Submission of Kevin Hollinrake, Member of Parliament for Thirsk and Malton regarding the Initial Proposals of the Boundary Commission for England for the North Yorkshire Region

**Introduction**

1. This submission represents the view of Kevin Hollinrake MP, Member of Parliament for Thirsk and Malton since 2015 and is in concurrence with the suggestions of the Conservative Party representatives in North Yorkshire.
2. I thank the Boundary Commission for advance sight of their proposals and for consideration of this document.
3. I support the need to reduce the electorate size to comply with the range of 69,724 and 77,062 electors and accept Thirsk and Malton currently exceeds this slightly.
4. I do not support the means for this to be achieved by forming a new constituency of Wetherby and Easingwold for a number of reasons outlined below.
5. I will outline below the suggestions I believe are more appropriate to achieve the aims of the review while at the same time, in the best interests of residents.

**Thirsk and Malton proposals**

1. I do not support the proposed constituency of Wetherby and Easingwold. This would mean a constituency extending over 20 miles from Leeds to the north of York. Geographically this seems illogical given the main metropolitan area utilised by Easingwold residents is York, given its location on the A19 whereas Wetherby’s nearest city is Leeds, easily accessible from the A58. This does not support the requirements outlined in Rule 5 (a).
2. Moreover, the proposals are confusing from a local government perspective, given the Easingwold area is an integral part of North Yorkshire and Wetherby is in West Yorkshire and run by a different local authority. The proposed constituency of Wetherby and Easingwold consists of four local authorities which is poorly compliant with Rule 5 (b).
3. Easingwold and Wetherby are also separated by the A1 and have little in common in terms of community ties. These proposed changes would inevitably lead to less efficient and possibly more expensive services and counteracts the requirements of Rule 5 (d).
4. There are currently just two constituencies in England containing four local authorities and one of these is reduced in the initial proposals to three authorities.
5. In concurrence with the local party representatives I would propose including the three Hambleton wards planned to be included in the Wetherby and Easingwold constituency in their current constituency of Thirsk and Malton.
6. I would include the remaining 6 Harrogate wards with 3 Leeds wards in a cross-county constituency only including 2 local authorities as opposed to the 4 in the proposed Wetherby and Easingwold constituency.
7. A proposed alternative suggestion is that Thornton Dale be moved back to Thirsk & Malton and Wolds to Bridlington and Filey, meaning 4 seats: Thirsk and Malton, Richmond, Scarborough and Whitby and Bridlington and Filey. It would be regrettable to lose Filey and the Wolds ward as areas in my constituency but would mean all four new constituencies were in quota with only five wards in the North Yorkshire parts of these constituencies changing hands from the old boundaries.
8. The reasoning for this is that Filey has far better links with Bridlington than it does with either Thirsk or Malton and there are very strong transport links along the A1165 linking the coastal communities of Bridlington, Filey and Scarborough.
9. In agreement with the local party representatives, I support creating an Elmet constituency which would include the two Leeds wards and the two Selby wards from the proposed Wetherby and Easingwold, but not include the Hambleton and Harrogate wards. This guarantees a constituency containing two local authorities not 4 so being much more compliant with Rule 5 (1) c.
10. I believe there are easier ways to make the modest reduction to the size of the Thirsk and Malton constituency than the current proposal of expanding to the west to include Bedale and Tanfield and simultaneously losing Easingwold and surrounding villages such as Huby, Raskelf and Husthwaite.
11. I would also include the Bedale ward in Richmond rather than Thirsk and Malton.
12. 7,178 electors in the Bedale ward are returned to their existing constituency of Richmond. Bedale has strong ties to Morton-on-Swale and Northallerton which are broken under the Commission’s proposals and restored under these proposals. Thus the proposals improve the position under Rule 5 (1) c and d. 74. We add instead the Great Ayton ward to Thirsk and Malton in order to get both Richmond and Thirsk and Malton within quota.
13. I would add instead the Great Ayton ward to Thirsk and Malton in order to get both Richmond and Thirsk and Malton within quota.

**Conclusion**

1. By keeping Easingwold part of Thirsk and Malton and merging Filey with Bridlington, this meets the quota of required. Ideally, I would not wish to lose Filey but feel this option is also the most suitable in terms of respecting local communities cultural and geographical ties.
2. Easingwold’s inherent links to the north Yorkshire region are much more in line with those of Malton and Thirsk, similarly Filey and Bridlington are more in line with regard to the similitudes that come with being a coastal town.
3. The proposals outlined for North Yorkshire in this document means less electors changing constituencies, improved the links with local authorities, eliminating a cross-border constituency consisting of four local authorities, and restoring local ties. The proposals are more compliant with Rule 5 (b), (c) and (d).
4. I look forward to any further representations I am able to make on behalf of my constituents’ and the wider region of North Yorkshire.