

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Derby City

Report to the Secretary of State for the  
Environment, Transport and the Regions

*June 2001*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

This report sets out the Commission's final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the city of Derby.

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)

© 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.

Report no: 228

# CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>3</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>7</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>9</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Derby (January 2001)	<i>27</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>29</i>

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





## Local Government Commission for England

26 June 2001

Dear Secretary of State

On 27 June 2000 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Derby under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in January 2001 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although some modifications have been made (see paragraph 79-80) in the light of further evidence. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Derby.

We recommend that Derby City Council should be served by 51 councillors representing 17 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

The Local Government Act 2000 contains provisions relating to changes to local authority electoral arrangements. However, until such time as Orders are made implementing those arrangements we are obliged to conduct our work in accordance with current legislation, and to continue our current approach to periodic electoral reviews.

I would like to thank members and officers of the City Council and other local people who have contributed to the review. Their co-operation and assistance have been very much appreciated by Commissioners and staff.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Malcolm Grant'.

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT  
Chairman



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Derby on 27 June 2000. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 9 January 2001, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Secretary of State.**

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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 79-80) 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 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 in all wards expected to vary by less than 10 per cent from the average for the city in 2005.**

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an Order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 6 August 2001:

**The Secretary of State  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Local Government Sponsorship Division  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU**

*Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
1 Abbey	3	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Littleover ward (part)
2 Allestree	3	Allestree ward (part); Darley ward (part)
3 Alvaston	3	Alvaston ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
4 Arboretum	3	Abbey ward (part); Babington ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
5 Blagreaves	3	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
6 Boulton	3	Boulton ward (part); Chellaston ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
7 Chaddesden	3	Alvaston ward (part); Breadsall ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
8 Chellaston	3	Boulton ward (part); Chellaston ward (part)
9 Darley	3	Abbey ward (part); Allestree ward (part); Breadsall ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
10 Derwent	3	Breadsall ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
11 Littleover	3	Blagreaves ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part)
12 Mackworth	3	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Mackworth ward
13 Mickleover	3	Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part)
14 Normanton	3	Babington ward (part); Blagreaves ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Normanton ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
15 Oakwood	3	Breadsall ward (part)
16 Sinfin	3	Litchurch ward (part); Osmaston ward (part); Sinfin 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 Final 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 Abbey	3	10,210	3,403	1	10,233	3,411	-1
2 Allestree	3	10,806	3,602	7	10,883	3,628	6
3 Alvaston	3	10,474	3,491	3	10,422	3,474	1
4 Arboretum	3	10,394	3,465	3	10,367	3,456	1
5 Blagreaves	3	9,529	3,176	-6	9,636	3,212	-6
6 Boulton	3	10,310	3,437	2	10,234	3,411	0
7 Chaddesden	3	10,399	3,466	3	10,319	3,440	0
8 Chellaston	3	9,210	3,070	-9	10,177	3,392	-1
9 Darley	3	10,501	3,500	4	10,727	3,576	4
10 Derwent	3	10,082	3,361	0	10,104	3,368	-2
11 Littleover	3	8,971	2,990	-11	10,682	3,561	4
12 Mackworth	3	10,259	3,420	1	10,427	3,476	1
13 Mickleover	3	11,188	3,729	10	11,137	3,712	8
14 Normanton	3	10,453	3,484	3	10,402	3,467	1
15 Oakwood	3	9,739	3,246	-4	9,807	3,269	-5
16 Sinfyn	3	9,888	3,296	-2	9,871	3,290	-4
17 Spondon	3	9,732	3,244	-4	9,394	3,131	-9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>172,145</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>174,822</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,375</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,428</b>	<b>-</b>

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 final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Derby City. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This was 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 for Derby from 64 to 44.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we have had 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.

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 have also had regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000), which 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 this PER is to achieve, so far as practicable, 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 district 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 district's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a district council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 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. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half the county council would be elected, and so on. In unitary authorities the White Paper proposed elections by thirds. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas and three-member wards in unitary authority areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral wards in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. 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 Orders under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation and our current *Guidance*.

10 This review was in four stages. 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. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

11 Stage Three began on 9 January 2001 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Derby City*, and ended on 5 March 2001. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.

## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

12 The city of Derby lies to the south of the Trent Valley, the Derbyshire Uplands and the Peak District and 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.

13 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'.

14 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.

15 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.

16 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 3: 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 Sinfyn	2	8,082	4,041	3	8,196	4,098	3
20 Spondon	3	9,732	3,244	-17	9,394	3,131	-21
<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>172,145</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>174,822</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,912</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,973</b>	<b>-</b>

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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

17 During Stage One we received five representations, including city-wide schemes from the City Council, Liberal Democrats and Conservative Group, and representations from the South Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party and a local resident. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Derby City*.

18 We proposed basing our draft recommendations on the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' schemes. We noted a considerable degree of consensus for specific boundaries between the two sets of proposals, particularly for wards in the east and north of the city. However, we made a number of our own proposals, to provide stronger boundaries, to further improve electoral equality and in our opinion more accurately reflected community identities. Under our draft recommendations the railway line, A38 and River Derwent would be used as ward boundaries. We proposed that:

- Derby City Council should be served by 51 councillors, compared with the current 44, representing 17 wards, three less than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified;
- the council should continue to be elected by thirds.

**Draft Recommendation**

Derby City Council should comprise 51 councillors, serving 17 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

19 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 16 of the 17 wards having an electoral variance of less than 10 per cent from the city average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward having a variance of more than 10 per cent from the average by 2005.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

20 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, five representations were received. A list of all respondents is available on request from the Commission. All representations may be inspected at the offices of Derby City Council and the Commission.

### **Derby City Council**

21 The City Council supported the majority of our draft recommendations, including the proposal to increase the council size from 44 to 51. However, it proposed small modifications to the boundaries of eight wards. In order to, in its opinion, better reflect community identities and provide more identifiable boundaries. It also proposed renaming Royce ward as Sinfin, and St Luke's ward as Abbey.

### **The Liberal Democrats**

22 Derby City Liberal Democrats supported "an increase in the number of councillors for the city to 51" and "much of the ward boundary layout". However, they proposed a number of modifications to the ward boundaries. Their 'Priority One' changes would "tidy up anomalies" and their 'Priority Two' changes would, in their opinion, provide stronger boundaries and better reflect community identities. Their proposals would affect 14 of the 17 wards and were the subject of a local consultation exercise.

### **Other Representations**

23 A further three representations were received in response to our draft recommendations. Sinfin Ward Labour Party proposed that the new Royce ward be renamed Sinfin ward, on the basis that "the name Sinfin has strong historical links to the area". Rolls Royce Plc also opposed the use of Royce as a ward name and a resident of Mickleover supported the City Council's proposal to modify the boundary between Mackworth and Mickleover wards, for reasons of community identity.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

24 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”.

25 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 ensuing five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

26 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.

27 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, such an objective 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 absolute electoral equality and only then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

28 At Stage One 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 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 was obtained. In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the forecast electorates, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

29 We received no comments on the Council’s electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates presently available.

## **Council Size**

30 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 carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

31 Derby City Council presently has 44 members. The City Council proposed a council of 51 members, an increase of seven, outlining a number of supporting arguments. The City Council has adopted the Government's modernisation agenda and introduced a leader/executive model of political management and a number of scrutiny committees. It argued that, under the current council size of 44, there are insufficient members available for appointment to the committees, particularly as they need 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. Additionally, the City Council stated that the achievement of unitary status in 1997 (with the consequent loss of 20 county councillors), had significantly increased the workload of councillors, particularly in relation to education and social services, as had new initiatives such as Single Regeneration Budget projects, an Education Action Zone and a New Deal for Communities Initiative.

32 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." They added 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 justification for an increase in council size.

33 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 outlined above in support of its proposal. These included an increase in population, the achievement of unitary status, changes in political management structures and subsequent 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."

34 We considered all the arguments in favour of an increase in council size and noted the degree of consensus. We were also mindful of the public consultation exercises undertaken by the City Council and Conservatives during Stage One. It is also noteworthy that, as pointed out by the City Council, "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 modified political management structure, to which the Council stated that it is finding it difficult to make appointments, is unavoidable in Derby.

35 After careful consideration of the issues we were of the opinion that the political groups on the Council had given the necessary regard to the internal political management of the council, the impact of the new structure on the role of councillors and its implications for both the council and residents. We were minded to agree with respondents that an increase in council size would provide more effective and convenient local government across the city and having noted a degree of cross-party consensus for a 51-member council, endorsed the proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

36 At Stage Three the proposal to increase council size received a significant amount of support, including from the City Council and Derby City Liberal Democrats. In the light of this support we are endorsing our draft recommendation for a council size of 51 as final.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

37 In formulating our draft recommendations we were 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. We also considered the Conservatives' scheme, but were concerned that three of the proposed 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 by 2005. Nevertheless, we attempted to build on the local knowledge that the Conservatives' scheme provided in formulating our draft recommendations.

38 We proposed basing our draft recommendations on the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' schemes, noting a considerable degree of consensus for specific boundaries, particularly for wards in the east and north of the city. We adopted a mix of the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' proposals, but proposed a number of modifications to provide stronger boundaries, better electoral equality and a more accurate reflection of community identities. Under our draft recommendations the railway line, A38 and River Derwent were used as ward boundaries.

39 The response to our draft recommendations has been generally positive, with many of the proposed wards and boundaries commanding local support. However, in the light of the representations and evidence received during Stage Three we have reconsidered our draft recommendations and made a number of minor modifications, to reflect local opinion and provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria.

40 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.

41 Details of our final 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**

42 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 respectively by 2005).

43 At Stage One the City Council proposed a modified three-member Allestree ward, comprising the majority of the existing Allestree ward and that part of the existing Darley ward north of the A38. The remainder of Allestree ward would be included in a modified three-member Darley ward, together with those parts of the existing Abbey, Breadsall and Derwent wards west of the railway line. Its proposed three-member Abbey ward would broadly include Derby city centre, 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 include Markeaton Park, Kingsway Hospital and part of 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).

44 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, but would include part of the city centre and exclude Colvile Street, Shaw Street and Merchant Street. A new three-member Markeaton ward would broadly include the existing Mackworth ward, Markeaton Park and part of Abbey ward. 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).

45 We adopted the City Council's proposed Allestree and Darley wards and broadly adopted the Liberal Democrats' Markeaton and Rowditch wards, modifying them to provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. 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. We proposed naming these wards Mackworth and St Luke's respectively. 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), 4 per cent above the average in Darley ward (unchanged by 2005), equal to the average in St Luke's ward (1 per cent below by 2005) and 2 per cent above the average in Mackworth ward (unchanged by 2005).

46 At Stage Three the City Council proposed modifying the western boundary of Mackworth ward, to include all the electors on Station Road in Mickleover ward, and the eastern boundary of St Luke's ward, to follow the length of Abbey Street. It argued that both modifications would provide stronger boundaries and better reflect community ties. It also proposed that St Luke's ward be renamed Abbey. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the city average in Abbey ward (1 per cent below by 2005) and 1 per cent above the average in Mackworth ward (unchanged by 2005).

47 The Liberal Democrats proposed a number of changes to our draft recommendations in this area. Under their Priority One Changes the southern boundaries of Allestree and Darley wards (the northern boundary of Mackworth ward) would follow Markeaton Brook, rather than Ashbourne Road. They also proposed that the eastern boundary of St Luke's ward (the western boundaries of Arboretum and Normanton wards) be modified to broadly include Belvoir Street, Haddon Street, Overdale Road and Uplands Gardens in St Luke's ward. They argued that both modifications would provide more identifiable boundaries and a better reflection of community identities. The Liberal Democrats also proposed that the whole of Station Road be included in Mickleover ward, that Mackworth ward be renamed Markeaton and St Luke's ward be renamed Abbey. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent above the city average in Abbey ward (3 per cent by 2005), 7 per cent above the average in Allestree ward (6 per cent by 2005), 2 per cent below in Darley ward (1 per cent by 2005) and 7 per cent above in Markeaton ward (unchanged by 2005).

48 We have carefully considered all the representations received during Stage Three and in the light of the evidence presented, we propose adopting the City Council's modifications to the boundaries and ward names in this area. In our opinion, the changes would provide stronger boundaries, without having a significant impact on electoral equality and would better reflect community identities. However, we do not consider that the Liberal Democrats' proposal to modify the northern boundary of Mackworth ward or the south-eastern boundary of St Luke's ward would facilitate an improved scheme. We are concerned that the proposals would provide worse levels of electoral equality and were not convinced by the evidence supplied that the arrangements would better reflect community identities. Under our final recommendations, outlined on the large map at the back of this report, the number of electors per councillor would be the same as under the draft recommendations for Allestree and Darley wards and the City Council's Stage Three proposals for Abbey and Mackworth wards.

### **Breadsall, Chaddesden and Derwent wards**

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

50 At Stage One the City Council proposed 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. A three-member Chaddesden ward would include 2,277 electors from the south of the existing Breadsall ward and the majority of the existing Chaddesden ward. The Liberal Democrats' proposed new Chaddesden East and Chaddesden West wards would broadly mirror these two wards. Both the City Council and Liberal Democrats 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 Oakwood ward would be 4 per cent below the city average both initially and by 2005. 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).

51 We considered that both schemes would facilitate a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, but noted that the City Council's scheme had been made available for public consultation, and would therefore be more likely to command local support. Although there is little difference between the two schemes, we adopted the City Council's Chaddesden, Derwent and Oakwood wards. Under our draft recommendations, the electoral variances would be the same as those under the City Council's scheme.

52 At Stage Three the City Council supported the majority of our draft recommendations in this area but proposed that the boundary between Chaddesden and Derwent wards be modified to include all the electors on Highfield Lane in Chaddesden ward, to provide a more identifiable boundary (this proposal was also submitted by the Liberal Democrats as part of their Priority One Changes). Under these proposals the electoral variances would be the same as those under the draft recommendations.

53 In addition to the proposal outlined above, under the Liberal Democrats' Priority One changes, 31 electors would be transferred from Oakwood ward to Derwent ward, to include the whole of Canterbury Street in a single ward. Under their Priority Two changes, they proposed modifying the eastern boundary of Derwent ward to include electors from Buxton Road in both Chaddesden and Oakwood wards and the whole of Taddington Road in Oakwood ward. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the average in Chaddesden ward (equal to the average by 2005), equal to the average in Derwent ward (2 per cent below by 2005) and 3 per cent below the average in Oakwood ward (4 per cent by 2005).

54 In the light of the evidence provided by both the City Council and Liberal Democrats we propose modifying the boundary between Chaddesden and Derwent wards, affecting five electors, considering the modification to provide a more identifiable boundary and to be a better reflection of community identities. We also propose that the draft recommendations be modified to include the whole of Canterbury Street in Derwent ward, as proposed by the Liberal Democrats. Although we do not consider it necessary to include all electors on a single street in a ward in all cases, in this instance we consider that the proposal provides a clear and identifiable boundary and would not have an adverse impact on electoral equality. However, we do not consider that the Liberal Democrats' other proposals for modifications to Derwent, Chaddesden and Oakwood wards

would provide better boundaries. Consequently, and in the light of the support expressed at Stage Three for our draft recommendations, we do not propose adopting these modifications as part of our final recommendations. Under our final recommendations, outlined on the large map at the back of the report, the number of electors per councillor would be the same as under draft recommendations.

### **Blagreaves, Kingsway, Littleover and Mickleover wards**

55 These four two-member wards are situated in the south-west of the city. Currently, the number of electors per councillor is 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 average in Littleover ward (4 per cent by 2005) and 21 per cent above the average in Mickleover ward (unchanged by 2005).

56 At Stage One the City Council proposed extending the existing Blagreaves ward northwards, to include 1,672 electors from the existing Normanton ward, 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 and parts of the existing Kingsway and Mickleover wards. The remainder of the existing Mickleover ward and part of the existing Kingsway ward 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 and 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).

57 The Liberal Democrats' proposed Mickleover ward would mirror the City Council's. Their Littleover North ward would be similar to the City Council's proposed Littleover ward, but would 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 would exclude the Repton Avenue and Warwick Avenue area in the north, instead including more of the existing Normanton ward. 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).

58 After noting the consensus for a modified Mickleover ward and visiting the area, we endorsed the proposed Mickleover ward, considering it to strike the best balance presently available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. We broadly adopted the City Council's Blagreaves and Littleover wards as part of our draft recommendations, proposing minor modifications to them to provide better electoral equality, further improve the boundaries and better reflect community identities in this and the surrounding areas. We suggested that the boundary between the City Council's proposed Blagreaves and Littleover wards be modified to broadly include Hollowood Avenue in Blagreaves ward and Kingsway Hospital in Littleover ward. Under these proposals 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).

59 At Stage Three the City Council proposed that the boundary between Mickleover and Mackworth wards be modified, to include all the electors on Station Road in a single ward. A resident of Mickleover also proposed that this boundary be modified. The City Council also proposed that the boundary between Blagreaves and Littleover wards be modified to broadly include Cotswold Close, Cross Close, Hollowood Avenue and Lawnswood Close in Littleover ward. It argued that the modification would better reflect community identities and that under the draft recommendations there would be no direct access to these electors from Blagreaves ward. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the city average in Blagreaves ward (unchanged by 2005), 11 per cent below the average in Littleover ward (4 per cent above by 2005) and 10 per cent above the average in Mickleover ward (8 per cent by 2005).

60 As a part of their Priority One changes the Liberal Democrats proposed the same modifications to Blagreaves, Littleover and Mickleover wards as the City Council. However, they proposed further modifications to Blagreaves and Littleover wards under their Priority Two changes. Specifically, they proposed that the whole of Normanton Lane be included in Littleover ward and that Grenfell Avenue, Kendon Avenue, Keswick Avenue, Stenson Avenue, Sunnyhill Avenue and the Ainsworth Drive estate (part of Normanton ward under the draft recommendations) be included in Blagreaves ward, which they asserted would better reflect communities. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the average in Blagreaves ward (equal to the average by 2005), 10 per cent below the average in Littleover ward (5 per cent above by 2005) and 10 per cent above the average in Mickleover ward (8 per cent by 2005).

61 As outlined above we propose endorsing the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' modification to the boundary between Mackworth and Mickleover wards, noting that it would better reflect communities. Additionally, we note that both the City Council and Liberal Democrats proposed a modification to the boundary between Blagreaves and Littleover wards. Although this proposal would slightly worsen electoral equality, we note that it would improve access to electors in both wards and are endorsing it as part of our final recommendations. We have noted the Liberal Democrats' Priority Two changes in this area but do not consider them to strike a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria or provide better boundaries than those included under the draft recommendations. Under our final recommendations, outlined on the large map at the back of the report, the number of electors per councillor would be the same as under the City Council's Stage Three proposals.

### **Babington, Litchurch, Normanton, Osmaston and Sinfin wards**

62 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).

63 The City Council's Stage One 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, the western half of the existing Osmaston ward, that part of Sinfin ward north of the railway line and 1,570 electors from the existing Normanton ward. That part of the existing Normanton ward south of Kenilworth Avenue and east of Stenson Road would be included in a modified Sinfin ward, with 210 electors from the existing Blagreaves ward 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. 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).

64 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 west of the railway line and that part of the existing Babington ward broadly east of Pear Tree Road. A new three-member Royce ward would 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).

65 As explained earlier in the chapter, we considered the railway line to provide a particularly identifiable boundary in Derby, and that it should, therefore, be utilised as a ward boundary. Consequently, we were not minded to endorse the City Council's proposed Osmaston or Sinfin wards because both would include electors either side of the railway in a single ward. We proposed basing our draft recommendations in this area on the Liberal Democrats' scheme, modifying it where we considered a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria could be achieved. We suggested extending the proposed Arboretum ward north-eastwards to include the whole of the city centre 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. Its north-eastern boundary would be the southern boundary of the proposed Arboretum ward (as detailed above). We proposed adopting the Liberal Democrats' Royce ward without modification. 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).

66 At Stage Three the City Council expressed general support for these proposals but suggested modifying the boundary between the new Arboretum and St Luke's wards to follow the length of Abbey Street. It also proposed that Royce ward be renamed Sinfin, to better reflect community identities. Under these proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the average in Arboretum ward (1 per cent by 2005).

67 As detailed earlier in the chapter, the Liberal Democrats proposed modifications to the western boundaries of Arboretum and Normanton wards under its Priority One changes and to the south-western boundary of Normanton ward under its Priority Two changes. They argued that these proposals would better reflect community identities and provide stronger boundaries. They opposed the City Council's proposal to rename Royce ward Sinfin, on the basis that the name would alienate sections of the electorate. They undertook a degree of local consultation on the issue. However, the majority of those consulted suggested that the ward be named Sinfin. Under these proposals the number of electors would be 3 per cent above the average in Arboretum ward (1 per cent by 2005), 8 per cent below the average in Normanton ward (10 per cent by 2005) and 2 per cent below the average in Sinfin ward (4 per cent by 2005).

68 The Sinfin Ward Labour Party opposed the ward name of Royce, proposing that Sinfin, the existing ward name for the area, be retained. Rolls Royce Plc also opposed the ward name of Royce.

69 As detailed above we propose endorsing the City Council's proposal to modify the eastern boundary of St Luke's ward (with Arboretum ward) as part of our final recommendations, considering it would provide a more identifiable boundary. We have noted the Liberal Democrats' proposals in this area but do not consider them to strike a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria or provide better boundaries than those included under the draft recommendations or the City Council's Stage Three proposals. Under our final recommendations, outlined on the large map at the back of the report, the number of electors per councillor would be the same as under the City Council's Stage Three proposals.

70 In light of views expressed by the City Council, Liberal Democrats, Sinfin Ward Labour Party and Rolls Royce Plc we are proposing that Royce ward be renamed Sinfin. Although we note that there is not local consensus regarding the naming of this ward, we propose endorsing the majority view expressed to us as part of our final recommendations.

### **Alvaston, Boulton, Chellaston and Spondon wards**

71 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).

72 At Stage One the City Council proposed a modified three-member Alvaston ward, to include that part of the existing Alvaston ward south of the River Derwent, together with those parts of the existing Litchurch and Osmaston wards 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 would form a modified three-member Chellaston ward. 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).

73 The Liberal Democrats' proposals for this area were very similar to those put forward by the City Council. However, their 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 include more electors from the existing Osmaston ward and fewer electors from the existing Boulton ward, in the modified Boulton ward. Under these recommendations the electoral variances would be almost identical to those under the City Council's Stage One scheme.

74 As part of our draft recommendations, we adopted the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' Chellaston and Spondon wards, having noted that both wards would provide good levels of electoral equality and strong boundaries and would command local support. We proposed adopting the City Council's Alvaston and Boulton wards, but proposed that Alvaston ward be extended westwards to utilise the railway line as its western boundary. Under our 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), 4 per cent below the average in Spondon ward (9 per cent by 2005).

75 At Stage Three the City Council supported our proposals in this area. The Liberal Democrats, as a part of their Priority One changes suggested a minor modification to the boundary between Boulton and Chellaston wards, to include an additional 20 electors from Boulton Lane in Boulton ward. As a result of this boundary modification the number of electors per councillor would be 2 per cent above the city average in Boulton ward (equal to the average by 2005) and 9 per cent below the average in Chellaston ward (1 per cent by 2005). The electoral variances of Alvaston and Spondon wards would remain unchanged from the draft recommendations.

76 In the light of the evidence provided by the Liberal Democrats we propose endorsing their proposal to modify the boundary between Chellaston and Boulton wards. We consider such a proposal, in this instance, to strike a better balance between the provision of identifiable boundaries, the reflection of community identities and electoral equality. Under our final recommendations, outlined on the large map at the back of the report, the number of electors per councillor would be the same as under the Liberal Democrats' Stage Three proposal.

## **Electoral Cycle**

77 At Stage One there appeared to be local support for the retention of the existing electoral cycle. We, therefore, proposed no change to the current cycle of elections by thirds for the City Council.

78 At Stage Three no further comments were received to the contrary, and we confirm our draft recommendation as final.

## **Conclusions**

79 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse our draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- the boundaries of Arboretum, Blagreaves, Boulton, Chaddesden, Chellaston, Derwent, Littleover, Mackworth, Mickleover, Oakwood and St Luke's wards should be modified;
- Royce ward should be renamed Sinfin and St Luke's ward should be renamed Abbey, to better reflect the constituent communities.

80 We conclude that, in Derby:

- there should be an increase in council size from 44 to 51;
- there should be 17 wards, three fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

81 Figure 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 and 2005 electorate figures.

*Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	2000 electorate		2005 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final 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

82 As Figure 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from ten to one, with no ward having a variance of more than 20 per cent from the city average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2005, with no ward having an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

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

*Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Derby*

## 6 NEXT STEPS

83 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Derby and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

84 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 6 August 2001.

85 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary of State  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Local Government Sponsorship Division  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU



## APPENDIX A

### Draft Recommendations for Derby

Our final recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 2, differ from those we put forward as draft recommendations in respect of 11 wards, where our draft proposals are set out below. The only other change from draft to final recommendations, which is not included in Figures A1 and A2, is that we propose to rename Royce ward as Sinfin.

*Figure A1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Constituent Areas*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
Arboretum	Abbey ward (part); Babington ward (part); Darley ward (part); Derwent ward (part); Litchurch ward (part); Sinfin ward (part)
Blagreaves	Blagreaves ward (part); Normanton ward (part)
Boulton	Boulton ward; Chellaston ward (part); Osmaston ward (part)
Chaddesden	Alvaston ward (part); Breadsall ward (part); Chaddesden ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
Chellaston	Chellaston ward (part)
Derwent	Breadsall ward (part); Derwent ward (part)
Littleover	Blagreaves ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part)
Mackworth	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Mackworth ward
Mickleover	Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part); Mickleover ward (part)
Oakwood	Breadsall ward (part)
St Luke's	Abbey ward (part); Kingsway ward (part); Littleover ward (part)

*Figure A2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2000)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2005)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
Arboretum	3	10,457	3,486	3	10,430	3,477	1
Blagreaves	3	9,781	3,260	-3	9,888	3,296	-4
Boulton	3	10,290	3,430	2	10,214	3,405	-1
Chaddesden	3	10,394	3,465	3	10,314	3,438	0
Chellaston	3	9,230	3,077	-9	10,197	3,399	-1
Derwent	3	10,056	3,352	-1	10,078	3,359	-2
Littleover	3	8,719	2,906	-14	10,430	3,477	1
Mackworth	3	10,279	3,426	2	10,447	3,482	2
Mickleover	3	11,168	3,723	10	11,117	3,706	8
Oakwood	3	9,770	3,257	-4	9,838	3,279	-4
St Luke's	3	10,147	3,382	0	10,170	3,390	-1

*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.*

## APPENDIX B

### Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, [www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm](http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm), requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Local Government Commission, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

*Table B1: Commission compliance with Code criteria*

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage	The Commission complies with this requirement
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose	The Commission complies with this requirement
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain	The Commission complies with this requirement
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals	The Commission complies with this requirement
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation	The Commission consults on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken	The Commission complies with this requirement
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated	The Commission complies with this requirement