | 1                       |

*Source: Electorate figures are based on North East Lincolnshire 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.*

## North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group’s Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Conservative Group. In its *Option A* proposals 11 wards were different and in its *Option B* proposals 10 wards were different. The Conservatives proposals were as follows:

*Figure A3: North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group’s Option A Proposal: Constituent Areas*

| Ward name  | Constituent areas  |
|------------|--|
| Alexandra  | Marsh ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| Freshney   | Freshney ward (part)   |
| Heneage    | <i>Unchanged</i>   |
| Immingham  | Immingham ward (part – Immingham parish)   |
| New Clee   | Marsh ward (part); North East ward   |
| Park       | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part)  |
| Scartho    | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward   |
| South      | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part)  |
| Waltham    | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Brigsley, East Ravendale, Hawerby-cum-Beesby, Waltham, West Ravendale and Wold Newton)  |
| Wolds      | Freshney ward (part); Immingham ward (part – the parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough); Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Aylesby, Beelsby, Bradley, Hatcliffe, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby) |
| Yarborough | South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |

*Figure A4: North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group's Option A Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

| <b>Ward name</b> | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (2000)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> | <b>Electorate (2005)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Alexandra        | 3                            | 8,346                    | 2,782                                    | -2                             | 8,153                    | 2,718                                    | -4                             |
| Freshney         | 2                            | 6,785                    | 3,393                                    | 20                             | 6,760                    | 3,380                                    | 19                             |
| Heneage          | 3                            | 8,421                    | 2,807                                    | -1                             | 8,316                    | 2,772                                    | -3                             |
| Immingham        | 2                            | 7,454                    | 3,727                                    | 32                             | 7,326                    | 3,663                                    | 29                             |
| New Clee         | 3                            | 8,441                    | 2,814                                    | -1                             | 8,130                    | 2,710                                    | -5                             |
| Park             | 3                            | 8,225                    | 2,742                                    | -3                             | 7,957                    | 2,652                                    | -7                             |
| Scartho          | 3                            | 7,946                    | 2,649                                    | -6                             | 9,602                    | 3,201                                    | 13                             |
| South            | 3                            | 7,160                    | 2,387                                    | -16                            | 7,255                    | 2,418                                    | -15                            |
| Waltham          | 2                            | 5,972                    | 2,986                                    | 6                              | 5,859                    | 2,930                                    | 3                              |
| Wolds            | 3                            | 7,064                    | 2,355                                    | -17                            | 7,454                    | 2,485                                    | -13                            |
| Yarborough       | 3                            | 8,431                    | 2,810                                    | -1                             | 8,245                    | 2,748                                    | -3                             |

*Source: Electorate figures are based on North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group'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.*

Figure A5: North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group's Option B Proposal: Constituent Areas

| <b>Ward name</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>   |
|------------------|--|
| Alexandra        | Marsh ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| Heneage          | <i>Unchanged</i>   |
| Immingham        | Immingham ward (part – Immingham parish)   |
| New Clee         | Marsh ward (part); North East ward   |
| Park             | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part)  |
| Scartho          | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward   |
| South            | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part)  |
| Waltham          | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Brigsley, East Ravendale, Hawerby-cum-Beesby, Waltham, West Ravendale and Wold Newton)                        |
| Wolds            | Immingham ward (part – the parishes of Habrough and Stallingborough); Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Aylesby, Beelsby, Bradley, Hatcliffe, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby) |
| Yarborough       | South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |

*Figure A6: North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group's Option B Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

| <b>Ward name</b> | <b>Number of councillors</b> | <b>Electorate (2000)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> | <b>Electorate (2005)</b> | <b>Number of electors per councillor</b> | <b>Variance from average %</b> |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Alexandra        | 3                            | 8,346                    | 2,782                                    | -2                             | 8,153                    | 2,718                                    | -4                             |
| Heneage          | 3                            | 8,421                    | 2,807                                    | -1                             | 8,316                    | 2,772                                    | -3                             |
| Immingham        | 2                            | 7,454                    | 3,727                                    | 32                             | 7,326                    | 3,663                                    | 29                             |
| New Clee         | 3                            | 8,441                    | 2,814                                    | -1                             | 8,130                    | 2,710                                    | -5                             |
| Park             | 3                            | 8,225                    | 2,742                                    | -3                             | 7,957                    | 2,652                                    | -7                             |
| Scartho          | 3                            | 7,946                    | 2,649                                    | -6                             | 9,602                    | 3,201                                    | 13                             |
| South            | 3                            | 7,160                    | 2,387                                    | -16                            | 7,255                    | 2,418                                    | -15                            |
| Waltham          | 2                            | 5,972                    | 2,986                                    | 6                              | 5,859                    | 2,930                                    | 3                              |
| Wolds            | 2                            | 6,058                    | 3,029                                    | 7                              | 6,448                    | 3,224                                    | 13                             |
| Yarborough       | 3                            | 8,431                    | 2,810                                    | -1                             | 8,245                    | 2,748                                    | -3                             |

*Source: Electorate figures are based on North East Lincolnshire Council Conservative Group'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.*

## North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Labour Group in 13 wards, where the Labour Group's proposals were as follows:

*Figure A7: North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

| <b>Ward name</b> | <b>Constituent areas</b>   |
|------------------|--|
| Croft Baker      | Croft Baker ward (part); Haverstoe ward (part)   |
| Freshney         | Freshney ward (part); Marsh ward (part)  |
| Haverstoe        | Haverstoe ward (part); Humberston ward (part)  |
| Heneage          | Heneage ward (part); North East ward (part)  |
| New Clew         | Marsh ward (part); North East ward (part)  |
| North Wold       | Freshney ward (part); Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Aylesby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Beelsby, Bradley, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby); Yarborough ward (part) |
| Park             | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward (part)  |
| Scartho          | Scartho ward (part)  |
| Sidney Sussex    | Croft Baker ward (part); Park (Cleethorpes) ward   |
| South            | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| St James         | Marsh ward (part); Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| Waltham          | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Brigsley, East Ravendale, Hatcliffe, Hawerby-cum-Beesby, Waltham, West Ravendale and Wold Newton)                |
| Yarborough       | Yarborough ward (part)   |

Figure A8: North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group'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 % |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Croft Baker   | 3                     | 9,156             | 3,052                             | 8                       | 8,940             | 2,980                             | 5                       |
| Freshney      | 3                     | 8,884             | 2,961                             | 5                       | 8,667             | 2,889                             | 2                       |
| Haverstoe     | 3                     | 8,487             | 2,829                             | 0                       | 8,570             | 2,857                             | 0                       |
| Heneage       | 3                     | 8,477             | 2,826                             | 0                       | 8,366             | 2,789                             | -2                      |
| New Clee      | 3                     | 8,377             | 2,792                             | -1                      | 8,086             | 2,695                             | -5                      |
| North Wold    | 3                     | 6,896             | 2,299                             | -19                     | 7,429             | 2,476                             | -13                     |
| Park          | 2                     | 6,227             | 3,114                             | 10                      | 6,091             | 3,046                             | 7                       |
| Scartho       | 3                     | 7,182             | 2,394                             | -15                     | 8,854             | 2,951                             | 4                       |
| Sidney Sussex | 3                     | 8,824             | 2,941                             | 4                       | 8,629             | 2,876                             | 1                       |
| South         | 3                     | 8,921             | 2,974                             | 5                       | 8,920             | 2,973                             | 5                       |
| St James      | 2                     | 5,728             | 2,864                             | 1                       | 5,564             | 2,782                             | -2                      |
| Waltham       | 2                     | 5,822             | 2,911                             | 3                       | 5,712             | 2,856                             | 0                       |
| Yarborough    | 3                     | 8,788             | 2,929                             | 4                       | 8,590             | 2,863                             | 1                       |

Source: Electorate figures are based on North East Lincolnshire Council Labour Group'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.

The above figures were taken from the Labour Group's submission. However, in some wards there was a discrepancy between the above figures and the areas outlined in its textual descriptions and illustrated on the mapping provided.

## North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Labour Party in 13 wards, where the Labour Party's proposals were as follows:

*Figure A9: North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

| <b>Ward name</b>           | <b>Constituent areas</b>   |
|----------------------------|--|
| Croft Baker                | Croft Baker ward (part); Haverstoe ward (part)   |
| Freshney                   | Freshney ward (part); Marsh ward (part)  |
| Haverstoe                  | Haverstoe ward (part); Humberston ward (part)  |
| Heneage                    | <i>Unchanged</i>   |
| Marsh                      | Marsh ward (part); Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| North East                 | Marsh ward (part); North East ward   |
| Park (Cleethorpes)         | Croft Baker ward (part); Park (Cleethorpes) ward   |
| Park (Great Grimsby)       | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward (part)  |
| Scartho                    | Scartho ward (part)  |
| South                      | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)  |
| Wold Parishes (North ward) | Freshney ward (part); Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Aylesby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Bradley, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber and Laceby); Yarborough ward (part)    |
| Wolds Parishes             | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Beelsby, Brigsley, East Ravendale, Hatcliffe, Hawerby-cum-Beesby, Waltham, West Ravendale and Wold Newton) |
| Yarborough                 | Yarborough ward (part)   |

Figure A10: North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party'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 % |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Croft Baker                | 3                     | 8,663             | 2,888                             | 2                       | 8,454             | 2,818                             | -1                      |
| Freshney                   | 3                     | 8,884             | 2,961                             | 5                       | 8,667             | 2,889                             | 1                       |
| Haverstoe                  | 3                     | 8,988             | 2,996                             | 6                       | 9,037             | 3,012                             | 5                       |
| Heneage                    | 3                     | 8,421             | 2,807                             | -1                      | 8,316             | 2,772                             | -3                      |
| Marsh                      | 2                     | 5,963             | 2,982                             | 5                       | 5,878             | 2,939                             | 3                       |
| North East                 | 3                     | 8,524             | 2,841                             | 0                       | 8,215             | 2,738                             | -4                      |
| Park (Cleethorpes)         | 3                     | 8,816             | 2,939                             | 4                       | 8,628             | 2,876                             | 1                       |
| Park (Great Grimsby)       | 2                     | 6,625             | 3,313                             | 17                      | 6,314             | 3,157                             | 10                      |
| Scartho                    | 3                     | 7,182             | 2,394                             | -15                     | 9,454             | 3,151                             | 10                      |
| South                      | 3                     | 8,923             | 2,974                             | 5                       | 8,957             | 2,986                             | 4                       |
| Wold Parishes (North ward) | 3                     | 6,852             | 2,284                             | -19                     | 7,381             | 2,460                             | -14                     |
| Wolds Parishes             | 2                     | 5,919             | 2,960                             | 5                       | 5,807             | 2,904                             | 2                       |
| Yarborough                 | 3                     | 8,007             | 2,669                             | -6                      | 7,899             | 2,633                             | -8                      |

Source: Electorate figures are based on North East Lincolnshire Local Government Labour Party'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.

## Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

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

*Figure A11: Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors' Proposal: Constituent Areas*

| Ward name  | Constituent areas   |
|------------|---|
| Alexandra  | Marsh ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)   |
| Heneage    | <i>Unchanged</i>  |
| New Clee   | Marsh ward (part); North East ward  |
| Park       | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); South ward (part)   |
| South      | Park (Great Grimsby) ward (part); Scartho ward (part); South ward (part)  |
| Waltham    | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Ashby-cum-Fenby, Barnoldby-le-Beck, Brigsley and Waltham)  |
| Wolds      | Wold Parishes ward (part – the parishes of Aylesby, Beelsby, Bradley, East Ravendale, Hatcliffe, Hawerby-cum-Beesby, Healing, Irby-upon-Humber, Laceby, West Ravendale and Wold Newton) |
| Yarborough | South ward (part); Yarborough ward (part)   |

*Figure A12: Liberal Democrat Group of North East Lincolnshire Councillors' 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                     | 8,346             | 2,782                             | 1                       | 8,153             | 2,718                             | -2                      |
| Heneage    | 3                     | 8,421             | 2,807                             | 2                       | 8,316             | 2,772                             | 0                       |
| New Clee   | 3                     | 8,441             | 2,814                             | 2                       | 8,130             | 2,710                             | -2                      |
| Park       | 3                     | 8,225             | 2,742                             | -1                      | 8,021             | 2,674                             | -4                      |
| South      | 3                     | 7,924             | 2,641                             | -4                      | 7,939             | 2,646                             | -5                      |
| Waltham    | 2                     | 5,788             | 2,894                             | 5                       | 5,680             | 2,840                             | 2                       |
| Wolds      | 2                     | 4,753             | 2,377                             | -14                     | 5,175             | 2,588                             | -7                      |
| Yarborough | 3                     | 8,431             | 2,810                             | 2                       | 8,245             | 2,748                             | -1                      |

*Source: Electorate figures are based on Liberal Democrat Group'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.*

## 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 Wear<sup>1</sup>. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

