



Comisiwn Ffiniau
i Gymru

Boundary Commission
for Wales

Boundary Commission
for Wales

Revised Proposals Consultation: Representations

Volume 2: 10247 (part 1)

Dear Mr Justice Dame Nerys Jefford,

May you and all your team be keeping well and thank-you for your work. Please would you keep all my particulars, etc private-thanks. Taking Wales as six different parts/regions to look at these and consider what the localities show. Beginning with the North-West and moving southward to the South-East.

North-West Many would wish keeping the holiday towns together. This would be particularly the case in Conwy district. From Llandrillo-yn-Rhos to Pentre Mawr, and so especially Rhin and Llandrillo-yn-Rhos wards. With Llandrillo-yn-Rhos going eastward rather than westward. It is a built-up area - one "conurbation". Keep the city of Bangor together, not to split Bangor

City. Not to divide Arfon. That the area/region can be seen as three - (1) Coasts - Holidaying (2) Inland - Farming (3) Built-up (Urban) towns. Mainly the urban towns of the coastal area and the rural countryside of the inland area. With Ynys Môn given special status this restricts, prohibits possibilities on the mainland. A good constituency would be Ynys Môn Bangor or Arfon Ynys Môn.

North-East Those that live there would say keep Rhyl & Prestatyn together. To keep all Wrescham Town together. To keep all North-East Wales together. Southern North-East Wales and north-east Mid Wales are two very different parts. Moreover there is no connection (physically, historically, socially, culturally) between them - Detached Parts. Berwyn Mountains are a natural barrier - mountain passes

extremely bad for vehicles (hard long way to walk!). These north and south parts are two very different parts, with no links between them. No common traditions, no associations between the two now or in the past. Constituencies ought not to have detach parts. There are several alternatives that avoid this. The two parts are in two very different regions of Wales. One in the North-East the other in Mid Wales.

Use of proper names. Delyn is NOT a name, it is an acronym, It is the English acronym from the first two letters of the river Dee - De. And the last three letters of the river Alyn - lyn. These are put together to form the acronym Delyn. Two major rivers of the area in English. Using alternative names (two languages equal) then the Welsh acronym would be Dylun. The first two letters of Dyffordwy and the last three letters of Alun, the two main rivers there in Welsh. Thus the Welsh equivalent to the English Delyn is Dylun. In a sense it is the same name as Alyn and Deeside but in a different form and the other way around - the two main rivers of Alyn & Dee.

Welsh names perhaps are most appropriate if you are to use one, But most certainly real names rather than acronyms is better, and to be used. Also each constituency to have a name unique to itself, Not just the same/similar name, but in another form &/or the other way around, Though Denbighshire is within the electoral range, By forming this as a constituency means it makes it difficult for other constituencies, Indeed it would require the splitting of Wrexham Town, It is more important to keep a town together rather than a district. It is more appropriate and suitable to separate towns & villages rather than splitting a town, and alot easier, The three local government districts therefore need to be shared amongst its constituencies in consideration of all the constituencies.

Mid Wales This is the most sparsely populated part of Wales. Thus with very near equal electorates the constituencies will be the largest, Though not the largest in the UK. And nowhere near the largest permitted, Mid Wales is very much a unique region of Wales, It is by far the most rural, It is virtually all farming, These cannot be said of the other regions, The best for this region would be to have all its constituencies within the region, Far better than sharing with other regions, The two factors above are enough in themselves - there are others, IF constituencies of this region are to be shared with other regions they need to be the most similar to it and with links/connections, Therefore the South-West and the North-West are the most suitable and appropriate for it, The Dyfi Valley in the north-west lends to this, The Tywi Valley and the Teifi Valley in the south-west lends to this, Mid Wales and South-West Wales are quite often put together, The roads, movement of people & so forth and in a north-west direction and west-south-west direction.

South-West Pembrokeshire at the tip of the South-West peninsula makes for a natural "unit", North Pembrokeshire, the N.W. part - St David's, Solva, Llanerston look to Hwlfordd, Maenclochog, Preseli Hills - N.E. part - look to Aberteifi/ Cardigan. Thus the north-west Pembrokeshire with the rest of Pembrokeshire, The North-East Pembrokeshire with Ceredigion, With County Caerfyrddin there are two major towns - Caerfyrddin Town and Llanelli, These make for a natural focus for constituencies, Originally rivers use to be a barrier, But with human development bridges came along, Rivers then brought people together, Indeed before bridges were formed, Wales shows this in many towns and cities, This is the case with the Caerfyrddin Town area, The river Tywi here is not a barrier, it brings people together, so Pen-sarn and Tregynwr are very much of Caerfyrddin town, That

means Llangymor to Caerfyrddin. The river is not a good separating line for constituencies (here or elsewhere in the South-West and in Wales). In many ways Llanelli is different to the rest of the district. Being located in the South-East corner. And culturally much similar to southern Wales with its industrial history, as with Ammanford.

South-Central Keep Swansea City proper (built-up conurbation) together in two constituencies. Not to mix parts of Swansea/Neath Port Talbot with Powys (rural). That Mayalls, Sketty, Killay, Uplands with Mumbles community (Oystermouth, Newton, West Cross) - Swansea Bay. Is River Tawe a boundary? Keep Bridgend together - all of town together as one. Porthcawl is closer to Bridgend than Port Talbot. They look to Bridgend not Port Talbot. Bridgend is also more direct and easier to get to - links. Bridgend and Porthcawl have been together for some time now.

Previously it was deemed to be better for it to go into & with Bridgend. Afan Valley have good road links and public transport to Maesteg and Caerau. Public services run in & around Maesteg down & up the Afan Valley to Port Talbot. Neath Port Talbot not to have one constituency of Neath and Port Talbot towns as it leaves the two valleys out on a limb. Each Valley to have its own constituency with each supplement to the east & west with neighbouring districts. One valley having additions from Bridgend district, one valley from Swansea district. No part of Neath Port Talbot to combine with Mid Wales. If anything S.W. Powys (Upper Tawe Valley) to either combine with Neath Port Talbot or Swansea (Swansea Valley). Keep all eastern ^{Vale} Valley of Glamorgan together (urban). Dinas Powys no natural link to Cardiff. Indeed various barriers. You have to go through Penarth or Llandough. Dinas Powys is rural, complete opposite to Cardiff. Being part of Cardiff they will loose out. And the Vale will loose its separate identity. Then its separate entity will have gone. A large proportion of the Vale lost to Cardiff. Vale gets less representation, confusion to who's who, what's what, etc. Cardiff dwarfs the Vale.

South-East This part has two of Wales's modern cities and the valleys. These are substantially South-East Wales. The two are very different. So naturally the constituencies would fall into these two types - City constituencies and Valley constituencies. Both Cardiff and Newport Cities do not have enough population/electorate to form complete number of constituencies. For supplement it would be natural and best for these to supplement each other. Cardiff and Newport Cities together have enough electorate/population to form complete

number of constituencies. With the valleys each valley, except for one (Llwyd), does not have the numbers to fall within the electoral range. Therefore Valleys have to be supplemented for this electoral range. Due to the number of constituencies for Wales, and so for the valleys, the valleys have to be placed into six constituencies. They have enough electorate/population to do this, and need not be supplemented by any other. Since they just have enough for their own, they cannot, and ought not supplement any other. There is also the Usk Vale, which can form its own constituency. Thus Taff Wells and Pont-y-Chun do not have to be "orphan" wards. Trowbridge does not have to be a "detached" part. No part of the valleys is lost from the valleys, lost to another part. The valleys do not need any other part added to them. Similarly this can be said about the cities. No part of a city is lost to a non-city part. No non-city part has to be added to a city, such as Dinas Powys, Pont-y-Chun, Taff Wells, etc. Cities are contained within Cities, and do not down, dwarf other parts of Wales. Valleys have only valleys & valleys' people within them. Valleys are contained within Valleys, and do not lose their uniqueness. Valley communities and movements are up and down. Thus valley constituencies are longer than following the valleys - they are like valleys.

Each constituency wants what they view as best for them. But then you would have 32 different sets of 32 constituencies. So we must all accept that we cannot have what we wish. What we view as best for us. We all need to and should desire to have what is best for all of us. Thus each, all of us, compromise. This will serve Wales as a whole best. Even if each particular constituency does not have what is best for them - exactly what they want. We must all compromise. Mid-Wales has often been squeezed. Been at the service of the other regions to make up numbers - their number. With reducing constituencies Mid-Wales ought not to loose out. Currently Mid-Wales has three constituencies purely for it. Two constituencies purely for Wales would be a reduction of a third (33%). Wales is to reduce its constituencies by 8 from 40. That is a reduction of a fifth (20%). With Mid-Wales having just two constituencies for itself it has a far greater reduction than Wales as a whole - 13% more, which is large greater reduction. Thus it ought not to have less. Therefore not to have shared constituencies with other regions. For Mid-Wales to have at least two constituencies to itself, to be fair & just to it.

All constituencies need a name that everyone in the constituency can relate to and identify with. Which identifies that constituency. For this and to show unity, one language should be used. This gives identity & entity, bringing unity & togetherness - one name. All know it by the same name. No mistakes, no mix-ups. Preferably one word name used - short and succinct. If more than one name. Then just those names together, for example Dwr for Meirionydd. That is no conjunction used, so do not require two names, just because of a conjunction. Being in and for Wales the preferred language used ought to be Welsh in writing and speaking. This is now used internationally for speaking & writing e.g. Mumbai, Beijing. Thence alternative names not required. This is the case with/in Scotland for some time now e.g. Western Isles.

It had always been known as Western Isles, and this form only used. Then Scotland decided to use the Gaelic for it. It became Na H-Eileanan Siar. It is now known as this and only this. It is used throughout the whole entire UK. No one uses Western Isles. Similarly with/in/for Wales. One name for each constituency. Preferably in Welsh. Constituency names formed in a suitable and appropriate way - constituency way and all can recognize with one language (using Welsh spelling). When a constituency has two names (an alternative name as well). Then if you do not know the name in the other language that other name can be confusing. They often are not a direct translation. They are two different and completely separate names e.g. Casnewydd/

Newport. In translating each you have four names. They need to know the name of the constituency in the other language i.e. both names. So everyone (throughout the UK) needs to know the two names of each constituency i.e. 64 names! Consequently to have one name in one language per constituency makes sense.

Constituency names formed in a constituency way. All names to be treated in the same way. Regardless of what type/kind that name/word is. That is whether it is a population centre, a council area, etc. Some names can be both. From the name you usually cannot say which it is. A lot of people would ask why do it one way if the name is one type, and yet another way if it's another kind? When a constituency name has two parts to it one usually modifies or qualifies the other, and is dependant on the other and is secondary. The most important name (can stand alone) is the primary part - the Principal Name, and comes first. The modifying dependant qualifying name is the secondary part - the Subsidiary Name, and comes second, usually not being able to stand alone, nor mean/identify alone, e.g. Compass points.

A Principal Name is independent stand alone name. A Subsidiary Name cannot do either of these and modifies, qualifies the Principal Name e.g. suburbs, compass points, etc. Hence these types/kinds of name are always a suffix. The Principle name is always a Prefix. This is User Friendly. Whenever a person wants to identify or look-up a constituency they go by the Principal name. This is the place they go to find it. And you would wish all constituencies that are there would be together in one place. You do not do this with a subsidiary name e.g. compass points. Most people do not wish to know all the constituencies that have West in their name, for example. You don't look-up South, for example. You'd find an ad hoc grouping of all "South _____" constituencies. This is usually NOT useful, NOT needed, NOT what people are looking for. It is unhelpful - User UNfriendly. ALL modifiers - compass points, suburbs, parts of an area, etc. would come last - - would be a suffix. Hence All names Names are better than compass-points.

Principal Name — Subsidiary Name

Wales is very rich in names.

Compass points ought not/never to be used. They are impersonal & non-descriptive.

CONNECTIVITY is very important, indeed essential. Where there is not this you get detached parts. This does not form a good coherent viable constituency. In Wales perhaps mountains are the biggest obstacle for this. The 'Guide' strongly goes against this. Which is right. How can it be seen as one constituency when parts do not connect?

Forming a set of constituencies

viable for all means & needs treating each part/area equally & fairly. Modification by all, compromises by all made. Compromises, etc. are necessary & needed by all for appropriate and suitable constituencies throughout Wales. Other constituency needs must be considered. So for example, though Denbighshire is within the electoral range and this Local Authority could form a constituency. This would require (the) Wrexham town to be split between two constituencies for the electoral range to be met. To divide Denbighshire (NO TOWNS SPLIT) is more favourable (for all) than splitting Wrexham town. Another example is with the Vale of Glamorgan constituency. This constituency is within the electoral range. Keeping this constituency makes it very hard to form other good viable constituencies bordering it. Thus other constituencies & knock-on effects must ALWAYS be considered. This restricts & limits choices available. A set of "balanced" constituencies" is needed and must be worked for. UNIFORM REDUCTION IN ALL PARTS OF WALES, with each part of Wales equally represented.

There are various ways constituencies can be sequenced/ordered, e.g. Alphabetically, Geographically, etc. As people are usually concerned with their constituency and its neighbours then geographical is more beneficial. With different languages the constituencies would have different sequencing/ordering depending on language (the one used) when doing it alphabetically. Thus for these reasons rather the geographical way is preferred. It is the USER FRIENDLY way. Obviously it is very suitable and indeed most appropriate if you are using maps - geographical is the way to go.

From the above each makes a compromise. It would not be right nor fair if only some did this. While others got treated favourably when they were treated unfavourably. One getting the best for them at the expense of another. The only thing the Commission has to do by law for constituencies is to get them within the electoral range - a much. Not anything to do with electoral quota or variance. To take notice of local ties, local authorities, constituencies as well as geographical, social, cultural, etc. considerations. In Wales it is most unlikely that Local Authorities and constituencies will fall in line. With local ties, Local Authorities and constituencies perhaps the order of preference for them that is most appropriate for the future constituencies. The most important is local ties. Next is the L.A. Local ties for they reflect communities, Local Authorities for MP's must deal with them. Thus the sequence/order of priority is 1) Local ties 2) Local Authority 3) Constituencies (current). Also, of course other (new) constituencies must be considered. Two examples were given above. Also each part of Wales needs to be equally represented. Therefore a uniform reduction in all parts of Wales.

Northern Wales 10, Central Wales 7, Southern Wales 23
currently giving 40 constituencies in all.

Northern Wales 8, Central Wales 6, Southern Wales 18
in the future giving 32 constituencies in all.

- Northern Wales — North-East and North-West
- Central Wales — Mid and South-West
- Southern Wales — South-Central and South-East

Except for Yngys Môn all constituencies will change and be different to the current ones. As the constituencies are different to present names should they have different names? Not only will they be different Westminster constituencies, They will also be different to the Senedd constituencies. To have the same names as the Senedd constituencies could easily lead to a mix-up. Certainly it will be confusing. Therefore ought Westminster and Senedd constituencies not have the same name. It would be clearer, more distinctive, and give a unique identity to them if they were differently named. Thus Westminster constituencies and Senedd constituencies to have different names. So the UK Parliament & Welsh Parliament have differently named constituencies. This is the case for Scotland, Indeed in Scotland by law the two Parliamentary constituencies cannot have the same name. Ought we do this in Wales. The Senedd to introduce an Act that prohibits the constituencies of the two Parliaments from have the same name — by statute.

Senedd Constituency Names Westminster Constituency Names

According to the nature and character of constituencies and what they are composed of gives constituency types. In Wales there are various types. These include Island constituency, Valleys' constituencies, Town(s)' constituencies, City constituencies, Countryside constituencies and so forth. Constituencies can broadly be divided in Urban & Rural constituency. The degree of "ruralness" affects the constituency member financially. Each constituency is designated either a 'borough constituency' or 'county constituency'. The distinguishing factor is, more than a small rural element they will be regarded as a county constituency. Thus those with a medium rural element will be 'county constituency'. All others will be 'borough constituency'. But what is a 'medium rural element'? Who decides? It will vary between those who decide. Thus it will not be standard. Not within the UK Parliament. Thus a more exact way is needed. In these "scientific times" a more exact way of gauging would be required & sought. Since its to administer travelling expenses. Then size and density would be two factors. As constituencies only vary by 10%. Therefore size would be sufficient to determine this. Thus size of constituency would determine travel expenses and so financing received. Would it therefore be needed to divide them into two types? If a sliding-scale was not used then perhaps two or three divisions. Those above a certain size would get the most, then an intermediate range, then the smallest — thus three bands for financing constituencies based on constituency size.

As we are using maps, then as said above (see page 7), then the geographical way will be used. Starting with Ynys Môn, the protected constituency. Numbering will go eastward, then westward; alternating, southward until all Wales is covered. The proposed 32 constituencies will be compiled from electoral wards, given a name and explained. A sketch map will approximate the constituency. The numbers are those of the registered electors. These at the specified time of the Act of Parliament. Registered electors does not reflect all those of electorate age (18 and above). And the accuracy of registered electors is viable. The representatives (MPs) represent everyone over age 18 in the constituency. Not just the registered electors. Therefore the true representation of the constituents of a constituency (the constituents, people each MP represents) is best done by the population than by the electorate. Thus to have the population numbers rather than the electorate numbers, Representatives (MPs) represent ALL People/members of a Constituency. NOT JUST those registered to vote. Thence NOT to be the registered electorate but the population. The population figures are more uniform throughout the country than the electorate figures. The population numbers are more accurate than electorate numbers. THIS OUGHT TO BE THE LAST REVIEW THAT USES ELECTORATE NUMBERS.

Population figures mirror and reflect the people the MPs represent than the electorate figures. Population figures are more correct than electorate figures. The most accurate figures of the population is the census. The census occurs every ten years. It has been said (by an international body) that ten years, certainly no longer, for such things. The maximum time between reviews. The census figures to be used will be the best, most accurate, and reflect & show each constituency, all the constituencies, truest and best. As they are the most correct figures we have for constituencies the census figures used. The figures come out about the year after the census. Modern technology may well speed this up. We have our census in the years ending in one. So each review can happen in the years ending in two. The next review will begin in 2032. Usually reviews take two and a half to three years. So the next review would be 2035, which will start in 2032. Possibly this could be earlier if technology brings forward the release/formation of these particular census figures. The current next review by present legislation is due in 2031. Legislation changing the numbers for constituencies from electorate to population would also state use of the census, and have the constituency review start immediately numbers are available. THENCE REVIEWS WOULD BE MIDDECADE FOR EACH DECADE.

THENCE REVIEWS WOULD BE MID-DECADE FOR EACH DECADE.

Because of the current review date and the date of the census, this makes the next review longer than current legislation. But to do this either a shorter time or longer time would result in this change over depending on those two dates above. Now it lengthens it rather than shortens it. But its length is not as long as many review dates & their intervals in the past, The current review being one of them. After this, then they would be once a decade following the census, using census numbers. Therefore for the first time we will have the truest figures for who our MPs will represent. The USA already does this - use its census figures, reviewing after these, once every 10 years. As most of the world have their census in the zero year, the first year of the decade. Then perhaps for our next census we'd wish to do this, and have legislation that changes our census year from the one year to the zero year. That would then shorten the interval between this review and the next review. Probably the review starting in 2031 for 2034.

Northern Wales (7 Constituencies)

NB. Meirionnydd has been placed with Mid Wales for much of the past. Indeed when the Senedd formed regions they placed the Meirionnydd part of Gwynedd district in, with Mid Wales. Here, likewise, Meirionnydd is not with Northern Wales but is with Mid Wales in Central Wales (see below).

1. Ynys Môn (52415)

Compilation Bro Aberffraw 3023
 Bro Rhosyr 3919 Aethwy 5175
 Seiriol 4550 Lligwy 4810 Twrceelyn
 5497 Talybolion 4762 Caergybi 5504
 Ynys Gybi 4434 Lligon 4104
 Cansolbarth Mon 6537

As Initial Proposals (Protected).

NOT TO SCALE

Designation Ynys Môn, the name of the island and district.