



**WATFORD
BOROUGH
COUNCIL**

COUNCIL FUNCTIONS COMMITTEE

7 November 2017

7.00 pm

Town Hall, Watford

Contact

Jodie Kloss/Alan Garside

legalanddemocratic@watford.gov.uk

01923 278376

For information about attending meetings please visit the [council's website](#).

Publication date: 26 October 2017

Committee Membership

Councillor D Walford (Chair)

Councillor M Watkin (Vice-Chair)

Councillors A Dychton, J Johnson, M Mills, N Shah and N Steele

Agenda

Part A - Open to the Public

1. **Apologies for absence/ committee membership**
2. **Disclosure of interests (if any)**
3. **Minutes**

The [minutes](#) of the meeting held on 07 September 2017 to be submitted and signed.

4. **Report on Boundary Commission Proposals for new Parliamentary Boundaries**
(Pages 3 - 70)

Report of the Head of Democracy and Governance.

Members are asked to consider the consultation document at Appendix 1 to the report and make any comments.

PART A

Report to: Functions Committee
Date of meeting: 2 November 2017
Report of: Head of Democracy and Governance
Title: Consultation on Proposed Boundary Changes for the Watford Parliamentary Constituency

1.0 **Summary**

1.1 On 17 October 2017 the Parliamentary Boundary Commission published its latest consultation on proposed changes to Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries. The consultation ends on 11 December 2017. In view of the potential impact on the Watford Constituency, members are asked if they wish to submit any comments on behalf of the Council.

2.0 **Risks**

2.1

Nature of Risk	Consequence	Suggested Control Measures	Response <i>(Treat, tolerate, terminate, transfer)</i>	Risk Rating (the combination of severity and likelihood)
That the Boundary Commission proceeds with proposals regardless of the views of the Council	If the proposals remain as is then Watford will not only have to take electors from Three Rivers but also have to lose electors to St. Albans	Unfortunately the council has no control over the final decision of the Commission	Tolerate	6

	creating extra work for the election team in what is always a busy period			
--	---	--	--	--

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 That members consider the consultation at appendix 1 and make any comments.

Contact Officer:

For further information on this report please contact
 Carol Chen Head of Democracy and Governance ext 8350 e-mail
carol.chen@watford.gov.uk

4.0 Detailed proposal

4.1 Attached as appendix 1 is the consultation document published on 17 October 2017 setting out the Parliamentary Boundary Commissions proposals for Parliamentary Constituencies in the Eastern Region of England.

4.2 This follows an earlier consultation which the Council did not participate in. The Consultation runs until 11 December 2017.

4.3 The aim of the Commission is to reduce the number of constituencies in England from 533 to 501 with the size of the electorate in each being no smaller than 71,030 and no larger than 78,507 (with the exception of the Isle of Wight). For the Eastern Region this means a reduction of 1 constituency.

4.4 The current proposals for Watford as set out in the appendix are:-

- Move part of Watford Borough (Woodside Ward area) together with the current 3 x Three Rivers District (Abbots Langley & Bedmond; Leavesden and Gade Valley) Wards area to the North of Watford, to proposed St Albans and Hemel Hempstead constituencies respectively;
- Extend the Watford constituency to the south, to take in Three Rivers' South Oxhey Ward area, in addition to existing Carpenters Park and Oxhey Hall & Hayling Wards;

But

- Disappointingly, has done nothing to establish all of the Meriden estate addresses within the Watford constituency. A small number of

properties/electors located, top eastern corner of estate, within Hertsmere BC area remain within the Hertsmere County constituency.

4.5 This is a change from the original proposals which did not see the current Watford Council wards split out of the Watford Constituency. The Council did not comment on the initial proposals, however, in view of the stated intention to recommend the splitting of the Woodside Ward out of the Watford Constituency members are asked if they wish to make any comments on behalf of the Council.

5.0 Implications

5.1 Financial

5.1.1 The Head of Finance comments that there are no direct financial implications in this report.

4.2 Legal Issues (Monitoring Officer)

5.2.1 The Head of Democracy and Governance comments that once the Parliamentary Boundary Commission has made its final recommendations to Parliament it will be up to Parliament to decide whether to accept or reject them.

5.3 Equalities/Human Rights

5.3.1 This is a piece of work being undertaken by the Parliamentary Boundary Commission.

5.4 Staffing

5.4.1 Depending on the final outcome if the proposals stay as they are this will mean more work for the elections office as they will have to liaise with two neighbouring authorities instead of one as at present.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Revised Proposals for New Constituency boundaries in the Eastern Region

Background Papers

- No papers were used in the preparation of this report.

File Reference

- None

Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the Eastern region



Contents

	Summary	3
1	What is the Boundary Commission for England?	5
2	Background to the 2018 Review	7
3	Revised proposals for the Eastern region	11
	The sub-region split	11
	Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolk	13
	Bedfordshire	28
	Essex	32
	Suffolk	40
4	How to have your say	45
	Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	47

Summary

Who we are and what we do

The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

The 2018 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 501), resulting in the number of constituencies in the Eastern region reducing by one, from 58 to 57. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions¹ – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

How did we conduct the 2018 Review?

We published our initial proposals for new boundaries in September 2016 and consulted on them. We received written comments and oral submissions at public hearings held in each region. We published all the comments we received and we held a second consultation exercise in relation to them in March 2017. We are very grateful for all the comments that these two consultation exercises have generated. We have now completed the next stage of the review process and we are now publishing our revised proposals. For each region, the revised proposals report sets

out our analysis of all the responses to our initial proposals in the first and second consultations, and the conclusions we have reached as to how those proposals should be revised as a result. The annex to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency in our revised proposals for the relevant region; maps to illustrate these constituencies can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

What are the revised proposals for the Eastern region?

We have revised the composition of 21 of the 57 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining 36 constituencies. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, seven constituencies in the Eastern region would be the same as they are under the existing arrangements.

As it was not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, our initial proposals grouped some local authority areas into sub-regions. It was also necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, the sub-regions used in formulating our revised proposals remain unchanged as shown in the table overleaf.

¹ The specified exemptions in England to the rules on constituency size are the two constituencies in the Isle of Wight.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
Cambridgeshire (including Peterborough), Hertfordshire and Norfolk	27	27
Bedfordshire (including Bedford, Central Bedfordshire and Luton)	6	6
Essex (including Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock)	18	17
Suffolk	7	7

In the sub-region of Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolk, we propose revisions to the constituencies of Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire, South East Cambridgeshire, Hertsmere, North East Hertfordshire, St. Albans, and Watford. In the sub-region it has still been necessary to propose two constituencies that cross county boundaries. As in the initial proposals, we propose that one constituency contain wards from Norfolk and Cambridgeshire and that another contain wards from Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire. We propose no changes to the initial proposals for Norfolk, apart from the name change of one constituency.

Of the six existing constituencies in the ceremonial County of Bedfordshire, we propose changes to three constituencies. We propose no changes to the remaining three constituencies, apart from the name of one constituency.

In the County of Essex (including the boroughs of Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock) we propose changes across the county and in particular to the constituencies in south Essex. We have therefore made revisions to seven of the 17 constituencies in the county and an additional change of name to one further constituency. The existing constituencies of Chelmsford, Epping Forest, and Thurrock remain unchanged, as in our initial proposals.

Of the seven constituencies in Suffolk, we have recommended revisions to the three constituencies of Bury St. Edmunds, Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, and Ipswich.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us. The best way to respond to our revised proposals is through our consultation website: www.bce2018.org.uk.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

1.1 The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required by Parliament to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every five years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries. We also make recommendations for any changes in the names of individual constituencies.

1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners take decisions on what recommendations to make for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 21 assistant commissioners (two or three allocated to each of the nine regions of England). Further information about the Commissioners and assistant commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our corporate website.²

1.3 Our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

The Secretary to the Commission
Boundary Commission for England
35 Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BQ

² <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us>

2 Background to the 2018 Review

2.1 There are four Boundary Commissions covering the UK with separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 states that they must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, every five years. Under the current review, we must report in September 2018. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the Eastern region.

2.2 Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. If our recommendations are accepted, they would be used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.

2.3 The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 501. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our Guide to the 2018 Review of Parliamentary constituencies ('the Guide'),³ published in the summer of 2016, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 71,031 and 78,507 electors.

2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, the largest constituency currently has around twice as many electors as the smallest. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant scale of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

2.5 If implemented, the recommendations that we will make in September 2018 will be the first set of boundaries to be defined under the new rules. While there has to be a significant amount of change across the country, we will, where possible, try to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors. Under the Act, we have a challenging job to do in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in a pattern of constituencies that is unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless the review has been one that we have conducted in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

2.6 The revised proposals that we set out in this report, and in the reports for the other eight regions across England, are made on the basis of the evidence we received during two consultation exercises, the careful consideration of our assistant commissioners and the best judgement of the three Boundary Commissioners. We are confident that these revised proposals strike the best balance

³ Available at <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/2018-review>

between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There may be particular areas across the country where our judgement has been a balanced and marginal one between competing alternatives, and in such cases we have made clear that we are looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many areas we are persuaded by the evidence we have received thus far, and we would therefore require new and significantly stronger arguments to make us depart from our revised proposals. If it exists, such new and compelling evidence would be welcome. However, we will not be assisted by repetition of arguments that have already been made, and which we have already considered. The requirement to keep constituencies within the permitted range of electors is strict, but otherwise we have sought to balance often conflicting considerations. Our proposals must also be comprehensive. We are acutely conscious that very often a change in one constituency necessarily requires an alteration in another and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.

2.7 The Guide contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the Guide, to enable greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

The rules in the legislation

2.8 The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 74,769. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- special geographical considerations, including the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency
- local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015
- boundaries of existing constituencies
- any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

2.9 It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2015, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. The Guide outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries that have been amended since 2015.

2.10 In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 11% of the existing constituencies in the Eastern region – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

2.11 Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to balance all the factors. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain seven (12%) of the existing 58 constituencies in the Eastern region.

The use of the regions used for European elections

2.12 Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the Eastern region. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the

2018 Review we decided, in agreement with all the main political parties, to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in the *Guide* and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

2.13 In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence across the country to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report, and all other regional reports, continues to use the regional boundaries as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for the review

Stage one – initial proposals

2.14 We began this review in February 2016 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the data pages of our corporate website.⁴ The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2016.

⁴ <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/data-and-resources>

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

2.15 We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2016 to 5 December 2016. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received more than 18,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including more than 1,700 unique written representations relating to the Eastern region. We also heard more than 65 oral representations at the four public hearings in the Eastern region. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

2.16 The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to send us comments on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 28 February 2017 and invited comments on them until 27 March 2017. We received more than 7,500 unique written representations across the country as a whole during those four weeks.

Stage four – publication of revised proposals

2.17 As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation), on 17 October 2017, we are publishing

this report – Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the Eastern region – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 11 December 2017. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

Stage five – final recommendations

2.18 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 11 December 2017, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this during September 2018. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in the Guide.

2.19 At the launch of each stage of consultation, we have taken – and are continuing to take – all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

3 Revised proposals for the Eastern region

3.1 In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of two assistant commissioners for the Eastern region – Sarah Hamilton and Laura Smallwood – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. This included chairing public hearings held in the region to collect oral evidence, as follows:

- Chelmsford: 31 October – 1 November 2016
- Norwich: 3–4 November 2016
- Luton: 7–8 November 2016
- Cambridge: 10–11 November 2016.

3.2 We asked the assistant commissioners to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of evidence provided in the representations. It is important to stress that the assistant commissioners had no involvement in developing – and therefore no vested interest in supporting – our initial proposals. Accordingly, they came to the analysis with an independent mind, open to viable alternative proposals supported by evidence. We are incredibly grateful for the thorough and methodical approach the assistant commissioners have taken to their work.

3.3 What follows in this chapter is:

- a brief recap of our initial proposals
- a description of the counter-proposals put forward during the consultations
- the assistant commissioners’ analysis of the strength of the arguments for adoption of any of those counter-proposals
- our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.

3.4 A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears at Annex A to this report.

3.5 Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent’s response we also include the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345. This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk. All representations received in response to the first two consultations are publicly available on this website. The representations received in response to these revised proposals will be published at the end of the review.

The sub-region split

3.6 The Eastern region comprises the counties of Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk. The counties are covered by a mixture of district councils, county councils and unitary authorities. The region currently has 58 constituencies. In this review the region has been allocated 57 constituencies, a reduction of one. Of the 58 existing constituencies, only 20 have electorates within 5% of the electoral quota (within the range of 71,031 to 78,507 registered

electors). In addition, the electors of 27 constituencies currently fall below the lower 5% limit, while the electorates of 11 constituencies fall above the upper limit.

3.7 In our initial proposals, six of the existing constituencies across the region were unchanged. Under our revised proposals, seven of the existing constituencies remain unchanged: the constituencies of Chelmsford, Epping Forest, Hitchin and Harpenden, South Suffolk, Thurrock, Waveney, and West Suffolk.

3.8 In Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolk, it was not possible to allocate a whole number of constituencies to each county. Therefore, in our initial proposals we proposed two constituencies that crossed county boundaries. One constituency contained electors from both Cambridgeshire and Norfolk, which combined the village of Littleport and the town of Downham Market. The other constituency contained electors from both Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire, which combined three wards from the District of South Cambridgeshire in a constituency with the towns of Letchworth and Royston. In Bedfordshire, Essex, and Suffolk, it was possible to allocate a whole number of constituencies to each county.

3.9 We received a number of counter-proposals. Among those that covered the whole of the Eastern region or specific sub-regions were counter-proposals from the Conservative Party (BCE-30338, BCE-32777 and BCE-41088), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259 and BCE-32797), the Green Party (BCE-28870, BCE-32533 and BCE-39914), Aaron Fear (BCE-31082 and BCE-40976),

Derek Jacobs (BCE-30171, BCE-31962, BCE-31963, BCE-32759, BCE-33620 and BCE-36669), Edward Carlsson Browne (BCE-28609), Daniel Summers (BCE-20687, BCE-32502 and BCE-39468), Oliver Raven (BCE-30024 and BCE-39493) and Alan Edmund Borgars (BCE-15921, BCE-15922, BCE-21960 and BCE-32659).

3.10 A large number of counter-proposals were also received that addressed issues for a smaller number of constituencies within a sub-region. Among these were counter-proposals from the Labour Party (BCE-30361, BCE-32779 and BCE-41085), Heidi Allen, Member of Parliament for South Cambridgeshire (BCE-23985), John Hill (BCE-27041 and BCE-36036), Pete Whitehead (BCE-24703), Jonathan Stansby (BCE-15599 and BCE-15860), Richard Huggins (BCE-31283 and BCE-32819) and Colin Rosenstiel (BCE-21596, BCE-32587 and BCE-37595).

3.11 A representation from Adrian Bailey (BCE-30336) suggested crossing the regional boundary into the East Midlands and South East regions, with a number of cross-regional constituencies that include parts of the counties of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. This would create a 'domino' effect and have consequential implications throughout the Eastern region. During the secondary consultation he suggested a region-wide proposal, which avoids crossing a regional boundary (BCE-41103). Our stated policy – which has received strong support – is to use the European regions as a basis for our recommendations, and only depart from that policy in light of very compelling reasons to do so. We agree with our assistant commissioners' recommendations that such reasons

do not exist here and we have therefore decided that the Eastern regional boundary should not be crossed with any other region.

Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolk

3.12 In our initial proposals, we noted that the electorate of the County of Cambridgeshire, including the unitary authority of Peterborough, resulted in an allocation of 7.4 constituencies. With seven whole constituencies, the average electorate of the constituencies in Cambridgeshire would be 79,270, which is outside the permitted electorate range. This made it impossible to allocate seven whole constituencies to Cambridgeshire and we knew that we would have to group the county with at least one other county in order to construct constituencies that were within 5% of the electoral quota. We also noted that the electorate of Hertfordshire gave an allocation of 10.7 constituencies. This would allow the allocation of 11 whole constituencies, but the very low average of electorates meant that it would be very challenging to construct constituencies that were within the permitted electorate range and that did not cause considerable disruption and division of towns. We therefore decided that Hertfordshire should be grouped with Cambridgeshire for the allocation of constituencies.

3.13 Norfolk's electorate of 645,761 gave it an allocation of 8.6 constituencies. This would result in an average constituency electorate of just 71,751 if Norfolk were allocated nine whole constituencies. It was therefore evident to us that it would be extremely difficult to construct nine constituencies in Norfolk on its

own. We therefore decided to consider Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolk as a sub-region. Of the existing 27 constituencies, only seven were within 5% of the electoral quota.

3.14 This approach was generally accepted, for example by the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) and Labour Party (BCE-30361). The Green Party (BCE-28870) suggested an alternative sub-region grouping of Norfolk (and Cambridgeshire) with Suffolk. They suggested that the Lothingland ward in Waveney District, which we have included in our proposed Waveney constituency, should be put together with the Lothingland ward of Great Yarmouth Borough in the Great Yarmouth constituency. Our assistant commissioners rejected the Green Party proposal to combine Suffolk in a sub-region with Norfolk, and we agree that Suffolk can be treated as a sub-region in its own right.

Cambridgeshire

3.15 Among the county-wide proposals for Cambridgeshire, which includes the unitary authority of Peterborough, our assistant commissioners noted that the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) supported our initial proposals. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) broadly supported our proposals, with the Labour Party (BCE-30361) proposing changes to the constituencies of Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire, and South East Cambridgeshire. All three of these political parties supported the inclusion of the town of Littleport in the cross-county constituency of South West Norfolk. In addition, there was support for this proposal from Whittlesey Town

Council (BCE-27006), recognising that this was the minimum change possible to satisfy the statutory requirements for new constituencies. However, this support was not unanimous. We received a letter from John Hill, the Chief Executive of East Cambridgeshire District Council (BCE-27041), opposing this proposal and putting forward an alternative, which included moving wards in and out of at least eight constituencies. The Green Party (BCE-28870) proposed changes to the initial proposals across the county, suggesting an Ely and Downham constituency which combined the towns of Ely, Littleport, and Downham Market from the counties of Norfolk and Cambridgeshire. Our assistant commissioners rejected these proposals, as it would result in unnecessary widespread disruption to multiple constituencies.

3.16 Adrian Bailey (BCE-41103), in his counter-proposal submitted during the secondary consultation, Derek Jacobs (BCE-30171) (and Daniel Summers (BCE-20687) all of whom spoke at our Chelmsford and Cambridge public hearings), opposed the inclusion of the two wards of Littleport East and Littleport West in a Norfolk constituency, proposing instead the inclusion of the Fenland District town of Wisbech in a Norfolk constituency. This was opposed by Cambridgeshire County Councillor Chris Boden (BCE-29605 and BCE-40325). Our assistant commissioners had already considered the inclusion of Wisbech in a Norfolk constituency, thereby allowing for the town of Littleport to be retained in the existing North East Cambridgeshire constituency, when they considered Norfolk. They had rejected

these proposals. Based on the evidence provided and the considerable knock-on effects to the counties of Cambridgeshire and Norfolk, we agree and propose no amendments to the configuration of constituencies for South West Norfolk and North East Cambridgeshire.

3.17 Our proposed Peterborough constituency generated representations that were mostly in support of our proposals, particularly regarding the inclusion of the Fletton and Woodston ward from the existing North West Cambridgeshire constituency. Stewart Jackson, the then Member of Parliament for Peterborough, said in his oral evidence on day one of the public hearing in Norwich (BCE-32301): ‘although I did oppose the inclusion of the Fletton and Woodston ward in the last boundary review in 2011 – the aborted sixth Boundary Commission review – I do nevertheless believe it is the ‘least worst’ option, in that clearly Fletton and Woodston is a city centre, urban ward’. A number of other representations supported our initial proposal for the Peterborough constituency, such as Councillor John Shearman (BCE-26241), Christopher Jones (BCE-25816) and Graeme Watkins (BCE-27826).

3.18 Our assistant commissioners considered the inclusion of the Stanground Central and Stanground East wards in the Peterborough constituency, and the Newborough ward in the North West Cambridgeshire constituency, as suggested by Alan Gasparutti (BCE-27525). However, this resulted in further disruption to the surrounding constituencies in Cambridgeshire. Therefore our assistant commissioners have recommended no

change to the Peterborough and North West Cambridgeshire constituencies, and we agree.

3.19 A large number of representations opposed the retention of the existing name of the Huntingdon constituency in Cambridgeshire, with many representations suggesting that the constituency name should incorporate the town of St Neots. Councillor Barry Chapman (BCE-15694) stated that ‘It would be absurd to continue using Huntingdon as the constituency name. The constituency should be renamed St Neots constituency or at an absolute minimum, St Neots & Huntingdon.’ This position was supported by others such as Justin Cooper-Marsh (BCE-22070), John Reed (BCE-34756) and Geoff Stephens (BCE-33836). An alternative name was proposed by Edward Keene (BCE-33177). He suggested the constituency name of Huntingdon and St Neots and stated that ‘the proposed constituency’s largest settlement is St Neots. Although Huntingdon is the old county town, it seems appropriate to also give reference to the second town of Huntingdonshire as well.’ Our assistant commissioners considered the different variations of names for the Huntingdon constituency and agreed with Edward Keene’s rationale. They recommended the constituency name of Huntingdon and St Neots as this continues to reflect the historical town of Huntingdon, while incorporating the newly expanded town of St Neots. We agree.

3.20 We received a number of representations in support of our initial proposals to move the Queen Edith’s ward from the existing South Cambridgeshire constituency to the

Cambridge constituency. Daniel Zeichner (BCE-20495), Member of Parliament for Cambridge, said that ‘there are strong local ties between Queen Edith’s ward and Cambridge constituency. Residential roads link the two areas and all electors in Queen Edith’s identify as residents of Cambridge.’ He further notes that the Queen Edith’s ward of the Cambridge City Council is the only ward currently excluded from the Cambridge constituency. John Beresford (BCE-32526), who spoke at day one of the public hearing in Cambridge, referred to the history of the Queen Edith’s ward and how it was once a ‘logical’ part of the South Cambridgeshire constituency. However, he considered that Queen Edith’s remoteness from the centre of Cambridge has ‘long gone’. He went on to state that ‘knocking on doors and meeting people in Queen Edith’s, there is still a strong sense of local community, but of one in Cambridge rather than in South Cambridgeshire. People in Queen Edith’s look to Cambridge for their services, their employment and their leisure.’ Dr Beresford’s comments were also supported by Marie Ferguson-Smith (BCE-37396). It was clear to our assistant commissioners that the Queen Edith’s ward has closer affiliations to the Cambridge constituency than it does to the South Cambridgeshire constituency. Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended no alteration to our initial proposals to include the Queen Edith’s ward in the Cambridge constituency, and we agree.

3.21 Many representations received opposed the inclusion of the South Cambridgeshire district ward of Milton (from the existing South East Cambridgeshire constituency) in our

proposed Cambridge constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-30338) supported the inclusion of the Milton ward in the Cambridge constituency, stating that it 'contains the University of Cambridge Science Park and which has close ties with the Chesterton and King's Hedges wards'. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) also supported our initial proposals, noting that 'Milton has very strong ties to the rest of Cambridge; and indeed the ward (and parish) of Milton has a detached area which is accessible by road only from within Cambridge itself. The Cambridge Science Park straddles the boundary between the City and Milton and there is continuous development between Milton and adjacent wards in the City.' Finally, Jon Coe (BCE-26435) supported this proposal, stating 'it makes sense for a single MP to cover Milton, the sewage works, the new station area and all the development on that site and the Science Park, as well as Cambridge City'.

3.22 However, there were also opposing views. Colin Rosenstiel who spoke at the Cambridge hearing (BCE-21596 and BCE-32587) believed that the Milton ward should not be in the Cambridge constituency. A campaign in opposition to the inclusion of the Milton ward in the Cambridge constituency (BCE-33229) contained almost 60 signatures. Former Councillor Ashley Walsh (BCE-37358) stated in his representation that 'Mr Rosenstiel, Ms Parkin, and Cllr Bradnam correctly point out that the Science Park is mostly in Milton Ward. They also remind us correctly that St. John's Innovation Centre, the Business Park, and associated developments along Cowley Road are mostly in Cambridge but partly in Milton. Given that these sites lie south of the A14

and Milton Country Park, it is incongruous that they should not be in Cambridge constituency.' We had a written response from J V Neal (BCE-28151), who stated that 'the A14 provides an obvious and natural and functional barrier that should not be breached'. In addition, John Harradine (BCE-23885) objected on the basis that Milton is still a village 'separate in both ethos and local community'.

3.23 The Labour Party (BCE-30361) also objected to the inclusion of the Milton ward in the Cambridge constituency and suggested that it be retained in the South East Cambridgeshire constituency. However, as a consequence, this would be above the permitted electorate range. To accommodate this change, they proposed that the South Cambridgeshire District Council ward of Teversham be transferred from South East Cambridgeshire to the South Cambridgeshire constituency. Former Councillor Ashley Walsh, Colin Rosenstiel and the Liberal Democrat Party all proposed that both the Teversham and Fulbourn wards be retained in the same constituency as they shared strong community ties. Former Councillor Ashley Walsh, who spoke on day one of the Cambridge public hearing, noted that 'Teversham is very close to Fulbourn, which is going to be moving into the proposed South Cambridgeshire constituency. It is in the same county division currently and will be in the same county division as Fulbourn, and in fact they both have residential roads which bisect the boundary between them, those being Yarrow Road, Fulbourn Old Drift, Speedwell Close and Teversham Road. Teversham and Fulbourn provide a natural pairing, have existing local government

arrangements shared between them, and are in the same present constituency.'

3.24 Given the contrasting arguments about whether or not the Milton ward should be included in the Cambridge constituency, our assistant commissioners visited the area. They observed that the ward was part of the northern overspill of Cambridge, but that it also had a somewhat separate, 'village feel' in nature. They agreed with the comment by Daniel Zeichner (BCE-37378) that 'the importance of coterminous government means that Milton would be better served by keeping matching arrangements with South East Cambridgeshire and South Cambridgeshire District Council'. While it might seem sensible for the area around the science park in the south of the Milton ward, within the A14, to be within the Cambridge constituency, we also note and accept the argument from the assistant commissioners that this is an existing local authority boundary, also highlighted by Mr Zeichner. We also note that the constituency boundary review is not an opportunity to tidy up such boundaries.

3.25 The assistant commissioners therefore recommended to us the inclusion of the Milton ward in the South East Cambridgeshire constituency. They also visited the Teversham and Fulbourn area. They noted the views about a shared identity that were expressed by local people, but 'on the ground' this was not evident to them and they considered that both wards had a separate village identity, being separated from Cambridge City by the expanse of the airport. However, if the Milton ward were to be retained in the

South East Cambridgeshire constituency, it would be necessary to reduce the electorate of South East Cambridgeshire to bring it within the permitted range. Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended to us that the Teversham ward be reunited with the Fulbourn ward in the South Cambridgeshire constituency.

3.26 We accept that this is a marginal decision. While accepting the recommendation from the assistant commissioners that the Milton ward should remain in the South East Cambridgeshire constituency, with the consequent changes, we therefore welcome further comments about this issue, provided it does not repeat representations already received.

3.27 Apart from the main political parties (Conservative, Labour, and Liberal Democrat Parties), all of whom supported our initial proposals for the cross-county boundary constituency of North East Hertfordshire, the majority of representations received for Cambridgeshire opposed the inclusion of the South Cambridgeshire District Council wards of Bassingbourn, Melbourn, and The Mordens in the North East Hertfordshire constituency, as we had proposed. This opposition included a campaign – 'Keep Melbourn in the South Cambridgeshire constituency' (BCE-27017) – which contained almost 100 signatures. The counter-proposal from Heidi Allen (BCE-23985), Member of Parliament for South Cambridgeshire, retained the three wards in the Cambridgeshire constituency and these proposals were supported by the Guilden Morden Parish Council (BCE-38061).

3.28 Ms Allen proposed that the South Cambridgeshire constituency should remain largely unchanged apart from the inclusion of the Queen Edith's ward in the Cambridge constituency. However, for Ms Allen's counter-proposal to be accepted, a different configuration of sub-regions in the Eastern region would be required that would consist of Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire and Norfolk, with only Suffolk as a stand-alone sub-region, with considerable knock-on effects throughout the region. Ms Allen's counter-proposals attracted some support, but only from members of the public in the South Cambridgeshire constituency and not from anyone from the other constituencies which would have been affected.

3.29 Our assistant commissioners were very mindful of the strong views and opposition received from Ms Allen and the public against the inclusion of the three South Cambridgeshire District Council wards in a cross-county Hertfordshire constituency. However, they considered that the disruption caused by this counter-proposal appeared to outweigh the benefits and would create further unnecessary changes to constituencies across the region. They also noted that, with the high electorates of constituencies in the area, the only ward out of the three in question that could be included in the South Cambridgeshire constituency without significant changes elsewhere was The Mordens. Our assistant commissioners agreed with the representations that these three wards should be kept together and rejected any suggestion to include just one of the wards in the South Cambridgeshire constituency. We agree.

3.30 The petition raised by Sarah Adam (BCE-27017) to 'Keep Melbourn in the South Cambridgeshire constituency' stated 'the proposal separates the Parishes of Melbourn and Meldreth. Yet the two villages are physically joined up and Meldreth relies on Melbourn for a number of services (e.g. health) and Melbourn shares the railway station in Meldreth. Melbourn is defined by South Cambridgeshire District Council as a minor rural centre for the villages in South Cambs 'attached' because of our links with other local villages – these do not include Bassingbourn or The Mordens.' A representation by Michael O'Shea (BCE-29955) proposed dividing the ward of Melbourn and stated 'adding back Polling district E07000012XJ1 (Melbourn village) to the South Cambridgeshire constituency would restore consistency with local government ward boundaries, as well as retaining at least some of the existing Cambridgeshire county border. It would add a slightly smaller number of voters to the constituency than adding back the whole of the ward (3,476 instead of 4,170).' However, our assistant commissioners did not consider that the evidence to split a ward in this area met our 'exceptional and compelling' criteria, and did not recommend the splitting of a ward. We agree.

3.31 Representations by Colin Rosenstiel (BCE-21596), former Councillor Ashley Walsh (BCE-37358), Daniel Summers (BCE-20687) and the Labour Party (BCE-30361) all proposed that the Meldreth and Melbourn wards of South Cambridgeshire District, should be retained in the same constituency. Our initial proposals had placed the two wards in different constituencies. The Labour

Party stated that ‘Meldreth has strong ties to Melbourn and also lies on the A10, while the Meldreth station serves both villages and was previously called Meldreth and Melbourn.’ Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence proposed by the Labour Party to include the additional ward of Meldreth in the North East Hertfordshire constituency as this would allow the Milton ward to be retained within the South East Cambridgeshire constituency. This would also allow both the Teversham and Fulbourn wards to be included in a South Cambridgeshire constituency and would unite the two wards of Meldreth and Melbourn in their proposed Letchworth and Royston constituency.

3.32 In view of the considerable debate about the proposed inclusion of three wards in the cross-county North East Hertfordshire constituency, our assistant commissioners visited the area. Driving along the main roads they considered that all three wards could be said to look, to some extent, towards Royston. They also travelled between the Melbourn and Meldreth wards and firmly agreed with those who said that the two wards were closely linked. As such, they considered that, in whichever constituency Melbourn were to be located, so too should the Meldreth ward.

3.33 Our assistant commissioners considered that the evidence looked both ways and that this was a difficult decision to make. Although they acknowledged the opposition to our initial proposal and the strength of feeling locally, they recommended to us that we reject the counter-proposal of Ms Allen and include the three wards of Bassingbourn, Melbourn, and The Mordens in the

North East Hertfordshire constituency. Furthermore, in view of the evidence given about the strong links between the Meldreth and Melbourn wards, and their own observations ‘on the ground’, they recommended to us that the Meldreth ward should also be included in the North East Hertfordshire constituency. However, they considered that the name of the proposed constituency would be unpopular and that, if we agreed with their recommendations, as the constituency would contain four Cambridgeshire wards, the name North East Hertfordshire would no longer be appropriate. They therefore considered that the name change suggested by the Labour Party – Letchworth and Royston – would be a more appropriate name for the constituency and recommended this to us. We agree with both their recommendations.

Hertfordshire

3.34 Very few representations were received for the constituencies of Broxbourne, Hertford and Stortford, Hitchin and Harpenden, Stevenage, and Welwyn Hatfield. In light of this our assistant commissioners decided to make no changes to our initial proposals for these constituencies, and we agree.

3.35 Among the region-wide counter-proposals, it was noted that the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) supported seven of our proposed constituencies (Broxbourne, Hertford and Stortford, Hertsmere, Hitchin and Harpenden, North East Hertfordshire, Stevenage, and Welwyn Hatfield) in Hertfordshire. The Labour Party (BCE-30361) proposed changes to only the North East Hertfordshire constituency, and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-

28259) supported our initial proposals for Hertfordshire in their entirety. Stephen McPartland (BCE-26990), Member of Parliament for Stevenage, supported our initial proposals and stated that it was 'correct to include both the Walkern and Watton-at-Stone wards' in the Stevenage constituency.

3.36 A representation by the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) proposed dividing the Dacorum Borough Council ward of Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield to retain the Ashridge ward in the Hemel Hempstead constituency, which would include the LD and LE polling districts of the Dacorum ward of Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield in the Hemel Hempstead constituency. They said that 'This ward comprises a rural part (LA, LB and LC polling districts) and a distinct urban part (LD and LE polling districts) which are part of Hemel Hempstead itself. We note that LA, LB and LC polling districts each comprise a civil parish, while the urban area of LD and LE polling district is, like Hemel Hempstead, unparished.' This representation also noted that the ward was split between constituencies along that line until 2010 when the whole ward was added to the South West Hertfordshire constituency. David Gauke (BCE-39362), Member of Parliament for South West Hertfordshire, Graeme Elliot (BCE-22712), Terry Douris (BCE-25000), Fiona Guest (BCE-25064), Herbert Chapman (BCE-26589) and Caroline Jenkins (BCE-30165) also proposed dividing the Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield ward. Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence provided but did not find that there was an exceptional or compelling

reason to divide the Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield ward, and recommended no change to the Hemel Hempstead and South West Hertfordshire constituency. We agree.

3.37 Further representations from Scott Crudginton (BCE-28434) and John Gardner (BCE-26981) divided the Chesfield ward, the latter of whom stated that 'in order to rebalance the electorate between the two constituencies if as requested you move the Stevenage constituency boundary to include the whole of Great Ashby with the 3,389 electorate of polling district FGB from the Chesfield Ward of Hitchin and Harpenden, we suggest that either the Codicote Ward (2,107) or possibly the Walkern Ward (2,085) could be moved into the Hitchin and Harpenden constituency.' He considered that both wards were 'free standing rural settlements not urban extensions of Stevenage. Geography and constituency mutual interest favours Codicote being a natural part of the Hitchin and Harpenden constituency.' A region-wide representation by Alan Borgars (BCE-21960) proposed dividing the Hatfield East ward of Welwyn Hatfield District Council, including the polling districts CCA/CCB in the Hertford and Stortford constituency, and polling disitrccts CCC/CCD in the proposed Welwyn Hatfield constituency. This was to avoid Cambridgeshire crossing into the County of Hertfordshire. Our assistant commissioners considered this evidence and concluded that this reasoning was not compelling enough to divide wards in the County of Hertfordshire and recommended that we reject the Conservative Party's counter-proposal and all the above proposals. We agree.

3.38 Daniel Summers (BCE-20687) put forward the suggestion to include the additional four South Cambridgeshire District Council wards of Fowlmere and Foxton, Gamlingay, Orwell and Barrington, and Meldreth in the proposed North East Hertfordshire constituency. Mr Summers proposed significant changes to the County of Hertfordshire and to the unchanged constituency of Hitchin and Harpenden where he proposed moving the Sandridge and Redbourn wards (in the St. Albans District Council) to the St. Albans constituency. He considered that it would be more appropriate to include the Sandridge ward in the St. Albans constituency rather than in the current constituency of Hitchin and Harpenden in view of what he considers is the continuous development of the Jersey Farm estate across the ward boundary with Marshalswick North. He went on to say that ‘Redbourn has good road access to St. Albans, equally as good as that to Harpenden. The largest settlement in the Watling ward is Markyate. This village is as well connected to St. Albans as it is to Hemel Hempstead. While for the remainder of the ward, its inclusion in St. Albans is not ideal, there are reasonable lines of communication, and there is some commonality between the villages on either side of the Dacorum/St. Albans boundary, so I feel the inclusion of this ward in St. Albans is a satisfactory solution.’

3.39 Furthermore Adrian Bourne (BCE-20175) refers to the fact that ‘nearby villages (like Redbourn) are on the doorstep of St. Albans. They shouldn’t be placed in a constituency with Hitchin, which is part of a single conurbation with Letchworth and Baldock but in a separate

constituency to them.’ Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence provided by Mr Summers and Mr Bourne and recommended that we reject these proposals as they created a ‘domino’ effect to not only the constituencies of Hertfordshire but also to constituencies in Cambridgeshire and Norfolk, and we agree.

3.40 Richard Harrington (BCE-32675), Member of Parliament for Watford, spoke on day two of the Cambridge public hearings and objected to the inclusion of the South Oxhey ward, which we had included within the Watford constituency. He said ‘It is problematic for a number of reasons, ... The area itself has no natural community links or ties to Watford and the area risks being within the community but very much out on its ear because it is just not really regarded as being part of Watford and never has been.’

3.41 Mr Harrington further proposed that the ward should be retained with the Eastbury ward of Moor Park and Eastbury in the South West Hertfordshire constituency. He also objected to the proposals covering the town of Abbots Langley, which he considered should be retained in a single constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence presented by Mr Harrington and recommended that we reject the proposals to retain the three wards of Abbots Langley & Bedmond, Gade Valley, and Leavesden in one constituency as this would create considerable changes across the county, and we agree.

3.42 However, we also received support for the inclusion of the South Oxhey ward in Watford by Councillor Stephen Cox

(BCE-24139) who said that South Oxhey was part of the Watford Rural Parish Council area and had historical and close ties with the town. He said 'So not only in any old constituency, but one with which it has an association by virtue of its good transport links. The train takes just five minutes to arrive at Watford High Street and the number 8 bus provides a frequent 7-day-a-week service to Watford. It is the nearest main shopping centre and entertainment venue.' Colin Gray (BCE-29889) also supported the South Oxhey ward in Watford and stated 'the community of South Oxhey has close ties with central Watford in terms of road, bus and rail connections'. Our assistant commissioners agreed with the evidence provided in support of the South Oxhey ward in Watford and recommended no change to this ward, and we agree.

3.43 We received a campaign opposing the inclusion of the Carpenders Park ward by J Fowler (BCE-41149) who said that our initial proposal 'contravenes clause 35 of your consultation document because under your proposals Carpenders Park would become a 'detached part' of Hertsmere'. We also received a larger campaign from the Carpenders Park Residents Association (BCE-33242) to 'Keep Carpenders Park in Watford' containing 348 signatures. This was supported by Graham Lloyd (BCE-25279 and BCE-39934) who stated that Carpenders Park was a fairly compact community that was geographically very close to Watford. He said that 'Across the entire age range of Carpenders Park residents Watford is an obvious place for shopping; many people work there or go there for entertainment and many children in our community traditionally attend secondary schools in Watford.'

He suggested that in the next few years substantial investment in Watford's infrastructure will create additional shopping outlets and extra employment opportunities that 'will enhance rather than diminish the attraction of Watford to Carpenders Park residents. None of these considerations apply to our virtually non-existent connection with Hertsmere.' Mr Lloyd also proposed the inclusion of the Carpenders Park ward in the Watford constituency and, to compensate for the loss, put forward the suggestion that the London Colney ward of St. Albans be transferred to the Hertsmere constituency. He said that the 'London Colney ward (6,642 electors) is geographically much closer to Hertsmere than Carpenders Park' and 'given that the Hertsmere MP has his constituency office in that ward it makes more sense for the ward to be in his constituency'.

3.44 Daniel Patterson (BCE-32700) also proposed the inclusion of the Carpenders Park ward in the Watford constituency and the ward of London Colney in the Hertsmere constituency. However, our assistant commissioners recognised that this would mean that the St. Albans constituency would be below the 5% electoral quota and would need to gain a ward. Our assistant commissioners visited the area of Carpenders Park and on inspection, they considered that it was an integral part of Watford. They considered that it would be necessary to include a different ward in the St. Albans constituency and considered whether the Woodside ward, at the northernmost part of Watford, would be a suitable candidate. They visited this area and, although they considered that it too was part of Watford, they noted that the ward is somewhat separated from the

rest of the Watford constituency by the A405. In the circumstances, our assistant commissioners recommended the inclusion of the Woodside ward in the St. Albans constituency and the inclusion of the Carpenters Park ward in Watford and, we agree.

3.45 The inclusion of the Carpenters Park ward in the Watford constituency, from our proposed Hertsmere constituency, would mean that other changes would have to be made. Our assistant commissioners considered whether to include either the ward of Colney Heath or the London Colney ward from St. Albans into the Hertsmere constituency. However, from their own observation of the area, they rejected the inclusion of Colney Heath in the Hertsmere constituency as there are no direct road links to the town centre and instead they recommend that the London Colney ward should be included in the Hertsmere constituency. They also noted that this had been proposed by Daniel Patterson (BCE-32700). Although this ward is separated from Hertsmere in the south by the M25, they considered that London Colney had more accessible road links to Hertsmere by the A1081, B5378 and B556. However, a consequence of the changes with regard to the Woodside and London Colney wards would be that both wards would be ‘orphan wards’⁵ in the St. Albans and Hertsmere constituencies respectively. Although they did not consider that this was an ideal solution, they considered that the benefit of including the Carpenters Park ward in Watford outweighed this disadvantage. They therefore recommended that the

London Colney ward should be included in the Hertsmere constituency, and we agree.

Norfolk

3.46 In general, our proposals in Norfolk did not generate a very large number of objections, although there were a number of counter-proposals. Our assistant commissioners noted that both the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) and the Labour Party (BCE-30361 and BCE-41085) supported our initial proposals in the county in their entirety.

3.47 Our proposed North West Norfolk constituency generated few representations and most of these were in support of our proposals, particularly in the Walpole and Walton wards in the extreme south-west part of the constituency. Typical of these were the representations from Emma Bateman (BCE-18963) who said ‘I fully support the proposal to include Walton ward in North West Norfolk constituency’; Anne Williams (BCE-17123) who said ‘I support the proposed changes which move West Walton back into the North West Norfolk constituency’; and Kay Manning (BCE-26089) who said ‘Walpole highway has road, and public transport links with Wisbech and King’s Lynn, Thetford is a long way away, with no road or public transport direct routes. Our local council is King’s Lynn. I think the new boundary proposal is the best option for Walpole Highway.’ Our assistant commissioners recommended no alterations to our proposed North West Norfolk constituency, and we agree.

⁵ ‘Orphan ward’ refers to a clear minority of wards (usually just one ward) from one local authority, in a constituency where the overwhelming majority of wards are from another local authority.

3.48 The Conservative Party (BCE-30338) also supported our proposed North West Norfolk constituency and accepted the need to create a cross-border constituency between Cambridgeshire and Norfolk. They agreed with us that this should be achieved by the inclusion of the two District of East Cambridgeshire wards of Littleport East and Littleport West in the South West Norfolk constituency, in their view ‘thereby minimising the disruption in Cambridgeshire and reducing the cross-county aspect of the constituency’. They also noted that Littleport has links with Downham Market via the A10. There was support for this proposal from Whittlesey Town Council (BCE-27006), recognising that this was the minimum change possible to satisfy the statutory requirements for new constituencies. However, this proposal was objected to by Derek Jacobs (BCE-34567 and BCE-36669) who also attended day two of the public hearing held in Chelmsford. He considered that the wards containing the town of Wisbech should be included in the South West Norfolk constituency, rather than the Littleport wards.

3.49 Our assistant commissioners weighed up the evidence and considered that Mr Jacobs’ proposal would be likely to result in more disruption than we had proposed and they consequently recommended that we reject his counter-proposal for South West Norfolk. We agree.

3.50 The Green Party (BCE-28870), while accepting that the boundary between Cambridge and Norfolk would have to be crossed, did not consider that separating Littleport from Ely was appropriate and

said that this resulted in ‘undesirable effects as far away as the proposed Great Yarmouth constituency and South East Cambridgeshire’.

3.51 Aaron Fear (BCE-31082) supported the inclusion of the two Littleport wards in South West Norfolk but was concerned that, in view of the disparate average constituency of electorates, there would be a systematic under-representation of Cambridgeshire and an over-representation of Norfolk. His views were considered by our assistant commissioners, but they correctly noted that the statutory rules are there to ensure that each constituency has an electorate within 5% of the electoral quota, and that the intention of the rules is not to bring average electorates closer to the electoral quota.

3.52 The assistant commissioners weighed up the evidence that was presented to them and considered that, on balance, our initial proposals to include the Littleport wards in South West Norfolk was the most appropriate solution. They did not, therefore, recommend any alteration to South West Norfolk apart from the constituency name. They proposed that the cross-county constituency which includes the wards of Littleport East and Littleport West should be renamed Thetford and Downham Market. This name reflects the largest settlements in the constituency, and the links of the Cambridgeshire wards to the town of Downham Market. We agree with both these recommendations.

3.53 The Conservative Party (BCE-30338) did not support our proposed Great Yarmouth constituency and counter-proposed that the North Norfolk ward of

Waxham, rather than Thurlton, should be included in the constituency as the Thurlton ward was separated from Great Yarmouth by the River Waveney, thereby retaining the whole of the Great Yarmouth local authority in the constituency (as in our initial proposals). However, this suggestion was objected to by the Labour Party (BCE-41085) who claimed that ‘the Waxham ward of North Norfolk is a remote sparsely populated area which stretches several miles to the north with only minor roads links and almost no ties to Great Yarmouth itself’.

3.54 The Green Party (BCE-28870) also objected to the inclusion of the Thurlton ward in Great Yarmouth and suggested that, while not ideal, Marshes ward would be a better fit than Thurlton. Steve Palmer (BCE-27228) stated that ‘Thurlton has had a long association with South Norfolk and the South Norfolk District Council, and this change would be considered quite disruptive to residents who may fear that the Great Yarmouth Council will not be suited to represent a predominantly rural area’. In addition, Donald Wiltshire (BCE-34560) objected to our proposal on the basis that ‘the population in the Great Yarmouth region is disproportionately larger than those in the more sparsely populated settlements in the existing boundaries of Thurlton. The views of the constituents in the Thurlton area will not therefore be fairly or proportionately represented.’ Our assistant commissioners weighed up the evidence and were not convinced that the counter-proposals provided a better solution and recommended to us that our proposed Great Yarmouth constituency should not be altered. We agree.

3.55 We received some support for our proposed North Norfolk constituency where we included the Broadland ward of Aylsham. Norman Lamb, the Member of Parliament for North Norfolk (BCE-23860), in ‘strongly’ supporting our approach ‘particularly as it relates to my own constituency’ said that ‘the addition of Aylsham makes sense’. However, both the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) and the Green Party (BCE-28870) objected to the inclusion of this, and other wards, which the Green Party considered were ‘on all definitions in Broadland’ and further said that this would make the ‘already unusually long-and-thin’ Broadland constituency even more so, tending ‘to work against common ties existing within it’.

3.56 A number of representations from members of the public objected to the inclusion of the Briston ward in the Broadland constituency. Many of these drew attention to the links of Briston with the north Norfolk coast, for example Margaret Ottey (BCE-30000) and Karen Massingham (BCE-28521). However, we noted the support from the Labour Party and Liberal Democrat Party, including Norman Lamb MP (BCE-23860) who said ‘It is regrettable that the Commission has found it necessary to remove the ward of Briston, but I accept that retaining it within the North Norfolk constituency would require consequential changes to other constituencies across Norfolk.’

3.57 Our assistant commissioners weighed the evidence before them. They considered that the inclusion of the Briston ward in the Broadland constituency allowed us to effect less change elsewhere to ensure all constituencies were within 5%

of the electoral quota and recommended to us that we should not alter our initial proposals for the North Norfolk and Broadland constituencies. We accept this recommendation.

3.58 We received a number of representations, containing conflicting evidence, concerning the two Norwich constituencies. In particular, this concerned the inclusion of the Cringleford and Old Costessey wards in our proposed Norwich South constituency (thus reuniting the two Costesseys) and the consequent inclusion of the Wensum ward in our proposed, Norwich North constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-30338) proposed that the Wensum ward continue to be included in Norwich South. Under the Conservative Party's counter-proposal, Norwich South constituency would therefore be unchanged except for the transfer of Old Costessey from South Norfolk to Norwich South 'therefore being much compliant with Rule 5 (1) c'. The Drayton and Taverham wards would be included in Norwich North, transferring from the existing Broadland constituency. This was supported by a number of speakers including Chloe Smith, Member of Parliament for Norwich North (BCE-22305), who said that Wensum was not the appropriate ward to be included in Norwich North as 'The boundary between the two constituencies has long been held to be the River Wensum.' Ben Foley of the Green Party (BCE-28870) agreed. He said that the Wensum ward should not be moved from Norwich South to Norwich North as 'doing so splits Earlham, since North Earlham and Earlham Rise are in Wensum Ward, while the rest of Earlham is proposed by the Commission to remain

in Norwich South constituency'. Councillor Martin Schmierer, on day one of the public hearing held in Norwich (BCE-32204), also considered that our initial proposals would divide the community of Earlham. Professor John Greenaway, on day one of the public hearing in Norwich (BCE-32313), said that his concern was that the initial proposals 'have the disadvantage of further diluting the representation of the Norwich city as a whole'.

3.59 There was, however, a degree of support for our proposals, including from Derek Jacobs (BCE-31962, letter one) who remarked that 'The Norfolk seats are virtually identical to what the Commission and myself produced a few years ago'. Thomas Osborne (BCE-29672) said 'It makes more sense to bring the Wensum ward in, than to take from the north, as local ties are stronger between Wensum (Earlham) and the city of Norwich, than between ... the countryside wards (to the north of Norwich) and Norwich city centre'. Daniel Summers (BCE-20687), in his region-wide counter-proposal, supported our initial proposals for the Norwich constituencies. He said that, in bringing both Norwich constituency electorates within quota, 'I believe the Commission are correct to obtain these extra electors from Cringleford and Old Costessey. Uniting Old and New Costessey in Norwich South is a sensible proposal, and Cringleford is well connected to the southern part of the city and lies along the A47 Norwich by-pass.' With regard to the Wensum ward he said 'I also agree with the BCE proposal to move the Wensum ward from Norwich South to Norwich North. This ward seems to have the best ties with Norwich North.' Erlend Watson (BCE-32341), on day one of

the public hearing held in Norwich, agreed with our proposals for Norwich, which were described as being ‘generally good’.

3.60 Further evidence, given on day one of the public hearing held in Norwich, referred to the village of Bawburgh, which is located in the Cringleford ward, with support for the inclusion of the village in the Norwich South constituency. James Anthony (BCE-32337) said ‘I agree with the current proposals. I have grown up in Bawburgh. I have lived there basically my whole life and I do not really connect, as many of my fellow people in Bawburgh, with South Norfolk. We consider ourselves part of Norwich. Even within Norfolk, if people ask ‘Where are you from?’ I will often simply say ‘Norwich.’

3.61 Our assistant commissioners considered carefully the evidence on the two Norwich constituencies and were of the view that it was finely balanced. They noted that in order to leave Wensum in Norwich South we would need to bring in a ward from Broadlands, which is more sparsely populated. They did not consider that it would be appropriate to have a rural ward in this constituency. While they understood the view of those who did not wish for the Wensum ward to be included in the proposed Norwich North constituency, they also considered that in order to effect necessary change elsewhere and to bring Norwich North within 5% of the electorate quota, it would be appropriate to include the Wensum ward in Norwich North and the Cringleford and Old Costessey wards in our proposed Norwich South constituency. They therefore recommended that our initial

proposals for the two constituencies in Norwich should not be altered. We agree.

3.62 Our proposals for the Mid Norfolk and South Norfolk constituencies did not elicit many representations, either in support of, or objection to, our initial proposals, although the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) proposed the retention of the wards of Cringleford and Thurlton in the South Norfolk constituency. This was supported by South Norfolk District Council Conservative Group (BCE-30723) and South Norfolk Conservative Association (BCE-31080). They also proposed the inclusion of the town of Wymondham in the Mid Norfolk constituency. However, there was support for our proposed inclusion of Wymondham in the South Norfolk constituency. The Labour Party (BCE-41085) said ‘it is sensible for the town of Wymondham once more to be included in the South Norfolk seat. It is the largest settlement in the South Norfolk District and it was a source of some controversy when it was removed from the South Norfolk CC in 2010.’ Rosemary Charles (BCE-21801) said that she would be happy should Wymondham return to South Norfolk and ‘to be reunited with our district is welcome news’. Councillor Bill Borrett (BCE-14587), a resident of the Mid Norfolk constituency, supported the composition of our proposals for the whole of Norfolk.

3.63 Our assistant commissioners considered all the evidence regarding the constituencies of Mid Norfolk and South Norfolk. They noted the limited support for our proposals here and also the limited opposition. On balance, they considered that the evidence was not sufficiently compelling to justify recommending

that our initial proposals for these two constituencies be changed. We agree.

Bedfordshire

3.64 In our initial proposals, we noted that the 439,574 electorate of the ceremonial County of Bedfordshire, comprising the unitary authorities of Luton, Bedford and Central Bedfordshire, resulted in an allocation of 5.9 constituencies. With six whole constituencies, the average electorate of the constituencies in Bedfordshire would be 73,262. Although towards the lower end of the permitted electorate range, we considered that it would be possible to create six whole constituencies without any need for the county to be grouped with another county or counties. We therefore decided to treat Bedfordshire as a sub-region in its own right in the construction of constituencies.

3.65 This approach was generally well received, for example by the Labour Party (BCE-30361), the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259), but this support was not unanimous. Oliver Raven (BCE-30024) proposed a Luton East and Knebworth constituency which crossed the Bedfordshire/Hertfordshire county boundary. However, our assistant commissioners did not consider that there was sufficiently good reason to cross the county boundary, as this would result in considerable knock-on effects to the surrounding constituencies, and rejected the proposal. We agree with their view.

3.66 Among the county-wide counter-proposals, it was noted that the Conservative Party supported only one of our proposed constituencies (North East

Bedfordshire), proposing ‘minor changes’ to the others, whereas the Labour Party supported our proposals in their entirety. Our assistant commissioners rejected the Green Party’s counter-proposal (BCE-28870) as it proposed splitting three wards in the county: Elstow and Stewartby, Kempston Rural, and Great Barford. They considered that no compelling evidence was put forward to justify the splitting of wards, given the ability to create a pattern of constituencies across the region that balances the criteria without splitting wards. We agree.

3.67 In order to reduce the electorate of the existing North East Bedfordshire constituency, we had transferred the Borough of Bedford ward of Eastcotts to the Mid Bedfordshire constituency and realigned a number of wards following local government ward boundary changes. Little in the way of representations was received regarding the North East Bedfordshire constituency, which was generally supported, although the Liberal Democrat Party proposed the retention of the Eastcotts ward in North East Bedfordshire, as did Daniel Summers (BCE-20687). Some concern was expressed regarding the separation of the towns of Stotfold and Arlesey in different constituencies, the latter of which we had proposed should be in the Mid Bedfordshire constituency. This was articulated by Sarah Passey (BCE-14834) who said ‘it seems very odd to split these two towns into separate constituencies with Arlesey moving to Mid Beds and Stotfold remaining in NE Beds’. While agreeing with us that the whole of the Arlesey ward should be included in our proposed Mid Bedfordshire constituency, Mr Summers did not believe it should be included without also including the Stotfold

and Langford ward 'given that Stotfold would be left on a salient in the south of the North East Bedfordshire constituency'. Our assistant commissioners weighed the evidence, but were not convinced that it was sufficient to recommend that we should make any alteration to the North East Bedfordshire constituency. We agree.

3.68 Our proposals to include the Borough of Bedford ward of Elstow and Stewartby in the Bedford constituency, and the Borough of Bedford ward of Kempston Rural in our proposed Mid Bedfordshire constituency, generated a larger number of representations. The Liberal Democrat Party, the Labour Party, Anne Thomas (BCE-25907), Councillor Saqhib Ali (BCE-28435) and Christine Mellors (BCE-28284) all supported these initial proposals. However, many representations did not agree. Richard Fuller, the then Member of Parliament for Bedford (BCE-31958), and the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) proposed the inclusion of the Kempston Rural ward in the Bedford constituency, and the Elstow and Stewartby ward in the Mid Bedfordshire constituency, citing connections between Kempston and Bedford and the physical separation of Elstow and Stewartby from Bedford. Similar opposition to the initial proposals, based on connections between the Kempston Rural ward and Bedford was received from Liam Rees (BCE-27705), Dr Margaret Turner (BCE-32467), Paul Stonebridge (BCE-25460), Juliet Gaishauer (BCE-31074), Catherine Dale (BCE-28494), and Marc Scheimann of the Green Party (BCE-32471).

3.69 Our assistant commissioners considered that the evidence regarding these two wards was finely balanced,

with both viewpoints well made and supported. However, on balance, they were persuaded by the evidence of those who identified the links of the Kempston Rural ward – and in particular, the area around Great Denham – with Bedford, and the Conservative Party evidence regarding the proportion of Bedford electors in each of the two wards. Accordingly, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that the Kempston Rural ward be included in the Bedford constituency, and the Elstow and Stewartby ward be included in the Mid Bedfordshire constituency. While we accept that this was a finely balanced judgement, we agree with their recommendation.

3.70 The transfer of the Kempston Rural, and Elstow and Stewartby wards between the Bedford and Mid Bedfordshire constituencies would result in the Mid Bedfordshire constituency having an electorate of 70,114, which is outside the permitted range, and it would therefore be necessary to include another ward in the constituency to increase its electorate. One candidate for inclusion in the Mid Bedfordshire constituency was the Central Bedfordshire ward of Barton-le-Clay, with both the Liberal Democrat Party and the Conservative Party proposing the retention of the Barton-le-Clay ward in Mid Bedfordshire to maintain existing links, rather than including it in our proposed South West Bedfordshire constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence with regard to this ward, noted its links with Flitwick and Shillington, and considered that our initial proposals could be changed to retain the ward in the Mid Bedfordshire constituency. This would have the effect of bringing the constituency within the permitted electorate range.

3.71 However, in his counter-proposal, Richard Fuller, proposed that the ward of Aspley and Woburn be transferred from our proposed South West Bedfordshire constituency to the Mid Bedfordshire constituency. Dr Margaret Turner also supported the retention of the Aspley and Woburn ward in the existing Mid Bedfordshire constituency. However, our assistant commissioners noted that it would not be possible to also transfer this ward to Mid Bedfordshire from South West Bedfordshire in addition to the Barton-le-Clay ward without further consequential knock-on effects elsewhere. Our assistant commissioners considered that neither of these representations regarding the Aspley and Woburn ward contained supporting evidence and, although they noted some support for Mr Fuller's Aspley and Woburn proposal, they considered this was as part of the Kempston Rural/Elstow and Stewartby ward switches, with no positive case being made for transferring the ward. As they considered that the evidence provided with regard to the Barton-le-Clay ward was more convincing, they therefore recommended to us that the Barton-le-Clay ward from the South West Bedfordshire constituency alone be included in the altered Mid Bedfordshire constituency. We agree.

3.72 The Labour Party and the Liberal Democrat Party supported our proposed constituencies of both Luton North and Houghton, and Luton South. On day one of the public hearing held in Luton, Kelvin Hopkins, MP for Luton North (BCE-32378), broadly welcomed the initial proposals and said 'I think we would accept and warmly

support what the Boundary Commission has proposed.' Although they proposed changes to both Luton constituencies, the Conservative Party did support bringing the town of Houghton Regis into the Luton North constituency, 'with which it has close ties'. The Liberal Democrat Party said in their representation 'We note it is not possible to create two whole constituencies without including some wards from outside the Luton Council area and we support the decision to include the minimum number of electors from Central Bedfordshire Council in order to bring both constituencies within the quota.' They also noted that 'Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis form a continuous built-up area but that the three towns are distinct with their own identity. We therefore further support the decision not to divide either the town of Dunstable or the parish of Houghton Regis, retaining the former wholly outside the Luton constituencies and the latter wholly within the Luton & Houghton constituency.'

3.73 More local support for our proposals came from Councillor Hazel Simmons (BCE-25672): 'Although Houghton Regis does fall outside the Borough it does have a natural affinity to Luton and follows natural communities'; from Councillor Jennifer Rowlands (BCE-25696): 'Houghton Regis has good links to the town of Luton'; and from Richard Spenser (BCE-25683): 'I believe that the boundary changes for Luton are fair and should go ahead'. On day one of the public hearing held in Luton, Bodrul Amin (BCE-32410) fully supported the inclusion of both Caddington in Luton South and Houghton Regis in Luton North which 'is a better option than part of Dunstable'.

3.74 However, there was significant opposition from residents in the Houghton area to our proposals, most of whom identified the links of Houghton Regis as being with Dunstable: ‘Houghton Regis has almost no cultural or leisure links with Luton, but is more linked with Dunstable’ – David Abbott (BCE-14757); ‘Houghton Regis is part of Dunstable and we consider ourselves to be Dunstablians’ – Dani Casey (BCE-17991); and ‘Whilst it is understandable that these changes need to be made, I think it really needs to be considered on a local level. Many residents of Houghton Regis, would closely identify with neighbouring Dunstable, and Eaton Bray as compared to the large almost city like town of Luton’ – Sam Duffy (BCE-27397).

3.75 There was also opposition from Caddington, where we had included the whole of the divided District of Central Bedfordshire ward of Caddington in our proposed Luton South constituency. Matthew Tomlin (BCE-22310) said ‘I feel as a resident of Caddington ... we have more in common with the villages of South West Bedfordshire as we are a rural community.’ The Conservative Party, in reconfiguring the constituencies in this part of Bedfordshire, included the Caddington ward in their South West Bedfordshire constituency. Under their proposals they said ‘no ward of the Central Bedfordshire constituency is contained in Luton South, and this authority is contained in part of four constituencies, rather than five under the Commission’s proposals, therefore being more compliant with Rule 5 (1) b ... Luton South is entirely contained within the Luton local authority, therefore being

more compliant with Rule 5 (1) b.’ However, the Labour Party strongly disagreed with the Conservative Party’s proposals and said ‘It produces a wholly new arrangement between the two Luton seats with just 61.4% of electors in Luton North remaining in Luton North & Houghton compared with 91.8% under the Initial Proposals, and 72.4% of those in Luton South which is kept intact under the IPs. We see no benefit or justification of this counter proposal.’

3.76 In their secondary representation, the Conservative Party (BCE-41088) drew attention to other representations from Caddington that spoke of the divide between Luton and the ward. These objections were echoed by the Member of Parliament for South West Bedfordshire, Andrew Selous (BCE-32371), who spoke on day one at the public hearing in Luton. While he welcomed the retention of the town of Dunstable in the South West Bedfordshire constituency, he objected to the inclusion of the Caddington ward in Luton South, highlighting the connection of local villages, and schools in particular, with Dunstable.

3.77 Our assistant commissioners noted other counter-proposals in this area, for example, Oliver Raven (BCE-30024) who split Houghton Regis between a South Bedfordshire seat and a ‘Luton West’ constituency to create a Bedfordshire/ Hertfordshire cross-county constituency of Luton East and Knebworth; Daniel Summers who, among other changes in the area, proposed that the Saints ward should be included in a redrawn Luton South constituency, and that the

Caddington ward be included in the South West Bedfordshire constituency; and Jonathan Stansby (BCE-15599) who included the town of Dunstable with the north-western suburbs of Luton in a Dunstable and Luton North West constituency, transferred the wards of Caddington and Stopsley from Luton South to South West Bedfordshire (which he renamed South Bedfordshire) and, in addition to Barnfield, included the wards of Saints and Icknield in Luton South (which he renamed Luton).

3.78 Our assistant commissioners carefully weighed up all the competing evidence, and while noting the opposition to our proposals, particularly in the Houghton Regis and Caddington area, decided that our initial proposals for the two Luton constituencies were logical, resulting in minimal change across the sub-region of Bedfordshire. They recommended to us that no changes be made to our initial proposals, for the composition of the two Luton constituencies. However, they considered that the suggestion by Daniel Summers to amend the name of the Luton North and Houghton constituency to Luton North and Houghton Regis was a more accurate description, and recommended this name change to us. We agree.

3.79 Our assistant commissioners noted that, apart from the issue of Houghton Regis, very little comment was received regarding our proposed South West Bedfordshire constituency and that there was support for the continued inclusion of the towns of Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard in the constituency (Tom Nicols, BCE-28746). In view of our

proposed changes to the Mid Bedfordshire constituency, no change to the two Luton constituencies (except the name change of Luton North and Houghton Regis), and its location in the south of the county, our assistant commissioners recommended that no further changes be made to the South West Bedfordshire constituency beyond the moving of the Barton-le-Clay ward. We agree.

Essex

3.80 In our initial proposals, we noted that the electorate of the County of Essex (including the two boroughs of Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock) gave an allocation of almost exactly 17 constituencies (17.05). A reduction of one constituency to 17 gave an average constituency electorate of 74,976, very close to the electoral quota. However, the reduction of a constituency in the county meant that change would be more significant than might otherwise have been the case. We decided to treat Essex as a sub-region in its own right. This was generally supported, although there was opposition from Heidi Allen, Member of Parliament for South Cambridgeshire (BCE-23985) who, in her counter-proposal to retain the existing South Cambridgeshire constituency, included Essex within a sub-region that comprised Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolk. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that it was appropriate or necessary to amend constituencies in Essex to resolve the issues with the South Cambridgeshire and North East Hertfordshire area or to include Essex within this sub-group, and they recommended to us that we reject

this proposal. As discussed in the section on the Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, and Norfolk sub-region above, we agree.

3.81 There was a notable degree of support for our initial proposals among the main political parties in their representations. For example, in their representation the Conservative Party (BCE-30338 and BCE-41088) supported our proposals in ten constituencies across the county and reserved their position on the remaining seven constituencies, which they did not subsequently amend. The Labour Party did not present any counter-proposals for Essex.

3.82 However, some wide-ranging counter-proposals were received from, for example, Daniel Summers (BCE-20687) who supported just two of the Essex constituencies (Colchester and Thurrock), Richard Huggins (BCE-31283) and the Liberal Democrat party (BCE-28259), with the latter proposal subsequently being supported by the Labour Party (BCE-41085). It was noted that Mr Huggins' and the Liberal Democrat Party' counter-proposals shared a number of similarities. Our assistant commissioners noted the wide-ranging and more radical proposals suggested by Oliver Raven (BCE-39493), but they considered that they resulted in significant and widespread change without sufficient evidence or justification, and that such change was not necessary. Paul Jeater of the Brentwood and Chelmsford Green Party gave oral evidence on day two of the public hearing held in Chelmsford (BCE-32729). Although he considered that some local ties in the county had been 'sacrificed', he did note that 'Losing a constituency from 18 to 17, Essex

will undoubtedly necessitate having its boundaries redrawn, more than any other county in the region. New constituencies will have to be created, some wards will need to be reallocated.'

3.83 In the north-east of the county, there was significant opposition to our proposals to include the Tendring ward of Golf Green, which includes the town of Jaywick, in our proposed North East Essex constituency, rather than retain it in the Harwich and Clacton constituency. The ward sits to the south-west of the town of Clacton-on-Sea and the objections cited the ward's close links with the town. Among local residents, Roy Murton (BCE-27245) said 'I am very upset at the prospect of our boundary being changed as we are next to Clacton-on-Sea, our seafront is joined to theirs, I walk along it to Clacton town and we are directly linked to them in so many ways.' In his representation Robert Young (BCE-16644) said 'As a resident of Clacton-on-Sea, I believe the Golf Green ward should not be separated from the rest of Clacton. The ward forms part of the unparished area of the town and forms an integral part of Clacton.' Thomas Stevenson (BCE-30105) described the initial proposal as 'deeply unsatisfactory', pointing out that the only road and public transport access to Jaywick is via Clacton, and that the only links between Golf Green and the adjacent St. Osyth and Point Clear ward in the North East Essex constituency are on foot. Aaron Fear (BCE-31082), in his counter-proposals for the Eastern region, said 'Jaywick's entire focus is the town of Clacton-on-Sea. It is a heavily deprived area which has nothing in common and no ties with the rural agricultural constituency into which it is proposed to move.'

3.84 Our assistant commissioners noted that a further number of counter-proposals, among them Derek Jacobs (BCE-32759 and BCE-36669) and Daniel Summers (BCE-20687), had suggested that the Golf Green ward be included in the Harwich and Clacton constituency, with the Little Clacton and Weeley ward transferring to the North East Essex constituency. The assistant commissioners considered that the evidence demonstrated that the Golf Green ward did indeed look towards Clacton-on-Sea and that the ward should be included in the Harwich and Clacton constituency, with the Little Clacton and Weeley ward transferring to the North East Essex constituency. We agree.

3.85 We had left the Colchester constituency unaltered in our initial proposals, apart from the addition of the Borough of Colchester ward of East Donyland, which had been in the existing Harwich and North Essex constituency. Our proposals for Colchester did not elicit much comment. However, there was support for our proposals from, for example, the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) and Aaron Fear (BCE-31082), and some opposition from, for example, Kade Ramsey (BCE-23478) who considered Colchester an ‘enclaved constituency’, surrounded by North East Essex. It was suggested that we use the River Colne to divide Colchester into two constituencies. However, our assistant commissioners did not consider that there was sufficient reason to change the initial proposals for the Colchester constituency, and we agree.

3.86 Similarly, very few representations were received concerning the Braintree and

Saffron Walden constituencies. However, Peter Long (BCE-25876), on behalf of both the Braintree and Witham Constituency Labour Parties, called for a Braintree and Witham constituency. Our assistant commissioners noted support for the proposed Saffron Walden constituency from Uttlesford District Council (BCE-27100), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) and the Conservative Party (BCE-30338). The Conservative Party noted that it contained wards from Braintree District Council that had been in the Saffron Walden constituency between 1885 and 2010, and included the whole of Uttlesford District Council. Our assistant commissioners recommended to us that we make no changes to the Braintree and Saffron Walden constituencies, and we agree with them.

3.87 The two proposed constituencies in the west of Essex, Epping Forest (which we had not changed in our initial proposals) and Harlow, did not generate a significant amount of comment. David Pracy (BCE-18608) objected to the separation of the ward of Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing, which we had included in the proposed Epping Forest constituency, from the Lower Nazeing and Roydon wards, which we had included in our proposed Harlow constituency on the grounds that it ‘breaks up a natural community’. John Lickman (BCE-24453), however, agreed with our proposals. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that there was sufficient evidence in the representations or counter-proposals that would lead them to recommend any changes to the two constituencies, and we agree with them.

3.88 While our initial proposals had not been particularly contentious in much of the County of Essex, this was not the case in the south of the county where there was considerable opposition to our proposed Brentwood and Ongar, South Basildon and East Thurrock, Castle Point, and Southend West constituencies. However, there was support for our proposed Thurrock constituency, which we had not altered in our initial proposals, for example from Christopher Harley (BCE-14490).

3.89 Kay Harper (BCE-18444), suggested that the constituency be renamed 'West Thurrock'. In view of the lack of opposition, and the fact that we had not changed the constituency, our assistant commissioners did not recommend any change to the constituency or to its name. We agree.

3.90 In our initial proposals, although the existing Brentwood and Ongar constituency was within 5% of the electoral quota, we had proposed substantial change as a result of the low electorates of surrounding constituencies. Among other changes, we had proposed that the Borough of Brentwood wards of Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon, and Warley be transferred from the Brentwood and Ongar constituency to our proposed South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency. This was very strongly objected to in the representations and we received two campaigns: 'Keep Warley in the Brentwood and Ongar constituency' (BCE-33236) contained more than 650 signatures, and the 'Keep Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon in Brentwood and Ongar' (BCE-33238) contained some 180 signatures.

3.91 Among the individual representations, Keith Howson (BCE-19803) said 'The proposal to take Warley out and include it within the new South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency is nothing short of ludicrous ... Warley is an integral part of Brentwood.' Councillor David Kendall, who spoke on day one of the public hearing held in Chelmsford (BCE-32806), highlighted community links: 'the reasons why both wards want to stay in the Brentwood and Ongar constituency is that they have strong links with Brentwood built up over hundreds of years. There is a real sense of community and identity with Brentwood and they are concerned that it will be lost if they are transferred into another constituency.' Elizabeth Outen (BCE-28725) said 'Warley is part of Brentwood. We have nothing in common with Basildon or Thurrock ... It even appears from your map that Brentwood station would no longer be in the Brentwood constituency.'

3.92 The point about Brentwood station was raised in a number of representations. Christopher Watkins (BCE-16158) and Anthony Hedley (BCE-15852) were among a number of respondents who suggested that the A127 would be a better boundary between the Brentwood and Ongar, and South Basildon and East Thurrock constituencies. Of the proposed Basildon and Billericay constituency, Mr Hedley said that it 'looks odd to have the two wards south of the A127. Why not use this natural boundary [to] define the new constituency?'

3.93 However, if these two wards were to be included in the Brentwood and Ongar constituency there would be implications elsewhere in this part

of Essex. Our assistant commissioners looked at the counter-proposals that had been received, and of particular interest to them were those of the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) and Richard Huggins (BCE-31283); both had proposed the inclusion of the Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon, and Warley wards in the Brentwood and Ongar constituency. The Liberal Democrat party said that Warley in particular was a built-up area of Brentwood and their proposals would mean that the whole of the Borough of Brentwood local authority would be contained in one constituency. To compensate for the inclusion of these two wards in Brentwood and Ongar, the ward of Boreham and The Leighs would be included in the Witham and Maldon constituency, and the ward of Writtle would be included in the proposed Basildon and Billericay constituency.

3.94 Our assistant commissioners visited the Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon, and Warley wards to observe for themselves the links between these wards and Brentwood. They considered that Warley in particular was part of Brentwood and that there was very strong evidence for both these wards being included in the Brentwood constituency.

3.95 The inclusion of the Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon, and Warley wards in the Brentwood and Ongar constituency would mean that the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency would now be outside the permitted range and would need to include additional wards. A representation from Daniel Lovey (BCE-17435) appreciated ‘how difficult a task this is’ and stated that ‘On balance, and looking at it from an overall

perspective, I think that the proposals I can accept and live with, rather than being ideal.’ However, he also said that ‘Ideally I would like to see the town of Basildon as one constituency on its own.’ The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) proposed that the Borough of Basildon ward of St. Martin’s would be a suitable candidate for the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency. This was also supported by Richard Huggins (BCE-31283) and the Labour Party (BCE-41085).

3.96 When they visited the area, our assistant commissioners were mindful of the representations that suggested using the A127 as a boundary between constituencies and considered that there was a good case for using this major road as a boundary between the Basildon and Billericay, and South Basildon and East Thurrock constituencies, and not just the Brentwood and Ongar, and South Basildon and East Thurrock constituencies. They visited the Borough of Basildon wards that were close to the A127 and considered that not just the St. Martin’s ward but also the adjacent Fryerns ward (also a Borough of Basildon ward), both of which were located south of the A127, close to the centre of Basildon, were very similar in nature and should, if possible, be kept together in the same constituency. It was their view that the inclusion of both these wards in South Basildon and East Thurrock would be an improvement on the initial proposals. However, the South Basildon and East Thurrock constituency could not accommodate both wards and remain within the electoral range and so if they were to be included, there would still be the need for one ward that lay south of the A127 to be included in the Basildon and Billericay

constituency. In visiting the area, they observed that the Basildon Borough ward of Laindon Park was further to the west of the St. Martin's and Fryerns wards, further from the centre of Basildon, and that it was different in nature, being semi-rural.

3.97 In view of the limited representations received in the area and their own observations, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that the Laindon Park ward, although lying to the south of the A127, should be included in the Basildon and Billericay constituency instead of in South Basildon and East Thurrock. This would allow for both the St. Martin's and Fryerns wards (both lying south of the A127) to remain together in South Basildon and East Thurrock. Furthermore, they considered that, if we were to agree to such changes, the Basildon and Billericay constituency could be renamed Billericay, as by far the larger part of Basildon would no longer be in the constituency, and that consequently South Basildon and East Thurrock could be renamed Basildon and East Thurrock. We therefore agree with their recommendations, both as to boundaries and suggested names.

3.98 However, the changes in this area still meant that there would need to be adjustments to the Basildon and Billericay constituency, now called Billericay. Apart from our own suggested transfer out of the St. Martin's and Fryerns wards, and the inclusion of the Laindon Park ward, the Liberal Democrat Party's counter-proposal offered a solution which involved considerable reconfiguration of our initial proposals. They included in the Billericay constituency a number of wards that had been included in the initial proposals

for the Rayleigh and Woodham Ferrers constituency: Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield, Rettendon and Runwell, South Woodham – Elmwood and Woodville, and South Woodham – Chetwood and Collingwood; the Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon ward from the initial proposals for the Witham and Maldon constituency; and the Writtle ward from the initial proposals for the Brentwood and Ongar constituency (as described above). They excluded from the constituency the three Wickford town wards of Wickford Castledon, Wickford North, and Wickford Park, which they included in the initial proposals for the Rayleigh and Woodham Ferrers constituency.

3.99 There was some support in our initial proposals for the inclusion of Wickford in a constituency with Billericay. For example, Sean Barlow (BCE-14382) said 'A lot of people were unhappy when the boundaries last changed that we were moved to being part of Rayleigh, as historically Wickford has always had closer ties with Billericay than Rayleigh.' However, this change would keep Wickford and Rayleigh in the same constituency, as they are in the existing constituency of Rayleigh and Wickford. Under the Liberal Democrat Party's proposals, the Purleigh ward would be removed from the Rayleigh and Woodham Ferrers constituency and included in the Witham and Maldon constituency. Following on from these changes, what had been the Rayleigh and Woodham Ferrers constituency would now be called Rayleigh and Wickford, as is the existing constituency. Under the counter-proposals suggested by the Liberal Democrat Party, the Rayleigh and Wickford constituency would be as

the existing constituency, apart from the Ashingdon and Canewdon ward, which we had included in our initial proposals for the Rochford and Southend East constituency.

3.100 Our proposed Witham and Maldon constituency had elicited little response from local residents, although, in addition to Peter Long (BCE-25876 and BCE-38216), as mentioned above, there was opposition from Thomas Kelly (BCE-16164), but some support, for example from Stewart Rodie (BCE-23863). As described above, the Liberal Democrat Party proposed that the constituency include the ward of Purleigh from our proposed Rayleigh and Woodham Ferrers constituency, the ward of Boreham and The Leighs from our proposed Brentwood and Ongar constituency, and that the orphan Chelmsford Borough ward of Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon be transferred from the constituency and included in a significantly reconfigured Basildon and Billericay constituency which they renamed Billericay. This, they said, would mean that the whole of Maldon Council area would be included in the constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered this evidence and noted that it did offer advantages, and also allowed for changes elsewhere in Essex that they would be considering.

3.101 Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the counter-proposals received for Essex, including those from Aaron Fear (BCE-31082), Andrew Binns (BCE-19255), Letrois Bernard (BCE-31285) and the Green Party (BCE-28870), and noted that the Liberal Democrat Party's solution for this part of Essex was very attractive to them. They considered that the counter-proposal was well presented and that all its suggestions were logical. It produced robust constituencies, and

had addressed a number of the objections that had been raised in south Essex. In considering the representations in this area, they noted that there were very few from residents of the proposed South Basildon and Billericay, and Rayleigh and Woodham Ferrers constituencies. However, they did note the representations of Sean Barlow (BCE-14382) and Roy Dell (BCE-14981) both of whom suggested that Wickford had always had closer ties with Billericay than with Rayleigh. Despite these limited comments, they therefore recommended to us that we adopt the Liberal Democrat Party's proposal (with the addition of their own suggestion for the Fryern and Laindon Park wards). We agree.

3.102 We received few representations from the Chelmsford area. Aaron Fear (BCE-31082), while acknowledging that 'it may comply with the rule on respecting existing constituencies to retain the seat unchanged', considered that doing so created a far greater degree of disruption elsewhere. However, there was support for making no change to the existing Chelmsford constituency from, for example, Chelmsford Conservative Association (BCE-31268) and Ian Phillipson (BCE-25290). Similarly, very few representations concerned the Rochford and Southend East constituency, although Daniel Summers did propose a Rochford and Southend North constituency (BCE-20687). However, in view of the limited evidence to the contrary, our assistant commissioners recommended that we make no change to the Chelmsford, and Rochford and Southend East constituencies, and we agree.

3.103 The boundaries of the existing Castle Point constituency were coterminous with the borough boundaries

and, with an electorate of 67,541, it would be necessary to make changes to bring additional electors into the constituency to bring it within 5% of the electoral quota. Also, the neighbouring Southend West constituency had an electorate of just 64,952 and also needed to have its electorate increased. We considered that our options were limited to some degree in this part of Essex due to the natural geography of the Thames estuary. In our initial proposals, we included the two Borough of Basildon wards of Pitsea North West and Pitsea South East in the Castle Point constituency. This in turn allowed us to include in the Southend West constituency the two Borough of Castle Point wards of St. James and Victoria, which contained the town of Hadleigh. We had considered that our options here were limited and had taken the view that the inclusion of the two wards that contained the town of Hadleigh was the best solution to increase the electorate of the Southend West constituency.

3.104 Although there was some support for our proposed Castle Point and Southend West constituencies, for example from the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259), our proposals for the two constituencies were almost universally objected to by local residents. Simon Hart, local councillor for the Victoria ward (BCE-28772), gave 17 reasons in his representation against the proposed changes. Some of these were also raised by Beryl Haisman-Baker (BCE-19768). She said ‘One of the biggest difficulties facing increasingly urbanised areas is maintaining Civic Pride and sustaining a sense of Community: these latest proposals are horribly divisive and counterproductive’ and cited the ‘muddles up’ of the local authority boundaries of

Basildon, Castle Point, and Southend; the separation of the hamlet of Daws Heath from its traditional Parish of Thundersley, as Daws Heath is a part of Thundersley; and that the proposals took the Grade 1 listed landmark, Hadleigh Castle, out of Castle Point. The latter point was raised by a number of residents, including Desi McKeown (BCE-28985) who said ‘surely Castle Point cannot lose its castle’ and Martin England (BCE-20317) who said ‘Castle Point needs its castle and the castle needs Castle Point.’ James Barber (BCE-29886) in his evidence said ‘All the towns of Castle Point have been part of the same constituency since at least 1893.’

3.105 Our assistant commissioners were struck by the strength of feeling contained within these representations and considered whether it would be possible to retain the St. James and Victoria wards in the Castle Point constituency. To assist them, they visited the area and observed that the town of Hadleigh was an important part of Castle Point. They were mindful of the oral evidence that Andrew Sheldon had given on day one of the public hearing in Chelmsford (BCE-32830): ‘The people of Castle Point, if you ask them, are perfectly happy for Castle Point to be added to in some way as a parliamentary boundary, but I think their preference, from their own ties and their own experience, would be not to be split up and to have part of Castle Point parliamentary constituency become part of Southend.’ They were also mindful of the geographical constraints in the area and that, were the St. James and Victoria wards to be returned to Castle Point, Southend West’s electorate would be too low and that, in order to bring it within the permitted range, considerable

disruption would be caused to a number of constituencies throughout south Essex.

3.106 Although they clearly understood and had taken on board the issues and the views that the residents of Castle Point had raised, and although they had considerable sympathy with those views, our assistant commissioners could not see a satisfactory solution that did not entail considerable further disruption elsewhere. Reluctantly therefore, they concluded that no changes should be made to the composition of our initial proposals for Southend West and Castle Point constituencies. However, to recognise that the town of Hadleigh would be contained within the Southend West constituency and that it would be a significant part of it, they recommended to us that the Southend West constituency should be renamed Hadleigh and Southend West. They considered that no change of name would be required for the Castle Point constituency as the majority of the borough would still be contained within it.

3.107 We agreed with the recommendations of our assistant commissioners in this area, although we have changed the order of the revised 'Southend West and Hadleigh' constituency name to recognise the larger settlement.

Suffolk

3.108 Of the seven existing constituencies in Suffolk, five are currently within 5% of the electoral quota. Under our initial proposals, we retained four existing constituencies: Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, Suffolk Coastal, Waveney, and West Suffolk. We received very few representations that either oppose or support the latter three of

those constituencies (Suffolk Coastal, Waveney, and West Suffolk). Our assistant commissioners therefore decided to make no change to the constituencies from our initial proposals, and we agree.

3.109 As the 70,702 electorate of the existing Ipswich constituency was below the 5% electorate quota, we decided to include the Pinewood ward (from the District of Babergh) in this constituency in our initial proposals. This change brought the Ipswich constituency within the permitted electoral range. To compensate for this transfer, we included the wards of Rattlesden, Onehouse, and Ringshall from the existing constituency of Bury St. Edmunds in our proposed constituency of South Suffolk. We proposed no further changes in this sub-region as this modification resulted in both the Bury St. Edmunds and South Suffolk constituencies being within the electoral range.

3.110 We have received some support for our proposals for Suffolk as a whole. The Labour Party (BCE-30361 and 41085) and Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-28259) both supported our initial proposals for this sub-region in their entirety. We also received a number of representations supporting our initial proposals for the Ipswich constituency, such as those from John Downie (BCE-18137), Alasdair Ross (BCE-23677) and Sandra Gage (BCE-23757). In developing our initial proposals, we considered that the Pinewood ward appeared to be a settlement that was part of the Ipswich area and that the A14 was an identifiable boundary between Ipswich and the South Suffolk constituency. In supporting our proposals for Ipswich, Sandra Gage stated 'those living in Pinewood believe they live

within Ipswich. They enjoy many of the services that their Ipswich neighbours have such as bus services, shops, supermarkets, libraries, dentists and doctors surgeries.’ She also stated that the Ipswich bypass (the A14) would be a sensible constituency boundary.

3.111 However, we received some opposition to our proposal to include the Pinewood ward in the Ipswich constituency. Alex Gordon (BCE-17065) indicated that ‘the villages of Belstead and Pinewood share common interests’ distinct from the urban borough of Ipswich. This view was supported by Edward Phillips (BCE-25809) and Benjamin Nunn (BCE-33373), who both considered that the inclusion of Pinewood in an Ipswich constituency was not logical, and suggested that the Ipswich constituency should instead include the Ipswich Borough ward of Castle Hill.

3.112 The Conservative Party (BCE-30338) put forward a counter-proposal for part of this sub-region. They suggested that the Ipswich constituency should include the Castle Hill ward ‘which has close ties with the St. Margaret’s and Westgate wards’ of Ipswich Borough Council, and that the Pinewood ward should be retained in a South Suffolk constituency. They counter-proposed that the wards of Rattlesden and Onehouse should be retained in the Bury St. Edmunds constituency and the wards of Needham Market and Ringshall should be included in the Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency. The Conservative Party identified that the Pinewood ward would be an orphan ward under our initial proposals and that their alternative would retain the existing South

Suffolk constituency, would mean fewer consequent changes to the existing Bury St Edmunds constituency and would result in a further Ipswich Borough ward being included in an Ipswich constituency. This counter-proposal received some support, including a representation from Onehouse Parish Council (BCE-27636) which indicated that the parish had ‘strong links and joint area work with Stowmarket’.

3.113 Paul West (BCE-32827) also pointed out that the inclusion of the Pinewood ward in the proposed Ipswich constituency creates an orphan ward. He too proposed the same changes as the Conservative Party to the constituencies of Bury St. Edmunds, Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, Ipswich, and South Suffolk. He suggested that the Pinewood ward should be retained in the existing South Suffolk constituency, and the Castle Hill ward be transferred to the Ipswich constituency. To compensate for the transfer of the Castle Hill ward from Central Suffolk and North Ipswich, he recommended ‘that Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency take in Needham Market and Ringshall’. He further stated that his proposals ‘affect just six local government wards’ and ‘would have benefits over the Boundary Commission proposals’. It would mean that all of Babergh District would be within South Suffolk instead of creating an orphan ward of Pinewood within the Ipswich constituency.

3.114 We also received representations which suggested that the Ipswich Borough ward of Whitehouse should be included in the Ipswich constituency instead of the Castle Hill ward. We received a letter (BCE-37305) which was jointly signed by

five current and former councillors that supported this alternative, asserting that Whitehouse and the adjacent Ipswich constituency ward of Westgate are 'a part of a confluent community area that is geographically indivisible' and share community facilities. The councillors indicated that the wards of Castle Hill and Whitton have corresponding shared community ties which would be broken under the Conservative Party's proposal and that there was a 'compelling community argument' for those two wards to remain in the same constituency. They considered that the Norwich Road (A1156) provided a 'well established geographical community dividing line' between the Whitton and Castle Hill wards to the east, and the Whitehouse and Westgate wards to the west.

3.115 Daniel Summers (BCE-20687) also suggested the inclusion of the Whitehouse ward in the Ipswich constituency to compensate for the loss of the Pinewood ward. He considered the inclusion of all the three wards – Castle Hill, Whitton, and Whitehouse – in the Ipswich constituency and identified a commonality, that 'the ward boundary between Castle Hill/ Whitton and Whitehouse is predominantly made up of the Bury Road and Norwich Road'. He also stated that 'Castle Hill has stronger links to Whitton as the ward boundary passes along or between residential streets.'

3.116 Mr Summers further suggested that the Rattlesden, Onehouse, and Ringshall wards (from Mid Suffolk District Council) remain in the Bury St. Edmunds constituency as 'many of the villages in these wards are within the orbit of Stowmarket and should ideally be retained

in the same constituency as that town'. In addition to this, he proposed the inclusion of Needham Market in the Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency, and the Pakenham ward from St. Edmundsbury Borough to the West Suffolk constituency, indicating that the 'Pakenham ward is well connected to other parts of West Suffolk, notably the Ixworth and Bardwell wards to the north by the A143 and A134 roads. The villages of this ward are of a similar nature to those in other neighbouring wards of West Suffolk.' While his proposal does retain the three Mid Suffolk District wards in the Bury St. Edmunds constituency, it requires modification to the otherwise unchanged constituency of West Suffolk. Our assistant commissioners took the view that it was unnecessary to create changes to the West Suffolk constituency and therefore rejected this counter-proposal. We agree.

3.117 Our assistant commissioners presented to us the evidence that had been received. In the light of the contrasting and conflicting arguments about which ward to add to the existing Ipswich constituency, they had also visited the area. In the Pinewood ward they observed that the ward is clearly Ipswich overspill, and although not part of Ipswich Borough Council, it is linked to the city and separated from the rest of Suffolk by the A14. They noted that the area around the Suffolk One college is more developed than the rest of the ward, and near the Aldi supermarket there is more of an 'edge of town' feel. Development is relatively modern and the area has its own clear identity and community facilities. The assistant commissioners considered that the Whitehouse ward is more urban compared to the Pinewood ward as the

area thins out along the A1214. Many of the local people and residents of the Whitehouse ward appeared to work in the nearby industrial estate, Whitehouse business centre, Asda supermarket and Anglia Retail Park among other employers. It was noted that the street names of the Whitehouse ward display the Ipswich coat of arms crest, signifying the close affiliation between the ward and Ipswich Borough Council.

3.118 The assistant commissioners observed that the Castle Hill ward is also an established urban area. They acknowledged that there appeared to be no differentiation between the Castle Hill and Whitton wards on the ground and that the two share a commonality of identity, an example being the Thomas Wolsey Endeavour Academy on Defoe Road which has children from both wards attending the school. However, despite this, due to its proximity to the centre of Ipswich, it was considered that the Castle Hill ward was more of an integral part of Ipswich than Whitehouse, evidenced by road links such as the A1156 and an older style of housing. The representation from Simon Thorpe (BCE-23999) reinforced this point. Of the initial proposals, he said ‘Carving off the Castle Hill area of Ipswich to be part of the Central Suffolk constituency appears to be both illogical and unfair to the people in that part of town.’

3.119 Their view was that the evidence provided by Paul West (BCE-32827) and the Conservative Party (BCE-30338) for the inclusion of the Castle Hill ward in the Ipswich constituency was more compelling than the counter-proposals which would move the Whitehouse ward into Ipswich. This was underlined to them by their visit

to the area. In addition, as they noted when presenting their recommendations to us, moving just one ward enables the existing South Suffolk constituency to be retained intact. The assistant commissioners therefore concluded that Castle Hill would be a better fit among these four wards for inclusion in an Ipswich constituency. We agree.

3.120 Under this proposal, the Ipswich constituency would be similar to the existing one and would include an additional Ipswich Borough ward. Consequently, the assistant commissioners proposed that the Babergh District ward of Pinewood be included in the South Suffolk constituency. Although we recognise the competing evidence presented regarding the links between Pinewood and Belstead, and Pinewood and Ipswich, we also noted from the assistant commissioners’ presentation to us that combining Pinewood and Ipswich would result in an orphan Babergh ward being included within an Ipswich constituency. The assistant commissioners’ recommendations avoid this, and also reflect the arguments received (such as those of Edward Phillips (BCE-25809) that Pinewood and Belstead share community ties.

3.121 Under the assistant commissioners’ recommendations that we should accept the Conservative Party’s counter-proposals for Suffolk, the consequent retention of the Onehouse and Rattlesden wards in the Bury St. Edmunds constituency respects the strong local ties of those wards to the towns of Bury St Edmunds and Stowmarket put forward in the evidence of Dr Helen Geake for the Green Party on day one of the Cambridge public hearing (BCE-32533). Likewise the inclusion of

the Needham Market and Ringshall wards together in the Central Suffolk and North Ipswich constituency reflects Dr Geake's evidence of the links between the two wards which should be maintained by putting them in the same constituency.

3.122 The assistant commissioners were in agreement with the Conservative Party's counter-proposals for Suffolk (BCE-30338), which they considered strikes the right balance between the criteria to which we work. This would result in an unchanged constituency of South Suffolk and fewer changes to the existing Bury St. Edmunds constituency. This would leave Suffolk Coastal, Waveney, and West Suffolk unchanged from our initial proposals. We agree with these recommendations.

4 How to have your say

4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Government.

4.2 While people are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. While we will consider representations that comment again on the initial proposals that we have not revised, it is likely that particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to depart at this late stage in the review from those of our initial proposals, which have withstood intensive scrutiny of objections in the process of consultation and review to which they have already been subject. Representations relating to initial proposals that we have not revised and that simply repeat evidence or arguments that have already been raised in either of the previous two consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.

4.3 When responding, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament and the decisions we have taken regarding adoption of a regional approach and use of local government wards discussed in chapter 2 and in the Guide. Most importantly:

- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight).
- We are obliged by law to use the Parliamentary electorate figures as they were in the statutory electoral register published by local electoral registration officers between December 2015 and February 2016. We therefore cannot base our proposals for this constituency review on any subsequent electorate figures.
- We are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (at May 2015) as the building blocks of constituencies. Exceptional and compelling evidence needs to be provided to persuade us that splitting a ward across two constituencies is necessary or appropriate.
- We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Particularly compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

4.4 These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a representation on a specific area to bear in mind the knock-on effects of their counter-proposals. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

How can you give us your views?

4.5 We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, www.bce2018.org.uk, when contributing to our consultation. That website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can instantly and directly submit to us your views on our revised proposals. If you are unable to access our consultation website for any reason, you can still write to us at 35 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BQ.

4.6 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available in our Data Protection and Privacy Policy, at:

<http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/freedom-of-information-and-data-protection>

What do we want views on?

4.7 We would like particularly to ask two things of those considering responding on the revised proposals we have set out. First, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so, as well as telling us where you object to them. Past experience suggests that too often people who agree with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals. Second, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, do please use the resources available on our website and at the places of deposit (maps and electorate figures) to put forward counter-proposals which are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.

4.8 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in September 2018.

Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
1. Basildon and East Thurrock CC			76,451
	Fryerns	Basildon	9,123
	Langdon Hills	Basildon	6,814
	Lee Chapel North	Basildon	8,775
	Nethermayne	Basildon	8,486
	St. Martin's	Basildon	5,730
	Vange	Basildon	6,547
	Corringham and Fobbing	Thurrock	4,326
	East Tilbury	Thurrock	4,536
	Orsett	Thurrock	4,823
	Stanford East and Corringham Town	Thurrock	6,307
	Stanford-le-Hope West	Thurrock	4,550
	The Homesteads	Thurrock	6,434
2. Bedford BC			74,520
	Brickhill	Bedford	6,348
	Castle	Bedford	5,000
	Cauldwell	Bedford	5,652
	De Parys	Bedford	4,908
	Goldington	Bedford	6,127
	Harpur	Bedford	5,233
	Kempston Central and East	Bedford	5,095
	Kempston North	Bedford	2,832
	Kempston Rural	Bedford	4,382
	Kempston South	Bedford	3,096
	Kempston West	Bedford	3,610
	Kingsbrook	Bedford	5,850
	Newnham	Bedford	5,443
	Putnoe	Bedford	5,868
	Queens Park	Bedford	5,076
3. Billericay CC			77,439
	Billericay East	Basildon	9,061
	Billericay West	Basildon	9,134
	Burstead	Basildon	8,430
	Crouch	Basildon	6,035
	Laindon Park	Basildon	8,597
	Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Chelmsford	4,102
	Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Chelmsford	6,613
	Rettendon and Runwell	Chelmsford	4,274
	South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Chelmsford	4,472
	South Woodham – Chetwood and Collingwood	Chelmsford	6,347
	South Woodham – Elmwood and Woodville	Chelmsford	6,223
	Writtle	Chelmsford	4,151
4. Braintree CC			75,132
	Bocking Blackwater	Braintree	7,232
	Bocking North	Braintree	4,018
	Bocking South	Braintree	4,230
	Braintree Central & Beckers Green	Braintree	5,905
	Braintree South	Braintree	4,347
	Braintree West	Braintree	4,643
	Coggeshall	Braintree	4,498
	Gosfield & Greenstead Green	Braintree	2,211

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Great Notley & Black Notley	Braintree	7,151
	Halstead St. Andrew's	Braintree	4,216
	Halstead Trinity	Braintree	4,598
	Hedingham	Braintree	4,109
	Kelvedon & Feering	Braintree	4,251
	Silver End & Cressing	Braintree	4,619
	Stour Valley North	Braintree	2,271
	Stour Valley South	Braintree	2,404
	The Colnes	Braintree	4,429
5. Brentwood and Ongar CC			75,442
	Brentwood North	Brentwood	5,054
	Brentwood South	Brentwood	4,204
	Brentwood West	Brentwood	5,096
	Brizes and Doddinghurst	Brentwood	4,648
	Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon	Brentwood	2,970
	Hutton Central	Brentwood	2,950
	Hutton East	Brentwood	2,873
	Hutton North	Brentwood	3,085
	Hutton South	Brentwood	3,029
	Ingatestone, Fryerning and Mountnessing	Brentwood	4,795
	Pilgrims Hatch	Brentwood	4,497
	Shenfield	Brentwood	4,187
	South Weald	Brentwood	1,437
	Tipps Cross	Brentwood	3,115
	Warley	Brentwood	4,505
	Broomfield and The Walthams	Chelmsford	6,367
	Chelmsford Rural West	Chelmsford	2,181
	Chipping Ongar, Greensted and Marden Ash	Epping Forest	3,435
	High Ongar, Willingale and The Rodings	Epping Forest	1,832
	Lambourne	Epping Forest	1,561
	Passingford	Epping Forest	1,884
	Shelley	Epping Forest	1,737
6. Broadland CC			71,085
	Hermitage	Breckland	2,205
	Acle	Broadland	2,116
	Blofield with South Walsham	Broadland	4,443
	Brundall	Broadland	4,441
	Burlingham	Broadland	2,057
	Buxton	Broadland	2,043
	Coltishall	Broadland	2,019
	Drayton North	Broadland	2,083
	Drayton South	Broadland	1,963
	Eynesford	Broadland	2,448
	Great Witchingham	Broadland	1,993
	Hevingham	Broadland	2,121
	Horsford and Felthorpe	Broadland	3,667
	Marshes	Broadland	2,363
	Plumstead	Broadland	2,360
	Reepham	Broadland	1,972
	Spixworth with St. Faiths	Broadland	4,260
	Taverham North	Broadland	3,779
	Taverham South	Broadland	3,636
	Wroxham	Broadland	3,879
	Astley	North Norfolk	1,774
	Briston	North Norfolk	1,955
	Lancaster North	North Norfolk	2,791
	Lancaster South	North Norfolk	3,186
	The Raynhams	North Norfolk	1,957
	Walsingham	North Norfolk	1,750
	Wensum	North Norfolk	1,824

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
7. Broxbourne BC			72,593
	Broxbourne and Hoddesdon South	Broxbourne	6,966
	Cheshunt North	Broxbourne	6,313
	Cheshunt South and Theobalds	Broxbourne	6,090
	Flamstead End	Broxbourne	6,580
	Goffs Oak	Broxbourne	6,734
	Hoddesdon North	Broxbourne	7,105
	Hoddesdon Town and Rye Park	Broxbourne	6,150
	Rosedale and Bury Green	Broxbourne	6,360
	Waltham Cross	Broxbourne	6,361
	Wormley and Turnford	Broxbourne	7,491
	Great Amwell	East Hertfordshire	2,173
	Northaw and Cuffley	Welwyn Hatfield	4,270
8. Bury St. Edmunds CC			77,733
	Bacton and Old Newton	Mid Suffolk	1,925
	Badwell Ash	Mid Suffolk	2,140
	Elmswell and Norton	Mid Suffolk	4,195
	Gislingham	Mid Suffolk	2,183
	Haughley and Wetherden	Mid Suffolk	1,746
	Onehouse	Mid Suffolk	1,868
	Rattlesden	Mid Suffolk	1,684
	Rickinghall and Walsham	Mid Suffolk	3,652
	Stowmarket Central	Mid Suffolk	3,577
	Stowmarket North	Mid Suffolk	7,465
	Stowmarket South	Mid Suffolk	3,708
	Stowupland	Mid Suffolk	1,819
	Thurston and Hessett	Mid Suffolk	3,481
	Woolpit	Mid Suffolk	1,619
	Abbeygate	St. Edmundsbury	3,270
	Eastgate	St. Edmundsbury	1,691
	Fornham	St. Edmundsbury	1,617
	Great Barton	St. Edmundsbury	1,716
	Horringer and Whelnetham	St. Edmundsbury	1,664
	Minden	St. Edmundsbury	3,287
	Moreton Hall	St. Edmundsbury	5,182
	Northgate	St. Edmundsbury	1,753
	Pakenham	St. Edmundsbury	1,907
	Risbygate	St. Edmundsbury	3,248
	Rougham	St. Edmundsbury	1,768
	Southgate	St. Edmundsbury	3,274
	St. Olaves	St. Edmundsbury	3,080
	Westgate	St. Edmundsbury	3,214
9. Cambridge BC			72,757
	Abbey	Cambridge	5,522
	Arbury	Cambridge	5,338
	Castle	Cambridge	5,086
	Cherry Hinton	Cambridge	5,449
	Coleridge	Cambridge	5,280
	East Chesterton	Cambridge	5,459
	King's Hedges	Cambridge	5,075
	Market	Cambridge	4,528
	Newnham	Cambridge	4,596
	Petersfield	Cambridge	4,275
	Queen Edith's	Cambridge	5,491
	Romsey	Cambridge	5,210
	Trumpington	Cambridge	6,347
	West Chesterton	Cambridge	5,101

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
10. Castle Point BC			75,130
	Pitsea North West	Basildon	8,900
	Pitsea South East	Basildon	8,469
	Appleton	Castle Point	5,311
	Boyce	Castle Point	5,133
	Canvey Island Central	Castle Point	4,959
	Canvey Island East	Castle Point	4,740
	Canvey Island North	Castle Point	5,090
	Canvey Island South	Castle Point	4,960
	Canvey Island West	Castle Point	3,679
	Canvey Island Winter Gardens	Castle Point	4,870
	Cedar Hall	Castle Point	4,663
	St. George's	Castle Point	4,495
	St. Mary's	Castle Point	4,853
	St. Peter's	Castle Point	5,008
11. Central Suffolk and North Ipswich CC			74,360
	Whitehouse	Ipswich	5,655
	Whitton	Ipswich	5,588
	Barking and Somersham	Mid Suffolk	1,785
	Bramford and Blakenham	Mid Suffolk	3,406
	Claydon and Barham	Mid Suffolk	3,604
	Debenham	Mid Suffolk	1,866
	Eye	Mid Suffolk	1,701
	Fressingfield	Mid Suffolk	1,931
	Helmingham and Coddensham	Mid Suffolk	1,799
	Hoxne	Mid Suffolk	1,670
	Mendlesham	Mid Suffolk	1,802
	Needham Market	Mid Suffolk	3,647
	Palgrave	Mid Suffolk	1,806
	Ringshall	Mid Suffolk	2,097
	Stradbroke and Laxfield	Mid Suffolk	2,125
	The Stonhams	Mid Suffolk	1,801
	Wetheringsett	Mid Suffolk	1,993
	Worlingworth	Mid Suffolk	1,923
	Framlingham	Suffolk Coastal	4,236
	Fynn Valley	Suffolk Coastal	2,470
	Grundisburgh	Suffolk Coastal	2,540
	Hacheston	Suffolk Coastal	2,452
	Kesgrave East	Suffolk Coastal	4,841
	Kesgrave West	Suffolk Coastal	5,333
	Tower	Suffolk Coastal	4,059
	Wickham Market	Suffolk Coastal	2,230
12. Chelmsford BC			78,107
	Chelmer Village and Beaulieu Park	Chelmsford	8,026
	Galleywood	Chelmsford	4,391
	Goat Hall	Chelmsford	4,495
	Great Baddow East	Chelmsford	6,438
	Great Baddow West	Chelmsford	4,760
	Marconi	Chelmsford	4,888
	Moulsham and Central	Chelmsford	7,706
	Moulsham Lodge	Chelmsford	4,307
	Patching Hall	Chelmsford	6,751
	Springfield North	Chelmsford	6,593
	St. Andrews	Chelmsford	6,572
	The Lawns	Chelmsford	4,230
	Trinity	Chelmsford	4,542
	Waterhouse Farm	Chelmsford	4,408

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
13. Colchester BC			74,140
	Berechurch	Colchester	6,424
	Castle	Colchester	6,662
	Christ Church	Colchester	3,275
	East Donyland	Colchester	1,845
	Highwoods	Colchester	6,732
	Lexden	Colchester	4,118
	Mile End	Colchester	7,104
	New Town	Colchester	6,223
	Old Heath	Colchester	4,126
	Prettygate	Colchester	5,794
	Shrub End	Colchester	7,224
	St. Andrew's	Colchester	4,861
	St. Anne's	Colchester	5,834
	St. John's	Colchester	3,918
14. Epping Forest CC			73,521
	Broadley Common, Epping Upland and Nazeing	Epping	1,693
	Buckhurst Hill East	Epping	3,433
	Buckhurst Hill West	Epping	5,234
	Chigwell Row	Epping	1,835
	Chigwell Village	Epping	3,304
	Epping Hemnall	Epping	4,858
	Epping Lindsey and Thornwood Common	Epping	5,239
	Grange Hill	Epping	4,898
	Loughton Alderton	Epping	3,258
	Loughton Broadway	Epping	3,173
	Loughton Fairmead	Epping	3,166
	Loughton Forest	Epping	3,349
	Loughton Roding	Epping	3,523
	Loughton St. John's	Epping	3,392
	Loughton St. Mary's	Epping	3,703
	Theydon Bois	Epping	3,296
	Waltham Abbey High Beach	Epping	1,987
	Waltham Abbey Honey Lane	Epping	4,508
	Waltham Abbey North East	Epping	3,254
	Waltham Abbey Paternoster	Epping	3,362
	Waltham Abbey South West	Epping	3,056
15. Great Yarmouth CC			71,907
	Bradwell North	Great Yarmouth	5,191
	Bradwell South and Hopton	Great Yarmouth	5,242
	Caister North	Great Yarmouth	3,654
	Caister South	Great Yarmouth	3,710
	Central and Northgate	Great Yarmouth	4,967
	Claydon	Great Yarmouth	5,414
	East Flegg	Great Yarmouth	3,950
	Fleggburgh	Great Yarmouth	2,042
	Gorleston	Great Yarmouth	3,887
	Lothingland	Great Yarmouth	4,262
	Magdalen	Great Yarmouth	5,130
	Nelson	Great Yarmouth	4,616
	Ormesby	Great Yarmouth	3,541
	Southtown and Cobholm	Great Yarmouth	3,256
	St. Andrews	Great Yarmouth	3,316
	West Flegg	Great Yarmouth	4,032
	Yarmouth North	Great Yarmouth	3,481
	Thurlton	South Norfolk	2,216

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
16. Harlow CC			71,459
	Hastingwood, Matching and Sheering Village	Epping Forest	1,883
	Lower Nazeing	Epping Forest	3,245
	Lower Sheering	Epping Forest	1,699
	Moreton and Fyfield	Epping Forest	1,661
	North Weald Bassett	Epping Forest	3,659
	Roydon	Epping Forest	1,780
	Bush Fair	Harlow	5,350
	Church Langley	Harlow	6,067
	Great Parndon	Harlow	4,899
	Harlow Common	Harlow	5,299
	Little Parndon and Hare Street	Harlow	5,629
	Mark Hall	Harlow	4,879
	Netteswell	Harlow	5,089
	Old Harlow	Harlow	5,661
	Staple Tye	Harlow	4,600
	Summers and Kingsmoor	Harlow	4,974
	Toddbrook	Harlow	5,085
17. Harwich and Clacton CC			77,200
	Alton Park	Tendring	3,420
	Beaumont and Thorpe	Tendring	1,782
	Bockings Elm	Tendring	4,036
	Burrsville	Tendring	1,782
	Frinton	Tendring	3,375
	Golf Green	Tendring	3,990
	Great and Little Oakley	Tendring	1,655
	Hamford	Tendring	3,259
	Harwich East	Tendring	1,779
	Harwich East Central	Tendring	3,656
	Harwich West	Tendring	3,902
	Harwich West Central	Tendring	3,792
	Haven	Tendring	1,796
	Holland and Kirby	Tendring	3,809
	Homelands	Tendring	1,706
	Peter Bruff	Tendring	3,238
	Pier	Tendring	3,326
	Ramsey and Parkeston	Tendring	1,677
	Rush Green	Tendring	3,428
	St. Bartholomews	Tendring	3,939
	St. James	Tendring	3,325
	St. Johns	Tendring	3,814
	St. Marys	Tendring	3,614
	St. Pauls	Tendring	3,761
	Walton	Tendring	3,339
18. Hemel Hempstead CC			73,526
	Adeyfield East	Dacorum	3,661
	Adeyfield West	Dacorum	3,970
	Apsley and Corner Hall	Dacorum	6,199
	Bennetts End	Dacorum	4,320
	Boxmoor	Dacorum	6,475
	Chaulden and Warners End	Dacorum	6,469
	Gadebridge	Dacorum	3,867
	Grovehill	Dacorum	5,203
	Hemel Hempstead Town	Dacorum	3,822
	Highfield	Dacorum	3,723
	Kings Langley	Dacorum	3,930
	Leverstock Green	Dacorum	6,748
	Nash Mills	Dacorum	2,350
	Watling	Dacorum	4,135
	Woodhall Farm	Dacorum	3,728
	Gade Valley	Three Rivers	4,926

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
19. Hertford and Stortford CC			75,023
	Bishop's Stortford All Saints	East Hertfordshire	5,431
	Bishop's Stortford Central	East Hertfordshire	6,537
	Bishop's Stortford Meads	East Hertfordshire	4,090
	Bishop's Stortford Silverleys	East Hertfordshire	3,949
	Bishop's Stortford South	East Hertfordshire	6,199
	Hertford Bengoe	East Hertfordshire	5,681
	Hertford Castle	East Hertfordshire	6,252
	Hertford Heath	East Hertfordshire	2,137
	Hertford Kingsmead	East Hertfordshire	3,912
	Hertford Sele	East Hertfordshire	3,921
	Hunsdon	East Hertfordshire	2,155
	Much Hadham	East Hertfordshire	2,082
	Sawbridgeworth	East Hertfordshire	6,511
	Stanstead Abbots	East Hertfordshire	2,204
	Ware Chadwell	East Hertfordshire	2,312
	Ware Christchurch	East Hertfordshire	3,880
	Ware St. Mary's	East Hertfordshire	3,850
	Ware Trinity	East Hertfordshire	3,920
20. Hertsmere CC			76,467
	Aldenham East	Hertsmere	3,639
	Aldenham West	Hertsmere	3,437
	Borehamwood Brookmeadow	Hertsmere	4,927
	Borehamwood Cowley Hill	Hertsmere	5,584
	Borehamwood Hillside	Hertsmere	6,243
	Borehamwood Kenilworth	Hertsmere	3,987
	Bushey Heath	Hertsmere	4,742
	Bushey North	Hertsmere	3,462
	Bushey Park	Hertsmere	5,622
	Bushey St. James	Hertsmere	4,936
	Elstree	Hertsmere	3,648
	Potters Bar Furzeffield	Hertsmere	4,841
	Potters Bar Oakmere	Hertsmere	5,212
	Potters Bar Parkfield	Hertsmere	5,774
	Shenley	Hertsmere	3,771
	London Colney	St. Albans	6,642
21. Hitchin and Harpenden CC			73,478
	Cadwell	North Hertfordshire	1,772
	Chesfield	North Hertfordshire	5,004
	Hitchin Bearton	North Hertfordshire	5,971
	Hitchin Highbury	North Hertfordshire	5,916
	Hitchin Oughton	North Hertfordshire	3,546
	Hitchin Priory	North Hertfordshire	3,587
	Hitchin Walsworth	North Hertfordshire	5,829
	Hitchwood, Offa and Hoo	North Hertfordshire	5,586
	Kimpton	North Hertfordshire	1,714
	Harpenden East	St. Albans	5,314
	Harpenden North	St. Albans	5,236
	Harpenden South	St. Albans	5,235
	Harpenden West	St. Albans	5,561
	Redbourn	St. Albans	4,746
	Sandridge	St. Albans	3,628
	Wheathampstead	St. Albans	4,833
22. Huntingdon and St Neots CC			77,715
	Alconbury and The Stukeleys	Huntingdonshire	2,532
	Brampton	Huntingdonshire	4,460
	Buckden	Huntingdonshire	2,616
	Fenstanton	Huntingdonshire	2,338
	Godmanchester	Huntingdonshire	4,818
	Huntingdon East	Huntingdonshire	6,686
	Huntingdon North	Huntingdonshire	3,510

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Huntingdon West	Huntingdonshire	4,772
	Kimbolton and Staughton	Huntingdonshire	2,485
	Little Paxton	Huntingdonshire	3,036
	St. Ives East	Huntingdonshire	4,762
	St. Ives South	Huntingdonshire	5,062
	St. Ives West	Huntingdonshire	2,363
	St. Neots Eaton Ford	Huntingdonshire	5,212
	St. Neots Eaton Socon	Huntingdonshire	4,098
	St. Neots Eynesbury	Huntingdonshire	7,503
	St. Neots Priory Park	Huntingdonshire	6,495
	The Hemingfords	Huntingdonshire	4,967
23. Ipswich BC			76,284
	Alexandra	Ipswich	5,618
	Bixley	Ipswich	5,434
	Bridge	Ipswich	5,223
	Castle Hill	Ipswich	5,582
	Gainsborough	Ipswich	5,747
	Gipping	Ipswich	5,191
	Holywells	Ipswich	5,040
	Priory Heath	Ipswich	5,796
	Rushmere	Ipswich	5,862
	Sprites	Ipswich	5,003
	St. John's	Ipswich	6,054
	St. Margaret's	Ipswich	5,912
	Stoke Park	Ipswich	4,910
	Westgate	Ipswich	4,912
24. Letchworth and Royston CC			76,505
	Braughing	East Hertfordshire	2,061
	Buntingford	East Hertfordshire	4,289
	Little Hadham	East Hertfordshire	1,857
	Mundens and Cottered	East Hertfordshire	1,927
	Puckeridge	East Hertfordshire	2,032
	Thundridge & Standon	East Hertfordshire	2,180
	Arbury	North Hertfordshire	2,045
	Baldock East	North Hertfordshire	2,251
	Baldock Town	North Hertfordshire	5,647
	Ermine	North Hertfordshire	1,949
	Letchworth East	North Hertfordshire	4,222
	Letchworth Grange	North Hertfordshire	5,492
	Letchworth South East	North Hertfordshire	5,415
	Letchworth South West	North Hertfordshire	5,910
	Letchworth Wilbury	North Hertfordshire	3,905
	Royston Heath	North Hertfordshire	4,166
	Royston Meridian	North Hertfordshire	4,078
	Royston Palace	North Hertfordshire	3,964
	Weston and Sandon	North Hertfordshire	1,637
	Bassingbourn	South Cambridgeshire	3,364
	Melbourn	South Cambridgeshire	4,170
	Meldreth	South Cambridgeshire	2,056
	The Mordens	South Cambridgeshire	1,888
25. Luton North and Houghton Regis BC			71,188
	Houghton Hall	Central Bedfordshire	5,717
	Parkside	Central Bedfordshire	3,220
	Tithe Farm	Central Bedfordshire	2,994
	Bramingham	Luton	5,366
	Challney	Luton	8,227
	Icknield	Luton	5,614
	Leagrave	Luton	7,492
	Lewsey	Luton	8,207
	Limbury	Luton	5,530
	Northwell	Luton	4,966

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Saints	Luton	8,501
	Sundon Park	Luton	5,354
26. Luton South BC			71,881
	Caddington	Central Bedfordshire	7,267
	Barnfield	Luton	5,295
	Biscot	Luton	8,351
	Crawley	Luton	4,696
	Dallow	Luton	8,243
	Farley	Luton	6,839
	High Town	Luton	4,206
	Round Green	Luton	7,566
	South	Luton	6,139
	Stopsley	Luton	5,294
	Wigmore	Luton	7,985
27. Mid Bedfordshire CC			74,088
	Eastcotts	Bedford	2,639
	Elstow and Stewartby	Bedford	3,131
	Wilshamstead	Bedford	3,476
	Wootton	Bedford	3,819
	Amphill	Central Bedfordshire	9,699
	Arlesey	Central Bedfordshire	11,121
	Barton-le-Clay	Central Bedfordshire	3,974
	Cranfield and Marston Moretaine	Central Bedfordshire	8,947
	Flitwick	Central Bedfordshire	10,075
	Houghton Conquest and Haynes	Central Bedfordshire	2,198
	Shefford	Central Bedfordshire	7,211
	Silsoe and Shillington	Central Bedfordshire	4,074
	Westoning, Flitton and Greenfield	Central Bedfordshire	3,724
28. Mid Norfolk CC			72,791
	All Saints & Wayland	Breckland	4,767
	Ashill	Breckland	2,163
	Attleborough Burgh & Haverscroft	Breckland	3,800
	Attleborough Queens & Besthorpe	Breckland	5,052
	Dereham Neatherd	Breckland	5,403
	Dereham Toftwood	Breckland	4,360
	Dereham Withburga	Breckland	4,321
	Guiltcross	Breckland	2,470
	Harling & Heathlands	Breckland	2,478
	Launditch	Breckland	2,054
	Lincoln	Breckland	4,065
	Mattishall	Breckland	4,384
	Necton	Breckland	2,116
	Saham Toney	Breckland	3,769
	Shipdham-with-Scarning	Breckland	4,265
	The Buckenams & Banham	Breckland	2,510
	Upper Wensum	Breckland	4,928
	Watton	Breckland	5,527
	Hingham and Deopham	South Norfolk	2,297
	Wicklewood	South Norfolk	2,062
29. North East Bedfordshire CC			74,198
	Bromham and Biddenham	Bedford	5,805
	Clapham	Bedford	3,364
	Great Barford	Bedford	6,173
	Harrold	Bedford	3,214
	Oakley	Bedford	2,987
	Riseley	Bedford	2,789
	Sharnbrook	Bedford	3,245
	Wyboston	Bedford	3,048
	Biggleswade North	Central Bedfordshire	5,709
	Biggleswade South	Central Bedfordshire	7,883
	Northill	Central Bedfordshire	3,453

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Potton	Central Bedfordshire	6,150
	Sandy	Central Bedfordshire	9,582
	Stotfold and Langford	Central Bedfordshire	10,796
30. North East Cambridgeshire CC			75,727
	Downham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	3,422
	Sutton	East Cambridgeshire	2,986
	Bassenhally	Fenland	3,769
	Benwick, Coates & Eastrea	Fenland	3,449
	Birch	Fenland	2,101
	Clarkson	Fenland	1,270
	Doddington & Wimblington	Fenland	3,568
	Elm & Christchurch	Fenland	3,674
	Kirkgate	Fenland	1,529
	Lattersey	Fenland	2,082
	Manea	Fenland	1,803
	March East	Fenland	5,591
	March North	Fenland	5,314
	March West	Fenland	5,339
	Medworth	Fenland	1,446
	Octavia Hill	Fenland	3,167
	Parson Drove & Wisbech St. Mary	Fenland	3,920
	Peckover	Fenland	1,646
	Roman Bank	Fenland	5,146
	Slade Lode	Fenland	1,867
	St. Andrews	Fenland	2,036
	Staithe	Fenland	1,790
	Stonald	Fenland	2,023
	The Mills	Fenland	2,161
	Waterlees Village	Fenland	2,969
	Wenney	Fenland	1,659
31. North East Essex CC			77,481
	Birch and Winstree	Colchester	4,233
	Copford and West Stanway	Colchester	1,468
	Dedham and Langham	Colchester	2,334
	Fordham and Stour	Colchester	4,180
	Great Tey	Colchester	2,138
	Marks Tey	Colchester	1,983
	Pyefleet	Colchester	2,087
	Stanway	Colchester	6,329
	Tiptree	Colchester	5,864
	West Bergholt and Eight Ash Green	Colchester	3,822
	West Mersea	Colchester	5,747
	Wivenhoe Cross	Colchester	1,627
	Wivenhoe Quay	Colchester	4,049
	Alresford	Tendring	1,677
	Ardleigh and Little Bromley	Tendring	1,846
	Bradfield, Wrabness and Wix	Tendring	1,828
	Brightlingsea	Tendring	6,398
	Great Bentley	Tendring	1,751
	Lawford	Tendring	3,364
	Little Clacton and Weeley	Tendring	3,797
	Manningtree, Mistley, Little Bentley and Tendring	Tendring	3,562
	St. Osyth and Point Clear	Tendring	3,673
	Thorrington, Frating, Elmstead and Great Bromley	Tendring	3,724
32. North Norfolk CC			71,657
	Aylsham	Broadland	5,972
	Chaucer	North Norfolk	1,920
	Corpusty	North Norfolk	1,872
	Cromer Town	North Norfolk	2,825
	Erpingham	North Norfolk	1,898
	Gaunt	North Norfolk	1,958

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Glaven Valley	North Norfolk	1,719
	Happisburgh	North Norfolk	2,013
	High Heath	North Norfolk	1,549
	Holt	North Norfolk	2,868
	Hoveton	North Norfolk	1,834
	Mundesley	North Norfolk	3,328
	North Walsham East	North Norfolk	3,305
	North Walsham North	North Norfolk	3,135
	North Walsham West	North Norfolk	3,308
	Poppyland	North Norfolk	1,988
	Priory	North Norfolk	3,164
	Roughton	North Norfolk	1,896
	Scottow	North Norfolk	1,956
	Sheringham North	North Norfolk	2,761
	Sheringham South	North Norfolk	3,116
	St. Benet	North Norfolk	1,781
	Stalham and Sutton	North Norfolk	3,355
	Suffield Park	North Norfolk	3,177
	The Runtons	North Norfolk	1,754
	Waterside	North Norfolk	3,535
	Waxham	North Norfolk	1,764
	Worstead	North Norfolk	1,906
33. North West Cambridgeshire CC			78,279
	Ellington	Huntingdonshire	2,417
	Elton and Folksworth	Huntingdonshire	2,109
	Ramsey	Huntingdonshire	6,258
	Sawtry	Huntingdonshire	5,144
	Somersham	Huntingdonshire	4,547
	Stilton	Huntingdonshire	2,342
	Upwood and The Raveleys	Huntingdonshire	2,418
	Warboys and Bury	Huntingdonshire	4,786
	Yaxley and Farcet	Huntingdonshire	8,021
	Barnack	Peterborough	2,471
	Glington and Wittering	Peterborough	4,901
	Northborough	Peterborough	2,198
	Orton Longueville	Peterborough	6,180
	Orton Waterville	Peterborough	6,321
	Orton with Hampton	Peterborough	8,971
	Stanground Central	Peterborough	7,057
	Stanground East	Peterborough	2,138
34. North West Norfolk CC			72,805
	Brancaster	King's Lynn	1,279
	Burnham	King's Lynn	1,435
	Clenchwarton	King's Lynn	1,791
	Dersingham	King's Lynn	3,979
	Docking	King's Lynn	1,515
	Fairstead	King's Lynn	3,643
	Gayton	King's Lynn	1,869
	Gaywood Chase	King's Lynn	3,168
	Gaywood North Bank	King's Lynn	5,591
	Grimston	King's Lynn	1,900
	Heacham	King's Lynn	3,944
	Hunstanton	King's Lynn	4,474
	North Lynn	King's Lynn	3,214
	North Wootton	King's Lynn	1,911
	Old Gaywood	King's Lynn	1,545
	Priory	King's Lynn	2,035
	Rudham	King's Lynn	1,808
	Snettisham	King's Lynn	3,432
	South and West Lynn	King's Lynn	3,058
	South Wootton	King's Lynn	3,634

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Spellowfields	King's Lynn	3,696
	Springwood	King's Lynn	1,562
	St. Margarets with St. Nicholas	King's Lynn	2,658
	Valley Hill	King's Lynn	1,890
	Walpole	King's Lynn	1,797
	Walton	King's Lynn	2,126
	West Winch	King's Lynn	3,851
35. Norwich North BC			71,192
	Hellesdon North West	Broadland	4,539
	Hellesdon South East	Broadland	3,894
	Old Catton and Sprowston West	Broadland	6,338
	Sprowston Central	Broadland	4,150
	Sprowston East	Broadland	5,617
	Thorpe St. Andrew North West	Broadland	5,635
	Thorpe St. Andrew South East	Broadland	5,074
	Catton Grove	Norwich	7,267
	Crome	Norwich	6,943
	Mile Cross	Norwich	6,939
	Sewell	Norwich	7,091
	Wensum	Norwich	7,705
36. Norwich South BC			71,804
	Bowthorpe	Norwich	7,872
	Eaton	Norwich	7,167
	Lakenham	Norwich	6,709
	Mancroft	Norwich	7,466
	Nelson	Norwich	6,650
	Thorpe Hamlet	Norwich	8,199
	Town Close	Norwich	7,968
	University	Norwich	5,101
	Cringleford	South Norfolk	4,448
	New Costessey	South Norfolk	4,126
	Old Costessey	South Norfolk	6,098
37. Peterborough BC			77,607
	Bretton North	Peterborough	5,782
	Bretton South	Peterborough	2,032
	Central	Peterborough	5,376
	Dogsthorpe	Peterborough	5,440
	East	Peterborough	5,847
	Eye and Thorney	Peterborough	4,825
	Fletton and Woodston	Peterborough	6,984
	Newborough	Peterborough	2,165
	North	Peterborough	3,163
	Park	Peterborough	5,367
	Paston	Peterborough	5,522
	Ravensthorpe	Peterborough	4,055
	Walton	Peterborough	4,062
	Werrington North	Peterborough	5,494
	Werrington South	Peterborough	5,159
	West	Peterborough	6,334
38. Rayleigh and Wickford BC			72,019
	Wickford Castledon	Basildon	6,160
	Wickford North	Basildon	9,487
	Wickford Park	Basildon	6,778
	Downhall and Rawreth	Rochford	3,705
	Grange	Rochford	2,762
	Hawkwell North	Rochford	3,440
	Hawkwell South	Rochford	3,410
	Hawkwell West	Rochford	3,447
	Hockley Central	Rochford	5,175
	Hockley North	Rochford	1,650

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Hockley West	Rochford	1,593
	Hullbridge	Rochford	5,350
	Lodge	Rochford	3,209
	Rayleigh Central	Rochford	3,236
	Sweyne Park	Rochford	3,361
	Trinity	Rochford	2,872
	Wheatley	Rochford	3,151
	Whitehouse	Rochford	3,233
39. Rochford and Southend East CC			72,970
	Ashingdon and Canewdon	Rochford	3,437
	Barling and Sutton	Rochford	1,383
	Foulness and Great Wakering	Rochford	4,436
	Rochford	Rochford	5,616
	Kursaal	Southend-on-Sea	6,912
	Milton	Southend-on-Sea	6,684
	Shoeburyness	Southend-on-Sea	8,346
	Southchurch	Southend-on-Sea	7,317
	St. Luke's	Southend-on-Sea	7,711
	Thorpe	Southend-on-Sea	7,244
	Victoria	Southend-on-Sea	6,666
	West Shoebury	Southend-on-Sea	7,218
40. Saffron Walden CC			72,780
	Bumpstead	Braintree	2,285
	Rayne	Braintree	2,203
	Three Fields	Braintree	4,480
	Yeldham	Braintree	2,110
	Ashdon	Uttlesford	1,560
	Broad Oak & the Hallingburys	Uttlesford	3,033
	Clavering	Uttlesford	1,776
	Debden & Wimbish	Uttlesford	1,628
	Elsenham & Henham	Uttlesford	2,800
	Felsted & Stebbing	Uttlesford	3,268
	Flitch Green & Little Dunmow	Uttlesford	1,546
	Great Dunmow North	Uttlesford	3,154
	Great Dunmow South & Barnston	Uttlesford	4,552
	Hatfield Heath	Uttlesford	1,676
	High Easter & the Rodings	Uttlesford	1,772
	Littlebury, Chesterford & Wenden Lofts	Uttlesford	3,290
	Newport	Uttlesford	2,652
	Saffron Walden Audley	Uttlesford	3,315
	Saffron Walden Castle	Uttlesford	3,002
	Saffron Walden Shire	Uttlesford	5,194
	Stansted North	Uttlesford	3,253
	Stansted South & Birchanger	Uttlesford	3,091
	Stort Valley	Uttlesford	1,559
	Takeley	Uttlesford	4,300
	Thaxted & the Eastons	Uttlesford	3,613
	The Sampfords	Uttlesford	1,668
41. South Cambridgeshire CC			76,968
	Gransden and The Offords	Huntingdonshire	3,593
	Bar Hill	South Cambridgeshire	3,638
	Barton	South Cambridgeshire	1,887
	Bourn	South Cambridgeshire	7,462
	Caldecote	South Cambridgeshire	1,829
	Comberton	South Cambridgeshire	1,761
	Cottenham	South Cambridgeshire	5,954
	Duxford	South Cambridgeshire	2,089
	Fowlmere and Foxton	South Cambridgeshire	1,870
	Fulbourn	South Cambridgeshire	3,608
	Gamlingay	South Cambridgeshire	3,850
	Girton	South Cambridgeshire	3,232

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Hardwick	South Cambridgeshire	1,995
	Harston and Hauxton	South Cambridgeshire	1,863
	Haslingfield and The Eversdens	South Cambridgeshire	2,141
	Linton	South Cambridgeshire	3,632
	Longstanton	South Cambridgeshire	2,336
	Orwell and Barrington	South Cambridgeshire	1,892
	Papworth and Elsworth	South Cambridgeshire	4,091
	Sawston	South Cambridgeshire	5,272
	Swavesey	South Cambridgeshire	1,827
	Teversham	South Cambridgeshire	1,736
	The Abingtons	South Cambridgeshire	1,764
	The Shelfords and Stapleford	South Cambridgeshire	5,577
	Whittlesford	South Cambridgeshire	2,069
42. South East Cambridgeshire CC			78,304
	Bottisham	East Cambridgeshire	3,028
	Burwell	East Cambridgeshire	4,709
	Cheveley	East Cambridgeshire	2,970
	Dullingham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	1,496
	Ely East	East Cambridgeshire	2,870
	Ely North	East Cambridgeshire	4,917
	Ely South	East Cambridgeshire	2,998
	Ely West	East Cambridgeshire	3,294
	Fordham Villages	East Cambridgeshire	2,783
	Haddenham	East Cambridgeshire	4,457
	Isleham	East Cambridgeshire	1,789
	Soham North	East Cambridgeshire	3,535
	Soham South	East Cambridgeshire	4,785
	Stretham	East Cambridgeshire	3,009
	The Swaffhams	East Cambridgeshire	1,505
	Earith	Huntingdonshire	4,723
	Balsham	South Cambridgeshire	3,583
	Histon and Impington	South Cambridgeshire	7,640
	Milton	South Cambridgeshire	3,022
	The Wilbrahams	South Cambridgeshire	2,034
	Waterbeach	South Cambridgeshire	3,936
	Willingham and Over	South Cambridgeshire	5,221
43. South Norfolk CC			77,348
	Abbey	South Norfolk	2,214
	Beck Vale	South Norfolk	1,818
	Bressingham and Burston	South Norfolk	2,228
	Brooke	South Norfolk	2,085
	Bunwell	South Norfolk	2,166
	Chedgrave and Thurton	South Norfolk	2,108
	Cromwells	South Norfolk	2,026
	Dickleburgh	South Norfolk	2,169
	Diss	South Norfolk	5,757
	Ditchingham and Broome	South Norfolk	1,945
	Earsham	South Norfolk	1,986
	Easton	South Norfolk	2,039
	Forncett	South Norfolk	2,175
	Gillingham	South Norfolk	2,261
	Harleston	South Norfolk	3,712
	Hempnall	South Norfolk	2,065
	Hethersett	South Norfolk	4,470
	Loddon	South Norfolk	2,182
	Mulbarton	South Norfolk	4,088
	Newton Flotman	South Norfolk	2,081
	Northfields	South Norfolk	2,149
	Poringland with the Framinghams	South Norfolk	4,044
	Rockland	South Norfolk	2,308
	Roydon	South Norfolk	1,837
	Rustens	South Norfolk	2,686

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Scole	South Norfolk	1,893
	Stoke Holy Cross	South Norfolk	2,226
	Stratton	South Norfolk	4,240
	Tasburgh	South Norfolk	1,907
	Town	South Norfolk	2,483
44. South Suffolk CC			71,445
	Alton	Babergh	3,125
	Berners	Babergh	3,029
	Boxford	Babergh	1,739
	Brett Vale	Babergh	1,634
	Brook	Babergh	3,230
	Bures St. Mary	Babergh	1,426
	Chadacre	Babergh	1,657
	Dodnash	Babergh	2,844
	Glemsford and Stanstead	Babergh	2,983
	Great Cornard North	Babergh	3,273
	Great Cornard South	Babergh	3,428
	Hadleigh North	Babergh	3,503
	Hadleigh South	Babergh	2,910
	Holbrook	Babergh	1,546
	Lavenham	Babergh	1,406
	Leavenheath	Babergh	1,429
	Long Melford	Babergh	3,001
	Lower Brett	Babergh	1,713
	Mid Samford	Babergh	3,234
	Nayland	Babergh	1,442
	North Cosford	Babergh	1,785
	Pinewood	Babergh	3,135
	South Cosford	Babergh	1,756
	Sudbury East	Babergh	3,130
	Sudbury North	Babergh	3,312
	Sudbury South	Babergh	3,219
	Waldingfield	Babergh	3,317
	Cavendish	St. Edmundsbury	1,582
	Clare	St. Edmundsbury	1,657
45. South West Bedfordshire CC			73,699
	Aspley and Woburn	Central Bedfordshire	3,681
	Dunstable-Central	Central Bedfordshire	3,332
	Dunstable-Icknield	Central Bedfordshire	5,731
	Dunstable-Manshead	Central Bedfordshire	3,575
	Dunstable-Northfields	Central Bedfordshire	6,528
	Dunstable-Watling	Central Bedfordshire	7,402
	Eaton Bray	Central Bedfordshire	3,292
	Heath and Reach	Central Bedfordshire	3,426
	Leighton Buzzard North	Central Bedfordshire	10,881
	Leighton Buzzard South	Central Bedfordshire	9,303
	Linslade	Central Bedfordshire	9,108
	Toddington	Central Bedfordshire	7,440
46. South West Hertfordshire CC			72,404
	Aldbury and Wigginton	Dacorum	1,839
	Ashridge	Dacorum	2,095
	Berkhamsted Castle	Dacorum	4,548
	Berkhamsted East	Dacorum	4,368
	Berkhamsted West	Dacorum	4,411
	Bovingdon, Flaunden and Chipperfield	Dacorum	6,276
	Northchurch	Dacorum	2,127
	Tring Central	Dacorum	3,822
	Tring East	Dacorum	2,149
	Tring West and Rural	Dacorum	4,017

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Chorleywood North & Sarratt	Three Rivers	5,848
	Chorleywood South & Maple Cross	Three Rivers	5,728
	Dickinsons	Three Rivers	5,147
	Durrants	Three Rivers	5,026
	Moor Park & Eastbury	Three Rivers	4,571
	Penn & Mill End	Three Rivers	5,063
	Rickmansworth Town	Three Rivers	5,369
47. Southend West and Hadleigh BC			74,732
	St. James	Castle Point	5,259
	Victoria	Castle Point	4,521
	Belfairs	Southend-on-Sea	7,262
	Blenheim Park	Southend-on-Sea	7,713
	Chalkwell	Southend-on-Sea	6,726
	Eastwood Park	Southend-on-Sea	7,477
	Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	7,124
	Prittlewell	Southend-on-Sea	7,419
	St. Laurence	Southend-on-Sea	7,328
	West Leigh	Southend-on-Sea	6,947
	Westborough	Southend-on-Sea	6,956
48. St. Albans BC			75,773
	Ashley	St. Albans	5,344
	Batchwood	St. Albans	5,128
	Clarence	St. Albans	4,887
	Colney Heath	St. Albans	4,266
	Cunningham	St. Albans	4,525
	Marshalswick North	St. Albans	4,820
	Marshalswick South	St. Albans	5,118
	Park Street	St. Albans	5,464
	Sopwell	St. Albans	4,950
	St. Peters	St. Albans	5,512
	St. Stephen	St. Albans	5,183
	Verulam	St. Albans	5,260
	Abbots Langley & Bedmond	Three Rivers	4,972
	Leavesden	Three Rivers	5,111
	Woodside	Watford	5,233
49. Stevenage CC			71,525
	Datchworth & Aston	East Hertfordshire	1,911
	Walkern	East Hertfordshire	2,085
	Watton-at-Stone	East Hertfordshire	1,880
	Codicote	North Hertfordshire	2,107
	Knebworth	North Hertfordshire	3,922
	Bandley Hill	Stevenage	4,833
	Bedwell	Stevenage	4,626
	Chells	Stevenage	4,775
	Longmeadow	Stevenage	4,284
	Manor	Stevenage	4,735
	Martins Wood	Stevenage	4,410
	Old Town	Stevenage	5,719
	Pin Green	Stevenage	4,411
	Roebuck	Stevenage	4,691
	Shephall	Stevenage	4,324
	St. Nicholas	Stevenage	4,696
	Symonds Green	Stevenage	4,142
	Woodfield	Stevenage	3,974
50. Suffolk Coastal CC			76,178
	Aldeburgh	Suffolk Coastal	3,944
	Deben	Suffolk Coastal	2,048
	Felixstowe East	Suffolk Coastal	4,014
	Felixstowe North	Suffolk Coastal	4,433
	Felixstowe South	Suffolk Coastal	4,611

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Felixstowe West	Suffolk Coastal	4,555
	Kirton	Suffolk Coastal	2,353
	Leiston	Suffolk Coastal	4,469
	Martlesham	Suffolk Coastal	3,968
	Melton	Suffolk Coastal	4,637
	Nacton & Purdis Farm	Suffolk Coastal	2,347
	Orford & Eyke	Suffolk Coastal	2,278
	Peasenhall & Yoxford	Suffolk Coastal	2,277
	Rendlesham	Suffolk Coastal	2,123
	Saxmundham	Suffolk Coastal	4,145
	The Trimleys	Suffolk Coastal	4,243
	Wenhaston & Westleton	Suffolk Coastal	2,177
	Woodbridge	Suffolk Coastal	7,187
	Blything	Waveney	1,710
	Halesworth	Waveney	3,958
	Southwold and Reydon	Waveney	2,890
	Wrentham	Waveney	1,811
51. Thetford and Downham Market CC			71,224
	Bedingfield	Breckland	2,336
	Forest	Breckland	2,162
	Nar Valley	Breckland	2,081
	Swaffham	Breckland	5,833
	Thetford Boudica	Breckland	3,290
	Thetford Burrell	Breckland	3,696
	Thetford Castle	Breckland	3,590
	Thetford Priory	Breckland	4,044
	Littleport East	East Cambridgeshire	3,694
	Littleport West	East Cambridgeshire	2,358
	Airfield	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,570
	Denton	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	5,513
	Downham Old Town	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,040
	East Downham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,208
	Emneth with Outwell	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,744
	Hilgay with Denver	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,901
	Mershe Lande	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,993
	North Downham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,843
	South Downham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,903
	St. Lawrence	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,929
	Upwell and Delph	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	3,916
	Watlington	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,957
	Wiggenhall	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,664
	Wimbotsham with Fincham	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	2,029
	Wissey	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	1,930
52. Thurrock BC			75,935
	Aveley and Uplands	Thurrock	6,386
	Belhus	Thurrock	6,459
	Chadwell St. Mary	Thurrock	6,870
	Chafford and North Stifford	Thurrock	4,994
	Grays Riverside	Thurrock	6,129
	Grays Thurrock	Thurrock	5,823
	Little Thurrock Blackshots	Thurrock	4,608
	Little Thurrock Rectory	Thurrock	4,290
	Ockendon	Thurrock	6,794
	South Chafford	Thurrock	4,251
	Stifford Clays	Thurrock	4,996
	Tilbury Riverside and Thurrock Park	Thurrock	4,022
	Tilbury St. Chads	Thurrock	3,811
	West Thurrock and South Stifford	Thurrock	6,502

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
53. Watford BC			72,651
	Carpenders Park	Three Rivers	5,006
	Oxhey Hall & Hayling	Three Rivers	4,857
	South Oxhey	Three Rivers	4,537
	Callowland	Watford	4,815
	Central	Watford	5,543
	Holywell	Watford	5,624
	Leggatts	Watford	5,518
	Meriden	Watford	5,679
	Nascot	Watford	6,002
	Oxhey	Watford	5,054
	Park	Watford	5,699
	Stanborough	Watford	5,189
	Tudor	Watford	4,430
	Vicarage	Watford	4,698
54. Waveney CC			77,408
	Beccles North	Waveney	3,876
	Beccles South	Waveney	3,892
	Bungay	Waveney	3,794
	Carlton	Waveney	3,425
	Carlton Colville	Waveney	6,355
	Gunton and Corton	Waveney	3,732
	Harbour	Waveney	5,197
	Kessingland	Waveney	3,995
	Kirkley	Waveney	5,060
	Lothingland	Waveney	1,702
	Normanston	Waveney	5,034
	Oulton	Waveney	3,333
	Oulton Broad	Waveney	3,744
	Pakefield	Waveney	5,289
	St. Margaret's	Waveney	6,186
	The Saints	Waveney	1,805
	Wainford	Waveney	1,752
	Whitton	Waveney	5,542
	Worlingham	Waveney	3,695
55. Welwyn Hatfield CC			72,763
	Hertford Rural North	East Hertfordshire	1,769
	Hertford Rural South	East Hertfordshire	1,968
	Brookmans Park and Little Heath	Welwyn Hatfield	4,516
	Haldens	Welwyn Hatfield	4,667
	Handside	Welwyn Hatfield	5,130
	Hatfield Central	Welwyn Hatfield	4,137
	Hatfield East	Welwyn Hatfield	4,501
	Hatfield South	Welwyn Hatfield	3,036
	Hatfield Villages	Welwyn Hatfield	3,522
	Hatfield West	Welwyn Hatfield	5,218
	Hollybush	Welwyn Hatfield	4,985
	Howlands	Welwyn Hatfield	4,398
	Panshanger	Welwyn Hatfield	4,671
	Peartree	Welwyn Hatfield	5,135
	Sherrards	Welwyn Hatfield	4,319
	Welham Green	Welwyn Hatfield	2,788
	Welwyn East	Welwyn Hatfield	4,787
	Welwyn West	Welwyn Hatfield	3,216
56. West Suffolk CC			72,809
	All Saints	Forest Heath	2,398
	Brandon East	Forest Heath	3,701
	Brandon West	Forest Heath	2,475
	Eriswell and The Rows	Forest Heath	3,173
	Exning	Forest Heath	1,430

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Great Heath	Forest Heath	2,595
	Iceni	Forest Heath	1,297
	Lakenheath	Forest Heath	3,066
	Manor	Forest Heath	1,267
	Market	Forest Heath	2,632
	Red Lodge	Forest Heath	2,761
	Severals	Forest Heath	4,219
	South	Forest Heath	1,363
	St. Mary's	Forest Heath	3,680
	Bardwell	St. Edmundsbury	1,941
	Barningham	St. Edmundsbury	2,089
	Barrow	St. Edmundsbury	1,795
	Chedburgh	St. Edmundsbury	1,670
	Haverhill East	St. Edmundsbury	4,954
	Haverhill North	St. Edmundsbury	5,192
	Haverhill South	St. Edmundsbury	3,439
	Haverhill West	St. Edmundsbury	3,675
	Hundon	St. Edmundsbury	1,669
	Ixworth	St. Edmundsbury	1,700
	Kedington	St. Edmundsbury	1,526
	Risby	St. Edmundsbury	1,875
	Stanton	St. Edmundsbury	1,991
	Wickhambrook	St. Edmundsbury	1,680
	Withersfield	St. Edmundsbury	1,556
57. Witham and Maldon CC			74,659
	Hatfield Peverel & Terling	Braintree	4,689
	Witham Central	Braintree	4,147
	Witham North	Braintree	4,759
	Witham South	Braintree	4,260
	Witham West	Braintree	4,801
	Boreham and The Leighs	Chelmsford	4,691
	Althorne	Maldon	3,208
	Burnham-on-Crouch North	Maldon	2,901
	Burnham-on-Crouch South	Maldon	3,147
	Great Totham	Maldon	2,851
	Heybridge East	Maldon	3,190
	Heybridge West	Maldon	3,014
	Maldon East	Maldon	1,548
	Maldon North	Maldon	3,189
	Maldon South	Maldon	2,969
	Maldon West	Maldon	3,030
	Mayland	Maldon	3,281
	Purleigh	Maldon	2,642
	Southminster	Maldon	3,105
	Tillingham	Maldon	1,669
	Tollesbury	Maldon	1,571
	Tolleshunt D'Arcy	Maldon	3,167
	Wickham Bishops and Woodham	Maldon	2,830