

**Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No.218**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO.218.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton GCB KBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Professor Michael Chisholm

Mr R R Thornton CB DL

Sir Andrew Wheatley CBE

To the Rt Hon Merlyn Rees, MP,  
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of North East Derbyshire, in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 19 August 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the North East Derbyshire District Council, copies of which were circulated to Derbyshire County Council, Clerks to the Parish Councils, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.
3. The North East Derbyshire District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the Council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The Council had passed a resolution under Section 7(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 requesting the Secretary of State to provide for a system of whole council elections.

5. On 9 January 1975, North East Derbyshire District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. They proposed to divide the area of the district into 24 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a council of 53.

6. We considered the draft scheme submitted by the Council, the comments which had been made on it and an alternative scheme which had been submitted. Taking account of the alternative proposals suggested in the comments for various areas of the district, we decided to adopt the District Council's proposed wards for the parish of Dronfield, but to give the parish of Unstone separate representation, thus reducing the number of councillors for Dronfield to twelve. We decided to separate the parish of Stretton from the Clay Cross South ward and as a consequence reduced the representation of Clay Cross to 5 councillors. We decided to regroup some of the parishes and parish wards in the south-eastern area of the district to include the parish of Stretton with this area and in order to achieve a greater equality of representation. Subject to these modifications, which had the overall effect of reducing the number of councillors for the district to 52, we adopted the Council's draft scheme as our draft proposals.

7. On 3 November 1975 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make the draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 29 December 1975.

8. The District Council accepted our modifications to their draft scheme with one exception. They opposed our proposed Pilsey and North Wingfield Central wards/ and asked for the adoption of their proposal to include the Waterloo ward of the parish of North Wingfield in the Pilsey ward. Pilsley Parish Council asked for separate representation with two members. Other comments proposed alternative arrangements for the wards in the south east of the district .

9. In view of these comments, we felt we needed more information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, and at our request, Mr W. Lane was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

10. Notice of the meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally.

11. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting at the Council House, Saltergate on 1 December 1976 and visited the areas which were the subject of comment. A copy of his report is attached at Schedule 1 for your information.

12. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner recommended that the draft proposals should be confirmed.

13. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the recommendations made by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. We confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

14. Details of these proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.

PUBLICATION

15. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to North East Derbyshire District Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map ) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description of the proposed ward boundaries as shown on the map is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

10 March 1977

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLANDREVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGMENTS : NORTH-EAST  
DERBYSHIRE  
DISTRICTREPORT BY ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER : W E LANE

As announced in the Derbyshire Times of 15 and 22 October 1976, a meeting open to anyone interested was held at the Council House, Saltergate, Derbyshire, on 1 December 1976 to enable me to hear local views on the proposed arrangements for the Milsley, North Wingfield Central, Hasland, Sutton, Morton, Ashover and Shirland wards.

Appendix A contains a list of the names and addresses of those attending the meeting and the interests they represented. A number of those present were members of interested bodies other than those they formally represented.

All present were invited to give their views on the wards listed above, other wards affected by their proposals or indeed any other aspect of the electoral arrangements for the District. The meeting was conducted informally so that everyone had the opportunity of expressing their views and commenting on the views of others.

I subsequently made a detailed inspection, as requested at the meeting, of all the wards and parishes under discussion, with particular reference to features mentioned at the meeting.

The District Council's draft scheme, submitted on 9 January 1975, provided for 24 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 councillors to make a council of 53. The Commission considered the various objections made to this scheme and on 3 November 1975, published their draft proposals which basically adopted the District Council's scheme but introduced modifications, producing 27 wards and a council of 52.

The electorate totalled 67,456 in 1974 and was estimated realistically to reach 76,855 in 1979. The average electorate per councillor is, therefore:-

	<u>in 1974</u>	<u>in 1979</u>
Council of 53	1272	1450
Council of 52	1297	1477

The "entitlement" of a ward, referred to later in this report, means the number of councillors to which the ward would be entitled on the basis of one councillor for the average electorate quoted above, varying, of course, between 1974 and 1979 and between a Council of 53 and 52.

There were 5 written objections to the Commission's proposals:-

	<u>Objector</u>	<u>Ward concerned</u>	
1	District Council	Pileley ) North Wingfield Central )	
2	Pilsley Parish Council	Pilsley	
3	Temple Normanton P.C.	Hasland	
4	Sutton-cum-Duckmanton P.C.	Sutton	
5	Brackenfield P.C. supported by Stretton P.C.	Ashover ) Morton ) Shirland )	

No other objections were raised at the meeting. Each of the objections was discussed in turn, the two concerning Pilsley being taken together. The District Council made it clear that

- (a) they accepted all the Commission's proposals modifying their scheme, with the exception of that concerning Pilsley and North Wingfield Central to which they had objected, and
- (b) the change in control of the Council which had occurred between the time of making their representations to the Commission and this meeting had not affected the Council's views; both groups supported the views expressed on behalf of the Council at the meeting.

PILSEY and NORTH WINGFIELD CENTRAL wards

The District Council's draft scheme for a Council of 53 provided:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
North Wingfield Central (the Central and Hephthorne Lane wards of North Wingfield)	3	3,402	2.67	3,988	2.75
Pilsley (plus the Waterloo ward of North Wingfield)	2	2,226	1.75	2,226	1.54

The Commission's draft proposals for a Council of 52 provided:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
North Wingfield Central (the Central, Hephthorne Lane and Waterloo wards of North Wingfield)	3	3,657	2.82	4,243	2.87
Pilsley	1	1,971	1.52	1,971	1.33

The difference turns on whether or not the Waterloo ward of North Wingfield parish should be combined with Pilsley parish to form a Pilsley ward with 2 members (the North Wingfield Central ward to have 3 members in either case).

The District Council asked that the Commission should revert to the District Council's draft scheme. In their written objection of 24 December 1975, which they reiterated and amplified at the meeting, they said:-

"It is considered that the District Council's original proposals were correct and more accurately reflect the local affinities of the Waterloo Ward to Pilsley rather than North Wingfield. Reference to a larger scale plan than that used for the draft proposals will show that the area of Parkhouse Green and Waterloo is also known as Lower Pilsley, with the main village of Pilsley often being referred to as Upper Pilsley. Recreation facilities, because of the location of the resident population, have been provided in a form which will serve the inhabitants of the proposed new ward best and local representatives are adamant that those living in the Waterloo Ward area do have a real affinity of community interest with the Parish of Pilsley".

They pointed out the sharp contrast between the existing level of representation for Pilsley, on 1973 figures, of 2 members for 1961 electors (average electorate for District, 1293) and the Commission's proposed 1 member for 1971 electors. The District Council's scheme was for 2 members for 2226 electors.

Pilsley Parish Council strongly supported the District Council's objection on the grounds of affinity of Waterloo ward with Pilsley parish rather than with the rest of North Wingfield parish. The parish boundary arbitrarily divided a single settlement in the Parkhouse Road and Locke Road area in a way which was difficult to make sense of on the ground. They also emphasised Pilsley's continuing need to be represented by 2 councillors, particularly if Waterloo ward is to be added, for the reasons given in their written objection of 8 December 1975:-

- "1. The present Councillors state that the work involved is too onerous for one Councillor.
2. The population of this Parish calls for two Councillors.
3. There are so many committees involved that it is not humanly possible for one Councillor to give the necessary time to serve on all the committees required by the District Council and to carry out the duties satisfactorily."

The effect of Pilsley parish alone having 2 members would be:-

Pilsley Parish - (Council of 53)

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Pilsley	2	1,971	1.55	1,971	1.36

North Wingfield Parish Council said that in their 3 member North Wingfield Central ward they could stand the loss of the 255 electors in Waterloo ward. On the grounds of affinity they would, indeed, like to transfer to Pilsley that part of Waterloo ward to the south-east of Locke Brook, but not Little Morton Road and Church Lane which were continuous extensions of development within North Wingfield with which they had the greater affinity. In the area between Little Morton Road, Church Lane and St. Lawrence Road in North Wingfield there was before long to be a considerable extension of the housing development known as Adlington's Estate, mostly in North Wingfield Central parish ward but partly in Waterloo ward, which would draw the Waterloo ward end of Little Morton Road and of Church Lane even more closely into north Wingfield. This will create an anomaly to be taken into account in the next review of parish wards by the District Council who were not aware of the point at the time of their last consideration of parish ward boundaries but now accept it.

Recalling that under the statutory rules equality of representation between wards, as nearly as may be, taking into account changes likely by 1979, was a firm requirement, whereas only "regard shall be had to" affinity and easy identification of boundaries, I asked for consideration

to be given to a possible arrangement, apparently not yet considered, which would give greater equality. This was to enlarge the Pilsley ward to the size appropriate to 2 members by adding from North Wingfield not only Waterloo ward but also Hephthorne Lane ward and that part of North Wingfield Central ward (Church Hill) lying between Waterloo ward and Hephthorne Lane ward. North Wingfield Central ward would be reduced to a size appropriate to 2 members. The Council would have 52 members.

The precise effect would be:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Pilsley parish (plus the existing Waterloo and Hephthorne Lane wards of the parish of North Wingfield and the area between them - Church Hill)	2	3,149	2.43	3,185	2.16
North Wingfield Central (the existing Central ward of the parish of North Wingfield minus the area to be added to the new ward or wards)	2	2,479	1.91	3,029	2.05

It is a statutory requirement that each parish ward shall be wholly within a single district ward. This proposal would sever the parish ward of North Wingfield Central and could not therefore be put into practice unless the District Council were prepared to re-ward the parish of North Wingfield accordingly.

Having considered the proposal during the adjournment, the District Council said they wished to adhere to their scheme for the addition of Waterloo ward only to Pilsley to form a ward for 2 members. They thought that any affinity which Hephthorne Lane ward had outside North Wingfield was greater for Tupton than Pilsley. North Wingfield Parish Council's reaction was that Hephthorne Lane ward and Church Hill (the area between Hephthorne Lane ward and Waterloo ward) were linked to North Wingfield and not, like Waterloo ward, to Pilsley. The District Council expected in due course to review their parishes, and then the parish ward boundaries. Such a review might eventually reopen the question of district ward boundaries, but they were not disposed to carry out an early review of parish and parish ward boundaries.

In view of the District Council's reaction, and of the various opinions voiced on the diverse affinities of the areas concerned which leave open to question whether a parish and parish ward review would, in fact, facilitate this particular proposal, it is not appropriate to pursue the proposal at this stage.

The Pilsley Parish Council proposal that Pilsley parish alone should have 2 members against an entitlement in a Council of 53 of 1.55 in 1974 and 1.36 in 1979 would clearly give such relative over-representation that it cannot be recommended, even though it is understandable that having so far enjoyed such a high level of representation Pilsley should object strongly to a reduction.

In the absence of any other proposals, the choice is left between the District Council's scheme and the Commission's proposals. In considering the required equality of representation between wards, as nearly as may be, it can be seen that the two areas in question, North Wingfield Central ward and Pilsley parish, together have an entitlement in a Council of 53 of 4.42 in 1974 but, taking account, as required, of changes by 1979, of only 4.29. This entitlement of 4.29 is so much nearer 4 than 5 that it points to the need so to divide the combined area as to achieve the best balance within a total of 4 members. The better balance is produced by the Commission's proposals which provide, in 1979, in a Council of 52, for 3 members for North Wingfield Central against an entitlement of 2.87 and 1 member for Pilsley against an entitlement of 1.33. In a Council of 52 the combined entitlement of 4.2 comes even closer to 4.

Having regard to affinity, there is a strong case for the inclusion with Pilsley of Waterloo ward as far as Locke Brook, but not beyond. Having regard to easy identification of boundaries, the boundary between the North Wingfield Central parish ward and Waterloo ward where it cuts across Little Morton Road, Church Lane and the impending extension of Adlington's Estate is no better than the boundary between Waterloo ward and Pilsley in the Parkhouse Road and Locke Road area. If on the grounds of affinity between Pilsley and the greater part of Waterloo ward the whole of the latter were to be combined with Pilsley into one ward, its entitlement in a Council of 52 would be only 1.50, not enough to justify 2 members, and certainly not 2 out of the total of 4 appropriate to the whole area in question.

The District Council's scheme providing 5 members for the whole area cannot be justified on grounds of equality of representation. The transfer of Waterloo ward from North Wingfield Central ward to Pilsley ward unnecessarily gives over-representation to North Wingfield Central and still leaves Pilsley excessively over-represented with 2 members against an entitlement of only 1.54. The considerations of affinity are not enough to outweigh the requirement for equality of representation. The over-representation in the District Council's scheme is greater than the under-representation in the Commission's proposals by a very large margin taking both areas together and by a significant margin in Pilsley alone.

I therefore recommend that the Commission should adhere to their own draft proposals.

HASLAND ward

The Boundary Commission's proposals adopted the District Council's scheme to continue the existing 2 member Hasland ward comprising the parishes of Hasland and Temple Normanton. In a Council of 52 this would provide:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Hasland	2	2,949	2.27	3,257	2.21

In their written objection of 13 November 1975, Temple Normanton Parish Council asked for a restoration of the separate single member representation which the parish had enjoyed until 4 years previously on the grounds that they, the smallest parish in the District, with a very active parish council for at least 30 years and no connection with Hasland, had for many years resisted moves by the District Council to include them in Hasland parish. There was no objection to the Commission's proposals from Hasland or anyone else, and neither parish was represented at the meeting.

The District Council, however, put Temple Normanton Parish Council's view and went on to explain that the parish was their smallest in area and second smallest in population and electorate, likely to remain static as development was stultified by the M1/Chesterfield link road cutting through it. There was a nostalgic longing for the return to having a separate councillor on a Council of only 33, but with only 236 electors giving an entitlement of 0.16 of a councillor, separate representation was impossible to justify. The Parish's relationship was with Hasland, to which it had a direct road, rather than with any other parish; already linked with Hasland for representation on the District Council, There was no need for a change.

The effect of the Temple Normanton request, in a Council of 53, would be:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Temple Normanton	1	236	0.19	236	0.16
Hasland	2	2,713	2.13	3,021	2.08

Although Hasland is big enough to stand alone with 2 members, but not too big with the addition of Temple Normanton, the latter is far too small, under the requirement of equality of representation, to stand alone with 1 member. The Parish Council have not expressed a desire to be linked with any other neighbouring parish or ward, nor would any such arrangement appear to be helpful.

I recommend that the Commission should adhere to their own proposals.

## SUTTON ward

The Boundary Commission's proposals, accepted by the District Council, provided for a 2 member Sutton ward comprising the parishes of Sutton-cum-Duckmanton and Calow. In a Council of 52 there would be:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Sutton	2	3,097	2.39	3,097	2.10

In their written objection of 25 November 1975, and in their representations at the meeting (also recorded in a letter put in) Sutton-cum-Duckmanton Parish Council argued strongly for their parish to continue as a separate 1 member ward. They referred to the existing scheme as having been prepared under Home Office guidelines for an average electorate of 1,000 - 1,500 and pointed out that their electorate nearly reached 1,000 and, they estimated, would in 1979 exceed it at 1,011, which compared with the representation proposed for Pilsley.

It was a large parish geographically, with a well-balanced, active self-reliant community. In a 2 member ward neither member might live in their parish and they would regard this as virtual disfranchisement.

Part of the parish had links for schooling and social life with Temple Normanton which at the time of local government reorganisation had been willing to combine with them.

The effect of their proposal to continue Sutton-cum-Duckmanton as a separate ward (i.e. the existing wards) would be, in a Council of 53:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Sutton-cum-Duckmanton	1	980	0.77	980	0.68
Calow	2	2,117	1.66	2,117	1.46

The District Council commented that the existing scheme had been prepared, with some urgency, to deal with the first elections in 1973 without prejudice to future changes. The 1,000 - 1,500 yardstick was now irrelevant, as the size of council was the determining factor for this review and had produced an average of between 1,450 and 1,477 in 1979. They did not realistically expect the parish's electorate to rise beyond 980, or possibly very marginally above, by 1979, and that was far too low for 1 member representation. It would still be too low with the addition of Temple Normanton, who had, in any case, given no indication during this review of favouring such a combination. Furthermore, Calow's electorate was too large for 1 member, and, by itself, too few for 2 members.

The District Council tried to avoid single member wards, particularly where they were not part of a parish with more members for the whole parish, because they regarded 2 and 3 member wards as advantageous - an opinion supported by a number of those present at the meeting.

It is to be noted that the comparison with Pilsley is irrelevant under the Commission's proposals which provide 1 member for Pilsley's 1971 electors. There would seem to be no advantage in disturbing satisfactory neighbouring wards by a combination of Sutton-cum-Duckmanton and Temple Normanton. In my view Sutton-cum-Duckmanton's proposal cannot meet the requirement for equality of representation as near as may be, and the Commission's proposed Sutton ward makes a satisfactory 2 member ward.

I recommend the Commission to adhere to it.

ASHOVER, MORTON and SHIRLAND wards

The existing scheme provides, in a Council of 52:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Ashover, Brackenfield, Stretton and Wessington	2	2,327	1.78	2,327	1.58
Shirland & Higham and Morton	3	4,519	3.48	4,519	3.06

The District Council's scheme detached Ashover parish as a separate 1 member ward, added Brackenfield and Wessington parishes to Shirland & Higham and Morton 3 member ward, and combined Stretton parish with part of Clay Cross to form Clay Cross South 3 member ward. This scheme, particularly on the last point, found no favour, was not adopted by the Commission, and has not been pursued by the District Council.

The Commission's proposals provided, in a Council of 52:-

<u>Ward</u>	<u>No of Cllrs</u>	1974		1979	
		<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>	<u>Electorate</u>	<u>Entitlement</u>
Ashover	1	1,397	1.08	1,397	0.95
Morton (the parishes of Morton, Stretton and Brackenfield)	1	1,427	1.10	1,427	0.97
Shirland (the parishes of Shirland and Higham and Wessington)	3	4,032	3.11	4,032	2.73

Brackenfield Parish Council, in its written objection of 28 November, 1975, supported by Stretton Parish Council in its letter of 20 December, 1975, asked for the retention of the existing scheme, but if that were not possible would reluctantly accept the Commission's proposals but not the District Council's scheme. They repeated their objections at the meeting, where their views were shared by Morton Parish Council, Shirland & Higham Parish Council, a County Councillor for the area and several District Councillors.

Their reasons taken collectively were:-

1. The existing scheme works very well, so why change?
2. It recognises important affinities between predominantly agricultural communities on the one hand and mining and industrial communities on the other.

3. It represents the considered wishes of the communities concerned expressed over several years.
4. They consider that 2 and 3 member wards facilitate more effective and comprehensive services by councillors to their constituents than do 1 member wards, especially in widespread rural wards.

The District Council reported that in a letter to them, dated 29 January, 1975, Wessington Parish Council had responded to their scheme by expressing the wish to be grouped with Shirland & Higham and Morton parishes and not with Ashover and Stretton parishes. No reasons were given and Wessington Parish Council did not make any representations at the meeting.

The objectors all recognised the arithmetic difficulties of reconciling their views with the requirement for equality of representation, and could see no acceptable alternatives other than as proposed by the Commission. The District Council thought that if equality of representation was to prevail over consideration of affinity no other combination would produce a more satisfactory result than that proposed by the Commission.

It would not be helpful, overall, to bring further neighbouring wards into consideration of this problem, which must therefore be solved within the area, for which in either the existing scheme or the Commission's proposals there would be a total of 5 councillors against an entitlement of 4.64 in 1979. The prospective over-representation needs to be spread as evenly as may be. The existing scheme, in giving 2 councillors to the Ashover, Brackenfield, Stretton and Wessington ward against an entitlement of only 1.58 in 1979, departs too far from the required equality of representation to justify acceptance on the grounds of affinity, a principal point of the objectors' case to which "regard shall be had" under the rules. This must be so even though the objection on the grounds of affinity was strong and keenly presented.

I therefore recommend that the Commission adhere to their own proposals, which give a better balance.

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS : NORTH -EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT

LIST OF THOSE PRESENT AT MEETING HELD ON : 1 DECEMBER 1976

Cllr Mrs B Lees, 4 Warren Rise, Dronfield.	N.E. Derbyshire D.C.
Cllr T Smith, 19 Falkland Rise, Dronfield.	N.E. Derbyshire D.C.
Cllr U E Bond, Hillside Cottage, Ashover. (also watching brief for Ashover P.C.)	N.E. Derbyshire D.C.
Cllr R G Cochrane, 29 Station Road, Spinkhill.	N.E. Derbyshire D.C.
Cllr Wm. Stoddart, 54 Rupert St., Pilsley. (also Pilsley P.C.)	N.E. Derbyshire D.C.
C Spencer, Secretary and Solicitor	N.E. Derbyshire D.C.
Cllr W Beaumont, Bungalow, Main Rd., Higham.	Shirland & Higham P.C.
Cllr Mrs D H Ward, 3 Cressbrook Ave, N.Wingfield.	Pilsley P.C.
Cllr Mrs G Clark, 74 Sutton Springs, Chesterfield	Sutton-cum-Duckmanton P.C.
G F Wilks, Mon Desir, Chesterfield Rd, Brissington.	Clerk, Sutton-cum-Duckmanton P.C
Cllr C G Grainger, Gable House, Chesterfield Road, Holmewood.	Heath P.C.
Cllr B Smith, 71 Slack Lane, Heath.	Heath P.C.
Cllr Mrs I E Garlick, 12 Hunlock Rd, Holmewood.	Heath P.C.
Cllr H Spenceley, 82 Whiteless Ave, N.Wingfield.	N. Wingfield P.C.
Cllr L Ralley, 108 Alm Rd., N. Wingfield.	N. Wingfield P.C.
Cllr W Gent, 29 Little Morton Rd., N.Wingfield.	N. Wingfield P.C.
Cllr Michael Tye, 12 Churchland Ave, Holmewood.	N. Wingfield P.C.
W H Dean, 149 Birchwood Lane, Summercotes. (also Clerk of Morton P.C.)	Clerk, N. Wingfield P.C.
Cllr G C J Rotter, Ilex Farm, Handley, Clay Cross.	Personal capacity.
H Cotterell, School House, Derby Rd., Swanwick.	Clerk, Stretton P.C.
Cllr G R W Turbott, Tanyard Farm, Brackenfield.	Brackenfield P.C.
E Fearn, 19 Leabrook Rd., Dronfield Woodhouse, Sheffield.	N.E. Derbyshire Labour Party Executive.
G A Lyons, Dep. Borough Secretary, Erewash Borough Council.	Spectator.

NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF  
COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO. OF COUNCILLORS</u>
ASHOVER	1
BARLOW AND HOLMESFIELD	1
BRAMPTON AND WALTON	3
COAL ASTON	2
CLAY CROSS NORTH	3
CLAY CROSS SOUTH	2
DRONFIELD NORTH	3
DRONFIELD SOUTH	3
DRONFIELD WOODHOUSE	1
ECKINGTON NORTH	2
ECKINGTON SOUTH	2
GOSFORTH VALLEY	3
HASLAND	2
HOLMEWOOD AND HEATH	2
KILLAMARSH EAST	1
KILLAMARSH WEST	3
MORTON	1
NORTH WINGFIELD CENTRAL	3
PILSLEY	1
RENISHAW	1
RIDGEWAY AND MARSH LANE	1
SHIRLAND	3
SUTTON	2
TUPTON	2
UNSTONE	1
WINGERWORTH	3

NORTH-EAST DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

ASHOVER WARD

The parish of Ashover

BARLOW AND HOLMESFIELD WARD

The parishes of Barlow and Holmesfield

BRAMPTON AND WALTON WARD

The parishes of Brampton and Walton

COAL ASTON WARD

The Coal Aston ward of the parish of Dronfield

CLAY CROSS NORTH WARD

The North ward of the parish of Clay Cross

CLAY CROSS SOUTH WARD

The South ward of the parish of Clay Cross

DRONFIELD NORTH WARD

The North ward of the parish of Dronfield

DRONFIELD SOUTH WARD

The South ward of the parish of Dronfield

DRONFIELD WOODHOUSE WARD

The Woodhouse ward of the parish of Dronfield

ECKINGTON NORTH WARD

The North ward of the parish of Eckington

ECKINGTON SOUTH WARD

The South ward of the parish of Eckington

GOSFORTH VALLEY WARD

The Gosforth Valley ward of the parish of Dronfield

HASLAND WARD

The parishes of Hasland and Temple Normanton

HOLMEWOOD AND HEATH WARD

The parish of Heath and the Holmewood ward of the parish of North Wingfield

KILLAMARSH EAST

The East ward of the parish of Killamarsh

KILLAMARSH WEST WARD

The West ward of the parish of Killamarsh

MORTON WARD

The parishes of Brackenfield, Morton and Stretton

NORTH WINGFIELD CENTRAL WARD

The Central, Hepthorne Lane and Waterloo wards of the parish of North Wingfield

PILSLEY WARD

The parish of Pilsley

RENISHAW WARD

The Renishaw ward of the parish of Eckington

RIDGEWAY AND MARSH LANE WARD

The Ridgeway and Marsh Lane ward of the parish of Eckington

SHIRLAND WARD

The parishes of Shirland and Higham and Wessington

SUTTON WARD

The parishes of Calow and Sutton cum Duckmanton

TUPTON WARD

The parish of Tupton

UNSTONE WARD

The parish of Unstone

WINGERWORTH WARD

The parish of Wingerworth