

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Derby City

January 2001

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)
Peter Brokenshire
Kru Desai
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, and the number of councillors and ward names.

© Crown Copyright 2001

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Proposed Electoral Arrangements from: Derby City Council Derby City Liberal Democrats Conservative Group on Derby City Council	<i>27</i>
B The Statutory Provisions	<i>33</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Derby is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Derby on 27 June 2000.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Derby:

- **in 10 of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city, and six wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **by 2005 this unequal representation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 13 wards and by more than 20 per cent in eight wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 71-72) are that:

- **Derby City Council should have 51 councillors, seven more than at present;**
- **there should be 17 wards, instead of 20 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each city councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In 16 of the proposed 17 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by less than 10 per cent from the city average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor expected to vary by less than 10 per cent from the average in all wards by 2005.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 9 January 2001. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 5 March 2001:

**Review Manager
Derby Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1 Allestree	3	Allestree ward (part); Darley ward (part)
2 Alvaston	3	Alvaston ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
3 Arboretum	3	Abbey ward (part); Babington ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
4 Blagreaves	3	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
5 Boulton	3	Boulton ward; Chellaston ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
6 Chaddesden	3	Alvaston ward (part); Breadsall ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
7 Chellaston	3	Chellaston ward (part)
8 Darley	3	Abbey ward (part); Allestree ward (part); Breadsall ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
9 Derwent	3	Breadsall ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
10 Littleover	3	Blagreaves ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part)
11 Mackworth	3	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Mackworth ward
12 Mickleover	3	Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part)
13 Normanton	3	Babington ward (part); Blagreaves ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Normanton ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
14 Oakwood	3	Breadsall ward (part)
15 Royce	3	Litchurch ward (part); Osmaston ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
16 St Lukes	3	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part)
17 Spondon	3	Alvaston ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Spondon ward

Notes: 1 The whole city is unparished.

2 The large map in the back of the report illustrates the proposed wards outlined above.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Derby

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Allestree	3	10,806	3,602	7	10,883	3,628	6
2	Alvaston	3	10,474	3,491	3	10,422	3,474	1
3	Arboretum	3	10,457	3,486	3	10,430	3,477	1
4	Blagreaves	3	9,781	3,260	-3	9,888	3,296	-4
5	Boulton	3	10,290	3,430	2	10,214	3,405	-1
6	Chaddesden	3	10,394	3,465	3	10,314	3,438	0
7	Chellaston	3	9,230	3,077	-9	10,197	3,399	-1
8	Darley	3	10,501	3,500	4	10,727	3,576	4
9	Derwent	3	10,056	3,352	-1	10,078	3,359	-2
10	Littleover	3	8,719	2,906	-14	10,430	3,477	1
11	Mackworth	3	10,279	3,426	2	10,447	3,482	2
12	Mickleover	3	11,168	3,723	10	11,117	3,706	8
13	Normanton	3	10,453	3,484	3	10,402	3,467	1
14	Oakwood	3	9,770	3,257	-4	9,838	3,279	-4
15	Royce	3	9,888	3,296	-2	9,871	3,290	-4
16	St Lukes	3	10,147	3,382	0	10,170	3,390	-1
17	Spondon	3	9,732	3,244	-4	9,394	3,131	-9
	Totals	51	172,145	-	-	174,822	-	-
	Averages	-	-	3,375	-	-	3,428	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Derby City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Derby City on which we are now consulting. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Derby. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in February 1977 (Report No. 233). Since undertaking that review, Derby has become a unitary authority (1997). The change in unitary status has led to the loss of 20 county councillors, reducing the total number of councillors representing Derby from 64 to 44.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix B).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the City Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the city as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that city but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a city’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a city council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission’s analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/2000 PER programme, including Derby City, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities’ electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections, and our present *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 27 June 2000, when we wrote to Derby City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Derbyshire Police Authority, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city, the Members of the European Parliament for the East Midlands Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 2 October 2000.

12 At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

13 Stage Three began on 9 January 2001 and will end on 5 March 2001. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

14 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 The city of Derby lies to the south of the Trent Valley, to the north extends the Derbyshire Uplands and the Peak District. Derby is bisected by the River Derwent. It comprises an unparished area of approximately 7,803 hectares and has a population of around 236,500. Located centrally in the country, Derby is well served by road, rail and air, with easy access to the M1 and M6, East Midlands International Airport and London by rail. Derby City Council became a unitary authority in 1997.

16 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the city average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

17 The electorate of the city is 172,145 (February 2000). The Council presently has 44 members who are elected from 20 wards, all of which are urban. Four of the wards are represented by three councillors each and 16 are represented by two councillors each. The Council is elected by thirds.

18 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Derby City, with around 7 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most notable increases have been in Breadsall, Chellaston and Mickleover wards.

19 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,912 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 3,973 by the year 2005 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 10 of the 20 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the city average, in six wards by more than 20 per cent and in three wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Breadsall ward where the councillor represents 106 per cent more electors than the city average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Derby

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Abbey	3	11,332	3,777	-3	12,021	4,007	1
2 Allestree	2	8,069	4,035	3	8,280	4,140	4
3 Alvaston	2	7,497	3,749	-4	6,962	3,481	-12
4 Babington	3	7,259	2,420	-38	7,183	2,394	-40
5 Blagreaves	2	9,886	4,943	26	10,706	5,353	35
6 Boulton	2	8,345	4,173	7	7,861	3,931	-1
7 Breadsall	2	16,104	8,052	106	16,424	8,212	107
8 Chaddesden	2	8,117	4,059	4	7,777	3,889	-2
9 Chellaston	2	10,263	5,132	31	11,361	5,681	43
10 Darley	3	9,411	3,137	-20	9,788	3,263	-18
11 Derwent	2	7,408	3,704	-5	7,529	3,765	-5
12 Kingsway	2	7,872	3,936	1	8,808	4,404	11
13 Litchurch	2	7,229	3,615	-8	7,003	3,502	-12
14 Littleover	2	7,264	3,632	-7	7,597	3,799	-4
15 Mackworth	2	6,276	3,138	-20	5,953	2,977	-25
16 Mickleover	2	9,444	4,722	21	9,594	4,797	21
17 Normanton	2	6,970	3,485	-11	6,663	3,332	-16
18 Osmaston	2	5,585	2,793	-29	5,722	2,861	-28
19 Sinfin	2	8,082	4,041	3	8,196	4,098	3
20 Spondon	3	9,732	3,244	-17	9,394	3,131	-21
Totals	44	172,145	-	-	174,822	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,912	-	-	3,973	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Derby City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2000, electors in Babington ward were over-represented by 38 per cent, while electors in Breadsall ward were under-represented by 106 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

20 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Derby City Council.

21 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received five representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council, Liberal Democrats and Conservative Group, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission by appointment.

Derby City Council

22 The City Council undertook a wide public consultation exercise during Stage One of the review and proposed a council of 51 members, seven more than at present, serving a pattern of 17 three-member wards. The Council pointed out that after local government reorganisation in 1997 Derby saw “councillor representation ... fall from 64 to 44, with the loss of the 20 former county councillors” and that the introduction of new political management structures had increased the workload of members.

23 The Council proposed that all of the existing 20 wards be modified, to provide improved levels of electoral equality and more identifiable boundaries, and better reflect community identities. Under its proposals no ward would have an electoral variance of more than 9 per cent by 2005.

24 The Council proposed no change to the existing pattern of elections by thirds. The Council’s scheme is summarised at Appendix A.

Liberal Democrats

25 Derby City Liberal Democrats proposed a city-wide scheme, based on council size of 51, serving a pattern of 17 three-member wards. In their submission they provided detailed argumentation in favour of the proposed increase and stated that “it was much easier to respect the clear communities of Spondon and Mickleover ... with 17 wards than with either 15 or 16”. The Liberal Democrats also stated that they considered the railway line and river to represent significant community boundaries in the city. They proposed no change to the existing cycle of elections by thirds.

26 Under their proposals no ward would have an electoral variance of more than 9 per cent by 2005. The Liberal Democrats’ scheme is summarised at Appendix A.

The Conservative Group on Derby City Council

27 The Conservative Group on Derby City Council proposed a city-wide scheme based on a 53-member council size, an increase of nine, representing a mixed pattern of 19 two- and three-member wards. In its submission the Group provided detailed argumentation in support of an increase in council size and stated that “our proposed ward areas follow natural and established boundaries with communities and wards which people will understand”. Under its scheme no ward would have an electoral variance of more than 11 per cent by 2005.

Other Representations

28 We received a further two representations. South Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party expressed support for Derby City Council’s scheme.

29 A resident of Derby made three submissions at Stage One. The resident opposed the Council’s proposal for 17 three-member wards, suggesting that the proposal would “reinforce the imperfections of the present system”. He also stated that multi-member wards “lessen rather than enhance democratic choice and empowerment” and proposed that the city be represented by 23 two-member wards (46 councillors in total). He did not provide detailed boundaries or electorate figures as part of his submission.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

30 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Derby is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

31 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

32 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

33 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates.

Electorate Forecasts

34 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting an increase in the electorate of 2 per cent from 172,145 to 174,822 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expects most of the growth to be in Blagreaves, Chellaston and Kingsway wards. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

35 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the City Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

36 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

37 Derby City Council presently has 44 members. The City Council proposed a council of 51 members, an increase of seven, outlining a number of arguments in favour of such a proposal. The City Council has adopted the Government's modernisation agenda and already introduced a leader/executive model of political management and new scrutiny committees. It argued that under the current council size of 44 there are insufficient members available for appointment to these committees, particularly as each committee needs to be politically balanced. Additionally, the City Council stated that "area committees" are a key element of its community development strategy and, as these develop, councillors may well be involved in meetings of additional groups or forums.

38 The City Council also stated that the achievement of unitary status in 1997 (with the consequent loss of 20 county councillors) had significantly increased the workload of city councillors, particularly in relation to education and social services, bringing with it "additional responsibilities for overview, scrutiny and inspection". The City Council has also undertaken new initiatives such as Single Regeneration Budget projects, an Education Action Zone and a New Deal for Communities Initiative, all projects that, according to the City Council, have created extra work and responsibilities for members.

39 The Liberal Democrats also proposed a council size of 51, arguing that "at present back benchers' and opposition members' main committee roles are on the regulatory and 'Best Value' committees ... but the greatest change ... will be to introduce a proper scrutiny function to the Council. We see this as a vital balance to the power of the executive." Additionally, they argued that "there is an expectation that councillors will take a greater role in 'community leadership'", inevitably calling on councillors' time and energy. The Liberal Democrats also cited the recent increase in the city's population and the achievement of unitary status as justifications for an increase in council size.

40 The Conservative Group on the City Council undertook some consultation during Stage One and proposed an increase in council size of nine, to 53. It cited many of the same issues in favour of its proposed increase, as outlined by other Stage One respondents. These included an increase in population, the achievement of unitary status, changes in political management structures and the introduction of scrutiny committees, and that Best Value initiatives are increasing the workload of members. It also suggested that under the current council size it is difficult to maintain levels of representation on external bodies, stating that "we must be mindful of the need to provide effective service and representation to the people who elect us and ... to the many outside bodies which serve the people of this City. Without a modest increase in members we are likely to fail on all counts."

41 We have considered all the arguments in favour of an increase in council size and noted the cross-party consensus for an increase, even if there is some disagreement on the exact number of

members. We are also mindful of the public consultation exercises undertaken by the City Council and Conservative Group. It is also noteworthy that, as pointed out by the City Council, that “under the legislation the Council cannot maintain a traditional style of administration as it serves a population of over 85,000”. Under the Local Government Act 2000 only districts with populations of under 85,000 may opt, following local consultation, for a committee structure, to be specified in Regulations by the Secretary of State. Therefore the introduction of a political management structure, to which the Council is finding it difficult to make appointments, is unavoidable in Derby.

42 After careful consideration of the issues we are of the opinion that the political groups on the Council have given the necessary regard to internal political management, and the impact of the new structure on the role of councillors and its implications both for the council and for residents. We are minded to agree with respondents that an increase in council size would provide more effective and convenient local government across the city. We have noted a degree of cross-party consensus for a 51-member council size and the substantial amount of public consultation undertaken by the City Council on its scheme. In the light of this, and having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 51 members.

Electoral Arrangements

43 We have been pleased to note a degree of consensus between the schemes submitted by the City Council and Liberal Democrats, particularly for 17 three-member wards. As indicated by the City Council, such a pattern would facilitate electoral arrangements which accurately reflect community identities across the city. In this instance, we are not minded to agree with a local resident that three-member wards would dilute the responsibility of the individual member. It is our opinion that a uniform pattern of three-member wards would provide effective and convenient local government across Derby, particularly as its electoral cycle is by thirds.

44 We considered the Conservative Group’s scheme, but we did not believe it would provide the best balance presently available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. Under the Conservatives’ scheme three wards would have electoral variances of 9 per cent or more by 2005, whereas under the City Council’s and the Liberal Democrats’ schemes no ward would have an electoral variance of more than 9 per cent from the city average. Additionally, in view of our recommendation for a council size of 51 and 17 three-member wards (outlined above), we have not been able to make detailed comparisons in all areas with the boundaries proposed under the Conservative Group’s scheme, as ward sizes and configurations vary substantially. It is important to note that its scheme included both two- and three-member wards and (based on the 2000 electorate) under a council size of 53 the number of electors per councillor would be 3,248, while under a council size of 51 the number of electors per councillor would be 3,375, a difference of approximately 450 electors per ward. We have attempted to build on the local knowledge that the alternative scheme provides in formulating our draft recommendations and have made comparisons where appropriate.

45 We propose basing our draft recommendations on the City Council and Liberal Democrat schemes. We have noted a considerable degree of consensus for specific boundaries between the two schemes, particularly for wards in the east of the district. Having visited the area we consider the Liberal Democrats' proposal to utilise the length of the railway line as a ward boundary to have merit and, having also noted that many of the boundaries included under the City Council's scheme were particularly identifiable, we have attempted to include both these elements in our draft recommendations. Consequently, we propose adopting a mix of the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' proposals, modified to provide stronger boundaries, better electoral equality and a more accurate reflection of community identities where possible. Under our draft recommendations the railway line, A38 and River Derwent would be used as ward boundaries.

46 For city warding purposes the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Abbey, Allestree, Darley and Mackworth wards;
- (b) Breadsall, Chaddesden and Derwent wards;
- (c) Blagreaves, Kingsway, Littleover and Mickleover wards;
- (d) Babington, Litchurch, Normanton, Osmaston and Sinfin wards;
- (e) Alvaston, Boulton, Chellaston and Spondon wards.

47 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Abbey, Allestree, Darley and Mackworth wards

48 These four wards are situated in the north-west of the city. Allestree and Mackworth wards are currently represented by two members each, while Abbey and Darley wards are each represented by three members. The number of electors per councillor is 3 per cent below the city average in Abbey ward (1 per cent above by 2005), 3 per cent above the average in Allestree ward (4 per cent by 2005) and 20 per cent below the average in Darley and Mackworth wards (18 per cent and 25 per cent by 2005 respectively).

49 At Stage One the City Council proposed a modified three-member Allestree ward, comprising the majority of the existing Allestree ward and the part of the existing Darley ward that lies north of the A38. The remainder of Allestree ward (218 electors south of the A38) would broadly be included in a modified three-member Darley ward, together with those parts of the existing Derwent and Breadsall wards west of the railway line and that part of the existing Abbey ward north of Ashbourne Road and Friar Gate. Its proposed three-member Abbey ward would broadly include Derby city centre (part of the existing Litchurch ward), that part of the existing Abbey ward south of Ashbourne Road and Friar Gate and that part of the existing Kingsway ward south of Uttoxeter New Road. The existing Mackworth ward would form the basis of a new three-member Mackworth ward but would be extended to broadly include Markeaton Park, Kingsway Hospital and 2,528 electors from the existing Abbey ward. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above the city average in Abbey ward (8 per cent by 2005), 7 per cent above the average in Allestree ward (6 per cent by 2005), 4 per cent above the

average in Darley ward (unchanged by 2005) and 7 per cent below the average in Mackworth ward (1 per cent by 2005). These proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

50 The Liberal Democrats' proposed Allestree ward would mirror that of the City Council, while its proposed Darley ward would be based on broadly the same boundaries as the City Council's Darley ward, but would include part of the city centre and exclude polling district AW (broadly Colvile Street, Shaw Street and Merchant Street). A new three-member Markeaton ward would broadly include the existing Mackworth ward, Markeaton Park and that part of the existing Abbey ward north of the dismantled railway. A new three-member Rowditch ward would be based on similar boundaries to the City Council's proposed Abbey ward, but would exclude most of the city centre in the east and include Kingsway Hospital in the west. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the city average in Allestree ward (6 per cent by 2005), 1 per cent above the average in Darley ward (2 per cent by 2005), 9 per cent above the average in Markeaton ward (7 per cent by 2005) and 8 per cent below the average in Rowditch ward (equal to the average by 2005). These proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

51 We have carefully considered the proposals for this area. We have noted that the City Council's proposed Allestree and Darley wards would provide good levels of electoral equality, are based on strong boundaries, reflect community identities and command some local support, and we therefore propose that they form part of our draft recommendations. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 7 per cent above the city average in Allestree ward (6 per cent by 2005) and 4 per cent above the average in Darley ward (unchanged by 2005).

52 We also propose broadly adopting the Liberal Democrats' proposed Markeaton and Rowditch wards, but suggest modifying them to provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, provide stronger boundaries and facilitate a good electoral scheme across the city. The Liberal Democrats' proposed Markeaton ward would be modified in the north to broadly exclude Markeaton Park and polling district AW, and Rowditch ward would be modified in the east to exclude part of the city centre, in the west to exclude Kingsway Hospital and in the south to include that part of the existing Littleover ward east of Warwick Avenue. To better reflect local community identities we suggest that these wards be named Mackworth and St Lukes respectively. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the average in St Lukes ward (1 per cent below by 2005) and 2 per cent above the average in Mackworth ward (unchanged by 2005). These proposals are outlined on the large map at the back of the report.

Breadsall, Chaddesden and Derwent wards

53 These wards are situated in the north-east of the city. Breadsall ward is currently 106 per cent under-represented (107 per cent by 2005), Chaddesden ward is currently 4 per cent under-represented (2 per cent over-represented by 2005) and Derwent ward is currently 5 per cent over-represented (unchanged by 2005). Each of these wards is represented by two members.

54 At Stage One the City Council proposed that the existing Breadsall ward be divided to form parts of three new wards, including a three-member Derwent ward, to include that part of the

existing Derwent ward east of the railway line and 4,049 electors from the south and east of the existing Breadsall ward (parts of polling districts CV and CX). A three-member Chaddesden ward would include 2,277 electors from the south of the existing Breadsall ward (broadly polling district CW) and the majority of the existing Chaddesden ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed new Chaddesden East and Chaddesden West wards to cover this area; the wards would broadly mirror the City Council's proposed Chaddesden and Derwent wards respectively, but the Liberal Democrats proposed that the whole of Canterbury Road be included in Chaddesden West ward. Under the City Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the city average in Chaddesden ward (equal to the average by 2005) and 1 per cent below the average in Derwent ward (2 per cent by 2005). Under the Liberal Democrats' scheme the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the city average in Chaddesden East ward (1 per cent below by 2005) and equal to the average in Chaddesden West ward (1 per cent below by 2005). Both schemes proposed that the remainder of the existing Breadsall ward form a new three-member Oakwood ward. Under both sets of proposals the number of electors per councillor in the new Oakwood ward would be 4 per cent below the city average both initially and by 2005. These proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

55 We have carefully considered all the representations received regarding electoral arrangements for this area and have been pleased to note a degree of local consensus for ward boundaries. We consider that both sets of proposals would facilitate a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, but note that the City Council's scheme was the subject of a significant public consultation exercise, and is therefore more likely to command local support. Although there is little difference between the two schemes, we propose adopting the City Council's arrangements for modified Chaddesden and Derwent wards and a new Oakwood ward (also proposed by the Liberal Democrats). Under our draft recommendations, outlined on the large map at the back of the report, the electoral variances would be the same as those under the City Council's scheme.

Blagreaves, Kingsway, Littleover and Mickleover wards

56 These four two-member wards are situated in the south-west of the city. The number of electors per councillor is currently 26 per cent above the average for the city in Blagreaves ward (35 per cent by 2005), 1 per cent above the average in Kingsway ward (11 per cent by 2005), 7 per cent below the city average in Littleover ward (4 per cent by 2005) and 21 per cent above the average in Mickleover ward (unchanged by 2005).

57 During Stage One the City Council proposed extending the existing Blagreaves ward northwards, to include 1,672 electors from the existing Normanton ward (part of polling district OV), while its existing western ward boundary would be modified to include the residential areas off The Hollow and exclude Littleover village. The village would be included in a modified Littleover ward with the majority of the existing Littleover ward, that part of the existing Mickleover ward south of the A516 and that part of the existing Kingsway ward south of the A38 and west of the A516. The remainder of the existing Mickleover ward (polling districts TW, TX and TY) and that part of the existing Kingsway ward west of the A38 would form a modified Mickleover ward. The remainder of the existing Kingsway ward would be included in modified Abbey and Mackworth wards (as detailed above). Kingsway ward would cease to exist under

these proposals. Each of these wards would be represented by three members. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the city average in Blagreaves ward (unchanged by 2005), 13 per cent below the average in Littleover ward (4 per cent by 2005) and 10 per cent above the average in Mickleover ward (8 per cent by 2005). These proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

58 The Liberal Democrats' proposed Mickleover ward would mirror that proposed by the City Council and would provide identical levels of electoral equality. Their proposed Littleover North ward would be similar to the City Council's proposed Littleover ward, but, it would also include that part of the existing Normanton ward broadly west of Repton Avenue and south of Warwick Avenue (included in the City Council's proposed Blagreaves ward). The Liberal Democrats' proposed Littleover South ward would be similar to the City Council's proposed Blagreaves ward, but, it would exclude the Repton Avenue and Warwick Avenue area in the north, instead including more of the existing Normanton ward (the part broadly west of Coleridge Street and south of Grange Avenue). The remainder of Kingsway ward would be included in a new Rowditch ward (outlined above). Kingsway ward would cease to exist under this scheme. Under these arrangements the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below the city average in Littleover North ward (5 per cent above by 2005) and 5 per cent below the average in Littleover South ward (6 per cent by 2005). These proposals are summarised at Appendix A.

59 We have noted the consensus for a modified Mickleover ward but were initially concerned that the proposals would not provide the levels of electoral equality normally expected in an urban area such as Derby. However, having visited the area and noted that the ward would be based on very identifiable boundaries, we are not minded to try to improve on the electoral equality achieved under the proposed schemes and a council size of 51. We consider that the proposed Mickleover ward strikes the best balance presently available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We have also noted both sets of proposals for the area currently covered by Blagreaves and Littleover wards. We consider that the City Council's proposals provide stronger boundaries than those suggested by the Liberal Democrats, better reflect community identities and have been the subject of a significant consultation exercise. We therefore propose basing our draft recommendations in this area on the City Council's proposals.

60 However, we propose minor modifications to the proposed Blagreaves and Littleover wards, in order to provide better electoral equality, further improve the boundaries and better reflect community identities in this and the surrounding areas. We suggest that the boundary between the City Council's proposed Blagreaves and Littleover wards be modified to broadly include Hollowood Avenue in Blagreaves ward and that part of polling district LX (Kingsway Hospital) be included in Littleover ward. Under these proposals, outlined on the large map at the back of the report, the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below the city average in Blagreaves ward (4 per cent by 2005), 14 per cent below the average in Littleover ward (1 per cent above by 2005) and 10 per cent above the average in Mickleover ward (8 per cent by 2005).

Babington, Litchurch, Normanton, Osmaston and Sinfin wards

61 These five wards cover the centre of the city, an area which is currently relatively over-represented. The three-member Babington ward has an electoral variance of 38 per cent (40 per

cent by 2005), the two-member Litchurch ward has a variance of 8 per cent (12 per cent by 2005), the two-member Normanton ward has a variance of 11 per cent (16 per cent by 2005) and the two-member Osmaston ward has a variance of 29 per cent (28 per cent by 2005). The number of electors per councillor in the two-member Sinfin ward is currently 3 per cent above the city average (unchanged by 2005).

62 The City Council's proposals for this area would significantly modify the existing arrangements. A three-member Osmaston ward would breach the railway line, broadly comprising the majority of the existing Litchurch ward (excluding the city centre), the western half of the existing Osmaston ward (broadly polling district PV), the part of Sinfin ward that lies north of the railway line (polling district QX) and 1,570 electors from the existing Normanton ward (polling district OW). The part of the existing Normanton ward south of Kenilworth Avenue and east of Stenson Road (polling district OX and part of polling district OV) would be included in a modified Sinfin ward, with 210 electors from the existing Blagreaves ward (part of polling district KX) and the majority of the existing Sinfin ward. A modified Normanton ward would include the whole of the existing Babington ward, that part of the existing Littleover ward east of Warwick Avenue and 861 electors from the existing Litchurch and Normanton wards. The remainder of Normanton ward would be included in a modified Blagreaves ward (as detailed above). Each of these wards would be represented by three members. These proposals are summarised at Appendix A. The number of electors per councillors would be 7 per cent above the city average in Normanton ward (4 per cent above the average by 2005), 2 per cent above the average in Osmaston ward (equal to the average by 2005) and 3 per cent below the average in Sinfin ward (4 per cent by 2005).

63 The Liberal Democrats' proposals in this area differed significantly from those put forward by the City Council, primarily because they utilised the railway line as a ward boundary. They proposed a new three-member Arboretum ward to broadly include the parts of the existing Litchurch and Sinfin wards that lie west of the railway line and the part of the existing Babington ward that lies broadly to the east of Pear Tree Road. They also proposed a new three-member Royce ward to broadly include that part of the existing Sinfin ward south-east of the railway line, that part of the existing Osmaston ward north of the Sinfin branch of the railway line and south of Osmaston Road and that part of the existing Litchurch ward south of Osmaston Road. A modified Normanton ward would include parts of the existing Babington, Littleover, Normanton and Sinfin wards (broadly polling districts NX, NY, OV and OW). The number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent above the average in the proposed Arboretum ward (4 per cent by 2005), 5 per cent below the average in Normanton ward (7 per cent by 2005) and 2 per cent below the average in Royce ward (4 per cent by 2005).

64 We have carefully considered both the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' schemes for this area. As explained earlier in the chapter, we consider the railway line to provide a particularly identifiable boundary, and therefore should be utilised as a ward boundary throughout the city. Consequently, we are not minded to endorse the City Council's proposed Osmaston or Sinfin wards because both would include electors either side of the railway in the same ward. We therefore propose basing our draft recommendations in this area on the Liberal Democrats' scheme, modifying it where we consider a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria could be achieved. We suggest extending the proposed Arboretum ward north-

eastwards to include the whole of the city centre in a single ward and modifying the southern boundary to broadly follow Harrington Street, Portland Street and Porter Road. The Liberal Democrats' proposed Normanton ward would be extended southwards to broadly include Caxton Street, Underhill Close, Kendon Avenue and Greenfell Avenue, and modified in the north-west to exclude that part of the existing Littleover ward east of Warwick Avenue, while its north-eastern boundary would be the southern boundary of the proposed Arboretum ward (as detailed above). We consider this arrangement to provide the best balance presently available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, particularly as the whole of the city centre would be included in a single ward and our proposed boundaries would be more identifiable than those submitted by the Liberal Democrats. We also propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' Royce ward, as we note that it would enable the use of the railway line as a ward boundary, provide an accurate reflection of community identities and at the same time achieve good levels of electoral equality. Under this arrangement the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the city average in Arboretum and Normanton wards (1 per cent by 2005) and 2 per cent below the average in Royce ward (4 per cent by 2005). Our draft recommendations are outlined on the large map at the back of the report. We would welcome the views of residents on these proposals at Stage Three.

Alvaston, Boulton, Chellaston and Spondon wards

65 Alvaston, Boulton and Chellaston wards are each represented by two members, whereas Spondon is a three-member ward. The number of electors per councillor is 4 per cent below the city average in Alvaston ward (12 per cent by 2005), 7 per cent above the average in Boulton ward (1 per cent below by 2005), 31 per cent above the average in Chellaston ward (43 per cent by 2005) and 17 per cent below the average in Spondon ward (21 per cent by 2005).

66 At Stage One the City Council proposed a modified three-member Alvaston ward, to include the part of the existing Alvaston ward that lies south of the River Derwent together with the parts of the existing Litchurch and Osmaston wards lying broadly east of Ascot Drive. It proposed that the existing Boulton ward be represented by three members and extended westwards to include that part of the existing Chellaston ward north of Merrill Way and that part of the existing Osmaston ward east of (and including) Lord Street and south of Harvey Road and Rowland Street. The remainder of Chellaston ward (broadly polling districts SV, SX and SY) would form a modified Chellaston ward, to be represented by three members. The City Council proposed that the existing Spondon ward be represented by three members and extended southwards to include that part of the existing Alvaston ward north of the River Derwent. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the city average in Alvaston ward (1 per cent by 2005), 2 per cent above the average in Boulton ward (1 per cent below by 2005), 9 per cent below the average in Chellaston ward (1 per cent by 2005) and 4 per cent below the average in Spondon ward (9 per cent by 2005).

67 The Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area were very similar to those put forward by the City Council. Their proposed Chellaston and Spondon wards were identical to those put forward by the City Council and would consequently provide the same levels of electoral equality. Their proposed Alvaston ward would extend further westwards than the City Council's, utilising the railway line as a boundary. Additionally, the boundary between the proposed Alvaston and

Boulton wards would be drawn to include more electors from the existing Osmaston ward and fewer electors from the existing Boulton ward in a modified Boulton ward. The boundary between the two wards would not be as identifiable as that proposed by the City Council. Under these recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent and 2 per cent above the average in Alvaston and Boulton wards respectively (both equal to the average by 2005).

68 Having carefully considered the representations received regarding warding arrangements in this area we propose adopting the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' Chellaston and Spondon wards. We are pleased to note that both wards would provide good levels of electoral equality, be based on strong boundaries and would command local support. We also consider that the arrangement would reflect community identities. Under our proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent below the average in Chellaston ward (1 per cent by 2005) and 4 per cent below the average in Spondon ward (9 per cent by 2005). We have noted the electoral variance of 9 per cent by 2005 in the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' proposed Spondon ward. However, we were unable to identify an alternative arrangement in the area that would provide an equally good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. To improve upon this electoral variance would require the arbitrary dividing of communities.

69 We propose adopting the City Council's proposed Alvaston and Boulton wards, except that Alvaston ward would be extended westwards to utilise the railway line as a ward boundary. We consider the City Council's proposals would provide the best balance available between achieving electoral equality and utilising identifiable boundaries. Under our proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the average in Alvaston ward (1 per cent by 2005) and 2 per cent above the average in Boulton ward (1 per cent below by 2005). Our draft recommendations are outlined on the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

70 We received three representations regarding the City Council's electoral cycle. There appears to be local consensus that the present electoral cycle should be retained and we therefore propose no change to the current electoral cycle of elections by thirds for the City Council.

Conclusions

71 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be an increase in council size from 44 to 51;
- there should be 17 wards;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three wards;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

72 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the City Council’s and Liberal Democrats’ schemes, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- we propose our own scheme for wards in the west of the city, to provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and utilise the railway line as a ward boundary.
- there should be change to all of the existing wards.

73 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2005.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2000 electorate		2005 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	44	51	44	51
Number of wards	20	17	20	17
Average number of electors per councillor	3,912	3,375	3,973	3,428
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	10	1	13	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	6	0	8	0

74 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Derby City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the city average from 10 to one. By 2005 no ward is forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city.

Draft Recommendation
 Derby City Council should comprise 51 councillors serving 17 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

75 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Derby and welcome comments from the City Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Derby

5 NEXT STEPS

76 We are putting forward draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for consultation. We will take fully into account all representations received by 5 March 2001. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the City Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

77 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Derby Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

www.lgce.gov.uk

78 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Derby City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the City Council only in eight wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure A1: Derby City Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Abbey	Abbey ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Litchurch ward (part)
Alvaston	Alvaston ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
Blagreaves	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Littleover	Blagreaves ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part)
Mackworth	Abbey ward (part); Darley ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Mackworth ward
Normanton	Babington ward; Litchurch ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Osmaston	Litchurch ward (part); Normanton ward (part); Osmaston ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
Sinfin	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)

Figure A2: Derby City Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Abbey	3	10,988	3,663	9	11,098	3,699	8
Alvaston	3	10,445	3,482	3	10,422	3,474	1
Blagreaves	3	9,532	3,177	-6	9,639	3,213	-6
Littleover	3	8,837	2,946	-13	9,841	3,280	-4
Mackworth	3	9,375	3,125	-7	10,172	3,391	-1

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Normanton	3	10,843	3,614	7	10,739	3,580	4
Osmaston	3	10,312	3,437	2	10,287	3,429	0
Sinfin	3	9,866	3,289	-3	9,862	3,287	-4

Source: Electorate figures are based on Derby City Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Derby City Liberal Democrats' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Liberal Democrats in 11 wards, where their proposals were as follows:

Figure A3: Derby City Liberal Democrats' Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Alvaston	Alvaston ward (part); Boulton ward (part); Litchurch ward (part) Osmaston ward (part)
Arboretum	Babington ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
Boulton	Boulton ward (part); Chellaston ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
Chaddesden West	Breadsall ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
Darley	Abbey ward (part); Allestree ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Litchurch ward (part)
Littleover North	Blagreaves ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Littleover South	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Markeaton	Abbey ward (part); Darley ward (part); Mackworth ward
Normanton	Babington ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Normanton ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
Oakwood	Breadsall ward (part)
Rowditch	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Litchurch ward (part)

Figure A4: Derby City Liberal Democrats' Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Alvaston	3	10,383	3,461	3	10,285	3,428	0
Arboretum	3	10,745	3,582	6	10,658	3,553	4
Boulton	3	10,285	3,428	2	10,291	3,430	0
Chaddesden West	3	10,140	3,380	0	10,152	3,384	-1
Darley	3	10,222	3,407	1	10,499	3,500	2
Littleover North	3	9,831	3,277	-3	10,835	3,612	5
Littleover South	3	9,664	3,221	-5	9,718	3,239	-6
Markeaton	3	11,003	3,668	9	11,002	3,667	7
Normanton	3	9,583	3,194	-5	9,549	3,183	-7
Oakwood	3	9,782	3,261	-3	9,843	3,281	-4
Rowditch	3	9,319	3,106	-8	10,262	3,421	0

Source: Electorate figures are based on the Liberal Democrats' submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The Conservative Group on Derby City Council’s Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Conservative Group on Derby City Council in all wards, where its proposals were as follows:

Figure A5: The Conservative Group on Derby City Council’s Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Abbey	Abbey ward (part); Babington ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Litchurch ward (part)
Allestree	Allestree ward (part); Darley ward (part)
Alvaston	Alvaston ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
Arboretum	Babington ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Sinfyn ward (part)
Blagreaves	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Boulton	Boulton ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
Chaddesden	Alvaston ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
Chellaston	Boulton ward (part); Chellaston ward (part)
Darley	Allestree ward (part); Breadsall ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
Derwent	Breadsall ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
Kingsway	Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part)
Littleover	Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part)
Mackworth	Abbey ward (part); Mackworth ward
Mickleover	Blagreaves ward (part); Mickleover ward
Normanton	Babington ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Oakwood	Breadsall ward (part)
Osmaston	Chellaston ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
Sinfyn	Litchurch ward (part); Normanton ward (part); Sinfyn ward
Spondon	Chaddesden ward (part); Spondon ward

Figure A6: The Conservative Group on Derby City Council's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2000)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2005)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Abbey	3	9,225	3,075	-5	9,376	3,125	-5
Allestree	3	9,224	3,075	-5	9,368	3,123	-5
Alvaston	2	7,497	3,749	15	6,962	3,481	6
Arboretum	2	7,306	3,653	12	7,311	3,656	11
Blagreaves	3	9,886	3,295	1	10,357	3,452	5
Boulton	3	9,825	3,275	1	9,341	3,114	-6
Chaddesden	3	9,447	3,149	-3	9,107	3,036	-8
Chellaston	3	9,230	3,077	-5	10,260	3,420	4
Darley	3	9,665	3,222	-1	10,015	3,338	1
Derwent	3	10,181	3,394	4	10,197	3,399	3
Kingsway	2	6,200	3,100	-5	7,099	3,550	8
Littleover	3	8,936	2,979	-8	9,329	3,110	-6
Mackworth	3	10,196	3,399	5	10,282	3,427	4
Mickleover	3	9,444	3,148	-3	9,855	3,285	0
Normanton	3	9,629	3,210	-1	9,616	3,205	-3
Oakwood	3	10,592	3,531	9	10,804	3,601	9
Osmaston	2	5,831	2,916	-10	5,925	2,963	-10
Sinfin	3	10,099	3,366	4	10,224	3,408	3
Spondon	3	9,732	3,244	0	9,394	3,131	-5

Source: Electorate figures are based on the Conservative Group's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

APPENDIX B

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish

¹ The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.