

COUNCIL

DATE	30 th October 2024
REPORT OF	Rob Walsh, Chief Executive
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	Helen Isaacs, Assistant Chief Executive
SUBJECT	North East Lincolnshire Council Ward Boundary Review
STATUS	Open

CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

The Council has two clear strategic priorities – stronger economy and stronger communities. Having clear Ward boundaries enables electors the opportunity to engage in local and national democracy, and provides a sense of belonging within their community.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report seeks approval of North East Lincolnshire Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's consultation on new ward boundaries in North East Lincolnshire. New ward boundaries will be required as part of the Electoral Review process currently being undertaken.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Ward Boundary Review Working Group's preferred option (Option 1 as set out in this report) be approved for submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England as this Council's preferred warding pattern for North East Lincolnshire.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 sets out the duty placed on the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to undertake electoral reviews of every principal local authority in England from 'time to time'. The last review for North East Lincolnshire Council was undertaken in 2000 and this current review needs to be completed in time for our May 2026 elections.

1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

- 1.1. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is carrying out a review of the council's size, wards and boundaries. The review is being conducted in two stages, firstly the number of councillors (council size) and then the warding pattern, including the names of those wards.
- 1.2. At the meeting of Council on 14th December 2023 it was resolved to establish a Ward Boundary Review Working Group to oversee the provision of key information from the Council required as part of the review, including details of

current Wards, polling districts and electorate. The Ward Boundary Review Working Group has considered electoral forecasts, mapping and details of housing development (including future housing developments covering the next five-year period) during its deliberations.

- 1.3. At its meeting on 18th July 2025, the Council confirmed its Council Size Submission required under the first phase of the review. Subsequent to that submission, the LGBCE concluded that North East Lincolnshire needs 42 councillors to be able to operate effectively; the same number as it currently has.
- 1.4. We have now entered the second phase of the review in which the LGBCE has invited proposals for new council wards and ward boundaries for North East Lincolnshire Council. This consultation closes on 7th November 2024 and the Commission will then use local views to help them draw up their proposals for new ward boundaries.
- 1.5. Council is reminded that it resolved to retain elections by thirds at its meeting on 25th May 2023, with the presumption of uniform three-member Wards being applied as part of the Electoral Review. Therefore, a decision to retain 42 Members would result in a reduction in the number of wards in North East Lincolnshire from 15 to 14. As noted above, this decision was subsequently confirmed by the LGBCE as the basis for its public consultation.
- 1.6 In drawing up a pattern of electoral wards, the LGBCE will seek to:
 - Make sure that, within an authority, each councillor represents a similar number of electors.
 - Create boundaries that are appropriate, and reflect community ties and identities.
 - Deliver reviews informed by local needs, views and circumstances.
 - Reflect the electoral cycle so that each ward is represented by three councillors.
- 1.7 In terms of electoral equality, the estimated total electorate for North East Lincolnshire in 2030 is 122,988, creating an average of 2,928 electors per councillor and 8784 electors per ward. The LGBCE sets a tolerance limit of 10% each way, which creates an upper limit of 9662 per ward and a lower limit of 7906 per ward.
- 1.8 The Ward Boundary Review Working Group has met three times to consider response options to be presented to Council. In identifying options, it was mindful of the need to achieve electoral equality whilst seeking to maintain community identity in the best way possible. However, this proved to be a difficult balance to achieve in all options considered.
- 1.9 Four options were presented to the Working Group in detail, two of which were unanimously disregarded. The first of those involved the merging of West and East Marsh wards, the second involved the reallocation of Heneage ward. The reasons for this were primarily around community identity, electoral equality and the impact on neighbouring wards.

- 1.10 The following ward pattern options have been put forward for consideration by the Working Group (individual ward maps for each option are included as appendices to this report):

1.10.1 Option 1 (ward maps at Appendix 1)

Loss of current Freshney ward:

Croft Baker

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8788

STAYS THE SAME

East Marsh

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary - 7060

Plus polling district HE3 from current Heneage ward – 1020

Total – 8080

Haverstoe

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8004

STAYS THE SAME

Heneage

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8663

Minus HE3 from current Heneage ward – 1020 (estimate)

Plus parts of PA2, PA4 and PA5 from current Park ward – 1300 (estimate)

Total – 8943

Humberston

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 10949

Minus HU5 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward - 1993

Minus HU6 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward – 1308

Total – 7648

Immingham

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 9449

STAYS THE SAME

Park

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 9273

Plus part SO7 from current South ward – 653 (estimate)

Plus part YA1 from current Yarborough ward – 700 (estimate)

Minus parts of PA2, PA4 and PA5 from current Park ward– 1300 (estimate)

Total - 9326

Scartho

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 9449

STAYS THE SAME

South

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8849

Plus YA4 from current Yarborough ward – 1335

Minus part SO7 from current South ward – 653 (estimate)

Total – 9531

Sidney Sussex

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8135

STAYS THE SAME

Waltham

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 6280

Plus HU5 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward – 1993

Plus HU6 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward – 1308

Minus WA1 (Ashby Cum Fenby) from current Waltham ward – 216

Total - 9365

Wolds

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 6915

Plus WA1 (Ashby Cum Fenby) from current Waltham ward – 216

Plus FR3 (Great Coates) from current Freshney ward – 1122

Total – 8253

West Marsh

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 5355

Plus FR4 from current Freshney ward – 1871

Plus FR5 from current Freshney ward – 1150

Total – 8376

Yarborough

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8583

Plus FR1 from current Freshney ward – 1415

Plus FR2 from current Freshney ward – 1678

Minus YA4 from current Yarborough ward – 1335

Minus part YA1 from current Yarborough ward – 700 (estimate)

Total - 9641

1.10.2 Implications

It was suggested by some members of the working group that while Freshney ward comprised of a number of community groups/areas, each with their own individual identity that these identities would not be unduly harmed by being moved into a different ward.

New Waltham village would be divided into two separate wards under this option. The parish council would be retained but split into two parish wards for the purpose of elections to the parish council. It is anticipated that a Community Governance Review would be required.

Humberston ward would be outside the 10% tolerance at the lower level. However, the Working Group felt that an exception could be

made given the likelihood of further housing growth in this ward.

For administrative purposes, the Working Group favoured maintaining co-terminosity between local government and parliamentary boundaries. Great Coates would move out of the Grimsby and Cleethorpes parliamentary constituency to the Brigg and Immingham constituency but as this would involve the movement of a whole polling district, minimal impact was anticipated in terms of electoral administration.

There would be some movement of parts of individual polling districts with associated community impact, although this was considered minimal. A review of polling districts would be conducted in any case.

1.10.3 Option 2 (ward maps at Appendix 2)

Loss of current Yarborough ward:

Croft Baker

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8788

STAYS THE SAME

East Marsh

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary - 7060

Plus polling district HE3 from current Henage ward – 1020

Total – 8080

Freshney

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 7236

Plus YA5 from current Yarborough ward – 1657

Plus YA6 from current Yarborough ward – 357

Plus part YA2 from current Yarborough ward – 657 (estimate)

Minus FR3 (Great Coates) from current Freshney ward – 1122

Total - 8785

Haverstoe

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8004

STAYS THE SAME

Heneage

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8663

Minus HE3 from current Heneage ward – 1020

Plus parts of PA2, PA4 and PA5 from current Park ward – 1300 (estimate)

Total – 8943

Humberston

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 10949

Minus HU5 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward - 1993

Minus HU6 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward – 1308

Total – 7648

Immingham

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 9449

STAYS THE SAME

Park

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 9273

Plus YA3 from current Yarborough ward – 1799

Plus part SO7 from current South ward – 653 (estimate)

Minus parts of PA2, PA4 and PA5 from current Park ward – 1300 (estimate)

Minus part PA1 from current Park ward – 800 (estimate)

Total – 9625

Scartho

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 9449

STAYS THE SAME

South

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8849

Plus YA4 from current Yarborough ward – 1335

Minus part SO7 from current South ward – 653 (estimate)

Total – 9531

Sidney Sussex

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 8135

STAYS THE SAME

Waltham

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 6280

Plus HU5 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward – 1993

Plus HU6 from current Humberston and New Waltham ward – 1308

Minus WA1 (Ashby Cum Fenby) from current Waltham ward – 216

Total - 9365

Wolds

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 6915

Plus WA1 (Ashby Cum Fenby) from current Waltham ward – 216

Plus FR3 (Great Coates) from current Freshney ward – 1122

Total – 8253

West Marsh

Estimated 2030 electorate based on current boundary – 5355

Plus YA1 from current Yarborough ward – 2128

Plus part YA2 from current Yarborough ward – 650 (estimate)

Plus part PA1 from current Park ward – 800 (estimate)

Total – 8933

1.10.4 **Implications**

There was some support within the working group for this option, as it was felt that there was a greater community affinity between certain communities on the Freshney and Yarborough than there was in, for example, the Willows and the West Marsh within Option 1.

Otherwise, similar issues to Option 1, namely:

New Waltham village would be divided into two separate wards under this option. The parish council would be retained but split into two parish wards for the purpose of elections to the parish council. It is anticipated that a Community Governance Review would be required.

Humberston ward would be outside the 10% tolerance at the lower level. However, the Working Group felt that an exception could be made given the likelihood of further housing growth in this ward.

For administrative purposes, the Working Group favoured maintaining co-terminosity between local government and parliamentary boundaries. Great Coates would move out of the Grimsby and Cleethorpes parliamentary constituency to the Brigg and Immingham constituency but as this would involve the movement of a whole polling district, minimal impact was anticipated in terms of electoral administration.

There would be some movement of parts of individual polling districts with associated community impact, although this was considered minimal. A review of polling districts would be conducted in any case.

- 1.11 Having considered both options, the Ward Boundary Review Working Group, by a majority vote, recommended Option 1 to Council as its preferred option.
- 1.12 Council is now asked to confirm its recommended response to the LGBCE.
- 1.13 Having considered all responses to the consultation, the LGBCE will publish its own draft recommendations for ward boundaries in North East Lincolnshire. There will be an opportunity for Council to comments on those draft recommendations as part of a further round of public consultation, which will close on 14th April 2025. It is expected that the new warding arrangements will be effective from the all-out North East Lincolnshire Council elections to be held in May 2026.

2. RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

- 2.1 Failure to submit a response to the LGBCE would result in the Council having no say on the recommendations put forward by the LGBCE.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 Do nothing – this would not be recommended as the LGBCE welcomes

submissions to help them understand the views of the council and to gain an insight into the local area.

4. REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The review involves consultation with a wide range of stakeholders including members, political parties, community groups and local residents. The LGBCE will make recommendations on ward boundaries having considered representations received.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 There will be minimal financial costs involved in undertaking the review.

6. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no direct implications on children and young people arising from this report.

7. CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no climate change or environmental implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

8. CONSULTATION WITH SCRUTINY

- 8.1 The cross party working group reports direct to Council, which will approve the final submissions on behalf of the authority.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 As outlined within section 5, there are minimal costs that would result from the consultation process.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The LGBCE is an independent body established by Parliament in April 2010 pursuant to The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. The LGBCE has a statutory duty to undertake electoral reviews.

11. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 There are no HR implications directly arising from the report.

12. WARD IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The proposals contained within this report will affect all Wards.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 13.1 None.

14. CONTACT OFFICERS

Paul Windley – Democratic and Scrutiny Team Manager – (01472) 324121

Laura Cowie – Elections Manager – (01472) 324295

Helen Isaacs – Assistant Chief Executive (01472) 326127

ROB WALSH
CHIEF EXECUTIVE