

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
East Riding of Yorkshire

*December 2000*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>11</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>15</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>35</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire: Detailed Mapping	<i>37</i>
B East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>43</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>45</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Beverley, Cottingham and Woodmansey is inserted inside the back cover of the report.



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for East Riding of Yorkshire on 16 May 2000.

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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in East Riding of Yorkshire:

- **in 12 of the 26 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2005 this unequal representation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 14 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 78-79) are that:

- **East Riding of Yorkshire Council should have 67 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 26 wards, the same as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In all of the proposed 26 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to 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.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Bridlington, Cottingham, Driffield and Woodmansey.**

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

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

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

**Review Manager  
East Riding of Yorkshire Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1 Beverley Rural	3	Beverley Rural ward (part - the parishes of Beswick, Bishop Burton, Cherry Burton, Dalton Holme, Etton, Leconfield, Leven, Lockington, Lund, Newbald, Routh and Walkington); Minster ward (part - Tickton parish); Wolds Weighton ward (part - Middleton parish)	Map 2 and large map
2 Bridlington Central & Old Town	3	Bridlington North ward (part - Bempton parish and part of Bridlington parish); Bridlington Old Town ward (the parishes of Grindale and Boynton and part of Bridlington parish)	Maps 2, A4 and A5
3 Bridlington North	2	Bridlington North ward (part - Flamborough parish and part of Bridlington parish)	Maps 2, A4 and A5
4 Bridlington South	3	Bridlington South ward (part - part of Bridlington parish)	Maps 2 and A5
5 Cottingham North	2	Cottingham North ward (part - part of Cottingham parish and part of Woodmansey parish); Cottingham South ward (part - part of Cottingham parish)	Map 2 and large map
6 Cottingham South	2	Cottingham North ward (part - part of Cottingham parish)	Map 2 and large map
7 Dale	3	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
8 Driffield & Rural	3	Driffield & Rural ward (part - the parishes of Cottam, Driffield, Fimber, Garton, Sledmere and Tibthorpe); East Wolds & Coastal ward (part - Bainton and Kirkburn parishes)	Map 2
9 East Wolds & Coastal	3	East Wolds & Coastal ward (part - the parishes of Barmston, Beeford, Burton Agnes, Burton Fleming, Carnaby, Foston, Harpham, Hutton Cranswick, Kelk, Kilham, Nafferton, North Frodingham, Rudston, Skerne & Wansford, Skipsea, Thwing, Ulrome, Watton and Wold Newton); Driffield & Rural ward (part - Langtoft parish); North Holderness ward (part - Brandesburton parish)	Map 2
10 Goole North	2	Boothferry West ward; Goole ward (part - Hook parish);	Maps 2 and A3
11 Goole Rural	2	Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland ward	Map 2

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
12 Goole South	2	Goole ward (part - part of Goole parish )	Maps 2 and A3
13 Hessle	3	Hessle ward; South Hunsley ward (part - part of Hessle parish)	Map 2
14 Howden	1	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
15 Howdenshire	3	<i>Unchanged</i>	Map 2
16 Mid Holderness	3	Mid Holderness ward; Beverley Rural ward (part - Wawne parish); North Holderness ward (part - the parishes of Catwick and Hatfield); South West Holderness ward (part - Burstwick parish)	Map 2
17 Minster & Woodmansey	3	Minster ward (part - part of Beverley parish); Cottingham North ward (part - part of Woodmansey parish)	Map 2 and large map
18 North Holderness	2	North Holderness ward (part - the parishes of Atwick, Bewholme, Hornsea, Mappleton, Seaton and Sigglesthorpe)	Map 2
19 Pocklington Provincial	3	Pocklington Provincial ward (part - the parishes of Barmby Moor, Catton, Newton on Derwent, Pocklington, Stamford Bridge, Sutton on Derwent and Wilberfoss)	Map 2
20 South East Holderness	3	South East Holderness ward; Mid Holderness ward (part - the parishes of Halsham, Rimswell and Roos)	Map 2
21 South Hunsley	2	South Hunsley ward (the parishes of North Ferriby, Swanland and Welton)	Map 2
22 South West Holderness	3	South West Holderness ward (part - the parishes of Hedon, Paull, Preston and Thorngumbald)	Map 2
23 St Mary's	3	Minster ward (part - part of Beverley parish); St Mary's ward	Map 2 and large map
24 Tranby	2	Tranby ward (part - part of Anlaby with Anlaby Common parish); Wolfreton ward (part - part of Anlaby with Anlaby Common parish)	Map 2

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
25	Willerby & Kirk Ella	3	Cottingham South ward (part - part of Willerby parish); Tranby ward (part - Kirk Ella parish); Wolfreton ward (part - part of Willerby parish)	Map 2
26	Wolds Weighton	3	Wolds Weighton ward (part - the parishes of Allertorpe, Bielby, Bishop Wilton, Bugthorpe, Cottingham, Everingham, Fangfoss, Fridaythorpe, Goodmanham, Hayton, Huggate, Kirby Underdale, Londesborough, Market Weighton, Melbourne, Millington, North Dalton, Nunburnholme, Sancton, Seaton Ross, Shiptonthorpe, South Cliffe, Thornton, Warter, Wetwang, Yapham); Pocklington Provincial (part - the parishes of Full Sutton and Skirpenbeck)	Map 2

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.*

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



	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2000)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2005)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
24	Tranby	2	8,030	4,015	9	8,238	4,119	5
25	Willerby & Kirk Ella	3	11,127	3,709	1	11,566	3,855	-2
26	Wolds Weighton	3	10,352	3,451	-6	11,628	3,876	-1
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>246,101</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>263,288</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,673</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,930</b>	<b>-</b>

*Source: Electorate figures are based on East Riding of Yorkshire Council's submission.*

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



# 1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of East Riding. The last such reviews of the constituent areas of the district were undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in November 1975 on Beverley District Council (Report No. 119), October 1975 on Boothferry District Council (Report No. 65), and June 1975 on Holderness District Council (Report No. 27). The electoral arrangements of the new unitary authority, which came into existence in April 1996, were put in place as part of the Structural Change Order which abolished the county of Humberside and its County Council.

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

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

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the District Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

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

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely

to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

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

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

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

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

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 2000/2001 PER programme, including East Riding of Yorkshire, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities’ electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing

legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections, and our present *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 16 May 2000, when we wrote to East Riding of Yorkshire Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Humberside Police Authority, the local authority associations, East Riding & Northern Lincolnshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire & Humber Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 21 August 2000.

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

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

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 East Riding of Yorkshire district is bordered to the north and west by North Yorkshire county and York city, to the south by Doncaster city and North Lincolnshire district, and to the east by the North Sea. It is the largest of the recently created unitary authorities, containing some 310,800 people within an area of 933 square miles. The North Sea coastline supports a strong tourist industry centred on the resorts of Bridlington, Hornsea and Withernsea, while elsewhere the historic Haltemprice villages and towns of Cottingham, Anlaby, Willerby, Kirk Ella and Hessle contain 55,000 people - the largest concentration of population in the district. Other significant towns are Beverley, Driffield and Goole, the latter a significant inland port. Important local industries include British Aerospace, BP Chemicals and British Gas along with a variety of small businesses. The district contains 164 parishes, and is entirely parished.

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

18 The electorate of the district is 246,101 (February 2000). The Council presently has 67 members who are elected from 26 wards. Sixteen of the wards are each represented by three councillors, nine are each represented by two councillors and one is a single-member ward. The whole Council is elected together.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in East Riding of Yorkshire district, with around 12 per cent more electors than at the time of the last review, as a result of new housing developments.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,673 electors, which the Council forecasts will increase to 3,930 by the year 2005 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the period since the time of the last review, the number of electors per councillor in 12 of the 26 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, five wards by more than 20 per cent and two wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Mary's ward where the councillor represents 46 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in East Riding of Yorkshire*

*Map 1 (continued): Existing Wards in East Riding of Yorkshire*

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Beverley Rural	2	9,878	4,939	34	10,336	5,168	32
2 Boothferry West	2	6,604	3,302	-10	7,035	3,518	-10
3 Bridlington North	3	10,397	3,466	-6	11,253	3,751	-5
4 Bridlington Old Town	3	8,843	2,948	-20	9,054	3,018	-23
5 Bridlington South	3	10,047	3,349	-9	10,393	3,464	-12
6 Cottingham North	3	14,069	4,690	28	14,579	4,860	24
7 Cottingham South	2	6,102	3,051	-17	6,291	3,146	-20
8 Dale	3	10,983	3,661	0	12,053	4,018	2
9 Driffield & Rural	3	10,082	3,361	-9	11,192	3,731	-5
10 East Wolds & Coastal	3	9,716	3,239	-12	10,649	3,550	-10
11 Goole	2	8,078	4,039	10	8,969	4,485	14
12 Hessle	2	8,293	4,147	13	8,723	4,362	11
13 Howden	1	3,470	3,470	-6	3,949	3,949	0
14 Howdenshire	3	10,617	3,539	-4	11,494	3,831	-3
15 Mid Holderness	3	9,618	3,206	-13	10,287	3,429	-13
16 Minster	3	9,232	3,077	-16	10,499	3,500	-11
17 North Holderness	2	9,200	4,600	25	9,967	4,984	27
18 Pocklington Provincial	3	12,033	4,011	9	12,851	4,284	9
19 Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland	2	6,929	3,465	-6	7,811	3,906	-1
20 St Mary's	2	10,731	5,366	46	10,932	5,466	39
21 South East Holderness	3	9,986	3,329	-9	10,357	3,452	-12
22 South Hunsley	3	10,396	3,465	-6	10,752	3,584	-9
23 South West Holderness	3	11,855	3,952	8	12,929	4,310	10

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 %
24 Tranby	3	8,922	2,974	-19	9,332	3,111	-21
25 Wolds Weighton	3	10,639	3,546	-3	12,033	4,011	2
26 Wolfreton	2	9,381	4,691	28	9,568	4,784	22
<b>Totals</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>246,101</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>263,288</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,673</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,930</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2000, electors in Bridlington Old Town ward were relatively over-represented by 20 per cent, while electors in St Mary's ward were relatively under-represented by 46 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

21 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for East Riding of Yorkshire Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from East Riding of Yorkshire Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 119 representations during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from East Riding of Yorkshire Council, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Council and the Commission.

#### **East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

23 During Stage One East Riding of Yorkshire Council stated that it had carried out its own consultation on two schemes: Model A which proposed a council size of 66 comprising 22 three-member wards and Model B which proposed a council of 67 members, the same as at present, in a pattern of 26 single-, two- and three-member wards, also as at present. It based its proposals on its own Model B, modified in a number of areas. The Council considered that its proposals would achieve substantial improvements to electoral equality while, it judged, reflecting local community identities and interests and minimising disruption to the existing arrangements. East Riding of Yorkshire Council also put forward revised parish warding arrangements for Bridlington, Cottingham, Driffield and Woodmansey.

24 Under the Council's proposals, two wards would initially vary by more than 10 per cent from the average either now or in 2005.

#### **Councillors Parnaby & Pollard**

25 Councillors Parnaby and Pollard stated that "although we are respectively Leader and Secretary of the Conservative Group on the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, we write here as members of the Working Group on the Periodic Electoral Review." They stated that they supported the Council's consultation Model A, as outlined earlier, as "it would provide a more balanced arrangement throughout the area." Under Model A, no wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2005.

#### **Parish and Town Councils**

26 Beswick, Newport, Seaton and Skidby parish councils and Pocklington Town Council all expressed support for Model B. Hayton & Burnby Parish Council stated that it supported Model A.

27 Bridlington Town Council, supported by Bempton and Flamborough parish councils, put forward alternative warding proposals for Bridlington and the surrounding parishes which it considered would better reflect local community identities and interests. Driffield Town Council considered that the town should form a two-member ward on its own. Paull Parish Council and Withernsea Town Council considered that the count for its town council elections should take place locally. Hedon Town Council considered that the town should be represented by two members on East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Hessle Town Council considered that the parish should form a ward on its own. Hornsea Town Council considered that the town should be represented without the inclusion of neighbouring areas. Bainton Parish Council supported a move to “join our near neighbours to the west or north”.

28 North Ferriby, Swanland and Welton parish councils proposed a two-member ward comprising the Melton, North Ferriby, Swanland and Welton area. Elloughton cum Brough Parish Council stated that it did not wish to be divided between different district wards. Brandesburton, Carnaby, Great Hatfield and Skerne & Wansford parish councils and Howden Town Council opposed East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s proposals for their areas. Carnaby, Dalton Holme, Grindale, Paull and Thwing & Octon parish councils supported retaining the existing arrangements in their areas. Atwick and Siggleshorne parish councils considered that the parish should be retained in North Holderness ward.

## **Other Representations**

29 East Riding District Labour Party made alternative proposals for warding in a number of areas across the district which, it considered, would secure improvements to electoral equality while having regard to local community identities and interests.

30 We received a further 80 representations from local political parties, elected members and local residents. Beverley & Rural Liberal Democrats, Hull West & Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats, Councillor Gill and 32 residents of the district expressed support for the Council’s consultation Model B. Councillor Kitchen, member for Goole ward, and two local residents supported Model B except in Goole. Two residents opposed the Council’s proposals for Goole. Councillor McClure and a local resident supported Model B, subject to proposing minor boundary amendments. Councillor Mrs Evison, together with a number of local residents, expressed support for Model A.

31 Three residents opposed the Council’s proposals for Bridlington. Five residents of Hessle considered that the town should constitute a ward on its own. A resident of Driffield considered that any changes to ward boundaries necessary in the district should be largely confined to the Bridlington area. Two residents of Holderness considered that representation for Holderness should be increased. Nine local residents opposed the proposals for Beverley town. Councillor Knight and seven local residents objected to the division of Cottingham parish between different district wards. Eleven local residents considered that the Hornsea area should have increased representation, while Councillor Jefferson expressed concern at the modifications to North

Holderness ward put forward by East Riding of Yorkshire Council. A resident of Seaton supported the removal of Great Hatfield parish from the same ward as Hornsea town. One local resident considered that Hornsea is not well served by East Riding of Yorkshire Council. A resident of Driffield opposed the Council's proposals for Bridlington and Hornsea. A resident of North Ferriby proposed amending the boundary between Hull and East Riding districts. Two residents of Howden and two residents of Goole opposed the Council's proposals for their areas. Two residents of Cranswick, a resident of Hutton Cranswick and a resident of Wold Newton each supported retaining the status quo.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

34 I10(per e)-5(s)-10(c)-5(ri)3(e nex)-12(t)he oar anexp12(tand -2(el)-4((overnm)t)-4(a)2(key)30)-4(-4(eh)-2

## **Council Size**

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

39 East Riding of Yorkshire Council presently has 67 members. The Council and a number of respondents proposed retaining a council of 67 members representing a mix of single-, two- and three-member wards. East Riding District Labour Party also supported retaining a council size of 67. Councillors Parnaby and Pollard, together with a number of other respondents, supported a council of 66 members representing 22 three-member wards.

40 As discussed below, in examining the two different schemes for council sizes of 66 and 67, we consider that a council size of 67 would facilitate a scheme providing the best balance between the need to improve electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Therefore, having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 67 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

41 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received during Stage One and, in particular, to the district-wide proposals which we received from East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and those supported by Councillors Parnaby and Pollard. We have also considered East Riding of Yorkshire District Labour Party's proposals affecting much of the district. We have calculated that each of the schemes received would provide substantial improvements to electoral equality both now and in 2005. We note that the most substantial difference between the two district-wide schemes relates to the pattern of warding which each proposes. East Riding of Yorkshire Council has proposed retaining a council size of 67 members serving a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards, while Councillors Parnaby and Pollard, together with a number of other respondents, supported a council size of 66 members representing a uniform pattern of 22 three-member wards. However, we are concerned that Councillors Parnaby and Pollard's preferred scheme would necessitate substantial re-warding across the district in order to secure a uniform pattern of three-member wards. Moreover we have not found that there is evidence of widespread support for this proposal for a uniform pattern of wards. Similarly we have not received evidence of support for the proposals put forward by East Riding of Yorkshire District Labour Party.

42 Additionally, we have noted that East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposal would result in less disruption to the existing arrangements while securing very good electoral equality. Neither have we seen a convincing argument as to why a uniform pattern of three-member wards would better facilitate convenient and effective government in East Riding of Yorkshire.

Therefore, and in view of the level of support which East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals have received, both in response to its own consultation exercise and during Stage One of our review, we are basing our draft recommendations on these proposals subject to some amendments where we judge improvements can be made. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Howdenshire, Pocklington Provincial and Wolds Weighton wards;
- (b) Boothferry West, Goole, Howden and Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland wards;
- (c) Beverley Rural, Dale, Driffield & Rural, East Wolds & Coastal and South Hunsley wards;
- (d) Bridlington North, Bridlington Old Town and Bridlington South wards;
- (e) Mid Holderness, North Holderness, South East Holderness and South West Holderness wards;
- (f) Cottingham North, Cottingham South, Hessle, Minster, St Mary's, Tranby and Wolfreton.

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

### **Howdenshire, Pocklington Provincial and Wolds Weighton wards**

44 These three three-member wards together cover a large area in the north-west of the district and each is predominantly rural. Howdenshire ward comprises the parishes of Blacktoft, Broomfleet, Bubwith, Eastrington, Ellerton, Foggathorpe, Gilberdyke, Holme upon Spalding Moor, Hotham, Kilpin, Laxton, Newport, North Cave, Spaldington and Wressle; Pocklington Provincial ward comprises the parishes of Barmby Moor, Catton, Full Sutton, Newton on Derwent, Pocklington, Skirpenbeck, Stamford Bridge, Sutton upon Derwent, Wilberfoss; and Wolds Weighton ward comprises the parishes of Allerthorpe, Bielby, Bishop Wilton, Bugthorpe, Cottingwith, Everingham, Fangfoss, Fridaythorpe, Goodmanham, Hayton, Huggate, Kirby Underdale, Londesborough, Market Weighton, Melbourne, Middleton, Millington, North Dalton, Nunburnholme, Sancton, Seaton Ross, Shipton Thorpe, South Cliffe, Thornton, Warter, Wetwang and Yapham. The number of electors per councillor is 4 per cent below the district average in Howdenshire ward (3 per cent below in 2005), 9 per cent above in Pocklington Provincial ward (9 per cent above in 2005) and 3 per cent below in Wolds Weighton ward (2 per cent above in 2005).

45 In its submission, East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed transferring Full Sutton and Skirpenbeck parishes from Pocklington Provincial ward to Wolds Weighton ward. The Council stated that such a modification would provide improvements to electoral equality while having regard to local community identities. It proposed that Howdenshire ward should be retained on its existing boundaries. Under the Council's proposed amendment the numbers of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the district average in Howdenshire ward (3 per cent below

in 2005), 6 per cent above in Pocklington Provincial ward (5 per cent above in 2005) and 6 per cent below in Wolds Weighton ward (1 per cent below in 2005).

46 Hayton & Burnby Parish Council stated that it preferred the proposals put forward under the Council's Model A but considered that the proposals for its area contained in Model B would also be acceptable. Newport Parish Council supported Model B in its area. Pocklington Town Council stated that of the options presented it preferred Model B, although its "most favoured solution would be to retain the status quo." Seaton Parish Council supported Model B.

47 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area. We note that East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposed modification would provide a fairer distribution of the electorate between the wards concerned. We also note that among the respondents who have commented in this area, there has been general acceptance of the Council's proposals. Consequently we are adopting the Council's proposals for the three wards of Howdenshire, Pocklington Provincial and Wolds Weighton as part of our draft recommendations. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Boothferry West, Goole, Howden and Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland wards**

48 These four wards are situated in the south-west of the district. Howden ward is represented by a single councillor, while the other three wards are each represented by two councillors. Boothferry West ward comprises the northern part of Goole parish; Goole ward comprises the remainder of Goole parish together with Hook parish; Howden ward comprises the parishes of Asselby, Barmby on the Marsh and Howden; and Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland ward comprises the parishes of Airmyn, Goole Fields, Gowdall, Pollington, Reedness, Snaith & Cowick, Swinefleet and Twin Rivers. The number of electors per councillor is 10 per cent below the borough average in Boothferry West ward both now and in 2005, 10 per cent above the borough average in Goole ward (14 per cent above in 2005), 6 per cent below in Howden ward (equal to the average in 2005) and 6 per cent below in Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland ward (1 per cent below in 2005).

49 In its submission East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed retaining the existing ward boundaries and level of representation for the wards of Howden and Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland, although it proposed that the latter ward should be renamed Goole Rural. It proposed that the urban area covered by Goole and Hook parishes should be re-warded to address the existing electoral imbalances in the two wards. It proposed that a new two-member Goole North ward should comprise Hook parish and Goole North and Goole North East parish wards, while the remainder of Goole parish, comprising Goole East, Goole Central & South and Goole West parish wards would form a new two-member Goole South ward. It considered that such a re-warding would provide "a sharper focus to the community interest" in the areas concerned. Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above

the district average in Goole North ward both now and in 2005, 6 per cent below in Goole Rural ward (1 per cent below in 2005), 3 per cent below in Goole South ward (1 per cent above in 2005) and 6 per cent below in Howden ward (equal to the average in 2005).

50 Howden Town Council proposed that the existing arrangements should be retained in its area. Two residents of Howden supported retaining a single-member Howden ward. Councillor Kitchen opposed the District Council's proposal to create a new ward combining Hook parish with an area in the north of Goole parish. She stated that the two areas concerned did not share a community of interest and were not directly connected by road. Councillor Kitchen, supported by four residents of Goole, also proposed some minor amendments to boundaries in the west of Goole parish.

51 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area. In particular we note that there is some local support for the proposal to retain the boundaries of the existing Howden and Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland wards and therefore, in view of the current and continuing good level of electoral equality, we are a

Sledmere and Tibthorpe; East Wolds & Coastal ward comprises the parishes of Bainton, Barmston, Beeford, Burton Agnes, Burton Fleming, Carnaby, Foston, Harpham, Hutton

concerned at the detrimental effect on electoral equality in the two wards concerned which would result from retaining Brandesburton parish in North Holderness ward. Accordingly, we have examined East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for these two wards and consider that they would secure improvements to electoral equality while, we judge, having regard to the other statutory criteria. We also note that overall the proposals would address the concerns of the majority of the remaining respondents who have expressed concerns in this area. Consequently we are adopting East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for Drifffield & Rural and East Wolds & Coastal wards as part of our draft recommendations, as illustrated on Map 2. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the district average in Drifffield & Rural ward (2 per cent below in 2005) and 2 per cent below in East Wolds & Coastal ward (4 per cent below in 2005).

57 East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed that Beverley Rural ward should be modified to include Middleton parish (currently in Wolds Weighton ward) and Tickton parish (currently in Minster ward). It also proposed that Wawne parish should be transferred from Beverley Rural ward to Mid Holderness ward (discussed later). The Council considered that its proposals would achieve substantial improvements to electoral equality while reflecting local community identities and interests. The Council proposed that Dale ward should be retained on its existing boundaries. It also proposed that South Hunsley ward should be modified by transferring all of Hessle parish from South Hunsley ward to a modified Hessle ward (discussed later). The Council considered that these proposals would provide a better reflection of community identities and interests than at present. Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average in Beverley Rural ward (2 per cent below in 2005), equal to the average in Dale ward (2 per cent above in 2005) and 1 per cent above in South Hunsley ward (1 per cent below in 2005).

58 Dalton Holme Parish Council stated that they wished to remain in the same ward as at present. Beswick Parish Council supported the Council's proposals in its area. A resident of Welton considered that Hessle should no longer form part of the same ward as the villages of North Ferriby, Melton and Welton. Elloughton cum Brough Parish Council stated that it would not wish to be divided between different district wards. A resident of Swanland considered that the boundary between Hull and East Riding authorities should be revised. Skidby Parish Council supported Model B in its area. North Ferriby, Swanland and Welton parish councils each proposed a two-member ward comprising the villages of North Ferriby, Melton, Swanland and Welton.

59 Having given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area, we have noted that East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals would achieve substantial improvements to electoral equality and would also, we judge, reflect local community identities and interests in the areas concerned while reflecting the concerns of a number of those who have responded to us during Stage One. We are therefore adopting the Council's proposals for the wards of Beverley Rural, Dale and South Hunsley as part of our draft recommendations, which are illustrated on Map 2. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be equal

to the district average in Beverley Rural ward (2 per cent below in 2005), equal to the average in Dale ward (2 per cent above in 2005) and 1 per cent above in South Hunsley ward (1 per cent below in 2005).

### **Bridlington North, Bridlington Old Town and Bridlington South wards**

60 These three three-member wards are situated in the north-east of the district and comprise the town of Bridlington together with a number of surrounding rural parishes. Bridlington North ward comprises Bempton and Flamborough parishes together with part of Bridlington parish; Bridlington Old Town ward comprises Boynton and Grindale parishes together with part of Bridlington parish; and Bridlington South ward comprises an area in the south of Bridlington parish. The area is significantly over-represented: the number of electors per councillor is 6 per cent below the district average in Bridlington North ward (5 per cent below in 2005), 20 per cent below in Bridlington Old Town ward (23 per cent below in 2005) and 9 per cent below in Bridlington South ward (12 per cent below in 2005).

61 At Stage One the District Council calculated that, under a council size of 67, the correct allocation of councillors for this area would be eight, one fewer than at present. Consequently, it proposed a pattern of two three-member wards and one two-member ward covering this area: it proposed that a modified two-member Bridlington North ward should comprise Flamborough parish and Bridlington Quay North parish ward of Bridlington parish; a new three-member Bridlington Central & Old Town ward should comprise the parishes of Bempton, Boynton and Grindale together with Bridlington Old Town parish ward and parts of Bridlington Bessingby and Bridlington Hilderthorpe parish wards; and a modified three-member Bridlington South ward should comprise the remainder of Bridlington parish. The Council considered that these proposals would provide improvements to electoral equality while reflecting local community identities and interests. Under their proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent above the district average in Bridlington Central & Old Town ward (1 per cent above in 2005), 5 per cent below in Bridlington North ward (4 per cent below in 2005) and 4 per cent below in Bridlington South ward (5 per cent below in 2005).

62 Bridlington Town Council opposed East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for Bridlington arguing that they do not "best reflect the interests of the electorate of Bempton, Bridlington and Flamborough". Consequently the Town Council proposed that a modified three-member Bridlington North ward should comprise the parishes of Flamborough and Bempton together with an area in the north of Bridlington parish. It proposed that a two-member Bridlington Old Town ward should comprise Boynton and Grindale parishes together with the Old Town area of Bridlington ward. The Town Council proposed that a revised three-member Bridlington South ward should cover the remaining area of Bridlington parish. It considered that its proposals would provide a better reflection of local community identities and interests than under East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals. Under Bridlington Town Council's proposals, which only included electorate data for 2005, the number of electors per councillor

would be equal to the district average in Bridlington North ward, 3 per cent below in Bridlington Old Town ward and 5 per cent below in Bridlington South ward.

63 Bempton and Flamborough parish councils both supported Bridlington Town Council's submission, as they judged that it would better reflect local community identities and interests. Grindale Parish Council stated that it "is satisfied within the Bridlington Old Town ward". Councillors Parnaby and Pollard opposed the proposals for Bridlington, noting that the original consultation option prepared by the District Council had been amended in this area so that Bridlington North ward would be represented by two councillors, while Bridlington Old Town ward would be represented by three. The Councillors considered that such a modification would not reflect local community identities and had arisen as a result of "deals done by the Liberal Democrat and Labour Groups for what can only be seen as crude electoral advantage".

64 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area. We note that there is little agreement between respondents regarding proposed warding arrangements for this area. In particular we note that while there is recognition by all respondents of the need to reduce the number of councillors serving the area from nine to eight, East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed that one councillor should be removed from Bridlington North ward, a proposal opposed by Councillors Parnaby and Pollard and local parish and town councils. Having visited the area, we are not persuaded that the District Council's proposal for Bridlington would provide a satisfactory reflection of local community identities and interests. We agree with the views of a number of respondents that Bridlington Old Town ward should be represented by two councillors and that Bridlington North ward should be represented by three. Consequently we are adopting the original consultation proposal put forward by East Riding of Yorkshire Council under Model B as part of our draft recommendations, which would provide substantial improvements to electoral equality while, we judge, providing a better reflection of the statutory criteria than Bridlington Town Council's alternative proposal. Our proposed boundaries for these wards are illustrated on maps A4 and A5.

65 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average in Bridlington Central & Old Town ward (3 per cent below in 2005), 7 per cent below in Bridlington North ward (6 per cent below in 2005) and 4 per cent above in Bridlington South ward (1 per cent above in 2005).

### **Mid Holderness, North Holderness, South East Holderness and South West Holderness wards**

66 These four wards are situated in the east and south-east of the district. North Holderness ward is represented by two councillors, and the remaining three wards are each represented by three councillors. Mid Holderness ward comprises the parishes of Aldbrough, Bilton, Burton Constable, Burton Pidsea, Coniston, East Garton, Ellerby, Elstronwick, Halsham, Humbleton, Rimswell, Rise, Riston, Roos, Skirlaugh, Sproatley, Swine and Withernwick; North Holderness

ward comprises the parishes of Atwick, Bewholme, Brandesburton, Catwick, Hatfield, Hornsea, Mappleton, Seaton and Siggleshorpe; South East Holderness ward comprises the parishes of Easington, Hollym, Holmpton, Keyingham, Ottringham, Patrington, Skeffling, Sunk Island, Welwick and Withernsea; and South West Holderness ward comprises the parishes of Burstwick, Hedon, Paull, Preston and Thorngumbald. At present there is substantial electoral inequality in the area: the number of electors per councillor is 13 per cent below the district average in Mid Holderness ward both now and in 2005, 25 per cent above in North Holderness ward (27 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent below in South East Holderness ward both now and in 2005, and 8 per cent above in South West Holderness ward (10 per cent above in 2005).

67 In its Stage One submission East Riding of Yorkshire Council put forward amendments to improve electoral equality in North Holderness ward. In addition to proposing the transfer of Brandesburton parish from North Holderness ward to East Wolds & Coastal ward (discussed earlier), the Council proposed transferring Catwick and Hatfield parishes from North Holderness ward to Mid Holderness ward. It stated that in addition to improving electoral equality such a modification would “recognise their closer links with the neighbouring ward”. The Council proposed further modifying Mid Holderness ward to include Wawne parish (currently in Beverley Rural ward) and Burstwick parish (currently in South West Holderness ward). It also proposed transferring the parishes of Halsham, Rimswell and Roos from Mid Holderness ward to South East Holderness ward, proposals which it noted would improve electoral equality while, it judged, providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identity. Each of these wards would retain its existing level of representation. Under the Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent below the district average in Mid Holderness ward (equal to the average in 2005), 2 per cent above in North Holderness ward (8 per cent above in 2005), 2 per cent above in South East Holderness ward (1 per cent below in 2005) and 5 per cent below in South West Holderness ward (1 per cent below in 2005).

68 Atwick and Siggleshorpe parish councils stated that the parishes should be retained in North Holderness ward. Hedon Town Council considered that the town should be represented by two councillors covering the town alone. Hornsea Town Council considered that Hornsea should be represented without the inclusion of neighbouring areas. A resident of Hornsea expressed concern that the present number of councillors representing Hornsea did not provide the local electorate with adequate access to representation. Additionally, a number of residents of Hornsea did not consider that the town was adequately represented on East Riding of Yorkshire Council and proposed an increase in the number of councillors serving this area of the district. Some of these respondents considered that the particular needs of Hornsea town reinforced arguments for such an increase, particularly when compared with other wards in the Holderness area, which are represented by three councillors each. One resident considered that a single ward should be created covering the area from Bridlington to Hornsea. A resident of Roos supported Model B in that area. Seaton Parish Council supported Model B for its area. Great Hatfield Parish Council considered that Hatfield & Goxhill parish should be retained in North Holderness ward as this would better reflect local community identities and interests. This proposal was supported by Councillor Mrs Evison, member for North Holderness ward. Councillor Mrs Evison also stated

that she generally supported Model A for the district, subject to proposing modifications to North Holderness ward to ensure that “the small villages surrounding Hornsea [are] included in the catchment”.

69 We have carefully considered the views which we have received in relation to the wards in this area. In the light of the request which we have received from Hornsea Town Council and a number of other respondents for representation for the two alone, we have revisited the electorate data in this area. However, in conducting a periodic electoral review we are unable to look at the proposals for any single area in isolation but must consider the impact which any modification would have on the proposals for the district as a whole. We judge that we have not received detailed proposals which would provide alternative representation for North Holderness ward while meeting the aims of the review for the wider area. Similarly we have not received proposals which would provide for either Hedon parish comprising a ward on its own which would be compatible with our proposals for the wider area. We also note that to retain Hatfield parish in North Holderness ward would be significantly detrimental to electoral equality, which we do not consider is justified in terms of the evidence which has been presented to us. Consequently we are adopting East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations as we judge that they would provide the best available balance of the need to improve electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria throughout the area. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent below the district average in Mid Holderness ward (equal to the average in 2005), 2 per cent above in North Holderness ward (8 per cent above in 2005), 2 per cent above in South East Holderness ward (1 per cent below in 2005) and 5 per cent below in South West Holderness ward (4 per cent below in 2005). Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 2.

### **Cottingham North, Cottingham South, Hessle, Minster, St Mary’s, Tranby and Wolfreton wards**

70 These seven wards are located in the south of the district and together cover a significant number of the more urban residential settlements in the district. Cottingham North, Minster and Tranby wards are each represented by three members, while Cottingham South, Hessle, St Mary’s and Wolfreton wards are each represented by two. Cottingham North ward comprises Woodmansey parish and part of Cottingham parish; Cottingham South ward comprises part of Cottingham and Willerby parishes; Hessle ward comprises part of Hessle parish; Minster ward comprises Tickton parish and part of Beverley parish; St Mary’s ward comprises the Molescroft parish and part of Beverley parish; Tranby ward comprises Kirk Ella parish and part of Anlaby with Anlaby Common parish; and Wolfreton ward comprises part of Anlaby with Anlaby Common and Willerby parishes. The number of electors per councillor is 28 per cent above the district average in Cottingham North ward (24 per cent above in 2005), 17 per cent below in Cottingham South ward (20 per cent below in 2005), 13 per cent above in Hessle ward (11 per cent above in 2005), 16 per cent below in Minster ward (11 per cent below in 2005), 46 per cent

above in St Mary's ward (39 per cent above in 2005), 19 per cent below in Tranby ward (21 per cent below in 2005) and 28 per cent above in Wolfreton ward (22 per cent above in 2005).

71 In its submission East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed substantial re-warding of this area. The Council proposed that a modified three-member St Mary's ward should comprise Molescroft parish and St Mary's East and St Mary's West parish wards of Beverley parish. It further proposed that the remainder of Beverley parish, namely Beverley Minster North and Beverley Minster South parish wards, should be combined with the majority of Woodmansey parish to form a new three-member Minster & Woodmansey ward. The remainder of Woodmansey parish would be included with the northern part of Cottingham North parish in a modified two-member Cottingham North ward, while a modified two-member Cottingham South ward would comprise the remainder of Cottingham parish. Under the Council's proposals a new three-member Willerby & Kirk Ella ward would comprise the parishes of the same names, while a new two-member Tranby ward would comprise Anlaby with Anlaby Common parish. A modified three-member Hessle ward would be enlarged to include the whole of Hessle parish. The Council's proposals would provide substantial improvements to electoral equality while, it considered, providing a better reflection of local community identities and interests.

72 Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average in Cottingham North ward (3 per cent below in 2005), equal to the average in Cottingham South ward (2 per cent below in 2005), 2 per cent above in Hessle ward (1 per cent below in 2005), 3 per cent above in Minster & Woodmansey ward (6 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent above in St Mary's ward (5 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent above in Tranby ward (5 per cent above in 2005) and 1 per cent above in Willerby & Kirk Ella ward (2 per cent below in 2005).

73 We also received a representation from Hessle Town Council, supported by Hull West & Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats and five local residents, proposing that the whole of Hessle parish should be contained in one ward.

74 Nine residents of Beverley opposed the Council's proposals to combine Minster East and Minster West parish wards with parts of Woodmansey parish, as they considered that such a proposal would not reflect local community identities and interests. They proposed instead two new wards in this area, first a ward including the two Minster parish wards and St Mary's East parish ward, and second a ward including Molescroft parish, St Mary's West parish ward and part of Woodmansey parish.

75 Councillor McClure, member for Cottingham South ward, supported East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for Cottingham, subject to proposing an amendment to the boundary between Castle and Millbeck parish wards. Cottingham Parish Council supported the proposed warding of the parish, noting that "some councillors ... have expressed disquiet that the small village of Dunswell has been added to Cottingham for electoral purposes." Councillor Knight, member for Cottingham South ward, considered that Cottingham should be represented

by councillors representing Cottingham alone. For this reason she opposed the inclusion of Dunswell village (part of Woodmansey parish), in Cottingham North ward. Seven residents of Cottingham opposed dividing the parish between different district wards. Beverley and Rural Liberal Democrats generally supported the Council's proposals in this area.

76 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in these areas. We note, in particular, the opposition of some respondents to our proposals in the Beverley and Cottingham areas. However, we note that in neither of the areas concerned have we received alternative proposals which would achieve as good electoral equality as under the Council's scheme and be compatible with our proposals for the wider area. Consequently we are adopting the Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations as we judge that they provide the best available balance between improvements to electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average in Cottingham North ward (3 per cent below in 2005), equal to the average in Cottingham South ward (2 per cent below in 2005), 2 per cent above in Hessle ward (1 per cent below in 2005), 3 per cent above in Minster & Woodmansey ward (6 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent above in St Mary's ward (5 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent above in Tranby ward (5 per cent above in 2005) and 1 per cent above in Willerby & Kirk Ella ward (2 per cent below in 2005). Our draft recommendations for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

77 At Stage One we received no evidence of widespread support for a change to the electoral cycle of the district. Accordingly, we make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

## **Conclusions**

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

- a council of 67 members should be retained;
- there should be 26 wards, the same as at present;
- the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

79 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s proposals, but propose departing from them in Bridlington, where we are adopting an earlier consultation option considered by the Council.

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

*Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	2000 electorate		2005 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	67	67	67	67
Number of wards	26	26	26	26
Average number of electors per councillor	3,673	3,673	3,930	3,930
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	12	0	14	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	5	0	7	0

81 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average from 12 to none. By 2005 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 East Riding of Yorkshire Council should comprise 67 councillors serving 26 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, Appendix A and the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

# Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

82 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Bridlington, Cottingham and Woodmansey, together with a minor amendment to the boundary between Minster North and St Mary’s East parish wards in Beverley parish which would not effect any electors, to ensure that the boundary follows recognisable ground features. We are also proposing new warding arrangements for Driffield parish, at the Parish Council’s request.

83 The parish of Bridlington is currently served by 12 councillors representing six two-member wards: Bessingby, Hilderthorpe, Old Town East, Old Town West, Quay North and Quay South. In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Bridlington, we propose creating three parish wards for Bridlington, coterminous with the boundaries of the district wards in the parish, to be named Bridlington North, Bridlington Old Town and Bridlington South. We propose that each ward should be represented by four councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Bridlington Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Bridlington North, Bridlington Old Town and Bridlington South (each returning four councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Maps A4 and A5 in Appendix A.

84 The parish of Cottingham is currently served by 11 councillors representing three wards: Castle, Millbeck & Croxby and Priory. Millbeck & Croxby and Priory wards are each represented by four councillors while Castle ward is represented by three. In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Cottingham parish, we propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to reflect the district wards put forward by the Council. The parish would comprise four wards: Castle, Croxby, Millbeck and Priory, to be represented by three, two, two and four councillors respectively.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Cottingham Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Castle (returning three councillors), Croxby (two), Millbeck (two) and Priory (four). The boundary between the four parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

85 The parish of Driffield is currently served by 16 councillors who represent two wards, North and South, represented by nine and seven councillors respectively. In agreement with East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Driffield Town Council proposed that the parish should be re-warded into four wards. It did not, however, propose names for these wards. We consider that these proposed wards would generally provide a good reflection of local community identities and are therefore putting them forward as part of our draft recommendations, subject to proposing two minor amendments to the proposed boundaries to ensure that they are tied to identifiable ground detail. We are proposing the names of Driffield North, Driffield South, Driffield South West and Driffield West for these parish wards, but would welcome comments on these names at Stage Three.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Driffield Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Driffield North (returning four councillors), Driffield South (two), Driffield South West (five) and Driffield West (five). The boundary between the four parish wards should be as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

86 The parish of Hornsea is currently served by 12 councillors representing two wards: North and South, represented by eight and four councillors respectively. Hornsea Town Council requested an increase in the number of parish councillors serving South parish ward from four to six due to increased development in this area in recent years. We are content to recommend such an increase.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Hornsea Council should comprise 14 councillors, two more than at present, representing two wards: North (returning eight councillors) and South (six).

87 The parish of Woodmansey is currently served by 12 councillors representing two wards: Dunswell and Woodmansey, represented by one and eleven councillors respectively. In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Woodmansey parish, we propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to reflect the district wards put forward by the Council. The parish would comprise four wards, Dunswell, Minster View, Nurseries and Victoria, to be represented by one, four, three and four councillors respectively.

**Draft Recommendation**

Woodmansey Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Dunswell (returning one councillor), Minster View (four), Nurseries (three) and Victoria (four). The boundary between the four parish wards should be as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

88 Pauls Parish Council and Withernsea Town Council considered that the count for town council elections should be conducted locally and immediately after the vote had closed. However, the arrangements relating to the conduct of elections are a matter for the local authority concerned, and we are therefore unable to make recommendations relating to this matter.

89 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

**Draft Recommendation**

For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

90 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for East Riding of Yorkshire and welcome comments from the Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

*Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire*

*Map 2 (continued): The Commission's Draft Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

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

92 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
East Riding of Yorkshire Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

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



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the East Riding of Yorkshire area.

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2, A3, A4 and A5 and the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed warding of Driffield parish.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed district warding in Goole.

**Map A4** illustrates the proposed warding in the north of Bridlington parish

**Map A5** illustrates the proposed warding in the centre of Bridlington parish.

The large map inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Beverley, Cottingham and Woodmansey.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Driffield Parish*

*Map A3: Proposed District Warding in Goole*

*Map A4: Proposed Warding in the North of Bridlington Parish*

*Map A5: Proposed Warding in the Centre of Bridlington Parish*

## APPENDIX B

### East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figure 2 differs from those put forward by East Riding of Yorkshire Council only in three wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure B1: East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Bridlington Central & Old Town	3	11,715	3,905	6	11,959	3,986	1
Bridlington North	2	6,967	3,484	-5	7,526	3,763	-4
Bridlington South	3	10,605	3,535	-4	11,215	3,738	-5

Source: Electorate figures are based on East Riding of Yorkshire Council's submission.

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



## APPENDIX C

### The Statutory Provisions

#### Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to shire districts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

