

LICENSING AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION COMMITTEE

DATE	15 th March 2022
REPORT OF	Rob Walsh - Chief Executive and Returning Officer
SUBJECT	Review of Parliamentary Constituencies – Second Consultation Stage
STATUS	Open

CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

The Council has two clear strategic priorities – Stronger Economy and Stronger Communities. Within that second priority, the proposed changes to the Parliamentary constituencies will have an impact on local democracy within North East Lincolnshire.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Boundary Commission for England has commenced the second consultation stage on the future arrangements for Parliamentary Constituencies across the country, including North East Lincolnshire.

For North East Lincolnshire, the proposals in the first consultation phase were that there should be a Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Borough Constituency and South Humber County Constituency in place of the current arrangements (Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes).

During the first consultation period, the Council (meeting on 29 July 2021) responded to state “That this Council supports the Boundary Commission for England’s proposed amendments to Parliamentary constituency boundaries as they affect North East Lincolnshire, i.e. the proposed new Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Borough Constituency and the South Humber County Constituency, though we wish to see the latter renamed the Northern Lincolnshire County Constituency”.

As part of phase two, the Boundary Commission for England has now published all of the representations received to this first consultation phase and is inviting comments on these representations. Great Grimsby representations are in Appendix 1 and Cleethorpes representations are in Appendix 2.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Licensing and Community Protection Committee is asked to consider the representations received by the Boundary Commission for England during the first consultation phase and make a recommendation to Council on any response (if any) the authority would like to make about those representations.

REASONS FOR DECISION

To ensure that Elected Members have the opportunity to comment on the representations received during the first consultation stage.

1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

- 1.1 On 8th June 2021, the Boundary Commission for England issued proposals to amend the Parliamentary Boundaries for Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Constituencies respectively. Details of the proposed changes are set out in the report

Boundary Commission for England

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

The 2023 Review

- 1.3 The BCE has the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all of the Parliamentary constituencies in England. This is principally so that constituencies are altered occasionally to take account of changes in population. Changes are also made to reflect local government boundary changes, so that administrative boundaries coincide as much as possible. The last full review was started in 2000 and completed in 2007; noting that two subsequent reviews aimed at reducing the number of MPs from 650 down to 600 were not adopted by Parliament.
- 1.4 The BCE is currently conducting a review on the basis of rules set by Parliamentary Constituencies Act 2020. These rules state that the BCE should retain the overall number of Constituencies across the UK at 650. However, each constituency must have an electorate that is no smaller than 69,724 and no larger than 77,062. By law, the electorate figures used are those that were calculated for each Ward on 2 March 2020.
- 1.5 The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 2020 has also altered the timings of future reviews following the completion of the 2023 Review. These must now be completed every eight years after that date.

Timetable for Boundary Commission Review

- 1.6 The BCE will make its final proposals in July 2023, and these will come into effect from the next scheduled Parliamentary elections in May 2024 (provided no snap Parliamentary election is called before then).
- 1.7 The timetable for the key stages of the Boundary Commission review is as follows:

Stage One	Development of initial proposals by the BCE	Started January 2021
Stage Two	8-week consultation on initial proposals.	8 June to 2 August 2021
Stage Three	6-week consultation on representations received • BCE are required to publish all responses received on the initial proposals and BCE comments. Plus 2 to 5 public hearings per region.	Early 2022
Stage Four	Development and publication of revised proposals, incorporating: • Analysis from 1st and 2nd representations made • Publication of revised proposals if change mind as a result of feedback • 4-week consultation period on the revisions made	Anticipated to be towards the end of 2022
Stage Five	Development and publication of the final report and recommendations: • All evidence received to be considered • Report will be published to Government to present to Speaker of the House of Commons	By 1 July 2023

Proposed Changes for North East Lincolnshire

- 1.8 Yorkshire and Humber has been allocated 54 Parliamentary constituencies – unchanged from the current number. The BCE’s proposals leave only 2 of the 54 current constituencies unchanged.
- 1.9 As it is not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual councils, the BCE has grouped some county and council areas into sub-regions. North East Lincolnshire has been included as part of the Yorkshire and Humber sub-region.
- 1.10 Both of the current constituencies in North East Lincolnshire have been significantly changed under the new proposals, as well as the names of both constituencies.
- 1.11 The current Parliamentary constituencies consist of the following Wards (electorate on 2 March 2020):-

Great Grimsby:

- East Marsh – 6,369
- Freshney – 7,210
- Heneage – 8,013
- Park – 8,967
- Scartho – 8,929
- South – 8,315

- West Marsh – 4,661
- Yarborough – 8,444

Total = 60,908

Cleethorpes:

- Croft Baker – 8,660
- Haverstoe – 8,195
- Humberston and New Waltham – 9,471
- Immingham – 8,771
- Sidney Sussex – 8,216
- Waltham – 5,683
- Wolds – 6,092
- Barton – 9,367 (North Lincs)
- Ferry – 8,975 (North Lincs)

Total = 73,430 electors

1.12 Under the new proposals, two new constituencies are proposed as follows:-

Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Borough Constituency:

- Croft Baker – 8,660
- East Marsh – 6,369
- Freshney – 7,210
- Haverstoe – 8,195
- Heneage – 8,013
- Park – 8,967
- Sidney Sussex – 8,216
- South – 8,315
- West Marsh – 4,661
- Yarborough – 8,444

Total = 77,050 electors

South Humber County Constituency:

- Humberston and New Waltham – 9,471
- Immingham – 8,771
- Scartho – 8,929
- Waltham – 5,683
- Wolds – 6,092
- Barton – 9,367 (North Lincs)
- Brigg and Wolds – 9,152 (North Lincs)
- Broughton and Appleby – 5,188 (North Lincs)
- Ferry – 8,975 (North Lincs)

Total = 71,628 electors

Phase 2 - Consultation Period

- 1.13 Between 8th June and 2nd August 2021, the Boundary Commission for England sought representations on the proposed changes to the Parliamentary boundaries. The feedback received affecting North East Lincolnshire is shown in Appendices 1 (Great Grimsby) and 2 (Cleethorpes).
- 1.14 As part of its phase 2 consultation period, the Boundary Commission is now seeking views on the representations made as part of the initial consultation period. The deadlines for responses to phase two of the consultation process is 4 April 2022.

2. RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

- 2.1 There are no direct risks or opportunities associated with this report.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 The Council can choose whether or not to make a response on the representations received by the Boundary Commission for England.

4. REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 If the Council chooses not to respond to this consultation document, then it cannot influence the proposed future changes to the Parliamentary Constituencies within North East Lincolnshire.
- 4.2 The public are able to access information online (see section 13 below) and, during phase 1 and 3 of the consultation period, will be able to view the proposals at the Council Offices.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 There are no financial considerations arising from this report.

6. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS

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

7. CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no climate change and environmental implications arising from this report.

8. CONSULTATION WITH SCRUTINY

- 8.1 No consultation has been undertaken with Scrutiny as, under the Constitution, the Licensing and Community Protection Committee is asked to make a recommendation to Council.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no direct financial implications that will arise from this report.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no immediate legal implications arising. The above report adequately reflects the parameters and relevant guidance available for the proposals outlined.

10.2 Any recommendations will be placed before Full Council on 17th March 2022 for a response to the consultation to be agreed.

11. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no HR implications arising from the contents of this report.

12. WARD IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The proposals contained within the consultation document will affect all Wards.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

13.1 Initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in Yorkshire and the Humber – Published by Boundary Commission for England <https://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/2021-06-08-Initial-Proposals-Yorkshire-and-the-Humber-Region.pdf>

13.2 Report to Council – 29th July 2022 [Council | Democracy \(nelincs.gov.uk\)](https://nelincs.gov.uk)

13.3 Boundary Commission – Second Consultation Proposals: [Secondary consultation now open: Have your say on our constituency boundary proposals | Boundary Commission for England \(independent.gov.uk\)](https://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/secondary-consultation-now-open-have-your-say-on-our-constituency-boundary-proposals/)

14 CONTACT OFFICER(S)

Stephen McGrath - Team Manager (Elections) - 01472 323737

Helen Isaacs – Assistant Chief Executive - 01472 326127

ROB WALSH
CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND RETURNING OFFICER

APPENDIX 1

Great Grimsby Borough Constituency - Comments Received by Boundary Commission for England

Comment ID	Comment
BCE-52149	A recent planning proposal has been published showing several large housing estates around this area, has this been taken into account in these plans thank you
BCE-52916	<p>I am the former Croft Baker Ward Councillor from 2010 until 2018 and I strongly object to the proposals by the Boundary Commission. Grimsby, Immingham, Cleethorpes and the Villages are very different in terms of their needs. Cleethorpes and the Villages are rural and have a focus on Tourism and agriculture. Grimsby and Immingham are potential industrial power houses that can generate jobs and wealth. By having Cleethorpes and Grimsby in one constituency you risk the needs of Cleethorpes being overlooked for the industrial needs of Grimsby. Conversely, by having Immingham and the Villages in a constituency you risk the villages rural needs being ignored by the potential greater needs of Immingham. I would recommend the following constituencies:</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby Constituency: East Marsh, West Marsh, South, Yarborough, Freshney, Waltham, Wolds, Immingham. In order to make the relevant electorate numbers I would include the North Lincolnshire Council Wards to the North and West. Such an arrangement would create a constituency that is industrial and have similar values, representation needs and strategy.</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages Constituency: For a Cleethorpes Seat I would go: Sidney Sussex, Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston and New Waltham, Scartho, Henage, and Park. The villages, of which I now live, see Cleethorpes as their shopping centre. They have similar needs based on tourism, agriculture and have seasonality issues. Thus, from a representation point of view it ensures there is a cohesive message a member of Parliament can give when representing the area. Henage Ward has the parish of Old Clee - the lost part of Cleethorpes that was absorbed into Great Grimsby many years ago. However, it is actually historically part of Cleethorpes- hence the name. Park Ward is also heavily linked with Henage and Cleethorpes due to its outlook, identity and values. That of a middle class agricultural area that was historically the home to land owners of the area.</p> <p>My proposals for 2 constituencies of Cleethorpes and Villages in addition to Immingham and Great Grimsby would ensure a more cohesive form of representation that is effective and takes into account historical and geographical needs. It would allow the MP to focus their efforts on topics that matter to those communities. The current boundary commission fudges this and results on an MP's efforts being split between agriculture/tourism and industry. That is no good for anyone and risks many people, organisations and businesses being overlooked and not having fair representation.</p>
BCE-54104	I believe the exclusion of the Ward of Scartho from Grimsby is a mistake. Scartho is a Much a part of Grimsby as Freshney south or any other ward is. It's inclusion in Grimsby would respect past boundary and also the feeling of many residents. I proud to call myself a grimbarian and I was born in this town. Scartho should be represented by the same MP as the rest of it.
BCE-54564	I live in New Waltham and I do not not understand why New Waltham are not part of a constituency with Cleethorpes. When I go shopping I see my Town Centre as Cleethorpes. Anything that happens in Cleethorpes effects me and my family. However, if my area was not linked with Cleethorpes then I could not go to my MP with issues in that area as they would not represent that area. I would like to see all of Cleethorpes(Sidney Sussex, Croft Baker and Haverstoe) linked with Humberston, New Waltham, Henage, Park and Scartho areas. I would also Split the Waltham ward and put Waltham into a Cleethorpes seat and the Wolds into an Immingham and Grimsby Seat. I would put Immingham and Grimsby together with areas to the north into Scunthorpe as those areas are business based. This is in contract with Cleethorpes and the area I live new Waltham which is touristsy, focused on small family run businesses and farms. The current plans proposed by the boundary commission will result in Cleethorpes being forgotten and the residents of New Waltham and similar places not having their views heard due to their town centre not being included. Please think again.
BCE-54752	I oppose the linking of Grimsby and Cleethorpes in one area of representation. Due to Grimsby's history as a port and the links to renewables it would make more sense to link Grimsby with Immingham. Such a move would allow residents to have more coherent representation as the Member of Parliament can focus on helping the area grow as the area would have the same challenges and issues - increasing investment into two areas that need a joined up plan. This is something that could not happen if Cleethorpes formed part of the constituency. It is my view that any area of representation should be formed with the wards of East Marsh, West Marsh, Caster Yarborough, Freshney, South, Immingham, Wolds together with the North Lincolnshire areas of Ferry, Brigg and Wolds. This is because the North Lincolnshire areas are linked to industry such as steel. This would link better with Grimsby and Immingham. This constituency should be called Immingham and Great Grimsby to ensure that Immingham is not forgotten but also retains the historical name of Great Grimsby.
BCE-55372	I have lived in great grimsby all my life and the constituency has great historical meaning and to change it is wrong and gerrymandering at its worst and I disagree totally with the proposed changes
BCE-55444	Having Grimsby and Cleethorpes makes no sense! It's a complete mishmash of needs. Why not have Grimsby and Immingham together. The are both ports and are both areas of industrial growth and of multinational businesses. They have more in common then Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Looking at the map you could easily link grimsby with Immingham by using the Waltham and Wolds ward as a connection. Put Cleethorpes with the villages as they have more in common. More tourist based. How can an MP vote the way residents want if, as under the current proposals, there would be a big difference in needs of residents. Grimsby and Immingham is the way for sure. Take Cleethorpes out of Grimsby proposal.
BCE-55843	An awful name should be called northern Lincolnshire if anything and should not split Scartho either.

BCE-57877	<p>I support the following alternative proposal:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-57878	<p>I support the following alternative proposals as I believe Grimsby and Immingham together would make greater sense due to their similar issues.</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>

BCE-57879	<p>I do not support linking Grimsby with Cleethorpes. We have nothing in common with Cleethorpes. Please see alternative proposal linking Grimsby with Immingham:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-58171	<p>Grimsby cleethorpes and surrounding villages are known and always have been as great Grimsby in North East Lincolnshire. Leave it be and stop messing about with our area.</p>
BCE-58175	<p>Will the fact that Grimsby has traditionally voted Labour and Cleethorpes always Conservative, and a smaller population than Grimsby be taken into account? If Cleethorpes also takes in next door Humberstone it may be more fairly represented. I feel that the current proposals will always return a Labour candidate to the area. The 2019 election result was the first in more than forty years to return a Tory to Grimsby</p>
BCE-58181	<p>The boundary commissions proposals to have Grimsby and Cleethorpes in one constituency is madness. I have lived in Cleethorpes all of my life and our area is unique to that of Grimsby. It is linked to the wider Lincolnshire area historically. I support the following alternative proposals:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>

BCE-58182	<p>Cleethorpes is unique to the area of Grimsby. I was born and raised in Cleethorpes. We have more in common with the villages and as far as Louth. Grimsby on the other hand is has more in common with Immingham, Barton and Ferry all having Humber ports. I support the following alternative proposals:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scarcho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-58200	I strongly object to merging Grimsby and Cleethorpes constituencies. Historically the two have been split between Labour and Conservative. Merging the two means the odds are tipped more one than the other. This law is unfair and unethical.
BCE-58202	Merging the two districts makes voting unfair as the Cleethorpes and Grimsby usually vote different parties.
BCE-58522	<p>I support the alternative proposal:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scarcho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-58841	<p>I disagree with the merging of Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Grimsby and Cleethorpes should remain seperate.</p> <p>Combining the two is a desperate attempt to gerrymander the area by the Tories.</p> <p>Merging the areas when the areas are already being managed by two constituents to only being badly managed by one would have long term damaging effects to our area. Being able to have more power within your own area will be more beneficial to the areas that are effected. The two areas are very different and both require different approaches and two minds are better than one. I oppose this decision.</p>
BCE-58867	Rediculous idea, this area barely has a voice already and a low voter turn out, this will just disenfranchise more people.
BCE-58874	This is clearly a way to make sure you always get the Tory vote don't even hide it.
BCE-59488	Scarcho should definitely be included in Grimsby & Cleethorpes BC. It is a core part of the Town.
BCE-60365	To whom it concerns, I wish to strongly object about the proposed boundary change to Scarcho, Grimsby, from being North East Lincolnshire back to Humberside, I am ** years of age and was proud to be a 'Lincolnshire yellow belly' and then to my dismay put to South Humberside. Imagine my pure joy at being put back to North East Lincolnshire. Now with this impending travesty, we are Lincolnshire and always will be. So yes I strongly disagree with the change back to the un popular Humberside.

BCE-62190	<p>Primarily this is since the needs of Cleethorpes and Great Grimsby are significantly different. Great Grimsby is a former industrial hub for fishing. It is now a prominent area in renewables and food processing and production. Great Grimsby also has a statistically high number of areas that are classed as some of the most deprived parts of the country in terms of health, wealth, and educational opportunities. In sharp contrast Cleethorpes constituency is based on the Tourist industry and rural based service providers and organisations. Cleethorpes and the surrounding villages are viewed by residents who live there of having a very different identity to that of the residents of Great Grimsby; significantly driven by the social, economic, and environmental factors. From an investment and economic point of view, Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes are at a different point in the regeneration scale. Grimsby has had significant investment provided by Central Government. However, Cleethorpes is still seeking significant redevelopment to boost its economy and community provisions. This includes areas such as sports provision, advice services, and business support. Should the area be linked with Great Grimsby the Member of Parliament representing Cleethorpes, may have a weaker argument for investment into their constituency due to the boundaries and previous investment in Great Grimsby. In addition, conflict in priorities may arise, as the current proposed 'community' suggested by the Boundary Commission for England, may not be able to easily consolidate a single view on how the constituency would be affected by the issues and debates of the day, due to the different needs of each area reflected above. Having considered several options and ensuring that our considerations were in line with the Boundary Commission for England's rules and regulations, we wish to propose the following as a viable counterproposal. The proposal would create the following two seats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cleethorpes And Villages. Comprising of the Ward Boundaries for: Sidney Sussex, Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston and New Waltham, Henage, Park, South, Scartho, Waltham. With a total electorate of 74,404. - Great Grimsby And Immingham. East Marsh, West Marsh, Freshney, Yarborough, Wolds, Immingham, Ferry, Brigg and Wolds, Broughton and Appleby, Barton. With a total electorate of 74,166. You will note that the counter proposals we support were proposed in The Boundary Commission for England's Sixth Periodic Review of Westminster constituencies (2020). As you know, the review was carried out between 2011 and 2018, and were formally laid aside in 2020. The The Boundary Commission for England in this review recognised the significant differences in the communities of Cleethorpes, Surrounding Villages and Great Grimsby. Whilst this report is clear that the final recommendations are not ideal, they do provide greater cohesion of community and views within the proposed structure. Moreover, they offer a greater equality of electors in comparison to the current proposals. It is believed this is a viable counter proposal; the seat of Great Grimsby and Immingham containing all the South Humber industrial hubs and ports of Great Grimsby, Immingham, brings a clear focus to the developing offshore wind industry, wider renewable energy revolution and associated chain of major manufactures, support services and wider food processing and production. The seat of Cleethorpes and Villages contains Cleethorpes at its heart with the historical associated areas of tourism and a wide network of rural service providers and organisations including farming. This will assist in ensuring that current and future government policy needs relating to rural communities is not dominated by urban thinking and the significant risks under the current proposal, that Cleethorpes and surrounding communities will either miss out on the benefits, and / or experience unintended consequences of policies which are poorly thought through from a rural perspective. It is considered this counterproposal reflects a more natural and cohesive arrangement, that will better serve community engagement, coordination and empowerment when compared with the initial proposal by the Boundary Commission for England. In turn supporting our Member of Parliament (MP) to be more effective in their representation.
BCE-65153	<p>I am in total support of the proposed constituency of Grimsby & Cleethorpes as they have forged an inseparable bond over centuries, due to their evolution to a conurbation. The name Cleethorpes is thought to come from joining the words clee, an old word for clay, and thorpes, an old English Norse word for 'villages'. Before becoming a unified town, Cleethorpes was made up of three small thorpes: Itterby, Oole and Thrunsoe. These were part of a wider parish called Clee (centred on the village of Old Clee). In the 1820's the small fishing village with oysters being a principal trade, soon became a resort when sea-bathing and the taking of medicinal waters became fashionable. As rail connections were forged through nearby Grimsby to other towns, Cleethorpes with Thrunsoe was created as a Local Board of Health District in 1873, and under the Local Government act of 1874 it became an urban district. Its headquarters was established at Cleethorpes Town Hall in 1905. Meanwhile Grimsby (Grim, a Danish fisherman. -by from the Norse byr for village), began to exploit the rich fishing grounds of the North Sea. The industry was to become the largest fishing port in the world in the 1950's-70s. The decline came, when the common fisheries policy imposed by the European Union parcelled out British sovereign Waters to other member states. At the same time, the now adjoining Cleethorpes, provided labour, and flourished because of the associated food processing and supporting businesses. Cleethorpes is now the destination of choice for most locals and nearby townsfolk as a thriving seaside venue. Their geographical situation on an estuary has always meant that people can't travel through Grimsby and Cleethorpes, if they're coming here, it's their destination! The estuary serves two refineries and many industries and businesses which have sprung up in and around the two towns. There is a labour pool which, because of the strong combined transport and services links, shows an indifference to domicile location. Grimsby and Cleethorpes have now long been physically linked to each other by built-up residential estates. The villages of Waltham and New Waltham are also contiguous with the two towns. The towns' borders are now indistinct, with only signage indicating a change of name as one drives through a junction. Even some locals are unsure of the borders. Grimsby has the distinction of being the only football league club to have its stadium in another town - Cleethorpes! As the two towns have grown together, their governance has evolved. Grimsby, from a municipal borough, then a county borough up until 1974, when Great Grimsby was reconstituted (with the same boundaries) as the Grimsby non-metropolitan district in the new county of Humberside. In the early 1990s, local government in the area came under the review of the 'Local Government Commission for England', and the extremely unpopular county of Humberside was abolished in 1996. The former area of the Great Grimsby district merged and since 1996, Grimsby and Cleethorpes have become an unparished area within the unitary borough of North East Lincolnshire.</p>
BCE-66684	<p>Although I agree with the configuration for the South Humber constituency, I don't agree with the name at all. I think Northern Lincolnshire is much more appropriate to avoid confusion. The wards comprising the constituency belong to either North East Lincolnshire Council or North Lincolnshire Council. It is therefore strange - and confusing - to name this new constituency 'South Humber', when the wards within it belong to authorities with Lincolnshire in the name. As a lifelong resident of North East Lincolnshire, I can assure you that the constituency being named 'South Humber' would be met with great distaste far and wide. Some time ago, this area was called South Humberside. The name was adopted in the 1970s, and was abolished in 1996, which then created the authorities of North Lincolnshire, North East Lincolnshire, Kingston Upon Hull, and the East Riding of Yorkshire. This was a welcome change for one big reason - the people here do not identify with Hull or the Humber. It is an identity issue for sure; the towns of Grimsby, Cleethorpes, and Immingham do not wish to be overshadowed by the name of Hull or Humberside. This is an issue that is felt very deep within many people and communities in this area. To conclude, I would like to reiterate that the constituency as proposed by the Boundary Commission is sensible as the communities within it have historical linkages and local government links. Furthermore, the constituency allows Grimsby and Cleethorpes to become it's own separate constituency which makes sense due to being more urban in nature and also sharing many historic links through industry. The only change which is needed to accurately reflect the constituency is a name change to Northern Lincolnshire.</p>
BCE-68302	<p>I totally oppose the combining of great grimsby and cleethorpes under the proposed review. We barely have contact with our MP to stretch the constituency out over 19 miles away will mean even less of a relationship with our Mp demeaning the idea of accountable democracy. Grimsby is defined ancient town as are the areas you seek to merge with it. Taking an industrial town and coupling it with rural areas like Brigg will again only lead to competing agenda which are incompatible and again water down the democratic process. We are a distinct coastal area with specialised industry and to seek to water this down is wrong and will cause damage to our sense of community and future. Leave us alone!</p>

BCE-68491	<p>Scartho is not a parish but a ward of Grimsby. To spilt us from our area of governance will mean that our MP will not have any sway on the policies, planning etc that affects us. What will be the point of them? We live in an urban area but we are lumped into rural community. How will democracy work for us? Our hospital is run by a trust - Northern Lincolnshire and Google NHS trust -:they provide services to Goole, West Lindsey, East Lindsey, they provide pathology services for the whole of Greater Lincolnshire. Our Ambulance Service is run from East Midlands including Nottingham and Derby. But more and more are we sent to Hull or for specialist care. Our Clinical Commissioning Group is run from Hull. Our police force is run from Hull our fire service is run from Hull. We are a mishmash of areas, we don't know where we belong. Who will fight for our benefits, our trade, our investments? We spent years fighting against the county of Humberside because investment was unfairly distributed. It is now happening again but this time you have not been upfront, it has been hidden. We have been deceived. Humberside has been reformed. The river Humber is a huge natural divide. The people of Grimsby and Hull are natural rivals, we speak differently, act differently and have different views. An MP who has no town to represent will be have no value, be insignificant and pointless. So to spilt us from our town and our county you make us homeless. South Humber is an absolute insult to who we are and where we live.</p>
BCE-71020	<p>Where I appreciate you have had your hands tied behind your back in trying to achieve a supposedly level playing field of X number of voters in an area, I live in GRIMSBY!!! not in any rural location many miles away and how my parliamentary representative is going to be able to deal with the issues that will affect me in the town I live in when he/she is also representing a huge rural community is beyond me. To limit the constituency by size and not by town/city/area covered is ridiculous and in my opinion politically driven and does not serve to give many constituents a decent local representation in parliament of an MP who would/should know and fight for the local issues. If this is the route the government wants to take lets make the country 1 big area and divide the MP's after an election to roughly represent an area, that roughly voted for any said party, that roughly knows the area. I'll probably at least feel my vote counted to make a parliament that will deal with my national views and issues properly this is going to disconnect voters from local issues and I suspect kill off many more peoples desire to vote as they know with these changes in my constituency I will not ever get the representation in parliament I vote for. So save the money this stupid politically driven exercise is costing draw some 600 odd rough areas round the country, save more money by abolishing the boundary commission afterwards and let's just vote for the party we want to represent our views in parliament as this change will take away any chance my local views will be represented properly by my MP.</p>
BCE-71643	<p>You will cause much distress by combining Cleethorpes with Grimsby- the two areas have always been recognised as separated by one being industrial and the other a seaside resort. You should redraw the boundary such that Grimsby absorbs the industry along the bank of the Humber up to Killingholme and the rural area left should be included with Cleethorpes. The two areas you have proposed are not connected commercially and will not blend together. It will be another big mistake such as when Humberside was created between non identical areas.</p>
BCE-74580	<p>This Council supports the Boundary Commission for England's proposed amendments to Parliamentary constituency boundaries as they affect North East Lincolnshire, i.e. the proposed new Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Borough Constituency and the South Humber County Constituency.</p>
BCE-75404	<p>I write in support of the Boundary Commission recommendations in Northern Lincolnshire, currently part of the Yorkshire and Humber region. Our association believes the boundaries proposed are equitable and would be effective to the greatest extent possible in addressing the size of constituencies across England, which has been recognised as a fundamental problem existing for many years. These reforms we are convinced can ensure every vote cast in a general election would carry equal weight, which is of paramount importance following years of demographic movement in the area and across the region, which has to some extent distorted the electoral balance. Bringing together the town of Great Grimsby and, as much as is possible, Cleethorpes is a sensible move given their interests which although distinct are clearly dependant on each other. In deciding which ward to leave out of the Great Grimsby & Cleethorpes constituency we believe Scartho ward is the most appropriate solution, particularly as it has its own specific identity and residents always refer to its retail centre as 'the village'. We are confident that the proposed recommendations address local sensitivities as best as possible within the guidelines by which they are governed and, will lead to minimal disruption for local people. Notwithstanding, we must respectfully point out that future reviews should not follow the regional boundary. Grimsby & Cleethorpes are right up against this boundary with the East Midlands and large numbers of people who look to Grimsby & Cleethorpes for their public services and who work and live-in villages that fall in a different region. Social interaction and identify is very important to family cohesion throughout both Grimsby and Cleethorpes communities, and should be considered. We strongly oppose the suggested constituency name of 'South Humber' Local opinion is quite infatic; people regard themselves as from Lincolnshire and use of Humber or Humberside (a previously failed experiment) is widely unpopular & is not acceptable. As an alternative, we propose 'Northern Lincolnshire'. We, therefore, subject to the descriptive title of Northern Lincolnshire being included, whole heartedly support the recommendations for the Lincolnshire part of the region.</p>
BCE-75924	<p>I live in Scartho, and as I complete my address in my response, I realise, I always write Scartho, Grimsby. Scartho is part of Grimsby. For it to be excluded from the Grimsby & Cleethorpes constituency seems illogical. These proposals merge Grimsby and Cleethorpes into a joint constituency, but this seems pointless if it is done at the expense of parts of Grimsby. I was shocked to hear this part of the proposal. It can be difficult to get hold of your member of parliament at the best of times, even with social media/email (our current MP only uses twitter to self-promote, not to consult/engage). If your member of parliament also has to represent Brigg, Barton, and other distant towns/areas, then suddenly, your representation is diluted. For no apparent reason except to meet the legal population requirement. What does Brigg or Barton have in common with Scartho? I believe Scartho should have the same MP as the rest of Grimsby. The local councillors would also suffer would continue to represent either Grimsby or Cleethorpes, but suddenly Scartho would be excluded, and would be potentially isolated. My suggestion is to amend the boundaries slightly to include Scartho in Grimsby and Cleethorpes, or keep Grimsby (including Scartho) and Cleethorpes separate.</p>
BCE-75952	<p>Interesting that all the 'smarter' parts of the area, Humberston, Waltham etc are being moved out of Grimsby as well as the expanding Europark area. Makes grimsby / Cleethorpes a much poorer area on the whole. Would make more sense to combine North & North East Lincolnshire councils and possibly add Holton-le-Clay as most people living there work or get educated in Grimsby. It also means the proposed western by-pass would be out of area for Grimsby council.</p>
BCE-77334	<p>As a long-time resident of Scartho, a contiguous area of Grimsby, it is difficult to understand why (other than the need to satisfy some mathematical criteria) it should not form part of the Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes BC constituency in the future. Given that Scartho is part of a large urban area - with all the advantages and disadvantages that confers - it is difficult to see what we have in common with the many small - mainly rural - villages of South Humberside with which it is intended to combine us. In terms of geography and commerce, it makes sense to combine Grimsby and Cleethorpes into a single entity: sadly this doesn't, apparently, fit within the numerical constraints. I fully understand that the idea of some constituencies being significantly larger (in voter terms) than others is anathema to some, but the division proposed here defies common sense and I, for one, oppose it.</p>

BCE-77351	I do not wish our area, Scartho to be included in an area that is not related to Grimsby. I am happy to be included in the Great Grimsby boundary and find excluding us will be detrimental to the area, I can see future funding for the area not being offered to Scartho and Humberston, how ridiculous to cut us off from our Town, we are part of Grimsby. I do not agree with this boundary re alignment. The boundary for Great Grimsby is just down the road from us this is political cutting Conservative Scartho out of Great Grimsby.
BCE-77446	Great Grimsby Labour party has consulted its members and is broadly supportive of the Boundary Commission's proposal for the area of Grimsby and Cleethorpes. However, there is one improvement we would suggest, which would keep communities together and save the rich heritage of the constituency since the very beginnings of Parliament. We believe that a straight swap of Scartho and Haverstoe wards would be a far better outcome, not only for heritage but actually for both the Scartho community and the village of Humberston, which would have two MP's in the original proposal. Scartho Ward is a urban ward with strong links to Grimsby, with great bus links to the town centre, it is served by Grimsby Minster and with Grimsby being the economic centre of the area shopping and jobs are important to the residents and therefore any potential MP. There is a natural boundary in the form of a green belt, so residents would clearly know which constituency they would belong to. Humberston lies in two local authority wards, which is bad enough, to split a village between two MP's would cause confusion and might cause residents to abandon their representation all together. Imagine the scenario of one MP in favour of some policy affecting Humberston and One MP opposed to the policy, this would be an absolute nonsense and switch residents off. Members of Great Grimsby Labour Party did comment and wanted it passing on that the last proposal which the Boundary commission came up with was very poor indeed and this one is far more sensible, which we believe could be improved by the swap of the two wards mentioned. Both Sydney Sussex and Croft baker have many attributes that would make it sensible to combine them with Great Grimsby constituency and we welcome this. Such as common types of Housing and demographics, bus routes, and access to the river Humber.
BCE-77642	Scartho has been part of Grimsby for decades. It is a suburb of Grimsby. It is nonsensical to make it part of another constituency. I object strongly to your proposal.
BCE-77683	I want to remain in the Grimsby electoral boundary. I do not want to have south Humber or be linked to Immingham or Healing. I would prefer to continue as we are know.
BCE-78458	Scartho is so closely attached to Grimsby both geographically and through a shared heritage that it would be detrimental to the area to attach it to hull, Scunthorpe etc. Problems and issues which are german to hull and Scunthorpe are not necessarily reflected in Scartho and my concern is that an MP for the area would not grasp the fundamental differences and less time and concentration would be given to our local issues. Grimsby has a rich heritage and when the area was reformed as part of Humberside the beneficiaries were Hull as our police, ambulance services etc were centralised over the bridge. Lincolnshire was eventually reestablished but the majority of services remained in Hull where the ethos and intentions for the area are completely different. Don't split the area up even more.
BCE-78571	Scartho, Waltham and new Waltham are next door to each other. We are separate areas but who together form a community with common interests and goals. We work together to help inform, and make the areas we live in better. To pair Scartho with a place miles away, with absolutely nothing in common between the areas is ridiculous. Whoever is elected will ultimately have to choose between Scartho and Immingham's concerns and where to invest. This will absolutely result in Scartho being ignored altogether. If only the government didn't always look to maps as the crow flies or expediency, but looked instead at the communities involved, the people who live there, what they have in common, this ridiculously ignorant suggestion would never have been put forward. Scartho and Immingham's communities are world's and miles apart, in every conceivable way possible. It won't work. There can be no fairness between the areas in help or support. You might as well pair Scartho with Wales for all the good it will do. I presume this is the brainchild of some jobsworth in London who has never been to either area, has no idea of the people who live there or the needs of either area.
BCE-78733	I believe the proposed changes to the Great Grimsby constituency will skew representation for the area. Grimsby has long been a Labour voting constituency (since 1945), while Cleethorpes and the surrounding areas tend more towards Conservative. Tying Cleethorpes to Grimsby is likely to result in underrepresentation of Labour votes.
BCE-79023	South Humberside was abolished years ago. It's now North East Lincolnshire, is this a proposal to re-introduce it? I live in Grimsby but under these proposals I don't have a vote for the Grimsby MP. How is that of any sense?
BCE-79200	The areas surrounding Grimsby (Scartho, Waltham etc) are all part of Grimsby. There are no green belts separating us and to link us to towns & villages miles away is absolutely madness! The people suggesting this have absolutely no idea of the traditional loyalties associated with the area of Grimsby. It seems to be a number crunching exercise with no thought to the British public.
BCE-83720	Geographically, Grimsby and Cleethorpes - for the people who live here - are one and the same; we use both towns' facilities and services equally, without distinction. All that separates the town is a boundary line, and a name. While the proposed constituency makes geographical and political sense, I must advise that the name is representative. We used to be called South Humberside - a much disliked moniker because residents of this area do not consider themselves remotely connected to Hull/East Riding, aligning themselves more with Lincolnshire, hence the authority name change some years ago. This remains strong in the collective memory of the public here; the name should therefore contain 'Lincolnshire'. The Boundary Commission's proposal is sound. I believe the public will appreciate the recognition that the two towns are bonded together in the past and present, and always will be.
BCE-85506	Reference the proposal for the Great Grimsby Constituency. I have to say it is more acceptable than the last one. I don't fully agree. It is wrong to remove Scartho from Grimsby. Historically it has always been integral to Grimsby. Our hospital and cemetery are there, links between primary and secondary schools, and our bus services includes Scartho within routes. I propose Scartho is left in but that Haverstoe is removed.

Cleethorpes County Constituency - Comments Received from Boundary Commission for England

Comment ID	Comment
BCE-52730	<p>It is a shame the Commission still treats North and North East Lincolnshire with Yorkshire, rather than with the rest of Lincolnshire where it belongs. Much better constituencies would follow if this was done - Cleethorpes could extend southwards towards Mablethorpe and Grimsby could extend northwards - better than the proposed. "Grimsby and Cleethorpes" which lops off southern parts of both Grimsby (Scartho) and Cleethorpes (Humberston/Waltham). The awkward shape of Wolds ward also does not help with sensible constituency building - hopefully this ward will be abolished in the next North East Lincolnshire boundary review.</p> <p>This would also allow the Isle of Axholme to be paired with Gainsborough rather than with Doncaster, although the proposed "Doncaster East and Axholme" seat does make some sense - although it would probably be better named Thorne and Axholme as most of the "Doncaster East" part is really small towns and villages near Doncaster rather than the eastern portion of the city itself. But considering there is little chance of changing the status quo in this boundary review, the proposed constituencies for North Lincolnshire, North East Lincolnshire and East Yorkshire as about as good as they could be. The proposed Scunthorpe is a marked improvement on the current seat as it includes Burringham and Gunness and pairing Brigg with Barton and Immingham makes far more sense than the messy Brigg and Goole seat, even though the extension down to Humberston is not ideal.</p> <p>The only thing that could be improved are the names of the some of the seats, chiefly "South Humber" and "Haltemprice and Goole". South Humber would be better named Barton and Immingham, reflecting the two largest towns in the constituency. Calling a seat "South Humber" without including all of the South Humber region (which includes Grimsby, Cleethorpes, Scunthorpe and the Isle of Axholme) makes little sense. Goole and Haltemprice would be better named Goole and Cottingham. While Haltemprice has been included in a constituency name for a long while, it is a bit of an anachronism, referencing the old Urban District abolished nearly 50 years ago. We don't have Boothferry in a constituency name any more so why is there some obsession with keeping Haltemprice! Anyway, the Goole and Haltemprice seat includes even less of the old Haltemprice UDC area than the current Haltemprice and Howden, now Tranby and South Hunsley wards have gone to join Hull West and Hessle. Cottingham is a sizeable place and Goole and Cottingham would be a much more understandable name.</p>
BCE-53243	<p>Please tell me why the name 'Humber' is always used to identify parts of Lincolnshire instead of the proper name North East and North Lincolnshire. Humberside was done away with years ago. Hull and 'Humber' seem to have replaced the name Lincolnshire. Why are jobs in Grimsby advertised at the job centre in Hull? why is part of Lincolnshire's police based in Hull? why do Lincolnshire's ambulance service have east Midlands written on them? why are we still using 'regions' when we have supposed to have come out of the EU? looks like you have already made changes without even asking the people.</p>
BCE-53619	<p>I am very concerned about what may happen to Immingham if it is to become part of this South Bank constituency. It is an extremely important and unique port town and I don't believe that a representative on South Bank would have as much care and knowledge of the town than the current set up of Immingham, Grimsby, Cleethorpes. It has been lumped with this South Bank constituency as though it is one of the smaller villages or wards like Haverstoe or Waltham. It is a large, significant town. It has a very big and important port, just as the one at Grimsby. I believe it is inconsiderate to do this to Immingham and I worry about what will happen to it if this it to go forward. The town has come so far in recent years and it would be a shame for this to occur and that effort to improve our town to be wasted.</p>
BCE-53783	<p>I have lived in Cleethorpes for 30 years and I object to this proposal. Grimsby and Cleethorpes are two different areas. We have different needs. If this proposal goes ahead the needs of Cleethorpes will be ignored in favour of Grimsby. This is currently the case on North East Lincolnshire Council which is overly focused on Grimsby to the detriment of Cleethorpes. Why are the boundary commission restricted by European Regional Boundaries. We are not in the EU anymore. Take this condition away and it would make sense to link Cleethorpes with Humberston, New Waltham, Tetney, Holton Le Clay and as far south as Louth. That makes sense as a constituency as all the areas are driven by tourism and agriculture. Without a synergy between areas values, culture and identity it will mean some parts of the population will feel unrepresented. Cleethorpes and Grimsby do not have the same identity, values or economic need. So to link them in a constituency will decimate democracy in the area.</p>
BCE-53790	<p>I do not want Cleethorpes to be absorbed into Grimsby. We have nothing in common. If this happens Cleethorpes won't matter any more and everything will be about Grimsby. It won't be worth a vote. Keep Grimsby and Cleethorpes separate areas. Please look again and put tourist areas like Cleethorpes and Waltham in one constituency, with business and industrial areas like Grimsby, Immingham and Scunthorpe in another constituency.</p>
BCE-53824	<p>Why I ask you, just why? In 1996 the County where I live now was 'renamed' as such North East Lincolnshire from South Humberside at a cost I might add. And yet, still today (June 2021), we still get mail and e-mails I might add, that states that our County address is South Humberside. Even up until recently, our prescriptions from our local Medical Centre had South Humberside on our address.</p> <p>Have you not heard and took on board the adage - If it ain't broke don't fix it? I dare say that no matter how many of the public object to this 'fix' of a plan, it'll already be signed, sealed and delivered. Totally, totally wrong!</p> <p>It's no good going on with my thoughts, they won't be listened to along with anyone else that objects to this ludicrous plan. You should hang your heads in shame. After all that's going on in this world and what we've all been through and are still going through and you sit there hoping that because we are so hung up with what's been going on we won't be bothered to object.</p> <p>You and your Political ideas are a pain in the proverbial. I could go on and on but to be honest, I know it will be a waste of time. However you sleep well at night, I'll never know!</p>
BCE-54338	<p>The proposed changes doesn't especially effect my property. The 'outlying' neighbouring area reaching almost as far as Scunthorpe seems far. Why isn't Midfield Road area, with its projected large house building scheme, within the proposed Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes BC constituency?</p>
BCE-54625	<p>I feel that the area proposed is too big for any one MP to be able to ensure they can fairly represent their constituents. In addition it seems like it has been cobbled together to make up the numbers as it is an odd grouping of locations. However, my biggest issue is the proposed name for the area. Nobody here considers them selves as living in South Humber. We live in North Lincolnshire and we are proud of that fact. Humberside was abolished years ago as many people did not recognise it. I suggest using North Lincolnshire to describe the area would be much better</p>

BCE-54709	<p>I am not politically inclined and I am NOT a member of any Party, but [RD:59]</p> <p>I remember when the Conservative Party, under the leadership of Mrs. T. "stuck their nose," in 1974, in and changed the boundaries of not only Lincolnshire, but of many counties and towns up and down and across England, (such as, West Hartlepool and Hartlepool) which resulted in Cleethorpes, Grimsby, Immingham, and Scunthorpe being 'moved' from Lincolnshire to "South Humberside", a name much hated by many people, and STILL IS!</p> <p>I never used that name in my postal address and although commonsense prevailed in 1996(?) and we were 'moved' back into Lincolnshire, sobeit N.E.L, I still use Lincolnshire as my postal address. As far as I am concerned, the BCE should leave the boundaries for Grimsby and Cleethorpes as they are. And I am not a " Yellow belly," although I have lived here since 1961, having been born in W. Hartlepool, Co: Durham. in 193'X", so that makes me a Geordie.</p>
BCE-55147	<p>Why try to repair things when they aren't broken?</p> <p>NO WAY does this area want a "HUMBER" title in it. I would have thought lessons would have been learnt when we had to put up with (and still have to, with some correspondence) having the dreaded HUMBERSIDE included in our addresses.</p> <p>My ward "Haverstoe" in Cleethorpes borders on Croft Baker, Humberston into New Waltham. To take Humberston and New Waltham into another area and us and Croft Baker into areas which include the town of Grimsby is madness. Grimsby and Cleethorpes are two separate towns. When we do work together it is for our own good and not meant to stretch far and wide. These proposals are madness and will cause outrage by residents who care about the area.</p>
BCE-55839	<p>Grimsby constituency should either include all of Scartho or none of it as some of Scartho was ripped out of Scartho and put into park ward. Furthermore the term Humberside should not be used as a do called region or as a new enforced constituency.</p>
BCE-56393	<p>The proposed South Humber constituency would be acceptable to me, as a resident of Barton Upon Humber (Barton). Whilst not necessarily my preferred choice, given the constraints the boundary commission have to work within, the proposal achieves electoral equality and avoids splitting either Grimsby or Cleethorpes into two constituencies, a key concern from earlier proposed boundary changes. The smaller towns of Barton and Immingham in particular may get more attention from not being overshadowed by a larger town in the constituency, currently Cleethorpes " Brigg provides a more similar sized third key town. I do appreciate though that the consequence of the Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes combination is a sub-optimal constituency for the villages south of Grimsby and Cleethorpes, such as Waltham and Humberston, who may feel little connection to towns such as Brigg. Given the regional boundary between Yorkshire and the Humber, and the East Midlands, it would appear that it is a trade-off between either splitting Grimsby or Cleethorpes into two constituencies, or placing the villages south of Grimsby and Cleethorpes into a sub-optimal constituency. I would also like to offer my strong support for the proposed South Humber name. It is a geographically accurate name, reflecting the estuary that forms the northern border of the constituency. It will avoid any confusion with the local councils, North Lincolnshire and North East Lincolnshire, who do not cover the same exact geography. In addition, another potential name, Northern Lincolnshire, is often used to refer to North and North East Lincolnshire combined, which again does not match the geography of the proposed constituency. As a resident of Barton, I would like to have seen the town included in the constituency name, but for the South Humber proposal with three similar sized towns included, as well as various significant villages south of Grimsby and Cleethorpes, to highlight only one or two place names maybe unfair. Should the commission be minded to consider alternative options for the constituency map, I would urge the commission to be open minded to including Barton with communities on the north bank of the Humber Estuary ' i.e. a constituency covering both sides of the Humber Bridge. There is various evidence to justify this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The December 2018 Grant Thornton report for the Humber LEP, 'Review of the Humber's Economic Geography' concluded that the Hull+ economic centre extended out to include Barton. - The 2019 North Lincolnshire Retail and Leisure Study notes that "Barton residents visit Hull to a greater extent than Scunthorpe for comparison shopping" (Paragraph 4.22). - The 2019 Planning Application for a new Wren Kitchens factory in Barton (PA-2019-1147) Economic Impact Report noted that in April 2019, 52% of the Wren staff employed at their Barton site were from HU postcodes (807 employees). - Provision of more bus services from Barton to Hull than to any other nearby town. - Much of the hospital care accessed by Barton residents is done so at Hull Royal Infirmary or Castle Hill Hospital in Cottingham. - Many Barton students attend sixth form college at the Wyke Sixth Form College in Hull.
BCE-56618	<p>Terrible name and brings back memories of North and South Humberside which were both roundly rejected. If it's a County, then why not have Lincolnshire or variation thereof. Changing a name will not in itself address inequalities of resources.</p>
BCE-57861	<p>I am the former Croft Baker Ward Councillor from 2010 until 2018. I am raised in Cleethorpes and born in Great Grimsby. I have considered the proposals outlined by the Boundary Commission and do not feel they take into account: 1) Identity 2) Social need of area 3) Economic need of area 4) Coherence of representation of future Members of Parliament. The current proposal does not take into account that the areas of Cleethorpes, Great Grimsby and Immingham are very different areas. They have very different identities and social and economic needs. Grimsby and Immingham have more in common as they are Port Based Industry. Grimsby, once the worlds largest fishing port and now one of the largest renewables areas and Immingham, the largest port by tonnage in the UK have much more in common than Grimsby and Cleethorpes. In addition the North Lincolnshire towns of Brigg and Barton will use Great Grimsby as their main shopping and travel to work area. Cleethorpes, Humberston and New Waltham and Wolds are more rural. The villages see Cleethorpes as their Town Centre. Their needs are not based around heavy industry in the same way Great Grimsby and Immingham are. The areas of Cleethorpes and Villages is based on tourism and agriculture. Based on this I propose the following seats:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p> <p>The proposal I have put forward ensures no one is left behind. A member of Parliament can put forward a coherent message to the UK Parliament. This is in contrast to the Boundary Commissions initial proposals which would create Constituencies with a clash of agricultural/tourism and that of Industry and big business. The Constituency names I have put forward also ensure that no area is left behind. By putting Immingham first in the proposed Immingham and Great Grimsby Constituency I have ensured that the villages that are strongly linked to Immingham: Ferry, Barton, Brigg and Wolds, and Barton are at the forefront of the Member of Parliaments thoughts. Immingham is the main work area for these areas due to the work at the Ports. It also preserves the historic Constituency name of Great Grimsby, a Constituency that has a stand glass window in Parliament such is the history of the area. The Constituency of Cleethorpes and Villages ensures that the main urban conurbation remains the focal point in the constituency name. However, by including 'Villages' it ensures the rural tourist focused nature is reemphasised to all. The proposals I have put forward also create two marginal constituencies, by luck rather than a well thought out plan. By having two marginal constituencies it ensures that a Member of Parliament has to really represent an area rather than simply be a vote for the government of the day. This strengthens the voice of the electorate by ensuring the area is on the mind of the government in every decision it makes. This could be extremely useful for an area such as these which require significant investment to bring the more deprived council wards out of deprivation and improving the life chances, health and economic wellbeing of the population.</p>

BCE-57871	<p>I disagree with the Boundary Commissions proposals to link Cleethorpes with Grimsby. I support the following proposal which would create more coherent constituencies with better representation.</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-57872	<p>I do not support The Boundary Commission and wish to put forward the following proposal:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-58166	<p>I do not agree with the proposed boundary changes for the area I live in..firstly Cleethorpes should not be lumped in with a huge area of Grimsby. Also including Humberside on another area is ridiculous. Humberside, thankfully, no longer exists.</p>
BCE-58169	<p>Humberside . . . No thank you. Lincolnshire born, and it makes no sense to single Humberston out. We have our boundaries. Its akin to deciding Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are smaller than England so we'll divvy England up so people can change to being Welsh, Scottish or Irish . . .</p>

BCE-58183	<p>I do not support the boundary commission. I support the following alternative proposals including proposed constituency names:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p>
BCE-58241	Absolutely do not agree cleethorpes is a seaside town and should stay cleethorpes ,
BCE-58256	Cleethorpes isnt Grimsby and shouldn't be included in this boundary as 1. This is rewriting history.
BCE-58313	The changes in this area are being made in an attempt for the Conservative party to maintain their status in this area. The currently cleethorpes constituency for as long as I've know has been conservative. Parts of the generally conservative cleethorpes have been added into the Great Grimsby constituency in an obvious attempt to bolster the number of conservative voters in the historically labour voting Grimsby.
BCE-58333	I have to say, being Cleethorpes born and raised, that Cleethorpes is and always should be an independent entity. Okay It has its own boarders it's own people and therefore it's own representation in our great parliament. This proposal is ludicrous and shows again that people that run our country from the heady heights of London have no idea what the people think and the pride people have in their birth place.
BCE-58423	My concerns are we used to be part of Lincolnshire many many years ago. We then got moved to South Humberside? We then changed to North East Lincolnshire. Please explain to me as a resident why the need for change again? Reason for being bothered is that I would like someone to explain why and yet again why?
BCE-58474	I live in one of the current Cleethorpes local government costituencies earmarked to be joined to Grimsby. I was born and brought up in Cleethorpes and am proud to say it is my home TOWN...that being the operative word! Cleethorpes is a town in its own right, not an appendage to Grimsby, and should therefore be treated as such in any boundary considerations.
BCE-58602	As a growing town on the outskirts of Grimsby all our facilities and transport links are closely tied to Grimsby itself and the current NELC if we become south humberside again the other constituents are a majority of small towns and villages. Rural communities farm based with different needs to our growing industrial town. I feel our own needs may be passed by under the new South Humberside but better covered under Great Grimsby
BCE-58842	The area outlined covers the main populated areas of two seperate towns, Grimsby & Cleethorpes, which have their own identity and demographic with differing needs and priorities, individual housing markets, economic activity, history and political majority. This plan would not provide adequate representation of the diverse population living within the boundry, and would leave one or other town disadvantaged, with their priorities not being at the forefront of presentations to Government. This could potentially risk a detrimental impact on future investment in one town over the other with Government representatives having focus on their home area and related interests. I am sure that this is one example of similar situations in other areas across the country, and a sweeping change which does not take into account the knock on effect at a local level could damage long established local economies and cause discontent amongst those who are affected. This is particularly relevant if they feel that their vote will not count as the traditional political seat in their home area is overshadowed by a larger political presence in the new larger area.
BCE-58851	Merging Grimsby and Cleethorpes would be a disaster. The towns are very different with very different needs and issues.
BCE-58865	Absolutely NO WAY do I wish to become part of Grimsby. I moved to Humberston, Cleethorpes, because it is a good area, mostly without any social problems... If I had wanted to live in Grimsby I would have moved to Grimsby. I most definitely wish to remain Humberston, Cleethorpes.
BCE-58931	Cleethorpes has always been independent from Grimsby. It makes more sense to link Grimsby with Immingham (all industrial) and join Cleethorpes with all the surrounding areas so we have an MP for Grimsby and Immingham and another MP for Cleethorpes and District.
BCE-59077	I disagree with the boundary changes. I see myself on the western side of town as being in Grimsby. Yet you put my village in the Cleethorpes constituency which I have no affiliation with. Under this new plan you have created South Humber! I'm sorry but this is unwieldy and you are then expecting my MP to cover a larger area with people in the neighbouring county. It would make more sense to put Cleethorpes, Grimsby and Immingham as one constituency and create another one with the people in North Lincolnshire. I for one am totally against this decision. MP in the South Humber would spend more time driving around then doing their work!
BCE-59373	I don't want to be under Grimsby I think Cleethorpes should be kept separate as I think we will be forgotten and Grimsby will have all the money and upkeep while Cleethorpes will be left to rot.

BCE-60245	<p>We write on behalf of our members of The Bangladeshi Islamic Cultural Society in Cleethorpes to oppose your initial proposals to have one Member of Parliament for Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes. We believe that having one Member of Parliament will not be very good for the area as we have a different cultural identity, different values and requirements. Our members have lived in Cleethorpes and surrounding villages for many years. We believe that Cleethorpes has little linking it to Great Grimsby. Cleethorpes is very rural and its industry is based on tourism. As a place it has more in common with Louth, Mablethorpe and Southern Lincolnshire. However, we appreciate that under your current requirements all parliamentary seats must remain in regional and council ward boundaries. Thus, linking Cleethorpes to Southern Lincolnshire would not be possible. As a Trustee Board we have voted unanimously to support the alternative proposals put forward by local resident [RD:19]. The proposals he has put forward are the creation of two seats called Cleethorpes & Villages and Immingham & Great Grimsby. The seats would be created in the following way:</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Villages - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p> <p>Immingham and Great Grimsby - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p> <p>We believe that Cleethorpes and Villages are historically linked and are more rural. Consequently, it would be a good idea to link the them into one parliamentary seat. We also believe the creation of a Humber Ports Constituency of Immingham & Great Grimsby would give that area a stronger and more coherent voice as those areas strive to rebuild their industry and communities to meet the emerging challenges of the 21st Century. The alternative proposals ensure genuine communities are brought together in our representative democracy. They ensure that everyone's voice is heard which is at the heart of our democratic society in the United Kingdom. As an organisation we would like to make it clear that we will not be taking part in any further part in the process. It is essential that our charity remains politically neutral and are aware that stages after the initial proposals can include political campaigns for or against proposals. As a charity, we represent a wide demographic of political views. Therefore, we would not want to be seen as taking political sides as neutrality is essential. Please consider our submission for all future stages. May Allah bless your work and grant you wisdom in your decision making.</p>
BCE-60573	I'm concerned about Cleethorpes losing its voice. Keeping the name Cleethorpes in the new constituency would be a crucial part of keeping this identity. How about Cleethorpes and Grimsby?
BCE-62628	the area that New Waltham is in looks too large and spread out. I think it should be reduced in area,distance, ie more compact.
BCE-62794	I am supportive of the proposals. The changes to the Cleethorpes constituency are sensible and necessary given the constraints placed on the constituency electorate sizes. However, I must voice my opposition to the name "South Humber". Whilst the reformed constituency does require a new name, given the loss of the naming town, I dislike the generic name used. The ordeal of "Humberside" left a sour-taste in the mouths of people in this area of Lincolnshire, and I do not wish to see that name used to denote this area again. Like happened during the existence of "Humberside", "Humber" tends to draw people's mind to Hull and the rest of eastern Yorkshire, not the towns of northern Lincolnshire. Therefore, a better reflection of the constituency would be given by avoiding that name. Might I suggest one of the following instead: "Barton and Immingham", "Barton, Immingham and Waltham" after the main towns of the constituency, or "Northern/North Lincolnshire" given the constituency covers a greater area of the northern part of our county than Cleethorpes does currently. "Northern/North Lindsey" is another option, recognising the historic part of Lincs the constituency lies in, if it is wished to avoid names similar to current authority areas where they don't closely align. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.
BCE-62924	Why on earth would you put Laceby in an area that includes a district as far out as new Holland also calling it South Humber is a kick in the teeth after campaigning so long to get rid of Humberside.
BCE-63114	I refer to the proposals for changes to parliamentary constituencies south of the river Humber and in particular my own constituency of Cleethorpes. These proposals are as extraordinary as they are unacceptable. The word gerrymandering does not do them justice. I submit below alternatives for consideration. The effect of your proposed changes is to disenfranchise sections of the electorate with the removal of any semblance of affinity, affection and loyalty. There is clearly no thought given to the coherent nature of the proposed constituency arrangements. Cross council proposals are made (indeed already exist) yet there is clearly no cross regional element in any of this draft work. Regional demarcations ceased to play any electoral part once the UK left the EU. These regions are highly contentious south of the River Humber. The northern parts of Lincolnshire are included in the Yorkshire and the Humber region, while the remainder of Lincolnshire is included in the East Midlands region. More importantly it has to be observed that the only reason the Yorkshire and The Humber name is used (and not merely Yorkshire) is a failed attempt to deceive or assuage public opinion south of the River Humber into believing they are actually living in the county of their choice while in fact they have remained in the dissolved County Humberside through the rigid continuation of its demarcations and remain officially considered as residents of Yorkshire. This is deeply offensive and highly inflammatory. I am dismayed these draft proposals have chosen to introduce the constituency name South Humber. This can only be with mischievous intent designed to distract from the demarcations proposed and to divert minds to changing the proposed name rather than boundaries. This is not appropriate for an independent review. Constituencies need a bonding coherence in order to have a collective interest that can be adequately represented and articulated in Parliament. Conflicting party loyalties detract from this at times when there are clear and unavoidable minority elements to a constituency makeup. This is in the nature of society in general - a clear majority should always prevail. None of these proposed constituency changes reflect any of the elements that contribute to social harmony, civic identity, and a personal commitment to community. The present Cleethorpes constituency is a deeply flawed design and does need to change. It brings together wholly disparate communities who were not previously brought together in a parliamentary constituency. The northern part of the constituency around Barton looks westward towards Scunthorpe and not to the south and to Grimsby. It shares little in common with the town of Cleethorpes and nothing at all with Immingham. There are diverging political elements here too. The proposals drafted here show a tortuous redrawing of the political mapping in order to merge Grimsby and Cleethorpes into a single entity. There is no local sentiment to support such a postulation and any such outcome is certain to be highly contentious and divisive. These two communities have diverging political interests and economies and have generations of separate and independent existence. There are conflicting interests that cannot be reconciled. Cleethorpes is not Grimsby. Clusters of electors are being shunted from one constituency to another without any thought given to whether they might actually have any of their interests represented in the proposed changes. This is simply not good enough for a democratic society and leaves some sections of society effectively disenfranchised. The rigid adherence to regional demarcations not recognised by those who live in these areas can be seen with proposals that remove the Isle of Axholme from Lincolnshire and cede it to Doncaster in Yorkshire when these two communities differ so greatly. This leaves Axholme in effect unrepresented. These regional demarcations are wholly contrived and do not represent local sentiment and their retention for electoral purposes is unsuited to forming constituencies with a balanced electorate and a coherent agenda. The unitaries of North & North Lincolnshire and the county of Lincolnshire are both included in regions to which they have no affinity and need to be moved to the East Anglia region where they have more in common. I therefore seek consideration of these changes to these draft proposals in my area.

<p>BCE-63114 (Continued)</p>	<p>PRESENT CONSTITUENCY: CLEETHORPES: This constituency should be dissolved with all wards moved to three other constituencies. The constituency has conflicting interests better served by other electoral arrangements and has little elector affinity to justify its continued existence.</p> <p>WARD LOSSES:</p> <p>TO PROPOSED NEW CONSTITUENCY OF CLEETHORPES & SKEGNESS: North East Lincolnshire: Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston and New Waltham, Sidney Sussex.</p> <p>TO PROPOSED CHANGED CONSTITUENCY OF GRIMSBY & IMMINGHAM: North East Lincolnshire: Immingham, Wolds, Waltham.</p> <p>TO PROPOSED CHANGED CONSTITUENCY OF BRIGG & GOOLE: North Lincolnshire: Barton, Ferry.</p> <p>PROPOSED NEW CONSTITUENCY: CLEETHORPES & SKEGNESS: This proposed new constituency removes conflicting economic interests for the new member to better serve a coherent local community having much in common. Coastal communities require closer political attention and in bringing together these neighbouring tourist destinations and hinterland their interest in Parliament can be articulated and heard.</p> <p>NEW ELECTORATE 74939</p> <p>WARD GAINS:</p> <p>FROM THE PRESENT CONSTITUENCY OF CLEETHORPES: North East Lincolnshire: Croft Baker, Haverstoe, Humberston and New Waltham, Sidney Sussex.</p> <p>FROM THE PRESENT CONSTITUENCY OF LOUTH & HORNCastle: East Lindsey: Chapel St Leonards, Mablethorpe, Marshchapel and Somercotes, Sutton on Sea, Tetney, Withern and Theddlethorpe, Alford.</p> <p>FROM PRESENT CONSTITUENCY OF THE BOSTON & SKEGNESS: East Lindsey: Winthorpe, Ingoldmells, St. Clements, Scarborough & Seacroft.</p> <p>PRESENT CONSTITUENCY: GREAT GRIMSBY: This should be enlarged with a change of name to GRIMSBY & IMMINGHAM. This proposal brings together the twin seaports of Grimsby and Immingham and the industrial ribbon that lies between them. It is a largely industrial focused constituency and these electoral arrangements preserve coherence and present sufficient community of interest to serve its electorate.</p> <p>NEW ELECTORATE: 82,294</p> <p>FROM THE PRESENT CONSTITUENCY OF GREAT GRIMSBY: North East Lincolnshire: East Marsh, Freshney, Heneage, Park, Scartho, South, West Marsh, Yarborough</p> <p>WARD GAINS:</p> <p>FROM THE PRESENT CONSTITUENCY OF CLEETHORPES: North East Lincolnshire: Immingham, Wolds, Waltham</p>
<p>BCE-64125</p>	<p>I am absolutely against combining Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Grimsby has had a far too big say in Cleethorpes politics for years. The council is combined already. We must have our independent MP . Since we lost our council we have seen the gradual demise in our resort. To me it is a pity that there aren't 20 miles between the two towns. Grimsby holds us back time after time.</p>
<p>BCE-65059</p>	<p>I support the proposed Grimsby and Cleethorpes constituency. Fishing and commerce have linked the North East Lincolnshire area since the Roman and Saxon times. This relationship centred on fishing based at Grimsby through to food manufacturing factories within the surrounding area continues to this day. In other words, the employment from this core industry links Grimsby and Cleethorpes.</p> <p>Another link is that Cleethorpes was originally founded as a holiday resort and a place for relaxation and recuperation, with soft sand beaches ideal for tourism and an alternative residential area for the people in Grimsby. Tourists come from all over the country to visit Cleethorpes. While visiting, they tend to also visit the fishing Heritage centre in Grimsby. The two towns and their suburbs are also in the same local authority area, so it makes sense to twin them into the same constituency.</p>
<p>BCE-67132</p>	<p>it is now time to stop using the word HUMBER, there is no such place , it isn't even a river , its an estuary , no one lives there to vote , even the M.E.P 's have gone from Europe that represented a place that was never there on a map , Yorkshire is Yorkshire [no Humber] if North E. Lincs goes back in to Lincolnshire the estuary can can be taken off the silly none sense title , Yorkshire and the Humber , Humber is not a place and never will be .</p>
<p>BCE-67407</p>	<p>We are North East Lincolnshire lucky if you can find us on any drop down box system. We either come under Lincolnshire or New South Humber. I remember many years became North East Lincs. We have been a boundary which was quite large then reduced abs then again. Investment has been sparse. We are classed as quite impoverished but this may be due to money in coffers. Recently became Tory in last election now money appears to be a plenty for project about the towns. However I would just hope we continue to attain investment from central government as European Union funding used to be our saviour.. investment should be fairly distributed . We are very industrialised no longer the fishing fleet of yester year more renewable energy. Hope we attain benefits of this to our area snd more especially those that ar e in need. Time for us to be the focus ot new investment with renewable energy options on our door step and our carbon footprint be for locals not just large payments to shareholders</p>
<p>BCE-67904</p>	<p>This area has always been part of Lincolnshire, experiments in the past trying to create a link with Yorkshire and the Humber failed miserably with the abolition of Humberside county council.</p> <p>Any new constituency should recognise the local links with the surrounding rural area.</p> <p>The Humber is a river not an area of land. Any constituency should be named after the geographical location of the county it is located in.</p>

BCE-69477	<p>I write to express concern at your initial proposals for the constituencies that include North East Lincolnshire towns and villages. I am not a native to North East Lincolnshire, indeed I am from Kent, originally from Mauritius and I do not live in the area. However, I worked in the area for 2 years as a Principle Dentist at a local dental practice, Dentaris Ltd. Whilst looking from the outside in, one would be forgiven for thinking that Grimsby, Cleethorpes and villages are the same area. Thus one would think, it makes little difference how the constituencies are configured. It is only when you work, live and get to know the area that the areas contained within the borough are very different and each have a distinct unique identity. Indeed, the main urban conurbations of Cleethorpes, Immingham and Grimsby have distinct separate identities, cultures and values of their individual peoples. This is especially true of Cleethorpes and Grimsby. Grimsby a once proud fishing town and Cleethorpes a rural seaside town with one of the best beaches in the UK. Some may say The Jewel in the Crown of the East Coast. They, especially, have very different peoples and community ethos.</p> <p>Having looked at your proposals and I would suggest that the areas of Grimsby and Immingham together with the other South Humber Ports have more in common than linking Cleethorpes with Grimsby. This is due to Grimsby, Immingham and the other South Humber ports being focused on industry including fishing, car transportation, renewables and food manufacturing. Cleethorpes is more strongly linked to the villages of Humberston, New Waltham and Waltham. Many of the tourist sites that make Cleethorpes unique is contained within these areas, especially Humberston and Waltham. Moreover, the people of the villages use Cleethorpes as their main area to access to sports, leisure, education, support services and health. By combining all of the villages in a South Humber Constituency you are combining self-contained communities that use the other main urban conurbations of Cleethorpes and Grimsby for the above services but have nothing in common apart from that. Consequently, there is a lack of influence from a Member of Parliament on their key issues. Having considered the options available I believe the following are more appropriate alternative proposals:</p> <p>South Humberside Ports Constituency - East Marsh: 6369 West Marsh: 4661 Freshney: 7210 Yarborough: 8444 Wolds: 6029 Immingham: 8771 Ferry: 8975 Brigg and Wolds: 9152 Broughton and Appleby 5188 Barton: 9367 Total Electors: 74166</p> <p>Cleethorpes and Rural District Constituency - Sidney Sussex: 8216 Croft Baker: 8660 Haverstoe: 8195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9471 Henage: 8013 Park: 8967 South: 8315 Scartho: 8929 Waltham: 5638 Total Electors: 74404</p>
BCE-70371	<p>I appreciate that the boundaries may change between now and the revised draft but I feel the name "South Humber" is terrible for this constituency.</p> <p>Why is it bad? Putting aside the immediate reminders of South Humberside the proposed constituency would not even include the two biggest conurbations and industrial centre of the south bank of the Humber, Grimsby and Scunthorpe, so it would not make sense to anyone in the area for Brigg to be in a constituency called South Humber but Cleethorpes not to be.</p> <p>Alternatives...</p> <p>Clearly the Commission has struggled to come up with a name given the large number of small towns in this proposed constituency. Any combination of towns would end up excluding others. In the east of the constituency Waltham and Scartho are the areas that everyone in that section of the constituency would most easily relate to. In the west, Brigg is the most obvious but that is so far away from Barton and Immingham that it appears to exclude them.</p> <p>I would therefore recommend that Elsham - an extremely well known village, historic hall and country park is used as the reference point for the west. Everyone in Brigg, Barton and Immingham can immediately relate to Elsham.</p> <p>Obviously Elsham and Waltham doesn't sound great. I therefore recommend that the constituency be named Elsham and Scartho.</p>
BCE-70613	<p>I have taken the view that the current proposals do not take into account the local views of the area. I live and was raised in Waltham. My town centre is either Cleethorpes or Grimsby. It is those two areas that I go to see my GP, use leisure facilities such as watching Grimsby Town or going to the gym or going on Cleethorpes Coast Light Railway and they are where I go shopping. Grimsby and Cleethorpes are the two natural Town Centres for my area. The boundary commissions proposal has lumped in all of the villages into one Parliamentary Constituency. This makes little sense from a local perspective. The proposed South Humber constituency links all of the surrounding villages into one constituency. The villages are self-contained communities. I can understand why the Boundary Commission has done this. However, it has not taken account of the use of services which I have described above. It is important that a Member of Parliament is able to support their residents, via their casework and work in Parliament, in advocating for the improvement of services and raising any issues that their residents are facing. This would be diluted in the current proposals. Traditionally, Waltham and the surrounding villages have been linked with Cleethorpes in a parliamentary constituency. This has been the case since I can remember. This traditional link makes much more sense due to the shared values, ethos and culture of an area that was once part of the wider Lincolnshire area which is more rural and traditional with a countryside feel due to the Lincolnshire Wolds been close by. I also do not think Grimsby should be linked with Cleethorpes. Grimsby would fit better with the other industrial areas of the borough. Areas that are focused on the renewables sector, food production, manufacturing and fishing. Some may say a more industrialised constituency should be created with the aim of bringing investment to the area and understanding the need of the significant amounts of deprivation in the areas contained within it. This would give the MP more opportunities to push for investment, opportunities and support to lift people out of poverty and give them greater life chances and opportunities which the community deserve so much having been felt behind following the slow collapse of the fishing industry. It would be much more cohesive to link the ports and manufacturing areas of Barton, Ferry, Immingham and Grimsby into a single constituency. Finally, I believe that the number of electors under the boundary commissions current proposals is unfair. The South Humberside Constituency contains 71,628 constituents. In comparison the Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Constituency contains 77,050 constituents. This results in the residents of the South Humberside Constituency having a greater say per person than those of Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Having researched alternatives I would recommend the following alternative:</p> <p>The Cleethorpes and Rural District Constituency - Sidney Sussex: 8,216 Croft Baker: 8,660 Haverstoe: 8,195 Humberston and New Waltham: 9,471 Henage: 8,013 Park: 8,967 South: 8,315 Scartho: 8,929 Waltham: 5,638 Total Electors: 74,404</p>

BCE-70613 (continued)	<p>The South Humberside Ports Constituency - East Marsh: 6,369 West Marsh: 4,661 Freshney: 7,210 Yarborough: 8,444 Wolds: 6,029 Immingham: 8,771 Ferry: 8,975 Brigg and Wolds: 9,152 Broughton and Appleby: 5,188 Barton: 9,367 Total Electors: 74,166</p> <p>This alternative proposal have a number of advantages: 1) It unites genuine communities into two constituencies that better fit those communities values, culture and ethos; 2) The number of electors is more evenly distributed. This means each residents views is worth similar to that of those in a neighbouring constituency; 3) The proposal unites genuine communities around a town centre that each area uses to access services and provisions; 4) It takes into account the historical formation of the constituencies and how each borough was formed " Cleethorpes and Villages formed as part of Lincolnshire, Grimsby as a County Borough; 5) It acknowledges and accepts the findings of the last review by the Boundary Commission for England: 'The Boundary Commission for England's Sixth Periodic Review of Westminster constituencies (2020)', carried out between 2011 and 2018 which recognised the significant differences in the communities of Grimsby, Cleethorpes, Immingham and the rural villages. Whilst this report is states the proposal is not ideal and there is no perfect option, the amended proposal I have put forward does provide greater cohesion of community and views within the proposed structure that is informed by local knowledge.</p> <p>I hope that the current Members of Parliament, Martin Vickers MP and Lia Nici MP, will launch a campaign to keep Cleethorpes and Grimsby separate and support these alternative proposals as it is essential that there is genuine cohesion in any parliamentary seat to promote the challenges residents face and find genuine, workable solutions and ensure genuine cohesive representation so that no one feels left behind. I hope these views help inform your final report and recommendations.</p>
BCE-71455	<p>My objection is to the name being South Humber. There is a great deal of local pride in being part of Lincolnshire and a great resentment to being part of any Humber association. How about Northern Lincolnshire ? Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>
BCE-72231	<p>I write in support of the Boundary Commission recommendations in Northern Lincolnshire, part of the Yorkshire and Humber region.</p> <p>I believe the boundaries proposed are the most fair and effective way of equalising, to the greatest extent possible, the size of constituencies across England which addresses a fundamental problem that has existed for many years.</p> <p>These reforms will ensure that every vote cast in a general election will carry equal weight which is paramount following years of people moving around the country and distorting the electoral balance.</p> <p>Bringing together the town of Cleethorpes and, as much as is possible, Grimsby is a sensible move as their interests are clearly, though distinct, dependant on each other. In deciding which ward to leave out of the Great Grimsby & Cleethorpes constituency the Scartho ward is the best solution. It has its own identity and residents always refer to the retail centre as 'the village.'</p> <p>The recommendations deal with local sensitivities as best as possible within the guidelines by which they are governed and, I believe, will lead to minimal disruption for local people. However, I would point out that future reviews should not follow the regional boundary. Grimsby & Cleethorpes are right up against this boundary with the East Midlands and large numbers of people who look to Grimsby & Cleethorpes for their public services and work live in villages that fall in a different region. Their social networks are also part of the Grimsby/Cleethorpes community.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the suggested constituency name of 'South Humber.' Local opinion is quite clear; people regard themselves as from Lincolnshire and use of Humber or Humberside is widely disliked & is not acceptable. As an alternative, I propose 'Northern Lincolnshire'</p> <p>Bar that one proviso, I whole heartedly support the recommendations for the Lincolnshire part of the region.</p>
BCE-74577	<p>This Council supports the Boundary Commission for England's proposed amendments to Parliamentary constituency boundaries as they affect North East Lincolnshire, i.e. the proposed new Great Grimsby and Cleethorpes Borough Constituency and the South Humber County Constituency, though we wish to see the latter renamed the Northern Lincolnshire County Constituency.</p>
BCE-74582	<p>I write on behalf of the Cleethorpes Conservative Association (CCA) in support of the Boundary Commission recommendations in Northern Lincolnshire, part of the Yorkshire and Humber region.</p> <p>We agree that the boundaries proposed are the most fair and effective way of equalising, to the greatest extent possible, the size of constituencies across England which addresses a fundamental problem that has existed for many years. CCA agree that these reforms will ensure that every vote cast in a general election will carry equal weight which is paramount following years of people moving around the country and distorting the electoral balance. Bringing together the town of Cleethorpes and, as much as is possible, Grimsby is a sensible move as their interests are clearly, though distinct, dependant on each other. In deciding which ward to leave out of the Great Grimsby & Cleethorpes constituency the Scartho ward is the best solution. It has its own identity and residents always refer to the retail centre as 'the village.'</p> <p>The recommendations deal with local sensitivities as best as possible within the guidelines by which they are governed and, we agree will lead to minimal disruption for local people. Future reviews should not follow the regional boundary. Grimsby & Cleethorpes are right up against this boundary with the East Midlands and large numbers of people who look to Grimsby & Cleethorpes for their public services and work/live in villages that fall in a different region. Their social networks are also part of the Grimsby/Cleethorpes community.</p> <p>CCA strongly oppose the suggested constituency name of 'South Humber.' Local opinion is very clear; people regard themselves as from Lincolnshire and the use of Humber or Humberside is widely disliked & is not acceptable. As an alternative, we propose 'Northern Lincolnshire.' Apart from the suggested constituency name, CCA support the recommendations for the Lincolnshire part of the region.</p>
BCE-78533	<p>I am concerned that NE Lincolnshire is not represented fully and some areas are going to be 'lumped in' with N Lincs ie Barton area with Humberston/Waltham etc</p> <p>Also, Cleethorpes and Grimsby both have their own MP's at present time, this proposal gives us 50% less representation in the House of Commons than we already have! We may be up north but we are important!</p>
BCE-83817	<p>I would like to mention that the geography of the boundaries would give a fair and diverse representation of each constituencies, and I agree that the name should have more of a Lincolnshire friendly name rather than South humber.</p> <p>I do support the name of Northern Lincolnshire that is being proposed.</p>