

Response to LGBCE Consultation on proposed warding patterns by North Herts Council

1. North Herts Council welcome the opportunity to respond to the LGBCE consultation on the proposed warding patterns.
2. The Council is broadly satisfied that the proposed warding patterns achieve the difficult balance between the statutory criteria – to ensure electoral equality, to deliver effective and convenient local governance, and to represent the interests and identities of local communities. On the whole, where the LGBCE have proposed warding arrangements that differ from those the Council submitted in the previous rounds of consultation, the Council is satisfied that these are appropriate and effective.
3. The Council supports the proposal that North Hertfordshire should be represented by 51 Councillors.
4. In addition, the Council supports the proposed warding arrangements for the following wards:
 - a. The renaming of Baldock Town to Baldock West.
 - b. The warding proposals for Royston, which maintain the majority of the existing boundaries within the town and keep the recognised existing wards, whilst recognising the ongoing growth in the local population.
 - c. The warding proposals for Hitchin, which maintain the majority of the existing boundaries within the town and keep the recognised existing wards.
 - d. The warding proposals for Ermine.
 - e. The warding proposals for Codicote & Kimpton.
 - f. The warding proposals for Langley, Preston & Walden. However, the Council objects to the proposed ward name and instead proposes the ward name *Hitchwood*, which is the former name for this area and is a more accurate representation of the different communities in the proposed ward (noting there is no village of Walden).
 - g. The warding proposals for Knebworth.
 - h. The warding proposals for Offley & Pirton. However, the Council objects to the proposed ward name, and instead proposed the ward name *Offa*, which is the former ward name for this area.
 - i. The warding proposals for Cadwell.
5. The Council broadly supports the proposed warding arrangements for Letchworth, provides the best option for both recognising the distinct communities of Letchworth and achieving good electoral balance. The railway line is a firm boundary between the north and south of Letchworth and it is entirely appropriate to use it as a basis for boundary divisions across the town. This also provides a more natural division than the current arrangements in Letchworth East - which crosses the tracks - which we support. The Commission proposals retain all existing communities without any inappropriate division, both north and south of the railway. They not only respect the main established communities of Wilbury, the Grange, Westbury, Jackmans and Old Pixmore (the area to the east of Norton Way South), but also the smaller communities within the Garden City, such as Norton village, the area around Nevells Road between the Common and the Railway, the small estate between Wilbury Road and the Pix Brook, (Longmead, Haymoor, Hawthorn Hill and Wheat Hill), and Willian Village.

However, the Council proposes that the 12 electors living in the area north of Wilbury Road between the Pix Brook and Stotfold Road be transferred from the Grange to Wilbury, as such links as they have are with Wilbury rather than the Grange.

6. Whilst the Council feels that the separation of developments GA1 and GA2 from Great Ashby does not lend itself to strong community identities, and it would be preferable to include them both within the same new ward, we recognise that due to the warding patterns elsewhere in the District this would result in unacceptable electoral variance elsewhere. Therefore, the Council reluctantly supports the proposed warding arrangements for Great Ashby and, by extension, the proposed arrangements for Wymondley, Graveley & St Ippolyts.
7. **However**, the Council **strongly objects** to the LGBCE's proposals regarding Baldock and the proposed Ashwell & Weston ward.
 - a. The developments outside of Baldock are an extension of the urban area and will be strikingly different in character and demographic from the very rural areas of Bygrave. The Council considers that there is no way that the development to the east of Baldock could be considered similar in nature or outlook to the rest of Bygrave. The issues residents will face will be different, and the community interests and identities will look to Baldock, not the rural areas of the parish of Bygrave. Bygrave currently has around 200 electors; the new development will contain around 1,400 electors by 2028 – vastly outnumbering the rest of Bygrave parish.
 - b. The proposed large ward would lead to a failure in representation of urban residents, who would be separated from their community in Baldock. It would also fail rural residents as the population of the new ward would be concentrated in the new developments of Baldock, in areas of Bygrave & Clothall parishes. As a result, the ward will be dominated by residents who will identify as being from Baldock and are serviced by Baldock's schools, shops, pubs and transport links.
 - c. The proposed Ashwell & Weston ward is too large to be effective and convenient, with 11 separate parish areas to represent. There is, as the LGBCE note, a single road that crosses the busy A505 dual carriageway – a junction with no lighting in which a narrow minor road crosses four lanes of traffic and a central reservation. Given the necessity for district Councillors to attend parish councils, meetings and events, many of which take place in the evenings, the proposed warding would require Councillors to potentially travel the length and breadth of a large rural ward on multiple occasions each week.
 - d. Current Councillors report that their wards, with up to 7 parish areas, can already be hard work to manage and consider that increasing this to 11 would be unviable and lead to worse representation for local communities.
 - e. In addition, a similar arrangement was put in place some years ago near Great Ashby, in which the new urban development was included with rural communities. That arrangement was ineffective and was resolved by creating a separate parish of Great Ashby. The Council suggests that, given it was ineffective then, it is unlikely to be a satisfactory resolution now.

- f. The LGBCE also says that the alternative proposed by the Council is not feasible since it would involve the creation of parish wards that would have an insufficient electorate in 2024. In fact, this is not the case. The population of the potential “Baldock Ward” of Bygrave Parish is currently 16% of the total population of Bygrave parish would allow a Parish Council of five to have four members from a Bygrave Ward and one from a Baldock Ward. It is the Council’s view that the challenge of having small parish wards should be navigated, not accommodated, and the goal of achieving good governance in parishes should not diminish good governance at district level.
- g. As acknowledged in the LGBCE’s proposals, the cross-party consensus represented in the North Herts Council’s initial proposal reflected this reality and we would encourage persistence in seeking arrangements that support this.
- h. Creation of a ward in Clothall Parish would not be necessary since there is no Parish Council in Clothall.
- i. The proposed arrangements are much less satisfactory from a community representation point of view and no better from the perspective of electoral equality. Therefore, the Council considers that the approach proposed previously by the council should be adopted rather than that recommended by the Commission.
- j. The Council also propose that, should the LGBCE revert to current warding arrangements in this area, the ward should retain the name *Arbury*, rather than be named after any specific villages.

From: [Melanie Stimpson](#)
To: [reviews](#)
Cc: [Kingsley, Paul](#); [Otterway, Richard](#); richardpbeesley@gmail.com; [James Lovegrove](#); [Thomas Marsh](#)
Subject: Warding Arrangements Submission - North Herts Council
Date: 20 December 2022 15:40:51
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[Council - Response to LGBCE proposals - Final.pdf](#)

Dear Reviews

I have just uploaded the formal submission to the current LGBCE consultation on warding arrangements for North Herts Council. The submission was agreed by full Council last night (19 Dec), following development and discussion of the proposals by a Project Board (comprising officers and the three Group Leaders). Councillors were also invited to submit considerations, which were considered by the Project Board, prior to the formal submission being agreed at Council last night.

I would be most grateful if you could confirm its safe receipt.

Once the minutes from the meeting have been finalised, in the new year, I will submit these.

If you need anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me or Richard Beesley.

Kind regards – Merry Christmas.

Melanie



**North
Herts**
Council

Melanie Stimpson
Democratic Services Manager

01462 474208

www.north-herts.gov.uk

Any opinions expressed in this email are those solely of the individual. This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering to the recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please delete it.

The Customer Service Centre at the Council Offices is open by appointment only, with a wide range of appointment times available. Our priority is ensuring we keep you and our staff safe as [many of our services are available online](#) without needing to visit us.

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES

Meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, District Council Offices, Gernon Road,
Letchworth
on Monday, 19th December, 2022 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors: Councillor Daniel Allen (Chair), Elizabeth Dennis-Harburg, Ian Albert, Simon Bloxham, Ruth Brown, George Davies, Elizabeth Dennis-Harburg, James Denselow, Morgan Derbyshire, Chris Hinchliff, Terry Hone, Keith Hoskins, Tony Hunter, Steve Jarvis, David Levett, Chris Lucas, Nigel Mason, Ian Moody, Ralph Muncer, Michael Muir, Lisa Nash, Sean Nolan, Tom Plater, Sean Prendergast, Claire Strong, Mandi Tandi, Richard Thake, Tamsin Thomas, Tom Tyson, Phil Weeder, Alistair Willoughby, Val Bryant and Terry Tyler

IN ATTENDANCE: Ian Fullstone (Service Director - Regulatory), Isabelle Alajooz (Legal Commercial Team Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer), Melanie Stimpson (Democratic Services Manager), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager), Richard Beesley (Consultant) and Louis Mutter (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer)

ALSO PRESENT: There were no members of the public present for the duration of the meeting.

158 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 1 minute 43 seconds

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Amy Allen, Kay Tart, Carol Stanier, Sam North, Ian Mantle, Jean Green, Gerald Morris, Juan Cowell, Adam Compton, Raj Bhakar, Sam Collins, David Barnard, Clare Billing and Adem Ruggiero-Cakir.

159 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 3 minutes 18 seconds

There was no other business notified.

160 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 3 minutes 26 seconds

- (1) The Chair paid tribute to former Councillor Judi Billing MBE who passed away on Thursday 24 November 2022. He remarked that Judi served as a district councillor for the Hitchin Bearton ward for over 40 years, as well as having served as County Councillor for Hitchin North since 2013. She served on Cabinet at North Herts Council as the Executive Member for Community Engagement, was Chair of the Standards Committee and co-Chair of the Cabinet Panel on Community and Enterprise. The Chair noted that outside of the Council Judi had worked across party lines with the Local Government Association and was awarded an MBE in 2015 for her services to local government.

Councillor Elizabeth Dennis-Harburg, Leader of the Council and the Labour group at North Herts, paid tribute to former Councillor Billing, and highlighted that Judi was a powerhouse of Local Government, who was committed to supporting communities. She noted that Judi was a phenomenal woman who had acted as her harshest critic but also her biggest support since her election. For many Members, Judi had acted as a grounding influence and made young, ambitious Members realise that being a District Councillor was a worthy role and was not just a springboard onto bigger things. Judi knew the how vital it was to sometimes just serve your community. Judi had been a passionate and caring individual and North Herts, as well as the entire Local Government family, had lost a giant following her passing.

The following Members also paid tribute to former Councillor Judi Billing MBE:

- Councillor Ian Albert
- Councillor Keith Hoskins
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Claire Strong
- Councillor Richard Thake
- Councillor Thomas Plater
- Councillor Michael Muir
- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor David Levett
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Daniel Allen

A minute of commemoration was held in memory of former Councillor Judi Billing MBE.

- (2) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be audio recorded.
- (3) Members were reminded that this Council had declared a Climate Emergency. This was a serious decision and meant that, as this was an emergency, all of us, officers and Members had that in mind as we carried out our various roles and tasks for the benefit of our District.
- (4) The Chair drew attention to the item on the agenda front pages regarding Declarations of Interest and reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest needed to be declared immediately prior to the item in question.
- (5) The Chair clarified the rules of debate for Members.
- (6) The Chair advised that a comfort break would be taken at a suitable time in the meeting, should proceedings continue at length.

161 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 34 minutes 05 seconds

There were no petitions or public requests to speak at this meeting.

162 ELECTORAL REVIEW – RESPONSE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND ON PROPOSED WARDING ARRANGEMENTS

Audio recording – 34 minutes 18 seconds

Monday, 19th December, 2022

The Democratic Services Manager presented the report entitled 'Electoral Review – Response to Local Government Boundary Commission for England on Proposed Warding Arrangements' and advised of the following:

- This was the second part of the ongoing consultation being undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and followed the conclusion of the information gathering exercise which concluded in August 2022 and the findings published on 1 November 2022.
- As a statutory consultee on the process, the Council had been invited to make a submission to the consultation on the proposed pattern of wards for the district. Individuals and community groups could make separate submissions.
- If the Council failed to approve a submission, then the LGBCE would base their final decision on other submissions received.
- The recommendation at this meeting was to approve the submission at Appendix A, which had been agreed following comments made by Councillors and discussion amongst Group Leaders at the Boundary Review Project Board.
- The deadline for submission was 9 January 2023.

Councillor Elizabeth Dennis-Harburg proposed and Councillor Ruth Brown seconded the proposals. Following this, the Chair opened up the debate to Members.

Councillor Morgan Derbyshire proposed an amendment to the wording of Point 7 in the appendix, to suggest that it highlight 'the Council strongly objects' to proposals regarding Baldock and surrounding areas, rather than has 'significant concerns'. This was seconded by Councillor Claire Strong.

Councillor Dennis-Harburg and Councillor Brown agreed to incorporate the amendment into the original motion.

Councillor Terry Tyler raised concerns regarding the proposals for the current Chesfield ward. He noted that Great Ashby already had an identity crisis and these proposals would destroy and confuse the community, who will not be represented by the same people. It would make more sense to include GA1 and GA2 in Great Ashby Parish Council, as creating a community was more important than making numbers work.

Councillor Michael Muir noted his concerns regarding the Baldock warding proposals. He advised that he agreed with the proposed names, but disagreed with proposals to make the proposed new housing to the north of Baldock part of a wider Gravely and Ashwell rural ward. These 3000 new houses would become part of the town of Baldock, just as the Clothall Common development in the current Baldock East ward had previously. He would prefer to see these houses included within the Baldock East ward, with an additional Councillor, and would make a separate submission to the consultation.

Councillor Richard Thake commented that although he did not agree with all the proposals, following discussions with residents on the issue it had become apparent that most were in favour of the process. However, many had raised issues with the proposed 'Mimram' name of the ward and requested this be changed. He proposed that this be changed to 'Codicote and Kimpton' ward and this was seconded by Councillor Ralph Muncer.

Councillor Dennis-Harburg and Councillor Brown agreed to incorporate the amendment into the original motion.

Councillor Steve Jarvis noted that he agreed with comments made by Councillor Muir with regard to the new houses in Baldock and suggested that these residents would not consider themselves part of Bygrave and it would be inappropriate to do so. There would be issues with the villages becoming part of a larger ward and the focus would be on the highest populated

Monday, 19th December, 2022

area in the new Baldock housing. Overall he agreed with the proposal, but suggested this ward was reviewed again.

Councillor Alistair Willoughby agreed with other comments regarding the Baldock proposals and noted that there was consensus that the new houses would be part of Baldock. Therefore these new residents would be part of the town and could not have their needs met by being part of a wider rural ward.

Councillor Tom Tyson noted the aim of the review was to create a good pattern of wards that should reflect community evidence and links, but the proposals to combine new housing in Baldock with the rural surrounding areas did not meet these requirements and there would be an obvious conflict between town and rural residents.

Councillor Claire Strong noted that following consultation with Parish Councils they had advised that they were not content with the proposed names of some of the Southern Rural wards. She noted that concerns had been raised about the name 'Offley and Pirton', as this omitted Lilley, and that the proposed 'Langley, Preston and Walden' ward name was inappropriate as there was no village called Walden. Councillor Strong proposed that the wording be amended to highlight that the Council objected to the ward names of 'Offley and Pirton' and 'Langley, Preston and Walden' and recommend that these instead be named 'Offa' and 'Hitchwood' respectively.

Councillor Dennis-Harburg and Councillor Brown agreed to incorporate these amendments into the original motion.

Councillor George Davies echoed comments made by Councillor Terry Tyler and noted that the exclusion of the development sites from Great Ashby was not satisfactory. He highlighted the section in the report which confirmed that this review could only affect district boundaries and could not impact parish boundaries. Therefore it was important that a Community Governance Review was carried out to amend the boundaries of the parish and this could be completed in the future following these changes proposed.

Having been proposed by Councillor Dennis-Harburg and seconded by Councillor Brown, with proposed amendments from the debate incorporated, the Chair moved to a vote and it was:

RESOLVED: That the Council approved the response to the LGBCE consultation, attached as Appendix A for submission to the LGBCE, subject to the following amendments:

- Point 4.e to remove suggested ward name 'Mimram' and retain the suggested ward name by the Commission of 'Codicote and Kimpton'.
- Point 4.f to include objection of the proposed ward name 'Langley, Preston and Walden' and that the ward name should instead be referred to as 'Hitchwood' (being the former name for this area and a more accurate reflection of the different communities in the proposed ward).
- Point 4.h to include objection of the proposed ward name 'Offley and Pirton' and the ward name should instead be referred to as 'Offa'.
- Point 7 to include that the Council 'strongly objects' to the proposals regarding Baldock and specifically the proposed Ashwell and Weston ward, rather than it 'has significant concerns'.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm

Chair

North Hertfordshire District Council

Personal Details:

Name: Melanie Stimpson
E-mail: melanie.stimpson@north-herts.gov.uk
Postcode: SG6 3JF
Organisation Name: North Hertfordshire District Council

Comment text:

Please find attached the response to the current LGBCE consultation on warding arrangements by North Herts Council. The submission was agreed by full Council last night (19 December), following development and discussion of the proposals by a Project Board (comprising officers and the three Group Leaders). Councillors were also invited to submit their considerations for incorporation by the Project Board prior to the Submission being finalised last night.

Uploaded Documents:

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1671550341_Council+-+Response+to+LGBCE+proposals+-+Final.pdf

