

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Derbyshire County Council

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

August 2000

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)
Peter Brokenshire
Kru Desai
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

© 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.

Report no:182

CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>1</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>9</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>13</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>17</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>19</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>23</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>53</i>
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Derbyshire: Detailed Mapping	<i>55</i>
B Draft Recommendations for Derbyshire (February 2000)	<i>59</i>



Local Government Commission for England

22 August 2000

Dear Secretary of State

On 24 August 1999 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Derbyshire County Council under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in February 2000 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation. We additionally undertook a limited further consultation for the Amber Valley area after the end of Stage Four.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have substantially confirmed our draft recommendations, although some modifications have been made (see paragraph 162) in the light of further evidence. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to the electoral arrangements of Derbyshire County Council.

We recommend that Derbyshire County Council should be served by 64 councillors representing 64 divisions, and that changes should be made to division boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

The Local Government Bill, containing legislative proposals for a number of changes to local authority electoral arrangements is currently being considered by Parliament. However, until such time as that new legislation is in place we are obliged to conduct our work in accordance with current legislation, and to continue our current approach to periodic electoral reviews.

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

Yours sincerely

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

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT

Chairman

1 SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council on 24 August 1999. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 22 February 2000, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in 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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 162–163) are that:

- **Derbyshire County Council should have 64 councillors, 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 except three divisions (Barlborough & Clowne, Brimington and Sutton) will be subject to change.**

These 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 two 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 only one expected to vary by more than 20 per cent.**

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 3 October 2000:

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

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
AMBER VALLEY	
1 Alfreton	Alfreton ward; Swanwick ward
2 Alport & Derwent	Alport ward; Belper North ward; Crich ward; South West Parishes ward
3 Belper Town	Belper Central ward; Belper East ward
4 Duffield & Belper South	Belper South ward; Duffield ward; South West Parishes ward
5 Heage	Heage & Ambergate ward; Ripley & Marehay ward
6 Heanor Central	Heanor & Loscoe ward; Heanor East ward
7 Horsley	Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook ward; Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse ward (part – the parishes of Horsley, Horsley Woodhouse and Smalley)
8 Greater Heanor	Heanor East ward; Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse ward (part – the parishes of Shipley and Mapperley); Langley Mill & Aldercar ward
9 Ripley	Codnor & Waingroves ward; Ripley ward
10 Somercotes	Ironville & Riddings ward; Somercotes ward
BOLSOVER	
11 Barlborough & Clowne	Barlborough ward; Clowne North ward; Clowne South ward
12 Bolsover & Scarcliffe	Bolsover South ward; Bolsover West ward; Scarcliffe ward
13 Elmton & Whitwell	Bolsover North-West ward; Elmton-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
CHESTERFIELD	
17 Ashgate	Loundsley Green ward; West ward
18 Birdholme	Hasland ward; Rother ward
19 Brimington	Brimington North ward; Brimington South ward; Hollingwood & Inkersall ward
20 Hipper	Holmebrook ward; Walton ward
21 Newbold	Brockwell ward; Moor ward
22 St Mary's	Dunston ward; Linacre ward
23 Spire	St Helens ward; St Leonards ward

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
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
DERBYSHIRE DALES	
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
EREWASH	
32 Breadsall & West Hallam	Little Eaton & Breadsall ward; Stanley ward; West Hallam & Dale Abbey ward (part –West Hallam parish)
33 Breaston	Breaston ward; Draycott ward (part –Draycott & Church Wilne parish); Ockbrook & Borrowwash ward (part – Borrowwash East and Borrowwash West parish wards of Ockbrook & Barrowash 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 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
HIGH PEAK	
41 Buxton North & East	Barms ward; Cote Heath ward; Limestone Peak ward (part –Wormhill and Green Fairfield parishes); 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; Limestone Peak ward (part – Dove Holes parish ward of Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish)

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
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
NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE	
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; Unstone ward
51 Dronfield South	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
53 Holymoorside & Wingerworth	Barlow & Holmesfield ward; Brampton & Walton ward; Wingerworth ward
54 Killamarsh	Killamarsh East ward; Killamarsh West ward
55 North Wingfield & Tupton	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
SOUTH DERBYSHIRE	
58 Aston & Melbourne	Aston ward; Melbourne ward
59 Hatton & Hilton	Etwall ward; Hilton ward; Hatton ward; North West ward
60 Linton & Church Gresley	Church Gresley ward; Linton ward (part – Cauldwell, Castle Gresley and Linton parishes); Seales ward (part – Overseal parish)
61 Midway & Hartshorne	Midway ward; Hartshorne & Ticknall ward
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

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Derbyshire

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
AMBER VALLEY					
1 Alfreton	1	10,557	17	10,675	16
2 Alport & Derwent	1	9,765	9	9,892	7
3 Belper Town	1	8,223	-9	8,545	-7
4 Duffield & Belper South	1	9,824	9	9,971	8
5 Heage	1	8,421	-6	8,545	-7
6 Heanor Central	1	8,464	-6	8,613	-7
7 Horsley	1	9,270	3	9,522	3
8 Greater Heanor	1	8,574	-5	8,985	-3
9 Ripley	1	10,490	17	10,807	17
10 Somercotes	1	8,845	-2	9,018	3
BOLSOVER					
11 Barlborough & Clowne	1	8,016	-11	8,841	-4
12 Bolsover & Scarcliffe	1	9,332	4	9,460	2
13 Elmtton & 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
CHESTERFIELD					
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
25 Staveley South	1	10,128	13	10,280	11

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
DERBYSHIRE DALES					
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
EREWASH					
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
HIGH PEAK					
41 Buxton North & East	1	8,614	-4	8,728	-5
42 Buxton West	1	9,136	2	9,510	3
43 Chapel & Hope Valley	1	8,754	-3	8,820	-4
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
NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE					
49 Clay Cross	1	8,702	-3	8,807	-5
50 Dronfield North	1	10,721	19	10,239	11
51 Dronfield South	1	8,799	-2	8,769	-5

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
52 Eckington	1	8,783	-2	9,082	-2
53 Holymoorside & Wingerworth	1	9,417	5	9,537	3
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
SOUTH DERBYSHIRE					
58 Aston & Melbourne	1	8,438	-6	9,401	2
59 Hatton & Hilton	1	9,210	2	11,184	21
60 Linton & Church Gresley	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
Totals	64	575,718	-	590,768	-
Averages	-	8,996	-	9,231	-

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council. 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 were reviewed in 1998/99, in October 1999.

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, ie the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999) 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 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 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the county as a whole. Our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable, having regard to our statutory criteria. We will 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 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 we are unlikely to achieve optimum electoral equality and complete coterminosity throughout a county area. Our objective will be to achieve the best balance between the two, taking into account our 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 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that 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 A further area of difference between county and district reviews is that we recognise it will not always 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 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 were 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 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 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 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, the Derbyshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Derbyshire Association of Local Councils, parish and town councils in the county, Members of Parliament and the Member 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. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

20 Stage Three began on 22 February 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council*, and ended on 17 April 2000. In the light of comments we received in Amber Valley during Stage Three, we undertook a limited additional consultation between 30 May and 27 June 2000. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we

reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and the additional period of consultation and now publish our final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

21 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 730,200, 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.

22 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'.

23 The electorate of the county is 575,762 (February 1999). The Council presently has 64 members, with one member elected from each division (Figure 3).

24 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.

25 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.

26 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 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Variance from average %
AMBER VALLEY					
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
BOLSOVER					
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
CHESTERFIELD					
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
DERBYSHIRE DALES					
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
EREWASH					
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
HIGH PEAK					
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
NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE					
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
SOUTH DERBYSHIRE					
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
Totals	64	575,762	-	590,770	-
Averages	-	8,996	-	9,231	-

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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

27 During Stage One we received 36 representations, including county-wide proposals from the County Council. In light of these representations and the evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council*.

28 Our draft recommendations were based on elements from the County Council's proposals, the Liberal Democrat Group and the Conservative Group proposals, along with recommendations we formulated ourselves, which we considered achieved the best possible balance between electoral equality, the statutory criteria and coterminosity. We proposed that:

- (a) Derbyshire County Council should be served by 64 councillors;
- (b) there should be 64 electoral divisions, involving changes to the boundaries of all but three of the existing divisions.

Draft Recommendation

Derbyshire County Council should comprise 64 councillors serving the same number of divisions.

29 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 45 of the 64 electoral divisions varying by no more than 10 per cent from the county average, with only one ward varying by more than 20 per cent. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with 49 of the divisions expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent, and one to vary by more than 20 per cent from the county average in 2004.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

30 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, we received 172 representations, including proposals from the County Council, four Members of Parliament, seven district and borough councils, 19 local political and civic groups and 46 parish or town councils. We also received representations from 15 county and borough councillors, 77 local residents and three petitions. Additionally, in response to our further limited consultation in the Amber Valley district area we received 35 responses, which are detailed at the end of this section. All representations 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

31 The County Council made revised proposals for the districts of Amber Valley, Bolsover, Chesterfield, High Peak, North East Derbyshire and South Derbyshire. The Council stated “these revised proposals have strong local support in most districts”.

Derbyshire County Council Liberal Democrat Group

32 The Liberal Democrat Group at Derbyshire County Council supported the draft recommendations for High Peak and North East Derbyshire. The Group also stated that for Chesterfield District “we have no difficulty accepting the Commission’s draft recommendations” although it considered the County Council’s Stage Three proposals better reflected community identities and therefore supported the County Council’s proposals. In Derbyshire Dales, the Liberal Democrat Group opposed the draft recommendations and proposed a new scheme.

Members of Parliament

33 We received representations from four Members of Parliament at Stage Three. Harry Barnes, Member of Parliament for Derbyshire North East, supported the County Council’s alternative warding pattern for the four divisions of Eckington, Killamarsh, Dronfield North and Dronfield South in North East Derbyshire district. Mark Todd, Member of Parliament for South Derbyshire, supported the County Council’s Stage One proposals for South Derbyshire which he considered better reflected local community links. Patrick McLoughin, Member of Parliament for Derbyshire West, supported the alternative proposals for Derbyshire Dales submitted at Stage Three by West Derbyshire Conservative Association. Judy Mallaber, Member of Parliament for Amber Valley, supported Derbyshire County Council’s Stage Three submission in relation to Amber Valley.

District and Borough Councils

34 Amber Valley Borough Council opposed the draft recommendation for the borough and “urges the Commission to adopt a more local approach which builds upon the strength of local communities and their identities”. We received representations from Bolsover District Council which stated that the “status quo should prevail”. Chesterfield Borough Council submitted an alternative pattern of divisions for the borough. Derbyshire Dales District Council opposed the draft recommendations in the district and supported the County Council’ Stage One Option B

scheme. Erewash Borough Council supported the draft recommendations for the borough which they considered were “sound and robust”. North East Derbyshire District Council supported the draft recommendations for the five ‘southern’ divisions although for the four northern divisions it supported the “status quo”. South Derbyshire District Council supported the County Council’s original proposals for South Derbyshire which they considered better reflected local community links than the draft recommendations.

Parish and Town Councils

35 We received representations from 46 parish and town councils during Stage Three. Of these, seven supported all or parts of the draft recommendations – Denby, Glapwell, Great Hucklow, Little Hucklow & Grindlow, Dale Abbey, Hayfield, Whaley Bridge and North Wingfield. The remaining parish and town councils opposed aspects of the draft recommendations. In Amber Valley we received such representations from the parish and town councils of Alderwasley, Belper, Dethick, Lea & Holloway, Dronfield, Heanor & Loscoe, Horsley, Horsley Woodhouse, Kilburn, Shipley and South Wingfield. In Bolsover, Scarcliffe and Whitwell Parish Councils opposed the draft recommendations whereas in Chesterfield, Ault Hucknall and Tupton Parish Councils opposed the draft recommendations in their areas. In Derbyshire Dales, the following parish and town councils opposed our draft recommendations: Bakewell, Bradwell, Brailsford & Ednaston, Calver, Critchlow, Elton, Great Longstone, Hathersage, Hassop, Kniveton, Longford, Matlock, Outseats and Tideswell. In Erewash, Breaston, Dale Abbey, Draycott and Ockbrook & Borrowash parish councils all opposed elements of the draft recommendations in the borough. In High Peak, Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council supported proposals by the County Council that the Dove Holes area from part of Chapel & Hope Valley division.

36 The parish and town councils of Killamarsh, North Wingfield, Ripley and Unstone each opposed part of the draft recommendations in North East Derbyshire. In South Derbyshire, Netherseale, Overseal, and South Darley parish councils opposed parts of the draft recommendations.

Other Representations

37 We received a further 111 representations. We received 15 representations from local political groups in the county. Of these, four groups supported elements from the draft recommendations: High Peak Borough Council Liberal Democrats, High Peak Conservative Association, North East Derbyshire Conservative Association and North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats. Three groups in Amber Valley, Amber Valley Constituency Labour Party, Amber Valley Conservative Association and Belper Town Council Labour Group opposed elements of the draft recommendations for the borough, while in Bolsover, Bolsover Constituency Labour Party supported no change to the existing arrangements. Chesterfield Liberal Democrats supported the Stage Three scheme for the borough proposed by the County Council. In Derbyshire Dales, the West Derbyshire Conservative Association supported the County Council’s Stage One (Option B) proposal as a first preference and, as a second preference, submitted a new scheme for the borough. The West Derbyshire Liberal Democrats submitted a scheme for Derbyshire Dales which was broadly similar to the County Council Liberal Democrats’ Stage Three proposals. Erewash Conservative Association proposed a modification in the south-east of the borough. In North-East Derbyshire, Dronfield & District Labour Party, Eckington Branch Labour Party and the North-East Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party each opposed the draft recommendations for the north of the district, while North-East Derbyshire

Conservative Association and North-East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations.

38 We also received representations from Dronfield Joint Burial Committee, Dronfield Civic Society, St Mary's Church Tuesday Group and Unstone & District Women's Institute, opposing the draft recommendations north of North East Derbyshire. We received representations from 15 county and borough councillors. Councillor Lancashire, member for Horsley division, considered that Horsley division in Amber Valley should remain unchanged and Councillor Wildsmith, member for Duffield division, made alternative proposals for Belper town. Councillor Carlile, member for Heage, opposed the draft recommendations for Amber Valley. In Derbyshire Dales, Councillor Bevan did not support the draft recommendations and Councillor Critchlow, was concerned that the proposed Dovedale division was too large. Councillor Twigg, member for Bakewell division, supported the County Council's alternative Stage One Option B proposals for Derbyshire Dales. In Erewash borough, Councillor Camm, member for Sawley division, proposed no change for this division.

39 In High Peak, Councillor Western, member for Chapel division, proposed that the Dove Holes area should form part of Chapel & Hope Valley division. Councillor Gillot, member for North Wingfield division in Chesterfield Borough, proposed renaming North Wingfield division as North Wingfield & Tupton and Councillor Goodhand, member for Dronfield North division in North East Derbyshire, objected to the draft proposals for Dronfield. Borough Councillor Ridgeway, member for Renishaw ward, opposed changes in the Renishaw and Spinkhill area of North East Derbyshire. Councillor Charles, member for Killamarsh division and Councillor Hopkinson opposed the draft recommendations in the northern part of North East Derbyshire. Councillor Pickford, member for Holymoorside & Wingerworth, supported the draft recommendations for North East Derbyshire. Councillor Lemmon, member for Etwall ward in South Derbyshire asked the Commission to set a maximum councillor:elector ratio for the proposed Hatton & Hilton ward.

40 We received representations from 77 local residents, the majority opposing elements of the draft recommendations. The greatest number of representations from local residents, 44, concerned North East-Derbyshire; there were also 12 representations specifically for Amber Valley, one for Chesterfield, 14 for Derbyshire Dales, one for Erewash, one for High Peak and two for South Derbyshire. We also received three petitions for North East Derbyshire district: one signed by 60 residents objecting to linking Renishaw with Killamarsh; one signed by 364 residents opposing the proposals to join Unstone with Eckington; and one signed by 570 residents opposing linking Renishaw with Killamarsh.

Additional Consultation in the Amber Valley Area

41 At Stage Three, the County Council's response to our draft recommendations provided an alternative proposal which for Amber Valley achieved a good level of electoral equality and coterminosity while reflecting the statutory criteria. We therefore undertook an additional limited consultation where we wrote to those from the district who responded to our draft recommendations, together with the constituent parishes, the Borough Council and the County Council, asking for a preference between our draft recommendations and the County Council's Stage Three (Option B) alternative. In response, we received 36 representations. Of these, 6 supported our draft recommendations while 27 supported the County Council's alternative. Three did not express a firm view.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

42 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 identities and interests 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”.

43 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.

44 We 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. In addition, our approach is 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.

45 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.

46 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.

47 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. Our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable, having regard to the statutory criteria. We 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 require strong justification.

Electorate Forecasts

48 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 expected the growth to be fairly evenly spread across all the districts, although the rate of increase of the electorate in South Derbyshire is forecast to be notably more than in

the other areas. The County Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the County Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to division boundaries has been obtained. In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to forecast electorates, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could be made at the time.

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

Council Size

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

51 Derbyshire County Council presently has 64 members. At Stage One, the County Council proposed a council size of 64 members, which was supported in the other submissions we received for individual districts.

52 In our draft recommendations report we considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received. We concluded that the achievement of electoral equality, the statutory criteria and coterminosity would best be met by a council size of 64 members.

53 The County Council, Tintwhistle Parish Council and Bolsover Constituency Labour Party supported the proposed council size of 64 in their Stage Three responses. We received no further comments on council size during Stage Three. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for a council size of 64 as final.

Electoral Arrangements

54 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the county-wide scheme from the County Council. From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our draft recommendations.

55 Under the majority of proposals we received at Stage One, substantial improvements in electoral equality would be secured across the county. However, we noted 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. In formulating our draft recommendations, we sought 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, we adopted elements from the County Council's proposals and also elements from the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups' schemes, as well as putting forward our own proposals, in order to achieve what we judge to be, the optimum balance between electoral equality, coterminosity and the statutory criteria.

56 It is relevant to reflect on the nature and status of draft recommendations. The Commission develops draft recommendations which, given the evidence available at the time, we would be content to present to the Secretary of State. We then undertake consultation on these draft recommendations in order to gauge local opinion on the recommendations and to seek further evidence to support or oppose them. We consider that the purpose of Stage Three is primarily to consult on our draft recommendations, and to make any amendments, in the light of the further evidence received, which we consider would result in a demonstrable improvement to the current arrangements and to our draft recommendations. We noted that, while some of the proposed divisions suggested by the County Council and others at Stage Three utilised the same boundaries as in the draft recommendations, other divisions were entirely new configurations. Furthermore, we noted that, unlike our draft recommendations, the County Council's and other Stage Three schemes had not been formally consulted upon locally.

57 We are grateful to all respondents for their constructive assessment of our draft recommendations, but we have concluded that we have not been presented with evidence to suggest that our draft recommendations are fundamentally flawed on the basis of the statutory criteria. However, we have been responsive to the views expressed to us at Stage Three and we have made a number of modifications to our draft recommendations in order to improve electoral equality or better address the statutory criteria.

58 For the purposes of county electoral divisions, the eight district areas in Derbyshire 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.

59 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Maps A1 and A2 in Appendix A and on the large map at the back of this report.

Amber Valley district

60 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.

61 At Stage One, we received three schemes for Amber Valley: 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.

62 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 Ironville & 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 wards. The County Council considered that its Ripley division would combine “two urban Amber Valley wards ... to maintain most of the original voting area”. Loscoe division would comprise the wards of Langley Mill & Aldercar, Heanor & Loscoe, part of Codnor & Waingroves ward and part of Riddings ward, 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). In support of its proposals, the County Council considered “the population of Holbrook does also look towards Belper for services”.

63 In the far south-east, Horsley division would comprise Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse ward 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’s proposals only three out of the 10 divisions would be coterminous.

64 The Conservative Group’s Stage One proposals (also submitted by the Amber Valley Conservative Association) differed from the County Council’s proposals in all divisions: Aldercar division would comprise Langley Mill & Aldercar ward, Heanor & Loscoe ward and part of Ironville & Riddings ward (Ironville parish); Belper division would comprise Belper Central and Belper East wards; Butterley division would comprise Swanwick ward, and part of Alfreton and Ripley wards; Cotes Park division would comprise Somercotes ward, part of Alfreton and Ironville & 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 & Loscoe division would comprise the wards of Heanor East, Heanor West and part of Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse ward; Horsley division would comprise Denby, Kilburn & Holbrook ward and part of Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse 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 of the Conservative Group’s proposed 10 divisions, Belper and Ecclestone, would be coterminous with district wards.

65 One local resident proposed an alternative pattern of divisions in the area at Stage One, 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.

66 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. 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. County Councillor Thorpe, Somercotes Parish Council and Ripley Town Council each supported little or no change to divisions in the borough. Two local residents of Amber Valley made submissions opposing the inclusion of the rural area of Pentrich parish with the more urban Alfreton area.

67 We carefully considered all the representations we received at Stage One. We were not convinced, however, 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 therefore developed its own proposals for Amber Valley, taking into account all the representations received, in order to secure significant improvements in coterminosity while not significantly reducing electoral equality and having regard to the statutory criteria.

68 We proposed an Alfreton division which would comprise Alfreton, Wingfield and Crich wards. To the south of this, Somercotes and Swanwick district wards would produce, we judged, a compact Somercotes division. Along the eastern side of the district we proposed a division to be called Riddings & Aldercar which would comprise the district wards of Ironville & Riddings and Langley Mill & Aldercar. The wards of Heanor West, Heanor & Loscoe and Ripley together with Codnor & Waingrove would, respectively, form two divisions which we proposed naming Heanor & Loscoe and Ripley. In the south-east of the district, Ripley & Marehay and Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook wards would comprise our proposed Denby division. To the south of our proposed Denby division, we proposed that the wards of Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse and Heanor East should form a new Horsley division. Duffield & Belper South division would comprise Belper South, Duffield and South West Parishes wards. To the north of this, we proposed 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. While we acknowledged the slight reduction in electoral equality under our proposals when contrasted with the County Council's and Conservative Group's schemes, we considered that our proposal provides a better balance of the competing criteria, significantly improving coterminosity across the district. Under our draft 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.

69 At Stage Three, the County Council developed two new schemes for Amber Valley. Its Option A had six out of ten coterminous divisions and its Option B had eight out of ten coterminous divisions. The only difference between its two options was in its proposed Ripley and Heage divisions where its proposed under its Option A that North Parish Ward of Ripley parish should form part of Heage division along with Codnor & Waingroves ward (under Option B it would form part of Ripley division). The Council's scheme was composed as follows: an Alfreton division would comprise Alfreton and Swanwick wards with Somercotes division to the east comprising Somercotes and Riddings wards. Alport & Derwent division would comprise

the wards of Wingfield, Crich, Alport and Belper North. To the south of this, a Duffield & Belper South division would be the same as the division we proposed in the draft recommendations. Horsley division would comprise the wards of Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook and part of Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse ward (Horsley, Horsley Woodhouse and Smalley parishes). The remaining part of Shipley Park, Horsley & Horsley Woodhouse ward (Shipley and Mapperley parishes) would form a Greater Heanor division along with Aldercar and Heanor East wards. The County Council's proposed Heanor Central division would be the same as the division we proposed in our draft recommendations. Finally, the County Council proposed a Belper Town division comprising Belper Central and Belper East wards.

70 Judy Mallaber, Member of Parliament for Amber Valley, supported the County Council's Stage Three proposals for the borough. She stated: "the proposals put forward by the Commission are very weak in terms of community identity and a number of the proposed divisions break natural links between areas". Amber Valley Borough Council stated: "dividing Belper between three separate divisions in the way proposed significantly diminishes Belper's identity". Additionally, it also considered the draft proposals for the Ripley, Riddings, Aldercar, Heanor and Shipley Park areas did not reflect local community links or combined rural and urban areas. The Borough Council did not, however, supply an alternative arrangement in these areas.

71 We received a number of representations from parish and town councils in the district at Stage Three. Alderwasley Parish Council opposed urban and rural areas forming parts of the same division and Belper Town Council "considered that Belper should be represented by two seats with members who only represent the urban area". Codnor Parish Council stated that the draft recommendations "do little to reflect the identities of local communities" but did not make alternative suggestions. Denby Parish Council supported the draft recommendations, whereas Dethick Lea & Holloway Parish Council supported the County Council's Stage Three (Option B) scheme. Heanor & Loscoe Parish Council supported either of the County Council's Stage Three schemes. Horsley Parish Council opposed 'dividing' the Heanor and Belper areas between divisions, and supported the division name of Horsley, while Horsley Woodhouse Parish Council supported naming the new division as Horsley Woodhouse. The Parish Council also proposed that Holbrook parish should form part of Horsley division for community identity reasons. Kilburn Parish Council opposed forming a division with part of Ripley town as it considered the two areas did not share community links. Ripley Town Council considered that those proposed divisions comprising parts of the town were "unacceptable" and not "in the community interest". Shipley Parish Council proposed transferring Heanor & Loscoe ward into the proposed Horsley ward rather than Heanor East ward, as in the draft recommendations, in order to reflect the "semi-rural" nature of the division. South Wingfield Parish Council opposed forming part of a division with Alfreton as it considered the rural identity of the area could be adversely affected.

72 Amber Valley Conservative Association broadly welcomed the draft recommendations although it expressed concern that the parish of Dethick, Lea & Holloway was effectively "detached" in the proposed division of Heage. It also proposed a number of alternative division names for the borough. Amber Valley Constituency Labour Party supported the County Council's revised proposals. Belper Town Council Labour Group opposed the draft recommendations, stating they divided the town into three divisions and instead supported the County Council's Stage Three scheme which "at least retains one Belper Town division". Councillor Wildsmith, county councillor for Duffield division, suggested that the proposed Duffield division should be renamed Ecclesbourne division in order to reflect the location of the south-western parishes in the division. Councillor Carlile, county councillor for Heage division,

did not consider that the draft proposals reflect the identities and interests of the communities. Councillor Lancashire, county councillor for Horsley division, opposed combining rural and urban areas within single divisions and did not consider that the draft recommendations accurately reflected local community ties in the borough. We received a further 13 representations from local residents in the Amber Valley, each objecting to the draft recommendations on community identity grounds.

73 We carefully considered the views expressed in Amber Valley. We did not judge that the County Council's Stage Three Option A proposal (that Ripley North parish ward of Ripley ward should form part of Heage division) would provide a good reflection of the statutory criteria. We noted, however, that the County Council's Stage Three (Option B) for the borough would achieve comparable electoral equality to the draft recommendations and achieved a comparable level of coterminosity. We also considered that in this instance, the County Council's proposals provided a good reflection of the statutory criteria while also meeting the concerns of a large proportion of respondents.

74 Therefore, in order to guide our decision, particularly with regard to the level of local support for the County Council's Option B proposals in comparison with the draft recommendations, we decided to seek further information from the parish and town councils in Amber Valley and those who made representations concerning the borough at Stage Three. We wrote to each asking for their views on each of these proposals and allowed four weeks for further information to be sent to us. We received 36 replies, of which 27 expressed support for the County Council's Stage Three Option B and six expressed support for the draft recommendations (three made ambiguous statements). Based on all the evidence available to us, we have concluded that in Amber Valley we should move away from our draft recommendations considerably. We have concluded that the County Council's Stage Three (Option B) scheme achieves good electoral equality and reflects the statutory criteria. Furthermore we consider, based on the available evidence, that it commands greater local support, particularly with reference to local community identity, than our draft recommendations. We also judge that the proposed names of the divisions suggested by the County Council are appropriate to the area. We are therefore adopting the County Council's Stage Three scheme (Option B) as our final recommendations for Amber Valley. Under our final recommendations for Amber Valley, no division would have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the average, with eight of the ten divisions being coterminous. Our final recommendations for Amber Valley are illustrated on the large map at the end of the report.

Bolsover district

75 Under the current arrangements, Bolsover district is represented by seven county councillors serving seven divisions: Bolsover, Clowne, Elmtown, 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.

76 At Stage One, 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). Elmtown & Whitwell division would comprise Shirebrook,

Langwith, Elmtton-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 Elmtton & Whitwell. Bolsover Constituency & District Labour Party proposed no change to the existing seven electoral divisions in Bolsover. 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 Elmtton division for community identity reasons.

77 We carefully considered all the representations we received for Bolsover at Stage One. 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 and no change was clearly not an option. We then considered the County Council's proposed pattern of divisions, which correctly allocated six councillors. However, having visited the district, we were not persuaded that its proposed divisions achieve the optimum balance between electoral equality and coterminosity and therefore we proposed a number of modifications.

78 We endorsed the Council's proposal for an unchanged, but renamed, Barlborough & Clowne division (also supported by Bolsover Constituency & District Labour Party). We proposed a new Elmtton & Whitwell division comprising the wards of Bolsover North West, Elmtton-with-Creswell and Whitwell and, to the south a Bolsover & Scarcliffe division comprising Bolsover South, Bolsover West and Scarcliffe wards. We considered that this group 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. In the centre of the district, we proposed modifying the County Council's Shirebrook & Pleasley division to include Shirebrook Langwith ward. We proposed 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 judged, better reflect community identities in the area.

79 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 adopted the division names proposed by the County Council, which we considered provided a good reflection of each division's composition, even when we departed from the County Council's constituent wards.

80 At Stage Three, Derbyshire County Council supported the draft recommendations for the proposed divisions of Barlborough & Clowne, Elmtton & Whitwell and Bolsover & Scarcliffe. It proposed an alternative pattern elsewhere, with Glapwell parish forming part of a modified

Tibshelf division and South Normanton East ward forming part of a modified South Normanton & Pinxton division. The County Council considered its modified proposals in the south of the district would better reflect the strong community links in the area. Under the County Council's proposals, four out of the six divisions would be coterminous and two divisions would have electoral variances of over 10 per cent. One proposed division, South Normanton & Pinxton, would have an electoral variance of 24 per cent in 2004.

81 Bolsover District Council supported no change to the existing divisions as its first preference at Stage Three. However, as a second preference, it opposed Bolsover North West ward forming part of Elmtun & Whitwell division, preferring that this ward should form part of the proposed Bolsover & Scarcliffe division. Additionally, the Borough Council supported the County Council's Stage One proposal to divide South Normanton East ward between two divisions, which it considered would help to equalise the electorate between the divisions.

82 Ault Hucknell Parish Council considered a "two-member" division would better reflect the geography of the area. However, under the present legislation, we are unable to recommend divisions with more than one member. Glapwell Parish Council as a first preference supported no change to the existing division. As a second preference it supported the proposed link with Shirebrook, as in the draft recommendations, and opposed being linked with the Tibshelf area to the south. Scarcliffe Parish Council considered that the "status quo position should be maintained". Whitwell Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations "on the grounds of diminution of local identity which has been built over decades", but did not suggest an alternative.

83 Bolsover Constituency Labour Party preferred to retain seven seats for the district although it supported the proposals for a council size of 64-members. However, as noted in the draft recommendations, based on a council size of 64, Bolsover district is correctly entitled to six members. The Constituency Labour Party proposed no change to the existing divisions.

84 We have carefully considered all the representations we received for Bolsover during Stage Three. Firstly, in considering the most appropriate pattern of divisions for Bolsover, we remain of the view that Bolsover merits six county councillors based on a council size of 64-members. Clearly, therefore, as stated in our draft recommendations report no change is not an option as the 'building blocks' for the new county divisions are the new district wards. For these reasons, proposals based on a seven county councillors and the old pattern of borough wards for Bolsover district are inconsistent with the objectives of the review.

85 In considering the County Council's Stage Three proposals, we noted the reduced level of coterminosity which would result were Glapwell parish to form part of a ward with Tibshelf. Additionally, we noted Glapwell Parish Council's assertion that it preferred to form part of a ward with Scarcliffe to its east, as in the draft recommendations, and that the County Council's Stage One submission had noted the "good communication links between the three settlements of Shirebrook, Pleasley and Glapwell". We therefore have not been persuaded to adopt the County Council's proposals in this area. Elsewhere, we were not persuaded that the County Council's proposals for a modified South Normanton & Pinxton division would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria than our draft recommendations and would also result in significant electoral inequalities which, in this area, we judge are not warranted. Furthermore, we have not been persuaded that Bolsover North West ward should form part of Bolsover & Scarcliffe division as this would have an adverse effect upon electoral equality in the area.

86 We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for divisions in Bolsover as final. Our proposal are illustrated on the large map at the end of this report. Under our final recommendations, all six divisions would be coterminous with district wards and only two divisions would have electoral variances of more than 10 per cent by 2004.

Chesterfield district

87 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, 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.

88 At Stage One, we received three alternative district-wide schemes for Chesterfield. The County Council, Liberal Democrat and Conservative Groups each proposed nine divisions for Chesterfield although there were significant differences in electoral equality together with varying levels of coterminosity between the three schemes.

89 Specifically, the County Council's Stage One 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). Sheepbridge division in the west of the borough would comprise Dunston and Old Whittington wards 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, only two out of the nine divisions would be coterminous.

90 The Liberal Democrat Group's Stage One 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 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 Group's proposed nine divisions would be coterminous.

91 The Conservative Group's Stage One 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. Under the Conservatives' proposals, divisions would be coterminous.

92 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".

93 Having considered the representations we received for Chesterfield at Stage One, 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 did, however, consider that the Conservative Group's scheme achieved a reasonable level of coterminosity and reflection of community identity. However, we considered that coterminosity could be improved still further without significantly affecting electoral equality and therefore proposed retaining Hollingwood parish ward of Staveley parish within the Conservative Group's proposed Staveley South division, thereby creating a coterminous Brimington division. Elsewhere, we adopted the Conservative Group's proposals for Chesterfield unchanged. 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.

94 At Stage Three, the County Council proposed a new pattern of divisions for the borough, with five out of nine divisions coterminous and four divisions having an electoral variance greater than 10 per cent by 2004. In particular, the County Council's proposals reflected its view that the Lowgates area associated more closely with Staveley division than Hollingwood. Elsewhere in the borough, it considered its proposals also better reflected community ties, particularly in relation to school catchment areas and retained much of the existing division pattern. The Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council supported the County Council's new proposals which it considered "better reflect community identities" although it also noted "we have no difficulty accepting the Commission's draft recommendations".

95 Chesterfield Borough Council noted, "we accept that the Commission's proposals give a reasonable level of coterminosity and electoral equality, but we do not accept that they reflect community identity". It proposed an alternative pattern of divisions in the borough stating that "the majority of the proposals reflect the existing County divisions" and that its proposals "allow for the [Borough Council's] Community Forums to keep as close as possible to their existing

areas”. Seven out of nine of the Borough Council’s proposed divisions would be coterminous. The Borough Council’s proposals were not supported by complete or accurate electorate figures. 96 Chesterfield Liberal Democrats supported the County Council’s Stage Three proposal as its first preference and, as a second preference, supported the draft recommendations. In particular, the Liberal Democrats supported the County Council’s alternative proposal that Lowgates parish ward of Lowgates and Woodthorpe ward form part of a Staveley division and that Linacre and Loundsley Green wards form a Newbold & Brockwell ward. One local resident asked the Commission to consider whether “an alternative electoral arrangement based on the Chesterfield Community Forum areas could be adopted”.

97 We have carefully considered all the representations we received for Chesterfield at Stage Three and have noted the two new schemes submitted by the County Council and Chesterfield Borough Council, but we have concluded that neither scheme achieves an improvement upon the draft recommendations in terms of electoral equality or coterminosity. Moreover, we do not consider that either have provided us with significant evidence as to how they would better reflect the statutory criteria. Specifically, we were concerned that Hollingwood parish ward of Staveley parish would form part of a division to the north, along with Barrow Hill & New Whittington ward, which we consider may not facilitate convenient and effective local government in the area. We also do not consider that the County Council’s proposals for two non-coterminous divisions in the urban area of Chesterfield town (between its proposed Walton & West and Newbold & Brockwell divisions) can be justified in terms of the statutory criteria, where an option which avoids this is available in the draft recommendations. Additionally, we have not been persuaded by the evidence presented by the County Council in support of its proposals, particularly that school catchment areas are reliable indicators of community identity. Both the Borough Council’s and County Council’s schemes make note of the comparability between their proposals and the existing electoral divisions in Chesterfield. However, in seeking to achieve the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, we do not consider the existing pattern of divisions are necessarily reliable indicators. Furthermore, we do not judge that the pattern of Community Forums for a Borough Council form an effective starting point towards achieving the best pattern of County Council divisions in a borough.

98 We are therefore confirming as final our draft recommendations for divisions in Chesterfield. Our proposals are illustrated on the large map at the end of this report.

Derbyshire Dales district

99 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.

100 The County Council submitted two different schemes for Derbyshire Dales at Stage One, 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 Stage One proposals for Derbyshire Dales were the same as the County Council’s Option B. 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 Bakewell, Bradwell, Hathersage & Eyam and Litton & Longstone. Derwent Valley division would comprise the wards of Calver, Chatsworth, Darley

Dale and Stanton. 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.

101 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, Brailsford, 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, Hulland 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, either initially or in 2004.

102 At Stage One, 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, Hulland 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. 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."

103 We received Stage One submissions from Councillor Mrs 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. The West Derbyshire Conservative Association's separate Stage One submission made the same proposals as the Conservative Group. Wirksworth Town Council considered its existing county division was "too large for the area and should be reduced". Derbyshire Dales District Council Labour Group, in its submission, reflected the views expressed by Wirksworth Town Council.

104 We carefully considered all the Stage One 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 considered that it provided a good balance of the various criteria and in our opinion reasonably reflected community identity. We therefore endorsed the County Council's Option A for Derbyshire Dales unchanged as part of our draft recommendations.

105 At Stage Three, the County Council supported the draft recommendations for Derbyshire Dales (which reflected its own Stage One submission). Patrick McLoughlin, Member of Parliament for Derbyshire West, noted that "the people of Ashbourne look to the City of Derby as their main town while residents of Tideswell go mainly to Buxton or Manchester" and that there was no connection between the two settlements which, under the draft recommendations, would both form part of the same division of Dovedale. Derbyshire Dales District Council opposed the draft recommendations for the district, considering that the proposed Dovedale and Bakewell divisions would be too large, noting the division would contain over twenty parishes. The District Council supported Derbyshire County Council's Stage One (Option B) scheme which it considered "has closer regard to the needs of communities".

106 We received a modified pattern of divisions from the Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council (also submitted by the West Derbyshire Liberal Democrats) at Stage Three. The Group considered that "although rural divisions are inevitably large" the geography of the proposed Dovedale division would make it difficult for a county councillor to represent the area. It also did not support part of Ashbourne being included in two divisions. Its proposals were broadly similar to the County Council's Stage One Option B proposal although it did not propose to transfer any part Wirksworth ward into the proposed Derwent Valley division (which it proposed naming Darley Dale division). Elsewhere, the Liberal Democrats proposed that the whole of Brailsford ward should form part of Henmore division (which it proposed naming Wirksworth division) and that the whole of Ashbourne North ward should form part of Dove Valley division (which it proposed naming Ashbourne division). Under this proposal, two wards would vary by more than 10 per cent in 2004 and all divisions would be coterminous. The West Derbyshire Liberal Democrats proposed a slight modification to the County Council Liberal Democrat Group's scheme, so that the parish of Northwood and Tinkersley would form part of its proposed Darley Dale division, which would impact upon coterminosity in the district.

107 West Derbyshire Conservative Association opposed the draft recommendations which it considered did not reflect the statutory criteria, in particular reflecting community links in the proposed Dovedale and Derwent Valley divisions and impacting upon convenient and effective local government in Dovedale as a consequence of its geographical size. Alternatively, the Conservative Association continued to support the County Council's Stage One (Option B) scheme stating: "as part of our desire to play a constructive role in the review process" it submitted a new scheme. Under its new scheme Hope Valley division would comprise the wards of Bradwell, Calver, Hathersage & Eyam, Litton & Longstone and Tideswell. To the south of this, it proposed a Bakewell & Dovedale division comprising the wards of Bakewell, Chatsworth, Dovedale & Parwich, Hartington & Taddington and Lathkill & Bradford. Matlock North division would comprise the wards of Darley Dale, Matlock All Saints and Stanton with Matlock South division comprising the wards of Masson, Matlock St Giles and Winster & South Darley. Its

proposed Ashbourne North & Wirksworth division would comprise the wards of Ashbourne North, Carsington Water and Wirksworth. Ashbourne division would comprise the wards of Ashbourne South, Brailsford, Clifton & Bradley, Doveridge & Sudbury, Hulland and Norbury. All divisions would be coterminous and only one division would vary by more than 10 per cent in 2004.

108 Bakewell, Bradwell, Claver, Hathersage and Tideswell Parish Council all supported the County Council's Stage One (Option B) alternative warding pattern. Brailsford & Ednaston Parish Council supported the District Council's comments and Elton Parish Council objected to the inclusion of the parish in the Dovedale division for community identity reasons. Great Longsone Parish Council opposed the linking of this parish with areas to the north which were divided by the Longstone Edge escarpment. Hassop Parish Meeting opposed the parish forming part of Hope Valley division for community identity and geographical reasons. Kniveton Parish Council opposed the parish forming part of Wirksworth division. Longton Parish Council opposed the settlement of Ashbourne forming part of two adjacent divisions whereas Matlock Town Council supported the proposed Matlock Division in the draft recommendations but considered divisions elsewhere were too large and that many settlements within the proposed divisions did not share common links. Outseats Parish Council supported the parish forming part of a division with the rest of Hope Valley and Calver, Cubar and Tideswell parishes. Tideswell Parish Council similarly commented that Ashbourne and Tideswell had no common identity in the proposed Dovedale division and supported the alternative Stage One County Council (Option B) scheme.

109 County Councillor Mrs Twigg, member for Bakewell division, supported the County Council's Stage One (Option B) scheme, particularly opposing the draft recommendation that Bakewell and Hathersage should form part of the same division which she considered did not share community links and would be geographically large. County Councillor Mrs Bevan also supported the County Council Stage One (Option B) scheme which she considered better reflected community identities in the area. As a second preference, Councillor Mrs Bevan supported the West Derbyshire Conservative Association's alternative Stage Three scheme and as a third preference proposed an alternative pattern of divisions in the central area, although without supplying electorate data or detailed mapping. Borough Councillor Mrs Critchlow, member for Tideswell ward, opposed the draft recommendations for the area stating, "the proposal which was put forward by the Conservative group is far more realistic".

110 We received 13 representations from local residents who opposed the draft recommendations and supported the County Council's Stage One (Option B) scheme, as also supported by Derbyshire Dales District Council. A number of respondents commented that "Bakewell should not be included with Hathersage and the Hope Valley, as they have nothing in common with each other". Another resident opposed the proposed Wirksworth division, particularly the proposal that the settlements of Matlock Bath and Kniveton form part of the same division, preferring rural areas to form part of divisions solely with other rural areas. One resident supported the draft recommendations for the district.

111 We have carefully considered all the representations we have received for Derbyshire Dales in response to our draft recommendations. We have noted the views expressed in support of the County Council's Stage One (Option B) scheme and the new schemes proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council (and West Derbyshire Liberal Democrats) and the West Derbyshire Conservative Association. Both these latter two schemes achieve coterminosity in

all divisions and comparable electoral equality to the draft recommendations whereas the County Council's (Option B) achieves coterminosity in only two divisions although with good electoral equality.

112 In relation to the County Council's Stage One (Option B) scheme we remain concerned that such a low level of coterminosity may impact upon the statutory criteria in the borough, particularly, convenient and effective local government. We have not been persuaded by the evidence submitted at Stage Three to alter this view. Elsewhere, we particularly noted the comments expressed in relation to the size of the proposed Dovedale division. However, we have not concluded that this division, in relation to the rural characteristics of the borough and settlement pattern, is too large or so arranged as to adversely impact upon convenient and effective local government. Specifically, we noted that the A515 provides a clear communication between the southern and more northerly part of Dovedale division. We also do not consider that we have received persuasive evidence that our proposed Bakewell or Ashbourne divisions do not satisfactorily meet the statutory criteria and we conclude that our draft recommendations are not fundamentally flawed in Derbyshire Dales.

113 While we welcomed the high degree of coterminosity achieved under the Liberal Democrat's Stage Three proposal, we were concerned that the new schemes from the Liberal Democrats would create a division, Wirksworth, which did not reflect the settlement pattern in the area and therefore may impact upon convenient and effective local government and local community interests and identities. Furthermore, under the West Derbyshire Conservatives' Stage Three scheme, we were concerned that the town of Matlock would not form a single division, which we concluded in this instance may not reflect community interests and identities in the area. We note that in the case of Ashbourne, there was no consensus on the area forming part of two divisions, with both the County Council's Stage One Options A and B and the West Derbyshire Conservative Association's scheme placing parts of the settlement in adjacent divisions. Therefore, we have not been persuaded that any of the alternative schemes coming forward provide a good reflection of the statutory criteria in Derbyshire Dales. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for divisions in Derbyshire Dales as final. Our proposals are illustrated on the large map at the end of this report.

Erewash borough

114 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. At Stage One, we received two proposals for the borough area, from the County Council and the Conservative Group.

115 At Stage One, 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 ward together with Borrowash West and Borrowash East parish wards of Ockbrook & Borrowash 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. Sandiacre division would comprise 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. 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.

116 The Conservative Group’s Stage One 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. 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 Wilsthorpe 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.

117 We considered all the representations received at Stage One. We did 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 judged 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 therefore adopted them unaltered as part of our draft recommendations.

118 At Stage Three, the County Council supported the draft recommendations for Erewash borough (which reflected its Stage One submission). Erewash Borough Council also supported the draft recommendations. Dale Abbey Parish Council supported the proposed Kirk Hallam division.

119 Breaston, Draycott and Ockbrook & Borrowash parish councils all opposed dividing Ockbrook & Borrowash parish between two separate divisions for community identity reasons.

Additionally, Ockbrook & Borrowash Parish Council stated that Ockbrook did not have any links with Sandiacre. Erewash Conservative Association proposed an alternative pattern of divisions in the far south-east of the borough, with a Long Eaton division comprising Nottingham Road and Derby Road East wards, Sawley division comprising Sawley and Long Eaton Central wards and Wilsthorpe division comprising Wilsthorpe and Derby Road West wards. It considered “new building in Wilsthorpe is moving the centre of the ward even further from Sawley and towards Derby Road”.

120 Councillor Bill Camm, County Councillor for Sawley division, opposed any change to the existing Sawley division. One local resident proposed retaining the existing boundaries in the Ockbrook and Borrowash area.

121 We have carefully considered the representations we received for Erewash. We noted the views expressed by respondents concerning the division of Ockbrook & Borrowash parish between two divisions. However, we note that the parish is already divided between wards at district level and that the division proposed utilises a clear boundary (the A52) and reflects the two settlements in the area. In forming county divisions, we must have regard to the district area as a whole and we cannot look at one area in isolation. We do not consider a suitable pattern of county divisions could be achieved which would keep Ockbrook & Borrowash parish together while achieving a reasonable balance of electoral equality and reflecting the statutory criteria in this and other divisions. Elsewhere we remain of the view that our draft recommendations would provide the most suitable pattern of electoral divisions in the light of the evidence received and we are therefore confirming them as final. Our final recommendations are illustrated on the large map at the end of this report.

High Peak borough

122 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.

123 We received four schemes for High Peak at Stage One, 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”.

124 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 wards 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.

125 The County Council's Stage One 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. 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.

126 At Stage One, 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. 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.

127 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.

128 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed a further three divisions covering the far south of the borough at Stage One: Whaley Bridge division would comprise the whole wards of Whaley

Bridge and Blackbrook along with Hartington Upper Quarter parish from Burbage ward and the parish of King Sterndale from Cote Heath ward; Buxton East division would comprise Central, Barms, Stone Bench and Wormhill wards 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 Democrat Group's proposals, one division 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. Additionally, Hayfield Parish Council stated that it considered "this parish has nothing in common with Glossop South".

129 We carefully considered the alternative Stage One options we received for High Peak. We were concerned that under the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals, only one division 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 might, 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 judged that the proposals from the Conservative Group achieved the best balance between electoral equality and coterminosity among the proposals we received.

130 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 were not persuaded that an alternative pattern of divisions could be found which would avoid separating the Furness Vale area from the rest of Whaley Bridge parish and, having visited the area, we judged that Hayfield Parish is more closely linked in terms of community identity with the New Mills area than with those areas to its south. In this instance, we considered that an alternative division comprising New Mills East, New Mills West, Sett and Hayfield wards (which we proposed 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.

131 At Stage Three, the County Council proposed an alternative pattern of divisions for High Peak with six out of the eight divisions coterminous and two divisions varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004. The County Council's Stage Three proposals were the same as its Stage One (Option A) proposals with the exception of the News Mills and Whaley Bridge & Blackbrook divisions, where it adopted the draft recommendations. The County Council noted that the draft proposal to include "Dove Holes in [the] proposed Buxton North & East division is poor. Dove Holes is in Chapel parish". Additionally it suggested that its proposal for the inclusion of Padfield ward in its Glossop North division would leave a "well known/established division unchanged". The County Council also suggested that to have Gamesley ward form part of Glossop South division would similarly retain an existing division, as would its proposals in

Buxton. The County Council stated that “Dove Holes Community Association support [the] inclusion of Doves Holes with Chapel as it lies within the parish”.

132 The Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council and High Peak Borough Council Liberal Democrat Group both supported the draft recommendations, although both proposed that the Dove Holes area of Chapel-en-le-Frith parish should form part of Chapel & Hope Valley division for community identity reasons. The Conservative Association and Conservative Group of High Peak Borough Council, “consider the draft recommendations to be sensible and practical”.

133 Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council noted the strong links the Doves Holes area has with the rest of Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish. Hayfield Parish Council supported Hayfield forming part of a division with New Mills ward, as in the draft recommendations. Whaley Bridge Town Council supported the draft proposal that the whole of the parish form part of a single county division. One local resident supported the draft proposals in the Buxton area. Councillor Anne Western, member for Chapel division, supported Dove Holes forming part of Chapel & Hope Valley division.

134 We have carefully considered all the Stage Three proposals we received for High Peak. We are not convinced that the County Council has presented any new or persuasive evidence in support of its proposals for High Peak. In particular, we do not consider, as mentioned previously, that the existing pattern of divisions within the borough can be logically used as supporting evidence for the pattern of new divisions as, clearly, these must be based on the pattern of new district wards. We have noted the comments made in respect of the Dove Holes area of Chapel-en-le-Frith parish. Under this modification electoral equality in Buxton North & East and Chapel & Hope Valley would improve to 4 per cent and 3 per cent respectively (5 per cent and 4 per cent in 2004). However, coterminosity would worsen under this proposal, with six out of eight divisions being coterminous. On balance, however, we have been persuaded that the statutory criteria of reflecting the interests and identities of local communities would best be met were Dove Holes to form part of Chapel & Hope Valley division and are therefore adopting this modification as part of our final recommendations. We are not proposing any modifications to the draft recommendations elsewhere in High Peak. Our final recommendations are illustrated on the large map at the end of this report.

North East Derbyshire district

135 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.

136 We received four alternative proposals for North East Derbyshire at Stage One, 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, both 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.

137 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.

138 In the southern part of the district, the County Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed almost identical Stage One 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 would comprise Grassmoor, Sutton and the remaining part of Holmewood & Heath wards. Sutton division would, under these proposals, retain its existing external boundaries unaltered.

139 The Conservative Group's Stage One 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 from Pilsley & Morton ward. To the east of this, a Clay Cross North division would comprise Morton and Pilsley parishes from 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.

140 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.

141 We also received a Stage One 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. 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.

142 We carefully considered all the alternative submissions we received for North East Derbyshire. We were 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 with the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals. We were satisfied that the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals broadly 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 therefore adopted the Liberal Democrat Group's proposals as part of our draft recommendations unaltered.

143 At Stage Three, the County Council supported the draft recommendations for the area apart from the four divisions of Dronfield North, Dronfield South, Eckington and Killamarsh where it restated its Stage One alternative pattern of divisions. In particular, it considered that Killamarsh, on the edge of the district and county, could only reasonably form part of a division with Renishaw but that Renishaw shares strong community links with the rest of Eckington parish to the west. Furthermore, the County Council stated that there are close community ties between the Unstone and Dronfield communities. Additionally, it proposed renaming North Wingfield division as North Wingfield & Tupton, in order to better reflect the identity of the area. However, the Liberal Democrat Group at the County Council in its submission stated, "we confirm our view that linking Renishaw with Killamarsh would not have any adverse effect on community identity, nor is there any overriding reason for continuing to include Unstone in Dronfield North Division".

144 Harry Barnes, Member of Parliament for Derbyshire North East, opposed the divisions for the north of the borough and similarly supported the pattern of divisions proposed by the County Council. In particular, he noted "Communications between Unstone and Eckington are poor". North East Derbyshire District Council did not support the proposals for the four divisions in the north of the district, instead supporting the "status quo" for community identity reasons. It also proposed renaming Ashover division as Clay Cross to reflect the composition of the division.

145 Dronfield Town Council opposed the draft proposal to link Unstone and Eckington and Killamarsh Parish Council supported Killamarsh East and Killamarsh West wards forming a single division, as also proposed by the County Council, noting its main road link is with the settlements of Renishaw and Spinkhill which in turn, the Parish Council suggested, have strong community links with the rest of Eckington Parish to the west. Tupton Parish Council considered that the division names should include reference to the parish of Tupton, as did North Wingfield Parish Council which additionally expressed support for the draft recommendations in the district. Unstone Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations for Unstone, proposing that Unstone form part of a division with North Dronfield ward.

146 North East Derbyshire Conservative Association and North East Derbyshire Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations. North East Derbyshire Constituency Labour Party and Eckington Branch Labour Party supported the alternative proposals for the four northern divisions in the district and Dronfield & District Labour Party supported no change to the existing divisions. Dronfield Civic Society opposed the draft recommendations, noting that “Unstone is a ‘suburb’ of Dronfield”. Dronfield & District Joint Burial Committee did not consider Unstone Parish had any community links with Eckington. Similarly, Unstone District Women’s Institute and St Mary’s Church Tuesday Group noted the community links between Dronfield and Unstone.

147 County Councillor Charles, member of Killamarsh division, noted “the intricate relationship both within, and between, close-knit coalfield communities” in North-East Derbyshire. County Councillor Gillot, member for North Wingfield electoral division, stated he supported an alternative name for the division of North Wingfield: North Wingfield & Tupton. County Councillor Goodhand, member for Dronfield North, noted the community links between Dronfield and Unstone and proposed that the Commission’s final recommendations should reflect this link. County Councillor Pickford, member for Holymoorside & Wingerworth supported the draft recommendations as they related to this proposed division. District Councillor Hopkinson, member for Unstone ward, did not support the draft recommendations for the Unstone area for community identity reasons.

148 We received an additional 45 representations from local residents in the area opposing the draft recommendations for the four northern divisions, largely for community identity reasons. We also received three petitions. One petition, signed by 570 residents of Eckington Parish, opposed the draft recommendation that Renishaw should form part of a division with Killamarsh, stating that there are few communication routes between the two. A second petition, signed by 52 residents, similarly opposed the Renishaw and Spinkhill areas forming part of a division with Killamarsh, stating that “Renishaw and Spinkhill people have strong ties with Eckington”. A third petition, forwarded by Unstone parish councillor, Councillor Hill, contained 374 signatures opposed to linking Unstone with Eckington, as under the draft recommendations, stating that Unstone has close ties with Dronfield.

149 We have carefully considered all the representations for North East Derbyshire. We welcomed the broad support for our proposals in the south of the borough. For the four divisions in the north, we noted the large number of representations from local residents opposing our draft recommendations. In order to further inform our final decision, we visited the area concerned. Based on all the evidence available to us, we concluded that we should modify our draft recommendations in the north of the borough. In particular, we have been persuaded of the view that the statutory criteria, particularly with respect to the parish of Unstone, would be better reflected under the County Council’s alternative proposals for the four divisions in the north of the district. We consider that were Unstone to form part of a division with Eckington, as in the draft recommendations, convenient and effective local government in the area might be adversely affected as the communication links in the area were not found to be favourable to the warding pattern we proposed. While we acknowledge that under these revised proposals electoral equality would worsen, we have concluded that in this instance, a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria would be achieved under the County Council’s alternative scheme and therefore we are adopting it as part of our final recommendations. We are also modifying one division name, North Wingfield, to North Wingfield & Tupton which would reflect representations received at Stage Three and, we judge, better reflect the composition of the division. Our final recommendations are illustrated on the large map at the end of the report.

South Derbyshire district

150 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.

151 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. 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). Repton & Willington division would comprise the remaining part of Etwall ward (the parishes of Bearwardcote, Burnaston, Egginton 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 Gresley 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 Gresley, Midway, Swadlincote and Woodville wards.

152 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 Gresley and Swadlincote wards and Linton division would comprise Linton and Seales wards together with polling districts DA and DD from Newhall ward.

153 We also received a representation at Stage One from Overseal Parish Council which considered that the new division "should be as similar to the existing Linton division as possible". 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.

154 We 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 recommended 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.

155 We noted that Hatton & Hilton division would have an electoral variance of 21 per cent but we considered that these three coterminous divisions achieved 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 judged, mean that the geography and communities of the north of the district would not be properly reflected and would result in an unacceptable reduction in coterminosity. We proposed two other coterminous divisions: the first comprising Midway and Hartshorne & Ticknall wards which we proposed calling Midway & Hartshorne division. Secondly, Swadlincote Central & Woodville division would comprise Swadlincote and Woodville wards. We proposed two non-coterminous divisions in the southern part of the district: Linton & Church Gresley which would comprise the whole of Church Gresley ward, together with part of Linton ward (Cauldwell, Castle Gresley 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.

156 Under our draft recommendations, 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. We acknowledged that electoral imbalances would remain, but, in this instance we judged that any further improvement in electoral equality would result in a significant reduction in coterminosity, which would adversely impact upon the convenience and effectiveness of local government in the district.

157 At Stage Three, the County Council resubmitted its Stage One proposals for South Derbyshire, where only one out of the seven divisions would be coterminous and all divisions would have electoral variances less than 10 per cent in 2004. The Council stated its proposals would allow Overseal parish to form part of a division with the rest of Seales & Linton division, and furthermore would provide two divisions covering the urban area of Swadlincote compared to the four divisions under the draft recommendations. Additionally, the County Council considered that Stenson Fields parish should form part of a division with those parishes to the north-east of the district rather than form part of the proposed Repton & Willington division as the area "links to Derby City".

158 We received a representations from Mark Todd, Member of Parliament for South Derbyshire who stated, "I feel the County Council's Stage One proposals had much to

recommend them”. In particular, he noted the greater electoral equality under the County Council’s proposals and considered they better reflected community identities in the district than the draft recommendations. Mr Todd also noted that the County Council’s proposals sought to minimize “the splitting of the urban Swadlincote area”. Furthermore, he considered that the draft recommendations for Newhall & Seales division did not reflect a common community identity and was geographically disparate.

159 South Derbyshire District Council stated, “Derbyshire County Council’s original submission is considered to be sound and should be re-examined further”. Netherseale Parish Council opposed urban and rural areas forming part of the same division and Overseal Parish Council stated it was “totally opposed to the suggested inclusion of Overseal within Newhall & Linton division” based on community identity arguments. Councillor Lemmon, district councillor for Etwall ward, requested that the Commission set a maximum number of electors to be represented by the county councillor for the proposed Hatton & Hilton division due to the significant forecast growth in that area. However, under current legislation, the Commission cannot set an upper limit for the number of electors a councillor should represent. Our recommendations do, however, take account of projected electorate for five years hence in order to minimise electoral inequalities due to changes in the electorate of an area.

160 We have carefully considered the representations we received for South Derbyshire at Stage Three. While we note the improved electoral equality under the County Council’s proposals, we remain of the view, as noted in our draft recommendations report, that the County Council’s proposals do not achieve a satisfactory balance between electoral equality and coterminosity. We judge that with only one out of the seven divisions coterminous there is an adverse impact upon convenient and effective local government in South Derbyshire. In particular, we were concerned that the County Council’s proposals would involve four non-coterminous divisions in the Swadlincote area. Furthermore, while it may be the case that the Stenson Fields area has connections with Derby City (a unitary authority which is not part of this review), we have not been persuaded that this is either a valid argument in favour of the County Council’s alternative pattern of divisions nor an argument against the draft recommendations.

161 Indeed, we have not been persuaded that new evidence has been presented which suggests that the draft recommendations are fundamentally flawed. As we stated in our *Guidance*, it may be the case that in order to achieve a reasonable balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, it may be necessary for urban and rural areas to form parts of the same division, and we have found this has been the case in South Derbyshire. Furthermore, looking at the district as a whole, we have found that in order to achieve a balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, one ward, Hatton & Hilton, has an electoral variance of greater than 20 per cent in 2004, which we conclude is, in this instance, justified. We have not been persuaded that our proposed Newhall & Seales division is fundamentally flawed in terms of the statutory criteria. Furthermore we do not consider that modifications in this area, such as suggested by Overseal Parish Council, are warranted as they would not provide a better match of the statutory criteria in this and surrounding areas. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for South Derbyshire as final. Our proposals are illustrated on the large map at the end of this report.

Conclusions

162 Having considered all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we proposed that:

- there should be no change in council size of 64 members;
- changes should be made to the boundaries of all but three divisions (Barlborough & Clowne, Brimington and Sutton).

163 We have decided to substantially confirm our draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- in Amber Valley, we are adopting the Stage Three alternative (Option B) proposed by the County Council which we judge better reflects the statutory criteria than our draft recommendations;
- in High Peak Borough, we propose that the Doves Holes area of Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish should form part of Chapel & Hope Valley division rather than Buxton North and East division in order to better reflect community links in the area;
- in North East Derbyshire, we are adopting the alternative proposals suggested by a number of respondents at Stages One and Three for the four wards of Dronfield North, Dronfield South, Eckington and Killamarsh which we consider would better reflect the statutory criteria than the draft recommendations. Also North Wingfield division should be renamed North Wingfield & Tupton in order to reflect the composition of the division.

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

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final 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	2	14	1

165 As shown in Figure 4, our draft recommendations for Derbyshire County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 20 per cent from the county average from 10 to two. By 2004 only one division is forecast to vary by more than 20 per cent from the average. Our final recommendations are set out in more detail in Figures 1 and 2, and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Final 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 on the large map inserted at the back of the report.

6 NEXT STEPS

166 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

167 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an order. Such an order will not be made earlier than six weeks from the date that our recommendations are submitted to the Secretary of State.

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

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

APPENDIX A

Final Recommendations for Derbyshire: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for Derbyshire.

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

Draft Recommendations for Derbyshire

Our draft recommendations differ from the final recommendations in the divisions below. Additionally we are renaming North Wingfield division as North Wingfield & Tupton:

Figure B1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Division name (by district council area)	Constituent district wards
AMBER VALLEY	
1 Alfreton	Alfreton ward; Wingfield ward
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 and Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook ward
4 Duffield and 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
HIGH PEAK	
41 Buxton North & East	Barms ward; Cote Heath ward; Limestone Peak ward; Stone Bench ward
43 Chapel & Hope Valley	Chapel East ward; Chapel West ward; Hope Valley ward
NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE	
52 Eckington	Eckington South ward; Eckington North ward; Ridgeway & Marsh Lane ward; Unstone ward
54 Killamarsh	Killamarsh East ward; Killamarsh West ward; Renishaw ward
50 Dronfield North	Coal Aston ward; Dronfield North ward; Dronfield Woodhouse ward
51 Dronfield South	Dronfield South ward; Gosforth Valley ward

Figure B2: 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 %
AMBER VALLEY					
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
HIGH PEAK					
41 Buxton North & East	1	9,341	4	9,492	3
43 Chapel & Hope Valley	1	8,027	-11	8,056	-13
NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE					
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
54 Killamarsh	1	8,583	-5	9,165	-1