

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Derbyshire County Council

*February 2000*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council.

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>33</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Derbyshire: Mapping	<i>35</i>
B Derbyshire County Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>39</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>45</i>



# SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council on 24 August 1999.

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

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

- **in 36 of the 64 divisions, each of which is represented by a single councillor, the number of electors varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the county and 10 divisions vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 35 divisions and by more than 20 per cent in 14 divisions.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 129 - 130) are that:

- **Derbyshire County Council should have 64 councillors, the same as at present, representing 64 divisions;**
- **as the divisions are based on district wards which have themselves changed as a result of the recent district reviews, the boundaries of all but three divisions (Barlborough & Clowne, Brimington and Sutton) will be subject to change.**

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

- **In 45 of the proposed 64 divisions the number of electors would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the county average, with only one varying by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **This improved electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors in 49 divisions expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the county in 2004 with, again, only one over 20 per cent.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited. Our proposals are set out in Figures 1 and 2 following this summary, and illustrated on the large map inside the back cover and in Appendix A.

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 22 February 2000. We have not yet decided on our final recommendations and wish to use this period to seek further evidence. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses if, in our judgement, the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would be better served. It is important, therefore, that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 17 April 2000:

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

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
<b>AMBER VALLEY</b>	
1 Alfreton	Alfreton ward; Wingfield ward; Crich
2 Belper North & Alport	Alport ward (part - Ashleyhay, Hazlewood, Idridgehay & Alton and Shottle & Postern parishes); Belper Central ward; Belper North ward
3 Denby	Ripley & Marehay ward; Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook ward
4 Duffield & Belper South	Belper South ward; Duffield ward; South West Parishes ward
5 Heage	Belper East ward; Heage & Ambergate ward; Alport ward (part - Alderwasley and Dethick Lea & Holloway parishes)
6 Heanor & Loscoe	Heanor West ward; Loscoe ward
7 Horsley	Heanor East ward; Horsley & Shipley Park ward
8 Riddings & Aldercar	Aldercar ward; Riddings ward
9 Ripley	Codnor & Waingrove ward; Ripley ward
10 Somercotes	Somercotes ward; Swanwick ward
<b>BOLSOVER</b>	
11 Barlborough & Clowne	Barlborough ward; Clowne North ward; Clowne South ward
12 Bolsover & Scarcliffe	Bolsover South ward; Bolsover West ward; Scarcliffe ward
13 Elmtun & Whitwell	Bolsover North-West ward; Elmtun-with-Creswell ward; Whitwell ward
14 Shirebrook & Pleasley	Pleasley ward; Shirebrook East ward; Shirebrook Langwith ward; Shirebrook North West ward; Shirebrook South East ward; Shirebrook South-West ward
15 South Normanton & Pinxton	Pinxton ward; South Normanton West ward
16 Tibshelf	Blackwell ward; South Normanton East ward; Tibshelf ward
<b>CHESTERFIELD</b>	
17 Ashgate	Loundsley Green ward; West ward
18 Birdholme	Hasland ward; Rother ward
19 Brimington	Brimington North ward; Brimington South ward; Hollinwood & Inkersall ward
20 Hipper	Holmebrook ward; Walton ward
21 Newbold	Brockwell ward; Moor ward
22 St Mary's	Dunston ward; Linacre ward

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
23 Spire	St Helens ward; St Leonards ward
24 Staveley North & Whittington	Barrowhill & New Whittington ward; Old Whittington ward; Lowgates & Woodthorpe ward (part - Lowgates parish ward of Staveley parish)
25 Staveley South	Hollingwood & Inkersall ward; Lowgates & Woodthorpe ward (part-Woodthorpe parish ward of Staveley parish); Middlecroft & Poolsbrook ward
<b>DERBYSHIRE DALES</b>	
26 Ashbourne	Ashbourne South ward; Brailsford ward; Clifton & Bradley ward; Doveridge & Sudbury ward; Hulland ward; Norbury ward
27 Bakewell	Bakewell ward; Bradwell ward; Hathersage & Eyam ward; Litton & Longstone ward
28 Derwent Valley	Calver ward; Chatsworth ward; Darley Dale ward; Stanton ward; Winster & South Darley ward (part - South Darley parish)
29 Dovedale	Ashbourne North ward; Dovedale & Parwich ward; Hartington & Taddington ward; Lathkill & Bradford ward; Tideswell ward; Winster & South Darley ward (part - Elton, Gratton and Winster parishes)
30 Matlock	Matlock All Saints ward; Matlock St Giles ward
31 Wirksworth	Carsington Water ward; Masson ward; Wirksworth ward
<b>EREWASH</b>	
32 Breadsall & West Hallam	Little Easton & Breadsall ward; Stanley ward; West Hallam & Dale Abbey ward (part -West Hallam parish)
33 Breaston	Breaston ward; Draycott & Stanton by Dale ward (part -Draycott & Church Wilne parish); Ockbrook & Borrowwash ward (part - Borrowwash East and Borrowwash West parish wards of Ockbrook & Borrowwash parish)
34 Cotmanhay	Abbotsford ward; Cotmanhay ward; Ilkeston North ward
35 Ilkeston	Ilkeston Central ward; Little Hallam ward; Old Park (Ilkeston) ward
36 Kirk Hallam	Hallam Fields ward; Kirk Hallam ward; West Hallam & Dale Abbey ward (part- Dale Abbey Village parish ward of Dale Abbey parish)
37 Long Eaton	Long Eaton Central ward; Nottingham Road (Long Eaton) ward
38 Petersham	Derby Road East ward; Derby Road West ward
39 Sandiacre	Draycott & Stanton by Dale ward (part- Hopwell, Risley and Stanton by Dale parishes); Ockbrook & Borrowwash ward (part - Ockbrook parish ward of Ockbrook & Borrowwash parish), Sandiacre North ward; Sandiacre South ward
40 Sawley	Sawley ward; Wilsthrope ward

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
<b>HIGH PEAK</b>	
41 Buxton North & East	Barms ward; Cote Heath ward; Limestone Peak ward; Stone Bench ward
42 Buxton West	Burbage ward; Central ward; Corbar ward; Temple ward
43 Chapel & Hope Valley	Chapel East ward; Chapel West ward; Hope Valley ward
44 Etherow	Gamesley ward; Hadfield North ward; Hadfield South ward; Tintwistle ward
45 Glossop South	Howard Town ward; Simmondley ward; Whitfield ward
46 Glossop North & Rural	Dinting ward; Old Glossop ward; Padfield ward; St Johns ward
47 New Mills	Hayfield ward; New Mills East ward; New Mills West ward; Sett ward
48 Whaley Bridge & Blackbrook	Blackbrook ward; Whaley Bridge ward
<b>NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE</b>	
49 Clay Cross	Ashover ward; Clay Cross North ward; Clay Cross South ward
50 Dronfield North	Coal Aston ward; Dronfield North ward; Dronfield Woodhouse ward
51 Dronfield South	Dronfield South ward; Gosforth Valley ward
52 Eckington	Eckington South ward; Eckington North ward; Ridgeway & Marsh Lane ward; Unstone ward
53 Holymoorside & Wingerworth	Barlow & Holmesfield ward; Brampton & Walton ward; Wingerworth ward
54 Killamarsh	Killamarsh East ward; Killamarsh West ward; Renishaw ward
55 North Wingfield	Tupton ward; North Wingfield Central ward; Holmewood & Heath ward (part- East parish ward of Holmewood & Heath parish)
56 Stonebroom & Pilsley	Shirland ward; Pilsley & Morton ward
57 Sutton	Grassmoor ward; Holmewood & Heath ward (part - North Wingfield parish); Sutton ward
<b>SOUTH DERBYSHIRE</b>	
58 Aston & Melbourne	Aston ward; Melbourne ward
59 Hatton & Hilton	Etwall ward; Hilton ward; Hatton ward; North West ward
60 Linton & Church Greasley	Church Greasley ward; Linton ward (part - Cauldwell, Castle Greasley and Linton parishes); Seales ward (part - Overseal parish)
61 Midway & Hartshorne	Midway ward; Hartshorne & Ticknall ward

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
62 Newhall & Seales	Linton ward (part - Drakelow and Rosliston parishes); Newhall & Stanton ward; Seales ward (part - Coton-in-the-Elms, Catton, Lullington, Netherseal and Walton upon Trent parishes)
63 Repton & Willington	Repton ward; Stenson ward; Willington & Findern ward
64 Swadlincote Central & Woodville	Swadlincote ward; Woodville ward

*Notes: 1 The constituent district wards are those resulting from the electoral reviews of the eight Derbyshire districts which were completed in 1998. Where whole district wards do not form the building blocks, constituent parishes and parish wards are listed.*

*2 The large map inserted at the back of the report illustrates the proposed divisions outlined above and the maps in Appendix A illustrate some of the proposed boundaries in more detail.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Derbyshire

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>AMBER VALLEY</b>					
1 Alfreton	1	10,003	11	10,145	10
2 Belper North & Alport	1	8,801	-2	8,955	-3
3 Denby	1	10,445	16	10,523	14
4 Duffield & Belper South	1	9,824	9	9,971	8
5 Heage	1	9,412	5	9,700	5
6 Heanor & Loscoe	1	8,464	-6	8,613	-7
7 Horsley	1	8,175	-9	8,787	-5
8 Riddings & Aldercar	1	8,147	-9	8,249	-11
9 Ripley	1	10,512	17	10,807	17
10 Somercotes	1	8,663	-4	8,836	-4
<b>BOLSOVER</b>					
11 Barlborough & Clowne	1	8,016	-11	8,841	-4
12 Bolsover & Scarcliffe	1	9,332	4	9,460	2
13 Elmtun & Whitwell	1	10,422	16	10,081	9
14 Shirebrook & Pleasley	1	10,869	21	10,473	13
15 South Normanton & Pinxton	1	7,660	-15	8,011	-13
16 Tibshelf	1	9,817	9	10,001	8
<b>CHESTERFIELD</b>					
17 Ashgate	1	8,461	-6	8,879	-4
18 Birdholme	1	9,702	8	10,088	9
19 Brimington	1	8,173	-9	8,154	-12
20 Hipper	1	8,288	-8	8,447	-8
21 Newbold	1	8,517	-5	8,353	-10
22 St Mary's	1	8,039	-11	8,093	-12
23 Spire	1	8,345	-7	8,624	-7
24 Staveley North & Whittington	1	9,703	8	10,125	10

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
25 Staveley South	1	10,128	13	10,280	11
<b>DERBYSHIRE DALES</b>					
26 Ashbourne	1	9,907	10	10,165	10
27 Bakewell	1	10,035	12	10,157	10
28 Derwent Valley	1	9,388	4	9,520	3
29 Dovedale	1	9,666	7	9,825	6
30 Matlock	1	8,784	-2	9,081	-2
31 Wirksworth	1	8,727	-3	8,772	-5
<b>EREWASH</b>					
32 Breadsall & West Hallam	1	8,529	-5	8,749	-5
33 Breaston	1	10,087	12	9,964	8
34 Cotmanhay	1	10,034	12	10,685	16
35 Ilkeston	1	9,610	7	9,822	6
36 Kirk Hallam	1	8,230	-9	8,163	-12
37 Long Eaton	1	9,280	3	9,667	5
38 Petersham	1	8,519	-5	8,419	-9
39 Sandiacre	1	9,146	2	9,125	-1
40 Sawley	1	10,222	14	10,123	10
<b>HIGH PEAK</b>					
41 Buxton North & East	1	9,341	4	9,492	3
42 Buxton West	1	9,136	2	9,510	3
43 Chapel & Hope Valley	1	8,027	-11	8,056	-13
44 Etherow	1	8,275	-8	8,458	-8
45 Glossop South	1	7,944	-12	8,440	-9
46 Glossop North & Rural	1	7,908	-12	8,437	-9
47 New Mills	1	9,356	4	9,682	5
48 Whaley Bridge & Blackbrook	1	7,986	-11	8,254	-11

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE</b>					
49 Clay Cross	1	8,702	-3	8,807	-5
50 Dronfield South	1	8,799	-2	8,769	-5
51 Dronfield North	1	9,223	3	8,812	-5
52 Eckington	1	8,796	-2	8,985	-3
53 Holymoorside & Wingerworth	1	9,417	5	9,537	3
54 Killamarsh	1	8,583	-5	9,165	-1
55 North Wingfield	1	7,893	-12	8,152	-12
56 Stonebroom & Pilsley	1	8,358	-7	8,508	-8
57 Sutton	1	8,381	-7	8,350	-10
<b>SOUTH DERBYSHIRE</b>					
58 Aston & Melbourne	1	8,438	-6	9,401	2
59 Hatton & Hilton	1	9,210	2	11,184	21
60 Linton & Church Greasley	1	8,375	-7	8,670	-6
61 Midway & Hartshorne	1	9,013	0	9,382	2
62 Newhall & Seales	1	8,166	-9	8,393	-9
63 Repton & Willington	1	9,992	11	10,568	14
64 Swadlincote Central & Woodville	1	8,317	-8	9,023	-2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>575,718</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>590,768</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,996</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,231</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on material provided by Derbyshire County Council.

Notes: 1 The electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor as each division is represented by a single councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors represented by each councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2 The total electorate for 1999 and 2004 shown in Figure 2 above differs from those shown in Figure 4 by 44 and 2 electors respectively, which has a negligible impact on variances.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 We are currently undertaking a review of the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council. This report contains our draft recommendations on which we are now consulting. Our review of the county is part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 In each two-tier county, our approach is first to complete the PERs of all the constituent districts and, when Orders for the resulting changes in those areas have been made by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, then to commence a PER of the county council's electoral arrangements. The Secretary of State made Orders for new electoral arrangements in the districts in Derbyshire, which we reviewed in 1998/99, in October 1999 and we are now embarking on our county review in this area.

## **Our Approach to County Reviews**

3 In undertaking all our PERs we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. 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* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties*, which we supplemented in October 1998 on our approach to county reviews.

5 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the County Council, and the number, boundaries and names of electoral divisions. Current legislation requires that county council electoral divisions should each return one councillor. In addition, the statutory Rules set out in the 1972 Act provide that each division should be wholly contained within a single district and that division boundaries should not split unwarded parishes or parish wards.

6 In considering the approach we should take to county reviews we valued the responses to the consultation we undertook in 1995 prior to the start of our PER programme, and the more recent discussions we have had with county council officers and the Local Government Association. We have also welcomed the opportunity to brief chief officers and, on an all-party basis, members of individual county councils, about our policies and procedures.

7 In October 1998 we wrote to all county councils setting out further advice on our approach to county reviews which supplemented our *Guidance*. First, as with all our reviews, 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 configuration is most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

8 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the county as a whole. For example, we will continue to require justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any division. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in exceptional circumstances, and will require strong justification.

9 Similarly, we will seek to ensure that the number of county councillors representing each district area within the county is commensurate with the district's proportion of the county's electorate.

10 Third, the Rules provide that, in considering county council electoral arrangements, we should have regard to the boundaries of district wards. We attach considerable importance to achieving coterminosity between the boundaries of divisions and wards. Where wards or groups of wards are not coterminous with county divisions, this can cause confusion for the electorate at local elections, lead to increased election costs and, in our view, may not be conducive to effective and convenient local government.

11 We recognise, however, that it is unlikely that optimum electoral equality and greatest coterminosity will be simultaneously achievable. In this respect, county reviews are different to those of districts. The Commission will seek to achieve the best available balance between electoral equality and coterminosity, taking into account the statutory criteria. While the proportion of electoral divisions that will be coterminous with the boundaries of district wards is likely to vary between counties, we would normally expect coterminosity to be achieved in a significant majority of divisions.

12 Where coterminosity is not possible in parished areas, and a district ward is to be split between electoral divisions, we would normally expect this to be achieved without dividing (or further dividing) a parish between divisions. There are likely to be exceptions to this, however, particularly where larger parishes are involved.

13 Fourth, we are not prescriptive on council size, but, as indicated in our *Guidance*, we start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that county 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 county's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a county council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other counties.

14 Fifth, a further area of difference between county and district reviews is that we recognise it will not be possible to avoid the creation of some county divisions which contain diverse

communities, for example, combining urban and rural areas. We have generally sought to avoid this in district reviews, in order to reflect the identities and interests of local communities. Some of the existing county council electoral divisions comprise a number of distinct communities, which is inevitable given the larger number of electors represented by each councillor, and we would expect that similar situations will continue under our recommendations in seeking the best balance between electoral equality, coterminosity and the statutory criteria.

15 Finally, before we started our county reviews, the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, in July 1998, setting out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. The Government's proposals provided for elections by halves in alternate years for all two-tier authorities. This would mean that district and county councils would each move to a cycle of elections by halves, with elections for district councils and county councils taking place in alternate years. The White Paper also refers to local accountability being maximised where the whole electorate in a council's area is involved in elections each time they take place, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member divisions in county councils to reflect a system of elections by halves. The proposals are now being taken forward in a Local Government Bill published in December 1999 and are currently being considered by Parliament.

16 In October 1998, we wrote to all local authorities, setting out our understanding of the White Paper proposals, following discussions that we had had with the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, the Local Government Association and the Association of London Government. In brief, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, and our present *Guidance*, until such time as the legislation changes. We have power only to recommend single-member divisions in county council areas.

17 As part of this review we may also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the county. However, we made some recommendations for new parish electoral arrangements as part of our district reviews. Furthermore, this is now a power that is open to district and unitary councils. We therefore only expect to put forward such recommendations during county reviews on an exceptional basis. In any event, we are *not* able to review the administrative boundaries *between* local authorities or parishes, or consider the establishment of new parish areas as part of this review.

## **The Review of Derbyshire**

18 We completed the reviews of the eight district council areas in Derbyshire in November 1998, and the Secretary of State has since made the Orders for the new electoral arrangements. This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Derbyshire County Council. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in September 1980 (Report No. 398).

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

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

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

20 Stage One of this review began on 24 August 1999, when we wrote to Derbyshire County Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the eight district councils in the county, Derbyshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Derbyshire Association of Local Councils, parish and town councils in the county, the Members of Parliament and the Members of the European Parliament with constituency interests in the county, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the County Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 13 December 1999.

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

22 Stage Three began on 22 February 2000 with the publication of these draft recommendations report, and public consultation on them will end on 17 April 2000.

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

## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

24 The county of Derbyshire comprises the eight districts of Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, Erewash, High Peak, North East Derbyshire and South Derbyshire. With a population of approximately 928,600, covering nearly 262,860 hectares (*Municipal Year Book*), the county has a population density of approximately 3.5 persons per hectare. The county borders Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire to the east, Warwickshire to the south with Staffordshire, Cheshire and Greater Manchester to the west and South and West Yorkshire to the north.

25 To compare levels of electoral inequality between divisions, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors represented by the councillor for each division varies from the county average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

26 The electorate of the county is 575,762 (February 1999). The Council presently has 64 members, with one member elected from each division (Figure 4).

27 Since the last review of the County Council's electoral arrangements there has been an increase in the electorate in Derbyshire, with around 13 per cent more electors than two decades ago. At present, each councillor represents an average of 8,996 electors, which the County Council forecasts will increase to 9,231 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors in 36 of the 64 divisions varies by more than 10 per cent from the county average and in 10 divisions by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Belper division, in Amber Valley borough, where the councillor represents 44 per cent more electors than the county average.

28 As detailed previously, in considering the County Council's electoral arrangements, we must have regard to the boundaries of district wards. Following the completion of the reviews of district warding arrangements in Derbyshire, we are therefore faced with a new "starting point" for considering electoral divisions. Our proposals for county divisions will be based on the new district wards as opposed to those which existed prior to the recent reviews. In view of the effect of these new district wards and changes in the electorate over the past 20 years which have resulted in electoral imbalances across the county, changes to most, if not all, of the existing county electoral divisions are inevitable.

29 In considering county council electoral arrangements, we have regard to the boundaries of district wards. The term 'coterminosity' is used throughout the report and refers to situations where the boundaries of county electoral divisions and district wards are the same, that is to say where county divisions comprise either one or more whole district wards.

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>AMBER VALLEY</b>					
1 Alfreton	1	6,322	-30	6,362	-31
2 Alport	1	10,019	11	10,199	10
3 Belper	1	12,961	44	13,366	45
4 Duffield	1	9,067	1	9,156	-1
5 Heage	1	8,421	-6	8,567	-7
6 Heanor	1	9,362	4	9,898	7
7 Horsley	1	10,224	14	10,476	13
8 Loscoe	1	7,490	-17	7,514	-19
9 Ripley	1	9,735	8	10,030	9
10 Somercotes	1	8,845	-2	9,018	-2
<b>BOLSOVER</b>					
11 Bolsover	1	8,921	-1	9,113	-1
12 Clowne	1	8,016	-11	8,841	-4
13 Elmton	1	7,544	-16	7,317	-21
14 Scarcliffe	1	7,208	-20	6,787	-26
15 Shirebrook	1	6,950	-23	6,800	-26
16 South Normanton	1	10,833	20	11,423	24
17 Tibshelf	1	6,644	-26	6,589	-29
<b>CHESTERFIELD</b>					
18 Brimington	1	8,186	-9	8,167	-12
19 Chesterfield North	1	8,870	-1	9,177	-1
20 Hasland & St Leonard's	1	9,228	3	9,839	7
21 Holmebrook & Rother	1	8,922	-1	8,950	-3
22 Moor & St Helen's	1	7,533	-16	7,312	-21

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
23 Newbold & Brockwell	1	10,868	21	11,520	25
24 Sheepbridge	1	7,986	-11	7,876	-15
25 Staveley	1	7,540	-16	7,714	-16
26 Walton & West	1	10,223	14	10,488	14
<b>DERBYSHIRE DALES</b>					
27 Ashbourne	1	11,495	28	11,854	28
28 Bakewell	1	8,637	-4	8,656	-6
29 Darley Dale	1	10,008	11	10,209	11
30 Matlock	1	8,784	-2	9,079	-2
31 Tideswell	1	8,377	-7	8,417	-9
32 Wirksworth	1	9,206	2	9,305	1
<b>EREWASH</b>					
33 Cotmanhay	1	10,135	13	10,799	17
34 Draycott	1	11,585	29	11,418	24
35 Ilkeston	1	9,878	10	10,072	9
36 Kirk Hallam	1	7,634	-15	7,546	-18
37 Long Eaton	1	8,977	0	9,336	1
38 Petersham	1	8,752	-3	8,657	-6
39 Sandiacre	1	7,887	-12	7,921	-14
40 Sawley	1	10,308	15	10,215	11
41 West Hallam	1	8,533	-5	8,749	-5
<b>HIGH PEAK</b>					
42 Buxton North	1	9,144	2	9,577	4
43 Buxton South	1	8,184	-9	8,251	-11
44 Chapel	1	8,972	0	9,034	-2
45 Glossop East	1	9,607	7	10,256	11
46 Glossop South	1	8,689	-3	9,016	-2
47 Glossop West	1	7,972	-11	8,300	-10

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
48 New Mills	1	7,217	-20	7,449	-19
49 Whaley Bridge	1	8,190	-9	8,448	-8
<b>NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE</b>					
50 Brackenfield	1	7,353	-18	7,484	-19
51 Clay Cross	1	6,980	-22	7,035	-24
52 Dronfield North	1	9,460	5	8,947	-3
53 Dronfield South	1	10,060	12	10,061	9
54 Eckington	1	8,783	-2	9,082	-2
55 Holymoore & Wingerworth	1	10,060	12	10,190	10
56 Killamarsh	1	7,098	-21	7,641	-17
57 North Wingfield	1	9,977	11	10,295	12
58 Sutton	1	8,381	-7	8,350	-10
<b>SOUTH DERBYSHIRE</b>					
59 Etwall	1	10,572	18	12,701	38
60 Linton	1	7,569	-16	7,746	-16
61 Melbourne	1	12,707	41	13,946	51
62 Newhall	1	10,549	17	10,916	18
63 Repton	1	10,310	15	10,806	17
64 Swadlincote	1	9,804	9	10,507	14
<b>Totals</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>575,762</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>590,770</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,996</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,231</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Derbyshire County Council's submission.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors represented by each councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Linton division in South Derbyshire were relatively over-represented by 16 per cent, while electors in Repton division were under-represented by 15 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

30 At the start of the review, we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council.

31 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the County Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 36 representations during Stage One, including a county-wide scheme from the County Council, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the County Council and the Commission by appointment. A list of respondents is available on request from the Commission.

#### **Derbyshire County Council**

32 The County Council proposed retaining a council of 64 members. During Stage One, the County Council devolved the formulation of proposals for each district area to its Local Area Committees and undertook to consult locally on its proposals before finalising its submission. The County Council proposed that South Derbyshire district should be represented by an additional seventh councillor whereas Bolsover district should return one less councillor, reducing from seven to six. In formulating its proposals, the County Council noted it had had regard to three main principles: “maintaining electoral equality ... coterminosity of wards and divisions where possible ... [and] maintaining community identities and boundaries”.

33 The County Council submitted two alternative options for two of the districts in the county: Derbyshire Dales and High Peak. In Derbyshire Dales, the Council’s Option A reflected the County Council’s preferred option whereas Option B, which proposed an alternative pattern of divisions, was referred to as the “Local Area Committee Alternative Proposal”. In High Peak, the Council noted “the County Council expresses no preference for either option”.

#### **The Conservatives**

34 The Conservative Group on the County Council submitted proposals for each of the districts within the county with the exception of Bolsover where it submitted no proposals. The Conservative Group had assumed an overall council size of 64, as at present, in formulating its proposals and proposed an additional county councillor for South Derbyshire district.

35 We also received representations directly from the West Derbyshire Conservative Association, High Peak Conservative Association, Derbyshire Dales Local Area Committee, Chesterfield Conservative Association, Erewash Conservative Association, North East Derbyshire Conservative Association and Amber Valley Conservative Association, which proposed identical schemes in four districts to the County Council Conservative Group.

## **The Liberal Democrats**

36 The Liberal Democrat Group on Derbyshire County Council submitted proposals for four districts in Derbyshire: High Peak, North East Derbyshire, Derbyshire Dales and Chesterfield. For the remaining four districts, it stated: “we do not differ significantly from the proposals put forward by the County Council”. The Liberal Democrats’ proposals were based on no change to the current council size. In formulating its proposal, the group noted that its proposals “have been re-drawn from first principles to give good electoral equality, although other considerations being equal, for continuity there is some advantage in retaining the basic structure of existing divisions”.

37 We received further submissions from High Peak Borough Council Liberal Democrat Group and North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrat Group which made proposals on their respective districts which were the same as those submitted by the County Council Liberal Democrat Group.

## **Borough and District Councils**

38 We received representations from Derbyshire Dales District Council and Amber Valley Borough Council. The District Council stated that it was unable to comment on the consultation document it had received from the County Council before the expiry of the end of Stage One. Amber Valley Borough Council made two comments on the County Council’s proposal - that the County Council’s proposed Horsley Division should be named Horsley Woodhouse, and that the names of the two Belper divisions “are not considered appropriate”.

## **Parish and Town Councils**

39 We received representations directly from 10 parish and town councils. Brimington Parish Council stated that “there should be one electoral division for the parish of Brimington”. Hayfield Parish Council considered that it should form part of an electoral division with the New Mills, Chinley and Chapel-en-le-Frith areas of High Peak in order to reflect community ties in the area. North Wingfield Parish Council supported the County Council’s proposals for the county as they related to the parish. Ripley Town Council stated that it supported the use of parish and district ward boundaries as the basis for electoral divisions. Overseal Parish Council supported minimal change to the current Linton division in South Derbyshire in order to reflect community identities in the area. Shirland & Higham Parish Council supported a new division comprising the adjoining parishes of Morton and Pilsley. Somercotes Parish Council proposed no change to the existing division, while Tupton Parish Council proposed a new division in North East Derbyshire district comprising Tupton and North Wingfield parishes. Wirksworth Town Council considered it had strong community ties with the surrounding villages of Cromford and Bonsall and that the present Wirksworth division was too geographically large. Breaston Parish Council did not consider it was able to respond before the end of Stage One to the County Council’s consultation document.

## **Other Representations**

40 We received further representations from seven local political groups, one county councillor and three local residents. Derbyshire County Labour Party wrote in support of the County

Council's proposals. North East Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party submitted proposals for the electoral divisions in North East Derbyshire stating that "our submission aims to relate county divisions to established communities, which are generally parish council areas". We received three representations from Labour Party groups in Bolsover: Bolsover Constituency & District Labour Party proposed no change to the existing electoral divisions in the district; Bolsover Branch Labour Party and Whitwell Branch of the Labour Party proposed no change to the divisions of Bolsover and Elmtun respectively.

41 Alfreton & Swanwick Labour Party, supported by Alfreton Town Council, proposed that Alfreton should form part of an electoral division with the parishes of South Wingfield and Crich. Derbyshire Dales District Council Labour Group made a number of suggestions for modifications to the electoral divisions in the Wirksworth area.

42 We received three separate letters in a submission from County Councillor Mrs J.N. Bevan, county councillor for the Tideswell Electoral Division, who noted the rural nature of parts of Derbyshire and supported a proposal to modify the external boundaries of Derbyshire Dales and High Peak districts in order to unite the Hope Valley area. Borough Councillor Thorpe, member for Wingfield ward, preferred to retain the existing Alport division unchanged for community identity reasons. We received proposals for Amber Valley from a local resident, and two further submissions from residents in Pentrich who did not support the combination of urban and rural wards in the north of the district to create new electoral divisions.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

43 As with our reviews of districts, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the interests and identities of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors being “as nearly as may be, the same in every division of the county”.

44 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 must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken, and to the boundaries of district wards.

45 We have discussed in Chapter One the additional parameters which apply to reviews of county council electoral arrangements and the need to have regard to the boundaries of district wards and coterminosity. We will also seek to ensure that the number of county councillors representing each district council area within the county is commensurate with the district’s proportion of the county’s electorate.

46 It is impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors in every division of a county. 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.

47 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, especially when also seeking to achieve coterminosity in order to facilitate convenient and effective local government. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review.

48 We therefore recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as the boundaries of district wards and community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an imbalance of over 10 per cent in any division. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in exceptional circumstances and will require strong justification.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

49 The County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting a marginal increase in the electorate of 3 per cent from 575,762 to 590,770 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects much of the growth to be in the South Derbyshire district. The County Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and

local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the County Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to division boundaries has been obtained.

50 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science. We have examined the methodology and assumptions used by the County Council and are content that their figures represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

## **Council Size**

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

52 Derbyshire County Council presently has 64 members. The County Council proposed a council of 64 members. Each of the other groups making proposals for one or more districts in the county had all also assumed a council size of 64 in their deliberations.

53 The Commission does not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but is prepared to consider the case for change where there is persuasive evidence. Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that, in Derbyshire, a council size of 64 members, as at present, would best meet the statutory criteria.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

54 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the county-wide proposals from the County Council (which included alternative options for Derbyshire Dales and High Peak). In the remaining six districts, the County Council submitted one set of proposals. As detailed above, we concluded that a council size of 64 would provide a fair level of representation across the county and facilitate a good electoral scheme.

55 We are grateful for the positive approach taken by the County Council and each of the other respondents in putting forward proposals for new electoral arrangements which would improve the severe electoral imbalances which exist among the present county divisions. Under the majority of proposals we received, substantial improvements in electoral equality would be secured across the county. However, we note that under a number of the County Council's and other representations a significant number of divisions would not be coterminous with district wards: under the County Council's proposals only 40 per cent of divisions would be coterminous with district wards. As outlined above, we seek to achieve coterminosity between the boundaries of divisions and wards in formulating new county electoral arrangements where possible, as this can be conducive to effective and convenient local government. Consequently, while we are adopting elements from the County Council's proposals, we are also adopting elements from the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups' schemes, as well as putting forward our own proposals, in order to achieve, we judge, the optimum balance between electoral equality, coterminosity and the statutory criteria.

56 For the purposes of county divisions, the eight district areas in the county are considered in turn, as follows:

- (a) Amber Valley district;
- (b) Bolsover district;
- (c) Chesterfield borough;
- (d) Derbyshire Dales district;
- (e) Erewash borough;
- (f) High Peak borough;
- (g) North East Derbyshire district;
- (h) South Derbyshire district.

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

### **Amber Valley district**

58 Under the current arrangements, the district of Amber Valley is represented by 10 county councillors serving 10 county divisions: Alfreton, Alport, Belper, Duffield, Heage, Heanor, Horsley, Loscoe, Ripley and Somercotes. There is a high degree of electoral imbalance in these divisions, with the number of electors represented by each councillor in two divisions varying by more than 20 per cent from the average for the county. Overall, relative to the size of the electorate in the rest of the county, the district is correctly represented on the County Council.

59 For Amber Valley, we received three schemes: from the County Council, the Conservative Group (the same scheme was also submitted by Amber Valley Conservative Association) and a local resident. Each of these schemes proposed significantly differing division patterns.

60 The County Council proposed 10 divisions for Amber Valley. In the north, Alfreton division would comprise Swanwick ward, part of Wingfield Ward and part of Alfreton ward with the adjoining Somercotes division comprising Somercotes ward and part of Alfreton and Riddings wards. To the south of this, it proposed a Ripley division, comprising Ripley ward and part of Codnor & Waingroves ward and Heage division, comprising Heage & Ambergate and Ripley & Marehay ward. The County Council considered that its Ripley ward would combine “two urban Amber Valley wards ... to maintain most of the original voting area”. Loscoe division would comprise the wards of Aldercar, Loscoe, part of Codnor & Waingroves and part of Riddings, with Heanor division comprising Heanor East and Heanor West wards. Belper North division would comprise Belper North and Belper East wards with Belper South division comprising Belper Central, Belper South, part of Kilburn ward and part of Denby & Holbrook ward (Holbrook parish). The County Council considered “the population of Holbrook does also look towards Belper for services”. In the far south-east, Horsley division would comprise Horsley & Shipley Park and part of Kilburn and Denby & Holbrook wards. The County Council’s proposed Alport division in the west of the district would cover a geographically large area comprising the four wards of Alport, Duffield, South West Parishes and Crich, together with Fritchley parish ward of Crich parish within Wingfield ward. Commenting upon its proposals for Alport, the County Council stated that “there should be natural links between communities both in terms of past

connections and their rural nature”. The County Council’s proposals would include two divisions with electoral variances of over 10 per cent: Alport at 14 per cent and Somercotes at 12 per cent. Overall, under the County Council proposals only three out of the 10 divisions would be coterminous.

61 The Conservative Group proposals (also submitted by the Amber Valley Conservative Association) differed from the County Council’s proposed in all divisions: Aldercar division would comprise Aldercar & Langley Mill ward, Loscoe ward and part of Riddings ward (Ironville parish); Belper division would comprise Belper Central and Belper East wards; Butterley division would comprise Swanwick ward, part of Alfreton and Ripley wards; Cotes Park division would comprise Somercotes ward, part of Alfreton and Riddings wards; Dethick division would comprise Alport ward, Belper North ward, Crich ward and part of Wingfield ward; Ecclesbourne division would comprise Belper South ward, Duffield ward and South West Parishes ward; Heanor division would comprise the wards of Heanor East, Heanor West and part of Horsley & Shipley Park ward; Horsley division would comprise Denby, Kilburn & Holbrook ward and part of Horsley & Shipley Park ward; Ridgeway division would comprise Heage & Ambergate ward, Ripley & Marehay ward and part of Wingfield ward; and Ripley & Codnor division would comprise Codnor & Waingroves ward and part of Ripley ward. Under the Conservative Groups’ proposals, one division, Cotes Park, would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average (12 per cent). Only two out of the Conservative Group’s proposed 10 divisions, Belper and Ecclestone would be coterminous with district wards. Amber Valley Conservative Association noted that its proposals were based, wherever possible on the existing divisions, achieved a “fair degree” of electoral equality and minimised the number of non-coterminous divisions.

62 One local resident proposed an alternative pattern of divisions in the area, supplying 2004 figures only. Under these proposals, however, five divisions would have an electoral variance of 20 per cent or more, although seven out of the 10 divisions would be coterminous.

63 We also received a submission from Amber Valley Borough Council who proposed that the County Council’s proposed Horsley division should be renamed Horsley Woodhouse division and that “the names proposed for the two Belper divisions are not considered appropriate”, although no alternatives were proposed. Alfreton & Swanwick Labour Party, with an appended supporting document from Alfreton Town Council, proposed that Alfreton ward should form part of a division with South Wingfield and Crich parishes to reflect community ties in the area. Somercotes Parish Council proposed that the existing Somercotes division should remain unchanged for community identity reasons. Ripley Town Council stated that it wished to retain the “building block principle - based on the current borough wards and parishes”. Councillor Thorpe, borough councillor for Wingfield ward, supported no change to Alport division, in order to reflect its rural composition. Two local residents of Amber Valley made submissions opposing the inclusion of rural area of Pentrich parish with the more urban Alfreton area.

64 We have carefully considered all the representations we received. We have not been convinced that any of the district-wide schemes we received achieved a satisfactory balance between achieving the optimum electoral equality and coterminosity while having regard to the statutory criteria. The Commission has therefore developed its own proposals for Amber Valley, taking into account all the representations received. We noted that there are a number of alternative combinations of wards within the district which would achieve a pattern of 10

divisions, but our approach was to secure significant improvements in coterminosity while not significantly reducing electoral equality, together with having regard, wherever possible, to views as to where community ties existed in the district, based upon the representations we received.

65 We propose an Alfreton division which would comprise Alfreton, Wingfield and Crich wards. To the south of this, Somercotes and Swanwick district wards would produce, we judge, a compact Somercotes division reflecting the geography of the area. Along the eastern side of the district we propose a division to be called Riddings & Aldercar which would comprise the district wards of the same name. The wards of Heanor West, Loscoe and Ripley and Codnor & Waingrove would, respectively, form two divisions we propose naming Heanor & Loscoe and Ripley. In this area, we judge that the division pattern we are proposing achieves good electoral equality, coterminous divisions and reflects the existing settlement pattern. In the south-east of the district, Ripley & Marehay and Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook wards would comprise our proposed Denby division. We particularly acknowledge that the warding pattern in Ripley does not lend itself easily to the creation of county divisions but we judge that our proposed Denby division would achieve the most practicable solution available while adequately reflecting community identity in the area.

66 To the south of our proposed Denby division, we propose that the wards of Horsley & Shipley Park and Heanor East should form a new Horsley division. Again, the district warding pattern in the Heanor area does not lend itself easily to the formation of county divisions; however, we consider that our proposals here reflect the statutory criteria, while achieving reasonable electoral equality (5 per cent in 2004) and facilitate coterminosity, not only in this area, but throughout the district. Duffield & Belper South division would comprise Belper South, Duffield and South West Parishes wards. To the north of this, we propose two non-coterminous divisions. Belper North & Alport division would comprise the wards of Belper Central and Belper North together with Ashleyhay, Idridgehay & Alton, Hazlewood and Shottle & Postern parishes from Alport ward. The remaining part of Alport ward (Alderwasley and Dethick Lea & Holloway parishes), together with Heage & Ambergate and Belper East wards, would form a Heage division. Our proposals are shown on the large map at the back of the report and detailed in Figures 1 and 2. Under our recommendations, three divisions, Denby, Ripley and Riddings & Aldercar would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average and all but two of our proposed 10 divisions would be coterminous.

67 While we acknowledge the slight reduction in electoral equality under our proposals when contrasted with the County Council's and Conservative Group's schemes, we consider that our proposal provides a better balance of the competing criteria, significantly improving coterminosity across the district. As noted earlier, in a review of county divisions it is often not possible to avoid creating divisions which combine rural and urban areas. This has been our experience in Amber Valley, and while we have noted the representations commenting on this issue, particularly in respect of the Alfreton/Alport areas, in these instances we judge that our proposals achieve a reasonable pattern of divisions which would achieve acceptable levels of electoral equality and coterminosity, while taking account of community identities within the area.

68 We are proposing to name the divisions within Amber Valley as detailed above, based upon the proposals we received, where applicable, and upon our own knowledge of the area. However, we would welcome comments on these division names during Stage Three.

## **Bolsover district**

69 Under the current arrangements, Bolsover district is represented by seven county councillors serving seven divisions: Bolsover, Clowne, Elmton, Scarcliffe, Shirebrook, South Normanton and Tibshelf. All divisions apart from Bolsover and Clowne are anticipated to vary by more than 20 per cent from the county average by 2004. Under a council size of 64, Bolsover district would be entitled to six county councillors, one less than at present, based on both current and forecast electorates.

70 The County Council proposed six new divisions for Bolsover, the correct allocation based on a 64-member council. Under its proposals, the wards of Barlborough, Clowne North and Clowne South would form a Barlborough & Clowne division (reflecting the area covered by the existing division). Elmton & Whitwell division would comprise Shirebrook Langwith, Elmton-with-Creswell and Whitwell wards, together with Scarcliffe North and Scarcliffe East parish wards of Scarcliffe parish. The remaining Scarcliffe West parish ward of Scarcliffe parish, together with Bolsover North West, Bolsover South and Bolsover West wards would form a new Bolsover & Scarcliffe division. To the south of Scarcliffe, the County Council proposed that Shirebrook North West, Shirebrook East, Shirebrook South East and Pleasley wards should form a new division, to be called Shirebrook & Pleasley. In the far south of the district, the County Council proposed a Tibshelf division comprising Blackwell, Tibshelf and part of South Normanton East wards. The remaining part of South Normanton East ward, together with Pinxton and South Normanton West wards would form a new South Normanton & Pinxton division. Under the County Council's proposals, two out of the six divisions would be coterminous. Three divisions would have electoral variances of over 10 per cent: Barlborough & Clowne, Bolsover & Scarcliffe and Elmton & Whitwell.

71 Bolsover Constituency & District Labour Party proposed no change to the existing seven electoral divisions in Bolsover. The Party proposed retaining the existing seven divisions in Bolsover on the grounds of community identity, stating that large parts of the district are rural/semi-rural in nature, that it has a disparate village settlement pattern and contains areas of high social deprivation. Additionally, Bolsover Branch Labour Party, in its submission, proposed retaining the existing Bolsover division unchanged. Whitwell Branch of the Labour Party proposed no change to the existing Elmton division for community identity reasons.

72 We have carefully considered all the representations we received for Bolsover. Our starting point was that Bolsover, based on current and forecast electorates, is entitled to six county councillors based on a council size of 64. We therefore could not take forward proposals based on seven members for the district; no change is not an option. We then considered the County Council's proposed warding pattern, which correctly allocated six councillors. However, having visited the district, we are not persuaded that its proposed divisions achieve the optimum balance between electoral equality and coterminosity and therefore we are proposing a number of modifications.

73 We propose endorsing the Council's proposal for an unchanged, but renamed, Barlborough & Clowne division (also supported by Bolsover Constituency & District Labour Party). We propose a new Elmton & Whitwell division comprising the wards of Bolsover North West, Elmton-with-Creswell and Whitwell, and to the south of that a Bolsover & Scarcliffe division comprising Bolsover South, Bolsover West and Scarcliffe wards. We consider that this pattern

of wards would form a division which would achieve the best balance between coterminosity and electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria. It would also help facilitate a coterminous pattern of divisions elsewhere in the district.

74 In the centre of the district, we propose modifying the County Council's Shirebrook & Pleasley division to include Shirebrook Langwith ward. While this would result in an initial electoral variance of 21 per cent, this is anticipated to improve to 13 per cent from the average by 2004. In considering the various criteria for this and surrounding divisions, it is our view that a moderate electoral imbalance in one division can be justified if it helps facilitate coterminosity between district wards and electoral divisions throughout the remainder of the district area. Additionally, we propose a further amendment to the County Council's proposed divisions of Tibshelf and South Normanton & Pinxton, including the whole of South Normanton East ward in Tibshelf division in order to facilitate coterminosity between the divisions and, we judge, better reflect community identities in the area.

75 Under our draft recommendations, all six divisions in Bolsover would be coterminous with existing district wards. Only two divisions, Shirebrook & Pleasley and South Normanton & Pinxton, would have electoral variances of over 10 per cent in 2004. We have adopted the division names proposed by the County Council, which we consider correctly reflect each division's composition, even when we have departed from the County Council's constituent wards. We would, however, particularly welcome comments on the proposed division names during Stage Three. The proposed divisions are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Chesterfield borough**

76 At present, the borough of Chesterfield is represented by nine county councillors, serving the nine divisions of Brimington, Chesterfield North, Hasland & St Leonard's, Holmebrook & Rother, Moor & St Helen's, Newbold & Brockwell, Sheepbridge, Staveley and Walton & West. There are significant electoral imbalances within the district area, with the number of electors in two of the nine divisions varying by at least 20 per cent from the average for the county by 2004. Under the proposed council size, the borough has the correct entitlement of nine county councillors.

77 We received three alternative district-wide schemes for Chesterfield. The County Council, Liberal Democrat and Conservative Groups each proposed nine divisions for Chesterfield, the correct allocation based on a 64-member council. There were, however, significant differences in electoral equality together with varying levels of coterminosity between the three schemes.

78 Specifically, the County Council's proposals were as follows: Brimington division would comprise Brimington North, Brimington South and part of St Leonard's wards. Chesterfield North division would comprise parts of Barrow Hill & New Whittington ward together with part of Hollingwood & Inkersall ward (Hollingwood and Inkersall Green parish wards of Staveley parish); Hasland & St Leonard's division would comprise Hasland ward and part of St Leonard's ward (broadly south of Hady Hill). Holmebrook & Rother division would comprise the two borough wards of the same name, with the adjacent Moor & St Helen's division comprising Moor ward, St Helen's ward and an area of Brockwell ward. Newbold & Brockwell division would comprise the remainder of Brockwell ward along with Linacre, Loundsley Green and part of West wards (broadly north of Ashgate Road).

79 The County Council's proposed Sheepbridge division in the west of the borough would comprise Dunston and Old Whittington wards, which the County Council noted would be "largely similar to the existing Sheepbridge division" and Staveley division to the east would comprise Lowgate & Woodthorpe ward, Middlecroft & Poolsbrook ward, part of Barrow Hill & New Whittington ward (around Barrow Hill) and part of Hollingwood & Inkersall ward (Duckmanton Parish ward of Staveley parish). Walton & West division would comprise Walton ward and part of West ward, broadly south of Ashgate Road which the County Council considered was a clear boundary. Under the County Council's proposal, two out of the nine divisions would be coterminous.

80 The Liberal Democrat Group's proposals were similar to the proposals from the County Council in a number of areas. Its proposed Brimington, Walton & West, Hasland & St Leonards, Holmebrook & Rother and Newbold & Brockwell divisions utilised a similar warding structure to the County Council's proposal, although with slightly different boundaries in the wards that would be divided between divisions. Only its proposed Moor & St Helen's and Sheepbridge divisions were the same as proposed by the County Council. Its proposed Chesterfield North and Staveley divisions differed from the County Council's proposed Chesterfield North and Staveley divisions in proposing that Barrow Hill parish ward of Staveley parish should form part of Chesterfield North division. Only one of the Liberal Democrat Groups proposed nine divisions would be coterminous.

81 The Conservative Group's proposals differed substantially from the County Council's and Liberal Democrat Group's. It proposed an Ashgate division comprising Loundsley Green and West wards, and a Birdholme division comprising Hasland and Rother wards. Brimington North and Brimington South wards, together with Hollingwood parish ward of Staveley parish within Hollingwood & Inkersall ward would form a Brimington division under the Conservative Group's proposals. Its proposed Hipper division would comprise Holmebrook and Walton wards and Newbold division would comprise Brockwell and Moor wards. St Mary's division and Spire division would comprise Dunston and Linacre wards and St Helen's and St Leonard's wards respectively. In the east of the district, Staveley North & Whittington divisions would comprise Barrow & New Whittington ward, Old Whittington ward, Lowgates parish ward from Lowgates & Woodthorpe ward and the adjacent division of Staveley South would comprise Inkersall Green ward and Duckmanton parish ward of Staveley parish in Hollingwood & Inkersall ward, Woodthorpe parish ward of Staveley parish in Lowgates & Woodthorpe ward and the whole of Middlecroft & Poolsbrook ward.

82 We also received a representation from Brimington Parish Council, who stated, "it is [our] preference that there should be one electoral division for the parish of Brimington".

83 We carefully considered the representations we received for Chesterfield. We were concerned that under two of the schemes we received, from the Liberal Democrats and the County Council, most divisions would not be coterminous with existing wards. We consider that this would not provide the best balance of the various criteria, although we noted the good electoral equality achieved under both of these proposals. We do, however, consider that the Conservative Group's scheme achieves a reasonable level of coterminosity and reflects community identity. However, we consider that coterminosity could be improved still further without significantly affecting electoral equality and therefore propose retaining Hollingwood parish ward of Staveley parish within the Conservative Group's proposed Staveley South division, thereby creating a

coterminous Brimington division (which would also retain the existing external division boundaries as at present and be coterminous with the parish boundaries). Elsewhere we are recommending adopting the Conservative Group's proposals for Chesterfield unchanged.

84 Under our draft recommendations for Chesterfield, three divisions, Brimington, St Mary's and Staveley South would have electoral inequalities of over 10 per cent in 2004 and seven out of the nine divisions would be coterminous. The proposed divisions are shown on the large map at the back of the report and Map A1 in Appendix A illustrates in detail our proposed boundary between Staveley North & Whittington and Staveley South divisions which would follow the existing parish ward boundary.

### **Derbyshire Dales borough**

85 Currently, there are six divisions in Derbyshire Dales: Ashbourne, Bakewell, Darley Dale, Matlock, Tideswell and Wirksworth. In one division, Ashbourne, the electoral variance is greater than 20 per cent both now and in 2004. Derbyshire Dales borough is entitled to six county councillors under our proposed council size of 64.

86 The County Council submitted two differing schemes for Derbyshire Dales, stating, "[Option] A is the County Council's preferred option. Option B is also presented as an alternative method of achieving suitable divisions". The Conservative Group's proposals for Derbyshire Dales were the same as the County Council's "Option B".

87 The County Council's Option A included a new Ashbourne division comprising the wards of Ashbourne South, Brailsford, Clifton & Bradley, Doveridge & Sudbury, Hlland and Norbury and a new Bakewell division comprising the wards of Bradwell, Hathersage & Eyam, Litton & Longstone, together with part of Bakewell ward. The remaining part of Bakewell ward would form part of Derwent Valley division, together with the wards of Calver, Chatsworth, Darley Dale and Stanton which the County Council considered comprised "a series of rural communities linked by main roads along the Derwent Valley". In the west of the district, a new Dovedale division would comprise the wards of Ashbourne North, Dovedale & Parwich, Hartington & Taddington, Lathkill & Bradford and Tideswell. The Council further proposed a Wirksworth division, comprising Carsington Water, Masson and Wirksworth wards. A final sixth division would be formed from the two Matlock wards: Matlock All Saints and Matlock St Giles.

88 The Option B proposals in the County Council's submission also proposed that the two Matlock wards should form a single division, although elsewhere they differed significantly. In the south, a Dove Valley division would comprise Parkside parish ward of Ashbourne parish in Ashbourne North ward together with the wards of Ashbourne South, Clifton & Bradley, Doveridge & Sudbury and Norbury. Henmore division would comprise part of Ashbourne North ward, excluding Parkside parish ward, together with the wards of Carsington Water, Dovedale & Parwich, Hlland and part of Wirksworth ward. Hope Valley division would comprise the wards of Bradwell, Calver, Hathersage & Eyam, Litton & Longstone and Tideswell. Wye division would comprise the wards of Bakewell, Chatsworth, Hartington & Taddington, Lathkill & Bradford and Stanton. Under the County Council's Option A, four out of the proposed six divisions would be coterminous with no division varying by more than 10 per cent in 2004. Under its Option B, only three divisions would be coterminous, with no divisions having an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

89 The Liberal Democrat Group similarly proposed that the two Matlock wards should form a single division. In the north of the district, the Liberal Democrat Group proposed a new division, Tideswell, comprising the wards of Hathersage & Eyam, Bradwell, Tideswell, Calver, Litton & Longstone and part of Hartington & Taddington. Bakewell division would comprise the whole wards of Chatsworth, Bakewell, Lathkill & Bradford and Stanton along with part of Hartington & Taddington ward (Hartington Middle Quarter and Hartington Town Quarter parishes) and part of Dovedale & Parwich ward (Hartington Nether Quarter, Eaton & Alsop and Parwich parishes). Darley Dale division would comprise the wards of Darley Dale, Winster & South Darley, Masson and part of Carsington Water (Ballidon, Aldwark, Ivonbrook Grange and Brassington parishes). Its proposed Wirksworth division would comprise the wards of Wirksworth, Hlland and Brailsford together with part of Dovedale & Parwich ward (Newton Grange, Tissington, Lea Hall, Thorpe, Fenny Bentley and Mapleton parishes), part of Carsington Water ward (Bradbourne, Kniveton, Atlow, Hognaston, Carsington, Hopton and Ible parishes) and part of Clifton & Bradley ward (Bradley, Yeldersley and Shirley parishes). Ashbourne division would comprise the wards of Ashbourne North, Ashbourne South, Norbury and Doveridge & Sudbury together with part of Clifton & Bradbury ward (Clifton & Compton, Osmaston, Edlaston & Wyaston and Snelston parishes). Under these proposals, only one division would be coterminous and no division would have an electoral variance of greater than 10 per cent in 2004.

90 The Liberal Democrat Group noted that “the major problem in the Derbyshire Dales area is to achieve reasonable equity between divisions without splitting significant centres of population”. We received a submission from Councillor Mrs J.N.Bevan, county councillor for Tideswell division, on behalf of the Derbyshire Dales Local Area Committee of Derbyshire County Council which made the same proposals for the district as the Conservative Group. This submission commented that the County Council’s Option A for Derbyshire Dales “is not accepted by the Local Area Committee councillors as it is unworkable and does not take into consideration the demographic differences within the Derbyshire Dales”. Councillor Bevan, in an earlier submission to us, had also noted the rural nature of the area and had suggested a modification to the external boundary of the district around the Hope Valley area. However, we are unable to amend the external boundaries of a district as part of a Periodic Electoral Review.

91 The West Derbyshire Conservative Association, whose separate submission made the same proposals as the Conservative Group considered that its proposals “minimise the confusion created by changes in electoral arrangements - all our proposals retain significant percentages of electors within the areas served by their existing divisions”. Wirksworth Town Council considered its existing county division was “too large for the area and should be reduced” and that “Wirksworth, Middleton and Bolehill are distinct communities which have very little in common with the communities on the eastern edge of the seat”. They also considered that Wirksworth parish should be joined in a single seat with the villages of Cromford and Bonsall to reflect local community ties. Derbyshire Dales District Council Labour Group, in its submission, reflected the views expressed by Wirksworth Town Council.

92 We have carefully considered all the representations we received. We noted that the Liberal Democrat Group’s and the County Council’s Option B/Conservative Group’s schemes both achieved a high degree of electoral equality, but we were concerned at the low levels of coterminosity which resulted. Under the County Council’s Option A proposals, however, we noted that greater levels of coterminosity had been achieved while maintaining a degree of electoral equality. Furthermore, while noting the Local Area Committee’s objection to Option A,

we consider that it provides a good balance of the various criteria and reasonably reflects community identity. We are therefore endorsing the County Council Option A for Derbyshire Dales unchanged as part of our draft recommendations. The draft recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Erewash borough**

93 Under the current arrangements, Erewash borough comprises nine county divisions: Cotmanhay, Draycott, Ilkeston, Kirk Hallam, Long Eaton, Petersham, Sandiacre, Sawley and West Hallam. One division, Draycott, has an electoral variance of over 20 per cent (29 per cent, and 24 per cent in 2004). The borough is entitled to nine county councillors, as at present, under the proposed council size. We received two proposals for the borough area, from the County Council and the Conservative Group.

94 The County Council proposed a new Breadsall & West Hallam division which would comprise Little Eaton & Breadsall ward, Stanley ward and the parish of West Hallam from West Hallam & Dale Abbey ward. Breaston division would comprise Breaston ward, the parish of Draycott & Church Wilne from Draycott & Stanton-by-Dale ward together with Borrowash West and Borrowash East parish wards of Ockbrook & Barrowash parish within Ockbrook & Borrowash ward. The County Council noted, “The A52 forms an obvious northern limit for this division”. Cotmanhay division would comprise Abbotsford ward, Cotmanhay ward and Ilkeston North ward, while the adjoining Ilkeston division would comprise Ilkeston Central ward, Little Hallam ward and Old Park (Ilkeston) ward which the County Council considered “forms a logical group of wards based on Central Ilkeston”. Kirk Hallam division would comprise Hallam Fields ward, Kirk Hallam ward and Dale Abbey parish within West Hallam & Dale Abbey ward. Long Eaton division would comprise Long Eaton Central and Nottingham Road (Long Eaton) wards while Petersham division would comprise Derby Road East and Derby Road West wards. The County Council described its proposed Sandiacre division as “a mix of rural areas and the urban area of Sandiacre” comprising Sandiacre North and Sandiacre South wards together with part of Draycott & Stanton by Dale ward (the parishes of Hopwell, Risley and Stanton by Dale) and part of Ockbrook & Borrowash ward (Ockbrook parish ward of Ockbrook parish). Sawley division would comprise Sawley and Wilsthorpe wards which would “largely [reflect] the existing Sawley division, with community identity”. Under the County Council’s proposals, two divisions, Cotmanhay and Kirk Hallam would have electoral variances greater than 10 per cent in 2004 and five out of its nine divisions would be coterminous.

95 The Conservative Group’s proposals for Erewash (also submitted by Erewash Conservative Association) included a Cotmanhay division similar to the County Council’s, although excluding parts of Cotmanhay ward. The Group also proposed an Ilkeston division comprising the remaining parts of Cotmanhay ward along with part of Little Hallam ward and the whole of Old Park and Ilkeston Central wards. Kirk Hallam division would comprise the wards of Kirk Hallam, Hallam Fields and part of Little Hallam. Sawley division would comprise the Sawley and Long Eaton Central wards, with the Group arguing that “Wilthorpe has gained its own identity ... and no longer regards itself as part of Sawley”. Its proposed Long Eaton division would comprise the whole of Nottingham Road and Derby Road East wards together with Breedon Street, College Street and William Street from Derby Road West ward. The remainder of Derby Road West ward, together with the whole of Wilthorpe ward, would comprise a new Petersham division. West Hallam division would comprise Little Eaton & Breadsall, Stanley and West Hallam & Dale

Abbey wards while a new Sandiacre division would be the same as that proposed by the County Council. Draycott division would comprise Breaston and Draycott wards together with the remainder of Ockbrook & Borrowash ward. Under the Conservative Group's proposals, only two out of the nine divisions would be coterminous but no division would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average by 2004.

96 We also received a representation from Breaston Parish Council which noted that it was unable to make comments before the end of Stage One, but intended to comment upon publication of our draft recommendations report.

97 We have considered the representations received. We do not consider that the Conservative Group's proposals, although achieving reasonable electoral equality, would best reflect the statutory criteria as they would create several new boundaries by splitting wards in a number of areas, thereby providing only two coterminous divisions overall. Under the County Council's proposals, five out of the nine divisions would be coterminous and two divisions, Cotmanhay and Kirk Hallam, would have electoral variances greater than 10 per cent in 2004. After careful consideration, we judge that the County Council's proposals for Erewash would achieve a reasonable balance between electoral equality and coterminosity while having regard to local community interests and identities in the borough. Furthermore, we found that no further improvements in electoral equality could be made to the County Council's proposals without significantly reducing coterminosity and we are therefore adopting them unaltered as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposals are shown on the large map at the back of the report and on Map A2 in Appendix A which illustrated the proposed boundary between Sandiacre and Breaston divisions.

### **High Peak borough**

98 High Peak borough currently returns eight county councillors from eight electoral divisions: Buxton North, Buxton South, Chapel, Glossop East, Glossop South, Glossop West, New Mills and Whaley Bridge. New Mills electoral division currently has the worst electoral inequality in the borough, with the county councillor representing 20 per cent fewer electors than the average for the county (19 per cent in 2004). Under the proposed council size of 64, High Peak continues to be entitled to eight councillors.

99 We received four schemes for High Peak, with two alternative options from the County Council, together with proposals from the Liberal Democrat Group and the Conservative Group (also separately submitted by High Peak Conservative Association). Each correctly allocated eight county councillors to the area. The County Council stated that it "expresses no preference for either" of its two options, noting that its Option A produced better coterminosity while its Option B "seeks to minimise the changes from the present arrangements".

100 Specifically, the County Council's Option A for High Peak proposed three divisions for the Glossopdale area of the borough: Hadfield division would comprise Hadfield North ward, Hadfield South ward, Padfield ward and Tintwistle ward; Glossop Central division would comprise Dinting, Howard Town and Old Glossop ward and Glossop South division would comprise Gamesley, Simmondley, St John's and Whitfield wards. To the south, it proposed a New Mills division comprising New Mills East, New Mills West and Sett wards together with the Furness Vale area of Whaley Bridge ward and a Whaley Bridge division comprising

Blackbrook ward, Hayfield ward and the remaining part of Whaley Bridge ward. The rural east of the borough would comprise Hope Valley, Chapel West, Chapel East and part of Limestone Peak ward (Dove Holes parish ward of Chapel-en-le-Frith parish) in a division to be called Chapel-en-le-Frith. The Council proposed two divisions for the Buxton area: Buxton North comprising the wards of Barms, Corbar, Stone Bench and Wormhill together with Green Fairfield parish of Limestone Peak ward, and Buxton South division comprising Central, Burbage, Cote Heath and Temple wards.

101 The County Council's Option B reiterated its Option A proposals for the divisions of Buxton North, Buxton South, Hadfield and Chapel-en-le-Frith. Its second option for the divisions of Glossop South and Glossop Central differed through the proposal to transfer Chisworth parish from Glossop South division into the adjoining New Mills division, placing Hayfield ward within Glossop South and also retaining an area of Whitfield ward within Glossop Central division. To the south, New Mills division, while gaining Chisworth parish, would no longer contain part of Whaley Bridge ward.

102 Under the County Council's Option A, four out of the eight divisions would be coterminous, while under its Option B, three out of eight divisions would be coterminous. One division, Glossop Central, would have an electoral variance greater than 10 per cent in 2004 under the County Council's Option A, whereas under Option B two divisions, New Mills and Whaley Bridge, would have electoral variances over 10 per cent.

103 The Conservative Group (with the same scheme also separately submitted by High Peak Conservative Association) proposed an alternative pattern of divisions in the Glossopdale area of the borough. It proposed a Glossopdale North & Rural division which would comprise Padfield, Dinting, Old Glossop and St John's wards, and an Etherow division comprising Gamesley, Hadfield North, Hadfield South and Tintwistle wards. Glossop South division would comprise Simmondley, Howard Town and Whitfield wards. Its New Mills division would comprise the wards of New Mills East, New Mills West, Sett and the Furness Vale area of Whaley Bridge with the adjoining Whaley Bridge, Hayfield & Blackbrook division comprising the remainder of Whaley Bridge ward together with Blackbrook and Hayfield wards. Chapel & Hope Valley division would comprise Chapel East, Chapel West and Hope Valley wards. The Buxton area would form two divisions: Buxton North & East division comprising Stone Bench, Barms, Cote Heath and Limestone Peak wards and Buxton West division comprising Corbar, Central, Temple and Burbage wards. The Conservative Group considered it was appropriate to combine the rural surrounds of Buxton with the town itself as "most of the rural population naturally look towards Buxton for employment, shopping services and leisure". Under the Conservative Group's proposals, one division, Chapel & Hope Valley, would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average (11 per cent initially and 13 per cent in 2004) and six out of the eight divisions would be coterminous.

104 The Liberal Democrat Group's scheme (also separately submitted by High Peak Borough Council Liberal Democrat Group) proposed a Hadfield division which would be the same as the County Council's proposed Hadfield division and a Glossop Central division which would be the same as the County Council's proposed Glossop Central division (Option B). Its proposed Glossop South division reflected the County Council's Glossop South division (under Option A) although it included that part of Hayfield parish within Sett borough ward and did not include that part of Hayfield parish within Hayfield borough ward. Its proposed New Mills division would

comprise the wards of New Mills West, New Mills East, Hayfield and that part of New Mills parish within Sett ward. Its Chapel ward, covering the far east of the borough, would be the same as the County Council's proposed Chapel-en-le-Frith division.

105 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed a further three divisions covering the far south of the borough: Whaley Bridge division would comprise the whole wards of Whaley Bridge and Blackbrook along with Hartington Upper Quarter parish of Burbage ward and the parish of King Sterndale from Cote Heath ward; Buxton East division would comprise Central, Barms, Stone Bench and Wormhill and Green Fairfield parishes of Limestone Peak ward; and Buxton West division would comprise the wards of Corbar and Temple along with that part of Buxton parish within Cote Heath ward and that part of Buxton parish within Burbage ward. Under the Liberal Democrats Group's proposals, one divisions would be coterminous but each would vary by less than 10 per cent from the county average under the present electorate and under the projected electorate in 2004.

106 Additionally, Hayfield Parish Council stated that it considered "this parish has nothing in common with Glossop South", an area with which it currently forms part of the existing electoral division, and proposed that it should be linked with the New Mills, Chinley and Chapel-en-le-Frith areas with which it considers that it shares greater community ties.

107 We have carefully considered the alternative options we received for High Peak. We were concerned that under the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals, only one divisions would be coterminous with district wards and, while we noted the high level of electoral equality achieved, we did not consider these proposals provided the optimum balance between the competing criteria and may, in particular, impact upon the convenience and effectiveness of local government in the district. We also looked at the two proposals from the County Council and the Conservative Group. In considering the differing pattern of divisions proposed under each of these proposals, we were satisfied that each had reasonable regard to the statutory criteria. In terms of electoral equality, however, we noted the slightly worse levels achieved under the County Council's Option B scheme when contrasted with the County Council's Option A and the Conservative Group's proposals. The Conservative Group's scheme provided notably better coterminosity (six divisions) than the County Council's Option A (four divisions). We judge that the proposals from the Conservative Group achieve the best balance between electoral equality and coterminosity among the proposals we received.

108 However, we did not consider that its proposals for the two divisions of New Mills and Whaley Bridge, Hayfield & Blackbrook would most closely reflect the existing district warding pattern and community identities within the area. In particular, we are not persuaded that there is not an alternative pattern of divisions which would avoid separating the Furness Vale area from the rest of Whaley Bridge parish and, having visited the area, we judge that Hayfield Parish is more closely linked in terms of community identity with the New Mills area than with those areas to its south. As noted previously, in a review of county divisions we would normally seek to avoid dividing (or further dividing) a parish solely contained within a district ward between divisions. In this instance, we consider that an alternative division comprising New Mills East, New Mills West, Sett and Hayfield wards (which we propose naming New Mills division) together with a Whaley Bridge & Blackbrook division comprising Blackbrook and Whaley Bridge wards, would achieve comparable electoral equality and provide coterminosity for the two divisions. Under our proposal, New Mills divisions would have an electoral variance of 5 per cent in 2004 and Whaley

Bridge & Blackbrook would have a variance of 11 per cent in 2004 and all our proposed divisions would be coterminous. Our recommendations for the High Peak area are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

### **North East Derbyshire district**

109 Presently, North East Derbyshire district has nine electoral divisions, to which the borough would be correctly entitled under the proposed council size. There are currently nine divisions: Brackenfield, Clay Cross, Dronfield North, Dronfield South, Eckington, Holymoore & Wingerworth, Killamarsh, North Wingfield and Sutton. One division, Clay Cross, would vary by more than 20 per cent in 2004.

110 We received four alternative proposals for North East Derbyshire, each correctly allocating nine county councillors for the district. The Liberal Democrat Group (also in a proposal separately submitted by the North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats) and the Conservative Group (also in a separately submitted proposal by the North East Derbyshire Conservatives) submitted the same proposals for the northern part of the district. Specifically, Killamarsh division would comprise the district wards of Killamarsh East, Killamarsh West and Renishaw. To the west, each proposed an Eckington division comprising Eckington North, Eckington South, Ridgeway & Marsh Lane and Unstone. Dronfield North division would comprise Coal Aston, Dronfield North and Dronfield Woodhouse while Dronfield South would be composed of the district wards of Dronfield South and Gosforth Valley. A Holymoorside & Wingerworth division would comprise Barlow & Holmesfield, Brampton & Walton and Wingerworth wards.

111 The County Council, however, made alternative proposals for three divisions in the north of the district under its proposals. Killamarsh division would comprise Killamarsh East and Killamarsh West wards only, with Eckington division being formed from Renishaw, Eckington North, Eckington South and Ridgeway & Marsh Lane wards. Dronfield North & Unstone division would comprise Dronfield Woodhouse, Dronfield North, Coal Aston and Unstone wards with the adjoining Dronfield South division being comprised of Dronfield South and Gosforth Valley wards together with part of Barlow & Holmesfield ward (Holmesfield parish). The remaining part of Barlow & Holmesfield ward (Barlow parish) would together with Brampton & Walton ward, Wingerworth ward and part of Clay Cross North ward (part of Wingerworth parish) comprise a proposed Holymoorside & Wingerworth division.

112 In the southern part of the district, the County Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed almost identical schemes. Both proposed a Clay Cross division comprising Ashover and Clay Cross South wards, although the County Council proposed that only part of Clay Cross North ward (Clay Cross parish) should be included while the Liberal Democrats placed the whole of Clay Cross North ward within this division. Elsewhere the composition of divisions was identical: Stonebroom & Pilsley division would comprise Shirland and Pilsley & Morton wards; North Wingfield division (named North Wingfield & Tupton division under the County Council's proposals) would comprise North Wingfield Central, Tupton and the part of North Wingfield parish in Holmewood & Heath ward; and, Sutton division comprising Grassmoor, Sutton and the remaining part of Holmewood & Heath wards. Sutton division would, under these proposals, retain its existing external boundaries unaltered.

113 The Conservative Group's proposals for the southern part of the district were for an Ashover division comprising the wards of Ashover, Clay Cross South and Shirland together with Stretton parish of Pilsley & Morton ward. To the east of this, a Clay Cross North division would comprise Morton and Pilsley parishes within Pilsley & Morton ward with Clay Cross South and Clay Cross North wards. In the east, Tupton and Grassmoor wards, together with Calow parish of Sutton ward would form a Tupton division. Scarsdale division would comprise Sutton cum Duckmanton parish of Sutton ward together with Holmewood & Heath and North Wingfield Central wards.

114 Under the County Council's proposals, four out of the nine proposed divisions would be coterminous and under the Conservative Group's proposals, five divisions would be coterminous. Three divisions under the County Council's proposals would vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004, Dronfield North & Unstone, North Wingfield & Tupton and Killamarsh. Under the Conservative Group's proposals, two divisions, Clay Cross North and Tupton, would vary by more than 10 per cent in 2004. Under the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals, seven out of the nine divisions would be coterminous with only one division, North Wingfield, varying by more than 10 per cent in 2004.

115 We also received a submission from the North East Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party. Its proposals were based on 2004 figures only, and two of its proposed divisions would vary from the county average by more than 10 per cent in 2004. Only four out of its proposed nine divisions would be coterminous.

116 In looking at the various proposals we noted several arguments in support of each. The County Council considered that its Killamarsh division did not share community links with the Renishaw ward and that the area is "geographically isolated". The Conservative Group considered that its proposals "ensure a high percentage of electors remain within their core electoral divisions as presently constituted". The Liberal Democrat Group noted that its proposals "seek to avoid any further splits of village and small town communities other than those which were necessary to achieve equity during the recent [Periodic Electoral Reviews]". The Constituency Labour Party stated "Our submission aims to relate county divisions to established communities, which are generally parish council areas".

117 Three parish councils in North East Derbyshire made submissions during Stage One. North Wingfield Parish Council broadly supported the County Council's proposals for the district. Shirland & Higham Parish Council argued in favour of it being joined with the parishes of Morton and Pilsley for community identity reasons. Tupton Parish Council suggested it should, together with North Wingfield parish, form a new county division.

118 We have carefully considered all the alternative submissions we received for North East Derbyshire. As noted previously, this review takes into account the revised district warding pattern for Derbyshire and therefore the retention of the existing county division structure is not likely to be possible. Neither would we accept a scheme based primarily on parish councils rather than new district wards, given the low consequential coterminosity which would be achieved. We aim to achieve the best possible balance between electoral equality and coterminosity, while having regard to the statutory criteria.

119 We were, therefore, not persuaded that the proposals from the North East Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party, the County Council or the Conservative Group achieved a sufficiently robust balance between electoral equality and coterminosity, particularly when contrasted to the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals. We were satisfied that the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals generally had regard to the statutory criteria and, in particular, we were not persuaded that its proposal (also proposed by the Conservatives) to join Renishaw ward with the two Killamarsh wards would adversely impact on community identity. We are therefore adopting the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals as part of our draft recommendations unaltered. Our draft recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

### **South Derbyshire district**

120 South Derbyshire district currently returns six county councillors from six electoral divisions: Etwall, Linton, Melbourne, Newhall, Repton and Swadlincote. Melbourne division has the worst forecast electoral variance in the district (and county) with a variance of 51 per cent in 2004. Under a council size of 64, South Derbyshire would correctly be entitled to seven county councillors, an increase of one, based upon both current and 2004 electorates.

121 The County Council and Conservative Group made alternative proposals for seven divisions, returning seven county councillors, in South Derbyshire. Under the County Council's proposals, Aston & Stenson division would comprise Aston and Stenson wards; the County Council stated that "the River Trent forms a logical southern boundary to the division". In the west of the district it proposed a Hatton & Hilton division comprising Hatton ward, Hilton ward, part of Etwall ward (Ash and Etwall parishes) and part of North West ward (the parishes of Barton Blout, Church Broughton, Foston & Scropton, Hoon, Sutton-on-the-Hill and North ward of Hatton parish). Its Melbourne & Hartshorne division would comprise Hartshorne & Ticknall ward, Melbourne ward and Woodville parish from Woodville ward. Newhall & Midway division would comprise part of Midway ward (broadly west of Midway Road/Sandcliffe Road) and part of Newhall & Stanton ward (broadly east of the dismantled railway line and Hall Fields Farm).

122 The County Council commented that "the split between Stanton village and the urban area was seen as logical, as the former forms part of the rural area to the south. Similarly, the eastern ward split along Sandcliffe Road is necessary to achieve electoral equality". Repton & Willington division would comprise the remaining part of Etwall ward (the parishes of Bearwardcote, Burnaston, Eggington and Radbourne), part of North West ward (the parishes of Dalbury Lees, Osleston & Thurstaston and Trusley), Repton ward and Willington ward. The County Council noted the strong community links between Willington and Repton. Its Seales & Linton division in the south of the district would comprise the whole of Linton and Seales wards together with part of Church Greasley ward (broadly around the Cappy Farm area) and part of Swadlincote ward. Finally, the County Council's proposed Swadlincote division would comprise the remaining parts of Church Greasley, Midway, Swadlincote and Woodville wards.

123 The Conservative Group's proposals for South Derbyshire differed from the County Council's throughout the district. Its Etwall division would comprise Hatton, Hilton and North West wards together with Etwall and Ashe parishes. Stenson and Willington & Findern wards, together with the parishes of Radbourne, Bearwardcote Burnaston within Etwall ward and Repton, Foremark and Ingleby parishes within Repton ward would comprise its Repton division while Aston and Melbourne wards, together with Stanton by Bridge parish of Repton ward would

form its Melbourne division. The two wards of Hartshorne and Woodville together with the parishes of Bretby and Newton Solney from Ripley ward and Egginton parish from Etwall ward would form a new Hartshorne division. Newhall division would comprise Midway ward and part of Newhall ward (less the current polling districts of DA and DD). Swadlincote division would comprise the whole of Church Greasley and Swadlincote wards and Linton division would comprise Linton and Seales wards together with polling districts DA and DD from Newhall ward.

124 Under the County Council's and the Conservative Group's proposals, only one division out of seven would be coterminous. Under the County Council's proposals, two divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent initially, Aston & Stenson and Hatton & Hilton, although no division would vary by more than 10 per cent in 2004. The Conservative Group's proposals would result in no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average initially or in five years time.

125 We also received a representation from Overseal Parish Council who considered that the new division "should be as similar to the existing Linton division as possible". It did not consider that a division which included Overseal parish together with the Woodville or Swadlincote areas would reflect local ties in the area.

126 We have considered all the representations we received and we concluded that neither the County Council's nor the Conservative Group's proposed divisions in South Derbyshire achieved a satisfactory balance between securing electoral equality and achieving a reasonable degree of coterminosity. We therefore devised our own proposals for the district which would, like the proposals received, provide a good level of electoral equality but would also improve coterminosity while having regard to the statutory criteria. Specifically, we are recommending an Aston & Melbourne division in the east of the district which would comprise Aston and Melbourne wards with a new Hatton & Hilton division in the far west of the district comprising the wards of Etwall, Hilton, Hatton and North West. A Repton & Willington division would comprise Repton, Stenson and Willington & Findern wards.

127 We note that Hatton & Hilton division would have an electoral variance of 21 per cent but we considered that these three coterminous divisions achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality when considering a district warding pattern in the area which does not lend itself easily to the creation of county divisions which meet all of the various criteria. Any further attempts to provide divisions with additional improvements to electoral equality would, we judge, mean that the geography of the north of the district would not be properly reflected and would result in an unacceptable reduction in coterminosity. We propose two other coterminous divisions: the first comprising Midway and Hartshorne & Ticknall wards which we propose calling Midway & Hartshorne division. Secondly, Swadlincote Central & Woodville division would comprise Swadlincote and Woodville wards. We propose two non-coterminous divisions in the southern part of the district: Linton & Church Greasley which would comprise the whole of Church Greasley ward together with part of Linton ward (Cauldwell, Castle Greasley and Linton parishes) and part of Seales ward (Overseal parish); and Newhall & Seales division comprising the remainder of Linton ward, the remainder of Seales ward and the whole of Newhall & Stanton ward. In these areas, the limitations in terms of the size and location of the district ward and parish building blocks prevented us from achieving coterminosity and electoral equality of an acceptable level.

128 Under our proposals, two divisions would vary by more than 10 per cent in 2004, Repton & Willington at 14 per cent and Hatton & Hilton at 21 per cent and five out of the seven divisions would be coterminous. While we acknowledge that electoral imbalances would remain, in this instance we judge that any further improvement in electoral equality would result in a significant reduction in coterminosity, which we consider would adversely impact of the convenience and effectiveness of local government in the district. The draft recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of the report.

## Conclusions

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

- (a) there should be no change in council size from 64;
- (b) the boundaries of all divisions, except three (Barlborough & Clowne, Brimington and Sutton) will be subject to change as the divisions are based on district wards which have themselves changed as a result of the recent district reviews.

130 Our draft recommendations are based on the County Council's, Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups' proposals, along with our own proposals in Amber Valley, Bolsover and South Derbyshire districts, which we judged would provide the best electoral scheme for the county as a whole, having regard to the statutory criteria. However, we proposed two modifications to the proposals which we received and have generally adopted, in order, in our view, to improve the schemes further, and these are set out below:

- (a) we propose that in Chesterfield district, the Conservative Group's proposals for Brimington and Staveley South divisions should be modified, placing Hollingwood parish ward of Staveley parish within Staveley South division. Elsewhere in the district, we are adopting the Conservative Group's proposals for Chesterfield unaltered.
- (b) we propose modifying the Conservative Group's proposals in High Peak district, transferring Hayfield ward into its proposed New Mills division and transferring the whole of Whaley Bridge ward into Whaley Bridge & Blackbrook division. Elsewhere in the district, we propose to adopt the Conservatives scheme unaltered.

131 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5:  
Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors/divisions	64	64	64	64
Average number of electors per councillor	8,996	8,996	9,231	9,231
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	36	19	35	15
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	10	1	14	1

132 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Derbyshire County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the county average from 36 to 19. By 2004 only 15 divisions are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average. Our draft recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated in Appendix A to this report.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Derbyshire County Council should comprise 64 councillors serving the same number of divisions, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated in Appendix A and the large map inserted at the back of the report.

133 Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government Act provides that if a parish is to be divided between different county divisions, it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division of the county. However, a number of parishes were warded as a consequence of the new district warding arrangements in Derbyshire and, in order to avoid proposals for unnecessary re-warding of parishes, we are not proposing any new parish wards as a consequence of this review.

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

## 5 NEXT STEPS

135 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 17 April 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the County Council by appointment, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

136 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

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



# APPENDIX A

## **Draft Recommendations for Derbyshire: Detailed Mapping**

**Map A1** illustrates the proposed boundary between Staveley North & Whittington and Staveley South divisions.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed boundary between Sandiacre and Breaston divisions.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates, in outline form, the Commission's proposed divisions for Derbyshire, including constituent district wards and parishes.

*Map A1:  
Proposed Boundary between Staveley North & Whittington and Staveley South divisions.*

*Map A2:  
Proposed Boundary between Sandiacre and Breaston divisions.*



## APPENDIX B

### Derbyshire County Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the County Council only in the following divisions, where the County Council's proposals were as follows. We only received proposals for the whole county from the County Council.

*Figure B1:  
Number of Councillors and Electors by Division*

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
<b>AMBER VALLEY</b>					
1 Alferton	1	9,484	5	9,562	4
2 Alport	1	10,246	14	10,401	13
3 Belper North	1	8,192	-9	8,410	-9
4 Belper South	1	9,298	3	9,521	3
5 Heage	1	8,421	-6	8,545	-7
6 Heanor	1	8,193	-9	8,729	-5
7 Horsley	1	8,925	-1	9,177	-1
8 Loscoe	1	9,881	10	9,983	8
9 Ripley	1	9,735	8	10,052	9
10 Somercotes	1	10,058	12	10,193	10
<b>BOLSOVER</b>					
11 Barlborough & Clowne	1	8,016	-11	8,841	-4
12 Bolsover & Scarcliffe	1	10,311	15	10,429	13
13 Elmtun & Whitwell	1	11,013	22	10,544	14
14 Shirebrook & Pleasley	1	9,299	3	9,044	-2
15 South Normanton & Pinxton	1	9,092	1	9,551	3
16 Tibshelf	1	8,385	-7	8,461	-8
<b>CHESTERFIELD</b>					
17 Brimington	1	9,071	1	9,104	-1
18 Chesterfield North	1	8,313	-8	8,639	-6

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
19 Hasland & St Leonard's	1	8,714	-3	9,277	0
20 Holmebrook & Rother	1	9,373	4	9,438	2
21 Moor & St Helen's	1	9,783	9	9,604	4
22 Newbold & Brockwell	1	9,185	2	9,833	7
23 Sheepbridge	1	8,510	-5	8,368	-9
24 Staveley	1	8,119	-10	8,300	-10
25 Walton & West	1	8,288	-8	8,505	-8
<b>HIGH PEAK - Option A</b>					
41 Buxton North	1	8,387	-7	8,720	-6
42 Buxton South	1	9,363	4	9,527	3
43 Chapel-en-le-Frith	1	8,754	-3	8,811	-5
44 Glossop Central	1	7,700	-14	8,205	-11
45 Glossop South	1	8,053	-10	8,438	-9
46 Hadfield	1	8,374	-7	8,692	-6
47 New Mills	1	8,799	-2	9,093	-1
48 Whaley Bridge	1	8,543	-5	8,843	-4
<b>NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE</b>					
49 Clay Cross	1	8,505	-5	8,607	-7
50 Dronfield North & Unstone	1	10,721	19	10,239	11
51 Dronfield South & Holmesfield	1	9,671	8	9,603	4
52 Eckington	1	8,783	-2	9,082	-2
53 Holymoorside & Wingerworth	1	8,742	-3	8,903	-4
54 Killamarsh	1	7,098	-21	7,641	-17
55 North Wingfield & Tupton	1	7,893	-12	8,152	-12
56 Stonebroom & Pilsley	1	8,358	-7	8,508	-8
57 Sutton	1	8,381	-7	8,350	-10
<b>SOUTH DERBYSHIRE</b>					
58 Aston & Stenson	1	7,919	-12	8,999	-3

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
59 Hatton & Hilton	1	7,785	-13	9,448	2
60 Melbourne & Hartsmore	1	9,693	8	10,141	10
61 Newhall & Midway	1	9,604	7	9,947	8
62 Repton & Willington	1	8,192	-9	8,864	-4
63 Seales & Linton	1	8,942	-1	9,186	0
64 Swadlincote	1	9,376	4	10,035	9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>575,718</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>590,768</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,996</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,231</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Derbyshire County Council's submission.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, hence the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Figure B2:  
Derbyshire County Council's Proposals: Constituent District Wards

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
<b>AMBER VALLEY</b>	
1 Alfreton	Alfreton ward (part - Alfreton West parish ward of Alfreton parish); Swanwick ward, Wingfield ward (part - Pentrich parish and South Wingfield parish)
2 Alport	Alport ward; Crich ward; Duffield ward; South West Parishes ward; Wingfield ward (part - Fritchley parish ward of Crich parish)
3 Belper North	Belper East ward; Belper North ward
4 Belper South	Belper Central ward; Belper South ward; Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook ward (part - Holbrook parish)
5 Heage	Heage & Ambergate ward; Ripley & Marehay ward
6 Heanor	Heanor East ward; Heanor West ward
7 Horsley	Horsley & Shipley Park ward; Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook ward (part Denby parish and Kilburn parish)
8 Loscoe	Aldercar ward, Codnor & Waingroves ward (part - Crosshill & East parish ward of Codnor parish), Loscoe ward, Riddings ward (part - Ironville parish).
9 Ripley	Codnor & Waingroves ward (part - Codnor and Waingroves parish wards of Codnor parish), Ripley ward.
10 Somercotes	Alfreton ward (part - Alfreton East parish ward), Riddings ward (part), Somercotes ward.
<b>BOLSOVER</b>	
11 Barlborough & Clowne	Barlborough ward; Clowne North ward; Clowne South ward.
12 Bolsover & Scarcliffe	Bolsover North West ward; Bolsover South ward; Bolsover West ward; Scarcliffe ward (part - Scarcliffe South parish ward).
13 Elmtton & Whitwell	Elmtton-with-Creswell ward; Scarcliffe ward (part - Scarcliffe North & Scarcliffe East parish wards), Shirebrook Langwith ward; Whitwell ward.
14 Shirebrook & Pleasley	Pleasley ward; Shirebrook East ward; Shirebrook North West ward; Shirebrook South East ward; Shirebrook South West ward.
15 South Normanton & Pinxton	Pinxton ward; South Normanton East ward (part); South Normanton West ward.
16 Tibshelf	Blackwell ward; South Normanton East ward (part); Tibshelf ward.

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
<b>CHESTERFIELD</b>	
17 Brimington	Brimington North ward; Brimington South ward; St Leonard's ward (part)
18 Chesterfield North	Barrow Hill & New Whittington ward (part); Hollingwood & Inkersall ward (part - Hollingwood & Inkersall Green parish wards).
19 Hasland & St Leonard's	Hasland ward; St Leonard's ward (part).
20 Holmebrook & Rother	Holmebrook ward; Rother ward.
21 Moor & St Helen's	Brockwell ward (part), Moor ward; St Helen's ward.
22 Newbold & Brockwell	Brockwell ward (part); Linacre ward; Loundsley Green ward, West ward (part).
23 Sheepbridge	Dunston ward; Old Whittington ward.
24 Staveley	Hollingwood & Inkersall ward (part - Duckmanton parish ward); Lowgates & Woodthorpe ward; Middlecroft & Poolsbrook ward; Barrow Hill & New Whittington ward (part).
25 Walton & West	Walton ward; West ward (part).
<b>HIGH PEAK - Option A</b>	
41 Buxton North	Barms ward; Corbar ward; Limestone Peak ward (part - Wormhill & Green Fairfield parishes); Stone Bench ward.
42 Buxton South	Central ward; Burbage ward; Cote Heath ward; Temple ward.
43 Chapel-en-le-Frith	Chapel East ward; Chapel West ward; Hope Valley ward; Limestone Peak ward (part).
44 Glossop Central	Dinting ward; Howard Town ward; Old Glossop ward.
45 Glossop South	Gamesley ward; Simmondley ward; St John's ward; Whitfield ward.
46 Hadfield	Hadfield North ward; Hadfield South ward; Padfield ward; Tintwistle ward.
47 New Mills	New Mills East ward; New Mills West ward; Sett ward; Whaley Bridge ward (part - Furness Vale parish ward of Whaley Bridge ward).
48 Whaley Bridge	Blackbrook ward; Hayfield ward; Whaley Bridge ward (part).
<b>NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE</b>	
49 Clay Cross	Ashover ward; Clay Cross North ward (part); Clay Cross South ward.
50 Dronfield North & Unstone	Coal Aston ward; Dronfield North ward; Dronfield Woodhouse ward; Unstone ward.
51 Dronfield South & Holmesfield	Barlow & Holmesfield ward (part - Holmesfield parish); Dronfield South ward; Gosforth Valley ward.
52 Eckington	Eckington North ward; Eckington South ward; Renishaw ward; Ridgeway & Marsh Lane ward.

<b>Division name (by district council area)</b>	<b>Constituent district wards</b>
53 Holymoorside & Wingerworth	Barlow & Holmesfield ward (part - Barlow parish); Brampton & Walton ward; Clay Cross North ward (part); Wingerworth ward.
54 Killamarsh	Killamarsh East ward; Killamarsh West ward.
55 North Wingfield & Tupton	Holmewood & Heath ward (part); North Wingfield Central ward; Tupton ward.
56 Stonebroom & Pilsley	Pilsley & Morton ward; Shirland ward.
57 Sutton	Grassmoor ward; Holmewood & Heath ward (part - the parish of Holmewood & Heath); Sutton ward.
<b>SOUTH DERBYSHIRE</b>	
58 Aston & Stenson	Aston ward; Stenson ward.
59 Hatton & Hilton	Etwall parish (part - the parishes of Ash and Etwall); Hatton ward; Hilton ward; North West ward (part - Barton Blunt, Church Broughton, Foston & Scropton, Hoon and Sutton on the Hill parishes and part of Hatton parish).
60 Melbourne & Hartsmore	Hartshorne & Ticknall ward; Melbourne ward; Woodville ward (part - Woodville parish).
61 Newhall & Midway	Midway ward (part); Newhall & Stanton ward (part).
62 Repton & Willington	Etwall ward (part - Bearwardcote, Burnaston, Eggington and Radbourne parishes); North West ward (part - Dalbury, Lees, Osleston & Thurvaston and Trusley parishes), Repton ward; Willington ward.
63 Seales & Linton	Church Greasley ward (part); Linton ward; Seales ward; Swadlincote ward (part).
64 Swadlincote	Church Greasley ward (part); Midway ward (part); Swadlincote ward (part); Woodville ward (part).

*Note: The constituent areas reflect the new district wards resulting from electoral reviews of the eight Derbyshire districts which were completed in 1998. Where whole district wards do not form the building blocks, constituent parishes are listed.*

# APPENDIX C

## The Statutory Provisions

### Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

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

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

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

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

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

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;

---

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

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to counties:

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

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

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

- (e) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable;
- (f) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary; and
- (g) the boundaries of the wards of the districts in the county.

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

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

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

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

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