

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

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 the district of East Riding of Yorkshire.

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: 224

# 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>5</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>13</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>17</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>43</i>
APPENDICES	
A Final Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire: Detailed Mapping	<i>45</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>51</i>

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





## Local Government Commission for England

15 May 2001

Dear Secretary of State

On 16 May 2000 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of East Riding of Yorkshire under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in December 2000 and undertook a ten-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have confirmed our draft recommendations without modification, in the light of the further representations we have received. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in East Riding of Yorkshire.

We recommend that East Riding of Yorkshire Council should be served by 67 councillors representing 26 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 whole council should continue to be elected together every four years.

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 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 East Riding of Yorkshire on 16 May 2000. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 12 December 2000, after which we undertook a ten-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 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 2004 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 14 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 102-103) 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 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 forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by less than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2005.**

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

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

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 25 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	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	2	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	3	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
12 Goole South	2	Goole ward (part – part of Goole parish )	Maps 2 and A3

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
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 (part -the parishes of Aldbrough, Bilton, Burton Constable, Burton Pidsea, Coniston, East Garton, Ellerby, Elstronwick, Humbleton, Rise, Riston, Skirlaugh, Sproatley, Swine and Withernwick); 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 (part - 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 and 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.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for East Riding of Yorkshire

	<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>
1	Beverley Rural	3	11,001	3,667	0	11,583	3,861	-2
2	Bridlington Central & Old Town	2	7,558	3,779	3	7,652	3,826	-3
3	Bridlington North	3	10,265	3,422	-7	11,109	3,703	-6
4	Bridlington South	3	11,464	3,821	4	11,939	3,980	1
5	Cottingham North	2	7,383	3,692	0	7,634	3,817	-3
6	Cottingham South	2	7,363	3,682	0	7,685	3,843	-2
7	Dale	3	10,983	3,661	0	12,053	4,018	2
8	Driffield & Rural	3	10,344	3,448	-6	11,587	3,862	-2
9	East Wolds & Coastal	3	10,770	3,590	-2	11,344	3,781	-4
10	Goole North	2	7,577	3,789	3	8,358	4,179	6
11	Goole Rural	2	6,929	3,465	-6	7,811	3,906	-1
12	Goole South	2	7,105	3,553	-3	7,646	3,823	-3
13	Hessle	3	11,236	3,745	2	11,721	3,907	-1
14	Howden	1	3,470	3,470	-6	3,949	3,949	0
15	Howdenshire	3	10,617	3,539	-4	11,494	3,831	-3
16	Mid Holderness	3	10,823	3,608	-2	11,797	3,932	0
17	Minster & Woodmansey	3	11,296	3,765	3	12,515	4,172	6
18	North Holderness	2	7,509	3,755	2	8,497	4,249	8
19	Pocklington Provincial	3	11,665	3,888	6	12,429	4,143	5
20	St Mary's	3	12,051	4,017	9	12,321	4,107	5
21	South East Holderness	3	11,248	3,749	2	11,650	3,883	-1
22	South Hunsley	2	7,453	3,727	1	7,761	3,881	-1
23	South West Holderness	3	10,482	3,494	-5	11,321	3,774	-4

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	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>263,288</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>3,673</b>	–	–	<b>3,930</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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of East Riding. We have now reviewed 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), in October 1975 on Boothferry District Council (Report No. 65), and in 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 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 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 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. 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*.

10 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. 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 East Riding of Yorkshire*, 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 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.

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 district 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 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 every four years.

15 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.

16 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, in five wards by more than 20 per cent and in 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 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 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

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 %
23 South West Holderness	3	11,855	3,952	8	12,929	4,310	10
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>263,288</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>3,673</b>	–	–	<b>3,930</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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

17 During Stage One we received 119 representations, including a district-wide scheme from East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and representations from East Riding District Labour Party, Beverley & Rural Liberal Democrats, Hull West & Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats, 32 parish councils, eight district councillors and a number of 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 East Riding of Yorkshire*.

18 Our draft recommendations were based on the Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a pattern of three-member wards for the majority of the district, and a mix of two-member wards and one single-member ward in the rest of the district. However, we moved away from the Council's scheme in the Bridlington area, using options generated by Council officers during the early stages of the review process. We proposed that:

- East Riding of Yorkshire Council should be served by 67 councillors, the same as at present, representing 26 wards, also the same as at present;
- the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified, while three wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for the parishes of Bridlington, Cottingham, Driffield and Woodmansey.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

East Riding of Yorkshire Council should comprise 67 councillors, serving 26 wards. The whole council should continue to be elected every four years.

19 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to continue, 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 East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the Commission.

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

21 East Riding of Yorkshire Council stated that it generally supported the draft recommendations, subject to stating that it noted the Commission's proposals for Bridlington Central & Old Town and Bridlington North wards. The Council also asked the Commission to note the contents of a letter from Great Hatfield Parish Council which objected to the transfer of Hatfield parish from North Holderness ward to Mid Holderness ward. The Council stated that its submission had received all-party approval from the Council.

### **Conservative Group on East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

22 The Conservative Group on the Council supported the draft recommendations for Bridlington North and Bridlington Central & Old Town wards.

### **Parish Councils**

23 At Stage Three we received representations from 13 parish and town councils in the district. Airmyn Parish Council proposed an increase in the number of councillors serving on the parish council. Anlaby with Anlaby Common Parish Council, Bridlington Town Council, Carnaby Parish Council, Elloughton cum Brough Parish Council, Nafferton Parish Council and Snaith & Cowick Town Council each supported the draft recommendations in their areas, although Snaith & Cowick Town Council opposed the proposal to change the name of the ward to Goole Rural.

24 Brandesburton Parish Council, Catwick Parish Council and Great Hatfield Parish Council each opposed the draft recommendations in their areas as the parishes of Brandesburton, Catwick and Hatfield would no longer be included in North Holderness ward, a ward with which they considered they shared a community of interest. Burstwick Parish Council objected to Burstwick parish being transferred from South West Holderness ward to Mid Holderness ward as it considered that it had closer community links with the former ward. Hook Parish Council opposed the proposal to include Hook parish in a revised Goole North ward as it considered that such an arrangement would not reflect local community identities and interests. Wetwang Parish Council proposed that the parish should be transferred from Wolds Weighton ward to Driffield Rural ward as this would better reflect local community identities and interests than our draft recommendations.

## **Other Representations**

25 A further 36 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations, councillors and residents.

26 Councillor Mrs Evison (member for North Holderness ward), Councillor Mrs Jefferson (member for North Holderness ward), Councillor Willie (member for Mid Holderness ward), Let's Go Hornsea! (a local association) and 18 residents of the area generally opposed the draft recommendation transferring the parishes of Brandesburton, Catwick and Hatfield from North Holderness ward to neighbouring wards. The respondents generally considered that these proposals would not reflect the community identities and interests of the parishes concerned, which they considered more closely aligned with the Hornsea area.

27 East Riding District Labour Party opposed the draft recommendations and argued in particular that the alternative proposals which it had submitted in the Beverley and Cottingham area would be compatible with our proposals for the wider area and would better meet the aims of the review. Beverley & Holderness Conservative Association, East Yorkshire Constituency Conservative Association, Haltemprice & Howden Conservative Association, the Howden Branch of Haltemprice & Howden Conservative Association, Hull West & Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats and West Hull & Hessle Conservative Association each generally supported the draft recommendations in their areas. However, Beverley & Holderness and East Yorkshire Constituency Conservative Associations expressed concern at the proposal to transfer Brandesburton parish from North Holderness ward to East Wolds & Coastal ward.

28 Councillor Mrs Kitchen (member for Boothferry West ward) and two local residents opposed the draft recommendations for warding in the Goole and Hook area. Councillor Kitchen proposed an alternative configuration of warding for the area covered by Goole and Hook parishes which she considered would better reflect local community identities and interests. In addition she queried the distribution of growth in electorate under our draft recommendations.

29 Councillor Male, joint leader of the Council, expressed concern at the proposal to reduce the number of councillors serving Bridlington town from nine to eight as it would result in an increased workload for councillors locally. He also stated that if change was necessary it would be preferable for Bridlington North ward to be represented by two councillors. A resident of Hessle supported the draft recommendations for the area. A resident of Middleton on the Wolds proposed a pattern of 22 three-member wards covering the district, and proposed modifications to the external boundary of the district. However, it should be noted that as part of this review the Commission is unable to recommend changes to the external boundary of the district. A resident of Nafferton generally supported the draft recommendations but opposed any proposal to reduce the number of councillors representing Bridlington North ward from three to two. Two residents of the district supported the draft recommendations. A resident of Cottingham supported

the draft recommendations, subject to opposing the division of Dunswell and Woodmansey between different district wards. A resident of North Ferriby supported the draft recommendations for the area.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

30 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”.

31 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.

32 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.

33 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**

34 At Stage One East Riding of Yorkshire Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 7 per cent from 246,101 to 263,288 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expects such growth to be relatively evenly distributed across the district, with the most substantial growth forecast in Bridlington North, Dale, Driffield & Rural, Minster, South West Holderness and Wolds Weighton wards. 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 Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries was obtained. In arriving at our draft recommendations we accepted that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having

given consideration to East Riding of Yorkshire Council's figures, were content that they represent the best estimates that could reasonably be made at this time.

35 At Stage Three, Councillor Mrs Kitchen, member for Boothferry West ward, queried the distribution of electors between the two proposed Goole North and South wards by 2005. As a result we asked officers at the Council to revisit their electorate projections in this area and they provided revised figures which, while they did not change the overall total electorate projection in the area concerned, redistributed the electorate between the proposed Goole North and Goole South wards. We did not receive any other queries regarding electorate projections for the remainder of the district and therefore, having examined the Council's projections, we are content that they represent the best estimates presently available.

## **Council Size**

36 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.

37 East Riding of Yorkshire Council is at present served by 67 councillors. At Stage One 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.

38 In arriving at our draft recommendations, we considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, and we concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 67 members.

39 During Stage Three a resident of the district proposed a council of 66 members. We received no further proposals with regard to council size, and consequently in view of the generally strong support that we have received for our draft recommendations across much of the district we are confirming our draft recommendation for a council size of 67 as final.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

40 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the district-wide scheme from the Council. From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our draft recommendations.



41 At Stage One we gave careful consideration to the views which we received 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 also considered East Riding of Yorkshire District Labour Party's proposals affecting much of the district. We calculated that each of the schemes received would provide substantial improvements to electoral equality both now and in 2005. We noted that the most substantial difference between the two district-wide schemes related to the pattern of warding which each proposed. East Riding of Yorkshire Council 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 were 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 did not find that there was evidence of widespread support for this proposal for a uniform pattern of wards. Similarly we did not receive evidence of support for the proposals put forward by East Riding of Yorkshire District Labour Party.

42 Additionally, we 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 did we see 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 based our draft recommendations on these proposals, subject to some amendments where we judged improvements could be made.

43 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. 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 wards.

44 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**

45 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, Easttrington, 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 and 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).

46 At Stage One, 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).

47 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 (which formed the basis for East Riding of Yorkshire Council's submission) 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.

48 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we received in this area. We noted that East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposed modification would provide a fairer distribution of the electorate between the wards concerned. We also noted that among the respondents who commented in this area, there had been general acceptance of the Council's proposals. Consequently we adopted the Council's proposals for the

three wards of Howdenshire, Pocklington Provincial and Wolds Weighton as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations the number 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).

49 At Stage Three Wetwang Parish Council proposed that Wetwang parish should be transferred from Wolds Weighton ward to Driffield & Rural ward, as it asserted that such an arrangement would better reflect the community identities and interests of the area concerned. Under this proposal the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the district average in Driffield & Rural ward (3 per cent above in 2005) and 11 per cent below in Wolds Weighton ward (6 per cent below in 2005). We received no other submissions in relation to this area.

50 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area. In particular we note that Wetwang Parish Council's alternative proposal would secure reasonable electoral equality by 2005. However, we also note that we have not received evidence of widespread support for such a modification and we also do not consider that there is sufficient evidence in terms of the statutory criteria to support such a modification. Consequently in the absence of further alternative proposals in this area we are confirming our draft recommendations for the wards in this area as final.

51 Under our final recommendations the number 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). Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

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

52 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 district average in Boothferry West ward both now and in 2005, 10 per cent above the district 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).

53 At Stage One 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).

54 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.

55 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we had received in this area. In particular we noted that there was 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 adopted East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s proposals for these two wards as part of our draft recommendations. In the remaining area, which comprises the existing Boothferry West and Goole wards, we noted that there was some local opposition to the Council’s proposal to combine Hook parish with an area in the north of Goole parish and, in particular, that there was concern that there is no direct road linking the two areas. We noted that travel between these wards necessitated traversing some distance through a neighbouring ward. However, we also noted that, under a council size of 67, we had not received alternative proposals for warding in this area which would provide as good electoral equality while reflecting the statutory criteria. Consequently, and in view of the improved electoral equality which would be achieved, we adopted East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s proposals for the wards of Goole North and Goole South as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations 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).

56 At Stage Three Councillor Mrs Kitchen (member for Boothferry West ward), Hook Parish Council and two local residents opposed the draft recommendations for warding in the Goole and Hook area. Councillor Kitchen also proposed an alternative configuration of warding for the area covered by Goole and Hook parishes which she considered would better reflect local community identities and interests. She proposed that Hook parish should be combined with the south and east of Goole parish to form a revised Goole South ward, and the remainder of Goole parish would form a revised Goole North ward. In addition she queried the distribution of the projected electorate under our draft recommendations.

57 Snaith & Cowick Town Council supported the draft recommendations subject to proposing that the ward should retain its existing name, Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland.

58 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area during Stage Three. We note that we have received opposition from Councillor Kitchen, Hook Parish Council and two local residents to our proposals for Goole parish. In view of Councillor Kitchen's query regarding the electorate projections for the area, we asked East Riding of Yorkshire Council to revisit its projections in this area. As a result the Council provided revised electorate projections for our proposed wards of Goole North and Goole South, which would vary by 6 per cent and 3 per cent from the district average respectively. We are not convinced that the alternative proposals which we have received from Councillor Kitchen would provide a better reflection of local community identities and interests than our draft recommendations as they would combine Hook parish with an area in the south of Goole town and consequently, in view of the satisfactory electoral equality which would continue to be secured, we are not modifying our draft recommendations in this area. We are also not adopting the proposal to retain the existing name of Snaith, Airmyn & Rawcliffe & Marshland ward as we have not received widespread support for this proposal and we continue to consider that the name of Goole Rural adequately reflects the area covered by the ward in question.

59 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average in Goole North ward in 2005 (6 per cent above in 2005), 6 per cent below in Goole Rural ward (1 per cent below in 2005), 3 per cent below in Goole South ward both now and in 2005 and 6 per cent below in Howden ward (equal to the average in 2005). Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A3.

### **Beverley Rural, Dale, Driffield & Rural, East Wolds & Coastal and South Hunsley wards**

60 These five wards are situated in the centre of the district. Beverley Rural ward is represented by two councillors while the remaining wards are each represented by three councillors. Beverley Rural ward comprises the parishes of Beswick, Bishop Burton, Cherry Burton, Dalton Holme, Etton, Kilnwick, Leconfield, Lockington, Lund, Newbald, Routh, Walkington and Wawne; Dale ward comprises the parishes of Brantingham, Brough, Ellerker, Rowley, Skidby and South Cave;

Driffield & Rural ward comprises the parishes of Cottam, Driffield, Fimber, Garton, Langtoft, Sledmere and Tibthorpe; East Wolds & Coastal ward comprises the parishes of Bainton, Barmston, Beeford, Burton Agnes, Burton Fleming, Carnaby, Foston, Harpham, Hutton Cranswick, Kelk, Kilham, Kirkburn, Nafferton, North Frodingham, Rudston, Skerne & Wansford, Skipsea, Thwing, Ulrome, Watton and Wold Newton; and South Hunsley ward comprises the parishes of Melton, North Ferriby and Swanland together with part of Hessle parish. The number of electors per councillor is currently 34 per cent above the district average in Beverley Rural ward (32 per cent in 2005), equal to the average in Dale ward (2 per cent above in 2005), 9 per cent below in Driffield & Rural ward (5 per cent below in 2005), 12 per cent below in East Wolds & Coastal ward (10 per cent below in 2005) and 6 per cent below in South Hunsley ward (9 per cent below in 2005).

61 At Stage One East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed that Driffield & Rural ward should be modified to include Bainton and Kirkburn parishes (currently in East Wolds & Coastal ward); it also proposed that Langtoft parish should be transferred from Driffield & Rural ward to East Wolds & Coastal ward, stating that these proposals would better reflect local community ties, and noting that Bainton Parish Council had particularly requested such a modification. It proposed that East Wolds & Coastal ward should also be modified to include Brandesburton parish which, it considered, would provide improvements to electoral equality while better reflecting the predominantly rural nature of the parish concerned. Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the district average in Driffield & Rural ward (2 per cent below in 2005) and 2 per cent below in East Wolds & Coastal ward (4 per cent below in 2005).

62 We received a number of further representations concerning this area during Stage One. Skerne & Wansford Parish Council considered that no change was necessary. Brandesburton Parish Council opposed the Council's proposals for the parish. Driffield Town Council and a resident of Driffield considered that a new two-member ward should cover the town on its own. Councillor Jefferson, member for North Holderness ward, opposed the Council's proposal to remove Brandesburton parish from North Holderness ward. Bainton Parish Council supported a move to "join our near neighbours to the west or north [for warding purposes]". Thwing & Octon Parish Council expressed satisfaction with the existing arrangements. Carnaby Parish Council opposed any proposal to include Wilsthorpe, Fraisthorpe or Barmston in a South Bridlington ward. Two residents of Cranswick, a resident of Hutton Cranswick and a resident of Wold Newton each considered that change was unnecessary in their areas. Two residents of Hutton Cranswick opposed any proposal which would combine East Wolds & Coastal ward with the Hornsea area.

63 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we received in this area. With regard to Driffield Town Council's proposal that the parish should form a two-member ward on its own, we noted that we were unable to consider any area in isolation and that this proposal would not be compatible with our proposals for the wider area; therefore we did not include this as part of our draft recommendations. We also considered

Brandesburton Parish Council's opposition to the proposal to transfer the parish to East Wolds & Coastal ward. However, we were 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 examined East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for these two wards and considered that they would secure improvements to electoral equality while, we judged, having regard to the other statutory criteria. We also noted that overall the proposals would address the concerns of the majority of the remaining respondents who expressed concerns in this area. Consequently we adopted East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for Driffield & Rural and East Wolds & Coastal wards as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the district average in Driffield & Rural ward (2 per cent below in 2005) and 2 per cent below in East Wolds & Coastal ward (4 per cent below in 2005).

64 At Stage Three Brandesburton Parish Council, Councillor Mrs Evison, Councillor Mrs Jefferson, one resident of the parish and one resident of Hornsea opposed the proposal to transfer Brandesburton parish from North Holderness to East Wolds & Coastal ward, as they considered that such a proposal would not reflect local community identities and interests. East Yorkshire Constituency Conservative Association expressed concern at the proposals for Brandesburton parish. Nafferton Parish Council supported the draft recommendations for its area.

65 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received during Stage Three. While we note that Brandesburton Parish Council and a number of other respondents opposed the proposal to transfer the parish from North Holderness ward to East Wolds & Coastal ward, we remain concerned at the very poor electoral equality which would result if the parish was to be retained in the former ward. We have calculated that, under such a warding configuration, the number of electors per councillor would be 12 per cent below the district average in East Wolds & Coastal ward (13 per cent below in 2005) and 17 per cent above in North Holderness ward (22 per cent above in 2005), levels of electoral inequality which we do not consider are justified by the evidence which we have received. Consequently, in the absence of further alternative warding configurations in this area we are confirming our draft recommendations for the wards of Driffield & Rural and East Wolds & Coastal as final. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the district average in Driffield & Rural ward (2 per cent below in 2005) and 2 per cent below in East Wolds & Coastal ward (4 per cent below in 2005). Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

66 In the remainder of this area, East Riding of Yorkshire Council proposed at Stage One 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).

67 Dalton Holme Parish Council stated that it 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.

68 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we had received in this area, and we noted that East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals would achieve substantial improvements to electoral equality and would also, we judged, reflect local community identities and interests in the areas concerned and reflect the concerns of a number of those who have responded to us during Stage One. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals for the wards of Beverley Rural, Dale and South Hunsley as part of our draft recommendations. 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).

69 At Stage Three East Riding District Labour Party proposed that Beverley Rural ward should be modified in a number of areas: in the east it proposed that Wawne parish should be retained in Beverley Rural ward, while Woodmansey Nurseries parish ward would also be transferred to Beverley Rural ward; in the west it proposed that Middleton parish should be retained in Wolds Weighton ward and Newbald parish should be transferred to Dale ward. Under the District Labour Party's proposals, which only included electorate figures for 2005, the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below the district average in Beverley Rural ward, 9 per cent below in Dale ward, 7 per cent above in Mid Holderness ward and 6 per cent below in Wolds Weighton ward.

70 We have given careful consideration to East Riding District Labour Party's proposals in this area. While we note that its proposals would secure reasonable electoral equality, we consider that our proposals for this area provide a better reflection of local community identities and interests and consequently we are confirming our draft recommendations as final. In particular we note they have not been opposed by any other interested parties. Under our final



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). Our final recommendations for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

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

71 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).

72 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).

73 Bridlington Town Council opposed East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for Bridlington, arguing that they did 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 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.

74 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".

75 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we received in this area. We noted that there was little agreement between respondents regarding proposed warding arrangements for this area. In particular we noted that while there was 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 were not persuaded that the District Council's proposal for Bridlington would provide a satisfactory reflection of local community identities and interests. We agreed 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 adopted 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 judged, providing a better reflection of the statutory criteria than Bridlington Town Council's alternative proposal.

76 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).

77 At Stage Three East Riding of Yorkshire Council noted the draft recommendations for Bridlington Central & Old Town ward and Bridlington North ward. Bridlington Town Council stated that it accepted the draft recommendations for the town. The Conservative Group on East Riding of Yorkshire Council and East Yorkshire Constituency Conservative Association supported the draft recommendations for Bridlington. Councillor Male, joint leader of East Riding of Yorkshire Council, expressed concern at the proposal to reduce the representation of the Bridlington area from nine district councillors to eight, as he felt that this would lead to an increase in workload for those councillors representing the area. He considered that, if such a

reduction was necessary, Bridlington Old Town and Bridlington South wards should each be represented by three councillors while Bridlington North ward should be represented by two. He provided an alternative boundary between the two wards which he argued would better reflect community ties in the area concerned.

78 We have carefully considered the views which we have received in response to our draft recommendations. We note that Councillor Male opposed the draft recommendations for Bridlington, instead proposing that Bridlington North ward should be represented by two councillors if change was necessary. However, we also note that we have received some support for our draft recommendations, which we continue to consider would provide a satisfactory balance of the need to seek improvements to electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Consequently, in view of the absence of widespread support for the alternative proposals put forward by Councillor Male, we are confirming our draft recommendations for Bridlington as final.

79 Under our final 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). Our final recommendations for Bridlington are illustrated on maps A4 and A5.

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

80 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 Sigglesthorpe; 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 (12 per cent below in 2005), and 8 per cent above in South West Holderness ward (10 per cent above in 2005).

81 At Stage One 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 (4 per cent below in 2005).

82 Atwick and Sigglesworth 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”. Councillor Mrs Jefferson, member for North Holderness ward also opposed the transfer of Catwick and Hatfield parishes from North Holderness ward to Mid Holderness ward.

83 In arriving at our draft recommendations we carefully considered the views which we received in relation to the wards in this area. In the light of the request which we received from Hornsea Town Council and a number of other respondents for representation for the town alone, we revisited the electorate data in this area. However, in conducting a periodic electoral review we noted that we were 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 judged that we had 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 had not received proposals which would provide for Hedon parish comprising a ward on its own which would be compatible with our proposals for the wider area. We also noted that to retain Hatfield parish in North Holderness ward would be significantly detrimental to electoral equality, which we did not consider was justified in terms of the evidence which had been presented to us. Consequently we adopted East Riding of Yorkshire Council's proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations, as we judged that they would provide the best available balance of the need to improve electoral equality and 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).

84 At Stage Three Brandesburton Parish Council, Catwick Parish Council, Great Hatfield Parish Council, Let's Go Hornsea!, Councillor Mrs Evison and Councillor Mrs Jefferson (members for North Holderness ward), Councillor Willie (member for Mid Holderness ward) and 18 residents of the area generally opposed the proposed modifications to North Holderness ward, namely that it should no longer include the parishes of Brandesburton, Catwick and Hatfield. They argued that the draft recommendations would not reflect local community identities and interests and would prevent the parishes concerned from being represented by the existing councillors. In addition Let's Go Hornsea! argued that the proposed modifications would prevent the parishes concerned from participating effectively in its activities.

85 Burstwick Parish Council opposed the draft recommendation transferring Burstwick parish from South West Holderness ward to Mid Holderness ward, stating that this would not reflect local community identities.

86 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area during Stage Three. We note that there is opposition to our proposed North Holderness ward on the grounds that the community of interest of the parishes concerned lies with the Hornsea area and not elsewhere. We have calculated that to retain Catwick parish in North Holderness ward would generally achieve reasonable electoral equality, but to also retain Hatfield or, as discussed earlier, Brandesburton parish would not. Furthermore, we are not persuaded that the arguments in terms of the statutory criteria justify the retention of the parishes concerned in North Holderness ward. Consequently in the light of the fact that we have not received detailed alternative proposals in this area which would provide satisfactory electoral equality and offer a good reflection of the statutory criteria, we are not proposing to modify our draft recommendations for North Holderness ward. Similarly, we are not convinced that changing the electoral arrangements in this area would prevent Brandesburton, Catwick and Hatfield parishes from participating in the Lets Go Hornsea! economic development initiative.

87 With regard to Burstwick Parish Council's proposal that it should remain in South West Holderness ward we have calculated that such a proposal would result in substantial electoral

inequality – Mid Holderness ward would vary by some 14 per cent from the district average in 2005. We do not judge that we have received sufficient evidence in terms of the statutory criteria to justify such inequality and we are therefore not adopting this modification as part of our final recommendations. Consequently, in the absence of further alternative proposals we are confirming our draft recommendations for the wards of Mid Holderness, North Holderness, South East Holderness and South West Holderness as final, without modification.

88 Under our final 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 final recommendations for this area are shown on Map 2.

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

89 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).

90 At Stage One 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.

91 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).

92 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.

93 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, firstly a ward including the two Minster parish wards and St Mary's East parish ward, and secondly a ward including Molescroft parish, St Mary's West parish ward and part of Woodmansey parish.

94 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 purpose". 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 & Rural Liberal Democrats generally supported the Council's proposals in this area.

95 We gave careful consideration to the views which we received in these areas in arriving at our draft recommendations. We noted in particular the opposition of some respondents to the Council's proposals in the Beverley and Cottingham areas. However, we noted that in neither of the areas concerned had 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 adopted the Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations, as we judged that they provided 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).

96 At Stage Three East Riding District Labour Party opposed the draft recommendations in the Beverley area, and proposed an alternative configuration of wards. They proposed that Beverley Minster ward should comprise the parish wards of Minster North, Minster South and St Mary's East, and that Beverley St Mary's ward should comprise the parish wards of St Mary's West, Molescroft, Woodmansey Victoria and Woodmansey Minster View. Under this proposal, which only included electorate figures for 2005, the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent below the district average in Beverley Minster ward and 3 per cent above in Beverley St Mary's ward.

97 Anlaby with Anlaby Common Parish Council, Hull West & Hessle Constituency Liberal Democrats, West Hull & Hessle Conservative Association and a resident of Hessle all supported the draft recommendations in their areas. A resident of Cottingham supported the draft recommendations, subject to opposing the division of Dunswell and Woodmansey between different district wards.

98 We have given careful consideration to the views which we received during Stage Three. While we note the District Labour Party's alternative proposal in the Beverley area, we are not persuaded that the alternative configuration of wards in the area concerned would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria than under our draft recommendations. In particular, we note the support which our draft recommendations have received from other respondents. Consequently, in the absence of further detailed proposals which achieve good levels of electoral equality and have regard to the statutory criteria, we are confirming our draft recommendations for the wards of Cottingham North, Cottingham South, Hessle, Minster & Woodmansey, St Mary's, Tranby and Willerby & Kirk Ella as final.

99 Under our final 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 final recommendations for this area are shown on the large map inserted at the back of this report.



## **Electoral Cycle**

100 At Stage One we received no evidence of widespread support for a change to the electoral cycle of the district and accordingly we made no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

101 We received no further evidence of widespread support for such a change during Stage Three and consequently we are confirming our draft recommendations as final.

## **Conclusions**

102 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report we have decided to endorse our draft recommendations, without modification.

103 We conclude that, in East Riding of Yorkshire:

- a council of 67 members should be retained;
- there should be 26 wards, the same at present;
- the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

104 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	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

105 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 12 to none. By 2005 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

**Final 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**

106 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable 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, in our draft recommendations report we proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for the parishes of Bridlington, Cottingham and Woodmansey to reflect the proposed district wards, together with a minor amendment to the boundary between Minster North and St Mary’s East parish wards in Beverley parish which would not affect any electors, to ensure that the boundary follows recognisable ground detail. We also proposed new warding

arrangements for Driffield parish, at the Town Council’s request and an increase in representation for Hornsea Town Council. At Stage Three we received proposals for an increase in council size from Airmyn Parish Council and from a resident of Cottingham in relation to Cottingham Parish Council.

107 Airmyn parish is currently served by seven councillors and is unwarded. At Stage Three, Airmyn Parish Council proposed an increase in the number of councillors serving the parish from seven to eight or nine, stating that a council size of nine would be its preference, due to the increase in population of the parish and the responsibilities of the Parish Council. We are content to recommend an increase in representation to nine councillors and therefore include it as part of our final recommendations.

**Final Recommendation**  
Airmyn Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, two more than at present, representing the parish as a whole.

108 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 proposed 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 proposed that each ward should be represented by four councillors. In view of our final recommendations, which confirm our draft recommendations for district warding in this area, we are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for parish warding in this area as final.

**Final 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.

109 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 proposed 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. At Stage Three a local resident proposed that Cottingham

Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, five more than at present, with each of the proposed wards returning four councillors. However we have not received evidence of further support for such a change and, in view of our final recommendations, which confirm our draft recommendations for district warding in this area, we are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for parish warding in this area as final.

**Final 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.

110 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 considered that these proposed wards would generally provide a good reflection of local community identities and therefore put 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 proposed the names of Driffield North, Driffield South, Driffield South West and Driffield West for these parish wards. At Stage Three no further comments were received in relation to this proposal, and we therefore confirm our draft recommendation for Driffield parish as final.

**Final 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.

111 The parish of Hornsea is currently served by 12 councillors representing two wards, North and South, represented by eight and four councillors respectively. At Stage One 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 were content to recommend such an increase and therefore included it as part of our draft recommendations. At Stage Three no further comments were received in relation to this proposal, and we therefore confirm our draft recommendation for Hornsea parish as final.

**Final Recommendation**

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

112 The parish of Woodmansey is currently served by 12 councillors representing two wards, Dunswell and Woodmansey, represented by one and 11 councillors respectively. In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Woodmansey parish, we proposed 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. In view of our final recommendations, which confirm our draft recommendations for district warding in this area, we are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for parish warding in this area as final.

**Final 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.

113 In our draft recommendations report we proposed that there should be no change to the electoral cycle of parish councils in the district, and are confirming this as final.

**Final Recommendation**

For parish councils, whole Council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the District Council.

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

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





## 6 NEXT STEPS

114 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in East Riding of Yorkshire and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

115 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 25 June 2001.

116 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

### **Final 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

### 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](http://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*

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Compliance/departure</b>
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

