

# Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council

Electoral review

August 2012

### **Translations and other formats**

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 020 7664 8534

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary 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 100049926 2012

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	10
Amber Valley Borough	10
Bolsover District	12
Chesterfield Borough	14
Derbyshire Dales District	15
Erewash Borough	16
High Peak Borough	17
North East Derbyshire District	19
South Derbyshire District	22
Conclusions	24
Parish electoral arrangements	24
3 What happens next?	29
4 Mapping	31
<b>Appendices</b>	
A Glossary and abbreviations	32
B Table B1: Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council	35



## Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Derbyshire County Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in May 2011.

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
9 August 2011	Submission of proposals of division arrangements to the LGBCE
6 December 2011	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
2 April 2012	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
9 June 2012	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 64, comprising 60 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. Our draft recommendations were broadly based on the Council's proposed division pattern, although in Bolsover district, we based our draft recommendations on the proposals of the Labour Group. In North East Derbyshire we also proposed significant modifications to the Council's proposals. Our proposals would provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the county.

## Submissions received

Following publication of our draft recommendations, we received 111 submissions including county-wide comments from the Council, the Labour Group and a local resident. The remaining submissions were largely in relation to the areas of Eckington, Grassmoor and North Wingfield within North East Derbyshire district. We also received a number of submissions in relation to the Codnor area within Amber Valley borough. Respondents in these areas proposed alternative division patterns. Elsewhere, the draft recommendations were broadly supported.

All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

## Electorate figures

Derbyshire County Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2017, a date five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% over this period. The majority of growth in the electorate is focused in the district of South Derbyshire. Elsewhere in the county, growth in the electorate is predicted to be modest.

Following publication of our draft recommendations, we did not receive comments on the electorate figures. We are content, therefore, that the forecasts are the most accurate available and we have used them as the basis of our final recommendations.

## General analysis

Having considered the submissions received, we have generally confirmed our draft recommendations as final. However, we propose a two-member Eckington & Killamarsh division in North East Derbyshire to reflect evidence of community identities received following publication of our draft recommendations. We also propose minor modifications in Chesterfield town, Amber Valley and South Derbyshire.

In light of the submissions received in relation to Grassmoor and North Wingfield, we gave serious consideration to an alternative division pattern and looked especially closely at these areas whilst visiting the county. However, on balance, we did not consider that we had received alternative proposals for this area (and their potential impact on neighbouring divisions) that would provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore confirmed our draft recommendations for these two areas as final.

Under our final recommendations only two electoral divisions will have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county by 2017. Having taken into account the evidence we have received during consultation, we believe that our proposals provide the best balance between our statutory criteria in ensuring good electoral equality, reflecting community identities and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Derbyshire County Council, in 2013.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Derbyshire County Council's electoral arrangements, to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We invited the County Council to submit proposals first on council size and then on division arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council*, which were published on 2 April 2012. We reconsidered the draft recommendations in light of the further evidence received and decided whether or not to make any modifications.

## What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Derbyshire?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2010 electorate figures, 39% of divisions in the county have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the county average. One division, Hatton & Hilton, also has 39% more electors per councillor than the county average.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the County Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish or town council wards you vote in. Your division name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Derbyshire is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- have regard to the boundaries of district and borough wards in drawing boundaries for county divisions
- ensure that proposed county divisions do not cross external district and borough boundaries
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

11 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Derbyshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

13 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

14 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the district council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

## Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Derbyshire County Council and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received two submissions on council size and four submissions relating to division patterns. Following publication of the draft recommendations, we received 111 submissions. All submissions may be inspected both at our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

16 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously. The submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have been assisted by officers at Derbyshire County Council who provided relevant information throughout the review.

## Electorate figures

17 As part of this review, Derbyshire County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2017, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% over the period from 2011 to 2017.

18 The majority of growth in the electorate is focused in the district of South Derbyshire. Elsewhere in the county, growth in the electorate is expected to be modest.

19 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we did not receive any comments on the accuracy of the electorate figures. Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are therefore content to use these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

20 Derbyshire County Council currently has 64 councillors elected from 64 single-member divisions and operates a Leader and Cabinet model. At the outset of the review, Derbyshire County Council's Cabinet proposed a council size of 64. The Labour Group on the County Council proposed a council size of 65.

21 In support of a council size of 64, the Cabinet outlined the governance functions of the Council in the context of its political management structure. It provided details of the composition and frequency of meetings of its committees and details of the

County Council's appointments to outside bodies. The Cabinet also outlined the representational role of members and provided evidence of member workload.

22 In considering council size, the Cabinet considered the impact of both a reduction and an increase in council size on member workload and member allowances. However, on balance, it concluded that a council size of 64 would provide effective and convenient local government with regular and adequate scrutiny. It was also confident that a council size of 64 would maintain the representational role of members.

23 The Labour Group broadly agreed with the Cabinet's assessment of the Council's governance arrangements but disagreed with the assessment of member workload. The Labour Group expressed concerns over the adequacy of the number of scrutiny committees. The Labour Group also felt the Cabinet's assessment of the representational role of members did not reflect member liaison with district councils, member involvement with community groups or the semi-rural geography of parts of the county.

24 The Labour Group added that an additional member was required to address the under-representation of South Derbyshire district. However, this could be addressed by transferring a member from North East Derbyshire District which, under a council size of 64, is over-represented.

25 Having considered both proposals for council size, we were satisfied by the evidence provided in relation to the management and committee structures and their respective workloads. We considered that the evidence received supported a council size of 64 as the optimum number of members for effective and convenient local government. Conversely, beyond an additional member being allocated to South Derbyshire District, we did not consider there to be a clear rationale for an additional member as proposed by the Labour Group. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 64 as part of our draft recommendations.

26 During consultation on the draft recommendations, Nigel Mills MP suggested a reduction in council size but did not specify what this should be. We received no further comment on council size. Consequently, we are basing our final recommendations on a council size of 64 members.

## Electoral fairness

27 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

28 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The county average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (602,466 in 2011 and 624,085 by December 2017) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 64 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 9,414 in 2011 and 9,751 by 2017.

29 Under our final recommendations, only two divisions would have more or fewer than 10% of electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. Overall, we are satisfied that we have achieved very good levels of electoral fairness under our final recommendations for Derbyshire.

## General analysis

30 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations, we received four submissions on division patterns for Derbyshire. The County Council and the Labour Group both submitted county-wide schemes based on a uniform pattern of single-member divisions. We also received localised submissions from Codnor Parish Council and from Councillor Juliette Blake (Heage division).

31 The County Council's and the Labour Group's proposals were similar in a number of areas. However, the Labour Group's proposal was based on a council size of 65, as it had previously proposed.

32 Both submissions were supported by limited evidence of community identity. However, we considered the County Council's proposals to provide slightly better electoral equality than the Labour Group's proposals in most areas of the county. We therefore broadly based our draft recommendations on the County Council's division pattern in most parts of the county, subject to a number of modifications. Most notably, we developed our own proposals for the town of Dronfield in North East Derbyshire district where we had concerns over the Council's proposed division pattern. In the district of Bolsover, we adopted the Labour Group's division pattern as, in our view, this would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

33 Our draft recommendations were based on a council size of 64 providing 60 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. Our final recommendations continue to be based on a council size of 64 members. The allocation of councillors across the districts is as follows:

- Amber Valley Borough – ten members
- Bolsover District – six members
- Chesterfield Borough – nine members
- Derbyshire Dales District – six members
- Erewash Borough – nine members
- High Peak Borough – eight members
- North East Derbyshire District – eight members
- South Derbyshire District – eight members

34 Following our draft recommendations, 111 submissions were received including county-wide comments from the County Council, the Labour Group, and a local resident. The County Council largely endorsed the draft recommendations with the exception of the proposed two-member divisions in the districts of High Peak and Amber Valley. Elsewhere the County Council proposed few modifications. Similarly, the Labour Group largely endorsed the draft recommendations. However, it proposed a number of modifications to the draft recommendations, most notably within North East Derbyshire District.

35 The local resident proposed a number of alternative division names. However, these were not supported by evidence of community identity to support a change from our draft recommendations. We have therefore not adopted the local resident's proposed division names as part of our final recommendations.

36 Ault Hucknall Parish Council and Councillor Robert Parkinson (Breaston division) also supported the draft recommendations.

37 Elsewhere, our draft recommendations were broadly well received with concerns focused on the areas of Eckington, Grassmoor and North Wingfield within North East Derbyshire District and Codnor in Amber Valley Borough. Respondents were opposed to the proposed division pattern in these areas, asserting that they would split established settlements between divisions. A number of respondents commenting on these areas provided supporting evidence of community identity with some also proposing alternative division patterns.

38 We gave careful consideration to the proposed division patterns in these areas and paid particular attention to the arguments that our proposals would split communities. We toured these areas and looked at the proposed boundaries in detail. Consequently, we have moved away from our draft recommendations in Eckington and adopted a two-member Eckington & Killamarsh division, as proposed by a number of respondents.

39 In Grassmoor and North Wingfield, we paid particular attention to the evidence of shared community identities in the respective areas. The community identity evidence received outlined why individual communities should not be divided, but in most cases did not propose alternative division patterns. Where alternatives were proposed, these did not take into account the adverse consequential effects for neighbouring divisions. We also received some support for our draft recommendations. Therefore, whilst acknowledging the views expressed about these areas, on balance, we felt unable to modify the scheme without disturbing acceptable proposals for adjacent areas and have decided to confirm our draft recommendations in this area as final.

40 In Codnor, we have adopted a modification to reflect the evidence of shared community identity within the village of Waingroves and wholly included the village within the proposed Ripley East & Codnor division.

41 A number of respondents also commented on the proposed two-member divisions of Glossop & Charlesworth and Alfreton & Somercotes which would depart from an otherwise uniform pattern of single-member divisions. The Derbyshire Dales Conservative Association and the North East Derbyshire Conservative Association expressed a general objection to two-member divisions. However, a number of respondents, including the Labour Group, endorsed our proposed two-member divisions.

42 Elsewhere, we are generally confirming our draft recommendations as final, subject to a number of minor boundary changes in Chesterfield and South Derbyshire districts. We also propose a division name change in Breadsall based on comments received during consultation.

43 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table B1 (on pages 35 – 41) and Map 1.

## Electoral arrangements

44 This section of the report details the submissions received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Derbyshire. The following areas are considered in turn:

- Amber Valley Borough (page 10)
- Bolsover District (page 12)
- Chesterfield Borough (page 14)
- Derbyshire Dales District (page 15)
- Erewash Borough (page 15)
- High Peak Borough (page 17)
- North East Derbyshire District (page 19)
- South Derbyshire District (page 22)

45 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table B1 on pages 35 – 41 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### Amber Valley Borough

46 Amber Valley is located in the east of the county. The borough is wholly parished and is semi-rural in nature with a number of small towns and settlements. Amber Valley currently comprises 10 single-member divisions, two of which would have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average by 2017. Under a council size of 64 members the borough is allocated 10 members, as at present.

47 In formulating our draft recommendation for the borough, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals, subject to a minor modification in the Codnor area. Most notably, we also proposed a two-member Alfreton & Somercotes division. The draft recommendations proposed that Amber Valley be represented by eight single-member divisions and one two-member division with none of the proposed divisions having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

48 Following the publication of the draft recommendations, 33 submissions were received for Amber Valley in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. These were in relation the draft recommendations in Codnor and the proposed two-member Alfreton & Somercotes division.

### Codnor

49 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 27 submissions opposing the proposed Ripley East & Codnor and Heanor Central divisions. This was on the basis of the village of Waingroves being split between the proposed divisions of Ripley East & Codnor and Heanor Central. Respondents argued that the village clearly looks toward Ripley rather than Heanor and should therefore be included in the proposed Ripley East & Codnor division.

50 We received good evidence of a shared community identity relating to Waingroves. Ripley and Codnor town councils, and a number of local residents, cited medical services, places of worship, and amenities and facilities used by residents within Waingroves either within the village or within Ripley. This was also supported by the Labour Group, which stated 'residents of Waingroves look towards Ripley rather than Heanor as their shopping, leisure and administrative centre'.

51 Given the evidence of community identity received we therefore propose Waingroves be wholly included in the proposed Ripley East & Codnor division. Consequently, the proposed Ripley East & Codnor and Heanor Central divisions would have 9% and 2% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. Overall, this would not represent a change in electoral equality in this area.

### **Alfreton & Somercotes**

52 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received seven submissions commenting on the proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division. This was in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. Respondents' views on the proposed division were mixed.

53 Alfreton Town Council, Somercotes Parish Council and QualitySolicitors Chapman & Chubb all supported the proposed division as it would avoid a split of Somercotes parish. The County Council, Amber Valley Conservative Association, Amber Valley District Councillor Kevin Buttery (Kilburn, Denby & Holbrook ward), Ironville Parish Councillor Jack Brown and Nigel Mills MP (Amber Valley) opposed the proposed two-member Alfreton & Somercotes division. They argued that it would not provide for effective and convenient local government and could cause confusion for the electorate.

54 Much of the opposition to the proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division was based on a general objection to multi-member divisions.

55 The Amber Valley Conservative Association and Councillor Buttery both proposed single-member division patterns in this area. Both respondents proposed the status quo be retained with a modification to include polling district AWP within a single-member Alfreton & Somercotes division. However, while this would avoid a split of Somercotes parish, it would result in a split of Alfreton parish.

56 Parish Councillor Brown proposed a single-member division pattern based on existing district wards. His proposal comprised a single-member division to include Ironville & Riddings and Swanwick district wards. This division would have 5% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. However, the resultant single-member Alfreton & Somercotes division would have 15% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

57 The County Council reiterated its initial proposal which would split Somercotes parish but did not provide any evidence of community identity to support this division pattern.

58 In the absence of evidence to support moving away from the proposed two-member Alfreton & Somercotes division, we are therefore confirming our draft

recommendations for this division as final. We note that both Alfreton Town Council and Somercotes Parish Council support the proposed division which, in our view, provides the best balance between the statutory criteria in this area.

59 Amber Valley Conservative Association proposed an alternative division name for Alfreton & Somercotes. The Association proposed the names Cotes Park or Leabrooks which they considered to be more reflective of the constituent areas of this division. However, we note Alfreton and Somercotes are the main settlements within the proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division. We have therefore not adopted this alternative division name as part of our final recommendations.

60 We received no further comments on our draft recommendations in Amber Valley Borough. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final subject to the above modification in Codnor. Under our final recommendations no division in the borough would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

61 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in Amber Valley. The final recommendations for Amber Valley are shown on Map 1 and Map 5b accompanying this report.

## Bolsover District

62 The district of Bolsover is located in the north-east of the county. The district is wholly parished and is largely rural with the main settlements of Barlborough, Bolsover, Clowne, Normanton and Shirebrook. The geography and the contours of the district, and its proximity to the county boundary, result in poor communication links across the district.

63 Bolsover currently comprises six single-member divisions, five of which would have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average by 2017. Under a council size of 64 members the district is allocated six members, as at present.

64 In formulating our draft recommendations for the district, we broadly adopted the Labour Group's proposals, subject to a minor modification to follow ground detail and changes to proposed division names. The draft recommendations proposed that Bolsover be represented by six single-member divisions with none of the proposed divisions having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

65 Following publication of the draft recommendations, five submissions were received for Bolsover in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34.

66 The County Council proposed a number of modifications to the proposed division pattern in the district. The Labour Group endorsed the draft recommendations, as did Tibshelf Parish Council and South Normanton Parish Council. Bolsover District Council also supported the draft recommendations for the district subject to a name change and changes to the parish electoral arrangements for South Normanton parish. These are discussed in paragraph 168.

### **Bolsover Village**

67 During consultation on the draft recommendations, the County Council reiterated its initial proposed division pattern. The County Council also argued that the proposed modification between the Barlborough & Clowne and Bolsover North divisions would not follow ground detail and would separate the settlement of Stanfree from Oxcroft to its south. However, we remain confident that the proposed boundary does follow ground detail in following field lines and paths. While the proposed boundary would separate Stanfree from Oxcroft, it does not split either settlement.

68 The Bolsover Constituency Labour Party proposed Bolsover North and Bolsover South divisions be named Bolsover North West, Elnton & Whitwell and Bolsover South West & Scarcliffe respectively. These names were proposed under the Labour Group's initial division pattern.

69 The Bolsover Constituency Labour Party argued these division names would provide a better reflection of the areas they comprised. However, we have not received any evidence of community identity to support moving away from the division names adopted as part of the draft recommendations. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations in this area as final.

### **South Normanton**

70 The County Council again reiterated its initial proposal in this area and was supported by the Bolsover Conservative Party. However, the Council's proposed division pattern would result in arbitrary boundaries and divisions with poor internal communication links. The Bolsover Constituency Labour Party proposed a two-member division comprising the proposed South Normanton & Pinxton and Tibshelf divisions. They argued that a two-member division would better reflect the communities in this area.

71 We have not received any evidence of community identity to support either of the alternative proposals. We therefore consider the draft recommendations to provide the best balance between the statutory criteria and confirm the draft recommendations for Bolsover as final.

72 Bolsover District Council proposed the existing division name South Normanton East & Tibshelf be retained. However, we consider this to be confusing as the adjacent division also contains South Normanton within the title. We have therefore not adopted this proposed division name as part of the final recommendations.

73 We received no further comment on our draft recommendation in Bolsover district and therefore confirm our draft recommendations for the district as final. Under our final recommendations no division would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

74 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in Bolsover. The final recommendations for Bolsover are shown on Map 1, Map 4a and Map 5a accompanying this report.

## Chesterfield Borough

75 The borough of Chesterfield is largely urban with the market town of Chesterfield and the smaller towns of Brimington and Staveley. The borough is surrounded by the districts of Amber Valley and North East Derbyshire and, with the exception of the parishes of Brimington and Staveley, is unparished.

76 Chesterfield currently comprises nine single-member divisions, five of which would have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average by 2017. Under a council size of 64 members the borough is allocated nine members, as at present.

77 In formulating our draft recommendation for the borough, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals, subject to a number of modifications to improve electoral equality and to follow clear ground detail. The draft recommendations proposed that Chesterfield be represented by nine single-member divisions with none of the proposed divisions having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

78 Following publication of the draft recommendations, two submissions were received for Chesterfield in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. The County Council endorsed the draft recommendations. The Labour Group, Chesterfield Borough Council and Councillor Sharon Blank (Spire division) also endorsed the draft recommendations subject to a modification.

### **Chesterfield town**

79 The Labour Group, Chesterfield Borough Council and Councillor Blank proposed that polling district PA1 should be wholly included in the proposed Loundsley Green & Newbold division. It was also proposed that polling district PA3 be included in the proposed Spire division. Polling district PA1 comprises the housing estate locally known as the Highbury estate which, under the draft recommendations, would be split between divisions. Similarly, the respondents argued that the main communication routes for residents within polling district PA3 is via Sheffield Road, hence the proposal for this area to be included within the proposed Spire division.

80 We noted the respondents' concerns regarding the Highbury estate. However, our proposed division pattern would provide an appropriate divide of this urban area. Furthermore, the area of the Highbury estate that is included in the proposed Spire division seemingly looks to its south with its primary access route being Highfield Road. With regard to the area within polling district PA3, we consider that the primary access route for this area is Highfield View Road rather than Sheffield Road.

81 In the absence of evidence of community identity to support the proposed modifications, we have not adopted these proposals as part of our final recommendations.

82 The County Council brought to our attention an anomaly of 72 electors in Annesley Close who should be included in the proposed Spire division. This has a minor effect on electoral equality giving the proposed Birdholme division 11% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. However, we propose a minor modification to the north-east of this area to transfer Penmore Gardens and

Penmore Lane from the proposed Birdholme division to the proposed Spire division. This modification would reflect the access routes for these properties and improve the electoral equality of Birdholme division to 9% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. Consequently, Spire division would have 10% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

83 We received no further comment on our draft recommendations in Chesterfield borough. Subject to the minor modification discussed above, we therefore confirm our draft recommendations in Chesterfield as final. Under our final recommendations no division would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

84 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in Chesterfield. The final recommendations for Chesterfield are shown on Map 1, Map 2b and 3 accompanying this report.

## Derbyshire Dales District

85 The district of Derbyshire Dales is located in the west of the county and is wholly parished. The district is rural in nature with the market towns of Ashbourne, Bakewell, Matlock and Wirksworth as the most populous settlements. The northern half of the district is largely covered by the Peak District National Park.

86 Derbyshire Dales currently comprises six single-member divisions, one of which would have an electoral variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2017. Under a council size of 64 members the district is allocated six members, as at present.

87 In formulating our draft recommendation for the district, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals. The draft recommendations proposed that the district be represented by six single-member divisions with none of the proposed divisions having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

88 Following the publication of the draft recommendations, two submissions were received for Derbyshire Dales in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. The County Council and the Labour Group wholly endorsed the draft recommendations for Derbyshire Dales, as did the Derbyshire Dales Conservative Association and Derbyshire Dales District Council.

89 We received no further comment on our draft recommendation in Derbyshire Dales District and therefore confirm our draft recommendations for the district as final. Under our final recommendations no division would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

90 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in Derbyshire Dales. The final recommendations for Derbyshire Dales are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## Erewash Borough

91 The borough of Erewash is located in the south-east of the county. The borough is largely rural with the towns of Ilkeston, Long Eaton and Sandiacre and a number of scattered settlements. The borough is largely parished with the exception of the towns of Ilkeston and Long Eaton.

92 Erewash currently comprises nine single-member divisions, four of which would have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average by 2017. Under a council size of 64 members the district is allocated nine members, as at present.

93 In formulating our draft recommendation for the borough, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals. The draft recommendations proposed that Erewash be represented by nine single-member divisions with none of the proposed divisions having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

94 Following the publication of the draft recommendations, 12 submissions were received for Erewash in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. The County Council endorsed the draft recommendations subject to a name change. The Labour Group broadly endorsed the draft recommendations with the exception of Ilkeston town.

### **Ilkeston town**

95 During the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received eight submissions in relation to this area. Some respondents supported the proposed division pattern in Ilkeston town, arguing it would reflect community identities. However, some respondents, including the Labour Group, proposed Ilkeston town form a three-member division to reflect shared community identities.

96 Respondents provided evidence to support a shared community identity within Ilkeston town in support of a three-member division comprising the whole town. The Labour Group added our draft recommendations would split the Kirk Hallam housing estate between the proposed Ilkeston West and Ilkeston South divisions. It also stated that it was not possible to travel from the northern corner of the proposed Ilkeston West division to the south western corner without leaving the division.

97 We acknowledge the shared community identity within Ilkeston town. However, adopting a three-member division in this area would have an electorate of almost 30,000 electors by 2017. We had serious concerns about the provision of effective and convenient local government in a division comprising that many electors and we have decided not to adopt this proposal as part of our final recommendations.

98 We note the Labour Group's concerns regarding the split of the Kirk Hallam estate. However, this is not uncommon in urban areas and the division follows a clear boundary formed by Kenilworth Drive. We also examined the Labour Group's comments regarding access routes in this area. However, we do not concur with the Labour Group's assertions. The eastern boundary of Ilkeston West division runs via the middle of Heanor Road and Bath Street and therefore provides clear access from the north to the south of the proposed division. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendations for Ilkeston town as final.

## **Breadsall**

99 The County Council and Erewash Borough Councillor Chris Corbett (Wilsthorpe ward) proposed Breadsall division be named West Hallam to better reflect the constituent settlements of the proposed division. Similarly, Councillor Carol Hart (Breadsall & West Hallam division) proposed the existing name of Breadsall & West Hallam be retained.

100 Given Breadsall and West Hallam are the largest settlements in this division, we have decided to adopt the name Breadsall & West Hallam as part of the final recommendations.

101 Dale Abbey Parish Council also proposed alternative parish electoral arrangements for the parish. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section of this report.

102 We received no further comment on our draft recommendations for Erewash Borough. Subject to the proposed division name change discussed above, we therefore confirm our draft recommendations in Erewash as final. Under our final recommendations no division would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

103 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in Erewash. The final recommendations for Erewash are shown on Map 1, Map 5c, Map 6a and Map 6b accompanying this report.

## **High Peak Borough**

104 The borough of High Peak is located in the north-west of the county. The borough is rural in nature and largely covered by the Peak District National Park. Consequently, much of the borough's terrain is moorland. The borough is sparsely populated with the market towns of Glossop and Buxton as the main settlements. Aside from the towns of Glossop and Buxton, the borough is wholly parished.

105 High Peak currently comprises eight single-member divisions, one of which would have an electoral variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2017. Under a council size of 64 members the borough is allocated eight members, as at present.

106 In formulating our draft recommendations for the borough, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals in High Peak, subject to an alternative division pattern in Glossop town where we proposed a two-member Glossop & Charlesworth division. The draft recommendations proposed that High Peak be represented by six single-member divisions and one two-member division with only one of the proposed divisions, Whaley Bridge, having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

107 Following the publication of the draft recommendations, five submissions were received for High Peak in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. The County Council opposed the proposed two-member Glossop & Charlesworth division while the Labour Group supported this division. The Labour Group did, however, oppose the draft recommendations for Buxton. A local resident

commented on the proposed division pattern within Glossop town but conceded no alternatives were apparent in this instance.

### **Glossop town**

108 During consultation on the draft recommendations, the County Council, the High Peak Conservative Association, Glossopdale Branch Labour Party and a local resident all opposed the proposed two-member Glossop & Charlesworth division. Much of the opposition to the proposed Glossop & Charlesworth division was based on a general objection to multi-member divisions.

109 The County Council reiterated its initial proposal and opposed the two-member division as potentially confusing for the electorate. The County Council also expressed concern at the proposed division not providing effective and convenient local government due to its size, nor reflecting community identities.

110 Contrary to our rationale for proposing a two-member division in this area, the County Council argued that reasonable communication links could be achieved through a single-member division pattern. However, we continued to have concerns regarding the County Council's proposal for a "doughnut" shaped Glossop North & Rural division centred on Glossop town. Under the County Council's proposed division pattern, there would be no direct access between the eastern area of Glossop town and the western area of the division without leaving the division itself.

111 The High Peak Conservative Association and the Glossopdale Branch Labour Party similarly proposed two single-member divisions be adopted in Glossop town. However, despite opposing the proposed two-member Glossop & Charlesworth division, the Glossopdale Branch Labour Party conceded the communication links within the County Council's proposed Glossop North & Rural division to be 'somewhat tortuous'.

112 Despite the opposition to the proposed Glossop & Charlesworth division, we do not consider that we have received new evidence or viable alternative division patterns to justify departing from the draft recommendations. We believe that the proposed Glossop & Charlesworth division provides the best balance between the statutory criteria and therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

### **Buxton**

113 Councillor Pam Reddy (Buxton North & East division) and a local resident endorsed the proposals for Buxton. The Labour Group opposed the proposed division pattern in this area, and proposed a modification between our proposed Buxton West and Buxton North & East divisions which, it argued, would avoid a split of Hartington Upper Quarter parish and Burbage district ward. However, we do not feel we have received sufficient evidence of community identities to support moving away from the draft recommendations in this instance. We also note that the draft recommendations for this area were supported by a number of other respondents. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Buxton as final.

114 We received no further comment on our draft recommendations in High Peak Borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations only one division, Whaley Bridge, would have an electoral

variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

115 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in High Peak. The final recommendations for High Peak are shown on Map 1 and Map 5d accompanying this report.

## **North East Derbyshire District**

116 North East Derbyshire District is located in the north-east of the county and virtually surrounds the borough of Chesterfield. The district is rural in nature with the main towns of Dronfield, Clay Cross, Killamarsh and Wingerworth. Elsewhere, the district is sparsely populated by scattered villages. The district is wholly parished.

117 In formulating our draft recommendation for the district, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals with the exception of those relating to Dronfield town where we formulated an alternative division pattern to better reflect the statutory criteria. The draft recommendations proposed that North East Derbyshire be represented by eight single-member divisions with three of the proposed divisions having electoral variances of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

118 Following the publication of the draft recommendations, 46 submissions were received for North East Derbyshire in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34. These were in relation to the draft recommendations for Eckington, Grassmoor and North Wingfield. Respondents opposed the draft recommendations in these areas, arguing the proposed division pattern would split the respective communities.

### **Dronfield town and Eckington**

119 During consultation on the draft recommendations we received 20 submissions in relation to Eckington, including a petition of approximately 200 signatures. Respondents were opposed to the split of Eckington town. The Labour Group and Natascha Engel MP also opposed the split of Eckington.

120 Under the draft recommendations, Eckington parish would be split between the proposed Apperknowle and Killamarsh & Spinkhill divisions. The proposed Apperknowle division would comprise the eastern area of Dronfield parish, Unstone parish and the western area of Eckington parish. The proposed Killamarsh & Spinkhill division would comprise the remaining area of Eckington parish and Killamarsh parish.

121 Respondents argued that Eckington was a cohesive community and had no commonality with the surrounding areas with which it would comprise the respective divisions. A local resident stated Eckington 'has its own shopping facilities, civic centre, leisure centre and doctors' surgeries' and added 'there is no public transport between Eckington and Apperknowle/Unstone'. In a joint submission, the parish councils of Eckington and Killamarsh added 'the centre of Eckington is a community hub for the parish with shops, newsagents, post office, library, swimming pool and community centre. It is where Eckington people come together yet the proposal separates it from the residential area of the village'.

122 A number of respondents, including the parish councils and Natasha Engel MP, proposed a two-member division comprising Eckington and Killamarsh parishes to address the split of Eckington. However, we noted that respondents argued Unstone parish, which under the draft recommendations would be in a division with the western area of Eckington, shared no commonality or direct public transport links with the town.

123 North East Derbyshire District Councillor Janet Hill (Unstone ward) argued Unstone looks to Dronfield to its west rather than Eckington to its east. Councillor Hill stated 'residents use the doctors and dentists in Dronfield. There is a regular bus service to Dronfield. There is also the Dronfield and Unstone Joint Burial Committee. Residents use Dronfield Sports Centre. Unstone and the other main village Apperknowle has no community connection with Eckington. The residents cannot even catch a direct bus service to visit Eckington'. This evidence was supported by the Labour Group in its submission.

124 In re-examining our draft recommendations, we toured Eckington and observed it to be a cohesive community. The B6056 and the B6052 provide clear communication links between the Coal Aston area of Dronfield town to Eckington. Eckington also shares strong communication links with Killamarsh via the B6053 and 6058. While the split of Eckington would not follow an arbitrary boundary, we noted it would nonetheless run via the apparent centre of the town.

125 Given the evidence of community identity and our observations of the area, we propose an alternative division pattern in this area. We propose a two-member division comprising the parishes of Eckington and Killamarsh and a revised Dronfield East division that includes Unstone parish as part of our final recommendations.

126 A two-member Eckington & Killamarsh division would have equal to the number of electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. Including Unstone parish in the proposed Dronfield East division would result in the division having 4% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

127 During consultation on the draft recommendations, Dronfield Town Council proposed alternative parish electoral arrangements for the parish which are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section of this report.

### **Clay Cross town, Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick and North Wingfield**

128 During the consultation on the draft recommendations, the proposed Clay Cross North, Clay Cross South and Sutton divisions were opposed by respondents on the basis of Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick and North Wingfield parishes being divided between divisions. Respondents also opposed the urban/rural mix within these proposed divisions. The Labour Group and Natascha Engel MP (North East Derbyshire) were also opposed to the division pattern on this basis.

129 We received nine submissions, including a petition of approximately 350 signatures, in opposition to the split of Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick parish between the proposed Clay Cross North and Sutton divisions. Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick Parish Council argued the proposed division pattern would 'break local ties', stating that under the proposals the parish's community centre and doctors'

surgery would be in Sutton division while the school would lie within Clay Cross North division.

130 Similarly, we received 11 submissions, including a petition of 14 signatures, in opposition to the split of North Wingfield parish between the proposed Clay Cross South and Sutton divisions.

131 North Wingfield Parish Council argued that the proposed division pattern would 'undermine community identity' and provided evidence of shared clubs, services, amenities and facilities. The Parish Council provided some evidence about the local shops, pubs, social clubs, a parent and toddler group, scouts, guides and football teams that are in the village and used by local residents.

132 Given the opposition to the proposed division pattern in this area, we toured both areas to observe the proposed division boundaries on the ground. We considered both areas to be cohesive communities. However, we also noted that reasonable communication links exist between the respective settlements and the areas of Clay Cross town to which they would be linked under the draft recommendations.

133 We noted that the settlement of Grassmoor, which would be in the proposed Clay Cross North division under our draft recommendations, is linked to Clay Cross town via Hagg Hill, Queen Victoria Road and the A61 but appeared to share only limited community identities with Clay Cross town. Under the draft recommendations, the proposed boundary between Clay Cross North and Sutton would run via the rear of properties within Grassmoor. While we did not feel this was an arbitrary boundary, we acknowledge it would run via a residential area of Grassmoor.

134 We considered North Wingfield to have stronger and more direct communication links with Clay Cross town via the A6175. We also noted North Wingfield is served by the number 54 bus that runs via Hasland, Grassmoor and North Wingfield before terminating in Clay Cross. The proposed boundary between Clay Cross South and Sutton would provide a reasonably natural and clear division of North Wingfield.

135 Based on the evidence received and our observations on tour, we gave serious consideration to adopting an alternative division pattern in this area. We first considered the alternative proposals submitted during the consultation on the draft recommendations. Natascha Engel MP proposed a two-member division based on district wards. However, this would have a knock-on effect on the surrounding divisions. Councillor Kevin Gillott (North Wingfield & Tupton division) and the Labour Group also proposed an alternative division pattern, largely based on existing district wards. However, this too would have a knock-on effect on the surrounding divisions in the south of the district and beyond the proposed divisions of Clay Cross North, Clay Cross South and Sutton.

136 We also investigated other alternative division patterns for this area. However, such alternatives would also have knock-on effects on other divisions and would not address the concerns expressed about the urban/rural mix of our proposed divisions.

137 On balance, we are therefore confirming our draft recommendations in this area as final. We are content that our draft recommendations for this area strike the right balance between our statutory criteria, having regard to the wider division pattern in this part of the district.

### **Wingerworth & Shirland**

138 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received four submissions in relation to the proposed Wingerworth & Shirland division. The County Council and the North East Derbyshire Conservative Association also commented on the proposed division names.

139 Councillor Barry Lewis (Stonebroom & Pilsley division) endorsed the proposed division. However, Shirland & Higham Parish Council opposed it, arguing that it would not reflect community identities and would not reflect communication links. A local resident opposed the division as considered it too geographically large and questioned if the constituent settlements have a shared community identity.

140 We acknowledge the geographic size of the proposed Wingerworth & Shirland division. However, this is not unusual in sparsely populated rural areas. Furthermore, we have not received any substantive evidence to prompt us to depart from the draft recommendations.

141 The County Council, Councillor Lewis and the North East Derbyshire Conservative Association all proposed the Wingerworth & Shirland division be named Brackenfield to further reflect the constituent areas of the proposed division. However, we did not receive any evidence to support such a change. Furthermore, a local resident supported the proposed division name while another local resident questioned the merits of adopting the division name of Brackenfield. We have therefore not adopted this alternative division name as part of the draft recommendations.

142 We received no further comments on our draft recommendations in North East Derbyshire. Subject to our proposed modification in Eckington, we therefore confirm our draft recommendations in North East Derbyshire as final. Under our final recommendations only one division, Wingerworth & Shirland, would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

143 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in North East Derbyshire. The final recommendations for North East Derbyshire are shown on Map 1, Map 2a and Map 4b accompanying this report.

### **South Derbyshire District**

144 South Derbyshire District is located in the south of the county. The district is largely rural with the main towns of Hilton, Melbourne and Swadlincote. Elsewhere, the district is sparsely populated in scattered villages. The district is wholly parished, with the exception of Swadlincote town.

145 South Derbyshire currently comprises seven single-member divisions, four of which would have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average by

2017. Under a council size of 64 members the borough is allocated eight members, one more than at present.

146 In formulating our draft recommendation for the district, we broadly adopted the County Council's proposals, subject to a minor modification in Swadlincote and Repton. The draft recommendations proposed that South Derbyshire be represented by eight single-member divisions with no divisions having an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

147 Following the publication of the draft recommendations, one submission was received for South Derbyshire in addition to the county-wide comments discussed in paragraph 34.

148 The County Council and the Labour Group proposed a minor modification to transfer Stanton by Bridge parish from the proposed Melbourne division to Aston division. The Labour Group stated this modification would reflect public transport links and shared community identities. The Labour Group proposed a further modification to transfer Ingleby and Foremark parishes from the proposed Aston division to the Etwall & Repton division. Both modifications were supported by a local resident.

149 We consider these proposals to better reflect the apparent community focus of settlements in this area as well as reflecting communication links. They would also have a negligible impact on electoral equality. We have therefore adopted these modifications as part of our final recommendations.

150 Consequently, the proposed Aston, Etwall & Repton and Melbourne divisions would have 5% more, 4% more and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

151 A local resident proposed Melbourne division be named Melbourne & Hartshorne. However, we did not receive any evidence to support adopting this proposal. We have therefore not adopted this alternative division name as part of our final recommendations.

152 We received no further comment on our draft recommendation in South Derbyshire. Subject to the modifications discussed above, we therefore confirm our draft recommendations in South Derbyshire as final. Under our final recommendations no division would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

153 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in South Derbyshire. The final recommendations for South Derbyshire are shown on Map 1 and Map 6c accompanying this report.

# Conclusions

154 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table B1 on pages 35–41, and illustrated on the large maps we have produced. The outline map which accompanies this report shows our final recommendations for the whole authority. It also shows a number of boxes for which we have produced more detailed maps. These maps are also available to be viewed on our website.

155 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2011 and 2017 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2011	2017
Number of councillors	64	64
Number of electoral divisions	61	61
Average number of electors per councillor	9,414	9,751
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	9	2
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Final recommendation**

Derbyshire County Council should comprise 64 councillors serving 61 divisions, as detailed and named in Table B1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

156 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

157 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the district council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

158 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Codnor, Dale Abbey, Dronfield,

Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick, Hartington Upper Quarter, North Wingfield, Ockbrook & Borrowash, Old Bolsover, South Normanton and Staveley.

159 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Codnor parish.

**Final recommendation**

Codnor Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Codnor (returning nine members) and Crosshill & East (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5b.

160 During consultation on the draft recommendations, Dale Abbey Parish Council proposed it return eight parish councillors, two fewer than at present, with an alternative allocation of parish councillors. As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we therefore propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Dale Abbey parish based on the Parish Council's proposals.

**Final recommendation**

Dale Abbey Parish Council should return eight councillors, two fewer than at present, representing three wards: Dale Abbey Village (returning three members), Ladywood (returning two members) and Kirk Hallam (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5c.

161 During consultation on the draft recommendations, Dronfield Town Council proposed alternative parish electoral arrangements for the parish to combine the proposed Bowshaw and North parish wards and the proposed Coal Aston East and Coal Aston West parish wards. This was to achieve a better allocation of parish councillors between wards. However, as discussed in paragraph 156, the Commission is required to ward Dronfield parish to ensure coterminosity with the proposed division boundaries and existing district ward boundaries. We must therefore confirm our draft recommendations for parish electoral arrangements in Dronfield as final.

162 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we therefore propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Dronfield parish.

**Final recommendation**

Dronfield Town Council should return 19 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Bowshaw (returning one member), Coal Aston East (returning two members), Coal Aston West (returning one member), Dronfield Woodhouse (returning two members), Gosforth East (returning one member), Gosforth Valley (returning four members), North (returning three members) and South (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2a.

163 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick parish.

**Final recommendation**

Grassmoor, Hasland & Winswick Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hasland & Winswick (returning seven members) and Grassmoor (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4b.

164 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Hartington Upper Quarter parish.

**Final recommendation**

Hartington Upper Quarter Parish Council should return six councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hartington Upper Quarter West (returning three members) and Hartington Upper Quarter East (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5d.

165 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for North Wingfield parish.

**Final recommendation**

North Wingfield Parish Council should return 10 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Central (returning four members), East (returning one member) and West (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4b.

166 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Ockbrook & Borrowwash parish.

**Final recommendation**

Ockbrook & Borrowwash Parish Council should return 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Borrowwash East (returning four members), Borrowwash West (returning four members) and Ockbrook (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 6a.

167 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Old Bolsover parish.

**Final recommendation**

Old Bolsover Town Council should return 12 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: North (returning one member), Central (returning three members), East (returning four members) and West (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4a.

168 During consultation on the draft recommendations, Bolsover District Council proposed South Normanton parish return 13 parish councillors, one fewer than at present, with an alternative allocation of parish councillors. As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we therefore propose revised parish electoral arrangements for South Normanton parish based on the District Council's proposals.

**Final recommendation**

South Normanton Parish Council should return 13 councillors, one fewer than at present, representing three wards: Central (returning three members), East (returning three members) and West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5a.

169 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Staveley parish.

**Final recommendation**

Staveley Parish Council should return 17 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Barrow Hill (returning two members), Duckmanton (returning two members), Hollingwood (returning two members), Inkersall Green (returning two members), Lowgates (returning two members), Middlecroft (returning four members), Poolsbrook (returning one member) and Woodthorpe (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3.



### 3 What happens next?

170 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Derbyshire County Council in 2013.

#### Equalities

171 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Derbyshire

172 The following maps illustrate our proposed division boundaries for Derbyshire County Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Derbyshire County Council.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2a** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Dronfield town.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2b** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Chesterfield town.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Staveley.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4a** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Old Bolsover.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4b** illustrates in outline form the proposed division boundaries in Grassmoor and North Wingfield.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5a** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in South Normanton.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5b** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Codnor.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5c** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Ilkeston town.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5d** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Hartington Upper Quarter.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6a** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Ockbrook & Borrowash.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6b** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Long Eaton.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6c** illustrates the proposed division boundaries in Swadlincote town.

# Appendix A

## Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010

Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish Council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'
Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England

Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

## Appendix B

**Table B1: Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
Amber Valley Borough								
1	Alfreton & Somercotes	2	19,955	9,978	6%	20,386	10,193	5%
2	Alport & Derwent	1	9,647	9,647	2%	9,749	9,749	0%
3	Belper	1	8,935	8,935	-5%	9,439	9,439	-3%
4	Duffield & Belper South	1	9,146	9,146	-3%	9,343	9,343	-4%
5	Greater Heanor	1	9,600	9,600	2%	10,269	10,269	5%
6	Heanor Central	1	9,673	9,673	3%	9,919	9,919	2%
7	Horsley	1	10,059	10,059	7%	10,309	10,309	6%
8	Ripley East & Codnor	1	10,340	10,340	10%	10,605	10,605	9%

**Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
9	Ripley West & Heage	1	10,629	10,629	13%	10,754	10,754	10%
Bolsover District								
10	Barlborough & Clowne	1	8,827	8,827	-6%	9,092	9,092	-7%
11	Bolsover North	1	10,415	10,415	11%	10,679	10,679	10%
12	Bolsover South	1	9,967	9,967	6%	10,529	10,529	8%
13	Shirebrook & Pleasley	1	8,889	8,889	-6%	9,213	9,213	-6%
14	South Normanton & Pinxton	1	9,915	9,915	5%	10,258	10,258	5%
15	Tibshelf	1	9,950	9,950	6%	10,421	10,421	7%
Chesterfield Borough								
16	Birdholme	1	8,995	8,995	-4%	8,918	8,918	-9%

**Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
17	Boythorpe & Brampton South	1	8,164	8,164	-13%	8,751	8,751	-10%
18	Brimington	1	9,813	9,813	4%	9,889	9,889	1%
19	Loundsley Green & Newbold	1	9,265	9,265	-2%	9,413	9,413	-3%
20	Spire	1	7,740	7,740	-18%	8,816	8,816	-10%
21	St Mary's	1	9,691	9,691	3%	9,722	9,722	0%
22	Staveley	1	9,317	9,317	-1%	9,344	9,344	-4%
23	Staveley North & Whittington	1	9,686	9,686	3%	9,812	9,812	1%
24	Walton & West	1	8,362	8,362	-11%	8,741	8,741	-10%
<b>Derbyshire Dales District</b>								
25	Ashbourne	1	9,471	9,471	1%	9,583	9,583	-2%

**Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
26	Bakewell	1	10,256	10,256	9%	10,375	10,375	6%
27	Derwent Valley	1	9,599	9,599	2%	9,855	9,855	1%
28	Dovedale	1	9,529	9,529	1%	9,637	9,637	-1%
29	Matlock	1	8,762	8,762	-7%	9,856	9,856	1%
30	Wirksworth	1	10,290	10,290	9%	10,427	10,427	7%
<b>Erewash Borough</b>								
31	Breadsall & West Hallam	1	9,214	9,214	-2%	9,318	9,318	-4%
32	Breaston	1	10,236	10,236	9%	10,343	10,343	6%
33	Ilkeston East	1	9,745	9,745	4%	10,179	10,179	4%
34	Ilkeston South	1	8,863	8,863	-6%	9,098	9,098	-7%
35	Ilkeston West	1	9,248	9,248	-2%	9,784	9,784	0%
36	Long Eaton	1	9,235	9,235	-2%	9,791	9,791	0%

**Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
37	Petersham	1	9,635	9,635	2%	9,937	9,937	2%
38	Sandiacre	1	9,303	9,303	-1%	9,493	9,493	-3%
39	Sawley	1	9,316	9,316	-1%	9,461	9,461	-3%
High Peak Borough								
40	Buxton North & East	1	8,906	8,906	-5%	9,678	9,678	-1%
41	Buxton West	1	9,672	9,672	3%	10,060	10,060	3%
42	Chapel & Hope Valley	1	9,225	9,225	-2%	9,514	9,514	-2%
43	Etherow	1	8,507	8,507	-10%	8,777	8,777	-10%
44	Glossop & Charlesworth	2	17,451	8,726	-7%	17,997	8,999	-8%
45	New Mills	1	9,889	9,889	5%	10,201	10,201	5%

**Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
46	Whaley Bridge	1	8,345	8,345	-11%	8,608	8,608	-12%
North East Derbyshire District								
47	Clay Cross North	1	8,699	8,699	-8%	9,605	9,605	-2%
48	Clay Cross South	1	9,591	9,591	2%	9,975	9,975	2%
49	Dronfield East	1	9,994	9,994	6%	10,130	10,130	4%
50	Dronfield West & Walton	1	10,562	10,562	12%	10,597	10,597	9%
51	Eckington & Killamarsh	2	19,254	9,627	2%	19,435	9,718	0%
52	Sutton	1	9,837	9,837	4%	10,023	10,023	3%
53	Wingerworth & Shirland	1	10,802	10,802	15%	10,871	10,871	11%
South Derbyshire District								
54	Aston	1	8,616	8,616	-8%	10,215	10,215	5%

**Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Derbyshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
55	Etwall & Repton	1	9,513	9,513	1%	10,180	10,180	4%
56	Hilton	1	9,300	9,300	-1%	9,482	9,482	-3%
57	Linton	1	8,620	8,620	-8%	9,442	9,442	-3%
58	Melbourne	1	8,994	8,994	-4%	9,399	9,399	-4%
59	Swadlincote Central	1	9,397	9,397	0%	9,552	9,552	-2%
60	Swadlincote North	1	9,353	9,353	-1%	9,475	9,475	-3%
61	Swadlincote South	1	8,257	8,257	-12%	9,361	9,361	-4%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>602,466</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>624,085</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,414</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,751</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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