

# New electoral arrangements for North Yorkshire Council Final Recommendations

# January 2026

## **Translations and other formats:**

To get this report in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England at:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

## **Licensing:**

The mapping in this report is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right.

Licence Number: AC 0000807452 2026

## **A note on our mapping:**

The maps shown in this report are for illustrative purposes only. Whilst best efforts have been made by our staff to ensure that the maps included in this report are representative of the boundaries described by the text, there may be slight variations between these maps and the large PDF map that accompanies this report, or the digital mapping supplied on our consultation portal. This is due to the way in which the final mapped products are produced. The reader should therefore refer to either the large PDF supplied with this report or the digital mapping for the true likeness of the boundaries intended. The boundaries as shown on either the large PDF map or the digital mapping should always appear identical.

# Contents

Introduction	1
Who we are and what we do	1
What is an electoral review?	1
Why North Yorkshire?	2
Our proposals for North Yorkshire	2
How will the recommendations affect you?	2
Review timetable	3
Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Number of councillors	6
Division boundaries consultation	8
Draft recommendations consultation	9
Further draft recommendations consultation	10
Final recommendations	10
Selby	11
Harrogate and Knaresborough	16
Skipton	24
Yorkshire Dales	27
Ripon	33
Richmond	36
Stokesley	40
Thirsk and Northallerton	42
Easingwold	45
Malton, Norton and Pickering	47
North York Moors	51
Whitby	53
Scarborough and Filey	55
Conclusions	61
Summary of electoral arrangements	61
Parish electoral arrangements	61
What happens next?	69
Equalities	71

Appendices	73
Appendix A	73
Final recommendations for North Yorkshire Council	73
Appendix B	79
Outline map	79
Appendix C	80
Submissions received	80
Appendix D	85
Glossary and abbreviations	85



# Introduction

## Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament.<sup>1</sup> We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

2 The members of the Commission are:

- Andrew Scallan CBE (Deputy Chair)
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Wallace Sampson OBE
- Liz Treacy
- Janet Waggott
- Ailsa Irvine (Chief Executive)

## What is an electoral review?

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed.
- How many wards or electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries are and what they should be called.
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division.

4 When carrying out an electoral review the Commission has three main considerations:

- Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.
- Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.
- Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

5 Our task is to strike the best balance between these three considerations when making our recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

6 More detail regarding the powers that we have, as well as further guidance and information about electoral reviews and the review process in general, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why North Yorkshire?

7 In 2021, the then Secretary of State agreed to create a new unitary local government structure for the North Yorkshire county area. The existing North Yorkshire County Council and the districts of Craven, Hambleton, Harrogate, Richmondshire, Ryedale, Scarborough and Selby were abolished, and the new single-tier unitary authority of North Yorkshire Council ('the Council') was created.

8 A shadow authority was established towards the end of 2021 with interim electoral arrangements. The new authority held its first elections in May 2022, with the expectation that the Commission would conduct a full electoral review before the subsequent elections in 2027.

9 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The divisions in North Yorkshire are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same across North Yorkshire.

## Our proposals for North Yorkshire

10 North Yorkshire should be represented by 89 councillors, one fewer than there is now.

11 North Yorkshire should have 87 divisions, two fewer than there are now.

12 The boundaries of most divisions should change.

13 We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for North Yorkshire.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

14 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on North Yorkshire Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division name may also change.

15 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of North Yorkshire Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices or car and house insurance premiums, and we are not able to consider any representations which are based on these issues.

## Review timetable

16 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for North Yorkshire. We then held three periods of consultation with the public on division patterns for North Yorkshire. The submissions received during consultation have informed our final recommendations.

17 The review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
18 September 2024	Number of councillors decided
1 October 2024	Start of consultation seeking views on new divisions
9 December 2024	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
1 April 2025	Publication of draft recommendations; start of second consultation
9 June 2025	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
2 September 2025	Publication of further draft recommendations; start of third consultation
14 October 2025	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and confirming final recommendations
14 January 2026	Publication of final recommendations





## Analysis and final recommendations

18 Legislation<sup>3</sup> states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors<sup>4</sup> there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our divisions.

19 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create divisions with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

20 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

	2024	2031
Electorate of North Yorkshire	483,562	517,784
Number of councillors	89	89
Average number of electors per councillor	5,433	5,818

21 When the number of electors per councillor in a division is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the division as having 'good electoral equality'. All but three of our proposed divisions for North Yorkshire are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2031.

## Submissions received

22 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

23 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2030, a period five years on from the originally scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2025. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 7%.

24 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. Given that we have conducted a round of further consultation in some areas of North Yorkshire, the year

<sup>3</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

of publication of our final recommendations changed from 2025 to 2026. However, we are content that these figures can still be used as a reasonable estimate of forecast elector numbers for 2031 and so we have used these figures to produce our final recommendations.

25 Our mapping tool uses geocoded electoral registers supplied by the Council to locate electors, by associating addresses with specific geographic coordinates. It considers each elector's location to produce precise elector counts for each ward. There can be very slight differences between the electorate figures published on our website at the beginning of the review and the electorate figures published in this report. However, these are very minor and do not impact on our recommendations.

## Number of councillors

26 North Yorkshire Council currently has 90 councillors. Before the start of the review, we received five submissions on councillor numbers, advocating for numbers ranging from 89 to 108. The Council proposed that the authority should have 89 members, arguing that this number would provide for effective decision-making, a good level of scrutiny and strong community leadership, given the unique geographical and population challenges of North Yorkshire.

27 The North Yorkshire Council Labour Group, supported by the North Yorkshire Green Councillors Group ('the Greens'), proposed increasing the number of councillors to 108. While the Labour Group agreed with the Council on the challenges posed by the area's geography, it contended that 108 councillors were necessary to adequately represent the distinct urban, rural and coastal areas. The group argued that increasing the number of councillors would improve community engagement and local representation, and enable councillors to address issues more effectively. It also argued that more councillors would facilitate more robust scrutiny.

28 The North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats and Liberal Group suggested an increase to 97 councillors, citing the heavy workload faced by current members who are managing responsibilities previously handled by more than 300 councillors. It argued that such an increase was necessary to ensure effective representation in the face of North Yorkshire's geographic size. Additionally, the group claimed that increasing the number of councillors would help enhance diversity and inclusivity by enabling individuals with caregiving or work responsibilities to serve as members. It also drew attention to North Yorkshire's high elector-to-councillor ratio compared to other large rural authorities.

29 Whitby Town Council submitted a proposal suggesting that approximately 90 councillors would provide an ideal division pattern for the town's area.

30 We carefully considered all the points raised in the submissions received. While we recognised the variety of views regarding the appropriate number of councillors for North Yorkshire, we concluded that the submission from the Council presented the most compelling argument in support of its proposed number. We determined that the Council's case for reducing the number of councillors to 89 was well-made, backed by evidence suggesting that this number would be sufficient for effective decision-making, scrutiny and community leadership. Although the Labour Group's proposal for an increased number of councillors had merit, we determined that the evidence provided did not sufficiently justify a substantial increase, particularly to more than 100 councillors.

31 Furthermore, we found the submission from the North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats and Liberal Group to lack sufficient supporting data. In particular, we considered it less convincing in demonstrating that an increase to 97 councillors would improve representation or reduce workload pressures when compared to the Council's proposal.

32 We concluded that a council of 89 members would enable councillors to deliver strong strategic leadership, robust scrutiny and effective community engagement. As a result, we decided to invite proposals for new division patterns based on 89 members.

33 At a Full Council meeting on 24 July 2024, the Council resolved to request that the Commission carry out this review on the basis of recommending a uniform pattern of single-member divisions. There is a presumption in legislation<sup>5</sup> that the Commission should agree to such requests and seek to provide a uniform pattern of single-member divisions across the authority. However, in all cases, this consideration will not take precedence over our other statutory criteria, and we will not recommend a uniform pattern of single-member divisions if, in our view, or as is shown in evidence provided to us, it is not compatible with our other statutory criteria.

34 Over the course of the review, we received over 20 submissions which commented on the number of councillors for North Yorkshire. A number of Labour Party-affiliated political groups, a number of parish councils and several local residents opposed our decision that North Yorkshire Council be represented by 89 councillors, arguing for an increase. However, having carefully considered the evidence received, we remain unpersuaded by the arguments put forward that increasing the total number of councillors from 89 would result in the authority being able to carry out its statutory functions in a more effective manner. We remain satisfied that 89 councillors will ensure the authority can carry out its roles and

---

<sup>5</sup> Section 57 of Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

responsibilities effectively both now and, in the future, so we have based our final recommendations on an 89-member council.

## Division boundaries consultation

35 We received 124 submissions in response to our consultation on division boundaries. These included two authority-wide proposals from the Council and the North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of North Yorkshire.

36 The Council's proposal provided for a uniform pattern of single-councillor divisions for North Yorkshire. The North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats proposed a near uniform pattern of single-councillor divisions but proposed a two-councillor division for the Malton and Norton area. The North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats agreed with the Council's proposals in the Scarborough, Whitby and Selby areas but generally proposed different boundaries elsewhere. We carefully considered the proposals received and were of the view that the proposed patterns of divisions resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the authority and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

37 We also received a partial scheme from the Thirsk & Malton Labour Party, which focused on the area covered by the Thirsk & Malton parliamentary constituency. This proposal was largely based on avoiding the creation of divisions that crossed parliamentary constituencies. This principle was further supported by the North Yorkshire Labour Party Local Government Committee and the Wetherby & Easingwold Constituency Labour Party, who requested that we consider a configuration that would keep the parishes currently in Hillside & Raskelf, Helmsley & Ampleforth, Amotherby & Hovingham and Wathvale & Bishop Monkton divisions entirely within the boundaries of Wetherby & Easingwold parliamentary constituency.

38 In the Scarborough, Whitby and Selby areas, our draft recommendations were based on the proposals made by the Council, which the North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats agreed upon. For the rest of North Yorkshire, our recommendations were broadly based upon the North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats' proposals. This was because we considered their proposals to better reflect community identities and interests, based upon the evidence we received during that consultation.

39 Our draft recommendations also took into account other local evidence that we received, which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas, we considered that the proposals did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria, so we identified alternative boundaries.

## Draft recommendations consultation

40 We received 195 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These included comments from the Council, Members of Parliament, political groups, local organisations, parish councils and local residents. The majority of the submissions focused on specific areas.

41 Based on the evidence received, we were persuaded to make significant changes to our draft recommendations with regard to divisions in the central and western areas of North Yorkshire. We determined that a period of further limited consultation was necessary in those areas, given the significant level of change we had proposed. We also recommend less significant boundary changes across the remainder of North Yorkshire, and the renaming of several divisions.

42 We conducted an in-person tour of North Yorkshire in July 2025 in order to look at the areas where we received strong evidence and feedback. This tour helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

43 The Richmondshire Branch of the Yorkshire Local Councils Associations expressed its opinion that the current boundaries, which it argued are based on community connectivity, were at risk of being replaced by arrangements driven primarily by achieving numerical equality. We note this representation but consider that our recommendations strike an appropriate balance between our statutory criteria, which are electoral equality, community identities and interests, and effective and convenient local government.

44 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received a detailed submission from the North Yorkshire Labour Party. This submission emphasised the importance of creating divisions that do not cross parliamentary constituencies, arguing that such arrangements can cause confusion for electors and weaken community identity. It expressed concern that our draft recommendations increased the number of divisions that crossed parliamentary constituencies. It stated that creating divisions that do not cross parliamentary constituencies should be considered as part of providing for effective and convenient local government.

45 We noted these concerns. However, the legislation governing our work requires that we base our recommendations on the statutory criteria of electoral equality, community identities and interests, and effective and convenient local government. Adhering to parliamentary constituency boundaries is not, of itself, an absolute requirement when we conduct electoral reviews. While there may be circumstances where following an existing parliamentary constituency boundary may reflect our statutory criteria, we do not consider evidence relating solely to parliamentary boundaries to be persuasive. Nonetheless, we carefully considered the alternative proposals submitted and assessed them against our statutory criteria. Where we

considered those alternatives to better reflect community identity or improve electoral equality while supporting effective and convenient local government, we have been prepared to adopt them.

## Further draft recommendations consultation

46 In response to this consultation, which was focused on proposed divisions in the central and west of the authority, we received 63 representations. Most of these focused on our proposals across the Nidderdale, Wharfedale and Washburn Valley areas. Based on the evidence received during this consultation, we have largely confirmed our further draft recommendations for North Yorkshire as final, subject to some relatively minor modifications made in response to the evidence received during consultation.

## Final recommendations

47 Our final recommendations are for two two-councillor divisions and 85 single-councillor divisions. We consider that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

48 The tables and maps on pages 11–59 detail our final recommendations for each area of North Yorkshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>6</sup> criteria of:

- Equality of representation.
- Reflecting community interests and identities.
- Providing for effective and convenient local government.


49 A summary of our proposed new divisions is set out in the table starting on page 71 and on the large map accompanying this report.

---

<sup>6</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.



## Selby



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton	1	-8%
Barlby, Osgodby & Staynor	1	8%
Brayton & Barlow	1	-2%
Camblesforth & Carlton	1	7%
Cawood & Riccall	1	-7%
Cliffe & Escrick	1	-7%



Osgoldcross	1	10%
Selby East	1	-4%
Selby West	1	6%
Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford	2	7%
Tadcaster	1	4%
Thorpe Willoughby & Hambleton	1	-1%

#### *Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton and Tadcaster*

50 Tadcaster Town Council, Stutton cum Hazlewood Parish Council and Councillor Poskitt objected to our draft recommendation to not include the entirety of Stutton cum Hazlewood parish in Tadcaster division. In those recommendations, we split the parish along the A64. This arrangement was proposed in order to achieve electoral equality for Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton division, and to use the A64 as a clear and identifiable division boundary.

51 However, we received compelling evidence from Tadcaster Town Council, Stutton cum Hazlewood Parish Council and Councillor Poskitt, highlighting strong community links between Stutton cum Hazlewood parish and Tadcaster town. During our visit to the area, we observed these links firsthand. We have therefore been persuaded to include the whole of Stutton cum Hazlewood parish in our proposed Tadcaster division to better reflect community identities and interests.

52 To address the resulting electoral imbalance in Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton division, we have adopted proposals from the North Yorkshire Conservative Party ('the Conservatives') and Tadcaster Town Council to transfer Healaugh and Wighill parishes from Tadcaster division into Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton. During our visit to the area, we determined that these parishes do not share as close a relationship with Tadcaster when compared to Stutton cum Hazlewood. We also received evidence from the Conservatives highlighting links between Catterton, Healaugh and Wighill. They also noted that our draft recommendations had split the grouped parish council of Healaugh & Catterton across divisions. We therefore consider that uniting these three parishes in Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton division will provide an effective balance of our statutory criteria, in particular ensuring effective and convenient local government.

53 Our draft recommendations had placed electors in the Wighill Lane area of Healaugh parish in Tadcaster division. This was due to the inclusion of Healaugh parish in this division. However, with the transfer of Healaugh parish into the Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton division, these electors will no longer be part of Tadcaster division. While we recognise Tadcaster Town Council's view that these electors form part of the Tadcaster urban area, we do not consider the proposal to split Healaugh parish across divisions in order to retain them in Tadcaster division would provide for effective and convenient local government. This is because it

would create a parish ward with fewer than 100 electors, which we consider to be too small to support efficient local governance. It might be the case that a community governance review to alter the parish boundary, followed by a related alteration to the division boundary, would be the most appropriate way to resolve this issue.

#### *Barlby, Osgodby & Staynor, Selby East and Selby West*

54 As outlined in our draft recommendations, the area covered by Selby parish is too large to be divided into two single-councillor divisions and achieve good electoral equality. To address this, we adopted the Council's proposal, placing the Staynor area of Selby parish in a division with Barlby with Osgodby parish. This arrangement allowed us to recommend three divisions – Barlby & Osgodby, Selby East and Selby West – with good levels of electoral equality. The Conservatives expressed support for these divisions.

55 However, we received objections to this arrangement from Selby Town Council, Councillor Proud, Councillor Matthews and six local residents. They argued that the Staynor area forms part of the broader Selby community, providing evidence of the stronger ties the area has to the town and the limited links it has to Barlby and Osgodby.

56 In response, Selby Town Council submitted three alternative division patterns for our consideration. Its preferred option was for three divisions entirely within the area covered by Selby Town Council. While we recognise the intention to create divisions that better reflect community identities, we decided not to adopt this proposal, as this arrangement would not provide for good electoral equality by 2031, as at least one division be significantly undersized.

57 The Council's second option was for the creation of two divisions for the Selby Town Council area. However, both these divisions would have poor electoral equality, and removing Staynor from Barlby & Osgodby division would result in that division being significantly undersized. We were therefore not persuaded to adopt this proposal either.

58 Selby Town Council's third and least preferred option was for two divisions covering the area of Selby parish, with the inclusion of the Staynor area in the Barlby & Osgodby division, should we remain minded not to place it in a Selby-based division. This proposal also included an amended boundary between Selby East and Selby West divisions to ensure that the Leeds Road area would be contained wholly within a single division. Councillor Matthews also requested that Leeds Road be included entirely within one division.

59 We acknowledge the evidence received about the community ties between the Staynor area and Selby town. However, given the need to achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality across divisions, and the lack of a viable alternative that meets

this requirement, we have decided to retain the Staynor area in our renamed Barlby, Osgodby & Staynor division. We consider that including 'Staynor' in the division name will help reflect and recognise the distinct identity of this community.

60 We also considered Selby Town Council's request to amend the boundary between Selby East and Selby West divisions to avoid dividing the Leeds Road area. While we were not able to include the road in its entirety within Selby East division without compromising on electoral equality, we were persuaded by the evidence submitted that Leeds Road should not be split. We are therefore proposing to include the whole of Leeds Road in our recommended Selby West division, in order to better reflect local community identities and interests. We note in particular that Councillor Proud suggested that Leeds Road could be included in Selby West division.

#### *Brayton & Barlow*

61 The Conservatives supported our proposed Brayton & Barlow division. They agreed with the inclusion of Burn parish, noting it was necessary to achieve electoral equality and highlighting its close links to the rest of the division via the A19. As no other submissions were received regarding this division, we are confirming it as part of our final recommendations.

#### *Camblesforth & Carlton and Osgoldcross*

62 The Conservatives also supported our proposed Camblesforth & Carlton and Osgoldcross divisions, noting that they form two divisions in the southernmost part of North Yorkshire with good levels of electoral equality. In addition, we received a submission from a local resident in support of the Osgoldcross division specifically. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for both divisions as final.

#### *Cawood & Riccall and Cliffe & Escrick*

63 The Conservatives supported our proposed Cawood & Riccall and Cliffe & Escrick divisions, agreeing with our view that each links together similarly sized parishes to the north and east of Selby, respectively, with strong community ties. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for both divisions as final.


#### *Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford*

64 Sherburn in Elmet Town Council, Councillor Packham, Councillor Tant-Brown and two local residents all supported our draft recommendation for a two-councillor Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford division. The Conservatives also supported this proposal. While generally opposed to two-councillor divisions, they recognised that in this instance, such a division would provide a good balance of our statutory criteria as it avoided an established community being split. We are therefore confirming this division as part of our final recommendations.

*Thorpe Willoughby & Hambleton*

65 The Conservatives agreed with our proposal to include Chapel Haddlesey and West Haddlesey parishes in a Thorpe Willoughby & Hambleton division, and the transfer of Burn parish to our Brayton & Barlow division. With no further submissions received pertaining to this division, we have decided to confirm it as part of our final recommendations.

## Harrogate and Knaresborough



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Bilton & Nidd Gorge	1	6%
Bilton Grange & Coppice Valley	1	0%
Duchy & Valley Gardens	1	5%
Granby	1	4%
Harlow Hill	1	10%
Harrogate Central	1	1%
Jennyfield	1	10%
Killinghall & Scotton	1	-11%
Knaresborough East	1	8%
Knaresborough West	1	9%
Oatlands & Rossett	1	0%
Starbeck	1	-7%
Stray & Hookstone	1	4%



### *Bilton & Nidd Gorge*

66 We received support for our proposed Bilton & Nidd Gorge division from Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, the Conservatives, Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party, Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy and two local residents. In our draft recommendations we had proposed retaining the existing division. It is forecast to deliver good electoral equality by 2031 and, based on the evidence received, continues to reflect established community identities effectively.

67 Councillor Goodall proposed that the division be named Bilton Woodfield & Nidd Gorge, in order to better reflect local community identities. However, we have not been persuaded to adopt this change, as we did not receive sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Woodfield constitutes a distinct and recognised community identity.

### *Bilton Grange & Coppice Valley*

68 We received support for our proposed Bilton Grange division from Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party and a local resident. However, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association and a local resident opposed our recommendations, expressing a preference for the proposals outlined in the Council's earlier submission. In particular, they objected to the use of Skipton Road and Ripon Road as boundaries for the division, arguing that these roads do not act as dividing lines but rather serve as key routes that connect communities.

69 Following our tour of the area, we remain of the view that Ripon Road, in particular, provides a clear and recognisable boundary. We were therefore persuaded to adopt Harrogate Town Council's proposal to use Ripon Road in its entirety as the division's western boundary. As a result, the Oak Beck Park area has been placed in Jennyfield division.

70 The Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party also argued that the boundary with Harrogate Central division was unclear. It proposed a revised boundary running further south, along Coppice Drive and King's Road. We have adopted this proposed boundary as we consider it to be more clearly identifiable. It will also result in improved electoral equality for both divisions.

71 We propose that the division be renamed Bilton Grange & Coppice Valley, in line with Harrogate Town Council's suggestion. We agree that this name better reflects the communities contained within the division. We have not adopted the inclusion of 'Knox' within the division name, which the Conservatives stated they would be comfortable with. We had previously welcomed feedback on whether the Council's initial suggestion to include 'Knox' in the division name was appropriate.

However, we received no strong support for its inclusion during consultation on our draft recommendations.

#### *Duchy & Valley Gardens and Harrogate Central*

72 Our proposed Duchy & Valley Gardens and Harrogate Central divisions were supported by Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, Councillor Metcalfe Councillor Timothy and a local resident. The Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party also broadly supported the two divisions but suggested two boundary amendments to Harrogate Central division.

73 The Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association and a local resident objected to our proposed Duchy & Valley Gardens and Harrogate Central divisions. They argued that the Duchy & Valley Gardens division would link distinct and separate communities and instead supported the Council's earlier proposal for two divisions named Oakdale and Central & Valley Gardens. They considered that these proposals would provide a better reflection of local identities and community links.

74 After careful consideration, we have decided to largely retain our draft recommendations for the Duchy & Valley Gardens and Harrogate Central divisions. We remain of the view that they offer an effective balance of the statutory criteria. In particular, we agree with Harrogate Town Council that the proposed Harrogate Central division consolidates the core central areas of Harrogate into a single coherent division.

75 The Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party proposed that the boundary between the two divisions follows the A61 in its entirety. We have adopted this suggestion, as we noted on our visit to Harrogate that it is more identifiable. We have also accepted its proposal to align the northern boundary along Coppice Drive and King's Road, as set out in the Bilton Grange & Coppice Valley section of this report.

#### *Granby*

76 Our proposed Granby division was supported by Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association and two local residents. Subject to the inclusion of Woodlands Grove in this division, as outlined in the Starbeck section of this report, we are confirming our draft recommendations for this division as final.

#### *Harlow Hill*

77 Our proposed Harlow division was supported by Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency

Labour Party, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy and two local residents.

78 Harrogate Town Council supported the inclusion of the Harlow Hill Grange area, which straddles the boundary between Beckwithshaw and Harrogate parishes, within the proposed Harlow division. Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw Parish Council objected to this, citing concerns that the area being moved into Harrogate parish would lead to it receiving less appropriate local representation and potentially higher precept charges under Harrogate Town Council. However, our recommendations do not alter parish boundaries, and Harlow Hill Grange will not move from Beckwithshaw parish as a consequence of this review. We have placed this area within Harlow Hill division, resulting in Beckwithshaw parish being split between divisions. The remainder of the parish is included in our recommended Pannal & Washburn division. We remain of the view that it is appropriate for Harlow Hill Grange to be contained wholly within our Harlow Hill division, given its proximity to urban Harrogate, and are therefore confirming this element of our recommendations as final.

79 Harrogate Town Council further requested that the division be extended along the B6162 to include the adjacent industrial estate and playing fields. It also proposed including all of the Cardale Park Estate and Vida Court in Harlow division. However, we have not adopted this proposal. In this instance, we consider that following the parish boundary between Harrogate and Beckwithshaw promotes effective and convenient local government, by avoiding the creation of a parish ward in Beckwithshaw parish with very few electors.

80 Harrogate Town Council additionally proposed renaming the division to Harlow Hill, to better reflect the identity of the area and to align it with local facilities such as Harlow Hill Methodist Church and the Harlow Hill Allotments. We have adopted this name change as we consider it to be more geographically specific and recognisable to local electors. We also note that other local landmarks, such as the historical water tower, the local park and the cemetery, also carry the Harlow Hill name.

81 A local resident also requested that Swinton Court and Harlow Oval be included in this division, stating that these roads form part of the Harlow Hill community. We have been persuaded by the evidence received that this will reflect community identities and have adopted this amendment as part of our final recommendations.

### *Jennyfield*

82 Our proposed Jennyfield division was supported by Tom Gordon MP, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy, Harrogate Town Council, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party and a local resident. However, the Council, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Broadbank and a local resident opposed the division on the



grounds that it would straddle the boundary between Harrogate and Killinghall parishes and also split Killinghall parish across divisions.

83 We visited this area of Harrogate during our tour of North Yorkshire and, following that visit, remain of the view that the boundary between Harrogate and Killinghall parishes does not represent a clear and identifiable boundary on the ground. While we recognised the presence of the parish wall, we consider that using this feature as a division boundary would divide the Jennyfield community between divisions. We acknowledge the argument that coterminosity with the new Harrogate Town Council boundary could support effective and convenient local government, but we do not consider this to outweigh the statutory criterion of reflecting community identities and interests. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final, subject to an amendment to the boundary with Bilton Grange & Coppice Valley division so that it includes the Oak Beck Park area, using the A61 as the boundary.

84 The Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association expressed concern about the inclusion of the King Edwin Park area in Jennyfield division. However, we recommend retaining it in our Jennyfield division, noting that further residential development in the area will link it to our Jennyfield division via Orchid Way.

85 We also propose retaining the name of Jennyfield for the division. We determined that is widely used and recognised by local residents, and more accurately reflects the identity of the community than alternatives such as Saltergate, as suggested by Councillor Broadbank.

### *Killinghall & Scotton*

86 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, several respondents objected to the proposed Lower Nidderdale division, arguing that it did not reflect local community identities. While our further draft recommendations largely retained the overall structure of this division, it proposed renaming it Killinghall & Scotton. These revised proposals also included the addition of Copgrove, Staveley and Walkingham Hill with Occaney parishes.

87 The revised division received support from the Conservative Party (North), Councillor Gibbs and two local residents. While some reservations remained about combining areas that are oriented towards either Harrogate or Knaresborough, respondents generally considered the revised division an improvement. Councillor Gibbs and a local resident specifically welcomed the inclusion of Copgrove, Staveley and Walkingham with Occaney parishes. One resident supported the inclusion of Old Scriven, citing its distinct rural character. Reform UK (Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency) also endorsed the grouping of Jennyfield and Killinghall Moor, noting their shared geography and services.

88 Having considered the feedback received, we have decided to confirm our recommended Killinghall & Scotton division as final.

#### *Knaresborough East and Knaresborough West*

89 The Greens, Tom Gordon MP, Knaresborough Town Council and Councillor Westmancoat supported our two proposed Knaresborough divisions. The Council, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Broadbank and a local resident also supported the principle of two Knaresborough-based divisions but favoured the creation of a third division that would link part of Knaresborough with surrounding rural villages, which they argued share community ties with the town. This proposed division would include that part of Knaresborough parish around the Scriven area along with the parishes of Arkendale, Coneythorpe, Ferrensby, Brearton, Allerton, Goldsborough, Flaxby, Farnham, Scotton, Occaney, Copgrove, Staveley, Burton Leonard and Scriven, which we proposed form part of Hammerton and Lower Nidderdale divisions.

90 We have carefully considered this alternative proposal but have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the Knaresborough area as final. Adopting a third division would require the removal of numerous parishes from our draft Hammerton and Lower Nidderdale divisions and would have substantial consequential effects on the division pattern across a wider Harrogate and Knaresborough area. We do not consider that the community evidence received in favour of this alternative is sufficient to justify this level of change. Furthermore, we remain of the view that the best balance of the statutory criteria is achieved by maintaining two urban-focused Knaresborough divisions, which reflect the town's identity. This division pattern also delivers good electoral equality and provides for effective and convenient local government. In contrast, the proposed Claro & Scotton division would link rural areas with a small part of urban Knaresborough, resulting in a division that is geographically large and more disparate in character.

91 The Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party supported our Knaresborough East division. However, it proposed that the boundary between our draft Knaresborough West and Lower Nidderdale divisions follows the B6165 up to Red Hill Lane, in order to retain areas such as the Appleby estate in a Knaresborough-based division. The Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association also opposed the exclusion of this area from a Knaresborough division. We do not propose adopting this change. Including this area would make Knaresborough West division too large in terms of electorate, resulting in a relatively high electoral variance. We remain satisfied that our proposed division boundary reflects the character of the surrounding communities while achieving a good balance of our statutory criteria.

92 We received support from the Council, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association and a local resident that the Calcutt, Forest Moor and

Thistle areas should remain in Knaresborough East division to reflect the Knaresborough parish boundary and the identity of these places as part of Knaresborough. We therefore recommend retaining them in Knaresborough East division as part of our final recommendations.

### *Oatlands & Rossett*

93 Our proposed Oatlands & Rossett division was supported by Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy and two local residents.

94 Harrogate Town Council suggested realigning the boundary to include all properties on Rossett Green Lane in Oatlands & Rossett division. The centre of this road currently forms the parish boundary between Harrogate and Pannal & Burn Bridge. We have not adopted this proposal, as moving the boundary in this way would require the creation of a parish ward for Pannal & Burn Bridge parish which would contain only a very small number of electors compared to the overall electorate of the parish. We do not consider that such an arrangement would provide for effective and convenient local government and therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Oatlands & Rossett division as final.

### *Starbeck*

95 We received support for our proposed Starbeck division. This included submissions from Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy, and two local residents.

96 Harrogate Town Council suggested two boundary modifications: that Woodlands Grove be removed from Starbeck division, and that the entirety of Prospect Road be included within it. We have adopted both of these amendments as part of our final recommendations as we are satisfied that they will result in clearer and more identifiable division boundaries.

### *Stray & Hookstone*


97 Tom Gordon MP, Harrogate Town Council, the Conservatives, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party, the Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association, Councillor Metcalfe, Councillor Timothy and two local residents supported our proposed Stray & Woodlands division.

98 Harrogate Town Council proposed that the division be renamed Stray & Hookstone, arguing that this name would offer greater clarity and be more recognisable to local residents. We agree and are therefore adopting Stray & Hookstone as the division name in our final recommendations. We note that the

name Hookstone is well established locally, with amenities such as Hookstone Woods and Hookstone Chase Primary School, as well as roads including Hookstone Chase and Hookstone Drive.

99 As discussed above, we also recommend the inclusion of Woodlands Grove in this division and the transfer of part of Prospect Road to Starbeck division.

## Skipton



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Aire Valley	1	-11%
Skipton East	1	-6%
Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby	1	-10%
Skipton West	1	-2%
South Craven	1	10%



### *Aire Valley and Skipton West*

100 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, several respondents opposed the inclusion of Carleton parish in the proposed Aire Valley division. In response, we transferred Carleton parish to the Skipton West division as part of our further draft recommendations, concluding that this change better reflected local community identity. Although this resulted in a forecast electoral variance of -11% for Aire Valley division, we considered this acceptable given the limited alternatives.

101 The North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats, the Greens, the Conservative Party (North), Councillor Brown, Councillor Solloway and Cononley Parish Council supported the revised Aire Valley division, while Lothersdale Parish Council raised no objections. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations for the Aire Valley and Skipton West divisions as final.

### *Skipton East and Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby*

102 Our draft recommendations to include Broughton, Elslack, Stirton with Thorlby and Thornton-in-Craven parishes in our proposed Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby division were met with objections. Respondents argued these parishes had limited ties to Skipton and would be better placed in Mid Craven division. We were persuaded by this evidence and transferred the parishes accordingly. To address the resulting shortfall in electorate for the proposed Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby division, we included Barden, Beamsley, Bolton Abbey, Halton East and Hazlewood with Storiths parishes, based on evidence we had received which indicated that they have with stronger links to Skipton, Embsay and Eastby.

103 In response, the North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats and the Conservative Party (North) supported these two divisions in full. The Greens, Councillor Brown and Councillor Solloway specifically welcomed the transfer of Thornton-in-Craven, Elslack and Broughton parishes to Mid Craven division, viewing it as a significant improvement in respect of community identity. Thornton-in-Craven Parish Council also endorsed the transfer of the parish.

104 During our further draft recommendations consultation, modifications to the proposed Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby division were suggested. The Council and the Greens argued that Appletreewick and Barden parishes should be placed in the same division due to strong community ties, recommending that Barden parish be included in Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division. The Greens and Councillor Brown also proposed using the River Wharfe as the eastern boundary of Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby division, with Beamsley and Hazlewood with Storiths parishes transferred to Pannal & Washburn division. They contended that these changes would better reflect community identity while maintaining acceptable electoral variances.


105 We have adopted both proposals in our final recommendations. We were persuaded that placing Appletreewick and Barden in the same division will better reflect community identities and interests. We were also persuaded that the River Wharfe provides a clear and identifiable feature on which to base our division boundary.

### *South Craven*

106 The Conservatives, the Greens, Councillor Barrett, Glusburn & Cross Hills Parish Council and Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council all supported our proposed Glusburn, Cross Hills & Sutton-in-Craven division.

107 The Conservatives suggested that the division be renamed South Craven. The Council had also previously suggested this name during the initial consultation. We have decided to adopt this name, as it is more succinct and still accurately describes the area concerned. We also note the presence in the division of South Craven School, South Craven Community Library and other local organisations using the name, demonstrating that South Craven is a well-established and widely recognised term in the community.

## Yorkshire Dales



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Bentham & Ingleton	1	5%
Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale	1	0%
Lower Nidderdale	1	-3%
Mid Craven	1	-8%
Pannal & Washburn	1	6%
Settle	1	-1%
Upper Dales	1	-7%
Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale	1	10%

### *Bentham & Ingleton*

108 In our draft recommendations we welcomed feedback on where the community identities and interests of Clapham cum Newby parish lie, noting that reasonable



electoral equality could be achieved whether it was included in Bentham & Ingleton division or Settle division. During consultation, we received evidence from the Council, the Conservatives, Councillor Staveley, Clapham cum Newby Parish Council and a local resident which demonstrated that the parish shares stronger links with communities in the proposed Bentham & Ingleton division than with those in Settle division. We have therefore decided to include Clapham cum Newby parish in a Bentham & Ingleton division in our final recommendations. We are satisfied that doing so will provide a better balance of our statutory criteria.

109 The local resident also requested that Austwick parish be included in Bentham & Ingleton division. However, we have not adopted this change, as we did not find the evidence in support of this modification to be sufficiently persuasive.

#### *Mid Craven*

110 In our draft recommendations, our proposed Mid Craven division included the parishes of Cracoe, Hetton-cum-Bordley and Rylstone, which are currently part of the existing Wharfedale division. During consultation, we received significant opposition to this proposal from the Council, Rylstone Parish Meeting, Hetton-cum-Bordley Parish Meeting and 18 local residents. These respondents provided strong community-based evidence demonstrating that the three parishes have long-standing links with neighbouring settlements in the existing Wharfedale division. This included shared use of local schools, community facilities and social events. We found this evidence to be persuasive and have therefore proposed the transfer of Cracoe, Hetton-cum-Bordley and Rylstone parishes to Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division as part of our final recommendations.

111 We also recommend that the parishes of Halton West and Wigglesworth be transferred to Settle division, and that Broughton, Elslack, Stirton with Thorlby and Thornton-in-Craven parishes be included in Mid Craven division. The reasoning for these changes is set out in the sections of this report covering Settle and Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby divisions.

#### *Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale*

112 Our final recommendations for Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale division are based on our draft recommendations, subject to the transfer of Hunton parish. While one local resident stated Hunton parish should be included in Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale division during the consultation on further draft recommendations, we were persuaded by evidence submitted by the Conservatives which indicated that Hunton parish shares stronger links with communities to the east rather than with Leyburn and the surrounding areas. We are content that the community identities and interests of the parish will be effectively represented within our Catterick Village & Crakehall division.

113 Constable Burton & Finghall Parish Council expressed concern that the proposed division would cover a significantly larger rural area than at present and felt this could reduce the level of representation available to electors. However, our single-councillor Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale division has good electoral equality, in line with nearly all other divisions across North Yorkshire, ensuring it has a comparable level of representation.

*Lower Nidderdale, Pannal & Washburn and Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale*

114 A number of respondents expressed strong opposition to our further draft recommendations for an Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division. These included the North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats, several parish councils in the Nidderdale area, Councillor Brown, Councillor Murday, Church in the Dale, the Nidderdale Museum Society CIO, Nidderdale Plus, the Nidderdale National Landscape Joint Advisory Committee and several local residents. These respondents told us the proposed division would cover an excessively large geographic area with limited connectivity and combine communities with distinct identities. They also highlighted the complexity of including both the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the Nidderdale National Landscape within a single division, and emphasised the strength of local ties in Nidderdale, supported by shared services and community events such as the Nidderdale Show. These respondents preferred our earlier draft recommendations for this area.

115 Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw Parish Council also opposed our Pannal & Washburn division, arguing that it brought together communities that were too diverse, with the needs of urban areas such as Pannal differing from those of surrounding rural communities.

116 Conversely, Hartwith cum Winsley Parish Council, Councillor Gibbs and a local resident supported our further draft recommendations. Councillor Gibbs and the local resident considered that our proposed Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division brings together similar upland communities with reasonable links along the B6265. They also supported our proposed Lower Nidderdale and Pannal & Washburn divisions suggesting that they achieved an appropriate balance between the statutory criteria. In particular, they noted that the Lower Nidderdale division links together lower dales communities that are distinct from those in the upper dales. They also noted that Pannal & Washburn division reflects communities in the Washburn Valley that share commuter patterns towards Leeds, Bradford, Otley and other parts of West Yorkshire. Councillor Gibbs specifically argued that these commuter villages differ from those in upper Wharfedale and that placing them in a Wharfedale division, as in our original draft recommendations, would not reflect community identities. A local resident also favoured placing Birstwith in a division with lower Nidderdale parishes rather than with those in the Washburn Valley. The content of these submissions were consistent with evidence received during earlier consultation stages that opposed our original draft recommendations.

117 In reaching our final recommendations, we carefully considered all the evidence received across the three consultation stages, together with our findings from our visit to the area. This included consideration of our statutory duty, under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (as amended by Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023), to seek to further the purposes of Protected Landscapes. We considered how this duty could be met in a reasonable and proportionate manner within the context of an electoral review, alongside our statutory criteria of electoral equality, community identities and interests, and effective and convenient local government.

118 As part of this process, we identified the boundaries of the Protected Landscapes within the North Yorkshire Council area in order to understand how our proposed divisions would interact with these designated areas. We note that both our draft and further draft recommendations would place areas of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the Nidderdale National Landscape across different divisions. We considered whether these configurations would enable councillors to maintain effective links with these landscapes, while also reflecting local community identities and supporting effective representation.

119 We also took account of information received at the councillor numbers stage regarding representation on outside bodies and advisory committees. This included details of appointments to the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority and the Nidderdale National Landscape Joint Advisory Committee, where priority is given to councillors representing divisions within the relevant designated areas. We are satisfied that our final recommendations will secure effective representation for communities within these Protected Landscapes and place councillors elected under the proposed arrangements in a position to support the statutory purposes. We consider our recommendations represent an appropriate and proportionate balance between our duty in respect of Protected Landscapes and our core objective of delivering a fair and workable pattern of divisions across North Yorkshire.

120 While our proposed division boundaries do not completely adhere to the boundaries of the Protected Landscapes, we are content that they enable councillors to be appointed to the relevant board or committee so that they can contribute meaningfully to decision-making on landscape management and public engagement. This is balanced with the need to ensure good electoral equality and reflect the identities and interests of communities across the wider area.

121 We recognise that confirming our further draft recommendations means that the Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division, in particular, will not enjoy full local support. We are grateful to those who explained in detail why they felt our proposals did not reflect their sense of community identity.

122 We acknowledge concerns about the geographic size of the Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division and about combining communities from different dales with distinct identities. We accept that for many residents, the identities of individual dales are a significant aspect of how they view their communities. However, we remain of the view that these upland areas also share important characteristics, including similar rural landscapes, economic profiles and local challenges. Grouping them together in a division can provide coherent representation for communities facing broadly similar issues, while achieving acceptable levels of electoral equality in a sparsely populated area.

123 We also recognise the preference expressed by many respondents for Nidderdale to not be split across divisions in the manner proposed in further draft recommendations. However, we must balance these views against the need to secure good electoral equality and effective and convenient local government across the wider area. We concluded that our previous draft recommendations resulted in division patterns for Wharfedale and the Washburn Valley that did not reflect established community links. We also note that Nidderdale has previously been divided at ward level under the former Harrogate Borough Council in a similar manner, and we have no information to suggest community interests were not adequately represented under that arrangement.

124 On balance, we are satisfied that our recommendations for Lower Nidderdale, Pannal & Washburn and Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale achieve the best available balance of our statutory criteria and duties. In our view, they group together communities with shared identities and interests, and will enable councillors to maintain effective links with the relevant Protected Landscapes and support their statutory purposes. Overall, we consider our recommendations provide a coherent and workable pattern of divisions across Nidderdale, Wharfedale and the Washburn Valley. We have therefore decided to confirm them as final, subject to the following small change. We propose that Barden parish should be included in the Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale division rather than in Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby division. The reasons for this change are set out earlier in this report under the section covering the Skipton area.

### *Settle*

125 As discussed above, our final recommendations for Settle division result in the exclusion of Clapham cum Newby parish. Our proposed division will include the parishes of Halton West and Wigglesworth, which we had previously included in Mid Craven division. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we were advised by Ribblesdale Parish Council, Councillor Staveley and the Conservatives that this arrangement would divide the grouped parish council, which comprises the parishes of Halton West, Rathmell and Wigglesworth. These three submissions also

indicated that the grouped parish council should be wholly included within a Settle division.

126 We agree that splitting this grouped parish council across divisions would not be conducive to effective and convenient local government. Based on the evidence received, we are also persuaded that the community interests of Ribble Banks Parish Council would be better represented within a Settle division. As part of our final recommendations, we have therefore included the three parishes that form Ribble Banks Parish Council in Settle division.


127 Councillor Staveley suggested that the division be renamed Pen-y-Ghent & Ribble Banks, to better reflect the wider geographic identity of the area. However, we have decided to retain the name Settle in our final recommendations, as we consider it to be the most appropriate and widely recognisable name for the division. Settle is the largest settlement and main service centre within the division, and we are satisfied that this name will be well understood by local electors.

128 A local resident requested that Hellifield be included in the same division as Settle. However, we are not persuaded that insufficient evidence has been received to support this change, and we have retained Hellifield parish in Mid Craven division as part of our final recommendations.

### *Upper Dales*

129 The Conservatives, Councillor Peacock and Carperby cum Thoresby Parish Council supported the proposed Upper Dales division. Councillor Peacock also submitted strong community-based evidence in support of the proposal. In light of this support, we are confirming our draft recommendations for this division as final.

## Ripon



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Boroughbridge	1	-1%
Masham & Fountains	1	0%
Ripon Canal & Ure	1	-5%
Ripon Cathedral & Spa	1	-10%
Ripon South	1	-6%

### *Boroughbridge*

130 We received three submissions relating to our further draft recommendations for Boroughbridge division. The North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats and a local resident supported the proposal. Another resident noted that under the draft recommendations, Kirby Hill & District Parish Council would have been split across three divisions, requiring three councillors to attend its meetings. Our further draft recommendations addressed this by uniting the grouped parish council within Boroughbridge division. Based on the evidence received, we are satisfied that the revised Boroughbridge division reflects the statutory criteria and therefore confirm it as part of our final recommendations.

### *Masham & Fountains*

131 Councillor Cunliffe-Lister and three local residents supported our proposal to include the parishes of West Tanfield and North Stainley in Masham & Fountains division. They argued that these communities share common interests and strong



connections with other villages in the division. Conversely, the Conservatives stated that West Tanfield parish should be included in a division with Bedale parish, citing its location north of the river and the historical ties to a different riding of Yorkshire. While this submission referenced historical ties, we were not persuaded that sufficient evidence was received in respect of contemporary community links with Bedale. The North Yorkshire Labour Party also suggested the parish move into our South Swale Villages division. However, we remain of the view that West Tanfield and North Stainley parishes share strong road connections with Masham town, particularly along the A6108 corridor.

132 While not specifically requested during consultation, we have also decided to transfer East Tanfield parish into this division to ensure that the grouped Tanfield Parish Council lies wholly within a single division. We consider this change provides for effective and convenient local government.

133 The North Yorkshire Labour Party requested that the parishes of Nidd, Ripley and South Stainley with Cayton remain in a Masham & Fountains division. We have not adopted this proposal, as we consider these parishes to have weaker links with the geographically distant town of Masham and the surrounding rural parishes to the north. In contrast, we consider them to have stronger connections with the communities in our proposed Killinghall & Scotton division. As such, we do not propose any change to their placement in our final recommendations.

#### *Ripon Canal & Ure, Ripon Cathedral & Spa and Ripon South*

134 We received four submissions regarding our proposed divisions for Ripon. The North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats supported our proposals. However, the Council reiterated its concerns about the use of North Street as a boundary, arguing that it divides key historic and cultural landmarks across divisions. It also considered the inclusion of eastern Ripon with rural southern areas in the proposed Ripon Canal & Ure division to be inappropriate.

135 The Council acknowledged the numerical challenge of dividing Ripon into either two or three divisions but maintained that the further draft recommendations did not sufficiently reflect community identities or support effective local governance. It recommended using the A61 and River Skell as alternative boundaries for the Ripon Cathedral & Spa division, with potential adjustments to the boundary of Ripon South division. This proposal also reflected a local resident's submission, which proposed transferring electors west of the River Ure to an adjacent division.


136 We carefully considered these proposals but were unable to identify a configuration using the suggested boundaries that would deliver electoral equality across all three divisions. Consequently, we have not adopted these proposals in our final recommendations.

137 We also received a submission from a local resident of Burton Leonard, opposing the parish's inclusion in the proposed Ripon Canal & Ure division. The respondent argued that Burton Leonard parish has stronger ties to Harrogate and Killinghall, citing its Harrogate postcode and the community's identification with Harrogate. They expressed concern that the village is geographically distant from Ripon and may be overlooked as an outlier.

138 We carefully considered this representation. However, transferring Burton Leonard parish to our Killinghall & Scotton division would result in Ripon Canal & Ure division having a forecast electoral variance of -16% by 2031, meaning it would possess poor electoral equality. As such, we have therefore not adopted this proposal and confirm our recommendations for the Ripon Canal & Ure, Ripon Cathedral & Spa and Ripon South divisions as final.



## Richmond



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton	1	1%
Hipswell & Colburn	1	8%
North Richmondshire	1	-2%
Richmond	1	5%

### *Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton*

139 While we received broad support for our Brompton & Scorton division, alternative names were suggested. The Conservatives, the Greens, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party, Councillor Broadbank and two local residents suggested it be renamed Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton. This name was intended to differentiate it from the nearby Northallerton North & Brompton division. Moulton Parish Meeting and a local resident suggested the name of North Swale Villages, as a counterpart to the previously proposed South Swale Villages division nearby.

140 We have decided to adopt the name of Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton as part of our final recommendations as we consider that it better reflects the communities contained within the division. Additionally, we agree that it will help avoid confusion with the nearby Northallerton North & Brompton division. We decided that the name North Swale Villages would be less appropriate given our

decision to not recommend a South Swale Villages division as part of our final recommendations.

141 Scorton Parish Council expressed concern that the proposed division covered a large geographic area, which could lead to residents – particularly those in rural communities – feeling less represented. While we recognise that representing a geographically large rural division can present challenges, this division provides for good electoral equality. This means that the elected councillor will represent a similar number of electors as councillors elsewhere in North Yorkshire, ensuring that this area is neither over- nor under-represented in comparison. Furthermore, we are not persuaded that the size of this division will hinder effective and convenient local government.

#### *Hipswell & Colburn*

142 The Conservatives, the Greens, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party and Councillor Broadbank all supported our proposed Hipswell & Colburn division.

143 We received a submission from Scotton Parish Council objecting to our proposed inclusion of Scotton parish in a Swale division. They emphasised Scotton's strong connections with Catterick Garrison, particularly in terms of shared schools, healthcare provision and military infrastructure. It argued that Scotton parish has no community links with distant rural communities, such as Morton-on-Swale parish. Scotton Parish Council also raised concerns about the impact of this change following a previous boundary review, which had already separated Scotton from the rest of the Catterick Garrison area.

144 We have carefully considered this evidence, particularly in relation Scotton's links with Catterick Garrison. We also visited the area on our tour of North Yorkshire. However, we were unable to identify a division pattern that would both include Scotton parish in a Catterick Garrison-based division and provide for acceptable electoral equality. The proposed Hipswell & Colburn division is already forecast to have an electoral variance of 8%; adding Scotton parish would increase this to 40%, which we consider unacceptably high. We are therefore recommending that Scotton parish be included in a Catterick Village & Crakehall division. We consider this arrangement reflects Scotton's reasonable links with nearby parishes west of the A1 and A6055 and provides a better balance of the statutory criteria than the previously proposed Swale division.

145 St Martins Parish Council expressed a preference to be included in Hipswell & Colburn division rather than in a Richmond division. Richmond Town Council also stated that the inclusion St Martins parish in a Richmond division ignored the physical barriers of the River Swale that forms a natural boundary between Richmond town and the parish. However, Baroness Harris of Richmond, Councillor Foster, a local resident, the Greens and Richmond & Northallerton Green Party all

supported its inclusion in a Richmond division, with the latter providing evidence that facilities within St Martins parish primarily serve the town of Richmond. Based on our visit to the area, we consider that St Martins parish shares stronger community links with Richmond and therefore propose that it remain in Richmond division as part of our final recommendations.

146 Although this area was not subject to further consultation, we received a submission from Councillor Foster during our third round of consultation suggesting the division be renamed Colburn & Hipswell. We noted this view, but no strong justification was provided for changing the name. In the absence of clear evidence in support, we have not adopted this suggestion in our final recommendations.

### *North Richmondshire*

147 Our proposed North Richmondshire division received support from the Conservatives, Baroness Harris of Richmond, Richmond & Northallerton Green Party, Councillor Foster, Councillor Broadbank and three local residents. However, we are proposing some amendments in response to submissions received during consultation. We propose reducing the area of Richmond included in this division, in line with Richmond Town Council's request to minimise the number of electors moved from the Richmond Town Council area. We also propose transferring the parishes of Cleasby and Stapleton from Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton division, as suggested by the Council. While this change was opposed by the Greens, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party and a local resident, we agree that these two parishes share stronger road links with Barton and with other communities in the North Richmondshire division. We have therefore concluded that this amendment would better reflect our statutory criteria.


### *Richmond*

148 As outlined in our draft recommendations, the town of Richmond is too large, in terms of electorate, to be represented by a single-councillor division. We therefore placed the area covered by the North parish ward in North Richmondshire division alongside several rural parishes, while the remainder of the town council area formed a Richmond division, together with St Martins parish. While support for this arrangement was received from the Conservatives, Baroness Harris of Richmond, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party, Councillor Broadbank, Councillor Foster and two local residents, there was opposition from Richmond Town Council, Councillor Harris and a local resident. They argued that Richmond functions as a cohesive urban community with strong internal ties and limited links to surrounding rural parishes. Richmond Town Council also expressed concern that splitting the town as proposed would undermine local community identity and effective local governance.

149 While we acknowledge these concerns, we note that a single-member Richmond division excluding St Martins parish would have a forecast electoral

variance of 16%. Including St Martins parish – which we consider necessary given our view that it shares close links with Richmond – would result in a variance of 19%. We consider both variances are not justified by the evidence received. Nonetheless, we note Richmond Town Council's alternative suggestion to transfer electors north of Cutpurse Estate and Conan Drive to North Richmondshire division, rather than transferring the entire North parish ward. We examined this proposal during our visit to the area and agree that this boundary is identifiable and minimises the number of electors from the Richmond Town Council area that are not included in Richmond division. We consider this amendment to strike an effective balance between the need to reflect community identities and achieve good electoral equality. We have amended our draft recommendations accordingly.

## Stokesley



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Great Ayton	1	1%
Hutton Rudby & Appleton Wiske	1	4%
Stokesley	1	-3%

### *Great Ayton*

150 In our draft recommendations, we proposed transferring Bilsdale Midcable parish from the existing Great Ayton division to our proposed Helmsley & Ampleforth division. We considered this change was required to achieve improved levels of electoral equality and to reflect the topography of the area.

151 During the consultation, one local resident supported this proposal. However, Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council strongly opposed the change, arguing that we had placed undue weight on topographical factors and did not sufficiently consider the parish's social and economic ties to communities to the north. This view was echoed by North Yorkshire Council, the Conservatives, the North Yorkshire Labour Party, the Greens, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party and Councillor Broadbank. Rudby Parish Council also noted that Bilsdale Midcable shares community connections with settlements in our Great Ayton division, although it did not express a preference as to which division the parish should be placed in.

152 We have been persuaded by the strength of the evidence that the community identity and interests of Bilsdale Midcable parish would be better served by its



inclusion in Great Ayton division. We have therefore placed the parish in Great Ayton division as part of our final recommendations.

#### *Hutton Rudby & Appleton Wiske*


153 The Council, the Conservatives, the Greens, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party, Councillor Broadbank and Rudby Parish Council supported our decision to include Middleton-on-Leven and Skutterskelfe parishes in Hutton Rudby & Appleton Wiske division. As stated in our draft recommendations, we included these parishes to reflect Rudby Parish Council's request for its grouped parish area to be contained entirely within a single division. These submissions also supported the configuration of the remainder of the division. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Hutton Rudby & Appleton Wiske division as final.

#### *Stokesley*

154 The Council, the Conservatives, the Greens, the Richmond & Northallerton Green Party and Rudby Parish Council supported our Stokesley division. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.



## Thirsk and Northallerton



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Bedale & Aiskew	1	-7%
Catterick Village & Crakehall	1	-5%
Dishforth & Topcliffe	1	-10%
Northallerton North & Brompton	1	-9%
Northallerton South	1	6%
Romanby	1	-2%
Sowerby	1	0%
Swale	1	-10%
Thirsk	1	-1%

### *Bedale & Aiskew and Swale*

155 The Conservative Party (North) supported our further draft recommendation for the Bedale & Aiskew division. A local resident also agreed with previous evidence received that Leeming Bar is distinct from Aiskew and Bedale, noting the physical barriers such as the railway line and the A1(M). However, two local residents objected to the proposed inclusion of Exelby, Theakston, Burneston and Carthorpe in Swale division, citing their strong geographic, service-based and community ties to Bedale. While we acknowledge these concerns, transferring the villages out of Swale division would result in the division being undersized and having electoral inequality. We have therefore retained these communities in our Swale division as part of our final recommendations.

156 The Council requested that Bolton-on-Swale, Ellerton-on-Swale and Scorton parishes all sit within a single division. In order to achieve this the Council proposed that Ellerton-on-Swale move into Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton division. We have adopted this proposal as part of our final recommendations because we were persuaded these three closely linked parishes should not be split across divisions.

### *Catterick Village & Crakehall*

157 Patrick Brompton Parish Council and Councillor Shepherd objected to the proposal to place Patrick Brompton parish in Catterick Village & Crakehall division, arguing that it does not reflect the parish's rural community identity. They highlighted strong ties with neighbouring villages such as Newton-le-Willows, including shared facilities and joint parish council activities. They also noted that the proposed division is more urban and focused on the Garrison community, making it incompatible with Patrick Brompton's character and interests.

158 The Parish Council requested that Patrick Brompton parish be placed in the Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale division, which they argued would better align with its local community identities while still achieving electoral equality. We were persuaded by this evidence and have transferred the parish to Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale division as part of our final recommendations. Apart from this transfer, we confirm our further draft recommendations for Catterick Village & Crakehall division as final.

### *Dishforth & Topcliffe*

159 Skelton cum Newby Parish Council welcomed the proposal to place all three of its parishes within a single division. However, it requested that the three parishes be included in the Ripon Canal & Ure division rather than Dishforth & Topcliffe, citing stronger ties to Ripon and the River Ure's presence within the parish. The Ripon Business Improvement District also requested that Newby Hall, which is in the parish of Newby with Mulwith, be included in a Ripon-centric division. While we acknowledge these community links, transferring the grouped parish council of Skelton cum Newby into Ripon Canal & Ure division would result in electoral inequality for Dishforth & Topcliffe division. Consequently, to maintain a balanced

level of representation across divisions, we are unable to accommodate this proposal. With no further submissions received relating to Dishforth & Topcliffe division, we confirm it as part of our final recommendations.

#### *Sowerby*

160 We received no submissions during the consultation on our further draft recommendations relating to Sowerby division. We therefore confirm the division as part of our final recommendations.

#### *Thirsk*

161 Carlton Miniott Parish Council expressed full support for the revised Thirsk division, noting that Thirsk serves as the primary service centre for the parish. Councillor Dadd also welcomed the inclusion of Carlton Miniott, Sandhutton and Kirby Wiske parishes within Thirsk division, highlighting their strong links to Thirsk through transport, education and local services. These submissions confirm that our Thirsk division reflects established community ties and will support effective local representation, so we confirm our recommendations for Thirsk division as final.


#### *Northallerton North & Brompton, Northallerton South and Romanby*

162 The Conservatives expressed support for our proposed Northallerton North & Brompton, Northallerton South and Romanby divisions. No other submissions were received specifically in relation to these three divisions.

163 We are, however, recommending the transfer of Danby Wiske and Yafforth parishes from our draft Northallerton North & Brompton division into our final Swale division. We recommend this change to achieve electoral equality in our Swale division, and to reflect the predominantly rural character of both parishes by placing them in a more rural division.

164 A local resident raised concerns about potential future housing development in the north of Northallerton, suggesting it may lead to a disproportionately large division. We are satisfied that the electorate forecasts to 2031 adequately reflect the development currently planned for the area. We also note that the relatively low electoral variance of the Northallerton North & Brompton division allows some flexibility to accommodate additional growth beyond the forecast period.

## Easingwold



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Easingwold	1	-4%
Huby & Tollerton	1	-3%
Ouseburn & Hammerton	1	-2%
Spofforth & Tockwith	1	0%

### *Easingwold*

166 The Conservative Party (North) supported the Easingwold division proposed as part of our further draft recommendations, particularly supporting the inclusion of Stillington parish. It noted that Stillington has strong practical and social links to Easingwold, including school catchments and the regular use of Easingwold's shops and markets. These connections support the rationale for placing Easingwold and Stillington parishes within the same division, and we confirm this arrangement as part of our final recommendations.

### *Huby & Tollerton and Ouseburn & Hammerton*

167 The Greens supported our further draft recommendations for Huby & Tollerton and Ouseburn & Hammerton divisions, particularly welcoming the use of the River Ouse as a natural boundary. They noted that limited crossing points result in minimal



interaction between communities on opposite sides of the river and supported the grouping of Marton cum Grafton and the Ouseburn parishes in a division with communities south of the Ouse. They also supported the grouping of Linton-on-Ouse parish in a division with parishes to the north of the river. The Greens stated this alignment better reflects community identity and local connectivity. We agree with this assessment and, subject to the transfer of Wilstrop parish from Ouseburn & Hammerton division to Spofforth & Tockwith (as described in the section below), we confirm these divisions as final.


168 Green Hammerton Parish Council noted that the Maltkiln development, comprising approximately 3,000 new dwellings, falls within the proposed division boundary and will significantly alter the rural character of the area. While we acknowledge the potential impact of this development, the Commission is required to base its recommendations on developments expected to contain electors by 2031 – five years after the publication of our final recommendations. As the Maltkiln development has not yet received full planning approval and its timeline remains uncertain, it has not been considered as part of this electoral review.

169 A local resident stated that Goldsborough parish should be included in a Knaresborough division. We did not adopt this proposal as we determined insufficient community evidence was supplied to support this proposal.

#### *Spofforth & Tockwith*

170 In our further draft recommendations, Tockwith parish was placed in Spofforth & Tockwith division, while Wilstrop parish was included in Ouseburn & Hammerton division. We were informed by both the Council and the Green Party that these two parishes form a grouped parish council. Both stated that splitting a grouped council across divisions would complicate governance and weaken representation. We agree with this assessment and recommend transferring Wilstrop parish into Spofforth & Tockwith division. This adjustment ensures both parishes remain within the same division.

## Malton, Norton and Pickering



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Howardian	1	-10%
Malton & Norton	2	4%
Pickering	1	12%
Sheriff Hutton & Derwent	1	-6%
Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds	1	7%

### Howardian

171 In response to the consultation on our further draft recommendations, the Council expressed concern with the inclusion of Huttons Ambo parish in Howardian division. It stated that the busy nature of the A64 in this area makes crossing it difficult and thus it acts as a barrier. The Council suggested that we consider placing the area to the south of the A64 in Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division with the other villages along the A64 corridor. We carefully considered this proposal, but have not adopted it, as it would result in poor electoral equality for Howardian division,



increasing its variance to -14%, which we judged to be too high based on the evidence received.

172 The Council stated that Whitwell-on-the-Hill and Crambe form a grouped parish council and that the draft recommendations placed the parishes in separate divisions, with Whitwell-on-the-Hill placed in Howardian division and Crambe parish in Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division. However, in our further draft recommendations, Whitwell-on-the-Hill parish was no longer located in Howardian division. On this basis, the Council presumed both parishes would be situated within the final Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division. This presumption is correct, and our final recommendations place the grouped parish council entirely within Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division. We are satisfied that this arrangement supports effective local governance, reflects community identity, and avoids the complications that can potentially arise from splitting grouped parish councils across divisions.

173 A local resident argued that York Road Industrial Park should be included in Malton & Norton division rather than Howardian division, stating that this growing commercial area functions as an urban extension of Malton and Norton and does not share the rural character of Howardian. We have not adopted the proposal as moving the industrial park would require creating a parish ward for Huttons Ambo parish with no electors, which we consider to be unviable. We therefore confirm our further draft recommendations for Howardian division as final.

#### *Malton & Norton*

174 Malton Town Council, Norton-on-Derwent Town Council and two local residents supported our draft recommendations for a two-councillor Malton & Norton division. The Council, the Conservatives and Councillor Broadbank also acknowledged that a two-member division offers the most effective way to balance the statutory criteria for this area. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for this division as final.

#### *Pickering*

175 The Council and Councillor Broadbank expressed concern that the Pickering division, which is forecast to have an electoral variance of 12% by 2031, may undermine the statutory criterion of providing for divisions with long-term electoral equality. While we acknowledge these concerns, we consider that this variance is justified in this instance, as it allows for a Pickering division that better reflects local community ties and promotes effective and convenient local government by avoiding the arbitrary division of Pickering parish. The Conservatives supported this approach. We were therefore not persuaded by the Council's proposal to transfer electors from the southern part of Pickering parish to improve electoral variances in this and the adjacent Howardian division. We are therefore confirming our proposed Pickering division as part of our final recommendations.

### *Sheriff Hutton & Derwent*

176 Both the Council and the North Yorkshire Labour Party proposed that the parishes of Bulmer, Welburn, Westow and Whitwell-on-the-Hill be transferred from our draft Howardian division into Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division. The Council provided evidence suggesting that excluding these parishes would diminish the Derwent-based character of the division and weaken its community cohesion. We are persuaded that transferring these four parishes will better reflect local community identities and interests. We have therefore included them in Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division as part of our final recommendations.

177 Our final Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division also excludes the parishes of Luttons, Kirby Grindalythe, Thixendale and Wharram. The justification for this change is set out in the following section.

### *Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds*

178 As part of our draft recommendations, we transferred the southernmost parishes of the current Thornton Dale & Wolds division – Luttons, Kirby Grindalythe, Thixendale and Wharram – into the adjacent Sheriff Hutton & Derwent division.


179 The Council and five local residents objected to this proposal, arguing that it split several Wolds Valley communities across different divisions. They provided evidence that the parishes of Luttons, Weaverthorpe, Helperthorpe, Kirby Grindalythe and Wharram share strong geographical, social, ecclesiastical and educational ties. These submissions also contended that dividing these parishes would weaken local representation and undermine established community identities. Hunmanby Parish Council and Councillor Donohue-Moncrieff also objected to the inclusion of some these parishes, such as Weaverthorpe and Foxholes, in Hunmanby division.

180 We have been persuaded that the statutory criteria will be better reflected by uniting the Wolds Valley parishes in a single division. We have therefore included the parishes of Luttons, Kirby Grindalythe, Thixendale and Wharram in our final Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds division. We have also transferred Weaverthorpe and Foxholes from our draft Hunmanby division into this division. We additionally recommend the transfer of Sherburn parish to Hunmanby division. The justification for this change can be found in the Hunmanby section of this report. As a result, our final Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds division is nearly identical to the existing division, with the only change being the inclusion of East Heslerton village. This adjustment was supported by the Council and Councillor Donohue-Moncrieff, who agreed that East and West Heslerton villages should be included in the same division.

181 We are also adopting a revised division name of Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds. The Council argued that the term 'Wolds' is rarely used in isolation and that the local preference is for the term 'The Wolds'. We are content that the revised

name better reflects the identity of the area. We could not adopt the name of Thornton Dale & Sherburn, as proposed by the Conservatives, given our decision to transfer Sherburn parish out of this division.

## North York Moors



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Helmsley & Ampleforth	1	-8%
Hillside	1	-7%
Kirkbymoorside & Dales	1	-7%

### *Helmsley & Ampleforth*

182 A local resident supported the decision to link Helmsley and Ampleforth in the same division. The Conservatives also largely supported our draft Helmsley & Ampleforth division but proposed including the grouped parish council of Byland with Wass & Oldstead from our draft Hillside division. We have adopted this proposal in our final recommendations. We were persuaded by the evidence supplied that these parishes have stronger connections with Helmsley, including public transport links and a shared location within the North York Moors National Park, consistent with the majority of Helmsley & Ampleforth division.

183 We have also moved Bilsdale Midcable parish from our draft Helmsley & Ampleforth division into Great Ayton division. The justification for this can be found in the Great Ayton section of this report.

### *Hillside*

184 The Thornton le Moor Crofters Association objected to our proposed Thirsk division, which included Thornton-le-Moor parish. It highlighted that Thirsk is an urban centre with planning priorities that differ from those of Thornton-le-Moor, a rural village with no community links to Thirsk. The association requested that the parish remain in the Hillside division, alongside other nearby rural communities. Our further draft recommendations for a predominantly rural Hillside division included Thornton-le-Moor parish. Based on this evidence, we are satisfied that our Hillside division effectively reflects community identities and interests. With no further submissions received that related to this division, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.


### *Kirkbymoorside & Dales*

185 The Conservatives supported our proposed Kirkbymoorside & Dales division. The North Yorkshire Labour Party, however, proposed modifications. They suggested transferring the parishes of Bransdale, Farndale East, Farndale West, Fadmoor, Gillamoore and Wombledon from Helmsley & Ampleforth division. Having considered this proposal, we consider it would leave that division undersized. If we are to ensure good electoral equality, this transfer was also dependent on adopting The North Yorkshire Labour Party's alternative Helmsley & Hillside division, which we are not minded to accept. They also further proposed transferring the parishes of Edstone, Salton, Sinnington, Marton and Normanby from Kirkbymoorside & Dales division into Howardian division. We do not support this proposal, as we consider these parishes share close community and geographic links with the nearby town of Kirkbymoorside.

186 We note the suggestion from a local resident to rename the division Kirkbymoorside & The Moors and that we create a division covering the entire North York Moors National Park. However, we do not recommend the name change, as we consider the current name appropriately reflects the division's geography and constituent communities. Additionally, a single division covering the whole of the moors would, in our view, be too large to provide effective and convenient representation.



## Whitby



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Danby, Glaisdale & Mulgrave	1	2%
Esk Valley & The Coast	1	4%
Whitby Streonshalh	1	1%
Whitby West	1	-5%

### *Danby, Glaisdale & Mulgrave*

187 The Conservatives and a local resident supported the proposed boundaries for the Danby & Glaisdale division. However, the Conservatives suggested renaming the division Danby, Glaisdale & Mulgrave to better reflect the geographic spread of this large rural area. We have decided to adopt this name in our final recommendations. We agree that it reflects the full extent of the division and note that the existing division name includes 'Mulgrave', as did previous ward names in this area under the former Scarborough Borough Council. This indicates to us that the name has relevance to local communities.

### *Esk Valley & The Coast*

188 The Conservatives and a local resident supported the proposed Esk Valley & The Coast division. In particular, the Conservatives welcomed the decision not to include the Ruswarp area of Whitby Town Council in the division.



189 A local resident argued that Robin Hood's Bay has different needs from other communities within the division and suggested it should instead be linked with Sandsend and Runswick Bay, given their similar coastal character. While we acknowledge that there may be similarities between these communities, they are geographically distant and separated by Whitby town. Linking them would result in a division with poor internal transport and travel links. We have therefore not adopted this proposal and confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final, subject to a minor amendment to include a detached part of Fylingdales parish.

#### *Whitby Streonshalh and Whitby West*

190 Our draft recommendation to create two divisions covering the area administered by Whitby Town Council was supported by the town council itself, the Scarborough & Whitby Constituency Labour Party and a local resident.

191 The Conservatives and two local residents proposed that the village of Ruswarp be included in Whitby Streonshalh division. They argued that Ruswarp has stronger community ties with electors in the eastern part of Whitby than with those in the proposed Whitby West division. To maintain electoral equality between the two divisions should Ruswarp be moved, they suggested transferring the area covered by the Town North ward to Whitby West division.

192 We have not been persuaded to make these changes as part of our final recommendations. While we acknowledge the views expressed about Ruswarp's community ties to the eastern side of Whitby, we consider that our draft recommendations offer a better balance of the statutory criteria, particularly given the support received from the town council directly affected. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for this area as final, subject to a minor amendment suggested by a local resident regarding the boundary near Spring Vale.

## Scarborough and Filey



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2031
Castle	1	2%
Cayton	1	-7%
Eastfield	1	0%
Falsgrave	1	9%
Filey	1	8%
Hunmanby	1	-8%
Newby	1	9%

North Bay	1	3%
Scalby & Derwent	1	-9%
Seamer & East Ayton	1	-3%
Stepney & Northstead	1	9%
Weaponness & Ramshill	1	10%

### *Castle*

193 We received support for our proposed Castle division from the Conservatives.

194 During the previous consultation, a local resident argued that the areas of Westwood, Westwood Road and Westwood Close are more closely linked to the Falsgrave community than to communities in the Castle division and should therefore be transferred to Falsgrave & Stepney division. While we did not adopt this proposal at that stage, we invited further feedback to determine whether the change was justified and would be supported locally. We subsequently received a submission from another local resident in favour of this modification. They argued that electors in this area look more towards the A64 and its surrounding amenities. Having visited the area during our tour of Scarborough, we agree that this modification would better reflect community identities. We therefore recommend adopting this change as part of our final recommendations.

195 Councillor Knowles stated that the area around Blenheim Terrace should be included in Castle division, due to its geographical proximity to Scarborough Castle. However, we are not adopting this change as we determined insufficient community evidence was supplied to justify amending this boundary.

### *Cayton and Eastfield*

196 The Council, the Conservatives, Councillor Swiers and two local residents objected to our proposal to include that part of the Eastfield area to the south of Eastway in our proposed Cayton division. They argued that this would divide the urban community of Eastfield. This element of our draft recommendations was based on the Council's original submission, which it subsequently acknowledged contained an error. While it supported transferring new housing in Eastfield parish into Cayton division, the Council clarified that the intended area for transfer was the Middle Deepdale development, not the area south of Eastway.

197 The Council therefore requested that the boundary be amended to reflect the intended justification. They argued that the Middle Deepdale development shares stronger community links with Osgodby and Cayton than with Eastfield. We visited the area and noted that Middle Deepdale is fairly distinct from the wider Eastfield community. However, transferring the entire development would result in an Eastfield division with a forecast electoral variance of -14%, which we consider too high. We have therefore placed the boundary along Crossdale Way, with electors north of the

road included in our proposed Cayton division. We consider Crossdale Way to be a clear and recognisable boundary. This results in Cayton and Eastfield divisions with forecast electoral variances of -7% and 0%, respectively, by 2031.

### *Falsgrave*

198 Our proposed Falsgrave & Stepney division received support from the Conservatives. Three local residents also supported our decision to transfer several hundred electors north of Stepney Road and Whin Bank into our proposed Woodlands division.

199 However, we recommend a name change to this division. Given the transfer of the Stepney area to a neighbouring division, we propose to adopt the suggestion of two local residents to rename the division Falsgrave. We consider this an appropriate name as it more accurately reflects the principal community now contained within the division.

200 The areas of Westwood, Westwood Road and Westwood Close have also been included in this division, for reasons set out in the Castle section of this report.

### *Filey*

201 Support for our proposed Filey division was received from the Conservatives. However, Councillor Donohue-Moncrieff objected to our proposal to split Filey parish across divisions. In our draft recommendations, we placed the Primrose Valley area in Hunmanby division in order to minimise electoral variances, while the remainder of the parish that includes Filey town, formed Filey division. Councillor Donohue-Moncrieff argued that these areas share close community links and should be kept together within a single division.

202 Following our decision to include Sherburn parish in Hunmanby division, it no longer requires part of Filey parish to achieve good electoral equality. We have therefore placed the Primrose Valley area in Filey division. This means our final recommendations for Filey result in a division which is coterminous with the Filey parish boundary. We consider this will better reflect community identities and interests, while supporting effective and convenient local government by ensuring unified representation for the parish.

### *Hunmanby*

203 Hunmanby Parish Council and Councillor Donohue-Moncrieff supported the division name, highlighting Hunmanby's role as the main service village within the division. The Conservatives supported our proposed Hunmanby division in its entirety.

204 However, Hunmanby Parish Council and Councillor Donohue-Moncrieff objected to the proposed division boundaries, arguing that linking Hunmanby with

the Wolds villages such as Weaverthorpe and Foxholes would not reflect our statutory criteria. They, alongside the Council, opposed the exclusion of Sherburn parish from the division, stating that the existing Hunmanby & Sherburn division better reflected local community ties. They provided evidence of shared services, infrastructure, and employment links between Hunmanby and Sherburn.

205 We were persuaded by the evidence received that including Sherburn parish and excluding Weaverthorpe and Foxholes parishes from this division will provide a better balance of our statutory criteria. We have therefore included Sherburn parish in Hunmanby division and transferred Weaverthorpe and Foxholes parishes to the Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds division.

#### *Newby*

206 The Conservatives and two local residents supported our proposed Newby division. The two local residents also supported the decision to use the Scalby Beck as the division boundary. Having received no further submissions relating to this division, we therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Newby division as final.

#### *North Bay and Stepney & Northstead*

207 We received support from the Conservatives for our proposed Northstead and Woodlands divisions. However, two local residents objected to the proposed name of the Northstead division, arguing that it was misleading as much of the Northstead area would, under our proposals, fall within the adjacent Woodlands division. One resident suggested that the division be renamed North Bay, stating that this name would more accurately reflect local identity. They noted that many residents refer to the area as North Bay and that the name was previously used for wards under the former Scarborough Borough Council. We also note that the division contains prominent features associated with the North Bay area, including North Bay Beach and the North Bay Railway.

208 Both local resident submissions also proposed that Woodlands division be renamed Stepney & Northstead, suggesting that this alternative name would be more recognisable and meaningful to local electors. One of the submissions highlighted that the name would better reflect the presence of key local facilities situated within the division, such as Northstead Primary School, Northstead Methodist Church, Northstead Pharmacy, Northstead Car Park and Northstead Manor Drive.

209 As part of our final recommendations, we have decided to adopt both of these name changes. We consider that the names of North Bay and Stepney & Northstead more accurately reflect local geography and community identities than the names put forward in our draft recommendations. We are satisfied that our final recommendations for this area reflect community identities while also delivering good electoral equality.



### *Seamer & East Ayton and Scalby & Derwent*

210 Seamer Parish Council, the Conservatives and two local residents supported the creation of a Seamer & East Ayton division. The Conservatives and two local residents also expressed support for the proposed Scalby & Derwent division.

211 However, we received strong opposition to these proposals from East Ayton Parish Council and a local resident. Both objected to the separation of East and West Ayton into different divisions, arguing that the two villages function as a single community with shared services and facilities. They highlighted close community ties, including the joint use of churches, schools, health services and community groups. Concerns were also raised that grouping Scalby with communities along the A170 would create a geographically dispersed division with poor public transport links, hindering effective representation.

212 The local resident proposed including the Crossgates area of Seamer parish in Cayton division to enable East and West Ayton to remain united. They further suggested incorporating Burniston, Cloughton, or parts of the North York Moors to offset the removal of West Ayton from Scalby & Derwent division.

213 We have carefully considered the proposed changes put forward for this area but were not persuaded that significant boundary changes to our Esk Valley & The Coast division, or to divisions in the North York Moors, were justified to accommodate this proposal. Accordingly, we propose no changes to our draft recommendations for these divisions. While we acknowledge and value the evidence submitted to us relating community ties between East and West Ayton, we do not consider that the alternative proposal put forward by the local resident provided a better balance of our statutory criteria for the wider area. On balance, we remain satisfied that our proposed divisions will deliver electoral equality, while adequately reflecting community identities and providing for effective local governance in this part of North Yorkshire.

### *Weaponness & Ramshill*

214 Support for our proposed Weaponness & Ramshill division was received from the Conservatives. A local resident also supported our decision not to make significant changes to the existing division, noting that it has a distinctive character separate from the rest of Scarborough town. However, they suggested a minor adjustment to the northern boundary to include all of Valley Road in Castle division, proposing that the boundary then follow Grosvenor Road and Cambridge Terrace to Ramshill Road. We have not adopted this proposal, as we do not consider the suggested boundary to be significantly clearer or more easily identifiable on the ground than the existing boundary which follows Valley Road. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Weaponness & Ramshill division as final.





## Conclusions

215 The table below provides a summary as to the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality in North Yorkshire, referencing the 2024 and 2031 electorate figures against the proposed number of councillors and divisions. A full list of divisions, names and their corresponding electoral variances can be found in Appendix A to the back of this report. An outline map of the wards is provided in Appendix B.

### Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2024	2031
Number of councillors	89	89
Number of electoral divisions	87	87
Average number of electors per councillor	5,433	5,818
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	11	3
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

#### Final recommendations

North Yorkshire Council should be made up of 89 councillors serving 87 divisions: 85 single-councillor divisions and two two-councillor divisions. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

#### Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed divisions for North Yorkshire Council. You can also view our final recommendations for North Yorkshire Council on our interactive maps at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

### Parish electoral arrangements

216 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

217 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, North Yorkshire Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

218 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Eastfield, Harrogate, Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw, Killinghall, Knaresborough, Littlethorpe, Newby & Scalby, Northallerton, Richmond, Ripon, Scarborough, Selby, Skipton and Whitby parishes.

219 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Eastfield parish.

#### Final recommendations

Eastfield Town Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Eastway	5
Middle Deepdale	1
Westway	5

220 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Harrogate parish. Harrogate Town Council is currently made up of 19 single-councillor wards. During the second consultation, the town council expressed a preference to retain this structure but noted it lacked the resources to propose how to achieve this. We have therefore recommended single-councillor parish wards to reflect their request, but we agree with the town council's view that a future Community Governance Review might be a more appropriate way to achieve their preferred arrangements.

#### Final recommendations

Harrogate Town Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing 19 wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Bilton & Nidd Gorge	1
Bilton Grange	1
Central East	1
Central West	1
Coppice	1
Duchy	1
Fairfax	1

Harlow Hill	1
Hookstone	1
Jennyfield	1
Kingsley	1
Oatlands	1
Pannal	1
St Georges	1
Starbeck East	1
Starbeck West	1
Stray	1
Valley Gardens	1
Woodfield	1

221 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for the grouped parish council of Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw. These arrangements differ from our further draft recommendations, after it was brought to our attention by North Yorkshire Council that we had not provided a parish ward for Haverah Park. For clarity, Haverah Park and Beckwithshaw remain two separate civil parishes, under a grouped parish council.

#### Final recommendations

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

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

222 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Killinghall parish.

#### Final recommendations

Killinghall Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Rural	4
Urban	6

223 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Knaresborough parish.

**Final recommendations**

Knaresborough Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing five wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Aspin & Calcutt	3
Castle	2
Eastfield	3
Nidd Gorge	1
Scriven Park	3

224 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Littlethorpe parish.

**Final recommendations**

Littlethorpe Parish Council should comprise five councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Fountains Walk	1
Littlethorpe	4

225 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Newby & Scalby parish.

**Final recommendations**

Newby & Scalby Town Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Newby	9
Scalby	4

226 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Northallerton parish.

**Final recommendations**

Northallerton Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Central	6
North	4
South	2

227 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Richmond parish.

**Final recommendations**

Richmond Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
East	5
North	2
West	8

228 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ripon parish.

**Final recommendations**

Ripon City Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
East	2
North	2
South	5
West	3

229 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Scarborough parish.

**Final recommendations**

Scarborough Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Castle	3
Falsgrave	3
North Bay	3
Stepney & Northstead	3
Weaponness & Ramshill	3

230 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Selby parish. Selby Town Council objected to our draft recommendation for two eight-councillor wards, arguing that such large wards were unsuitable for effective representation at parish level. We have therefore broadly adopted their proposal for smaller parish wards, content that it will provide the town council with parish wards that will aid effective and convenient local governance.

231 Selby Town Council also noted we did not consider changes to the parish's external boundaries as part of this review. However, such matters fall outside of our



remit and should be addressed through a Community Governance Review conducted by North Yorkshire Council.

#### Final recommendations

Selby Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing six wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Abbots	3
Central	2
North East	2
North West	6
South West	3
Staynor	2

232 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Skipton parish. Skipton Town Council, the Greens, Councillor Solloway and Councillor Heseltine all expressed a preference for retaining the current arrangement, where each ward is represented by four councillors regardless of variations in electorate. However, we have decided not to adopt this proposal. Our approach is to assign parish councillor numbers based on the forecast electorate for each parish ward. This is to ensure that representation is proportionate and reflects expected the total number of electors in each parish ward.

#### Final recommendations

Skipton Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
East	4
North	4
South	2
West	6

233 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Whitby parish. During the second round of consultation, three local residents objected to the number of councillors allocated to Whitby Town Council. The Commission's approach is that it will not alter the number of parish or town councillors as part of an electoral review. We consider that any changes to the total number of councillors is more appropriately addressed through a Community Governance Review conducted by North Yorkshire Council.

#### Final recommendations

Whitby Town Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing six wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Abbey	6
Ruswarp	2
Stakesby	4
Town North	3
Town South	1
West Cliff	3



## What happens next?

234 We have now completed our review of North Yorkshire. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2027.



## Equalities

235 The Commission is satisfied that it complies with its legal obligations under the Equality Act and that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.





# Appendices

## Appendix A

### Final recommendations for North Yorkshire Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2024)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2031)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Aire Valley	1	4,999	4,999	-8%	5,196	5,196	-11%
2	Appleton Roebuck & Church Fenton	1	5,103	5,103	-6%	5,344	5,344	-8%
3	Barlby, Osgodby & Staynor	1	5,827	5,827	7%	6,289	6,289	8%
4	Bedale & Aiskew	1	5,028	5,028	-7%	5,382	5,382	-7%
5	Bentham & Ingleton	1	5,553	5,553	2%	6,116	6,116	5%
6	Bilton & Nidd Gorge	1	5,875	5,875	8%	6,152	6,152	6%
7	Bilton Grange & Coppice Valley	1	5,584	5,584	3%	5,802	5,802	0%
8	Boroughbridge	1	5,477	5,477	1%	5,733	5,733	-1%
9	Brayton & Barlow	1	5,345	5,345	-2%	5,699	5,699	-2%
10	Brompton-on-Swale & Scorton	1	5,193	5,193	-4%	5,897	5,897	1%
11	Camblesforth & Carlton	1	5,800	5,800	7%	6,228	6,228	7%
12	Castle	1	5,184	5,184	-5%	5,952	5,952	2%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2024)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2031)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13	Catterick Village & Crakehall	1	5,282	5,282	-3%	5,509	5,509	-5%
14	Cawood & Riccall	1	5,150	5,150	-5%	5,385	5,385	-7%
15	Cayton	1	3,851	3,851	-29%	5,405	5,405	-7%
16	Cliffe & Escrick	1	5,096	5,096	-6%	5,418	5,418	-7%
17	Danby, Glaisdale & Mulgrave	1	5,651	5,651	4%	5,947	5,947	2%
18	Dishforth & Topcliffe	1	5,133	5,133	-6%	5,239	5,239	-10%
19	Duchy & Valley Gardens	1	5,858	5,858	8%	6,093	6,093	5%
20	Easingwold	1	5,258	5,258	-3%	5,577	5,577	-4%
21	Eastfield	1	4,886	4,886	-10%	5,829	5,829	0%
22	Esk Valley & The Coast	1	5,561	5,561	2%	6,028	6,028	4%
23	Falsgrave	1	5,918	5,918	9%	6,327	6,327	9%
24	Filey	1	5,869	5,869	8%	6,263	6,263	8%
25	Granby	1	5,632	5,632	4%	6,068	6,068	4%
26	Great Ayton	1	5,644	5,644	4%	5,867	5,867	1%
27	Harlow Hill	1	6,143	6,143	13%	6,398	6,398	10%
28	Harrogate Central	1	5,692	5,692	5%	5,895	5,895	1%
29	Helmsley & Ampleforth	1	5,029	5,029	-7%	5,334	5,334	-8%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2024)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2031)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
30	Hillside	1	5,169	5,169	-5%	5,392	5,392	-7%
31	Hipswell & Colburn	1	6,034	6,034	11%	6,295	6,295	8%
32	Howardian	1	4,913	4,913	-10%	5,232	5,232	-10%
33	Huby & Tollerton	1	5,394	5,394	-1%	5,629	5,629	-3%
34	Hunmanby	1	4,981	4,981	-8%	5,346	5,346	-8%
35	Hutton Rudby & Appleton Wiske	1	5,821	5,821	7%	6,060	6,060	4%
36	Jennyfield	1	5,959	5,959	10%	6,426	6,426	10%
37	Killinghall & Scotton	1	4,940	4,940	-9%	5,182	5,182	-11%
38	Kirkbymoorside & Dales	1	5,201	5,201	-4%	5,434	5,434	-7%
39	Knaresborough East	1	5,793	5,793	7%	6,259	6,259	8%
40	Knaresborough West	1	6,033	6,033	11%	6,350	6,350	9%
41	Leyburn & Lower Wensleydale	1	5,453	5,453	0%	5,847	5,847	0%
42	Lower Nidderdale	1	5,504	5,504	1%	5,672	5,672	-3%
43	Malton & Norton	2	10,976	5,488	1%	12,136	6,068	4%
44	Masham & Fountains	1	5,530	5,530	2%	5,846	5,846	0%
45	Mid Craven	1	5,018	5,018	-8%	5,373	5,373	-8%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2024)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2031)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
46	Newby	1	5,961	5,961	10%	6,345	6,345	9%
47	North Bay	1	5,501	5,501	1%	5,992	5,992	3%
48	North Richmondshire	1	5,465	5,465	1%	5,677	5,677	-2%
49	Northallerton North & Brompton	1	4,684	4,684	-14%	5,286	5,286	-9%
50	Northallerton South	1	5,960	5,960	10%	6,175	6,175	6%
51	Oatlands & Rossett	1	5,475	5,475	1%	5,803	5,803	0%
52	Osgoldcross	1	5,458	5,458	0%	6,390	6,390	10%
53	Ouseburn & Hammerton	1	5,194	5,194	-4%	5,675	5,675	-2%
54	Pannal & Washburn	1	5,584	5,584	3%	6,157	6,157	6%
55	Pickering	1	6,210	6,210	14%	6,523	6,523	12%
56	Richmond	1	5,912	5,912	9%	6,125	6,125	5%
57	Ripon Canal & Ure	1	5,198	5,198	-4%	5,522	5,522	-5%
58	Ripon Cathedral & Spa	1	4,809	4,809	-11%	5,228	5,228	-10%
59	Ripon South	1	5,147	5,147	-5%	5,486	5,486	-6%
60	Romanby	1	5,447	5,447	0%	5,699	5,699	-2%
61	Scalby & Derwent	1	4,705	4,705	-13%	5,303	5,303	-9%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2024)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2031)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
62	Seamer & East Ayton	1	5,237	5,237	-4%	5,619	5,619	-3%
63	Selby East	1	5,231	5,231	-4%	5,566	5,566	-4%
64	Selby West	1	5,660	5,660	4%	6,174	6,174	6%
65	Settle	1	5,284	5,284	-3%	5,761	5,761	-1%
66	Sherburn in Elmet & South Milford	2	11,777	5,889	8%	12,423	12,423	7%
67	Sheriff Hutton & Derwent	1	5,287	5,287	-3%	5,457	5,457	-6%
68	Skipton East	1	4,703	4,703	-13%	5,453	5,453	-6%
69	Skipton North & Embsay-with-Eastby	1	4,971	4,971	-9%	5,259	5,259	-10%
70	Skipton West	1	5,323	5,323	-2%	5,727	5,727	-2%
71	South Craven	1	6,170	6,170	14%	6,426	6,426	10%
72	Sowerby	1	5,606	5,606	3%	5,794	5,794	0%
73	Spofforth & Tockwith	1	5,527	5,527	2%	5,838	5,838	0%
74	Starbeck	1	5,034	5,034	-7%	5,399	5,399	-7%
75	Stepney & Northstead	1	5,870	5,870	8%	6,360	6,360	9%
76	Stokesley	1	5,184	5,184	-5%	5,627	5,627	-3%
77	Stray & Hookstone	1	5,837	5,837	7%	6,062	6,062	4%




	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2024)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2031)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
78	Swale	1	4,880	4,880	-10%	5,230	5,230	-10%
79	Tadcaster	1	5,813	5,813	7%	6,061	6,061	4%
80	Thirsk	1	5,442	5,442	0%	5,771	5,771	-1%
81	Thornton-le-Dale & The Wolds	1	5,924	5,924	9%	6,248	6,248	7%
82	Thorpe Willoughby & Hambleton	1	5,303	5,303	-2%	5,755	5,755	-1%
83	Upper Dales	1	5,209	5,209	-4%	5,385	5,385	-7%
84	Upper Wharfedale & Upper Nidderdale	1	6,139	6,139	13%	6,425	6,425	10%
85	Weaponness & Ramshill	1	5,929	5,929	9%	6,391	6,391	10%
86	Whitby Streonshalh	1	5,053	5,053	-7%	5,855	5,855	1%
87	Whitby West	1	5,155	5,155	-5%	5,522	5,522	-5%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>89</b>	<b>483,562</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>517,784</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
<b>Averages</b>		<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>5,433</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>5,818</b>	<b>–</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by North Yorkshire Council.

Note: The ‘variance from average’ column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral division varies from the average for North Yorkshire. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

## Appendix B

### Outline map



A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/north-yorkshire](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/north-yorkshire)

## Appendix C

### Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at:

[www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/north-yorkshire](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/north-yorkshire)

*Submissions received during the consultation on our draft recommendations*

#### *Local Authority*

- North Yorkshire Council

#### *Political Groups*

- Harrogate & Knaresborough Conservative Association
- Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency Labour Party
- North Yorkshire Conservative Party
- North Yorkshire Council Green Councillors' Group
- North Yorkshire Labour Party
- North Yorkshire Labour Party Local Government Committee
- Richmond & Northallerton Green Party
- Richmond & Northallerton Liberal Democrats
- Scarborough & Whitby Constituency Labour Party
- Skipton and Ripon Constituency Labour Party

#### *Councillors*

- Councillor P. Barrett (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor N. Brown (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor A. Brown (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor P. Broadbank (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor B. Brodigan (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor F. Cunliffe-Lister (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor G. Critchlow (Skelton-cum-Newby Parish Council)
- Councillor G. Davis (Thornton le Beans & Crosby with Cotcliffe Parish Council)
- Councillor M. Donohue-Moncrieff (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor K. Foster (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor D. Goodall (Harrogate Town Council)
- Councillor J. Harris (Richmond Town Council)
- Councillor P. Horton (Ripon City Council)
- Councillor N. Hull (North Yorkshire Council)

- Councillor D. Knowles (Scarborough Town Council)
- Councillor F. Matthews (Selby Town Council)
- Councillor E. Metcalfe (Harrogate Town Council)
- Councillor T. Miles (Asenby Parish Council)
- Councillor A. Murday (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor R. Packham (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor Y. Peacock (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor K. Poskitt (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor J. Proud (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor G. Scully (Rylstone Parish Meeting)
- Councillor R. Swiers (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor A. Solloway (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor J. Spillings (Skelton-cum-Newby Parish Council)
- Councillor D. Staveley (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor A. Tant-Brown (Sherburn in Elmet Town Council)
- Councillor A. Timothy (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor H. Westmancoat (Knaresborough Town Council)
- Councillor A. Williams (North Yorkshire Council)

#### *Members of Parliament*

- Baroness Harris of Richmond
- Tom Gordon MP (Harrogate & Knaresborough)

#### *Local organisations*

- Richmondshire Branch of the Yorkshire Local Councils Associations
- Upper Wharfedale Rural Watch

#### *Parish and Town Councils*

- Aiskew and Leeming Bar Parish Council
- Bewerley Parish Council
- Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council
- Birstwith Parish Council
- Carperby cum Thoresby Parish Council
- Carleton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Clapham cum Newby Parish Council
- Cononley Parish Council
- Constable Burton & Finghall Parish Council
- Darley and Menwith Parish Council
- East Ayton Parish Council

- Glusburn & Cross Hills Parish Council
- Green Hammerton Parish Council
- Hartwith cum Winsley Parish Council
- Harrogate Town Council
- Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw Parish Council
- Hewick & Hutton Parish Council
- Hetton cum Bordley Parish Meeting
- Hunmanby Parish Council
- Kirby Hill & District Parish Council
- Kirk Hammerton Parish Council
- Knaresborough Town Council
- Malton Town Council
- Melmerby & Middleton Quernhow Parish Council
- Moulton Parish Meeting
- Newton-on-Ouse Parish Council
- Norton-on-Derwent Town Council
- Pannal & Burn Bridge Parish Council
- Pateley Bridge Town Council
- Ribble Banks Parish Council
- Richmond Town Council
- Ripon City Council
- Roecliffe and Westwick Parish Council
- Rudby Parish Council
- Rylstone Parish Meeting
- Scorton Parish Council
- Scotton Parish Council
- Seamer Parish Council
- Selby Town Council
- Sherburn in Elmet Town Council
- Skelton-cum-Newby Parish Council
- St Martins Parish Council
- Stutton cum Hazlewood Parish Council
- Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Tadcaster Town Council
- Weeton Parish Council
- Whitby Town Council
- Whixley Parish Council

#### *Local residents*

- 100 local residents

## *Submissions received during the consultation on our further draft recommendations*

### *Local Authority*

- North Yorkshire Council

### *Political Groups*

- Harrogate North Yorkshire Green Councillors Group
- North Yorkshire Liberal Democrats
- Reform UK (Harrogate & Knaresborough Constituency)
- The Conservative Party (North)

### *Councillors*

- Councillor A. Brown (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor G. Dadd (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor K. Foster (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor S. Gibbs (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor R. Heseltine (North Yorkshire Council & Skipton Town Council)
- Councillor A. Murday (North Yorkshire Council)
- Councillor G. Shepherd (Patrick Brompton Parish Council)
- Councillor A. Solloway (North Yorkshire Council)

### *Local organisations*

- Church in the Dale – Local Churches Together Group
- Nidderdale Museum
- Nidderdale Museum Society CIO
- Nidderdale National Landscape Joint Advisory Committee
- Nidderdale Plus
- Nidderdale Plus Community Hub
- Ripon Business Improvement District
- Thornton le Moor Crofters Association

### *Parish and Town Councils*

- Bewerley Parish Council
- Carlton Miniott Parish Council
- Cononley Parish Council
- Dacre Parish Council



- Darley and Menwith Parish Council
- Green Hammerton Parish Council
- Hartwith cum Winsley Parish Council
- Haverah Park with Beckwithshaw Parish Council (x2)
- Hetton cum Bordley Parish Meeting
- Lothersdale Parish Council
- Patrick Brompton Parish Council
- Pateley Bridge Town Council
- Skipton Town Council
- Skelton-cum-Newby Parish Council
- St Martins Parish Council
- Thornton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Upper Nidderdale Parish Council

#### *Local residents*

- 24 local residents

## Appendix D

### Glossary and abbreviations

Councillor numbers	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Changes Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority.
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. We only take account of electors registered specifically for local elections during our reviews.
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents

Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government.

Local Government Boundary Commission for  
England  
7th Floor, 3 Bunhill Row,  
London,  
EC1Y 8YZ

**Telephone:** 0330 500 1525  
**Email:** [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)  
**Online:** [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)  
**X:** @LGBCE