

North Yorkshire County Council

Collated requests and comments from County Councillors regarding the proposed warding of the unitary council to be considered at the Executive meeting on 21 September 2021

1. On 21 September 2021 the Executive will consider a paper <https://edemocracy.northyorks.gov.uk/documents/s7740/Response%20to%20Proposed%20Warding%20Arrangements%20for%20new%20Unitary%20Authority.pdf> regarding proposed interim ward boundaries for the new unitary council, which includes the recommendations of the members working group.
2. Following publication of the paper, the Leader emailed all County Councillors asking them to submit any amendments or changes to the recommendations of the members working group, including the names of proposed wards, by Friday 17 September. All of the requests and comments received from County Councillors are set out in this report.
3. MHCLG said that the maximum number of councillors in the new unitary council should be 90. The members working group's main proposal has 89 councillors and the working group's secondary supplementary proposal would add an additional councillor, taking the total to 90.
4. Some of the requests and comments set out in this report would add an additional councillor to the number in the main proposal.

Section A – the makeup of the proposed wards:

<i>Requests and comments from County Councillor</i>	<i>County Councillor</i>	<i>Officer comment</i>
<p>A1 - Selby ward should have 3 Cllrs or be split into two wards, Selby West with 2 Cllrs and Selby East with 1 Cllr.</p> <p>Needed because of the high level of deprivation in Selby, which will lead to more requests to the Council and a higher workload for the Cllrs.</p>	<p>Cllr Eric Broadbent</p>	<p>The Selby ward (2 Cllrs) is made up of the district wards of Selby East (5,654 voters) and Selby West (7,639 voters).</p> <p>If the Selby ward has 2 Cllrs the variance from ideal (based on 89 Cllrs in total) is +23.3%. If it has 3 Cllrs the variance is -16.8%.</p> <p>It is possible to split the Selby ward into two wards and this would require Selby West to have 2 Cllrs (variance -29.1%) and Selby East 1 Cllr (variance 4.9%).</p> <p>Increasing the number of Cllrs for Selby from 2 to 3 would increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council by 1.</p>

		The members working group aimed for as many wards as possible having 1 Cllr. There are no feasible options to split the Selby ward or a Selby West ward to enable 1 Cllr per ward using parish or parish ward boundaries.
<p>A2 - Selby ward should have 3 Cllrs or be split into two wards, Selby West with 2 Cllrs and Selby East with 1 Cllr; Sheriff Hutton district ward should be grouped with Derwent and Ryedale South West district wards (with 1 Cllr); Huby district ward should be grouped with Easingwold district ward (with 2 Cllrs); and an addition should be made to the supplementary proposal to split Easingwold & Huby ward into two wards (each with 1 Cllr) using parishes as building blocks.</p> <p>One ward in the supplementary proposal would comprise the parishes of Alne, Aldwark area, Crayke, and Easingwold. The other would comprise the parishes of Beningbrough, Linton-on-Ouse, Newton-on-Ouse, Overton, Shipton, Tollerton, Brandsby-cum-Stearsby, Dalby-cum-Skewsby, Farlington, Huby, Marton-cum-Moxby, Stillington, Sutton-on-the-Forest, Whenby, and Yearsley.</p>	Cllr John Weighell	This proposal (taken as a whole) would not increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council. The addition to the supplementary proposal would also reduce the number of wards with 2 Cllrs.
<p>A3 - Splitting Easingwold ward (Easingwold district council ward) (2 Cllrs) into two wards, each with 1 Cllr, by parishes and including some parishes from Raskelf district ward.</p>	Cllr Peter Sowray	<p>It is not possible to split Easingwold ward (Easingwold district council ward) into two wards, each with 1 Cllr, by parishes. Including some parishes from Raskelf district ward would need to be an additional (third) supplementary proposal.</p> <p>This proposal would not increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council.</p>

<p>A4 - Barlby & Riccall and Cawood & Escrick wards should be regrouped as Barlby & Escrick and Cawood & Riccall wards.</p> <p>Escrick & Riccall have historically been part of the same ward and division. Broadly they share similar challenges and opportunities given their shared location on the A19 corridor. It would make more sense for these two villages to be put together in one new division.</p> <p>That would leave Cawood, Wistow and Barlby together and again that would make sense. Rivers are a feature of this area but they have been seen as an opportunity rather than a threat – most trade links were with communities on the other side of the river and it would be historically accurate to link the communities in this way.</p> <p>A number of wards / divisions are split by major rivers and / or the fastest route from one part of ward / division to another requires the Cllr to travel through another ward / division / county; so this should not be used as a reason to justify the grouping in the main proposal.</p>	<p>Cllr Richard Musgrave; Cllr Mike Jordan; & Cllr Cliff Lunn</p>	<p>The members working group considered both options and concluded that the grouping set out in the main proposal is the best option.</p> <p>This proposal would not increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council.</p>
<p>A5 - Washburn & Spofforth with Lower Wharfedale should not be grouped together into one ward.</p> <p>The historic Ainsty area of Selby & Ainsty constituency is entirely self-contained. It is a well-defined area and should be retained as such; any calls to artificially put it with the Washburn area should be resisted at all costs.</p>	<p>Cllr Richard Musgrave</p>	<p>The members working group proposed the Washburn & Spofforth with Lower Wharfedale ward in the main proposal to avoid having to have an additional two wards with 2 Cllrs (one in Ainsty and one in Harrogate district).</p> <p>The members working group's recommendations include a secondary supplementary proposal that would avoid the need for a ward split between two constituency areas. This proposal deviates from the rules set out by MHCLG in that it proposes using parishes as building blocks in some places, rather than district wards, but a precedent in Dorset suggests that this might be acceptable. The secondary supplementary proposal would increase</p>

		the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council by 1.
<p>A6 - Grouping of wards to form Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby ward and to form Skipton West & West Craven ward.</p> <p>Concerned about splitting the current division up and grouping with very different wards.</p> <p>The proposal to put Skipton North in with Embsay-with-Eastby has a number of issues. Firstly, part of Embsay and Eastby ward is in the National Park and as such comes under a different planning regime. It also joins two fairly distinct communities in one new ward.</p> <p>The main problem is that to enable this to happen, this will mean that Skipton West ward will be combined with West Craven, where there is a stark difference in the communities there. Skipton West ward has the largest BAME community in North Yorkshire, the rest of the ward consists of dense housing which is being added to at an incredible rate. West Craven ward couldn't be more different, it is largely rural, it consists of one bigger village, plus three or four which are very small and one is right on the border of another authority. When we are trying to keep rural and urban areas of the county distinct, I feel that adding West Craven to Skipton West ward will contradict this and will result in poor representation for either area.</p> <p>Skipton West should be a 2 Cllr ward, as it takes in a busy town centre with all the planning, licensing, economic development functions as well as having several schools, care facilities as well as other NYCC functions. The deliberations over this should take into account workload as well as numbers of electors and whether 1 Cllr can effectively represent all the functions of</p>	Cllr Andy Sollway	<p>The members working group considered various options in the Skipton area and felt that the grouping in their proposal is the best option.</p> <p>The members working group aimed for as many wards as possible having 1 Cllr.</p> <p>Skipton West district ward by itself or grouped with West Craven district ward does not have sufficient voters to justify 2 Cllrs.</p> <p>It would be possible to group together Embsay-with-Eastby, Skipton North and Skipton West district wards to create one ward with 2 Cllrs – but West Craven district ward would then need to be grouped with either Aire Valley with Lothersdale and Cowling district wards, or with Gargrave & Malhamdale and Hellifield & Long Preston district wards, both options with 1 Cllr. None of these options would increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council.</p>

<p>a new council in what is the busiest part of the biggest market towns in North Yorkshire.</p> <p>West Craven with its largely rural nature is not suitable to be combined with Skipton West ward with its very different demographic.</p> <p>Possible suggestion. Add Embsay-with-Eastby to Skipton North ward and Skipton West ward creating a ward with 7,713 voters, bearing in mind that Embsay and Eastby has planning permission for another 150 or more houses, but make this combined ward a 2 Cllr ward to spread the workload.</p>		
<p>A7 - Increasing the number of Cllrs in the Harrogate & Knaresborough constituency from 13 to 14.</p> <p>The Harrogate & Knaresborough area will be under-represented compared with all other areas in North Yorkshire, with wards having an average of 6,194 voters compared to 5,329 across North Yorkshire. This may be temporary until a proper boundary review in time for the 2027 elections but will disadvantage the Harrogate and & Knaresborough area disproportionately for the first five years of the unitary council. Having 14 Cllrs can be achieved by a different grouping of some district wards, which would also better reflect community interests.</p> <p>Killinghall Moor & Hampsthwaite ward (5,853 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Saltergate and Killinghall & Hampsthwaite district wards – as in main proposal.</p> <p>Oakdale & Valley Gardens ward (5,753 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Duchy and Harrogate Valley Gardens districts wards. The Valley Gardens are central to this ward and many issues around the area are shared by the two wards. Also development</p>	<p>Cllr Philip Broadbank</p>	<p>The members working group considered a number of options and concluded that the grouping set out in the main proposal is the best option.</p> <p>The members working group aimed for as many wards as possible having 1 Cllr.</p> <p>Increasing the number of Cllrs for the Harrogate & Knaresborough area from 13 to 14 would increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council by 1.</p>

currently taking place in the Penny Pot Lane area puts greater emphasis on the Oakdale area and the common interests shared here.

Harlow & St Georges Ward (6,380 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Harlow and Harrogate St Georges district wards – as in main proposal.

Oatlands & Pannal ward (6,205 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Oatlands and Harrogate Pannal district wards – as in main proposal.

Bilton Grange & New Park ward (9,381 voters, 2 Cllrs) – grouping together Harrogate Bilton Grange, Harrogate Coppice Valley and Harrogate New Park district wards. The busy Skipton Road and Ripon Road create common interests here and historically a large part of the ward is considered by locals to be the New Park area.

Bilton & Nidd Gorge ward – (6,164 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Bilton Woodfield and Harrogate Old Bilton district wards – as in main proposal.

Town Centre & High Harrogate ward (6,539 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Central and Harrogate High Harrogate district wards. A large part of the existing Central ward is historically part of High Harrogate and the traffic and parking issues are shared in this compact ward.

The Stray & Woodlands ward (9,654 voters, 2 Cllrs) – grouping together Harrogate Fairfax, Harrogate Hookstone Harrogate Stray district wards. Traffic issues on Wetherby Road and parking issues around the District Hospital are major issues to many residents in these wards. Historically most residents here will identify with this ward.

<p>Kingsley & Starbeck ward (5,964 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Harrogate Kingsley and Harrogate Starbeck district wards. These two wards are linked and affected by development currently taking place on the borders of the two wards. A part of the Kingsley ward is also currently included in the existing County Starbeck division. Traffic and planning issues are shared by residents in both wards here.</p> <p>Knareborough East ward (6,043 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Knareborough Eastfield and Knareborough Scriven Park district wards – as in main proposal.</p> <p>Knareborough West ward (6,690 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Knareborough Aspin & Calcutt and Knareborough Castle district wards – as in main proposal.</p> <p>Boroughbridge & Claro ward (5,891 voters, 1 Cllr) – grouping together Boroughbridge and Claro district wards – as in main proposal.</p>		
---	--	--

In addition a request was received from Richmondshire District Councillor Pat Middlemiss that the Hipswell and Scotton district wards should be grouped together as one ward with 1 Cllr, as Hipswell and Scotton are intrinsically linked through the Garrison and share all local services, rather than linking Scotton with Lower Wensleydale district ward. Officer comment: this request does not suggest where Colburn and Lower Wensleydale district wards would be grouped. Colburn would need to be grouped with Catterick & Brompton-on-Swale district wards (creating a ward with 2 Cllrs) and Lower Wensleydale would need to be grouped with either Leyburn and Middleham district wards (creating a ward with 1 Cllr) or with Bedale and Tanfield district council wards (creating a ward with 2 Cllrs). The overall impact would be to increase the total number of Cllrs in the unitary council by 1.

Section B – Names of the proposed ward

<i>Requests and comments from County Councillor</i>	<i>County Councillor</i>	<i>Officer comment</i>
B1 - Rename Eggborough & Whitley ward as Osgoldcross ward.	Cllr John McCartney	Close match to current NYCC Osgoldcross division. The members working group

Historic name for the area (wapentake and rural district council pre 1974) and name of current NYCC division is called Osgoldcross. Retain historic name.		supported retaining historic names.
B2 - Harrogate Stray & Hookside should be Harrogate Stray & Hookstone.	Cllr. John Ennis	Hookside was a typo – should be Hookstone.
B3 – various name changes in the Harrogate & Knaresborough area, including dropping the word Harrogate from the start of relevant ward names, as set out in A7 above.	Cllr Philip Broadbank	If the changes in groupings set out in A7 are not agreed, many of the names changes in A7 could still be implemented together with the dropping of the word Harrogate from the start of other relevant ward names.