

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Kingston upon Hull

Report to the Secretary of State for the
Environment, Transport and the Regions

May 2001

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

This report sets out the Commission's final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Kingston upon Hull.

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)

© Crown Copyright 2001

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.

Report no.: 220

CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>3</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>7</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>9</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>35</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Kingston upon Hull (December 2000)	<i>37</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>39</i>

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



Local Government Commission for England

16 May 2001

Dear Secretary of State

On 16 May 2000 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Kingston upon Hull under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in December 2000 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although some modifications have been made (see paragraph 107) in the light of further evidence. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Kingston upon Hull.

We recommend that Kingston upon Hull City Council should be served by 59 councillors representing 23 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

The Local Government Act 2000 contains provisions relating to changes to local authority electoral arrangements. However, until such time as Orders are made implementing those arrangements we are obliged to conduct our work in accordance with current legislation, and to continue our current approach to periodic electoral reviews.

I would like to thank members and officers of the City Council and other local people who have contributed to the review. Their co-operation and assistance have been very much appreciated by Commissioners and staff.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Malcolm Grant'.

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT
Chairman

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Kingston upon Hull on 16 May 2000. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 12 December 2000, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Secretary of State.**

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

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

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 107-108) are that:

- **Kingston upon Hull Council should have 59 councillors, one fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 23 wards, instead of 20 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified and no wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In 22 of the proposed 23 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the city average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, 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.**

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an Order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 26 June 2001:

**The Secretary of State
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Local Government Sponsorship Division
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU**

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

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

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

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

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Avenue	3	10,062	3,354	6	9,747	3,249	3
2 Beverley	2	6,893	3,447	9	6,662	3,331	5
3 Boothferry	3	9,699	3,233	2	9,594	3,198	1
4 Bransholme East	2	6,392	3,196	1	6,384	3,192	1
5 Bransholme West	2	6,551	3,276	4	6,331	3,166	0
6 Bricknell	2	6,354	3,173	0	6,226	3,113	-2
7 Derringham	3	9,143	3,048	-4	8,853	2,951	-7
8 Drypool	3	9,861	3,287	4	9,994	3,331	5
9 Holderness	3	9,878	3,293	4	9,566	3,189	1
10 Ings	3	9,685	3,228	2	9,381	3,127	-1
11 Kings Park	2	3,942	1,971	-38	6,346	3,173	0
12 Longhill	3	9,238	3,079	-3	9,154	3,051	-3
13 Marfleet	3	9,338	3,113	-2	9,433	3,144	-1
14 Myton	3	9,855	3,285	4	9,932	3,311	5
15 Newington	3	9,016	3,005	-5	9,500	3,167	0
16 Newland	2	6,668	3,334	5	6,506	3,253	3
17 Orchard Park	3	9,571	3,190	1	9,249	3,083	-2
18 Pickering	3	8,854	2,951	-7	8,985	2,995	-5
19 St Andrew's	2	6,171	3,086	-2	5,990	2,995	-5
20 Southcoates East	2	6,060	3,030	-4	6,088	3,044	-4
21 Southcoates West	2	6,226	3,113	-2	6,065	3,033	-4
22 Sutton	3	10,445	3,482	10	10,131	3,377	7
23 University	2	6,621	3,311	5	6,408	3,204	1
Totals	59	186,514	-	-	186,525	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,161	-	-	3,161	-

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The total electorate figures in 2005 differ marginally from Figure 3; however, we consider that this has a negligible effect on electoral variances.

1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This was our first review of the electoral arrangements of Kingston upon Hull. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1979 (Report No. 318). The electoral arrangements of the new unitary authority, which came into existence on 1 April 1996, were put into place as part of the Structural Change Order which abolished the county of Humberside and its County Council.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we have had 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.

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

5 We have also had regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000), which 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, so far as practicable, 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 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half the county council would be elected, and so on. In unitary authorities the White Paper proposed elections by thirds. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas and three-member wards in unitary authority areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral wards in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. 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 Orders under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation and our current *Guidance*.

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

11 Stage Three began on 12 December 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Kingston upon Hull*, and ended on 19 February 2001. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

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

13 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 city average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

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

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

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

Map 1: Existing Wards in Kingston upon Hull

Figure 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Avenue	3	9,342	3,114	0	9,047	3,016	-3
2 Beverley	3	10,193	3,398	9	9,913	3,304	6
3 Boothferry	3	9,768	3,256	5	9,661	3,220	4
4 Derringham	3	10,221	3,407	10	9,895	3,298	6
5 Drypool	3	11,587	3,862	24	11,662	3,887	25
6 Holderness	3	9,673	3,224	4	9,557	3,186	2
7 Ings	3	9,100	3,033	-2	8,796	2,932	-6
8 Longhill	3	8,251	2,750	-12	8,141	2,714	-13
9 Marfleet	3	7,756	2,585	-17	7,859	2,620	-16
10 Myton	3	8,875	2,958	-5	8,989	2,996	-4
11 Newington	3	9,034	3,011	-3	9,517	3,172	2
12 Newland	3	8,782	2,927	-6	8,581	2,860	-8
13 Noddle Hill	3	8,326	2,775	-11	8,253	2,751	-12
14 Orchard Park	3	8,861	2,954	-5	8,573	2,858	-8
15 Pickering	3	7,707	2,529	-17	7,876	2,625	-16
16 St Andrew's	3	7,853	2,618	-16	7,616	2,539	-18
17 Stoneferry	3	11,208	3,736	20	13,368	4,456	43
18 Southcoates	3	9,201	3,067	-1	8,947	2,982	-4
19 Sutton	3	12,514	4,171	34	12,285	4,095	31
20 University	3	8,262	2,754	-11	7,984	2,661	-14
Totals	60	186,514	-	-	186,520	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,109	-	-	3,109	-

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

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

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

17 During Stage One we received eleven representations, including city-wide schemes from the City Council and two local residents, and representations from St Andrew's Ward Labour Party, Hull West and Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats and six local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Kingston upon Hull*.

18 Our draft recommendations were based on the City Council's proposals for the south-west of the city, which achieved good electoral equality and reflected community interests. In other parts of the city, we drew upon the proposals of W Harris, as these secured warding arrangements which provided the correct allocation of councillors across the city. However, we moved away from both of these schemes in a number of areas, using our own proposals where none of the locally generated schemes provided, in our opinion, the best solution currently available. We proposed that:

- Kingston upon Hull City Council should be served by 59 councillors, compared with the current 60, representing 22 wards, two more than at present;
- the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified.
- elections should continue to take place by thirds.

Draft Recommendation

Kingston upon Hull City Council should comprise 59 councillors, serving 22 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

19 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 21 of the 22 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the city. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2005.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

20 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, 51 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available on request from the Commission. All representations may be inspected at the offices of Kingston upon Hull City Council and the Commission.

Kingston upon Hull City Council

21 At Stage Three the City Council generally supported the draft recommendations, but proposed major amendments in three areas of the city. It proposed changes to the boundaries of Newland, Orchard Park and University wards which would involve making Cottingham Road the whole boundary between Newland ward and University ward. It proposed two new wards of Southcoates East and Southcoates West, which would enable the whole of the Preston Road Estate, the subject of a New Deal for Communities initiative, to be kept in one ward. The City Council also proposed two Bransholme wards, Bransholme East and Bransholme West, so keeping most of the Bransholme estate in two wards. It was argued that this would better reflect community identity than the draft recommendations which would also severely prejudice future funding from Central Government and the European Union. The City Council also found five minor anomalies in the draft recommendations, which are dealt with elsewhere in this report. The City Council's amendments would lead to a 60-member council.

Local Political Groups

22 Hull Independent Labour Group put forward amendments to the boundaries of Beverley North, Orchard Park and University wards, which would include transferring part of University ward to Orchard Park ward, and part of Orchard Park ward to Beverley North ward. West Hull and Hessle Conservative Association supported the proposals for the west of the city but favoured whole-council elections every four years. East Hull Conservative Association opposed the proposal for part of Noddle Hill ward to be transferred to Sutton ward, on the grounds of community identity, and the proposal for the Tweendykes area of Sutton ward to be transferred to Holderness ward, on the grounds that it defied all natural boundaries and historic ties. Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association preferred all wards have three members and the council size to remain at 60. While having no objections to the western wards, it had concerns over some of the northern and eastern wards. For community identity purposes it considered that Kingswood and Sutton Park form a cohesive unit, as do Bransholme North and South, while Sutton village and environs form another.

23 Hull West and Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations as they affect the constituency, but proposed that the name of Boothferry ward be changed to East Ella ward, as the Boothferry estates would be in Pickering ward and the new Boothferry ward would comprise part of the old Humberside County Council division of East Ella. Hull North Liberal Democrats suggested renaming two wards - Haworth for Beverley North and Bricknell for Newland ward, the latter on the grounds of community interests.

Members of Parliament

24 Kevin McNamara, MP for Kingston upon Hull North, objected to the proposal for Newland ward in that some houses in Newland Park had been put in a different ward from the rest of the houses and that a part of University ward had been transferred to Newland ward. His main objection concerned the horizontal division of Stoneferry and Noddle Hill wards and the consequent breaking up of the Bransholme estate which “would have severe repercussions on the allocation of Government funds to the Noddle Hill ward - one of the areas of greatest deprivation in the country”.

Other Representations

25 Representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from four councillors and three local organisations. Councillors Neilson and Woodford, members for Noddle Hill ward, were opposed to the proposals as they affected the Bransholme estate because they considered them to be against the interests of its residents and community groups. Councillor Fareham, member for Newland ward, supported the proposals generally but was opposed to elections by thirds and to part of Newland ward being transferred to University ward. This last point was also expressed by Councillor Percy, member for Newland ward, who was opposed to the draft recommendations as he felt they “seriously compromise local communities such as the Hessle Road community and communities in the east of the city”. He supported the creation of Sculcoates ward, but not the name.

26 Bransholme Community Groups Forum was opposed to the proposals for the Bransholme estate, believing they would “divide and sub-divide the new spirit that is emerging on Bransholme”. Seven residents also expressed concern over the proposals for the area. The Garths Residents’ Association was opposed to the proposals for Bransholme as they would divide the Garths area, recipient of a large regeneration grant, into two and make the association’s work more difficult. Acorn Residents’ Association organised the sending of 82 pro-forma letters which opposed the proposal to move part of the North Hull Estate from University ward to Orchard Park ward. Opposition was also expressed by 13 other respondents. Concerns were expressed that this would lead to loss of community identity, loss of relationships with councillors, an increase in insurance premiums, a decrease in house prices, changes to school catchment areas and a rise in the crime rate.

27 A further 16 representations were received from residents. Eight concerned the proposals for Newland ward. While some supported the proposals in general, opposition was expressed to some of the Newland Park properties being placed in Sculcoates ward and to part of Newland ward being transferred to University ward. Two residents suggested a small change to the boundary between Drypool and Marfleet wards to continue along the footpath to the river and so include the whole of the Victoria Dock estate in Drypool ward. Five residents were opposed to the proposed wards of North Southcoates and South Southcoates, and suggested that the Preston Road estate should form one ward. Two residents supported the proposals for Longhill ward, while one was opposed to the proposals for Newington ward, requesting that part of the proposed St. Andrew’s ward, which is in Newington, should be in Newington ward. He submitted alternative proposals.

28 A number of residents suggested name changes for some wards: Avenue ward (Avenues), Beverley North ward (Beverley or Haworth), Sculcoates ward (Newland), Newland ward (Bricknell), Boothferry ward (Calvert), Bransholme ward (Fordyke), Orchard Park ward (Greenwood, Coldharbour or Ophne) and Kingswood and Sutton Park area (Kings Park ward). One resident supported annual elections. Another resident was concerned that we had not looked at the boundary between Hull and East Riding, but it is not within the Commission's remit to make any recommendations with regard to local authorities' external boundaries as part of this review.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

30 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 ensuing five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

31 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.

32 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, such an objective 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 absolute electoral equality and only then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate Forecasts

33 At Stage One the City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting negligible growth in the electorate of just six electors from 186,514 to 186,520 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. There were, however, expected to be areas of growth and the council expected most of this to be in the north-eastern part of the city. The Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries had been obtained. In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given careful consideration to the forecast electorates, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

34 We received no comments on the Council’s electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates presently available.

Council Size

35 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

36 Kingston upon Hull City Council is at present served by 60 councillors. At Stage One the City Council proposed retaining the present council size of 60 members. We also received two city-wide proposals based on a 60-member council.

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

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

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

40 During Stage Three the City Council proposed amendments to the draft recommendations which would necessitate a council size of 60. Given the reasons for recommending a council size of 59 in the draft recommendations, as stated in paragraph 37 above, and the fact that we are of the opinion that the City Council's amendments could be reflected adequately in a 59-member scheme, we are confirming our draft recommendation for a council of 59 members as final.

Electoral Arrangements

41 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the city-wide scheme from the City Council and those from Mr D Harris and Mr W Harris. From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our draft recommendations.

42 In looking at the representation across the two parts of the city, we found that the correct allocation for the west of the River Hull would be 31 councillors and in east Hull it would be 28

councillors, given the relative electorate sizes, which would lead to a council size of 59 and provide for a pattern of two and three-member wards rather than a uniform pattern of three-member wards. Given that we received proposals for both 60 and 59-member councils, we found that the ward pattern and individual boundaries proposed differed significantly between the schemes throughout the city. Furthermore, we did not consider that any one scheme proposed ward boundaries which would best meet the objectives of the review. Therefore, having carefully considered all the submissions received, we proposed adopting a mixture of the proposed ward boundaries from the City Council, W Harris and proposals of our own where we found that they provided the best balance between providing improvements in electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria. Additionally, in a number of areas our proposals bore a broad similarity to those of D Harris.

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

44 At Stage Three the City Council was pleased that most of its original proposals had been adopted by the Commission. However, it proposed amendments in three parts of the city - the Orchard Park ward and University ward area, the Bransholme and Kingswood area and the Preston Road/Holderness Road area. Hull Independent Labour Group put forward alternative proposals for the boundaries of Orchard Park, University and Beverley North wards, Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association gave alternative proposals for some northern and eastern wards and two residents put forward their own proposals. Mr D Harris submitted alternative proposals for Newington ward.

45 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

West Hull

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

East Hull

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

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

West Hull

Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards

47 These four three-member wards are situated in the south-western part of the city. The number of electors per councillor is 5 per cent above the average in Boothferry ward (4 per cent above in 2005), 10 per cent above the average in Derringham ward (6 per cent above in 2005), 3 per cent below the average in Newington ward (2 per cent above in 2005) and 17 per cent below the average in Pickering ward (16 per cent below in 2005).

48 At Stage One the City Council proposed that all four wards should be represented by three councillors and that each should be subject to minor boundary alterations. It proposed that the boundary between Boothferry and Derringham wards should be changed, arguing that this would achieve better electoral equality in both wards and unite areas with community ties. The City Council proposed a further change which would include parts of Boothferry ward in Pickering ward. It stated that the proposed Pickering ward would “unite a Council estate within this three-member ward, and give a better electoral balance within this part of the city”. It also proposed that Newington ward remain unchanged apart from a small area in the east of the ward which would be transferred to Myton ward. Under the Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor in Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards would be 4 per cent above, 2 per below, 3 per below and 5 per cent below the city average respectively (3 per cent above, 5 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 4 per cent below the average in 2005).

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

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

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

52 Having carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, we decided to adopt the Council's proposals without amendment in this area of the city as part of our draft recommendations. We noted the proposals from Mr D Harris and Mr W Harris and, while we considered there was some merit in both these schemes, we considered that the Council's proposals would best reflect community ties and provide significant improvements in electoral equality. We also noted the Liberal Democrats' proposals for alternative names for the Council's proposed East Ella and Derringham wards, but we did not feel that they provided sufficient evidence of local support for the proposed name changes. The number of electors per councillor in the proposed Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards would be 2 per cent above, 3 per cent below, 5 per cent below and 7 per cent below the city average respectively (1 per cent above, 7 per cent below, equal to and 5 per cent below in 2005).

53 At Stage Three the City Council generally supported our draft recommendation for this area, but proposed one minor boundary change. It proposed that the boundary between Newington ward and Myton ward should follow the current Brough-Hull (Paragon) railway line to its junction with the Scarborough/Bridlington/Hull (Paragon) line, rather than using the avoiding line to the west. This would then place the whole of the area of the proposed new Community Sports Stadium into one ward. Mr D Harris proposed that the boundary of Newington ward should be altered to take in part of St Andrew's ward, which includes part of the old South Newington ward. Hull West and Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations as they affect the constituency, and proposed that the name of Boothferry ward be changed to East Ella ward, as the Boothferry estates would now be in Pickering ward and the new Boothferry ward would comprise part of the old Humberside County Council division of East Ella. A resident also suggested this, while another suggested that the ward be named Calvert ward.

54 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to generally endorse our draft recommendations for Boothferry, Derringham and Pickering wards. We are not convinced by the arguments for alternative ward names, and so have decided not to accept either amendment to change the name. Mr D Harris's proposal for changing the boundary of Newington ward was generally dealt with at Stage One and we remain of the opinion that the draft recommendations best reflect community ties and provide significant improvements in electoral equality. However, we have decided to modify the proposed boundary between Newington and Myton wards to follow the Brough/Hull and Scarborough/Bridlington/Hull railway lines to their junction as this has no effect on electoral equality and reflects the views of respondents.

55 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Boothferry, Derringham, Newington and Pickering wards would be 2 per cent above, 4 per cent below, 5 per cent below and 7 per cent below the city average respectively (1 per cent above, 7 per cent below, equal to and 5 per cent below in 2005). Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Avenue, Beverley, Myton and St Andrew's wards

56 These four three-member wards are also situated in the south-western part of the city. The number of electors per councillor is equal to the city average in Avenue ward (3 per cent below in 2005), 9 per cent above the average in Beverley ward (6 per cent above in 2005), 5 per cent

below the average in Myton ward (4 per cent below in 2005) and 16 per cent below the average in St Andrew's ward (18 per cent below in 2005).

57 At Stage One the City Council proposed a modified Avenue ward which would include part of Myton ward. It argued that this would unite all of Park Road in the proposed Avenue ward and stated that it was possible to do this because the former railway line at this juncture is a cycle/pedestrian walkway. It also proposed creating two new two-member wards of Beverley North, in the north of the existing Beverley ward, and Sculcoates, in the southern part of the existing Beverley ward, arguing that the area in the north of the ward is a distinct community that had always had very little in common with the section of the ward to the south of Cottingham Road. It also stated that its proposals for Sculcoates ward would ensure that the major inner ring road of Cottingham Road/Clough Road would be the northern boundary to this ward and create a new two-member ward containing a homogeneous community. The Council also proposed that the western boundary of Myton ward should be altered to follow a more natural western boundary along Rawlings Way. It also proposed altering the boundaries of St Andrew's ward. Under its proposals the number of electors per councillor in Avenue, Beverley North, Myton, St Andrew's and Sculcoates wards would be 8 per cent above, 4 per cent below, 6 per cent above, 1 per cent below and 7 per cent above the city average respectively (5 per cent above, 7 per cent below, 6 per cent above, 4 per cent below and 5 per cent below in 2005).

58 W Harris proposed retaining the existing boundaries for Avenue and Beverley wards, but renaming Beverley as Bankside ward. He also proposed creating a new ward called Brunswick, comprising the northern part of Myton ward, together with a new ward called Riverside, comprising the eastern part of St Andrew's ward and the southern part of Myton ward. Under his proposals the number of electors per councillor in Avenue ward, Bankside ward, Brunswick ward and Riverside ward would be equal to, 9 per cent below, 1 per cent above and 1 per cent above the average respectively (5 per cent below, 9 per cent below, 1 per cent below and 6 per cent below in 2005).

59 In his submission D Harris proposed retaining the existing boundaries of Avenue ward. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Beverley ward to include part of Drypool ward on the eastern side of the River Hull. He proposed creating a new ward which would include parts of St Andrew's ward, to be called Paragon ward, together with altering the boundaries of Myton ward to include part of Drypool ward, also on the eastern side of the River Hull. Under his proposals the number of electors per councillors in Avenue ward, Paragon ward and Myton ward would be equal to, 1 per cent above and 2 per cent below the average respectively (3 per cent below, 1 per cent below and 3 per cent above in 2005).

60 The St Andrew's Labour Ward Party proposed moving the boundary of St Andrew's ward eastwards to include part of Myton ward, arguing that this would unite the Thornton Street Estate in St Andrew's ward and fit in with the recommendations of the City Council Officers. It also proposed including part of Beverley ward in Myton ward, arguing that it would enable the majority of the ward to remain intact.

61 Having carefully considered the representations received we considered that the City Council's proposals would best reflect community ties while achieving a reasonable level of electoral equality. We noted the improvements to electoral equality under the proposals of both Mr D Harris and Mr W Harris, but did not consider that they provided a better reflection of the

statutory criteria as a whole. We also noted the concerns of St Andrew's Ward Labour Party and the local community in the Hessle area of the city and considered on balance that the City Council was right to include the Thornton Road Estate in its proposed Myton ward and that Rawlings Way was a more identifiable boundary for Myton ward. Additionally, in the case of the residents' concerns, it was not clear where they considered the boundaries of "the Hessle area" to be. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Avenue, Beverley North, Myton, St Andrew's and Sculcoates wards would be 6 per cent above, 6 per cent below, 4 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 6 per cent above the city average respectively (3 per cent above, 9 per cent below, 5 per cent above, 5 per cent below and 3 per cent above in 2005).

62 At Stage Three the City Council generally supported our proposals for this area, but proposed some minor changes. It pointed out that the proposed boundary between Sculcoates and Newland wards divided Newland Park, placing 25 houses in Sculcoates ward whereas the rest were in Newland ward. It proposed adopting the Council's original boundary along the perimeter of the Hull Grammar School field and the allotments. This was supported by Kevin McNamara MP and a number of residents. The City Council also proposed three minor changes to the northern boundary of Myton ward; namely that, on its borders with Avenue and Sculcoates wards, where it deviates twice from the former railway line, it should continue to follow the former railway line, and that the boundary around Pearson Primary School should be re-drawn to the west of the school, thus retaining it in Myton ward. Hull North Liberal Democrats suggested renaming Beverley North ward as Haworth ward after the Howarth Park area, and Sculcoates ward as Newland ward on the basis that the name Newland is associated with the Newland Avenue area which is in Sculcoates ward. Three residents also suggested this change, while one suggested that renaming Avenue ward as Avenues ward would more accurately describe the area it covers. Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association proposed changing the name of Beverley North ward to Beverley ward.

63 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received, and have noted the general support for the draft recommendations for these wards. However, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations and modify the boundary between Newland and Sculcoates wards to follow the perimeter of the Hull Grammar School field and the allotments. This would put the whole of Newland Park in the same ward. We are also adopting two of the City Council's proposals for amending the northern boundary of Myton ward - to follow the footpath along the former railway line instead of deviating along Temple Street and to go to the west of Pearson Primary School, as these have a negligible affect on electoral equality. However, we cannot revert to the existing boundary between Myton and Avenue wards at the junction of Princes Avenue and Spring Bank as there is no ground detail to which it can be tied. We are persuaded by the argument that the name Newland is associated with the Newland Avenue area and that it would be a more appropriate name for Sculcoates ward. However, there is no evidence that the suggested change of name for Avenue ward has local support and so we propose to make no change. With regard to the suggested name changes for Beverley ward, we are minded to retain the name Beverley as the northern part of the current ward is retained, but dispense with the suffix North as there is no Beverley South ward. We have also decided to include in Beverley ward polling district OP7 from Orchard Park ward. The arguments for this are detailed in paragraphs 70 and 73 of this report in the section dealing with Orchard Park and University wards.

64 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards, subject to the amendments described in the paragraph above. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent above the city average in Avenue ward (3 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent above in Beverley ward (5 per cent above in 2005), 4 per cent above in Myton ward (5 per cent above in 2005), 5 per cent above in Newland ward (3 per cent above in 2005) and 2 per cent below in St Andrew's ward (5 per cent below in 2005). Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Newland, Orchard Park and University wards

65 These three three-member wards are situated in the north-western part of the city. The number of electors per councillor is 6 per cent below the city average in Newland ward (8 per cent below in 2005), 5 per cent below in Orchard Park ward (8 per cent below in 2005) and 11 per cent below in University ward (14 per cent below in 2005).

66 At Stage One the City Council proposed transferring part of Newland ward to a new two-member Sculcoates ward. It argued that the ward would be very socially homogeneous. It also proposed that University ward should be a three-member ward stating that "the council believes that a vigorous electoral registration campaign could result in as many as over 1,000 student voters being placed on the register in this area." The council proposed no change to the boundary of Orchard Park ward. Under its proposals the number of electors per councillor in Newland, Orchard Park and University wards would be 2 per cent below, 5 per cent below and 11 per cent below the city average respectively (equal to the average, 8 per cent below and 14 per cent below in 2005).

67 W Harris and D Harris proposed similar arrangements in this part of the city. They proposed that the existing boundaries for two of the wards in the area should be altered while retaining the existing boundary for Newland ward. They proposed that the boundary of Orchard Park ward should be altered to include the part of University ward and that the boundary of University ward should be altered to include the south-west part of Beverley ward. The number of electors per councillor in their proposed Newland, Orchard Park and University wards would be 6 per cent below, 2 per cent above and 1 per cent below the city average respectively (10 per cent below, 2 per cent below and 4 per cent below in 2005).

68 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we proposed making boundary alterations to all three wards and reducing the number of councillors representing University ward to two. Under the Council's proposed council size of 60, University ward would have 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average in 2005. However, we had ascertained that, to achieve the correct allocation of councillors either side of the River Hull, there should be a council size of 59. Given that under a council size of 60, University ward would be substantially over-represented, it was decided it would be more appropriate to reduce its representation in order to ensure the correct allocation of councillors to West Hull. We were not convinced by the Council's assertion that a voter registration scheme taking place in this ward would substantially improve the numbers of registered students, given that we found no evidence of a campaign to support this statement in the material or the 2005 figures supplied by the Council. We therefore proposed reducing the representation in University ward from three to two councillors, together with proposing a number of boundary alterations transferring electors from University ward to the two neighbouring wards of Newland and Orchard Park in order to further

improve electoral equality while providing a good reflection of the statutory criteria. Specifically, we proposed that an area bounded by Inglemire Lane to the north, Hall Road to the east and the city boundary to the west should be transferred from University ward to Newland ward, and that an area bounded by Ellerburn Avenue to the east and Endike Lane to the south and an area bounded to the east by Hall Road and to the south by Inglemire Lane should be transferred from University ward to Orchard Park ward. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed two-member University ward, three-member Newland ward and three-member Orchard Park ward would be 7 per cent above, 8 per cent above and 4 per cent above the city average respectively (3 per cent above, 6 per cent above and 1 per cent above in 2005).

69 At Stage Three the City Council put forward proposals for alternative boundaries for the three wards. It proposed that what has come to be known as the “Newland finger” should remain in University ward rather than be transferred to Newland ward. The Council stated that Cottingham Road/Clough Road is a major community boundary, accepted for police beats, surgery practices and school catchment areas, and that there is a public perception that the community on one side of the road is different from that on the other. In order to deal with the subsequent electoral imbalance between Orchard Park ward and University ward, the City Council proposed transferring most of polling district UN1 and part of polling district UN5 from University ward to Orchard Park ward, which it proposed renaming Greenwood ward. The City Council claimed that the student registration scheme in University ward was beginning to bear fruit; however, it did not provide amended 2005 electorate forecasts to support this assertion. Its scheme assumed a council of 60 members, due to its amended proposals for East Hull. Under its proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the city average in Greenwood ward (4 per cent above in 2005), 2 per cent above in Newland ward (equal to the average in 2005) and 15 per cent above in University ward (10 per cent above in 2005).

70 Hull Independent Labour Group also proposed alterations to ward boundaries in this area. It proposed transferring polling district OP7 from Orchard Park ward to Beverley North ward on the grounds that it is separated from Orchard Park by a storm drain and sociologically has more in common with Beverley North ward. It put forward two options for amendments to the boundary between Orchard Park ward and University ward. The first would involve transferring the section of UN4 polling district west of Hall Road to Orchard Park ward, along with most of polling district UN1. The second option would include, in addition to these, transferring the northern and eastern parts of polling district UN5 to Orchard Park. Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association also proposed that the Beverley and Barmston Drain should be the division between Orchard Park ward and Beverley North ward in the interests of community identity.

71 There was opposition to the draft recommendation to transfer part of the North Hull Estate from University ward to Orchard Park ward from Acorn Residents’ Association, which organised the sending of 82 pro-forma letters, and also from 13 other residents. All correspondents expressed concern over the perceived results of this change in terms of higher insurance costs, lower house prices, loss of identity and link with councillors, changes to school catchment areas and higher crime rates. Opposition to the draft recommendation to transfer part of University ward to Newland ward was also expressed by Kevin McNamara MP, Councillors Fareham and Percy, members for Newland ward, and four residents. Two residents suggested that Newland ward should be called Bricknell ward as the main highway through the ward is Bricknell Avenue, and

another resident suggested that Orchard Park ward should be renamed either Greenwood, Coldharbour or Ophne ward.

72 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period. We note the arguments against our proposal to transfer part of University ward to Newland ward, and are persuaded that, on the grounds of community identity, the area concerned should remain in University ward as it has more in common with the area north of Cottingham Road than the rest of Newland ward, and Cottingham Road is a strong, natural boundary which we have utilised elsewhere. We are therefore making this proposal part of our final recommendations for this area. We have considered the opposition to our draft recommendation to transfer part of University ward to Orchard Park ward and, although we understand the strength of feeling, the reasons given by the respondents are not ones that we are able to take into consideration. We have also noted that the North Hull Estate currently straddles the boundary between the two wards and, contrary to some of the views expressed, our draft recommendation for the area would not result in the estate being transferred from one ward to another. We therefore propose to confirm our draft recommendation for this area as final.

73 As we are no longer proposing that part of University ward is transferred to Newland ward, the issue of providing good electoral equality has had to be resolved in another way. We have considered the proposals from the City Council and Hull Independent Labour Group and arrived at a solution by adopting parts of both proposals, both of which provide a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We propose transferring polling district UN1, bounded by Beverley Road, Hall Road, the Beverley and Barmston Drain and Endike Lane, from University ward to Orchard Park ward, and we propose transferring polling district OP7, bounded by Beverley Road, Hall Road and the Beverley and Barmston Drain, from Orchard Park ward to Beverley ward, as proposed by Hull Independent Labour Group and Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association for the reasons given in paragraph 70 of this report. In doing so, we note the City Council's claim that its student registration scheme is bearing fruit, but are not able to take this into account in undertaking this review for reasons stated in paragraph 69 of this report.

74 We received three submissions suggesting that the name of Newland ward be changed to Bricknell ward. The reasons given were that the name Newland is more appropriate for the proposed Sculcoates ward, as people associate the name with the area around Newland Avenue, which is in the proposed Sculcoates ward. As Bricknell Lane is the main highway in the proposed Newland ward it was suggested that this would be a readily identifiable and acceptable name. The City Council proposed changing the name of Orchard Park ward to Greenwood ward, and a resident suggested it should be renamed either Greenwood, Coldharbour or Ophnee. Having accepted the proposal to change the name of Sculcoates ward to Newland ward, we propose accepting the suggestion to change the name of Newland ward to Bricknell ward. We are minded to retain the name Orchard Park, as Greenwood Avenue has been transferred to University ward, thus rendering the name Greenwood inappropriate. There is no evidence of public support for either of the other suggested names.

75 Under our final recommendations the number of councillors per elector in Bricknell, Orchard Park and University wards would be equal to the average, 1 per cent above and 5 per cent above the city average respectively (2 per cent below, 2 per cent below and 1 per cent above in 2005).

Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

East Hull

Noddle Hill, Stoneferry and Sutton wards

76 These three three-member wards are situated in the north-east of the city. The number of electors per councillor is 11 per cent below the city average in Noddle Hill ward (12 per cent below in 2005), 20 per cent above the average in Stoneferry ward (43 per cent above in 2005) and 34 per cent above the average in Sutton ward (31 per cent above in 2005).

77 At Stage One the City Council proposed creating a new three-member ward called Kingswood from parts of Stoneferry ward and a new three-member ward called Bransholme from parts of Noddle Hill and Sutton wards. It argued that under its proposals the Bransholme Estate, which has distinct needs of its own, would be covered by two wards but is separated from areas of private housing with which it does not share a community identity. The Council also stated that separating the privately-owned areas from the current Bransholme ward would mean that these dwellings could be placed in a new Kingswood ward separate from the Bransholme estate, which has a distinctive community identity. It also argued that under its proposals Sutton Village and surrounding areas of similar social profile would be represented in one ward. Under the City Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor in Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would be 1 per cent above, 3 per cent below and 2 per cent above the city average respectively (3 per cent below, 35 per cent above and 1 per cent above in 2005).

78 D Harris proposed creating two new three-member wards and altering the existing boundaries of Sutton ward in this area of the city. Specifically he proposed that a new three-member ward called Kingswood and a new three-member ward called Bransholme should be created from parts of Stoneferry and Noddle Hill wards. He also proposed that the boundaries of Sutton ward should be altered so that the area to the east of Howdale Road, including Balham Avenue, should be included in his proposed Bellfield ward. Under his proposals the number of electors per councillor in Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would be 4 per cent above, 7 per cent below and 1 per cent above the city average respectively (2 per cent above, 5 per cent above and 2 per cent below in 2005).

79 W Harris put forward a similar proposal to D Harris. Specifically he proposed that a new three-member ward called Kingswood should be created from parts of Stoneferry and Noddle Hill wards, and another new three-member ward, Bransholme, should be created from parts of the same two wards. He also proposed that the existing boundaries of Sutton should be altered so that the area bounded by Howdale Road to the west and the Holderness Drain to the east should be divided between his proposed three-member wards. Under W Harris' proposals the number of electors per councillor in Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would be 3 per cent above, 8 per cent below and 1 per cent above the city average respectively (equal to, 2 per cent above and 6 per cent above in 2005).

80 Having considered all the representations in relation to this area at Stage One, we proposed drawing on certain elements of the Council's scheme together with parts of the proposals of W Harris in this area of the city. In particular we noted that the Council's proposals resulted in the

proposed Kingswood ward having 35 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average. The City Council failed to provide any evidence to justify this high level of electoral inequality. Additionally we were not aware of any significant evidence supporting their argument that future growth in the area could improve electoral equality before 2005. The City Council themselves stated that they were “unsure these optimistic targets will be realised”. We also considered that, despite the fact that the Council’s proposals for Sutton ward achieved good electoral equality, in order to achieve good electoral equality across the eastern part of Hull as a whole the boundaries of Sutton ward needed to be altered. We therefore looked at the alternatives and considered that, although Mr W Harris’ proposals were not supported by detailed argumentation, they provided a good starting point for the formation of electoral arrangements in east Hull, ensuring that, under a council size of 59, the area would have the correct allocation of councillors, together with a ward pattern which would resolve the high electoral inequality in Kingswood ward.

81 We proposed creating a new three-member ward, Kingswood, from the northern part of the existing Stoneferry ward and the northern part of the existing Noddle Hill ward. We proposed creating a new three-member Bransholme ward from the central part of the existing Stoneferry ward and central part of the existing Noddle Hill ward. We also proposed altering the boundaries of the existing Sutton ward by transferring the south-eastern part of the ward to our proposed Ings ward. We also proposed transferring a southern part of the existing Sutton ward to our proposed Holderness ward. Finally, we proposed including the southern part of the existing Noddle Hill ward in our Sutton ward. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in our proposed Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton wards would be 6 per cent above, 21 per cent below and 4 per cent above the city average respectively (2 per cent above, 3 per cent above and 3 per cent above in 2005).

82 At Stage Three the City Council expressed concern at the draft recommendations for the Bransholme, Kingswood and Sutton areas. It stated that they would break up the Bransholme Estate in terms of its community identity, and would severely prejudice future funding from Central Government and the European Union as the estate would not appear high on indexes of need. The City Council further stated that the new developments on the Kingswood area would not share a common community identity with the northern part of the Bransholme estate. The City Council’s alternative proposals for this area were that two two-member wards of Bransholme East and Bransholme West should be created, which would leave just the Dorchester Road area of the estate in Sutton ward, where it is at present. Bransholme East ward would comprise the existing Noddle Hill ward, apart from the triangle between Holwell Road and Wawne Road which would become part of Bransholme West ward. The remainder of Bransholme West ward would comprise part of the existing Stoneferry ward east of Bude Road, Cheltenham Avenue and Littondale and the part of Sutton ward bounded by Wawne Road, Leads Road, Midmere Avenue and Barnstaple Road. The Council wished its original proposal for a ward covering Kings Park and Sutton Park, which would be called Kingswood, and its proposal for Sutton ward to be reconsidered as part of its alternative scheme. These proposals would necessitate an extra councillor, meaning the council would comprise 60 members rather than the 59 proposed in the draft recommendations. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above, 5 per cent above, 30 per cent below and equal to the city average respectively in Bransholme East, Bransholme West, Kings Park and Sutton wards (3 per cent above, 2 per cent above, 5 per cent below and 1 per cent below in 2005).

83 The East Hull Conservative Association regarded the joining of part of Noddle Hill ward with Sutton ward as “potentially disastrous for that local community” with both Sutton and the Bransholme estate suffering as a consequence. Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association regarded the warding in the area to have been “more or less arbitrarily drawn with little regard to any community or geographical considerations.” Councillor Woodford, member for Noddle Hill ward, was not able to endorse the Commission’s proposals for Bransholme, believing they would split the community and lead to the loss of Government-sponsored Education Action Zone finance. Councillor Neilson, member for Noddle Hill ward, considered that the proposals would work against the unifying process currently taking place on the Bransholme estate. Kevin McNamara MP expressed his grave concern that the horizontal division of Stoneferry and Noddle Hill wards “would have severe repercussions on the allocation of Government funds to the Noddle Hill ward as it is one of the areas of greatest deprivation in the United Kingdom.” Further objections to the draft recommendations for this area were received from the Bransholme Community Groups’ Forum, the Garths Residents’ Association and four residents on the grounds that they went against the Commission’s remit of having regard for community identity.

84 We have given careful consideration to the views we have received for this area, and in the light of this have decided to modify our draft recommendations. We are persuaded that the Bransholme estate should be kept together as far as possible and that dividing it between east and west rather than between north and south is preferable. We are also persuaded that to join the Kingswood area with Sutton Park would be a better reflection of community identity than joining either with the Bransholme estate. While we are convinced of the merits of the City Council’s amendments, we are unable to adopt them fully as they necessitate a 60-member council. We are still of the opinion that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 59 members, for the reasons given earlier in this report. As a consequence, we are adopting the City Council’s proposal for the two wards of Bransholme East and Bransholme West, but propose a smaller two-member Kings Park ward comprising the Kingswood area and the part of Sutton Park to the north of Littondale, and a two-member Sutton ward of which the eastern and southern boundaries would be the same as those proposed in our draft recommendations. The northern boundary with Bransholme East ward would be that of the existing ward along Castlehill Road and Noddle Hill Way. The ward would be extended to the west to include the part of Sutton Park south of Littondale, thus achieving a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

85 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Bransholme East, Bransholme West, Kings Park and Sutton wards would be 1 per cent above, 4 per cent above, 38 per cent below and 10 per cent above the city average respectively (1 per cent above, equal to the average, equal to the average and 7 per cent above in 2005). Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards

86 These three three-member wards are situated in the east of the city. Currently the number of electors per councillor is 4 per cent above the city average in Holderness ward (2 per cent above in 2005), 2 per cent below the average in Ings ward (6 per cent below in 2005) and 12 per cent below the average in Longhill ward (13 per cent below in 2005).

87 At Stage One the City Council proposed creating a new three-member ward called East Park, containing parts of the existing Holderness, Stoneferry and Southcoates wards. It further proposed altering the boundaries of Ings ward by transferring to it part of the existing Sutton ward. It also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Longhill ward by transferring to it part of the existing Ings ward. The number of electors per councillor in its proposed East Park, Ings and Longhill wards would be 4 per cent above, 3 per cent above and 1 per cent below the city average respectively (2 per cent above, 1 per cent below and 2 per cent below 2005).

88 D Harris proposed altering the boundaries of the three three-member wards in this area of the city. Specifically he proposed adding part of the existing Stoneferry ward to Holderness ward. He also proposed transferring an area to the south of Holderness Road from Holderness ward to his proposed Southcoates ward. Additionally he proposed altering the existing boundaries of Ings ward by transferring areas of the ward to the existing Longhill ward. Under his proposals, the number of electors per councillor in Holderness, Bellfield and Longhill wards would be 3 per cent below, 1 per cent below and equal to the city average respectively (4 per cent above and 3 per cent above and 1 per cent below in 2005).

89 W Harris proposed altering the boundaries of three three-member wards in this area of the city. He proposed the same alterations to Holderness and Southcoates wards as Mr D Harris. He also proposed transferring the south-eastern part of the existing Sutton ward to his proposed Ings ward. Additionally, he proposed transferring an area from the south-east of the existing Ings ward to his proposed Marfleet ward. The number of electors per councillor in his proposed Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards would be 6 per cent above, 5 per cent above and equal to the city average respectively (2 per cent above, 1 per cent below and 3 per cent above in 2005).

90 In the light of the Stage One representations received in relation to this area of the city we proposed drawing on certain elements of the City Council's scheme together with elements of W Harris' proposals. We considered that the Council's proposals for the Holderness ward, although achieving good electoral equality, were not the best reflection of community ties within the area. We also considered that the Council's proposal to link the area to the south-east of the Holderness Road to an area to the south of Chamberlain Road and the north of the railway line was not the best reflection of community ties. However, we considered that W Harris' proposals utilised a strong boundary by using the Holderness Road and proposed adopting it for part of the boundary between Holderness and North Southcoates wards. However, we proposed a significant reconfiguration of wards in this area involving seven significant boundary changes together with some minor modifications as we considered that they would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria. We proposed transferring an area of the existing Sutton ward to our proposed Holderness ward, as described earlier. We also proposed transferring an area to the south-east of Holderness Road from Holderness ward to our proposed two-member ward of North Southcoates. We further proposed transferring the southern part of the existing Stoneferry ward to our proposed Holderness ward. We also proposed transferring the north-western part of the existing Drypool ward to our proposed Holderness ward. We also proposed that another part of the existing Drypool ward, to the north of a boundary running to the rear of the properties on Dornoch Drive, should be transferred to our proposed Holderness ward.

91 Additionally, we proposed broadly adopting the Council's scheme for Ings ward with some boundary modifications to improve electoral equality for this ward and across the eastern part of Hull. In particular we were persuaded by the Council's argument that community ties stretch

across the Salthouse Road and we proposed transferring an area of the existing Sutton ward, to the north of Salthouse Road, to our proposed Ings ward. We also proposed transferring the south-eastern part of the existing Ings ward to our proposed Marfleet ward.

92 However, in the area of the existing Longhill ward we proposed broadly adopting the City Council's proposals. We considered that the Council's ward utilised strong boundaries while achieving good electoral equality and reflecting community identity. We were persuaded by the Council's argument that the area to be transferred from the existing Ings ward to its proposed Longhill ward shared community ties with the rest of Longhill ward. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards would be 3 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 3 per cent below the city average respectively (equal to, 4 per cent below and 3 per cent below in 2005).

93 At Stage Three the City Council proposed changes to the boundaries of Holderness and Ings wards. As a consequence of its proposed changes in the Southcoates area (see below for details) Holderness ward would lose part of Sutton ward and part of Drypool ward, both of which were added as part of our draft recommendations. The council argued that this "would place DR5 polling district back with similar properties north of Holderness Road and put the area north of Sutton Road back into Sutton ward." It also proposed transferring the whole of the Sutton Fields Industrial estate west of Holwell Road into its proposed Kings Park ward. The City Council proposed changing the name of the ward to Stoneferry as it would cover the Stoneferry village area, a proposal also made by another correspondent. It proposed amending the boundaries of Ings ward to the west and south-east. In the west the boundary would run along Wembley Park and then proceed in a north-westerly direction between the boundary proposed by the Commission and East Carr Road. In the south-east, an area bounded by Marfleet Lane to the north and west, Staveley Road to the east and Hopewell Road to the south would be transferred to Marfleet ward. The Council proposed no amendments to the boundary of Longhill ward. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor in Ings, Longhill and Stoneferry wards would be 5 per cent below, 1 per cent below and 5 per cent above the city average respectively (7 per cent below, 3 per cent below and 2 per cent above in 2005). The other submissions concerning this area were from East Hull Conservative Association, which opposed the Tweendykes area being transferred from Sutton ward to Holderness ward, and from two residents, who supported the proposal for Longhill ward, though one added the rider "as long as we keep the name Longhill for this ward."

94 We have given careful consideration to the views we have received for this area, and in the light of this have decided to modify our draft recommendations, particularly in the light of our recommendations for the Preston Road estate, which are discussed below. Because of different ward boundaries due to a different council size, we are not able to adopt the City Council's amendments for this area in their entirety, but have accepted them in part. We have amended our draft recommendations with regard to Holderness and Ings wards. In the interests of community identity we are persuaded that Holderness Road should form the whole of the south-eastern boundary of Holderness ward and that the north-eastern part of the existing Drypool ward which we proposed being part of West Southcoates ward in our draft recommendations should become part of Holderness ward. We also propose retaining Chamberlain Road as the boundary between Holderness and Drypool wards, but continuing in the west to the River Hull rather than along Stoneferry Road and Ferry Lane. We have decided not to change the name of Holderness ward to Stoneferry ward, as proposed by the City Council, as not all of the Stoneferry village area is within the boundaries of our revised Holderness ward. We propose amending the boundary of

Ings ward to the east and the west. In order to achieve good electoral equality in Marfleet ward we are following the proposed amendment by the City Council to transfer from Ings ward to Marfleet ward an area bounded by Marfleet Lane to the north and west, Staveley Road to the east and Hopewell Road to the south. To counterbalance this we are proposing transferring to Ings ward a part of the existing Sutton ward which we proposed transferring to Holderness ward in our draft recommendations. This is the area bounded by Ings Road and Wembley Park Avenue to the south, and the perimeter of the school grounds to the north. We are confirming our draft recommendations for Ings ward as final. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Holderness, Ings and Longhill wards is 4 per cent above, 2 per cent above and 3 per cent below the city average respectively (1 per cent above, 1 per cent below and 3 per cent below in 2005). Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Drypool, Marfleet and Southcoates

95 These three three-member wards are situated in the south-east of the city. Currently, the number of electors per councillor is 24 per cent above the city average in Drypool ward (25 per cent above in 2005), 17 per cent below in Marfleet ward (16 per cent below in 2005) and 1 per cent below in Southcoates ward (4 per cent below in 2005).

96 At Stage One the City Council proposed that the existing boundaries of all three wards in this area of the city should be altered. It proposed that the existing boundaries of Drypool ward should be altered so that two areas to the north of the ward would be transferred to the Council's proposed East Park ward. The Council argued that its proposed Drypool ward would ensure that a number of distinct communities were contained within one ward. It maintained that Drypool would remain a ward comprising two major communities - the Victoria Dock development and the Garden Village - with many smaller areas of residential dwellings between them, and that the proposed Drypool ward would ensure that these communities were united around the Holderness Road axis and have a clear distinction in their own right. It proposed that the existing boundaries of Marfleet ward should be altered so that it would include the south-eastern corner of the existing Ings ward. It argued that the inclusion of this area, which is part of the Bilton Grange Estate, meets the statutory criteria in that it is adjacent to the current Marfleet ward. It also proposed altering the existing boundary of Southcoates ward so that an area of the existing Holderness ward would be transferred to its proposed Southcoates ward. In support of its proposals the Council argued that its Southcoates ward would ensure that all of the Preston Road Estate, "subject of a New Deal for Communities initiative", was contained within one ward. Under its proposals the number of electors per councillor in Drypool, Marfleet and Southcoates wards would be equal to, 2 per cent below and 2 per above the city average respectively (equal to, 2 per cent below and 2 per cent above in 2005).

97 D Harris also proposed that there should be three wards broadly covering this area. He proposed creating a three-member ward called Alexandra from part of the existing Drypool ward bounded to the west by Mount Pleasant Way, to the north-west by James Reckitt Avenue and to the north-east and east by Laburnum Avenue and Southcoates Lane. He also proposed transferring part of the existing Drypool ward into his proposed Myton ward. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Marfleet ward by moving the boundary northwards to include part of the existing Ings ward, running south along Barham Road and Amethyst Road and east to the City boundary. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Southcoates ward so that an area

bounded to the north and east by Southcoates Lane, to the west by New Bridge Road and to the south by the railway line, would be transferred to his proposed three-member ward, called Alexandra. He also proposed that a part of the existing Holderness ward to the south-east of the Holderness Road should be included in his proposed Southcoates ward. Under his proposals the number of electors per councillor in Alexandra, Marfleet, Myton and Southcoates wards would be 3 per cent above, 3 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 2 per cent above the city average respectively (3 per cent above, 6 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 7 per cent below in 2005).

98 W Harris proposed altering the existing boundaries of Drypool ward by transferring the north-eastern corner to his proposed Holderness ward. He also proposed altering the existing boundaries of Southcoates ward to include an area of the existing Holderness ward south of Holderness Road. Under his proposals the number of electors per councillor in Drypool, Marfleet and Southcoates wards would be 3 per cent below, equal to and 4 per cent above the city average respectively (3 per cent below, 4 per cent above and 8 per cent above in 2005).

99 We also received a proposal from a local resident concerning the existing Southcoates ward. Specifically he argued that the City Council's proposals would divide the community of Southcoates, and that under his proposals the whole of the community of Southcoates would be contained in one ward and consequently a new ward comprising the area subject to the Preston Road Regeneration initiative would be created.

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

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

102 At Stage Three the City Council expressed concern with the draft recommendations for this area. In particular, it was concerned that the proposals would split the Preston Road estate, subject of a New Deal for Communities funding initiative by the Government, into three wards, with the eastern part being absorbed into Marfleet ward with which it has no affinity. The City Council's solution was to propose two new Southcoates wards which would contain the estate within their boundaries. The western boundary of Southcoates East ward would be Southcoates Lane/Southcoates Avenue, the north-eastern boundary would be Holderness Road and Maybury Road, with Marfleet Lane being the eastern boundary. The boundaries of Southcoates West ward would be Southcoates Lane/Southcoates Avenue to the east, Holderness Road to the north and New Bridge Road to the west. The southern boundary for both wards would be the railway line running from the centre of Hull to the eastern dock area. The Council stated that this proposal would "place the estate into a coherent setting, keep a densely populated area of private houses based on Southcoates Lane together and place DR5 polling district back with similar properties north of Holderness Road." The Council's proposals for this area also included amending the boundary between Drypool ward and Marfleet ward to follow Earl's Road to the river, so keeping the whole of the Victoria Dock development together. Finally, the City Council proposed transferring to Marfleet ward part of Ings ward, which has been described above. Under the City Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor in Drypool, Marfleet, Southcoates East and Southcoates West wards would be equal to, equal to, 2 per cent below and equal to the city average respectively (2 per cent above, 1 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 2 per cent below in 2005).

103 Several residents commented upon the draft recommendations for this area. Five were opposed to the proposals as they affected the Preston Road estate, believing the estate should be included in one ward rather than three. Three commented on the proposals for Drypool ward, in particular that the whole of the Victoria Dock development should be included within the ward. Two also proposed alternative ward boundaries, but as these were not supported by electoral figures and variances, and as they generally follow the Council's proposals, we are not commenting upon them further, as we believe they are adequately covered by the City Council's proposals.

104 Having given careful consideration to the views we have received for this area, we have decided to modify our draft recommendations. We are persuaded by the arguments concerning the desirability of the whole of the Preston Road estate being within one ward, particularly as it is the subject of a New Deal for Communities funding initiative and is recognised as a community in its own right. The creation of the wards of Southcoates East and Southcoates West provides for good electoral equality while providing identifiable boundaries and reflecting the interests of local communities, and so we are adopting these wards as part of our final recommendations. In order to achieve good electoral equality in Marfleet ward, we are amending our proposed boundary with Ings ward, following the proposal from the City Council, by transferring from Ings ward to Marfleet ward an area bounded by Marfleet Lane to the north and west, Staveley Road to the east and Hopewell Road to the south. We are further modifying our draft proposals by amending the boundary between Drypool and Marfleet wards, as suggested by the City Council and a number of respondents, to follow Earl's Road and then continue along the footpath to the river. This will enable the whole of the Victoria Dock development to be retained in the same ward. One further modification of our draft recommendations for this area is to amend the boundary between Drypool and Holderness wards by retaining the existing boundary of Chamberlain Road, but continuing in the west to the River Hull rather than following Stoneferry

Road and Ferry Lane. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Drypool, Marfleet, Southcoates East and Southcoates West wards would be 4 per cent above, 2 per cent below, 4 per cent below and 2 per cent below the city average respectively (5 per cent above, 1 per cent below, 4 per cent below and 4 per cent below in 2005). Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

105 At Stage One the City Council supported its present system of elections by thirds, but highlighted the issue of the synchronisation of the Council's electoral cycle with that of other Unitary Authorities in the area. A resident of the city argued that the recent adoption of a cabinet style of local government by the City Council necessitated a move to elections every four years. However, we did not consider there was sufficient support for a change and so proposed no change to the present system of elections by thirds.

106 At Stage Three West Hull and Hessle Conservative Association proposed that the electoral cycle be changed to whole-council elections every four years, claiming that this would better reflect the will of the electorate. Kingston upon Hull North Conservative Association thought that further consideration should be given to whole-council elections while East Hull Conservative Association was opposed to elections by thirds on the grounds that "it would cause confusion to the electorate and an unfair advantage to those councillors elected in the two-seat wards." Councillor Fareham, member for Newland ward, opposed elections by thirds on the grounds that they lead to voter apathy while a resident took the opposite view, stating that annual elections mean the electorate are better able to give an early response to the Council's actions. Noting that the only opposition to the present system of elections by thirds has come from one political party, we are persuaded that there is not sufficient evidence of popular support to change it, and so confirm our draft recommendation for a continuation of the system of elections by thirds as final.

Conclusions

107 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse our draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- retaining the existing southern boundary of University ward, and amending the boundary between University ward and Orchard Park ward;
- transferring polling district OP7 from Orchard Park ward to Beverley North ward;
- creating two new wards of Bransholme East and Bransholme West to replace Bransholme ward, and amending the boundaries of Kingswood and Sutton wards;
- creating two new wards of Southcoates East and Southcoates West to replace North Southcoates and South Southcoates wards, and amending the boundaries of Drypool, Holderness, Ings and Marfleet wards;
- renaming Beverley North, Kingswood, Newland and Sculcoates wards as Beverley, Kings Park, Bricknell and Newland respectively.

108 We conclude that, in Kingston upon Hull:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 60 to 59;
- there should be 23 wards, three more than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

109 Figure 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 and 2005 electorate figures.

Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2000 electorate		2005 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	60	59	60	59
Number of wards	20	23	20	23
Average number of electors per councillor	3,109	3,161	3,109	3,161
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	9	1	9	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	2	1	3	0

110 As Figure 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from nine to one. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2005, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation

Kingston upon Hull City Council should comprise 59 councillors serving 23 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Kingston upon Hull

6 NEXT STEPS

111 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Kingston upon Hull and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

112 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 26 June 2001.

113 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary of State
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Local Government Sponsorship Division
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Kingston upon Hull

Our final recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 2, differ from those we put forward as draft recommendations in respect of a number of wards, where our draft proposals are set out below. The only other change from draft to final recommendations, which is not included in Figures A1 and A2, is that we propose to rename Beverley North, Kingswood, Newland and Sculcoates wards as Beverley, Kings Park, Bricknell and Newland respectively.

Figure A1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Beverley North	Beverley ward (part)
Bransholme	Noddle Hill ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part); Sutton ward (part)
Drypool	Drypool ward (part)
Holderness	Drypool ward (part); Holderness ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part); Sutton ward (part)
Ings	Ings ward (part); Sutton ward (part)
Kingswood	Noddle Hill ward (part); Stoneferry ward (part)
Marfleet	Holderness ward (part); Ings ward (part); Marfleet ward; Southcoates ward (part)
Newland	Newland ward; University ward (part)
North Southcoates	Drypool ward (part); Holderness ward (part); Southcoates ward (part)
Orchard Park	Orchard Park ward; University ward (part)
Sculcoates	Beverley ward (part); Newland ward (part)
South Southcoates	Southcoates ward (part)
Sutton	Noddle Hill ward (part); Sutton ward (part)
University	University ward (part)

Figure A2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: 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 %
Beverley North	2	5,962	2,981	-6	5,762	2,881	-9
Bransholme	3	10,012	3,337	6	9,678	3,226	2
Drypool	3	9,282	3,094	-2	9,434	3,145	-1
Holderness	3	9,779	3,260	3	9,520	3,173	0
Ings	3	9,314	3,105	-2	9,067	3,022	-4
Kingswood	3	7,483	2,494	-21	9,767	3,256	3
Marfleet	3	9,517	3,172	0	9,561	3,187	1
Newland	2	6,808	3,404	8	6,704	3,352	6
North Southcoates	2	6,442	3,211	2	6,382	3,191	1
Orchard Park	3	9,888	3,296	4	9,556	3,185	1
Sculcoates	2	6,668	3,334	6	6,506	3,253	-3
South Southcoates	2	6,734	3,367	7	6,563	3,282	4
Sutton	3	9,835	3,278	4	9,747	3,249	3
University	2	6,772	3,386	7	6,523	3,262	3

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

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

APPENDIX B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm, requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Local Government Commission, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Commission compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage	The Commission complies with this requirement
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose	The Commission complies with this requirement
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain	The Commission complies with this requirement
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals	The Commission complies with this requirement
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation	The Commission consults on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken	The Commission complies with this requirement
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated	The Commission complies with this requirement