



# Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the South West



# Contents

	<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>What is the Boundary Commission for England?</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background to the 2018 Review</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Revised proposals for the South West</b>	<b>11</b>
	The sub-region split	11
	Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset	14
	Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire	16
	Bristol	21
	Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay	22
	Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire	27
	North Somerset	32
	Swindon	32
<b>4</b>	<b>How to have your say</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates</b>	<b>37</b>

# Summary

## Who we are and what we do

The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

## The 2018 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 501), resulting in the number of constituencies in the South West reducing by two, to 53. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions<sup>1</sup> – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

## How did we conduct the 2018 Review?

We published our initial proposals for new boundaries in September 2016 and consulted on them. We received written comments and oral submissions at public hearings held in each region. We published all the comments we received and we held a second consultation exercise in relation to them in March 2017. We are very grateful for all the comments that these two consultation exercises have generated. We have now completed the next stage of the review process and we are now publishing our revised proposals. For each region, the revised proposals report sets

out our analysis of all the responses to our initial proposals in the first and second consultations, and the conclusions we have reached as to how those proposals should be revised as a result. The annex to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency in our revised proposals for the relevant region; maps to illustrate these constituencies can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

## What are the revised proposals for the South West?

We have revised the composition of 21 of the 53 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining 32. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies.

Under our revised proposals, 10 constituencies in the South West would be the same as they are under the existing arrangements.

As it was not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, our initial proposals grouped some local authority areas into sub-regions. It was also necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposal sub-regions remain unchanged from those initial proposals, as shown in the table overleaf.

<sup>1</sup> The specified exemptions in England to the rules on constituency size are the two constituencies in the Isle of Wight.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset	7	7
Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire	13	12
Bristol	4	4
Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay	18	17
Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire	9	9
North Somerset	2	2
Swindon	2	2

As in our initial proposals, we are recommending four cross-county constituencies. We have proposed one constituency that contains electors from both Cornwall and Devon; it crosses the boundary in the north of the two counties, combining the towns of Bude, Bideford and Launceston. Another proposed constituency contains electors from both Dorset and Wiltshire and combines the towns of Shaftesbury and Warminster.

Additionally, we propose that some electors from the north-east of the County of Somerset are combined with electors from Bath and North East Somerset in one constituency. We also propose that some electors from the south of the County of Gloucestershire are combined with electors from South Gloucestershire.

In the Bristol, North Somerset, and Swindon sub-regions, we are making no change to the initial proposals.

In the Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset sub-region, the only change we are proposing is to the name of the Yeovil constituency.

In the Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire sub-region, we are making substantial change in the Bournemouth and Poole area to more closely reflect the existing pattern of Parliamentary constituencies. As a result of the changes in that part of the sub-region, other changes have been proposed that alter every proposed constituency in Dorset. We have also proposed a change in Wiltshire

to include all of the town of Corsham in one constituency, and to the names of two constituencies.

In the Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay sub-region, we have proposed changes to the East Devon and Exeter constituencies, and to the Bodmin and St. Austell, and Truro and Newquay constituencies. We have also proposed name changes for four constituencies.

In the Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire sub-region, we have proposed a change to the Cheltenham constituency, and as a result, we have decided to split the Coombe Hill ward between constituencies. We have also proposed changes to every constituency in Gloucestershire.

## How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us. The best way to respond to our revised proposals is through our consultation website: [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk).

# 1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

**1.1** The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required by Parliament to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every five years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries. We also make recommendations for any changes in the names of individual constituencies.

**2.2** The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners take decisions on what recommendations to make for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 21 assistant commissioners

(two or three allocated to each of the nine regions of England). Further information about the Commissioners and assistant commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our corporate website.<sup>2</sup>

**1.3** Our consultation website at [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk) contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing [information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk](mailto:information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk), by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

The Secretary to the Commission  
Boundary Commission for England  
35 Great Smith Street  
London  
SW1P 3BQ

<sup>2</sup> <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us>

## 2 Background to the 2018 Review

**2.1** There are four Boundary Commissions covering the UK with separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 states that they must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, every five years. Under the current review, we must report in September 2018. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the South West.

**2.2** Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. If our recommendations are accepted, they would be used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.

**2.3** The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 501. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our Guide to the 2018 Review of Parliamentary constituencies ('the Guide'),<sup>3</sup> published in the summer of 2016, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 71,031 and 78,507 electors.

**2.4** This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, the largest constituency currently has around twice as many electors as the smallest. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant scale of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

**2.5** If implemented, the recommendations that we will make in September 2018 will be the first set of boundaries to be defined under the new rules. While there has to be a significant amount of change across the country, we will, where possible, try to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors. Under the Act, we have a challenging job to do in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in a pattern of constituencies that is unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless the review has been one that we have conducted in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

**2.6** The revised proposals that we set out in this report, and in the reports for the other eight regions across England, are made on the basis of the evidence we received during two consultation exercises, the careful consideration of our assistant commissioners and the best judgement of the three Boundary Commissioners. We are confident that these revised proposals strike the best balance

<sup>3</sup> Available at <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/2018-review>.

between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There may be particular areas across the country where our judgement has been a balanced and marginal one between competing alternatives, and in such cases we have made clear that we are looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many areas we are persuaded by the evidence we have received thus far, and we would therefore require new and significantly stronger arguments to make us depart from our revised proposals. If it exists, such new and compelling evidence would be welcome. However, we will not be assisted by repetition of arguments that have already been made, and which we have already considered. The requirement to keep constituencies within the permitted range of electors is strict, but otherwise we have sought to balance often conflicting considerations. Our proposals must also be comprehensive. We are acutely conscious that very often a change in one constituency necessarily requires an alteration in another and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.

**2.7** The Guide contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the Guide, to enable greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

## The rules in the legislation

**2.8** The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 74,769. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- special geographical considerations, including the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency
- local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015
- boundaries of existing constituencies
- any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

**2.9** It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2015, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. The Guide outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries that have been amended since 2015.

**2.10** In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 16% of the existing constituencies in the South West – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

**2.11** Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to balance all the factors. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain 10 (18%) of the existing 55 constituencies in the South West.

## The use of the regions used for European elections

**2.12** Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the South West. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the 2018 Review we decided, in agreement with all the main political parties, to use

these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in the Guide and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

**2.13** In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence across the country to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report, and all other regional reports, continues to use the regional boundaries as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

## Timetable for the review

### Stage one – initial proposals

**2.14** We began this review in February 2016 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the data pages of our corporate website.<sup>4</sup> The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2016.

<sup>4</sup> <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/data-and-resources>



## Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

**2.15** We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2016 to 5 December 2016. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received more than 18,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including more than 1,500 unique written representations relating to the South West. We also heard more than 100 oral representations at the four public hearings in the South West. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

## Stage three – consultation on representations received

**2.16** The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to send us comments on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 28 February 2017 and invited comments on them until 27 March 2017. We received more than 7,500 unique written representations across the country as a whole during those four weeks.

## Stage four – publication of revised proposals

**2.17** As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation),

on 17 October 2017, we are publishing this report – Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the South West – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 11 December 2017. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

## Stage five – final recommendations

**2.18** Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 11 December 2017, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this during September 2018. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in the Guide.

**2.19** At the launch of each stage of consultation, we have taken – and are continuing to take – all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

## 3 Revised proposals for the South West

**3.1** In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of two assistant commissioners for the South West – Anita Bickerdike and Catherine Elliott – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. This included chairing public hearings held in the region to collect oral evidence, as follows:

- Exeter: 7–8 November 2016
- Truro: 10–11 November 2016
- Poole: 14–15 November 2016
- Bristol: 17–18 November 2016

**3.2** We asked the assistant commissioners to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of evidence provided in the representations. It is important to stress that the assistant commissioners had no involvement in developing – and therefore no vested interest in supporting – our initial proposals. Accordingly, they came to the analysis with an independent mind, open to viable alternative proposals supported by evidence. We are incredibly grateful for the thorough and methodical approach the assistant commissioners have taken to their work.

**3.3** What follows in this chapter is:

- a brief recap of our initial proposals
- a description of the counter-proposals put forward during the consultations
- the assistant commissioners' analysis of the strength of the arguments for adoption of any of those counter-proposals
- our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.

**3.4** A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears at Annex A to this report.

**3.5** Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent's response we also include the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345. This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk). All representations received in response to the first two consultations are publicly available on this website. The representations received in response to these revised proposals will be published at the end of the review.

**3.6** The use of the term 'ward' throughout this document should be taken to mean electoral division in reference to the county unitary authorities of Cornwall and Wiltshire.

### The sub-region split

**3.7** In our initial proposals, we decided to divide the South West region into seven sub-regions. These were: Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset; Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire; Bristol; Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay; Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire; North Somerset; and Swindon. We noted that Somerset, with an electorate of 389,032, did not need to be grouped with a neighbouring county, as it could be allocated five constituencies with an average electorate size of 77,806. However, the electorate of the neighbouring authority of Bath and North East Somerset (129,407) was not enough to be allocated two whole constituencies, so we considered that the two areas should be combined and allocated seven constituencies.

**3.8** We noted that the electorate of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly was 393,874 and that if we were to allocate five constituencies, the average electorate of those five constituencies would be 78,775, which is more than 5% above the electoral quota, and therefore outside the permitted electorate range. We were aware that there would be opposition to the creation of a constituency that crossed the Cornwall county boundary, but we considered that the ‘Rules for distribution of seats’ in Schedule 2 of the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended) meant that we had no option but to recommend a constituency that crossed the county boundary between Cornwall and Devon. We noted that the county of Devon, together with the unitary authorities of Plymouth, and Torbay, had an electorate of 852,765 and could be allocated 11 whole constituencies on its own, but we also noted that to do so would mean that the region as a whole would have only 52 constituencies, instead of the 53 it was entitled to. We therefore decided to allocate 17 constituencies to Cornwall, Devon, Plymouth, and Torbay, and to propose one constituency (named Bideford, Bude and Launceston) that contained parts of Cornwall and Devon. We decided to recommend a constituency that crossed the county boundary in the north, rather than in the south where the River Tamar is at its widest.

**3.9** We noted that Dorset, together with the unitary authorities of Bournemouth and Poole, had an electorate of 555,760, which was too small to retain the current allocation of eight constituencies, but was also too large for an allocation of seven constituencies. We also noted that the

county of Wiltshire had an electorate of 346,724, which was too small to continue an allocation of five constituencies. We therefore decided to combine the two counties and to allocate 12 constituencies.

**3.10** We noted that Gloucestershire, with an electorate of 460,522, did not need to be grouped with a neighbouring county, as it could be allocated six constituencies with an average electorate size of 76,754. However, the electorate of the neighbouring authority of South Gloucestershire (202,593) was not enough to be allocated three whole constituencies, so we considered that the two areas should be combined and allocated nine constituencies.

**3.11** We considered that the three unitary authorities of Bristol, North Somerset, and Swindon should be treated as separate sub-regions, which would allow us to only make minor changes in Bristol and Swindon to ensure that all the constituency electorates were within the permitted electorate range. In North Somerset, we proposed that neither of the existing constituencies be changed.

**3.12** There was a large amount of support for our proposed sub-regions. The main political parties all submitted counter-proposals that adhered to the sub-regions, while acknowledging that there were objections to the creation of a ‘Devonwall’ cross-county boundary constituency. For example, the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) said ‘We protest at the creation of a “cross-border” seat. We recognise the legal and population requirements. We accept the proposed boundaries and name of the cross-border

seat as “Bideford, Bude and Launceston”.’ There were a number of objections from respondents in Cornwall to the combining of Cornwall and Devon, with many citing Cornwall’s separateness from the rest of England – see the Cornish Nationalist Party (BCE-29305), the Cornish Stannary Parliament (BCE-34907 and BCE-31410) and Mebyon Kernow (BCE-29560).

**3.13** There was some opposition to the cross-county boundary constituency of Warminster and Shaftesbury. For example, Laura Scott Walby (BCE-16751) and Malcolm Scott Walby (BCE-19325) argued that people in the North Dorset part of the proposed constituency looked south towards Bournemouth and Poole, rather than north towards Warminster. However, nobody suggested any alternative pairings for Dorset that would enable the creation of constituencies with electorates within the permitted electorate range.

**3.14** Oliver Raven (BCE-33022 and BCE-39493) suggested in his counter-proposal that North Somerset should be included in the same sub-region as Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset. Other individuals who submitted counter-proposals either did so for the whole region using our initially proposed sub-regions, or did so for individual sub-regions.

**3.15** Our assistant commissioners considered these issues carefully, and decided not to alter our sub-regional grouping. While they acknowledged the depth of feeling in Cornwall against our initial proposals, and were struck in particular by the eloquent and passionate way the views were expressed at the public hearing in Truro, they concluded that

there was no valid alternative to a cross-county boundary constituency that would adhere to the statutory rules. Nor did they consider that the any other sub-regional groups would allow for a better pattern of constituencies across the region.

**3.16** We received some representations (such as from Samantha Owen on behalf of a number of parish councils, BCE-27031) that suggested crossing the regional boundary between Hampshire and Wiltshire to solve an issue relating to the inclusion of the Test Valley borough ward of Dun Valley in the proposed New Forest East constituency, in the South East region.

**3.17** Our assistant commissioners considered these proposals, and recommended that we do not accept them, noting that the evidence accompanying the proposals was not sufficiently compelling. We agree – it is our view that they would cause unnecessary disruption to the pattern of constituencies in the South West region, and we have decided that the South West regional boundary should not be crossed with any other region. We have also accepted the assistant commissioners’ recommendations that the following sub-regions continue to be used in formulating the revised proposals:

- Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset
- Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire
- Bristol
- Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay
- Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire
- North Somerset
- Swindon.

**3.18** In the next sections of our report, we consider each sub-region in turn, summarising our initial proposals, followed by the responses and counter-proposals received, our assistant commissioners' consideration of the evidence and their recommendations, and our revised proposals on the basis of the evidence received and in accordance with the statutory rules for the 2018 Review. We were struck by the general levels of support for much of our initial proposals in this region, with significant concerns only being raised in Dorset and Gloucestershire, and are grateful for the constructive counter-proposals being presented in these areas, and the general levels of agreement and consensus (though by no means complete) on how best to address them.

### **Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset**

**3.19** Of the seven existing constituencies in this sub-region, four have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals we proposed no reduction in the number of constituencies in this sub-region, and we recommended that two of the existing constituencies (Taunton Deane, and Yeovil) remain unchanged.

**3.20** In Bath and North East Somerset district, both the existing constituencies of Bath, and North East Somerset have an electorate below the permitted electorate range. We proposed that the three Bath and North East Somerset district wards of Bathavon North, Bathavon South, and Peasedown be included in the Bath constituency. We also proposed that six

Mendip district wards, including the town of Shepton Mallet, be included in the North East Somerset constituency.

**3.21** In Somerset, we proposed the minimum changes required to the Bridgwater and West Somerset, Somerton and Frome, and Wells constituencies to realign ward and constituency boundaries, and to ensure that the electorates were within the permitted electorate range.

**3.22** There was general support for our initial proposals. The Conservative Party (BCE-31941), the Labour Party (BCE-33148) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) all supported the seven proposed constituencies. There were objections to the inclusion of Shepton Mallet in the North East Somerset constituency. For example, Ian Keys (BCE-34074) said 'Firstly, Shepton and Wells have historically always been intertwined in their economies and communities and that remains the case today. Indeed, the fortunes of one have often risen as the other waned; for example, 60–70 years ago it was Wells that suffered economically while Shepton thrived. Secondly, we have lived in Shepton for 12 years and have never looked to Midsomer Norton as a place we might visit, shop or spend leisure time in. In Wells, however, we have often used the leisure facilities, our sons have been members of the Wells Rugby Club, we have used the cinema, our sons went to school there, our friends have delighted in the attractions we have taken them to and our eldest and his friends have often used the numerous pubs that still seem to thrive there. And numerous Shepton families look to Wells to supply their more specialist clothing, food and drink needs.'

**3.23** There were a small number of representations objecting to the inclusion of the Sedgemoor district wards of Huntspill and Pawlett, and Puriton and Woolavington in the Wells constituency. For example, Sam Winter (BCE-18067), on behalf of Puriton Parish Council, said ‘Puriton Parish Council opposes the proposals to move the parish of Puriton from the Bridgwater to the Wells constituency’ and ‘Puriton needs to have appropriate representation from an MP who has the specific knowledge and interests of Bridgwater at heart. As such, Puriton must remain in the Bridgwater constituency.’

**3.24** Aaron Fear (BCE-31500 and BCE-40973) submitted a counter-proposal that included Shepton Mallet in a Wells constituency, and the Mendip district wards of Rodney and Westbury, and St. Cuthbert Out North, and the Sedgemoor district ward of Cheddar and Shipham were included in a revised North East Somerset constituency. He also included the Sedgemoor district ward of Huntspill and Pawlett in the Bridgwater and West Somerset constituency, even though there is no direct road connection across the River Parrett between the Huntspill and Pawlett ward and the town of Bridgwater, without going through the neighbouring ward of Puriton and Woolavington, which would be included in the Wells constituency.

**3.25** As mentioned earlier, Oliver Raven (BCE-33022 and BCE-39493) suggested in his counter-proposal that North Somerset should be included in the same sub-region as Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset. There was no other support for this counter-proposal.

**3.26** In Bath, there were objections to the inclusion of the Bathavon West ward in the North East Somerset constituency, with representations highlighting the ward’s links to Bath. It was noted that, while the Bathavon West ward could be included in a Bath constituency, it would require further alterations to the proposed North East Somerset constituency, to ensure that it had an electorate within the permitted electorate range. There was support for the inclusion of the Peasedown ward in the Bath constituency. For example, Chris Sanders (BCE-34881) commented ‘I completely agree with the views of the majority of residents and councillors on the Peasedown Council. Our links these days are with Bath so we will have much better representation if we are part of the Bath constituency.’

**3.27** Ben Stevens (BCE-28845), on behalf of Bath and North East Somerset Liberal Democrats, suggested dividing the Bathavon West ward to include the N-BW5A and N-BW5B polling districts in the Bath constituency, as these polling districts contained students from Bath Spa University, and to do so would include all of the student accommodation in Bath in one constituency.

**3.28** Marcus Fysh Member of Parliament for Yeovil (BCE-33210) submitted a petition of 188 signatures suggesting that the Yeovil constituency be renamed Yeovil and South Somerset. He argued that the constituency contained other towns and villages as well as Yeovil, and that the name change would assure residents that the focus of the MP was not just on the town of Yeovil.

**3.29** Having weighed up our initial proposals, all the counter-proposals and suggestions for the Bath and North East Somerset, and Somerset sub-region, our assistant commissioners considered that there was no need to change the initial proposals, except for renaming the Yeovil constituency as Yeovil and South Somerset.

**3.30** The assistant commissioners considered that there was sufficient support for the initial proposals and that none of the counter-proposals provided enough evidence, nor attracted any consistent level of support, to warrant adoption. They noted that, while Shepton Mallet had close ties with the town of Wells, there were good communication links with the rest of the proposed North East Somerset constituency along the A37. They also considered that, while there were close ties with the Huntspill and Pawlett, and Puriton and Woolavington wards and the town of Bridgwater, there were also good communication links with the towns of Burnham-on-Sea and Highbridge, which are in the Wells constituency, via the M5 and the A38.

**3.31** They considered that, while there were links between the Bathavon West ward and the rest of the proposed Bath constituency, to include the ward in that constituency would result in further change to neighbouring constituencies in the sub-region, for which there was no substantial level of support. They also considered that the counter-proposal to split the Bathavon West ward did not meet our test of 'exceptional and compelling circumstances' and they did not recommend splitting that ward.

**3.32** The assistant commissioners accepted the argument in favour of changing the name of the Yeovil constituency to Yeovil and South Somerset, even though the constituency would otherwise be unchanged.

**3.33** Having considered the assistant commissioners' arguments and their interpretation of the evidence, we endorse their conclusion that making no change to our proposals strikes the best balance, given the criteria to which we work. While we note the evidence presented about ties across the sub-region, we considered that there was not enough support to warrant further changes. We decided to accept the assistant commissioners' name change for the Yeovil constituency.

### **Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire**

**3.34** Of the 13 existing constituencies in this sub-region, only four have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals, we reduced the number of constituencies in this sub-region to 12 and we altered all of the 13 existing constituencies.

**3.35** In the boroughs of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole and the district of East Dorset, we had proposed a constituency containing all of the borough of Christchurch, together with five wards from the north of the borough of Bournemouth, thereby not retaining the existing Bournemouth East constituency, which has an electorate within the permitted electorate range. We made consequential changes to the existing Bournemouth West, Mid Dorset and North

Poole, and Poole constituencies. One of the reasons for this was to avoid an altered Mid Dorset and North Poole constituency that would contain parts of four districts (East Dorset, North Dorset, Poole, and Purbeck), which we considered should be avoided if at all possible. We acknowledge that there was little support for our initial proposals in Dorset, and in particular the strength of local opinion in Bournemouth and Christchurch.

**3.36** A number of counter-proposals suggested that we should retain the existing Bournemouth East constituency unchanged and only make minor amendments to the existing constituencies of Bournemouth West, Christchurch, and Mid Dorset and North Poole, to ensure that their electorates were within the permitted electorate range. While there were some minor differences in the counter-proposals, in general the Conservative Party (BCE-31941), the Labour Party (BCE-33148), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821), Bournemouth Borough Council (BCE-26459), Dorset Labour Party (BCE-26532) and Aaron Fear (BCE-31500) all proposed the same division of the boroughs of Bournemouth and Poole between constituencies. As well as these organisations, there was substantial support for the counter-proposed constituencies from local MPs, such as Conor Burns (Bournemouth West) (BCE-29554, BCE-33119 and BCE-40232), Christopher Chope (Christchurch) (BCE-33111), Simon Hoare (North Dorset) (BCE-33094), Robert Syms (Poole) (BCE-31465 and BCE-33103) and Michael Tomlinson (Mid Dorset and North Poole) (BCE-33099), and also from a number of individuals in the affected areas.

**3.37** In these counter-proposals, the whole of the borough of Christchurch continued to be in a constituency with wards from East Dorset district, as it is in the existing Christchurch constituency. There was very little objection to a revised Mid Dorset and North Poole constituency containing parts of four districts. There were other alternative divisions of Bournemouth, Christchurch, East Dorset, and Poole suggested – for example, by the Pirate Party (BCE-31942), Mid Dorset and North Poole UKIP (BCE-18149), Stephen Godley (BCE-25005) and Oliver Raven (BCE-33022 and BCE-39493), but these were rejected by the assistant commissioners as being too disruptive and not having the same level of support as the minimum change counter-proposals listed above.

**3.38** The existing South Dorset constituency has an electorate of 68,211 and needs additional electors to bring it within the permitted electorate range. In our initial proposals, we had suggested the inclusion of the three Purbeck district wards of Bere Regis, St. Martin, and Wareham. This was objected to, with the Conservative Party, the Liberal Democrat Party, Bournemouth Borough Council, and Dorset Labour Party suggesting that the West Dorset district ward of Chickerell & Chesil Bank be included in the South Dorset constituency, due to the proximity of the ward to the town of Weymouth, which is the largest town in the constituency. It was argued Chickerell had close links with Weymouth. For example, Jim Goodey (BCE-15555) commented ‘Chickerell ... has merged physically into Weymouth and it will be harder to split in future when further house building takes



place.’ The Labour Party suggested that the Wareham ward on its own should be included in the revised South Dorset constituency, as this would not require any further alterations to constituency boundaries.

**3.39** The existing West Dorset constituency had only been altered to realign ward and constituency boundaries following changes to ward boundaries in West Dorset district. By including the Chickerell & Chesil Bank ward in a South Dorset constituency, it would mean that wards from North Dorset district would need to be added to the West Dorset constituency, thereby making greater change and dividing the North Dorset district between three constituencies. The Conservative Party suggested including four North Dorset wards (Blackmore, Bulbarrow, Lydden Vale, and Sturminster Newton), due to close links between these wards and the town of Sherborne. It was noted that moving the four North Dorset wards would also result in consequential changes being made to the proposed Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency. The Liberal Democrat Party suggested including just two North Dorset wards (Blackmore, and Lydden Vale), which did not require any consequential changes to the proposed Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency.

**3.40** While there was general agreement that there should be only minimal change to the existing South Dorset and West Dorset constituencies, Oliver Raven proposed that there should be a coastal constituency that included the towns of Bridport, Lyme Regis, Portland, and Weymouth, and another constituency that included the whole of Purbeck district,

the town of Dorchester and the remainder of West Dorset district. This was rejected by the assistant commissioners as being unnecessarily disruptive.

**3.41** In order to ensure that the Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency had an electorate within the permitted electorate range, the Conservative Party (BCE-31941) proposed that the Wiltshire ward of Southwick be included in the Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency, instead of the Trowbridge constituency. The Conservative Party also suggested changes to the proposed Chippenham, Devizes, and Trowbridge constituencies. They objected to the inclusion of the eight wards of the town of Chippenham in a constituency based in the north of Wiltshire. They suggested that the town of Calne and the Box and Colerne ward should be included in a renamed North Wiltshire constituency instead. They proposed that the town of Melksham be included in the Devizes constituency, and that the towns of Chippenham and Trowbridge be included in a renamed Mid Wiltshire constituency. They argued that this was a minimum change to the existing pattern of constituencies in Wiltshire. The counter-proposal was supported by local MPs, such as Michelle Donelan (Chippenham) (BCE-31477 and BCE-33109), James Gray (North Wiltshire) (BCE-31422 and BCE-33105) and Andrew Murrison (South West Wiltshire) (BCE-33282), and also by a number of individuals in Wiltshire.

**3.42** The Liberal Democrat Party proposed fewer changes in Wiltshire, with the ward of The Lavingtons and Erlestoke being included in the Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency, the Summerham

and Seend ward included in the Devizes constituency, the Box and Colerne ward included in a renamed North Wiltshire constituency, and the Corsham Pickwick and Corsham Town wards included in a renamed West Wiltshire constituency, which would unite the whole of the town of Corsham in one constituency.

**3.43** There was general support for our proposed Salisbury constituency, although Oliver Raven suggested an alternative division of Wiltshire between constituencies, with the town of Salisbury being included in the same constituency as the town of Shaftesbury, to reflect the link provide by the A30. This counter-proposal was rejected by the assistant commissioners as being unnecessarily disruptive.

**3.44** Having weighed up our initial proposals, and all the counter-proposals and suggestions for Bournemouth, Dorset, Poole, and Wiltshire, our assistant commissioners considered that there was no one counter-proposal that should be adopted in its entirety, but that the counter-proposal put forward by the Liberal Democrat Party provided the best solution for the sub-region. They have recommended to us that we alter our initial proposals and adopt the majority of the Liberal Democrat Party counter-proposal.

**3.45** They considered that the evidence for the return to the existing pattern of constituencies in the Bournemouth, Christchurch, East Dorset, and Poole area was very persuasive. The lack of support for the initial proposals in this part of the sub-region and the near unanimous support for the counter-proposals

convinced them to adopt the alternative Bournemouth East, Bournemouth West, Christchurch, and Poole constituencies as proposed, among others, by the Conservative, Labour, and Liberal Democrat Parties.

**3.46** The assistant commissioners considered whether to include the Purbeck district ward of Wareham in a Mid Dorset constituency or a South Dorset constituency. They noted the evidence from Stephen Link (BCE-27863) that Wareham's ties were with Lytchett Matravers and Lytchett Minster, and not with the South Dorset constituency. They concluded that it would be less disruptive not to move Wareham into the South Dorset constituency. They also recommended that, rather than retain the name of the existing Mid Dorset and North Poole constituency, it should be called Mid Dorset, to reflect the reduction in the number of Poole borough wards in the constituency from four to two.

**3.47** They considered that, while the move of the West Dorset district ward of Chickerell & Chesil Bank to the South Dorset constituency would be disruptive to the existing West Dorset constituency, there were compelling reasons to adopt this aspect of the counter-proposals. They accepted the evidence relating to the closeness of the Charlestown part of the ward to the Westham part of Weymouth and Portland, with there being some housing development on either side of the boundary. They considered that to include a second West Dorset district ward in the South Dorset constituency would also be beneficial.

**3.48** Our assistant commissioners considered that there was no need to move four North Dorset district wards to the West Dorset constituency, as proposed by the Conservative Party. While they noted that these four wards would have to move constituency in any event, they recommended the Liberal Democrat Party proposal to move just two wards (Blackmore and Lydden Vale) into the West Dorset constituency. They also noted that moving four North Dorset district wards, as the Conservatives proposed, would mean that the Wiltshire ward of Southwick would have to be included in the Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency, and they considered that Southwick has very close ties to the town of Trowbridge and should be included in the same constituency as that town.

**3.49** They also considered that, while the Conservative Party counter-proposal was based upon the existing constituencies, the changes proposed were not ideal. They noted that to travel by road from Chippenham to Trowbridge would require going through Melksham on the A350, which would be in another constituency. They agreed with the comment of the Labour Party (BCE-41028): ‘The Conservative scheme in particular has a very awkward arrangement which links Trowbridge and Chippenham without Melksham which leaves all of these towns on the periphery of their constituencies.’

**3.50** They noted the opposition to the Liberal Democrat Party’s proposal to include the ward of The Lavingtons and Erlestoke in the Warminster and Shaftesbury constituency, for example from Councillor Richard Gamble (BCE-28168), and decided not to adopt that

element of the counter-proposal, nor the inclusion of the Summerham and Seend ward in the Devizes constituency. However, they saw merit in the Liberal Democrat counter-proposal to include the Box and Colerne ward in the proposed Chippenham constituency and the Corsham Pickwick and Corsham Town wards in the proposed Trowbridge constituency. They noted that the Conservative Party had supported the Box and Colerne ward being included in a North Wiltshire constituency and that there was merit in including all of the town of Corsham in one constituency. They noted that this would break ties between Chippenham and Corsham, but that it would retain ties between Corsham and the towns of Bradford-on-Avon and Melksham. They considered that it was not easy to include both the towns of Chippenham and Corsham in the same constituency, without making other changes across much of Wiltshire.

**3.51** They decided that no changes need to be made to the proposed Devizes and Salisbury constituencies, which would be the only constituencies in this sub-region not to be altered.

**3.52** Our assistant commissioners noted that the alternative names of North Wiltshire and West Wiltshire had been suggested, respectively, for the proposed Chippenham and Trowbridge constituencies. They noted the support for the proposed names from Trowbridge Town Council (BCE-22511), but decided that these two constituencies should be called North Wiltshire and West Wiltshire respectively. Apart from the names altered due to changes in the adopted counter-proposal, no other constituency name changes are proposed in this sub-region.

**3.53** We considered the assistant commissioners' recommendations were a significant improvement on the initial proposals for this sub-region and have decided to adopt them as our revised proposals.

## Bristol

**3.54** Of the four existing constituencies in this sub-region, only two have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals we proposed no reduction in the number of constituencies in this sub-region, but we altered two of the four existing constituencies.

**3.55** The electorate of the existing Bristol East constituency was below the permitted electorate range and the electorate of the existing Bristol West constituency was above the permitted electorate range. We decided to transfer the Bristol city ward of Easton from the Bristol West constituency to the Bristol East constituency, which would result in all four Bristol constituencies having an electorate within the permitted electorate range. This was the only change we proposed in this sub-region.

**3.56** There was general support for our initial proposals. The Conservative Party (BCE-31941), the Labour Party (BCE-33148) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) all supported the four initially proposed constituencies. However, there were objections to the inclusion of the Easton ward in the proposed Bristol East constituency. It was argued that the Easton and Lawrence Hill wards cover the city centre of Bristol and should be in the same constituency to recognise their close ties.

Stephen Williams (BCE-30007), a former MP for Bristol West, suggested that the Easton and Lawrence Hill wards should be included in the Bristol East constituency, with the Henleaze ward being transferred from the Bristol North West constituency to the Bristol West constituency and the Frome Vale ward being transferred from the Bristol East constituency to the Bristol North West constituency. The assistant commissioners noted that the M32 forms the constituency boundary between the Bristol East and Bristol North West constituencies, with there being no direct road access between the Frome Vale ward and the rest of the Bristol North West constituency, which is also separated by the open space of Stoke Park.

**3.57** Philip Pope (BCE-15574) also suggested that both the Easton and Lawrence Hill wards should be included in the Bristol East constituency. He suggested that the Stockwood ward should be transferred from the Bristol East constituency to the Bristol South constituency, and the Southville ward should be transferred from the Bristol South constituency to the Bristol West constituency. The assistant commissioners noted that the River Avon formed the boundary between the Bristol South and Bristol West constituencies and they considered that this formed a clear boundary between the two constituencies.

**3.58** Mary Southcott (BCE-22650) suggested that both the Easton and Lawrence Hill wards should remain in the Bristol West constituency, with the Bishopston ward being transferred from the Bristol West constituency to the Bristol North West constituency, and the Lockleaze ward being transferred from

the Bristol North West constituency to the Bristol East constituency. As with Mr Williams' counter-proposal, the assistant commissioners noted the lack of a road link between the Lockleaze ward and the rest of the Bristol East constituency.

**3.59** Our assistant commissioners rejected all of these counter-proposals in Bristol. They considered that they each made more change than was necessary to create four constituencies within the permitted electorate range and that each crossed an easily identifiable boundary.

**3.60** Having considered the assistant commissioners' arguments and their interpretation of the evidence, we endorse their conclusion that making no change to the four proposed constituencies strikes the best balance between the criteria we work to. While we noted the evidence presented about ties in the sub-region, we considered that there was not enough support to warrant further changes.

## **Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay**

**3.61** Of the 18 existing constituencies in this sub-region, only seven have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals, we proposed to reduce the number of constituencies in this sub-region to 17 and we retained the three existing constituencies of Exeter, North Devon, and Torbay unchanged.

**3.62** In the east and the south of Devon, we had made the minimum changes required to the existing constituencies to ensure that all of them had an electorate within the permitted electorate range.

**3.63** We proposed a cross-county boundary constituency containing 18 wards from Torridge district in Devon, and nine wards from Cornwall. We made consequential changes in Cornwall to ensure that each constituency had an electorate within the permitted electorate range. In general, we proposed constituencies in Cornwall that crossed the county from the north coast to the south coast, rather than constituencies that followed the coastline.

**3.64** There was support for our proposed constituencies, but also many objections to the creation of a so-called 'Devonwall' cross-county constituency, as detailed previously in this report. Many of those who objected to a cross-county constituency did not submit a counter-proposal to create five constituencies wholly within Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly, each with an electorate within the permitted electorate range. It was argued that Cornwall was a separate entity to the rest of England and should be treated in the same way as Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales in terms of the review.

**3.65** Our assistant commissioners were sympathetic to the arguments against a cross-county constituency between Cornwall and Devon, but accepted that the statutory rules left them with no choice but to recommend such a constituency.

**3.66** In Devon, the Conservative Party (BCE-31941) submitted a counter-proposal to include the Exeter city ward of St. Loyes in the Exeter constituency. They argued that the St. Loyes ward had strong links with the rest of the Exeter constituency and few with the rural East Devon constituency.

This counter-proposal was supported by a number of respondents, such as Keith Sparkes (BCE-22822) who said ‘It was nonsensical to move an urban part of the city to a rural constituency especially as the area is served by Exeter City Council. The natural boundaries of the urban conurbation does not sit well in its current configuration so St. Loyes and Countess Wear need to move back to Exeter.’ It was also argued by others that, with the rate of planned housing development in East Devon, a change would be required at the next review.

**3.67** Strong support for the proposed East Devon and Exeter constituencies was also received, with respondents noting that our initial proposals were minimum change options for both constituencies, as both already had an electorate within the permitted electorate range. For example, Ben Bradshaw, Member of Parliament for Exeter (BCE-31418 and BCE-40576), said ‘I wanted to remind the Boundary Commission of the very clear statements and guidance you and the Government have made throughout on this review, that if a constituency is within the required size range it should not be changed. Both Exeter and East Devon are within the required range and should therefore not be changed. Furthermore, the electoral roll on which the electorate sizes are based dates back to the end of 2015. While I recognise this is the roll which the Commission is required to use, Exeter lost a significant (several thousand) mainly students in 2015 as a result of the introduction of individual voter registration. Exeter’s numbers have gone back up again significantly thanks to the voter registration drive carried out in the run up to last year’s Referendum

and, combined with the rapid growth of housing in the city, means that Exeter’s electorate is now closer to the higher end of the required range, than the lower end, so moving more voters in from St. Loyes would be likely to take us over the upper limit based on current numbers.’

**3.68** The Labour Party (BCE-41028) also objected to the Conservative Party counter-proposal, saying ‘One reason being used to justify this proposal is the fast pace of growth in the electorate of the East Devon CC over the last six years which has resulted in its having an above average electorate. We note that these are issues beyond the scope of the statutory criteria but that the Commission say that they are not obliged to ‘shut their eyes’ entirely to growth or decline in the electorate (Guide to the Review of Parliamentary Constituencies, para. 40). However they also state that they will only take these into account where there are ‘two or more competing options for the same area that satisfy the statutory rules’. We would argue that, as the Initial Proposals would leave Exeter BC unchanged and, by definition, no ties can be broken if no changes are made, the two options are not of equal status within the statutory criteria.’

**3.69** Our assistant commissioners visited the area and noted that the St. Loyes ward is very similar to other Exeter wards and is separated from the rest of the East Devon constituency by the M5 (motorway). They considered that it would be appropriate for the St. Loyes ward to be included in the Exeter constituency. They noted that the argument was finely balanced between respecting the existing constituency

boundary and recognising the close links of St. Loyes with Exeter. They also noted that this change would result in the Exeter city ward of Topsham being an ‘orphan ward’<sup>5</sup> in the revised East Devon constituency. They decided to recommend the transfer of the St. Loyes ward to the Exeter constituency.

**3.70** There were objections to the inclusion of the Teignbridge district ward of Chudleigh in the Newton Abbot constituency. Aaron Fear (BCE-31500 and BCE-40973) and Peter Kingswood (BCE-31938) suggested including the ward in a Central Devon constituency to recognise its ties with that constituency. Hennock Parish Council (BCE-37387), which is part of the Chudleigh ward, said ‘Hennock Parish is a rural parish and its identity is not with the urban community of Newton Abbot. It is frustrated by the split of the Parish between two wards and the further likely split between two parliamentary constituencies is extremely unwelcome; it will result in further loss of the Parish’s rural identity. The Parish Council, therefore, urges the Commission to retain Chudleigh Ward in Central Devon constituency and thereby secure the future of the whole of Hennock Parish in one parliamentary constituency.’

**3.71** To ensure that all of the constituencies were within the permitted electorate range, both Aaron Fear and Peter Kingswood suggested moving the Teignbridge district wards of Ambrook and Ipplepen to the Newton Abbot constituency to reflect the ties of these wards with the town of Newton Abbot, the Teignbridge district ward of Ashburton and

Buckfastleigh to the Totnes constituency, and the West Devon borough ward of Mary Tavy to the Central Devon constituency.

**3.72** Our assistant commissioners noted that there was very little support for this counter-proposal and that there had been general support for the pattern of the proposed constituencies in the south of Devon. They considered that the consequential changes needed to include the Chudleigh ward in the Central Devon constituency were too widespread, and therefore decided not to adopt them. They recommended that the inclusion of the Exeter city ward of St. Loyes in the Exeter constituency was the only change to the proposed constituency boundaries in Devon.

**3.73** As part of their regional counter-proposal, in Devon the Conservative Party suggested that the names of the proposed Plymouth North, Plymouth South, Tavistock and Ivybridge, and Totnes constituencies be changed. They suggested the alternatives of Plymouth Moor View, Plymouth Sutton and Devonport, South West Devon, and South Devon respectively. There was support for these proposed name changes, particularly from Sarah Wollaston, Member of Parliament for Totnes (BCE-18000), and from Oliver Colville (BCE-31469 and BCE-33012), then Member of Parliament for Plymouth Sutton and Devonport.

**3.74** Plymouth City Council (BCE-21129 and BCE-39625) wanted the three constituencies covering the city to have Plymouth in the name. They agreed with keeping the existing constituency names

<sup>5</sup> ‘Orphan ward’ refers to a clear minority of wards (usually just one ward) from one local authority, in a constituency where the overwhelming majority of wards are from another local authority.

of Plymouth Moor View and Plymouth Sutton and Devonport, but wanted the Tavistock and Ivybridge constituency to be renamed either 'Plymouth East, Tavistock and Ivybridge' or 'Plymouth East and South West Devon', to reflect the fact that the Plymouth part is the largest part of the proposed constituency. Other respondents, such as Louise Bird (BCE-30084), suggested that the name should be 'Plympton, Tavistock and Ivybridge'. She said 'Plympton is a stannary town with a population of nearly 30,000 people, more than either Tavistock or Ivybridge yet Plympton is not even referred to. I suggest that the new area be called Plympton, Tavistock and Ivybridge which is a more accurate representation of the electorate.'

**3.75** The assistant commissioners decided to recommend changes to the names of the initially proposed Plymouth North, Plymouth South, and Tavistock and Ivybridge constituencies. They have accepted the evidence that the constituency names should be Plymouth Moor View, Plymouth Sutton and Devonport, and Plympton, Tavistock and Ivybridge respectively. They also rejected changing the names of the initially proposed Torbay and Totnes constituencies.

**3.76** Some respondents objected to parts of the borough of Torbay not being in the Torbay constituency. Others suggested that the constituency should be renamed, with Michael Auld (BCE-15026) suggesting Torquay and Paignton. He said the 'Reason for this being that said constituency does not include the whole Torbay council area (notably omitting Brixham) and I feel my suggested new name would better reflect local identities and the area covered.'

This was rejected by the assistant commissioners.

**3.77** In Cornwall, there were very few alternatives put forward to our initial proposals. As mentioned earlier, the majority of respondents were against the initial proposals in principle, and did not submit any alternatives.

**3.78** Councillor Malcolm Brown (BCE-32754 and BCE-40924) noted that the initial proposals divided the 'China Clay District' around St. Austell and suggested that as much of this area should be in the same constituency as the town of St. Austell as possible. He proposed that the St. Stephen-In-Brannel ward be included in the Bodmin and St. Austell constituency. Councillor Brown also suggested that the St. Columb Major ward should be included in the Truro and Newquay constituency to recognise the close ties between St. Columb Major and the town of Newquay. Councillor Brown acknowledged that this would not unite the whole of the 'China Clay District' within a single constituency, but considered it to be the best that could be achieved within the statutory rules.

**3.79** The proposal to include the St. Columb Major ward in the Truro and Newquay constituency also received support. David Swindells (BCE-31347) said 'I have seen the proposals for the revision of electoral boundaries within Cornwall and the proposals regarding the proposed move of St. Columb Major into a new Constituency. I have concerns that the proposed changes do not reflect the economic and community links with the newly proposed Truro Constituency especially in its links with



our nearby larger town of Newquay ... I recognize that reviews are necessary but would request that the Commission maintain the vital links with Newquay in terms of the vibrant linkage which exists and urge the Commission to consider an alternative location which would numerically compensate for a revision of the proposals not to include St. Columb Major in a Constituency outside the economic affiliation this town has with its Newquay neighbour.'

**3.80** The assistant commissioners agreed with the proposal to swap the St. Columb Major and St. Stephen-In-Brannel wards between constituencies, thereby respecting the ties of these two wards.

**3.81** Councillor Brown also referred to the Mount Hawke and Portreath ward, which had been included in the Truro and Newquay constituency. He said that Portreath's ties were with the town of Redruth, and not with Truro. Among the respondents who agreed with him was George Eustice, Member of Parliament for Camborne and Redruth (BCE-32489). In his evidence at the Truro public hearing, he said 'The village of Portreath has always been very closely linked to Redruth and indeed under the old Camborne and Falmouth seat that existed pre-2010 Portreath was part of that Camborne and Falmouth seat. I do understand the argument that there is a reluctance on the Boundary Commission to split divisions and under the new divisions, as part of the unitary council, you would therefore be splitting a division if Portreath were to stay with Camborne and Redruth but I would ask you to consider this because I think if we see, as is possible in future, fewer divisions in Cornwall, therefore even larger

wards, we may in future when we look at this have to start to consider in some cases, where there is a strong argument for it, splitting individual council divisions in order to make sure that parliamentary constituencies make sense.'

**3.82** It was acknowledged by Councillor Brown that including the whole of the ward of Mount Hawke and Portreath in the Falmouth and Camborne constituency was not possible without making a number of other changes to neighbouring constituencies. The assistant commissioners considered that the proposal to divide the Mount Hawke and Portreath ward would not satisfy our 'compelling and exceptional circumstances' test. They also rejected including the whole of the ward in the Falmouth and Camborne constituency. They recommended no change to the proposed Bideford, Bude and Launceston, South East Cornwall, and St. Ives constituencies.

**3.83** The Conservative Party (BCE-31941) had suggested changes to the names of some of the proposed constituencies in Cornwall. They suggested that the Bideford, Bude and Launceston, and St. Ives constituencies be renamed North Cornwall and Torridge, and West Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly respectively. However, the assistant commissioners advised us that the arguments were not persuasive enough to alter the names of these proposed constituencies. We agreed with this recommendation.

**3.84** A number of respondents suggested that the proposed Falmouth and Camborne constituency should be renamed Falmouth, Camborne and Redruth to recognise the

three largest towns in the constituency. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) and Laura Avery (BCE-33182) both suggested this alternative. Our assistant commissioners agreed with this proposal.

**3.85** We agreed with our assistant commissioners' proposed changes in Cornwall, Devon, Isles of Scilly, Plymouth, and Torbay. We noted that this would entail a change to the existing Exeter constituency, which could otherwise remain unchanged. We considered the arguments accepted by them and agreed that the inclusion of the Exeter city ward of St. Loyes in the Exeter constituency was justifiable in terms of recognising the close links between St. Loyes and the rest of the Exeter constituency.

## Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire

**3.86** Of the nine existing constituencies in this sub-region, only three have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals, we proposed no reduction in the number of constituencies in this sub-region, but we altered all of the nine existing constituencies.

**3.87** We noted that we had to make changes to the existing Forest of Dean constituency to make the electorate within the permitted electorate range. We noted that to include the Tewkesbury borough ward of Coombe Hill in an expanded Forest of Dean constituency – renamed as West Gloucestershire – would divide the existing Tewkesbury constituency into two detached parts. We therefore decided to include the Cheltenham borough ward of Springbank in the Tewkesbury

constituency, so as to provide a link between both parts of the constituency. There was some opposition to the inclusion of the Coombe Hill ward in the proposed West Gloucestershire constituency, for example from Peter Cripps (BCE-14661) who argued that Coombe Hill's ties were with Cheltenham and Tewkesbury, and not with Forest of Dean district across the River Severn. However, none of these respondents suggested an alternative ward to be added to the existing constituency in place of the Coombe Hill ward.

**3.88** Under our initial proposals, we also decided to include the Gloucester city ward of Longlevens in the Gloucester constituency, and to include the two Gloucester city wards of Quedgeley Fieldcourt and Quedgeley Severn Vale in a Stroud constituency. We decided to include the Stroud district ward of Nailsworth in The Cotswolds constituency, and seven wards from the south of Stroud district, including the towns of Cam and Dursley in a Dursley, Thornbury and Yate constituency. We decided to include the South Gloucestershire district ward of Boyd Valley in an expanded Kingswood constituency, and the South Gloucestershire ward of Frampton Cotterell in an expanded Filton and Bradley Stoke constituency.

**3.89** There was some support for our initial proposals, with the Conservative Party (BCE-31941) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) approving the composition of all nine of the proposed constituencies. However, there was strong opposition from other individuals and organisations, particularly to our proposed Cheltenham and Stroud constituencies.

**3.90** The Labour Party (BCE-33148) suggested a number of changes, including retaining the two Quedgeley wards in a Gloucester constituency, with the Gloucester city wards of Elmbridge and Longlevens being included in a Tewkesbury constituency. They also included the two Stroud district wards of Bisley and Painswick, and the two Tewkesbury borough wards of Isbourne and Winchcombe in The Cotswolds constituency. This allowed for Cam, Dursley and Nailsworth to be included in a Stroud constituency. The counter-proposal also included four Cotswold district wards, including the town of Tetbury, in a renamed Thornbury and Yate constituency.

**3.91** There was support for this aspect of the Labour Party counter-proposal, with many representations being received from Cam, Dursley, and Nailsworth. For example, Cam Parish Council (BCE-29413) and Nailsworth Councillor Stephen Robinson (BCE-36599) both cited the close ties their towns have with the town of Stroud.

**3.92** There was also objection to this counter-proposal, with the Conservative Party (BCE-41027) noting that both the Bisley and Painswick wards 'are contiguous to Stroud Town and identify historically, socially and economically more with Stroud than with The Cotswold District' The Conservative Party also objected to the division of Cotswold district between constituencies.

**3.93** In relation to the counter-proposed Gloucester constituency, Elizabeth Jack (BCE-19226) said 'Longlevens is on the outskirts of the city of Gloucester and is approximately 10 miles from Tewkesbury. We have no traditional

links with Tewkesbury whatsoever but many such links to Gloucester. Our local council is Gloucester City Council, not Tewkesbury borough Council.' Shane Daley (BCE-16951) said 'Longlevens should be included within the Gloucester constituency. The boundary is only 1 mile from the city centre and forms an integral part of Gloucester itself.'

**3.94** In Cheltenham, there was considerable opposition to the inclusion of the Springbank ward in the proposed Tewkesbury constituency. For example, Michael Farmer (BCE-22082), who also gave evidence at the Bristol public hearing (BCE-33055), highlighted the close ties between the Springbank ward and the rest of the Cheltenham constituency. Some objectors called for the existing Cheltenham constituency to be left unchanged, while others suggested alternative Cheltenham borough wards to be included in a Tewkesbury constituency, in place of the Springbank ward. For example, Richard Harrison (BCE-15129) said 'The proposal to move Springbank from Cheltenham into Tewkesbury is not logical at all. Springbank is a sub-urban part of Cheltenham and has no logical link to the rural area of Tewkesbury. All of the facilities we use are Cheltenham based, e.g. the Hospital, Theatre, Cinema, Restaurants, shops, church, dentist, doctor, gym, railway station. Springbank has never been a separate village in the way that Prestbury or Swindon Village have been. The All Saints Academy, a major Secondary school serves the whole of Cheltenham, not rural Tewkesbury! The majority of people in the area work in Cheltenham, including myself.' In addition, 192 people signed a petition (BCE-33207) objecting to the inclusion of the Springbank ward in the Tewkesbury constituency.

**3.95** Mark Chapman, on behalf of the Pirate Party (BCE-31942), submitted a counter-proposal that was similar to the Labour Party's, but which suggested the splitting of the Coombe Hill ward between the proposed West Gloucestershire and Tewkesbury constituencies, thereby allowing the Springbank ward to remain in a Cheltenham constituency. Unlike the Labour Party counter-proposal, this one suggested that all of Cotswold district should be included in The Cotswolds constituency, and the five Stroud district wards of Berkeley, Bisley, Minchinhampton, Nailsworth, and Painswick wards be included in a Stroud constituency. A similar counter-proposal was submitted by Aaron Fear (BCE-31500 and BCE-40973), except that it did not split the Coombe Hill ward and did not include Springbank in a Cheltenham constituency. Alan Borgars (BCE-30092) also suggested splitting the Coombe Hill ward between constituencies.

**3.96** The Labour Party also suggested that the South Gloucestershire district ward of Boyd Valley should not be included in the proposed Kingswood constituency, with the South Gloucestershire district ward of Staple Hill being included instead. They proposed that the Boyd Valley ward would remain in a renamed Thornbury and Yate constituency. To compensate for the inclusion of the Staple Hill ward in a Kingswood constituency, they proposed that the South Gloucestershire district ward of Severn be included in the Filton and Bradley Stoke constituency.

**3.97** There were a number of objections to this counter-proposal. For example, Councillor Sam Bromiley (BCE-29513 and BCE-37527) highlighted the close

links between the Boyd Valley ward and the neighbouring South Gloucestershire district wards of Bitton, Oldland Common, and Siston. He pointed out that 'All of our wards are connected by fields which create very weak boundary lines.'

**3.98** Support for the inclusion of the Staple Hill ward in the Kingswood constituency came from Councillor Ian Boulton (BCE-37347 and BCE-22111), who argued that the Staple Hill ward had closer links with neighbouring wards in the Kingswood constituency than with the Downend ward and other wards in the Filton and Bradley Stoke constituency. However, Councillor Judy Adams (BCE-38966) argued the opposite and considered Staple Hill to be separate from Kingswood.

**3.99** There were objections to the proposed inclusion of the Severn ward in the Filton and Bradley Stoke constituency. For example, Anthony England (BCE-29482) stated 'I oppose this proposal as our village, and indeed all those in the Severn Ward, have strong connections particularly with Thornbury, and also with Berkeley, which are used for shopping, schooling and other personal services.'

**3.100** Adrian Bailey (BCE-40923) submitted a counter-proposal that suggested alterations to the Tewkesbury constituency to include Moreton-in-Marsh and Stow, and for the Cotswold constituency to include the area between Cheltenham and Gloucester. Mr Bailey did not give any reasons for proposing these changes. This was rejected by the assistant commissioners as being too disruptive.

**3.101** Having weighed up our initial proposals, and all the counter-proposals and suggestions for Gloucestershire, and South Gloucestershire, our assistant commissioners considered that the counter-proposal from the Pirate Party be adopted in its entirety in this sub-region. We noted that this counter-proposal split the Tewkesbury borough ward of Coombe Hill. It proposed that the civil parishes of Elmstone Hardwicke (polling district ELH) and Uckington (polling district UCK) be included in the Tewkesbury constituency, with the rest of the ward remaining in the proposed West Gloucestershire constituency.

**3.102** Our assistant commissioners considered that splitting the Coombe Hill ward would meet our test of 'exceptional and compelling circumstances' for splitting a ward. By splitting this ward, it enabled the existing Cheltenham constituency to be retained unchanged, thereby satisfying the objections within the Springbank ward. It also allowed for road access between the two parts of the Tewkesbury constituency, which was wholly within the constituency.

**3.103** We noted that the assistant commissioners had visited the Springbank ward and had found that it was of a similar character to other Cheltenham wards and should be retained in a Cheltenham constituency.

**3.104** As part of this counter-proposal, the Gloucester city wards of Elmbridge and Longlevens would be included in the Tewkesbury constituency. The Longlevens ward is currently part of the existing Tewkesbury constituency, and the assistant commissioners had observed that there were similarities between both

wards, which convinced them that these wards could both be part of a Tewkesbury constituency. The assistant commissioners noted that the A40 provided ready access from Gloucester to the villages just north of the city. They also noted the support for the inclusion of the Longlevens ward in a Gloucester constituency, such as from Douglas Rugg (BCE-19190), who considered that the Longlevens ward had closer links with the rest of the Gloucester constituency than with the Tewkesbury constituency.

**3.105** We noted that the assistant commissioners had also visited the Quedgeley area of Gloucester and seen that it had good communication links with the rest of Gloucester. They noted that the electorate of the city of Gloucester was too large to form one constituency and that two city wards had to be included in a neighbouring constituency. They also noted that not including Elmbridge and Longlevens wards in a Gloucester constituency would mean that fewer electors would be moved between constituencies than in the initial proposals.

**3.106** The Pirate Party counter-proposal suggested including the two Tewkesbury borough wards of Isbourne and Winchcombe in The Cotswolds constituency. We noted that the assistant commissioners had visited the wards and had observed that the area was very different from other parts of the Tewkesbury constituency, which lay in the Vale of Gloucester, whereas these two wards were situated in the hills overlooking the Vale. As such, they concluded that these two wards had a lot in common with other wards in The Cotswolds constituency, particularly in terms of

the similarities of the housing stock and tourism, and that they were both largely within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. They recommended that these two wards be included in The Cotswolds constituency, which would also contain the whole of Cotswold district. They noted that this would mean that Tewkesbury district would be divided between three constituencies, but considered this to be necessary to get the best solution overall for the sub-region.

**3.107** By including the two Quedgeley wards in a Gloucester constituency, the counter-proposal allowed for the inclusion of the three Stroud district wards of Berkeley, Minchinhampton and Nailsworth in a Stroud constituency. They agreed that this would produce a compact Stroud constituency, and means that Stroud district would only contain parts of two constituencies. They considered that there was no case to move the Bisley and Painswick wards to The Cotswolds constituency. While the Minchinhampton ward is part of the existing The Cotswolds constituency, there were representations, such as from Elizabeth Peters (BCE-21431), calling for Minchinhampton to be included in a Stroud constituency.

**3.108** The assistant commissioners noted that the electorate of Stroud district was too large to be included in one constituency. They acknowledged the ties between Cam and Dursley and the town of Stroud, but concluded that including the six wards from the south of Stroud district in a Dursley, Thornbury and Yate constituency allowed for the best solution for the sub-region as a whole.

**3.109** Our assistant commissioners considered that the initial proposals for Filton and Bradley Stoke, and Kingswood constituencies, which only resulted in two South Gloucestershire district wards changing constituencies, did not need to be altered.

**3.110** Overall, they noted that the recommended counter-proposal (discussed earlier in this chapter) was a better match to existing constituency boundaries, thereby better respecting the statutory rules.

**3.111** The assistant commissioners noted that there were suggestions for alternative names for some of the proposed constituencies. The Conservative Party suggested the alternative name of Stroud Valleys and Vale for the proposed Stroud constituency. The assistant commissioners saw no merit in adopting a longer name when Stroud succinctly describes the constituency. The Labour Party suggested the Tewkesbury constituency should be renamed as Tewkesbury and North Gloucester. The assistant commissioners also saw no merit in adopting the longer name. A number of representations, such as M Butson (BCE-16252), called for the proposed West Gloucestershire constituency to retain the existing name of Forest of Dean. The assistant commissioners accepted these arguments, noting that there was very little change to the existing constituency under the counter-proposal they recommended, and proposed that the constituency be named Forest of Dean.

**3.112** We considered the assistant commissioners' recommendations were an improvement on the initial proposals and adopted them as our revised proposals. Our policy on splitting wards is that we must be convinced that there are exceptional and compelling reasons to do so. The assistant commissioners presented to us the evidence of the break in local ties by the removal of the Springbank ward from the Cheltenham constituency, and we agree that this issue must be addressed. They also set out for us the beneficial consequential changes to the county that can be made if we split the Coombe Hill ward across two constituencies. We therefore accept the assistant commissioners' recommendations for this area.

## North Somerset

**3.113** There are currently two constituencies within this sub-region (North Somerset and Weston-super-Mare). Both existing constituencies have electorates within the permitted electorate range. We therefore did not propose any change to either constituency in this sub-region.

**3.114** There was general support for our initial proposals. The Conservative Party (BCE-31941), the Labour Party (BCE-33148) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) all supported both proposed constituencies. However, Councillor Donald Davies (BCE-15176) considered that the North Somerset constituency was a 'collection of disparate small towns and villages', and suggested that there should be a cross-river constituency with Bristol. Oliver Raven (BCE-33022) objected to our proposal and suggested including the Winford ward from the North

Somerset constituency and the Blagdon and Churchill ward from the Weston-super-Mare constituency in a North East Somerset constituency.

**3.115** The assistant commissioners considered that there was no need to alter the proposed constituencies, given that they are unchanged from the existing constituencies. We are in full agreement with them.

## Swindon

**3.116** Of the two existing constituencies in this sub-region, only one (North Swindon) has an electorate within the permitted electorate range. We noted that two Swindon borough wards (Covingham and Dorcan, and Mannington and Western) are currently divided between both existing constituencies. We proposed to include the whole of the Mannington and Western ward in the South Swindon constituency and to include the whole of the Covingham and Dorcan ward in the North Swindon constituency. We noted that the majority of the existing Mannington and Western ward was in the existing North Swindon constituency, but that this change was better geographically, as to include this ward in the North Swindon constituency would have isolated the Lydiard and Freshbrook, and Shaw wards from the rest of the South Swindon constituency.

**3.117** There was general support for our initial proposals. The Conservative Party (BCE-31941), the Labour Party (BCE-33148) and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-32821) all supported both proposed constituencies. Justin Tomlinson Member of Parliament for North Swindon (BCE-21222) identified the community ties

this proposal preserves, saying ‘These recommendations gets both the North Swindon & South Swindon constituencies closer to the quota, makes the most sense geographically & crucially, causes the least disruption to local communities.’

**3.118** There have been, however, some objections to our proposals, for example Pauline Spink (BCE-20700) and Robert Albright (BCE-20732) submitted objections to the inclusion of the whole of Covingham and Dorcan ward in the North Swindon constituency. Daniel Mosley (BCE-16039) also objected to including the Covingham and Dorcan ward in the North Swindon constituency, pointing out that ‘you result in having parts of Liden in a North Swindon constituency; which is pretty much as south Swindon as you can go.’ He submitted a counter-proposal for a Swindon East and Swindon West constituency. Oliver Raven (BCE-33022) also suggested a different Swindon East and Swindon West constituency.

**3.119** Our assistant commissioners rejected all of these counter-proposals in Swindon. They considered that they each made more change than was necessary to create two constituencies within the permitted electorate range and noted that none of the counter-proposals had support from anyone other than the proposer. We agreed with them that no changes needed to be made.



## 4 How to have your say

**4.1** We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Government.

**4.2** While people are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. While we will consider representations that comment again on the initial proposals that we have not revised, it is likely that particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to depart at this late stage in the review from those of our initial proposals, which have withstood intensive scrutiny of objections in the process of consultation and review to which they have already been subject. Representations relating to initial proposals that we have not revised and that simply repeat evidence or arguments that have already been raised in either of the previous two consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.

**4.3** When responding, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament and the decisions we have taken regarding adoption of a regional approach and use of local government wards discussed in chapter 2 and in the Guide. Most importantly:

- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight).
- We are obliged by law to use the Parliamentary electorate figures as they were in the statutory electoral register published by local electoral registration officers between December 2015 and February 2016. We therefore cannot base our proposals for this constituency review on any subsequent electorate figures.
- We are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (at May 2015) as the building blocks of constituencies. Exceptional and compelling evidence needs to be provided to persuade us that splitting a ward across two constituencies is necessary or appropriate.
- We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Particularly compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

**4.4** These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a representation on a specific area to bear in mind the knock-on effects of their counter-proposals. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

## How can you give us your views?

**4.5** We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk), when contributing to our consultation. That website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can instantly and directly submit to us your views on our revised proposals. If you are unable to access our consultation website for any reason, you can still write to us at 35 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BQ.

**4.6** We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available in our Data Protection and Privacy Policy, at: <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/freedom-of-information-and-data-protection>

## What do we want views on?

**4.7** We would like particularly to ask two things of those considering responding on the revised proposals we have set out. First, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so, as well as telling us where you object to them. Past experience suggests that too often people who agree with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals. Second, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, do please use the resources available on our website and at the places of deposit (maps and electorate figures) to put forward counter-proposals which are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.

**4.8** Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in September 2018.

# Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
<b>1. Bath CC</b>			<b>73,586</b>
	Abbey	Bath and North East Somerset	3,554
	Bathavon North	Bath and North East Somerset	5,586
	Bathavon South	Bath and North East Somerset	2,105
	Bathwick	Bath and North East Somerset	3,262
	Combe Down	Bath and North East Somerset	3,813
	Kingsmead	Bath and North East Somerset	3,526
	Lambridge	Bath and North East Somerset	4,062
	Lansdown	Bath and North East Somerset	3,097
	Lyncombe	Bath and North East Somerset	4,175
	Newbridge	Bath and North East Somerset	4,119
	Odd Down	Bath and North East Somerset	3,912
	Oldfield	Bath and North East Somerset	3,919
	Peasedown	Bath and North East Somerset	4,929
	Southdown	Bath and North East Somerset	4,005
	Twerton	Bath and North East Somerset	3,578
	Walcot	Bath and North East Somerset	4,004
	Westmoreland	Bath and North East Somerset	4,424
	Weston	Bath and North East Somerset	3,989
	Widcombe	Bath and North East Somerset	3,527
<b>2. Bideford, Bude and Launceston CC</b>			<b>71,465</b>
	Bude	Cornwall	5,905
	Camelford	Cornwall	2,952
	Grenville and Stratton	Cornwall	3,279
	Launceston Central	Cornwall	2,500
	Launceston North and North Petherwin	Cornwall	3,552
	Launceston South	Cornwall	2,681
	Poundstock	Cornwall	3,458
	St. Teath and St. Breward	Cornwall	3,085
	Tintagel	Cornwall	3,019
	Appledore	Torridge	2,216
	Bideford East	Torridge	4,785
	Bideford North	Torridge	4,277
	Bideford South	Torridge	4,220
	Broadheath	Torridge	1,371
	Clovelly Bay	Torridge	1,224
	Coham Bridge	Torridge	1,310
	Forest	Torridge	1,420
	Hartland and Bradworthy	Torridge	2,438
	Holsworthy	Torridge	3,269
	Kenwith	Torridge	1,346
	Monkleigh and Littleham	Torridge	1,232
	Northam	Torridge	4,361
	Orchard Hill	Torridge	1,453
	Shebbear and Langtree	Torridge	1,538
	Tamarside	Torridge	1,383
	Waldon	Torridge	1,378
	Westward Ho!	Torridge	1,813
<b>3. Bodmin and St. Austell CC</b>			<b>72,375</b>
	Bodmin St. Leonard	Cornwall	3,007
	Bodmin St. Mary's	Cornwall	3,332
	Bodmin St. Petroc	Cornwall	3,593
	Bugle	Cornwall	3,333

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Fowey and Tywardreath	Cornwall	3,167
	Lanivet and Blisland	Cornwall	3,056
	Mevagissey	Cornwall	3,086
	Mount Charles	Cornwall	3,219
	Padstow	Cornwall	3,063
	Par and St. Blazey Gate	Cornwall	3,016
	Penwithick and Boscoppa	Cornwall	3,309
	Roche	Cornwall	2,831
	St. Austell Bay	Cornwall	3,608
	St. Austell Bethel	Cornwall	3,499
	St. Austell Gover	Cornwall	3,055
	St. Austell Poltair	Cornwall	3,256
	St. Blazey	Cornwall	2,986
	St. Issey and St. Tudy	Cornwall	3,305
	St. Mewan	Cornwall	2,967
	St. Minver and St. Endellion	Cornwall	2,394
	St. Stephen-In-Brannel	Cornwall	3,456
	Wadebridge East	Cornwall	3,022
	Wadebridge West	Cornwall	2,815
<b>4. Bournemouth East BC</b>			<b>71,748</b>
	Boscombe East	Bournemouth	7,396
	Boscombe West	Bournemouth	5,612
	East Cliff and Springbourne	Bournemouth	7,804
	East Southbourne and Tuckton	Bournemouth	7,973
	Littledown and Iford	Bournemouth	7,429
	Moordown	Bournemouth	7,325
	Queen's Park	Bournemouth	7,522
	Strouden Park	Bournemouth	7,191
	Throop and Muscliff	Bournemouth	6,672
	West Southbourne	Bournemouth	6,824
<b>5. Bournemouth West BC</b>			<b>77,012</b>
	Central	Bournemouth	6,240
	Kinson North	Bournemouth	7,662
	Kinson South	Bournemouth	7,674
	Redhill and Northbourne	Bournemouth	7,656
	Talbot and Branksome Woods	Bournemouth	6,762
	Wallisdown and Winton West	Bournemouth	7,370
	Westbourne and West Cliff	Bournemouth	7,865
	Winton East	Bournemouth	7,428
	Alderney	Poole	7,780
	Branksome East	Poole	5,396
	Branksome West	Poole	5,179
<b>6. Bridgwater and West Somerset CC</b>			<b>73,223</b>
	Bridgwater Dunwear	Sedgemoor	3,401
	Bridgwater Eastover	Sedgemoor	2,885
	Bridgwater Fairfax	Sedgemoor	4,973
	Bridgwater Hamp	Sedgemoor	3,566
	Bridgwater Victoria	Sedgemoor	3,785
	Bridgwater Westover	Sedgemoor	3,663
	Bridgwater Wyndham	Sedgemoor	3,602
	Cannington and Wembdon	Sedgemoor	3,529
	East Polden	Sedgemoor	1,634
	King's Isle	Sedgemoor	4,022
	North Petherton	Sedgemoor	6,373
	Quantocks	Sedgemoor	3,614
	West Polden	Sedgemoor	1,912
	Alcombe	West Somerset	2,103
	Brendon Hills	West Somerset	955
	Carhampton and Withycombe	West Somerset	952
	Crowcombe and Stogumber	West Somerset	955
	Dulverton and District	West Somerset	1,915

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Dunster and Timberscombe	West Somerset	954
	Greater Exmoor	West Somerset	918
	Minehead Central	West Somerset	2,842
	Minehead North	West Somerset	1,653
	Minehead South	West Somerset	1,946
	Old Cleeve	West Somerset	1,717
	Porlock and District	West Somerset	1,857
	Quantock Vale	West Somerset	1,632
	Watchet	West Somerset	2,834
	West Quantock	West Somerset	901
	Williton	West Somerset	2,130
<b>7. Bristol East BC</b>			<b>76,627</b>
	Brislington East	Bristol	8,602
	Brislington West	Bristol	8,223
	Easton	Bristol	8,428
	Eastville	Bristol	8,210
	Frome Vale	Bristol	8,185
	Hillfields	Bristol	9,237
	St. George East	Bristol	9,040
	St. George West	Bristol	8,302
	Stockwood	Bristol	8,400
<b>8. Bristol North West BC</b>			<b>71,869</b>
	Avonmouth	Bristol	8,745
	Henbury	Bristol	7,508
	Henleaze	Bristol	7,895
	Horfield	Bristol	9,225
	Kingsweston	Bristol	7,324
	Lockleaze	Bristol	8,051
	Southmead	Bristol	7,844
	Stoke Bishop	Bristol	7,254
	Westbury-on-Trym	Bristol	8,023
<b>9. Bristol South BC</b>			<b>78,060</b>
	Bedminster	Bristol	9,654
	Bishopsworth	Bristol	8,513
	Filwood	Bristol	8,026
	Hartcliffe	Bristol	8,499
	Hengrove	Bristol	8,830
	Knowle	Bristol	8,166
	Southville	Bristol	9,266
	Whitchurch Park	Bristol	7,907
	Windmill Hill	Bristol	9,199
<b>10. Bristol West BC</b>			<b>73,639</b>
	Ashley	Bristol	10,383
	Bishopston	Bristol	9,823
	Cabot	Bristol	10,296
	Clifton	Bristol	8,127
	Clifton East	Bristol	7,491
	Cotham	Bristol	9,231
	Lawrence Hill	Bristol	9,827
	Redland	Bristol	8,461
<b>11. Central Devon CC</b>			<b>71,231</b>
	Boniface	Mid Devon	2,798
	Bradninch	Mid Devon	1,491
	Cadbury	Mid Devon	1,288
	Lawrence	Mid Devon	2,761
	Newbrooke	Mid Devon	1,195
	Sandford and Creedy	Mid Devon	2,653
	Silverton	Mid Devon	1,469
	Taw	Mid Devon	1,297
	Taw Vale	Mid Devon	1,315

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Upper Yeo	Mid Devon	1,334
	Way	Mid Devon	1,213
	Yeo	Mid Devon	2,609
	Ashburton and Buckfastleigh	Teignbridge	6,060
	Bovey	Teignbridge	6,437
	Haytor	Teignbridge	2,287
	Moorland	Teignbridge	2,264
	Teign Valley	Teignbridge	2,206
	Teignbridge North	Teignbridge	2,423
	Clinton	Torrige	1,251
	Three Moors	Torrige	1,339
	Torrington	Torrige	4,240
	Two Rivers	Torrige	1,498
	Winkleigh	Torrige	1,699
	Bridestowe	West Devon	2,465
	Chagford	West Devon	1,152
	Drewsteignton	West Devon	1,325
	Exbourne	West Devon	2,968
	Hatherleigh	West Devon	2,341
	Okehampton North	West Devon	3,642
	Okehampton South	West Devon	2,696
	South Tawton	West Devon	1,515
<b>12. Cheltenham BC</b>			<b>77,222</b>
	All Saints	Cheltenham	3,909
	Battledown	Cheltenham	4,142
	Benhall and The Reddings	Cheltenham	4,095
	Charlton Kings	Cheltenham	4,370
	Charlton Park	Cheltenham	4,028
	College	Cheltenham	4,184
	Hesters Way	Cheltenham	4,681
	Lansdown	Cheltenham	3,989
	Leckhampton	Cheltenham	4,290
	Oakley	Cheltenham	4,278
	Park	Cheltenham	4,703
	Pittville	Cheltenham	4,344
	Springbank	Cheltenham	4,557
	St. Mark's	Cheltenham	4,533
	St. Paul's	Cheltenham	3,904
	St. Peter's	Cheltenham	4,595
	Up Hatherley	Cheltenham	4,274
	Warden Hill	Cheltenham	4,346
<b>13. Christchurch CC</b>			<b>78,506</b>
	Burton and Winkton	Christchurch	3,334
	Grange	Christchurch	3,405
	Highcliffe	Christchurch	3,065
	Jumpers	Christchurch	3,256
	Mudford and Friars Cliff	Christchurch	4,161
	North Highcliffe and Walkford	Christchurch	2,928
	Portfield	Christchurch	3,208
	Purewell and Stanpit	Christchurch	3,294
	St. Catherine's and Hurn	Christchurch	3,217
	Town Centre	Christchurch	3,329
	West Highcliffe	Christchurch	4,706
	Ameysford	East Dorset	2,403
	Ferndown Central	East Dorset	6,769
	Hampreston & Longham	East Dorset	2,660
	Parley	East Dorset	4,562
	St. Leonards	East Dorset	7,174
	Verwood East	East Dorset	4,646
	Verwood West	East Dorset	5,079
	West Moors & Holt	East Dorset	7,310

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
14. Devizes CC			75,543
	Aldbourn and Ramsbury	Wiltshire	3,881
	Bromham, Rowde and Potterne	Wiltshire	3,784
	Burbage and the Bedwyns	Wiltshire	3,719
	Calne Central	Wiltshire	3,164
	Calne Chilvester and Abberd	Wiltshire	3,770
	Calne North	Wiltshire	3,095
	Calne Rural	Wiltshire	3,398
	Calne South and Cherhill	Wiltshire	3,689
	Devizes and Roundway South	Wiltshire	3,392
	Devizes East	Wiltshire	3,003
	Devizes North	Wiltshire	3,028
	Ludgershall and Perham Down	Wiltshire	3,350
	Marlborough East	Wiltshire	3,170
	Marlborough West	Wiltshire	2,848
	Pewsey	Wiltshire	3,743
	Pewsey Vale	Wiltshire	3,451
	Roundway	Wiltshire	3,288
	The Collingbournes and Netheravon	Wiltshire	3,156
	The Lavingtons and Erlestoke	Wiltshire	3,961
	Tidworth	Wiltshire	3,759
	Urchfont and The Cannings	Wiltshire	3,670
	West Selkley	Wiltshire	3,224
15. Dursley, Thornbury and Yate CC			73,901
	Charfield	South Gloucestershire	3,145
	Chipping Sodbury	South Gloucestershire	5,454
	Cotswold Edge	South Gloucestershire	2,725
	Dodington	South Gloucestershire	5,778
	Ladden Brook	South Gloucestershire	3,101
	Severn	South Gloucestershire	3,010
	Thornbury North	South Gloucestershire	6,178
	Thornbury South and Alveston	South Gloucestershire	5,982
	Westerleigh	South Gloucestershire	3,164
	Yate Central	South Gloucestershire	6,406
	Yate North	South Gloucestershire	8,771
	Cam East	Stroud	3,465
	Cam West	Stroud	3,261
	Dursley	Stroud	5,128
	Kingswood	Stroud	1,662
	Vale	Stroud	1,562
	Wotton-under-Edge	Stroud	5,109
16. East Devon CC			73,355
	Broadclyst	East Devon	5,653
	Budleigh	East Devon	5,057
	Clyst Valley	East Devon	1,916
	Exe Valley	East Devon	1,587
	Exmouth Brixington	East Devon	4,989
	Exmouth Halsdon	East Devon	5,272
	Exmouth Littleham	East Devon	5,797
	Exmouth Town	East Devon	4,662
	Exmouth Withycombe Raleigh	East Devon	5,370
	Newton Poppleford and Harpford	East Devon	1,716
	Ottery St. Mary Rural	East Devon	3,410
	Ottery St. Mary Town	East Devon	3,874
	Raleigh	East Devon	1,681
	Sidmouth Rural	East Devon	1,903
	Sidmouth Sidford	East Devon	5,335
	Sidmouth Town	East Devon	4,487
	Whimble	East Devon	1,930
	Woodbury and Lypstone	East Devon	3,493
	Topsham	Exeter	5,223

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
<b>17. Exeter BC</b>			<b>76,008</b>
	Alphington	Exeter	6,189
	Cowick	Exeter	4,247
	Duryard	Exeter	2,218
	Exwick	Exeter	6,138
	Heavitree	Exeter	3,997
	Mincinglake	Exeter	3,952
	Newtown	Exeter	3,523
	Pennsylvania	Exeter	3,855
	Pinhoe	Exeter	4,984
	Polsloe	Exeter	4,167
	Priory	Exeter	6,468
	St. David's	Exeter	3,863
	St. James	Exeter	3,908
	St. Leonard's	Exeter	3,710
	St. Loyes	Exeter	4,604
	St. Thomas	Exeter	4,588
	Whipton & Barton	Exeter	5,597
<b>18. Falmouth, Camborne and Redruth CC</b>			<b>72,184</b>
	Camborne Pendarves	Cornwall	3,049
	Camborne Roskear	Cornwall	3,261
	Camborne Trelowarren	Cornwall	3,036
	Camborne Treslothan	Cornwall	2,887
	Camborne Treswithian	Cornwall	2,810
	Carharrack, Gwennap and St. Day	Cornwall	3,630
	Constantine, Mawnan and Budock	Cornwall	3,656
	Falmouth Arwenack	Cornwall	2,638
	Falmouth Boslowick	Cornwall	3,591
	Falmouth Penwerris	Cornwall	3,092
	Falmouth Smithick	Cornwall	2,964
	Falmouth Trescobeas	Cornwall	3,363
	Four Lanes	Cornwall	3,305
	Illogan	Cornwall	3,509
	Lanner and Stithians	Cornwall	3,640
	Mabe, Perranarworthal and St. Gluvais	Cornwall	3,714
	Penryn East and Mylor	Cornwall	3,904
	Penryn West	Cornwall	3,239
	Pool and Tehidy	Cornwall	3,001
	Redruth Central	Cornwall	2,792
	Redruth North	Cornwall	4,210
	Redruth South	Cornwall	2,893
<b>19. Filton and Bradley Stoke CC</b>			<b>75,495</b>
	Almondsbury	South Gloucestershire	3,254
	Bradley Stoke Central and Stoke Lodge	South Gloucestershire	5,717
	Bradley Stoke North	South Gloucestershire	2,835
	Bradley Stoke South	South Gloucestershire	6,137
	Downend	South Gloucestershire	8,777
	Filton	South Gloucestershire	7,506
	Frampton Cotterell	South Gloucestershire	6,040
	Frenchay and Stoke Park	South Gloucestershire	4,058
	Patchway	South Gloucestershire	7,613
	Pilning and Severn Beach	South Gloucestershire	2,777
	Staple Hill	South Gloucestershire	5,683
	Stoke Gifford	South Gloucestershire	9,029
	Winterbourne	South Gloucestershire	6,069
<b>20. Forest of Dean CC</b>			<b>71,648</b>
	Alvington, Aylburton and West Lydney	Forest of Dean	2,451
	Awre	Forest of Dean	1,351
	Berry Hill	Forest of Dean	1,293
	Blaisdon and Longhope	Forest of Dean	1,430
	Bream	Forest of Dean	2,508



Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Bromesberrow and Dymock	Forest of Dean	1,548
	Christchurch and English Bicknor	Forest of Dean	1,307
	Churcham and Huntley	Forest of Dean	1,437
	Cinderford East	Forest of Dean	2,593
	Cinderford West	Forest of Dean	3,846
	Coleford Central	Forest of Dean	2,669
	Coleford East	Forest of Dean	4,167
	Hartpury	Forest of Dean	1,375
	Hewelsfield and Woolaston	Forest of Dean	1,422
	Littledean and Ruspidge	Forest of Dean	3,211
	Lydbrook and Ruardean	Forest of Dean	3,914
	Lydney East	Forest of Dean	4,009
	Lydney North	Forest of Dean	1,512
	Mitcheldean and Drybrook	Forest of Dean	3,553
	Newent Central	Forest of Dean	3,140
	Newland and St. Briavels	Forest of Dean	2,772
	Newnham and Westbury	Forest of Dean	2,478
	Oxenhall and Newent North East	Forest of Dean	1,287
	Pillowell	Forest of Dean	2,910
	Redmarley	Forest of Dean	1,449
	Tibberton	Forest of Dean	1,389
	Tidenham	Forest of Dean	4,154
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district DRH)	Tewkesbury	762
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district LGH)	Tewkesbury	243
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district LNG)	Tewkesbury	1,013
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district NRT)	Tewkesbury	377
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district SND)	Tewkesbury	396
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district TWG)	Tewkesbury	267
	Highnam with Haw Bridge	Tewkesbury	3,415
<b>21. Gloucester BC</b>			<b>74,774</b>
	Abbey	Gloucester	7,099
	Barnwood	Gloucester	7,169
	Barton and Tredworth	Gloucester	6,204
	Grange	Gloucester	4,353
	Hucclecote	Gloucester	6,832
	Kingsholm and Wotton	Gloucester	4,779
	Matson and Robinswood	Gloucester	7,195
	Moreland	Gloucester	6,685
	Podsmead	Gloucester	2,118
	Quedgeley Fieldcourt	Gloucester	7,936
	Quedgeley Severn Vale	Gloucester	5,123
	Tuffley	Gloucester	4,429
	Westgate	Gloucester	4,852
<b>22. Kingswood CC</b>			<b>73,384</b>
	Bitton	South Gloucestershire	2,774
	Boyd Valley	South Gloucestershire	5,815
	Emersons Green	South Gloucestershire	9,237
	Hanham	South Gloucestershire	8,882
	Kings Chase	South Gloucestershire	8,239
	Longwell Green	South Gloucestershire	5,727
	Oldland Common	South Gloucestershire	5,968
	Parkwall	South Gloucestershire	6,139
	Rodway	South Gloucestershire	8,592
	Siston	South Gloucestershire	3,623
	Woodstock	South Gloucestershire	8,388
<b>23. Mid Dorset CC</b>			<b>77,172</b>
	Alderholt	East Dorset	2,444
	Colehill East	East Dorset	4,898
	Colehill West	East Dorset	2,042
	Corfe Mullen	East Dorset	7,908

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Crane	East Dorset	2,512
	Handley Vale	East Dorset	2,278
	Stour	East Dorset	2,177
	Wimborne Minster	East Dorset	4,998
	Abbey	North Dorset	2,913
	Blandford Central	North Dorset	2,999
	Blandford Hilltop	North Dorset	1,537
	Blandford Langton St. Leonards	North Dorset	1,513
	Blandford Old Town	North Dorset	1,318
	Lower Tarrants	North Dorset	1,484
	Riversdale & Portman	North Dorset	2,757
	Broadstone	Poole	8,335
	Merley & Bearwood	Poole	7,965
	Bere Regis	Purbeck	1,352
	Lytchett Matravers	Purbeck	2,712
	Lytchett Minster and Upton East	Purbeck	3,058
	Lytchett Minster and Upton West	Purbeck	3,039
	St. Martin	Purbeck	2,506
	Wareham	Purbeck	4,427
<b>24. Newton Abbot CC</b>			<b>71,099</b>
	Bishopsteignton	Teignbridge	2,171
	Bradley	Teignbridge	4,421
	Buckland and Milber	Teignbridge	5,546
	Bushell	Teignbridge	4,992
	Chudleigh	Teignbridge	4,959
	College	Teignbridge	3,914
	Dawlish Central and North East	Teignbridge	7,003
	Dawlish South West	Teignbridge	3,909
	Kenn Valley	Teignbridge	5,067
	Kenton with Starcross	Teignbridge	2,356
	Kerswell-with-Combe	Teignbridge	4,634
	Kingsteignton East	Teignbridge	4,568
	Kingsteignton West	Teignbridge	4,134
	Shaldon and Stokeinteignhead	Teignbridge	1,986
	Teignmouth Central	Teignbridge	3,732
	Teignmouth East	Teignbridge	3,959
	Teignmouth West	Teignbridge	3,748
<b>25. North Devon CC</b>			<b>73,240</b>
	Bickington and Roundswell	North Devon	3,523
	Bishop's Nympton	North Devon	1,715
	Bratton Fleming	North Devon	1,668
	Braunton East	North Devon	3,208
	Braunton West	North Devon	3,403
	Central Town	North Devon	3,468
	Chittlehampton	North Devon	2,010
	Chulmleigh	North Devon	1,827
	Combe Martin	North Devon	3,243
	Forches and Whiddon Valley	North Devon	3,035
	Fremington	North Devon	3,609
	Georgeham and Morteohoe	North Devon	2,881
	Heanton Punchardon	North Devon	1,522
	Ilfracombe Central	North Devon	3,229
	Ilfracombe East	North Devon	1,972
	Ilfracombe West	North Devon	3,468
	Instow	North Devon	1,244
	Landkey, Swimbridge and Taw	North Devon	4,003
	Longbridge	North Devon	3,378
	Lynton and Lynmouth	North Devon	1,391
	Marwood	North Devon	1,565
	Newport	North Devon	3,557
	North Molton	North Devon	1,753

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Pilton	North Devon	3,455
	South Molton	North Devon	3,904
	Witheridge	North Devon	1,942
	Yeo Valley	North Devon	3,267
<b>26. North East Somerset CC</b>			<b>73,006</b>
	Bathavon West	Bath and North East Somerset	1,984
	Chew Valley North	Bath and North East Somerset	1,923
	Chew Valley South	Bath and North East Somerset	2,037
	Clutton	Bath and North East Somerset	1,993
	Farmborough	Bath and North East Somerset	2,034
	High Littleton	Bath and North East Somerset	2,358
	Keynsham East	Bath and North East Somerset	4,412
	Keynsham North	Bath and North East Somerset	4,001
	Keynsham South	Bath and North East Somerset	4,034
	Mendip	Bath and North East Somerset	2,111
	Midsomer Norton North	Bath and North East Somerset	4,468
	Midsomer Norton Redfield	Bath and North East Somerset	4,170
	Paulton	Bath and North East Somerset	4,332
	Publow and Whitchurch	Bath and North East Somerset	2,018
	Radstock	Bath and North East Somerset	3,928
	Saltford	Bath and North East Somerset	3,419
	Timsbury	Bath and North East Somerset	2,067
	Westfield	Bath and North East Somerset	4,532
	Ammerdown	Mendip	1,810
	Ashwick, Chilcompton and Stratton	Mendip	3,342
	Chewton Mendip and Ston Easton	Mendip	1,611
	Coleford and Holcombe	Mendip	3,570
	Shepton East	Mendip	3,331
	Shepton West	Mendip	3,521
<b>27. North Somerset CC</b>			<b>75,979</b>
	Backwell	North Somerset	3,514
	Clevedon East	North Somerset	3,153
	Clevedon South	North Somerset	3,218
	Clevedon Walton	North Somerset	3,346
	Clevedon West	North Somerset	3,091
	Clevedon Yeo	North Somerset	3,156
	Gordano Valley	North Somerset	3,370
	Long Ashton	North Somerset	6,267
	Nailsea Golden Valley	North Somerset	3,330
	Nailsea West End	North Somerset	2,931
	Nailsea Yeo	North Somerset	3,226
	Nailsea Youngwood	North Somerset	2,757
	Pill	North Somerset	3,255
	Portishead East	North Somerset	4,926
	Portishead North	North Somerset	3,659
	Portishead South	North Somerset	3,191
	Portishead West	North Somerset	6,948
	Winford	North Somerset	3,239
	Wrington	North Somerset	3,096
	Yatton	North Somerset	6,306
<b>28. North Swindon CC</b>			<b>76,254</b>
	Blunsdon and Highworth	Swindon	8,634
	Covingham and Dorcan	Swindon	8,413
	Gorse Hill and Pinehurst	Swindon	8,209
	Haydon Wick	Swindon	8,779
	Penhill and Upper Stratton	Swindon	9,100
	Priory Vale	Swindon	7,986
	Rodbourne Cheney	Swindon	8,678
	St. Andrews	Swindon	7,613
	St. Margaret and South Marston	Swindon	8,842

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
<b>29. North Wiltshire CC</b>			<b>73,782</b>
	Box and Colerne	Wiltshire	3,670
	Brinkworth	Wiltshire	3,687
	By Brook	Wiltshire	3,475
	Chippenham Cepen Park and Derriads	Wiltshire	3,326
	Chippenham Cepen Park and Redlands	Wiltshire	3,355
	Chippenham Hardenhuish	Wiltshire	3,210
	Chippenham Hardens and England	Wiltshire	3,005
	Chippenham Lowden and Rowden	Wiltshire	3,430
	Chippenham Monkton	Wiltshire	2,921
	Chippenham Pewsham	Wiltshire	3,266
	Chippenham Queens and Sheldon	Wiltshire	3,244
	Cricklade and Latton	Wiltshire	3,816
	Kington	Wiltshire	3,822
	Lyneham	Wiltshire	2,876
	Malmesbury	Wiltshire	3,790
	Minety	Wiltshire	3,700
	Purton	Wiltshire	3,637
	Sherston	Wiltshire	3,891
	Royal Wootton Bassett East	Wiltshire	3,654
	Royal Wootton Bassett North	Wiltshire	3,395
	Royal Wootton Bassett South	Wiltshire	4,612
<b>30. Plymouth Moor View BC</b>			<b>75,751</b>
	Budshead	Plymouth	9,146
	Eggbuckland	Plymouth	9,854
	Ham	Plymouth	9,094
	Honicknowle	Plymouth	9,761
	Moor View	Plymouth	9,142
	Peverell	Plymouth	9,846
	Southway	Plymouth	9,670
	St. Budeaux	Plymouth	9,238
<b>31. Plymouth Sutton and Devonport BC</b>			<b>78,406</b>
	Compton	Plymouth	8,529
	Devonport	Plymouth	9,380
	Drake	Plymouth	5,504
	Efford and Lipson	Plymouth	9,121
	Plymstock Dunstone	Plymouth	9,465
	Plymstock Radford	Plymouth	9,800
	St. Peter and the Waterfront	Plymouth	9,221
	Stoke	Plymouth	8,796
	Sutton and Mount Gould	Plymouth	8,590
<b>32. Plympton, Tavistock and Ivybridge CC</b>			<b>72,375</b>
	Plympton Chaddlewood	Plymouth	5,945
	Plympton Erle	Plymouth	6,680
	Plympton St. Mary	Plymouth	9,973
	Bickleigh & Cornwood	South Hams	2,197
	Charterlands	South Hams	2,217
	Ermington & Ugborough	South Hams	2,195
	Ivybridge East	South Hams	4,201
	Ivybridge West	South Hams	4,634
	Newton & Yelmpton	South Hams	4,785
	Wembury & Brixton	South Hams	3,664
	Woolwell	South Hams	2,215
	Bere Ferrers	West Devon	2,847
	Buckland Monachorum	West Devon	2,969
	Burrator	West Devon	2,866
	Dartmoor	West Devon	1,363
	Mary Tavy	West Devon	1,305
	Milton Ford	West Devon	1,454
	Tamarside	West Devon	1,400

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Tavistock North	West Devon	3,696
	Tavistock South East	West Devon	2,946
	Tavistock South West	West Devon	2,823
<b>33. Poole BC</b>			<b>73,678</b>
	Canford Cliffs	Poole	7,862
	Canford Heath East	Poole	5,106
	Canford Heath West	Poole	4,949
	Creekmoor	Poole	7,051
	Hamworthy East	Poole	4,598
	Hamworthy West	Poole	4,894
	Newtown	Poole	7,926
	Oakdale	Poole	7,853
	Parkstone	Poole	8,218
	Penn Hill	Poole	7,804
	Poole Town	Poole	7,417
<b>34. Salisbury CC</b>			<b>77,247</b>
	Alderbury and Whiteparish	Wiltshire	3,314
	Amesbury East	Wiltshire	4,199
	Amesbury West	Wiltshire	3,580
	Bourne and Woodford Valley	Wiltshire	3,354
	Bulford, Allington and Figheldean	Wiltshire	3,817
	Downton and Ebble Valley	Wiltshire	3,679
	Durrington and Larkhill	Wiltshire	4,711
	Fovant and Chalke Valley	Wiltshire	3,283
	Laverstock, Ford and Old Sarum	Wiltshire	3,685
	Redlynch and Landford	Wiltshire	3,707
	Salisbury Bemerton	Wiltshire	4,230
	Salisbury Fisherton and Bemerton Village	Wiltshire	3,296
	Salisbury Harnham	Wiltshire	3,911
	Salisbury St. Edmund and Milford	Wiltshire	3,425
	Salisbury St. Francis and Stratford	Wiltshire	3,987
	Salisbury St. Mark's and Bishopdown	Wiltshire	3,522
	Salisbury St. Martin's and Cathedral	Wiltshire	3,930
	Salisbury St. Paul's	Wiltshire	3,464
	Till and Wylde Valley	Wiltshire	3,487
	Wilton and Lower Wylde Valley	Wiltshire	3,565
	Winterslow	Wiltshire	3,101
<b>35. Somerton and Frome CC</b>			<b>72,417</b>
	Beckington and Selwood	Mendip	1,573
	Butleigh and Baltonsborough	Mendip	1,702
	Cranmore, Douling and Nunney	Mendip	1,744
	Creech	Mendip	1,755
	Frome Berkley Down	Mendip	3,265
	Frome College	Mendip	3,230
	Frome Keyford	Mendip	3,692
	Frome Market	Mendip	3,384
	Frome Oakfield	Mendip	1,791
	Frome Park	Mendip	3,453
	Postlebury	Mendip	1,637
	Rode and Norton St. Philip	Mendip	1,787
	The Pennards and Ditcheat	Mendip	1,817
	Blackmoor Vale	South Somerset	4,169
	Bruton	South Somerset	1,863
	Burrow Hill	South Somerset	1,783
	Camelot	South Somerset	2,042
	Cary	South Somerset	4,276
	Curry Rivel	South Somerset	2,031
	Islemoor	South Somerset	2,157
	Langport and Huish	South Somerset	2,253
	Martock	South Somerset	4,332

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Milborne Port	South Somerset	2,188
	Northstone	South Somerset	2,339
	Tower	South Somerset	1,853
	Turn Hill	South Somerset	2,244
	Wessex	South Somerset	4,089
	Wincanton	South Somerset	3,968
<b>36. South Dorset CC</b>			<b>74,789</b>
	Castle	Purbeck	1,411
	Creech Barrow	Purbeck	1,475
	Langton	Purbeck	1,281
	Lulworth and Winfrith	Purbeck	1,331
	Swanage North	Purbeck	3,734
	Swanage South	Purbeck	3,862
	Wool	Purbeck	4,503
	Broadmayne & Crossways	West Dorset	4,201
	Chickerell & Chesil Bank	West Dorset	5,466
	Littlemoor	Weymouth and Portland	2,442
	Melcombe Regis	Weymouth and Portland	3,979
	Preston	Weymouth and Portland	4,213
	Radipole	Weymouth and Portland	2,787
	Tophill East	Weymouth and Portland	2,477
	Tophill West	Weymouth and Portland	3,689
	Underhill	Weymouth and Portland	2,573
	Upwey and Broadwey	Weymouth and Portland	2,780
	Westham East	Weymouth and Portland	2,610
	Westham North	Weymouth and Portland	4,003
	Westham West	Weymouth and Portland	2,752
	Wey Valley	Weymouth and Portland	2,760
	Weymouth East	Weymouth and Portland	2,493
	Weymouth West	Weymouth and Portland	3,848
	Wyke Regis	Weymouth and Portland	4,119
<b>37. South East Cornwall CC</b>			<b>71,138</b>
	Altarnun	Cornwall	2,536
	Callington	Cornwall	3,321
	Gunnislake and Calstock	Cornwall	3,412
	Liskeard East	Cornwall	3,407
	Liskeard North	Cornwall	1,330
	Liskeard West and Dobwalls	Cornwall	3,135
	Looe East	Cornwall	2,559
	Looe West, Lansallos and Lanteglos	Cornwall	3,621
	Lostwithiel	Cornwall	3,212
	Lynher	Cornwall	3,361
	Menheniot	Cornwall	3,014
	Rame Peninsular	Cornwall	3,631
	Saltash East	Cornwall	3,093
	Saltash North	Cornwall	3,030
	Saltash South	Cornwall	3,012
	Saltash West	Cornwall	3,224
	St. Cleer	Cornwall	3,401
	St. Dominick, Harrowbarrow and Kelly Bray	Cornwall	3,323
	St. Germans and Landulph	Cornwall	3,290
	Stokeclimland	Cornwall	2,947
	Torpoint East	Cornwall	2,782
	Torpoint West	Cornwall	2,903
	Trelawny	Cornwall	3,594
<b>38. South Swindon CC</b>			<b>72,332</b>
	Central	Swindon	6,607
	Chiseldon and Lawn	Swindon	4,663
	Eastcott	Swindon	6,430
	Liden, Eldene and Park South	Swindon	8,073

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Lydiard and Freshbrook	Swindon	8,061
	Mannington and Western	Swindon	6,648
	Old Town	Swindon	7,248
	Ridgeway	Swindon	2,484
	Shaw	Swindon	7,799
	Walcot and Park North	Swindon	8,250
	Wroughton and Wichelstowe	Swindon	6,069
<b>39. St. Ives CC</b>			<b>73,971</b>
	Breage, Germoe and Sithney	Cornwall	3,397
	Crowan and Wendron	Cornwall	4,102
	Gulval and Heamoor	Cornwall	3,140
	Gwinear-Gwithian and St. Erth	Cornwall	3,444
	Hayle North	Cornwall	3,387
	Hayle South	Cornwall	3,107
	Helston North	Cornwall	3,504
	Helston South	Cornwall	3,734
	Lelant and Carbis Bay	Cornwall	2,993
	Ludgvan	Cornwall	3,157
	Marazion and Perranuthnoe	Cornwall	3,477
	Mullion and Grade-Ruan	Cornwall	3,211
	Newlyn and Mousehole	Cornwall	3,233
	Penzance Central	Cornwall	2,903
	Penzance East	Cornwall	2,907
	Penzance Promenade	Cornwall	2,938
	Porthleven and Helston West	Cornwall	3,145
	St. Buryan	Cornwall	3,424
	St. Ives East	Cornwall	2,668
	St. Ives West	Cornwall	3,011
	St. Just In Penwith	Cornwall	3,591
	St. Keverne and Meneage	Cornwall	3,847
	Isles of Scilly	Isles of Scilly	1,651
<b>40. Stroud CC</b>			<b>71,107</b>
	Amberley and Woodchester	Stroud	1,714
	Berkeley	Stroud	3,454
	Bisley	Stroud	1,841
	Cainscross	Stroud	5,798
	Central	Stroud	1,722
	Chalford	Stroud	5,096
	Coaley and Uley	Stroud	1,935
	Eastington and Standish	Stroud	1,499
	Farmhill and Paganhill	Stroud	1,647
	Hardwicke	Stroud	4,408
	Minchinhampton	Stroud	3,624
	Nailsworth	Stroud	5,245
	Painswick	Stroud	1,487
	Randwick, Whiteshill and Ruscombe	Stroud	3,688
	Rodborough	Stroud	3,566
	Severn	Stroud	3,801
	Slade	Stroud	1,546
	Stonehouse	Stroud	6,082
	The Stanleys	Stroud	3,361
	Thrupp	Stroud	1,878
	Trinity	Stroud	1,701
	Uplands	Stroud	1,661
	Upton St. Leonards	Stroud	2,411
	Valley	Stroud	1,942
<b>41. Taunton Deane CC</b>			<b>78,187</b>
	Bishop's Hull	Taunton Deane	3,142
	Bishop's Lydeard	Taunton Deane	4,505
	Blackdown	Taunton Deane	1,747

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Bradford-on-Tone	Taunton Deane	1,819
	Comeytrowe	Taunton Deane	4,180
	Milverton and North Deane	Taunton Deane	1,635
	Monument	Taunton Deane	1,695
	Neroche	Taunton Deane	1,779
	North Curry and Stoke St Gregory	Taunton Deane	2,411
	Norton Fitzwarren	Taunton Deane	2,061
	Ruishton and Creech	Taunton Deane	3,169
	Staplegrave	Taunton Deane	2,960
	Taunton Blackbrook and Holway	Taunton Deane	4,185
	Taunton Eastgate	Taunton Deane	2,503
	Taunton Fairwater	Taunton Deane	3,952
	Taunton Halcon	Taunton Deane	3,745
	Taunton Killams and Mountfield	Taunton Deane	2,854
	Taunton Lyngford	Taunton Deane	3,650
	Taunton Manor and Wilton	Taunton Deane	3,933
	Taunton Pyrland and Rowbarton	Taunton Deane	4,171
	Trull	Taunton Deane	1,511
	Wellington East	Taunton Deane	2,894
	Wellington North	Taunton Deane	2,753
	Wellington Rockwell Green and West	Taunton Deane	4,473
	West Monkton	Taunton Deane	3,574
	Wiveliscombe and West Deane	Taunton Deane	2,886
<b>42. Tewkesbury CC</b>			<b>72,645</b>
	Prestbury	Cheltenham	4,389
	Swindon Village	Cheltenham	4,201
	Elmbridge	Gloucester	4,355
	Longlevens	Gloucester	7,298
	Ashchurch with Walton Cardiff	Tewkesbury	3,222
	Badgeworth	Tewkesbury	2,224
	Brockworth	Tewkesbury	5,907
	Churchdown Brookfield	Tewkesbury	3,377
	Churchdown St. John's	Tewkesbury	5,154
	Cleeve Grange	Tewkesbury	1,536
	Cleeve Hill	Tewkesbury	3,220
	Cleeve St. Michael's	Tewkesbury	3,846
	Cleeve West	Tewkesbury	3,266
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district ELH)	Tewkesbury	208
	Part of Coombe Hill (polling district UCK)	Tewkesbury	498
	Hucclecote	Tewkesbury	1,777
	Innsworth with Down Hatherley	Tewkesbury	1,801
	Northway	Tewkesbury	3,626
	Oxenton Hill	Tewkesbury	1,531
	Shurdington	Tewkesbury	1,520
	Tewkesbury Newtown	Tewkesbury	1,585
	Tewkesbury Prior's Park	Tewkesbury	2,900
	Tewkesbury Town with Mitton	Tewkesbury	3,701
	Twynning	Tewkesbury	1,503
<b>43. The Cotswolds CC</b>			<b>72,939</b>
	Abbey	Cotswold	1,859
	Blockley	Cotswold	2,121
	Bourton Vale	Cotswold	2,164
	Bourton Village	Cotswold	1,989
	Campden & Vale	Cotswold	4,331
	Chedworth & Churn Valley	Cotswold	1,975
	Chesterton	Cotswold	1,814
	Coln Valley	Cotswold	1,948
	Ermin	Cotswold	1,994



Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Fairford North	Cotswold	1,825
	Fosseridge	Cotswold	2,065
	Four Acres	Cotswold	1,431
	Grumbolds Ash with Avening	Cotswold	2,005
	Kemble	Cotswold	2,003
	Lechlade, Kempsford & Fairford South	Cotswold	4,184
	Moreton East	Cotswold	1,897
	Moreton West	Cotswold	1,881
	New Mills	Cotswold	1,848
	Northleach	Cotswold	2,074
	Sandywell	Cotswold	2,098
	Siddington & Cerney Rural	Cotswold	1,887
	South Cerney Village	Cotswold	1,943
	St. Michael's	Cotswold	1,857
	Stow	Cotswold	2,081
	Stratton	Cotswold	2,018
	Tetbury East & Rural	Cotswold	1,549
	Tetbury Town	Cotswold	1,602
	Tetbury with Upton	Cotswold	1,686
	The Ampneys & Hampton	Cotswold	2,133
	The Beeches	Cotswold	2,023
	The Rissingtons	Cotswold	1,511
	Watermoor	Cotswold	2,029
	Isbourne	Tewkesbury	1,662
	Winchcombe	Tewkesbury	5,452
<b>44. Tiverton and Honiton CC</b>			<b>75,818</b>
	Axminster Rural	East Devon	2,165
	Axminster Town	East Devon	3,595
	Beer and Branscombe	East Devon	1,517
	Coly Valley	East Devon	3,774
	Dunkeswell	East Devon	1,675
	Feniton and Buckerell	East Devon	1,841
	Honiton St. Michael's	East Devon	5,232
	Honiton St. Paul's	East Devon	3,782
	Newbridges	East Devon	2,007
	Otterhead	East Devon	1,798
	Seaton	East Devon	5,920
	Tale Vale	East Devon	1,970
	Trinity	East Devon	2,066
	Yarty	East Devon	1,982
	Canonsleigh	Mid Devon	2,520
	Castle	Mid Devon	2,924
	Clare and Shuttern	Mid Devon	2,720
	Cranmore	Mid Devon	3,784
	Cullompton North	Mid Devon	2,924
	Cullompton Outer	Mid Devon	1,440
	Cullompton South	Mid Devon	3,001
	Halberton	Mid Devon	1,504
	Lower Culm	Mid Devon	4,354
	Lowman	Mid Devon	4,380
	Upper Culm	Mid Devon	3,194
	Westexe	Mid Devon	3,749
<b>45. Torbay BC</b>			<b>71,459</b>
	Clifton-with-Maidenway	Torbay	5,386
	Cockington-with-Chelston	Torbay	8,040
	Ellacombe	Torbay	4,854
	Goodrington-with-Roselands	Torbay	5,539
	Preston	Torbay	7,930
	Roundham-with-Hyde	Torbay	5,475

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Shiphay-with-the-Willows	Torbay	7,062
	St. Marychurch	Torbay	8,393
	Tormohun	Torbay	7,538
	Watcombe	Torbay	5,037
	Wellswood	Torbay	6,205
<b>46. Totnes CC</b>			<b>72,989</b>
	Allington & Strete	South Hams	2,306
	Blackawton & Stoke Fleming	South Hams	1,808
	Dartington & Staverton	South Hams	1,984
	Dartmouth & East Dart	South Hams	6,216
	Kingsbridge	South Hams	4,454
	Loddiswell & Aveton Gifford	South Hams	2,054
	Marldon & Littlehempston	South Hams	2,293
	Salcombe & Thurlestone	South Hams	3,958
	South Brent	South Hams	4,075
	Stokenham	South Hams	2,146
	Totnes	South Hams	6,364
	West Dart	South Hams	2,016
	Ambrook	Teignbridge	4,767
	Ipplepen	Teignbridge	2,056
	Berry Head-with-Furzeham	Torbay	7,494
	Blatchcombe	Torbay	7,800
	Churston-with-Galmpton	Torbay	5,578
	St. Mary's-with-Summercombe	Torbay	5,620
<b>47. Truro and Newquay CC</b>			<b>73,775</b>
	Chacewater, Kenwyn and Baldhu	Cornwall	2,914
	Feock and Playing Place	Cornwall	3,649
	Ladock, St. Clement and St. Erme	Cornwall	3,410
	Mount Hawke and Portreath	Cornwall	3,447
	Newlyn and Goonhavern	Cornwall	3,656
	Newquay Central	Cornwall	2,534
	Newquay Pentire	Cornwall	2,936
	Newquay Treloggan	Cornwall	2,902
	Newquay Tretherras	Cornwall	2,817
	Newquay Treviglas	Cornwall	2,956
	Perranporth	Cornwall	3,455
	Probus, Tregony and Grampound	Cornwall	3,136
	Roseland	Cornwall	2,764
	St. Agnes	Cornwall	3,510
	St. Columb Major	Cornwall	3,432
	St. Dennis and Nanpean	Cornwall	3,112
	St. Enoder	Cornwall	3,236
	St. Mawgan and Colan	Cornwall	2,799
	Threemilestone and Gloweth	Cornwall	3,072
	Truro Boscawen	Cornwall	3,765
	Truro Redannick	Cornwall	3,368
	Truro Tregolls	Cornwall	3,460
	Truro Trehaverne	Cornwall	3,445
<b>48. Warminster and Shaftesbury CC</b>			<b>72,679</b>
	Bulbarrow	North Dorset	1,533
	Gillingham Rural	North Dorset	3,146
	Gillingham Town	North Dorset	4,255
	Hill Forts	North Dorset	4,891
	Motcombe & Bourton	North Dorset	3,131
	Shaftesbury East	North Dorset	2,867
	Shaftesbury West	North Dorset	2,881
	Sturminster Newton	North Dorset	2,987
	The Beacon	North Dorset	1,528

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	The Stours & Marnhull	North Dorset	3,350
	Ethandune	Wiltshire	3,540
	Mere	Wiltshire	3,319
	Nadder and East Knoyle	Wiltshire	3,321
	Tisbury	Wiltshire	3,370
	Warminster Broadway	Wiltshire	3,465
	Warminster Copheap and Wylde	Wiltshire	3,404
	Warminster East	Wiltshire	4,016
	Warminster West	Wiltshire	3,917
	Warminster Without	Wiltshire	3,327
	Westbury East	Wiltshire	3,576
	Westbury North	Wiltshire	3,228
	Westbury West	Wiltshire	3,627
<b>49. Wells CC</b>			<b>71,669</b>
	Crocombe and Pilton	Mendip	1,930
	Glastonbury St. Benedict's	Mendip	1,734
	Glastonbury St. Edmund's	Mendip	1,546
	Glastonbury St. John's	Mendip	1,697
	Glastonbury St. Mary's	Mendip	1,586
	Moor	Mendip	1,968
	Rodney and Westbury	Mendip	1,723
	St. Cuthbert Out North	Mendip	1,842
	Street North	Mendip	2,773
	Street South	Mendip	3,530
	Street West	Mendip	1,689
	Wells Central	Mendip	1,500
	Wells St. Cuthbert's	Mendip	3,180
	Wells St. Thomas'	Mendip	3,198
	Wookey and St. Cuthbert Out West	Mendip	1,858
	Axevale	Sedgemoor	3,248
	Berrow	Sedgemoor	1,750
	Burnham Central	Sedgemoor	5,351
	Burnham North	Sedgemoor	5,030
	Cheddar and Shipham	Sedgemoor	5,521
	Highbridge and Burnham Marine	Sedgemoor	5,817
	Huntspill and Pawlett	Sedgemoor	1,760
	Knoll	Sedgemoor	3,951
	Puriton and Woolavington	Sedgemoor	3,766
	Wedmore and Mark	Sedgemoor	3,721
<b>50. West Dorset CC</b>			<b>72,286</b>
	Blackmore	North Dorset	2,777
	Lydden Vale	North Dorset	1,464
	Beaminster	West Dorset	4,101
	Bridport North	West Dorset	5,784
	Bridport South	West Dorset	5,133
	Broadwindsor	West Dorset	2,093
	Burton Bradstock	West Dorset	2,084
	Cerne Valley	West Dorset	4,043
	Chideock & Symondsburly	West Dorset	1,933
	Dorchester East	West Dorset	3,614
	Dorchester North	West Dorset	4,206
	Dorchester South	West Dorset	3,430
	Dorchester West	West Dorset	3,539
	Frome Valley	West Dorset	1,865
	Lyme Regis & Charmouth	West Dorset	3,920
	Maiden Newton	West Dorset	2,024
	Netherbury	West Dorset	2,029
	Piddle Valley	West Dorset	2,060

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Puddletown	West Dorset	1,954
	Queen Thorne	West Dorset	1,911
	Sherborne East	West Dorset	3,693
	Sherborne West	West Dorset	3,067
	Winterborne St. Martin	West Dorset	1,874
	Yetminster & Cam Vale	West Dorset	3,688
<b>51. West Wiltshire CC</b>			<b>78,042</b>
	Bradford-on-Avon North	Wiltshire	3,724
	Bradford-on-Avon South	Wiltshire	3,873
	Corsham Pickwick	Wiltshire	3,561
	Corsham Town	Wiltshire	3,712
	Corsham Without and Box Hill	Wiltshire	3,933
	Hilperton	Wiltshire	3,737
	Holt and Staverton	Wiltshire	3,334
	Melksham Central	Wiltshire	3,675
	Melksham North	Wiltshire	3,419
	Melksham South	Wiltshire	3,963
	Melksham Without North	Wiltshire	4,093
	Melksham Without South	Wiltshire	3,915
	Southwick	Wiltshire	3,376
	Summerham and Seend	Wiltshire	3,416
	Trowbridge Adcroft	Wiltshire	3,128
	Trowbridge Central	Wiltshire	3,254
	Trowbridge Drynham	Wiltshire	2,967
	Trowbridge Grove	Wiltshire	3,188
	Trowbridge Lambrok	Wiltshire	3,504
	Trowbridge Park	Wiltshire	3,294
	Trowbridge Paxcroft	Wiltshire	3,715
	Winsley and Westwood	Wiltshire	3,261
<b>52. Weston-super-Mare CC</b>			<b>75,333</b>
	Banwell & Winscombe	North Somerset	5,802
	Blagdon & Churchill	North Somerset	2,998
	Congresbury & Puxton	North Somerset	3,007
	Hutton & Locking	North Somerset	5,455
	Weston-super-Mare Bournville	North Somerset	5,514
	Weston-super-Mare Central	North Somerset	5,364
	Weston-super-Mare Hillside	North Somerset	5,854
	Weston-super-Mare Kewstoke	North Somerset	6,392
	Weston-super-Mare Mid Worle	North Somerset	2,959
	Weston-super-Mare Milton	North Somerset	6,406
	Weston-super-Mare North Worle	North Somerset	5,945
	Weston-super-Mare South Worle	North Somerset	5,975
	Weston-super-Mare Uphill	North Somerset	6,090
	Weston-super-Mare Winterstoke	North Somerset	4,311
	Wick St. Lawrence & St. Georges	North Somerset	3,261
<b>53. Yeovil and South Somerset CC</b>			<b>76,351</b>
	Blackdown	South Somerset	1,846
	Brympton	South Somerset	4,822
	Chard Avishayes	South Somerset	1,806
	Chard Combe	South Somerset	1,590
	Chard Crimchard	South Somerset	1,847
	Chard Holyrood	South Somerset	2,052
	Chard Jocelyn	South Somerset	1,812
	Coker	South Somerset	4,098
	Crewkerne	South Somerset	6,092
	Eggwood	South Somerset	1,911
	Hamdon	South Somerset	2,040
	Ilminster	South Somerset	4,404
	Ivelchester	South Somerset	2,275
	Neroche	South Somerset	1,975

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Parrett	South Somerset	1,855
	South Petherton	South Somerset	3,898
	St. Michael's	South Somerset	1,754
	Tatworth and Forton	South Somerset	2,083
	Windwhistle	South Somerset	1,830
	Yeovil Central	South Somerset	4,785
	Yeovil East	South Somerset	4,656
	Yeovil South	South Somerset	6,159
	Yeovil West	South Somerset	4,910
	Yeovil Without	South Somerset	5,851