

# North Yorkshire

## Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Postcode: [REDACTED]  
Organisation Name: (Member of the public)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Scarborough and Whitby

As regards Whitby the current set up of two urban wards (split roughly east and west within the parish boundaries) and two rural ward (given your aim to have 89 wards in total) are a reasonable setup. There does however clearly need to be a re-drawing of the borders between Whitby West and Streonshall and between Dandy & Mulgrave and Esk Valley to give them more equal electorates. But I would oppose having those wards cross the Whitby Parish boundary or have areas to the east or south of the 2 rural wards being added into them and hence crossing the Parliamentary Boundary.

Specifically regarding the 2 wards within the parish of Whitby, the Town Council there has already requested and is in desperate need of having it's own boundary review. It has been told that this NYC review must happen first. So I would advise that you do the detailed groundwork now during this boundary review so that a further review of the Town Council's wards can be undertaken much more easily.

As regards Scarborough, the only area I have specific comments on is in the Seamer/Cayton area. Both those wards are currently FAR too small. I would suggest combining them in some way (which would make it into a single but too large ward) and then give small parts of that new single ward to surrounding wards (such as giving Osgoodby to Eastfield) to make the overall sizes more equal.

Of course what you do in that area will rely heavily on changes you make to the urban Scarborough wards. I notice there are some significant differences in electorate size there and that is difficult to equal those urban Scarborough wards out without involving those semi-rural wards like Seamer and Cayton which are outside the currently unparished area of Scarborough.

## Attached Documents:

*None attached*