

## **Response to the Third Boundary Review Consultation – October 2025**

### **Background**

1. Following consideration of the responses to the second consultation on the Boundary Commission's proposed boundaries for North Yorkshire, the Commission determined that it would consult again on 25 revised divisions across the central and western areas of the county.
2. The Boundary Review Member Working Group (BRMWG) has reconvened to consider these revised proposals. This report reflects the broad feedback and recommendations from the group, alongside other feedback from officers in respect of the implications for Community Governance Reviews.

### **General Response**

3. The BRMWG considered that the amendments to the 25 divisions are an improved position from the previous proposals. There remain some areas which are not ideal from either a numerical or geographic perspective, but it is recognised that there is no perfect solution. For this reason, the BRMWG has decided to raise only those issues which it feels are significant and potentially resolvable.

### **Specific concerns**

#### ***Appletreewick and Barden***

4. Appletreewick and Barden Parishes are closely aligned and should be part of the same division. This is noted below in relation to the Community Governance Review, paragraphs 24-27.
5. Aligning them both within the Skipton North and Embsay-with-Eastby division is not recommended as this would take in the main A6265 route through Wharfedale, meaning people travelling across Wharfedale would need to leave the division and re-enter it to reach its eastern area.
6. **Recommendation** – to align these parishes without disconnecting Wharfedale, it is recommended that Barden moves into Upper Wharfedale and Upper Nidderdale.

#### ***Ripon***

7. The BRMWG strongly considers that the proposal for Ripon does not effectively represent the character of the area.

8. Using North Street as a dividing line through the centre of the city splits the Cathedral from the Cathedral School and disconnects the ancient and historic areas of the city from one another. The eastern side of the city is then aligned with the rural areas to the south within the proposed Ripon Canal and Ure division.
9. It is recognised that this is a challenging area numerically, given that it is too big for two divisions and too small for three. However, the proposals do not accurately reflect any specific community identity nor particularly represent areas which support good local governance.
10. **Recommendation** – the Commission should review whether the A61 and River Skell provide a more sensible boundary for Ripon Cathedral and Spa Division. This would increase the electorate within this division (currently -10%) with the potential to offset this by moving the northern boundary of Ripon South further north if required.

### **Howardian**

11. There remains concern with the addition of High Hutton to Howardian Division. The Howardian Division is clearly characterised by the extent of the Howardian Hills National Landscape, which the inclusion of High Hutton not only extends this sound but crosses the main road of the A64. The busy nature of the A64 in this area, as a single carriageway with at-grade junctions, makes crossing it difficult and so it does act as somewhat of a natural barrier across the area.
12. **Recommendation** – the Commission should consider whether the area to the south of the A64 should remain within Sheriff Hutton and Derwent, consistent with the other villages along the A64 corridor.

### **Parish arrangements**

13. The BRMWG also heard feedback from the separate Community Governance Reviews Officer Working Group, which has highlighted some implications of the Commission's proposals in respect of Parish arrangements. Whilst Community Governance Reviews are outside the BRMWG's remit, it is recognised that the Boundary proposals will have an impact upon them, and so this is being communicated alongside the BRMWG's own response.
14. There are some aspects of proposals which do not recognise existing arrangements and some aspects which will have implications for, or restrictions upon, the outcomes of the Community Governance Reviews.


## Proposals that do not recognise existing grouped parish councils

### *Haverah Park-with-Beckwithshaw Parish Council*

15. Haverah Park-with-Beckwithshaw Parish Council is a grouped parish council comprised of the parishes of Beckwithshaw (5 seats) and Haverah Park (1 seat).

OS map showing the [2 civil parishes](#):

16. The Commission’s proposal for Haverah Park-with-Beckwithshaw Parish Council



below does not appear to recognise that Haverah Park is a separate parish and therefore the below warding pattern does not work. Haverah Park needs listing in the draft recommendation.

#### Further draft recommendations

Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw Parish Council should comprise five councillors, as at present, representing two wards:


Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Beckwithshaw	4
Harlow Hill Grange	1

17. **Recommendation** – that the Commission’s draft recommendation be amended to take into account that Haverah Park-with-Beckwithshaw is a grouped parish council, comprised of 2 civil parishes including Haverah Park which needs to be allocated at least 1 councillor seat.

### Tockwith and Wilstrop Parish Council

18. Tockwith and Wilstrop is a grouped parish council comprised of the parishes of Tockwith (7 seats) and Wilstrop (2 seats).

OS map showing the [2 civil parishes](#):



19. Tockwith is proposed to sit in the Spofforth and Tockwith division, whilst Wilstrop is proposed to sit in the Hammerton division.
20. A grouped parish council should ideally not be split across divisions.
21. **Recommendation** – that the Commission alters the division boundary lines to ensure that the parishes of Tockwith and Wilstrop sit in the same division.

### ***Whitwell-on-the-Hill with Crambe Parish Council***

22. Whitwell-on-the-Hill with Crambe is a grouped parish council comprised of the parishes of Whitwell-on-the-Hill (3 seats) and Crambe (2 seats).
23. During the Commission's stage 2 recommendations, it was proposed that Whitwell-on-the-Hill sit in the Howardian division, and Crambe sit in the Sheriff Hutton and Derwent division.
24. Following the publication of the stage 3 consultation report, Whitwell-on-the-Hill parish is no longer proposed to sit within the Howardian division, presumably both parishes will now sit within Sheriff Hutton and Derwent division, however, this is not explicitly referred to within the stage 3 report as the Sheriff Hutton and Derwent division is not one of the 25 divisions under review.
25. **Recommendation** – that the Commission ensures that Whitwell-on-the-Hill parish and Crambe parish sit in the same division

## **Parishes under review in North Yorkshire Council's 2025/26 Community Governance Review (CGR) that may be impacted by the proposed division boundaries**

### ***Appletreewick Parish Council and Barden Parish Meeting***

26. A CGR will take place to review the governance arrangements of Barden Parish Meeting and Appletreewick Parish Council (5 seats). One of the potential options is to merge the two parishes together and form a single parish council.
27. Barden Parish Meeting is proposed to sit in the Skipton North and Embsay-with-Eastby division whilst Appletreewick is proposed to be in the Upper Wharfedale and Upper Nidderdale division.
28. If the outcome of the CGR was to merge both parishes together, a single parish council could not be created as a parish council must be wholly within a single division (unless it is warded). If a grouped parish council was formed, it would straddle multiple divisions.
29. **Recommendation** – that the Commission considers altering the North Yorkshire Council division boundary lines to ensure that the parishes of Barden and Appletreewick sit in the same division, namely that Barden moves into Upper Wharfedale and Upper Nidderdale.

### ***Bolton-on-Swale Parish Meeting, Ellerton-on-Swale Parish Council and Scorton Parish Council***

30. A CGR will take place to review the governance arrangements of Bolton-on-Swale Parish Meeting, Ellerton-on-Swale Parish Council (5 seats) and Scorton Parish Council (7 seats). One of the potential options is to merge the three parishes together and form a single parish council.
31. Bolton-on-Swale Parish Meeting and Scorton Parish Council are both proposed to sit in the Brompton and Scorton division whilst Ellerton-on-Swale Parish Council is proposed to sit in the Swale division (as per the stage 3 recommendations).
32. If the outcome of the CGR was to merge all 3 parishes together, a single parish council could not be created as a parish council must be wholly within a single division (unless it is warded). If a grouped parish council was formed, it would straddle multiple divisions.
33. **Recommendation** – that the Commission considers altering the North Yorkshire Council division boundary lines to ensure that the parishes of Bolton-on-Swale, Ellerton-on-Swale and Scorton sit in the same division, namely that Ellerton-on-Swale moves into Brompton and Scorton.