

Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Rotherham

Report to The Electoral Commission

August 2003

© Crown Copyright 2003

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 Electoral Commission 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. 348

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee For England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	13
2 Current electoral arrangements	15
3 Draft recommendations	19
4 Responses to consultation	21
5 Analysis and final recommendations	23
6 What happens next?	39
Appendices	
A Final recommendations for Rotherham: Detailed mapping	41
B Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order	43
C First draft of electoral change Order for Rotherham	45

What is The Boundary Committee for England?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of The Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) were transferred to The Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 3692). The Order also transferred to The Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Robin Gray
Joan Jones CBE
Ann M. Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Rotherham.

Summary

We began a review of the electoral arrangements for Rotherham on 8 May 2002. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 11 February 2003, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation. We now submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations that we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

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

- **in 13 of the 22 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the borough average and seven wards vary by more than 20% from the average;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 13 wards and by more than 20% in eight wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 75–76) are that:

- **Rotherham Borough Council should have 63 councillors, three fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 21 wards, one less than at present;**
- **the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net decrease of one, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each borough councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In one of the proposed 21 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10% from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Aston cum Aughton, Bramley, Dalton, Maltby, Thrybergh, Thurcroft and Wickersley.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 8 October 2003. The information in the representations will be available for public access once the Order has been made.

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Fax: 020 7271 0667

**Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk
(This address should only be used for this purpose)**

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
1	Anston & Woodsetts	3	Unchanged (the parishes of North and South Anston and Woodsetts)	4, 5 and 7
2	Boston Castle	3	Part of Boston ward; part of Central ward; part of Park ward	1 and 3
3	Brinsworth & Catcliffe	3	The parishes of Brinsworth and Catcliffe; part of Boston ward	3
4	Dinnington	3	The parishes of Dinnington St John's, Firbeck, Gildingwells, Laughton-en-le-Morthen, Letwell; the proposed Thurcroft South parish ward of Thurcroft parish	4, 5 and 7
5	Holderness	3	The proposed Aston cum Aughton North and Aston cum Aughton South parish wards of Aston cum Aughton parish	4 and 6
6	Hooper	3	The parishes of Brampton, Bierlow and Wentworth; part of Brampton, Melton and Wentworth ward	1
7	Keppel	3	Part of Kimberworth ward; Thorpe Hesley ward	1 and 3
8	Maltby	3	The parish of Hooton Levitt; the proposed Maltby East parish ward of Maltby parish	4 and 5
9	Rawmarsh	3	Part of Central ward; part of Greasbrough ward; part of Rawmarsh East ward; part of Rawmarsh West ward	1 and 2
10	Rother Vale	3	The parishes of Orgreave, Treeton and Ulley; the proposed Aston cum Aughton West parish ward of Aston cum Aughton parish; the proposed Thurcroft North parish ward of Thurcroft parish	3, 4 and 6
11	Rotherham East	3	Part of Herringthorpe ward; part of Park ward	1, 2, 3 and 4
12	Rotherham West	3	Part of Central ward; part of Kimberworth ward	1 and 3
13	Silverwood	3	The parishes of Hooton Roberts and Ravenfield; the proposed Bramley North parish of Bramley parish; the proposed Dalton East Parish ward of Dalton parish; the proposed Thrybergh North parish ward of Thrybergh parish; part of Herringthorpe ward; part of Rawmarsh East ward	2 and 4
14	Sitwell	3	Whiston parish; part of Broom ward	3 and 4
15	Swinton	3	Part of Rawmarsh East ward; part of Swinton ward; part of Wath ward	2
16	Valley	3	The proposed Dalton West parish ward of Dalton parish; the proposed Thrybergh South parish ward of Thrybergh parish; part of Boston ward; part of Broom ward; part of Herringthorpe ward; part of Park ward	2, 3 and 4
17	Wales	3	The existing Kiveton Park ward (the parishes of Harthill and Woodall, Thorpe Salvin, Todwick and Wales)	4, 6 and 7
18	Wath	3	Part of Brampton, Melton and Wentworth ward; part of Swinton ward; part of Wath ward	1 and 2

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
19	Wickersley North	3	The proposed Bramley North parish ward of Bramley parish; the proposed Dalton South parish ward of Dalton parish; the proposed Wickersley North parish ward of Wickersley parish	4
20	Wickersley South	3	The proposed Bramley South parish ward of Bramley parish; the proposed Maltby West parish ward of Maltby parish; the proposed Wickersley South parish ward of Wickersley parish	4 and 5
21	Wingfield	3	Part of Greasbrough ward; part of Kimberworth ward; part of Thorpe Hesley ward	1

Notes: 1 The borough contains twenty-nine parishes and the unparished area of Rotherham.

2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.

3 We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.

Table 2: Final recommendations for Rotherham

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Anston & Woodsetts	3	9,224	3,075	-1	9,011	3,004	-3
2	Boston Castle	3	9,582	3,194	3	9,446	3,149	1
3	Brinsworth & Catcliffe	3	9,367	3,122	1	9,222	3,074	-1
4	Dinnington	3	8,929	2,976	-4	9,237	3,079	-1
5	Holderness	3	9,616	3,205	4	9,753	3,251	5
6	Hooper	3	8,479	2,826	-9	9,051	3,017	-3
7	Keppel	3	9,487	3,162	2	9,380	3,127	1
8	Maltby	3	9,575	3,192	3	9,518	3,173	2
9	Rawmarsh	3	9,732	3,244	5	9,513	3,171	2
10	Rother Vale	3	8,153	2,718	-12	9,419	3,140	1
11	Rotherham East	3	9,679	3,226	4	9,505	3,168	2
12	Rotherham West	3	9,579	3,193	3	9,356	3,119	0
13	Silverwood	3	8,648	2,883	-7	9,302	3,101	0
14	Sitwell	3	9,693	3,231	4	9,536	3,179	2
15	Swinton	3	9,386	3,129	1	9,247	3,082	-1
16	Valley	3	9,277	3,092	0	9,361	3,120	0
17	Wales	3	8,454	2,818	-9	8,426	2,809	-10
18	Wath	3	9,466	3,155	2	9,415	3,138	1
19	Wickersley North	3	9,636	3,212	4	9,399	3,133	1
20	Wickersley South	3	9,206	3,069	-1	9,212	3,071	-1
21	Wingfield	3	9,694	3,231	4	9,464	3,155	2
	Totals	63	194,862	-	-	195,773	-	-
	Averages	-	-	3,903	-	-	3,108	-

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

1 Introduction

1 This report contains our final recommendations for the electoral arrangements for the borough of Rotherham. We are reviewing the four metropolitan boroughs in South Yorkshire as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. The programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Rotherham. Rotherham's last review was carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1978 (Report no. 306).

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.
- The general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1996 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to:
 - eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
 - promote equality of opportunity; and
 - promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Rotherham was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Periodic Electoral Reviews*. This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the borough.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the borough as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10% in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20% or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that whatever council size interested parties may propose to us, they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. 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 electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of the council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit to the number of councillors which can be returned from each metropolitan borough ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan borough wards currently return three

councillors. Where our recommendation is for multi-member wards, we believe that the number of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, other than in very exceptional circumstances. Numbers in excess of three could lead to an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

9 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 8 May 2002, when we wrote to Rotherham Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified South Yorkshire Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Yorkshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the borough, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire & the Humber Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 27 August 2002. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our final recommendations.

10 Stage Three began on 11 February 2003 with the publication of the report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Rotherham*, and ended on 7 April 2003. During this period, comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 Current electoral arrangements

11 The borough of Rotherham lies on the southeastern edge of South Yorkshire. Comprising a mix of urban towns and rural villages, Rotherham has good road and rail links with the rest of South Yorkshire and the north. The electorate of the borough is 194,862 (December 2001). The Council presently has 66 members who are elected from 22 wards. All wards are three-member wards. The borough contains 29 parishes.

12 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,953 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 2,966 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 13 of the 22 wards varies by more than 10% from the borough average, seven wards by more than 20% and four wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley ward, where the councillor represents 64% more electors than the borough average.

13 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

Map 1: Existing wards in Rotherham

Table 3: Existing electoral arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Anston & Woodsetts	3	9,224	3,081	4%	9,011	3,004	1%
2	Aston, Orgreave & Ulley	3	11,912	3,971	34%	12,523	4,174	41%
3	Boston	3	7,708	2,569	-13%	7,568	2,523	-15%
4	Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley	3	14,500	4,833	64%	14,537	4,846	63%
5	Brampton, Melton & Wentworth	3	7,354	2,451	-17%	7,875	2,625	-12%
6	Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton	3	10,462	3,487	18%	10,602	3,534	19%
7	Broom	3	7,892	2,631	-11%	7,777	2,592	-13%
8	Central	3	5,890	1,963	-34%	5,814	1,938	-35%
9	Dalton, Hooton Roberts, & Thrybergh	3	10,253	3,418	16%	10,953	3,651	23%
10	Greasbrough	3	6,961	2,320	-21%	6,801	2,267	-24%
11	Herringthorpe	3	6,367	2,122	-28%	6,272	2,091	-30%
12	Kimberworth	3	8,506	2,835	-4%	8,339	2,780	-6%
13	Kiveton Park	3	8,454	2,818	-5%	8,426	2,809	-5%
14	Maltby	3	13,328	4,443	50%	13,195	4,398	48%
15	Park	3	7,010	2,337	-21%	6,848	2,283	-23%
16	Rawmarsh East	3	7,429	2,476	-16%	7,291	2,430	-18%
17	Rawmarsh West	3	8,201	2,734	-7%	8,097	2,699	-9%
18	St John's	3	9,034	3,011	2%	9,339	3,113	5%
19	Swinton	3	9,070	3,023	2%	8,891	2,964	0%
20	Thorpe Hesley	3	8,657	2,886	-2%	8,548	2,849	-4%
21	Thurcroft & Whiston	3	8,047	2,682	-9%	8,489	2,830	-5%
22	Wath	3	8,603	2,868	-3%	8,577	2,859	-4%
	Totals	66	194,862	-	-	195,773	-	-
	Averages	-	-	2,953	-	-	2,966	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Rotherham Borough Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Central ward were relatively over-represented by 34%, while electors in Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley ward were relatively under-represented by 64%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 Draft recommendations

14 During Stage One, four representations were received, including a borough-wide scheme from Rotherham Borough Council, and representations from Aston cum Aughton Parish Council, Thorpe Salvin Parish Council and a local resident. The Council proposed reducing its size by three members, to 63, representing 21 wards.

15 After carefully considering all representations received during Stage One, we were content to recommend a reduction in council size of three members to 63 councillors. We based our draft recommendations entirely on the Borough Council's proposals. We proposed that:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 66 to a council of 63 members;
- there should be 21 wards;
- the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries.

Draft recommendation

Rotherham Borough Council should comprise 63 councillors, serving 21 wards.

16 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards varying by no more than 10% from the borough average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no wards varying by more than 10% from the average by 2006.

4 Responses to consultation

17 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, 20 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Rotherham Borough Council.

Rotherham Borough Council

18 The Borough Council gave its full support for our draft recommendations.

Elected members and political groups

19 Denis MacShane, Member of Parliament for Rotherham, raised concern over the Corus Steel Works being removed from his constituency. Councillor Richardson, member for Thrybergh, Dalton & Hooton Roberts ward, opposed our draft recommendations for Thrybergh, and offered support for Thrybergh Parish Council's submission. Councillors St John and Stonebridge, both representing Anston & Woodsetts ward, argued against the ward being renamed Lindrick ward. Both preferred to retain the existing ward name. Brinsworth, Catcliffe and Treeton Ward Labour Party offered full support for our draft recommendations.

Parish and Town Councils

20 Anston Parish Council opposed the renaming of Anston & Woodsetts ward as Lindrick ward. It preferred retaining the existing ward name. Aston cum Aughton Parish Council supported our draft recommendations, however proposed a minor boundary amendment to unite the Swallownest area. It further made comments about its internal electoral arrangements. Brinsworth Parish Council and Catcliffe Parish Council both opposed the renaming of Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton ward as Waverley ward. Both preferred the name of Brinsworth & Catcliffe ward. Ravenfield Parish Council proposed that Ravenfield would have been better placed in a ward with Bramley rather than Hooton Roberts. It further argued that changing the number of councillors representing each ward would allow a better reflection of communities.

Other representations

21 A further eight representations were received in response to our draft recommendations. A local resident opposed the division of the parish of Thrybergh. The vicar of St John's church in Kimberworth Park opposed the division of the Kimberworth Park area, however making no specific counter proposals. A local resident of Wickersley proposed transferring the roads around Wignal Avenue and Marcliff Lane from Valley ward into Wickersley ward. A local resident of Wath-on-Dearne proposed three ward name changes. A local resident of Wickersley opposed the renaming of Wickersley South ward as Hellaby ward, preferring the retention of Wickersley South ward. A local resident of Brinsworth opposed the renaming of Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton ward as Waverley ward. He proposed the ward name of Brinsworth & Catcliffe. Two residents of the Highfield Estate opposed its transferral from Swinton ward into Wath ward. Both preferred to remain in Swinton ward.

5 Analysis and final recommendations

22 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Rotherham is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended): the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being 'as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough'.

23 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the next five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

24 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

25 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

26 Our recommendations do not affect county, district or parish external boundaries, local taxes, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that these recommendations will have an adverse effect on house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Electorate forecasts

27 Since 1975 there has been a 10% increase in the electorate of Rotherham borough. The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 1% from 194,862 to 195,773 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Rothervale ward, although a significant amount is also expected in Silverwood ward. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to unitary development plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, we stated in our draft recommendations report that we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

28 During Stage Three, we received no comments on the electoral forecasts provided by the Council and remain satisfied that these represent the best estimates that could be made and are content to base our final recommendations on them.

Council size

29 Rotherham Borough Council presently has 66 members. At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed a council of 63 members, a reduction of three. It recognised that, with the introduction of new political management arrangements, there was a need to review council size. It felt that it was important to consider how changes in council size would affect the broader representational roles of councillors and how councillors work within their respective areas.

30 The decision by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council to propose a council size of 63 was reached following careful consideration of different options for council size and further consideration of the implications of different council size in the rural and urban areas of the borough, in order to ensure that electors in the rural and urban areas of Rotherham have equal access to a councillor.

31 In outlining political management arrangements, the Council highlighted scrutiny panels, the performance and scrutiny overview committee and the executive and non-executive roles of councillors. The Council considered that in the light of the new political management arrangements and to ensure that members have the capacity to fulfil their representational roles it would need a council size of at least 60. Upon giving further consideration to the distribution of councillors in urban and rural areas it concluded that the council would best function with 63 members.

32 In view of the consensus from the council, the detailed argumentation that we received and our own study of the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, we concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 63 members.

33 We received no comments on our proposed reduction in council size of three members during Stage Three and, given the general levels of overall support received, are therefore content to confirm a council size of 63 as final.

Electoral arrangements

34 As detailed previously, we based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals as we considered that they struck the best balance in meeting our statutory criteria.

35 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. After considering those representations, we are broadly confirming our draft recommendations for Rotherham as final, subject to two minor boundary amendments and the renaming of four wards. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- i. Brampton, Melton & Wentworth, Swinton and Wath wards (pages 24,25);
- ii. Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley, Dalton, Hooton Roberts & Thrybergh and Rawmarsh East wards (pages 26, 27);
- iii. Anston & Woodsetts, Maltby and St John's wards (pages 27,28);
- iv. Aston, Orgreave & Ulley, Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton and Kiveton Park wards (pages 29, 30);
- v. Boston, Broom, Park and Thurcroft & Whiston wards (page 30);
- vi. Central, Herringthorpe and Kimberworth wards (pages 30,31);
- vii. Greasbrough, Rawmarsh West and Thorpe Hesley wards (pages 31,32).

36 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Brampton, Melton & Wentworth, Swinton and Wath wards

36 These three wards cover the north of the borough. Brampton, Melton & Wentworth ward comprises the parishes of Brampton Bierlow and Wentworth and an unparished area. Wath and Swinton wards are unparished. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Brampton, Melton & Wentworth, Swinton and Wath wards is 17% below, 2% above and 3% below the borough average currently (12% below, equal to and 4% below by 2006).

37 At Stage One, the Council proposed slightly revised warding arrangements based predominantly on the existing ward arrangements. The proposed Hooper ward would retain the existing Brampton, Melton & Wentworth ward boundary to its south. To the east, the proposed boundary would follow Brook Dike, Packman Road, along Wentworth Road and Harding Road then follow the pathway behind Clay Hill. Its proposed Wath ward would comprise the majority of the current Wath ward but include the area of the current Brampton, Melton & Wentworth ward to the east of Brooks Dike. Its boundary in the south with Swinton ward would follow Roman Ridge Dyke, a pathway behind Golden Smithies Lane and St Mary's Crescent, continuing south behind the houses on Church Road and along Park Road and Woodlands Crescent. Where Woodlands Crescent meets Rockingham Road, the boundary would continue southwards along the A663, Warren Vale. Swinton ward would retain the majority of the existing ward. However, its boundary with Wath ward would be amended as stated previously. In the east and south east, the proposed boundary would follow along the River Don, to the north of Hooton Road where it would continue in a westerly direction to the north of Springfield Road. From here it would continue south along the railway line and then west to the corner of Sandalwood Rise, where the boundary would follow an easterly direction along Wentworth Road, before continuing south along the railway line to where it meets Colliers Brook, and would continue west along Colliers Brook before proceeding west along Wentworth Road towards Swinton Common. Under the Borough Council's scheme, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Hooper, Swinton and Wath wards would be 9% below, 1% above and 2% above the borough average initially (3% below, 1% below and 1% above by 2006).

38 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we proposed adopting the Borough Council's proposals without modification. We considered that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities, while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries. Our draft recommendations provided identical levels of electoral equality as under the Borough Council's proposals. The proposed Hooper ward contained the parishes of Brampton, Bierlow and Wentworth; Swinton ward contained part of Rawmarsh East ward, part of Swinton ward, part of Wath ward and Wath ward contained part of Brampton, Melton & Wentworth ward, part of Swinton ward and part of Wath ward.

39 During Stage Three, we received three representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. Two residents of the Highfield Estate opposed our draft recommendations to transfer the area from Swinton ward into Wath ward. One of the residents enclosed a petition to this effect. Both residents argued that the Council had not included this proposal in its original consultation document, and that the residents of the Highfield Estate share more community identity with Swinton than with Wath. One of the residents further supported the inclusion of St Margaret's Parish Church in Swinton ward. A local resident proposed renaming Swinton ward as Swinton Locks ward and Wath ward as Manvers ward.

40 Having considered the representations received regarding these wards, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations as final. We note the opposition to the transferral of the Highfield Estate from Swinton to Wath ward, but we do not consider that sufficient argumentation was received to justify us amending our draft recommendations for this boundary. We also note that the electoral variance in both wards would deteriorate to 8% below the borough average (in Wath ward) and 8% above (in Swinton ward) Similarly, we consider that we have not received

sufficient evidence of local support for the renaming of both Swinton and Wath wards, and are of the opinion that the existing names better reflect the constituent communities of the wards. We have also noted the full support for our draft recommendations received from the Borough Council. We therefore propose confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

41 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Hooper, Swinton and Wath wards would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley, Dalton, Hooton Roberts & Thrybergh and Rawmarsh East wards

42 These three wards are located in the northeast and east of the borough. Dalton, Hooton Roberts & Thrybergh ward comprises the parishes of Dalton, Hooton Roberts and Thrybergh. Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley ward comprises the parishes of Bramley, Ravenfield and Wickersley. Rawmarsh East ward is unparished. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley, Dalton, Hooton Roberts & Thrybergh and Rawmarsh East wards is 64% above, 16% above and 16% below the borough average currently (63% above, 23% above and 18% below by 2006).

43 In this area the Council proposed a slightly revised warding pattern based mainly on the existing arrangements. The southern boundary of its proposed Silverwood ward would follow the railway line and continue west behind Wayford Avenue, along Lidget Lane, north along Moor Lane South and continue around the back of the houses along Crescent East and the Crescent West, taking in the area comprising Belvedere Parade and Holyrood Rise. It would also include part of Dalton parish to the south of Holling's Lane. The boundary would then follow Vale Road, Poplar Avenue and south along Doncaster Road. Its western boundary would include the unparished areas of the current Herringthorpe and Rawmarsh East wards to the east of Clay Pit Lane and St Nicholas Road and to the north of Kilnhurst Road. The proposed Wickersley ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Silverwood ward and in the east of the ward would follow the M18 and continue west along the A631 Bawtry Road. The boundary to the west of the ward would continue behind the houses on Marcliff Crescent, continuing through Brecks plantation and following Hilltop Lane. The proposed Hellaby ward would comprise the area of the current Bramley, Ravenfield & Wickersley ward to the south of the A631 Bawtry Road and to the east of the M18. It would also comprise an area of Maltby parish. The boundary would follow Dale Hill Road, continuing south behind the houses on Trueman Green, Frobisher Grove and Columbus Way, until it meets Lilly Hall Road. From Lilly Hall Road the boundary would continue behind the school as far as Larch Plantation and continue towards Rotherham Road, behind the houses on Oak Road and Lilac Grove. Under the Borough Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Hellaby, Silverwood and Wickersley wards would be 1% below, 7% below and 3% above the borough average respectively and 2% below, equal to and 1% above the borough average by 2006.

44 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we adopted the Borough Council's proposals without modification, as we considered that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities, while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries. Under our draft recommendations Hellaby ward would comprise the proposed Bramley South parish ward of Bramley parish; the proposed Maltby West parish ward of Maltby parish; the proposed Wickersley South parish ward of Wickersley parish; Silverwood ward would cover the parishes of Hooton Roberts and Ravenfield; the proposed Bramley South parish of Bramley parish; the proposed Dalton East Parish ward of Dalton parish; the proposed Thrybergh North parish ward of Thrybergh parish; part of Herringthorpe ward; part of Rawmarsh East ward; and Wickersley ward would comprise the proposed Bramley North parish ward of Bramley parish; the proposed Dalton parish ward of

Dalton parish; the proposed Wickersley North parish ward of Wickersley parish. Our draft recommendations provide identical levels of electoral equality as under the Borough Council's proposals.

45 During Stage Three we received six representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. Thrybergh Parish Council, Councillor Richardson and a local resident all opposed our draft recommendations for the Thrybergh area. The Parish Council argued that our draft recommendations would split the parish in half, and cause confusion for the electorate. It proposed that Thrybergh South parish ward be transferred into Silverwood ward, and that an area of Herringthorpe or Dalton East parish ward be transferred into Valley ward, in order to 'balance out numbers'. However, it made no specific proposals regarding boundaries. Councillor Richardson supported the Parish Council's proposals.

46 Ravenfield Parish Council opposed our draft recommendations for its parish, stating it 'would have been better placed with Bramley... whereas Hooton Roberts is a community with few links to Ravenfield'. It also argued that the number of elected councillors per ward should be altered to accommodate community concerns. A local resident of Wickersley proposed uniting both sides of Wignall Avenue in Wickersley ward as it is divided under the current arrangements and our draft recommendations. He further contended that those roads to the immediate west of Wignall Avenue (Marcliff Close, Marcliff Lane and Palmhollow Close) would be better represented in Wickersley ward. Another local resident of Wickersley opposed the proposed ward name of Hellaby ward, asserting that Wickersley South would better reflect the area, in terms of historic significance and community identity.

47 After carefully considering all representations received during Stage Three, we propose confirming our draft recommendations as final, subject to two amendments. We agree that the residents of Wignall Avenue, Marcliff Close, Marcliff Lane and Palmhollow Close would be better represented in a Wickersley ward, and intend proposing an amended boundary to the north of these roads accordingly. This has a negligible effect on electoral equality. We also concur that the ward name of Hellaby does not best reflect the area covered by the ward. We note that Wickersley forms the largest community in both Wickersley and Hellaby wards, and intend renaming these wards as Wickersley North and Wickersley South wards, respectively.

48 Having considered those representations received from interested parties in Thrybergh and Ravenfield, we do not intend moving away from our draft recommendations. While we consider that the division of Thrybergh parish is not ideal, we note that this proposal was locally generated at Stage One. We also note that no specific alternative was proposed, and that reuniting the Thrybergh area in Silverwood ward would result in electoral variances of 15% above the borough average and 14% below the borough average in Silverwood and Valley wards by 2006. We do not consider that the evidence provided at Stage Three justifies these levels of electoral inequality. Similarly, in the Ravenfield area, we note that the only counter proposal provided was to alter the number of elected members per ward. As detailed previously, under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 the number of councillors that is returned from each metropolitan borough ward must be divisible by three and, in practice, all metropolitan borough wards currently return three councillors. We have also noted the full support for our draft recommendations received from the Borough Council. We therefore do not propose amending our draft recommendations for this area.

49 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Silverwood ward would be the same as under our draft recommendations. The number of electors per councillor in Wickersley North and Wickersley South wards would be 4% above and 1% below the borough average initially (1% above and 1% below the borough average by 2006). Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Anston & Woodsetts, Maltby and St John's wards

50 These three wards are located in the west and southwest of the borough. Maltby ward comprises the parish of Maltby, St John's ward comprises the parishes of Dinnington St John's, Firbeck, Gildingwells, Hooton Levitt, Laughton-en-le-Morthen and Laughton parish ward of Thurcroft parish. Anston & Woodsetts comprises the parishes of North & South Anston and Woodsetts. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Anston & Woodsetts, Maltby and St John's wards is 4% above, 50% above and 2% above the borough average currently (1% above, 48% above and 5% above by 2006).

51 The Council proposed revised warding arrangements in this area. It proposed that the parish of Hooton Levitt be combined with that part of the parish of Maltby not to be included within its proposed Hellaby ward. Neighbouring Dinnington ward would retain all of its boundaries, with a minor alteration in the southwest of the ward, where the boundary would follow Laughton Road, continue down the dismantled railway line, then head west along Laughton Common Road where it meets with the existing boundary. It proposed that Anston & Woodsetts ward be maintained upon its current boundaries but be renamed Lindrick ward. Under the Borough Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Dinnington, Lindrick and Maltby wards would be 4% below, 1% below and 3% above the borough average initially and 1% below, 3% below and 2% above the borough average by 2006.

52 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we proposed adopting the Borough Council's proposals without modification, as we considered that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries. Under our draft recommendations Dinnington ward would cover the parishes of Dinnington St John's, Firbeck, Gildingwells, Laughton-en-le-Morthen, Letwell and the proposed Thurcroft South parish ward of Thurcroft parish; Lindrick ward comprises the parishes of North & South Anston and Woodsetts and Maltby ward covers the parish of Hooton Levitt and the proposed Maltby East parish ward of Maltby parish. The levels of electoral equality under our draft recommendations would be identical to those provided under the Borough Council's proposals.

53 During Stage Three we received four representations regarding these wards. Anston Parish Council, Councillor St John and Councillor Stonebridge all proposed that the name of Anston & Woodsetts be retained, rather than changed to Lindrick ward. A local resident proposed that Maltby ward be renamed Roche Abbey ward.

54 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage Three, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations as final, subject to the renaming of Lindrick ward as Anston & Woodsetts. We agree that this name provides a better reflection of the constituent communities of the ward. However, we consider that there is little evidence that the renaming of Maltby ward as Roche Abbey would better reflect the constituent community of the ward. We therefore intend retaining the name of Maltby as part of our final recommendations. We have also noted the full support for our draft recommendations received from the Borough Council.

55 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Dinnington and Maltby wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. The number of electors per councillor in Anston & Woodsetts ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations for Lindrick ward. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Aston, Orgreave & Ulley, Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton and Kiveton Park wards

56 These three wards are situated in the south and southwest of the borough. Kiveton Park ward comprises the parishes of Harthill with Woodhall, Thorpe Salvin, Todwick and Wales. Aston, Orgreave & Ulley ward comprises the parishes of Aston cum Aughton, Orgreave and Ulley and Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton ward comprises the parishes of Brinsworth, Catcliffe and Treeton. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Aston, Orgreave & Ulley, Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton and Kiveton Park wards is 34% above, 18% above and 5% below the borough average currently (41% above, 19% above and 5% below by 2006). Aston, Orgreave & Ulley ward covers the parishes of Aston cum Aughton, Orgreave and Ulley. Brinsworth, Catcliffe & Treeton ward comprises the parishes of the same names. Kiveton Park ward covers the parishes of Harthill with Woodall, Thorpe Salvin, Todwick and Wales.

57 At Stage One, the Borough Council's proposed Wales ward would comprise the existing Kiveton Park ward in its entirety. Its proposed Waverley ward would comprise the parishes of Brinsworth and Catcliffe. Its proposed Holderness ward would comprise part of the parish of Aston cum Aughton. The boundary would follow Chesterfield Road until it meets the A618 Aughton Road, where it would continue behind the school and houses on Springwood Avenue and Coral Road and proceed along the footpath to Penny Hill Lane. The remainder of the parish would be combined with the parishes of Orgreave, Treeton and Ulley and part of Thurcroft to form the proposed Rother Vale ward. Under the Borough Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Holderness, Rother Vale, Wales and Waverley wards would be 3% above, 11% below, 9% below and 1% above the borough average respectively (4% above, 2% above, 10% below and 1% below the borough average by 2006).

58 In addition to the Borough Council's proposal, we also received a representation from Aston cum Aughton Parish Council objecting to the proposed division of its parish between the proposed Holderness and Rother Vale ward which, it argued, would divide the Swallowneast community. It proposed that the number of borough wards be reduced to 19 and that the whole of this community be included within one ward. When formulating our draft recommendations we noted that these proposals would give an electoral variance of 12% under our proposed council size of 63, whereas adopting the Borough Council's scheme allowed for better electoral equality. Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the Borough Council's proposals without modification. We considered that these revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities, while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries. Under our draft recommendations, Holderness ward would comprise the proposed Aston cum Aughton North and Aston cum Aughton South parish wards of Aston cum Aughton parish; Wales ward covers the parishes of Harthill and Woodall, Thorpe Salvin, Todwick and Wales; and Waverley ward comprises the parishes of Brinsworth and Catcliffe as well as an unparished area. Rother Vale ward would be unparished. The levels of electoral equality under our draft recommendations would be identical to those provided under the Borough Council's proposals.

59 We received four representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. Aston cum Aughton Parish Council proposed amending the boundary between Holderness ward and Rother Vale ward, in order to unite the Swallowneast area in Holderness ward. It further made comments on its internal electoral arrangements, to be discussed later in this report. Brinsworth Parish Council, Catcliffe Parish Council and a local resident all argued against the proposed ward name of Waverley, preferring Brinsworth & Catcliffe ward. Brinsworth, Catcliffe and Treeton Ward Labour Party offered full support for our draft recommendations.

60 Having considered the representations received during Stage Three, we propose amending the boundary in the Swallowneast area, in order to unite the town centre in Holderness ward. We agree that this would provide a better reflection of the community in the area. Similarly, we

concur that the ward name of Waverley does not best reflect the constituent communities of the ward, and propose renaming the ward as Brinsworth & Catcliffe. Subject to these amendments, we intend confirming our draft recommendations as final. We have also noted the full support for our draft recommendations received from the Borough Council.

61 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Holderness and Rother Vale wards would be 4% above and 12% below the borough average respectively (5% and 1% above by 2006). The number of electors per councillor in Brinsworth & Catcliffe ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations for Waverley ward, and the number of electors per councillor in Wales ward would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Boston, Broom, Park and Thurcroft & Whiston wards

62 These four wards are situated in the centre and east of the borough. Thurcroft & Whiston ward comprises the parish of Whiston and Thurcroft and Brampton parish wards of Thurcroft parish, while Boston, Broom and Park wards are all unparished. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Boston, Broom, Park and Thurcroft & Whiston wards is 13% below, 11% below, 21% below and 9% below the borough average currently (15% below, 13% below, 23% below and 5% below by 2006). Thurcroft & Whiston ward comprises the parishes of the same names. Boston, Broom and Park wards are unparished.

63 At Stage One the Council proposed creating two new wards. The boundary in the north of Waverley ward would follow the footpath behind the golf course in the current Boston ward. The northern boundary of the proposed Boston Castle ward would follow the Trans Pennine Trail footpath towards the football ground and continue along the A630 Centenary Way, in the north of the ward. The eastern boundary would follow the A633 on to St Ann's Lane, down Middle Lane and on to the A6021, proceeding along Broom Lane, continuing behind the houses in front of the Sheffield laboratories and continuing southwards along the A618 where it joins the existing boundary. The proposed Sitwell ward would share this boundary in the northern part of the ward and would include the parish of Whiston. Under the Borough Council's scheme, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Boston Castle and Sitwell wards would be 3% above and 4% above the borough average respectively, and 1% above and 2% above the borough average by 2006.

64 In addition to the Borough Council's proposals, a further representation was received from a local resident, who suggested the creation of a new Whiston and South West Rotherham ward, so that Whiston would no longer have to share councillors with Thurcroft. Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the Borough Council's proposals without modification. We considered that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries. Under our draft recommendations the parish of Whiston would be situated in Sitwell ward. The remainder of the area covered by these wards is unparished.

65 During Stage Three, we received no representations regarding these wards. However, we have noted the full support for our draft recommendations by the Borough Council. We therefore propose confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final. Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Boston Castle and Sitwell wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Central, Herringthorpe and Kimberworth wards

66 These three wards are situated in the centre and east of the borough. Kimberworth, Central, Herringthorpe and Broom wards are all unparished. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Central, Herringthorpe and Kimberworth wards is 34% below, 28% below and 4% below the borough average currently (35% below, 30% below and 6% below by 2006). These three wards are unparished.

67 At Stage One the Council proposed a revised warding arrangement in this area. The eastern boundary of the proposed Rotherham West ward would be shared with neighbouring Boston Castle ward as described earlier and the northern boundary would proceed behind the back of the houses on Barber Balk Road, along Green Lane and down on to Winter Hill Lane. This boundary would continue behind the school, along Meadowhill Road, behind the houses on Churchfields, following on towards Kimberworth Park Road, where the boundary includes the area comprising Kiln Road and Ten Acre Road, before proceeding along the path that runs parallel with Bassingthorpe Lane. The proposed Rotherham East ward would retain its existing boundary to the north and share its western boundary with neighbouring Boston Castle ward, as described previously. The eastern ward boundary would follow the A6123 and continue behind the houses on Tennyson Road, behind the houses on Browning Road and along Middle Lane South. This would also act as the western boundary of the proposed Valley ward. To the north and east Valley ward would share a boundary with Silverwood ward, as described previously and to the south share a boundary with the Hellaby and Sitwell wards. Under the Borough Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Rotherham East, Rotherham West and Valley wards would be 4% above, 3% above and 1% above the borough average respectively (2% above, equal to and 1% above the borough average by 2006).

68 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we adopted the Borough Council's proposals without modification as we considered that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities, while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries.

69 During Stage Three, one representation was received regarding these wards. The vicar of St John's Church in Kimberworth Park opposed our draft recommendations for this area, arguing that there had been no consultation and that the division of the Kimberworth area had a detrimental affect on the levels of funding received by the area. However, no specific counter proposals were offered. Having considered the wards in the area in question, and in light of the lack of opposition following our own consultation, we do not intend departing from our draft recommendations, as no alternative was offered and we remain of the opinion that our draft recommendations strike the best balance to meet our statutory criteria. Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Rotherham East, Rotherham West and Valley wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Greasbrough, Rawmarsh West and Thorpe Hesley wards

70 These three wards are situated in the centre and northeast of the borough. All three wards are unparished. Under the existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Greasbrough, Rawmarsh West and Thorpe Hesley wards is 21% below, 7% below and 2% below the borough average currently (24% below, 9% below and 4% below by 2006). These three wards are unparished.

71 At Stage One the Borough Council's proposed that Keppel ward comprise the majority of the current Thorpe Hesley ward subject to a boundary amendment in the southeast of the ward, where the boundary would follow Winter Hill Lane and Meadowhall Road. Similarly, in the

proposed Wingfield ward the boundaries would be subject to two modifications, with the rest of the ward boundaries remaining unaltered. The modifications relate to where the boundary is shared with Rotherham West ward and Keppel ward and include the existing western boundary of the Greasbrough ward and the area of Keppel ward mentioned above. The proposed Rawmarsh ward would retain its existing boundaries in the south and west. The modified boundary to the east is shared with Silverwood ward. The proposed boundary would follow the railway line and continue west behind Wayford Avenue, along Lidget Lane, north along Moor Lane South and around the back of the houses along the Crescent East and the Crescent West, taking in the area comprising Belvedere Parade and Holyrood Rise. The north of Rawmarsh ward boundary shares a boundary with Hooper ward which would follow the Packman Road, along the Wentworth Road and Harding Road then follow the pathway behind Clay Hill. The southwest tip of Rawmarsh ward shares a boundary with Wingfield ward, which follows Potter Hill and Carr Hill. Under the Borough Council's scheme the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Keppel, Rawmarsh and Wingfield wards would be 2% above, 5% above and 4% above the borough average respectively (1% above, 2% above and 2% above the borough average by 2006).

72 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the Borough Council's proposals without modification. We considered that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities while providing improved levels of electoral equality and strong and easily identifiable boundaries. Our draft recommendations would therefore result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the Council's proposals.

73 During Stage Three, we received no representations regarding these wards. We therefore propose confirming our draft recommendations as final. The number of electors per councillor in Keppel, Rawmarsh and Wingfield wards would be the same as under the Borough Council's Stage One proposals. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Electoral Cycle

74 Under section 7(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, all metropolitan boroughs have a system of elections by thirds.

Conclusions

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

- we propose uniting the Swallownest town centre in Holderness ward to better reflect the community;
- we propose amending the boundary between our proposed Wickersley and Valley wards, in order to better reflect the community;
- we propose renaming Hellaby, Lindrick, Waverley and Wickersley wards as Wickersley South, Anston & Woodsetts, Brinsworth & Catcliffe and Wickersley North wards respectively, in order to better reflect the constituent communities within the ward.

76 We conclude that, in Rotherham:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 66 to 63;
- there should be 21 wards;
- the boundaries of 20 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and two wards should retain their current boundaries.

77 Table 4 (below) shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	66	63	66	63
Number of wards	22	21	22	21
Average number of electors per councillor	2,953	3,093	2,966	3,108
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	13	1	13	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	7	0	8	0

78 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 13 to one. This level of electoral equality would improve further by 2006, with no wards varying by more than 10% from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final recommendation

Rotherham Borough Council should comprise 63 councillors serving 21 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A and the large maps.

Parish and town council electoral arrangements

79 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. Accordingly, as part of our draft recommendations we proposed consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Aston cum Aughton, Bramley, Dalton, Maltby, Thrybergh, Thurcroft and Wickersley to reflect the proposed borough wards.

80 The parish of Aston cum Aughton is currently served by 15 parish councillors and is warded. Aston parish ward returns eight parish councillors and Swallownest parish ward returns seven parish councillors. At Stage One Aston cum Aughton Parish Council suggested that the majority of the community of Swallownest remain in Holderness ward. However, its proposal was not compatible with the Council's scheme and, as a result of adopting the Borough Council's proposed Rother Vale and Holderness wards we did not adopt the Parish Council's proposal. We therefore proposed new parish warding arrangements for the parish of Aston cum Aughton as part of our draft recommendations. We proposed that Aston cum Aughton West parish ward, part of the proposed Rother Vale ward, be represented by three parish councillors and Aston cum Aughton East parish ward, part of the proposed Holderness ward, be represented by 12 parish councillors.

81 During Stage Three, Aston cum Aughton Parish Council proposed an amendment to the borough ward boundary between Rother Vale and Holderness wards, in order to unite the Swallownest town centre, detailed previously. It also proposed that the Aston cum Aughton East

parish ward be divided into two parish wards, Aston cum Aughton North and Aston cum Aughton South which, it claimed, would be ‘far more balanced and administratively prudent’.

82 Having considered the representation received from Aston cum Aughton Parish Council, we intend adopting its proposal to create new Auson-cum-Aughton North and Aston cum Aughton South parish wards in the east of the parish as well as adopting its proposal to include the Swallownest area in Holderness ward at borough level. As a consequence we propose modifying the draft recommendations boundary between Aston cum Aughton North and Aston cum Aughton West parish wards to reflect the borough ward boundaries. We agree that this would provide for more convenient and effective local government, and note that the boundary proposed uses easily identifiable roads.

Final recommendation

Aston cum Aughton Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Aston cum Aughton North (returning seven councillors), Aston cum Aughton South (returning five councillors) and Aston cum Aughton West (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

83 The parish of Bramley is currently served by 15 parish councillors and is not warded. As a result of adopting the Borough Council’s proposed Silverwood, Wickersley and Hellaby wards at borough level, we proposed new parishing arrangements for the parish of Bramley as part of our draft recommendations. We proposed that Bramley North parish ward, part of the proposed Silverwood ward, should be represented by two parish councillors. Bramley Central parish ward, part of the proposed Wickersley ward, should be represented by seven parish councillors, and Bramley South parish ward, part of the proposed Hellaby ward, should be represented by six parish councillors.

84 We received no comments regarding the internal arrangements of Bramley parish during Stage Three, and therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Final recommendation

Bramley Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Bramley North (returning two councillors) Bramley Central (returning seven councillors) and Bramley South (returning six councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

85 The parish of Dalton is currently served by 15 parish councillors and is not warded. As a result of adopting the Borough Council’s proposed Silverwood, Wickersley and Valley wards at borough level, we consequently proposed new parishing arrangements for the parish of Dalton as part of our draft recommendations. Dalton East parish ward, part of the proposed Silverwood ward, should be represented by two parish councillors. We proposed that Dalton South parish ward, part of the proposed Wickersley ward, should be represented by seven parish councillors and Dalton West parish ward, part of the proposed Valley ward, should be represented by seven parish councillors, one more councillor than at present.

86 During Stage Three, we received a representation proposing an amendment to the borough ward boundary between Wickersley (to be renamed Wickersley North) and Valley wards, which we have adopted as part of our final recommendations, detailed previously. This has consequential effects on the parish ward boundary between Dalton South parish ward and Dalton West parish ward. This amendment is shown on the large maps and has no effect on the number of councillors representing each parish ward.

Final recommendation

Dalton Parish Council should comprise 16 parish councillors, one more than at present, representing three wards: Dalton East (returning two parish councillors) Dalton South (returning seven parish councillors) and Dalton West (returning seven parish councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

87 The parish of Maltby is currently served by 18 parish councillors and is warded. Maltby parish ward number one returns four parish councillors, Maltby parish ward number two returns four parish councillors, Maltby parish ward number three returns five parish councillors and Maltby parish ward number four returns five parish councillors. As a result of adopting the Borough Council's proposed Maltby and Hellaby wards at borough level as part of the draft recommendations, we proposed new parishing arrangements for the parish of Maltby. We proposed that Maltby East parish ward, part of the proposed Maltby ward, should be represented by 13 parish councillors. Maltby West parish ward, part of the proposed Hellaby ward, should be represented by five parish councillors.

88 We received no comments regarding the internal arrangements of Maltby parish during Stage Three, and therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Final recommendation

Maltby Parish Council should comprise 18 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Maltby East (returning 13 parish councillors) and Maltby West (returning five parish councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

89 The parish of Thrybergh is currently served by 15 councillors and is not warded. As a result of adopting the Borough Council's proposed Silverwood and Valley wards at borough level, as part of the draft recommendations we proposed new parishing arrangements for the parish of Thrybergh. We proposed that Thrybergh North parish ward, part of the proposed Silverwood ward, should be represented by eight parish councillors, and Thrybergh South parish ward, part of the proposed Valley ward, should be represented by seven parish councillors.

90 We received no comments regarding the internal arrangements of Thrybergh parish during Stage Three, and therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Final recommendation

Thrybergh Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Thrybergh North (returning eight parish councillors) and Thrybergh South (returning seven parish councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

91 The parish of Thurcroft is currently served by 18 parish councillors and is warded. Brampton parish ward returns one parish councillor, Laughton Common parish ward returns three parish councillors and Thurcroft parish ward returns 14 parish councillors. As a result of adopting the Borough Council's proposed Rothervale and Dinnington wards at borough level, we proposed new parishing arrangements for the parish of Thurcroft as part of our draft recommendations. We propose that Thurcroft North parish ward, part of the proposed Rothervale ward, should be represented by 15 parish councillors. Thurcroft South parish ward, part of the proposed Dinnington ward, should be represented by three parish councillors.

92 We received no comments regarding the internal arrangements of Thurcroft parish during Stage Three, and therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Final recommendation

Thurcroft Parish Council should comprise 18 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Thurcroft North (returning 15 parish councillors) and Thurcroft South (returning three parish councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

93 The parish of Wickersley is currently served by 16 parish councillors and is warded. North parish ward returns six parish councillors, South parish ward returns six parish councillors and West parish ward returns four parish councillors. As a result of adopting the Borough Council's proposed Wickersley and Hellaby wards at borough level under the draft recommendations, we propose new parishing arrangements for the parish of Wickersley. We proposed that Wickersley North parish ward, part of the proposed Wickersley ward, should be represented by eight parish councillors. Wickersley South parish ward, part of the proposed Hellaby ward, should be represented by eight parish councillors.

94 We received no comments regarding the internal arrangements of Wickersley parish during Stage Three, and therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Final recommendation

Wickersley Parish Council should comprise 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Wickersley North (returning eight parish councillors) and Wickersley South (returning eight parish councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

Map 2: Final recommendations for Rotherham

6 What happens next?

95 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Rotherham and submitted our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 3692).

96 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 8 October 2003, and The Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made by that date. It particularly welcomes any comments on the first draft of the Order, which will implement the new arrangements.

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

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Fax: 020 7271 0667

**Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk
(This address should only be used for this purpose)**

Appendix A

Final recommendations for Rotherham: Detailed mapping

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Rotherham area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on the large maps.

The **large maps** illustrate the proposed warding arrangements for Rotherham.

Map A1: Final recommendations for Rotherham: Key map

Appendix B

Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order

Preamble

This describes the process by which the Order will be made, and under which powers. Text in square brackets will be removed if The Electoral Commission decide not to modify the Final recommendations.

Citation and commencement

This establishes the name of the Order and when it will come into force.

Interpretation

This defines terms that are used in the Order.

Wards of the borough of Rotherham

This abolishes the existing wards, and defines the names and areas of the new wards, in conjunction with the map and the schedule.

Elections of the council of the borough of Rotherham

This sets the date on which a whole council election will be held to implement the new wards, and the dates on which councillors will retire.

Wards of the parish of ...

This describes how parishes in Rotherham are being changed.

Maps

This requires Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council to make a print of the map available for public inspection.

Electoral registers

This requires the Council to adapt the electoral register to reflect the new wards.

Revocation

This revokes the Order that defines the existing wards, with the exception of the articles that established the system of election by thirds.

Explanatory Note

This explains the purpose of each article. Text in square brackets will be removed if The Electoral Commission decide not to modify the Final recommendations.

Appendix C

First draft of electoral change Order for Rotherham

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

2003 No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND

The Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Changes) Order 2003

Made - - - - *2003*

Coming into force in accordance with article 1(2)

Whereas the Boundary Committee for England(**a**), acting pursuant to section 15(4) of the Local Government Act 1992(**b**), has submitted to the Electoral Commission(**c**) recommendations dated August 2003 on its review of the borough(**d**) of Rotherham:

And whereas the Electoral Commission have decided to give effect [with modifications] to those recommendations:

And whereas a period of not less than six weeks has expired since the receipt of those recommendations:

Now, therefore, the Electoral Commission, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by sections 17(**e**) and 26(**f**) of the Local Government Act 1992, and of all other powers enabling them in that behalf, hereby make the following Order:

Citation and commencement

- 1.—(1) This Order may be cited as the Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Changes) Order 2003.
- (2) This Order, with the exception of articles 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, shall come into force –
 - (a) for the purpose of proceedings preliminary or relating to any election to be held on the ordinary day of elections in 2004, on the day after that on which it is made;

-
- (a) The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, established by the Electoral Commission in accordance with section 14 of the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c.41). The Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (S.I. 2001/3962) transferred to the Electoral Commission the functions of the Local Government Commission for England.
- (b) 1992 c.19. This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962.
- (c) The Electoral Commission was established by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c.41). The functions of the Secretary of State, under sections 13 to 15 and 17 of the Local Government Act 1992 (c.19), to the extent that they relate to electoral changes within the meaning of that Act, were transferred with modifications to the Electoral Commission on 1st April 2002 (S.I. 2001/3962).
- (d) The metropolitan district of Rotherham has the status of a borough.
- (e) This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962 and also otherwise in ways not relevant to this Order.
- (f) This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962.

- (b) for all other purposes, on the ordinary day of elections in 2004.
- (3) Articles 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 shall come into force –
 - (a) for the purpose of proceedings preliminary or relating to the election of a parish councillor for the parishes of Aston cum Aughton, Bramley, Dalton, Maltby, Thrybergh, Thurcroft and Wickersley to be held on the ordinary day of elections in 2007, on 15th October 2006;
 - (b) for all other purposes, on the ordinary day of elections in 2007.

Interpretation

2. In this Order –

“borough” means the borough of Rotherham;

“existing”, in relation to a ward, means the ward as it exists on the date this Order is made;

any reference to the map is a reference to the map marked “Map referred to in the Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Changes) Order 2003”, of which prints are available for inspection at –

- (a) the principal office of the Electoral Commission; and
- (b) the offices of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council; and

any reference to a numbered sheet is a reference to the sheet of the map which bears that number.

Wards of the borough of Rotherham

3.—(1) The existing wards of the borough(a) shall be abolished.

- (2) The borough shall be divided into twenty-one wards which shall bear the names set out in Schedule 1.
- (3) Each ward shall comprise the area designated on the map by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by red lines; and the number of councillors to be elected for each ward shall be three.
- (4) Where a boundary is shown on the map as running along a road, railway line, footway, watercourse or similar geographical feature, it shall be treated as running along the centre line of the feature.

Elections of the council of the borough of Rotherham

4.—(1) Elections of all councillors for all wards of the borough shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004(b)(c).

- (2) The councillors holding office for any ward of the borough immediately before the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004 shall retire on that date and the newly elected councillors for those wards shall come into office on that date.
- (3) Of the councillors elected in 2004 one shall retire in 2006, one in 2007 and one in 2008.
- (4) Of the councillors elected in 2004 –
 - (a) the first to retire shall, subject to paragraphs (6) and (7), be the councillor elected by the smallest number of votes; and
 - (b) the second to retire shall, subject to those paragraphs, be the councillor elected by the next smallest number of votes.

(a) See the Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979 (S.I. 1979/1323).

(b) Article 4 provides for a single election of all the councillors and for reversion to the system of election by thirds, as established by section 7 of the Local Government Act 1972 (c.70).

(c) For the ordinary day of election of councillors of local government areas, see section 37 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2), amended by section 18(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1985 (c.50) and section 17 of, and paragraphs 1 and 5 of Schedule 3 to, the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (c.29).

- (5) In the case of an equality of votes between any persons elected which makes it uncertain which of them is to retire in any year, the person to retire in that year shall be determined by lot.
- (6) If an election of councillors for any ward is not contested, the person to retire in each year shall be determined by lot.
- (7) Where under this article any question is to be determined by lot, the lot shall be drawn at the next practicable meeting of the council after the question has arisen and the drawing shall be conducted under the direction of the person presiding at the meeting.

Wards of the parish of Aston cum Aughton

- 5.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Aston cum Aughton shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into three parish wards which shall bear the names Aston cum Aughton North, Aston cum Aughton South, and Aston cum Aughton West; and the wards shall comprise the areas designated on sheet 3, 4 and 6 by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by orange lines.
 - (3) The number of councillors to be elected for the Aston cum Aughton North parish ward shall be seven, for the Aston cum Aughton South parish ward shall be five, and for the Aston cum Aughton West parish ward shall be three.

Wards of the parish of Bramley

6. The parish of Bramley shall be divided into three parish wards which shall bear the names set out in column (1) of Schedule 2; each parish ward shall comprise the area of the borough ward specified in respect of the parish ward in column (2) of that Schedule, and the number of councillors to be elected for each parish ward shall be the number specified in respect of the parish ward in column (3) of that Schedule.

Wards of the parish of Dalton

7. The parish of Dalton shall be divided into three parish wards which shall bear the names set out in column (1) of Schedule 3; each parish ward shall comprise the area of the borough ward specified in respect of the parish ward in column (2) of that Schedule, and the number of councillors to be elected for each parish ward shall be the number specified in respect of the parish ward in column (3) of that Schedule.

Wards of the parish of Maltby

- 8.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Maltby shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into two parish wards which shall bear the names set out in column (1) of Schedule 4; each parish ward shall comprise the area of the borough ward specified in respect of the parish ward in column (2) of that Schedule, and the number of councillors to be elected for each parish ward shall be the number specified in respect of the parish ward in column (3) of that Schedule.

Wards of the parish of Thrybergh

9. The parish of Thrybergh shall be divided into two parish wards which shall bear the names set out in column (1) of Schedule 5; each parish ward shall comprise the area of the borough ward specified in respect of the parish ward in column (2) of that Schedule, and the number of councillors to be elected for each parish ward shall be the number specified in respect of the parish ward in column (3) of that Schedule.

Wards of the parish of Thurcroft

- 10.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Thurcroft shall be abolished.

- (2) The parish shall be divided into two parish wards which shall bear the names set out in column (1) of Schedule 6; each parish ward shall comprise the area of the borough ward specified in respect of the parish ward in column (2) of that Schedule, and the number of councillors to be elected for each parish ward shall be the number specified in respect of the parish ward in column (3) of that Schedule.

Wards of the parish of Wickersley

- 11.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Wickersley shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into two parish wards which shall bear the names Wickersley North and Wickersley South; and each parish ward shall comprise the area of the borough ward bearing the same name, and the number of councillors to be elected for each parish ward shall be eight.

Parish elections

- 12.—(1) Elections of all parish councillors for the parish[es] of *insert name[s]* shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in *insert year* and every fourth year after *insert same year*.
- (2) The term of office of all parish councillors elected in accordance with any of the paragraphs above shall be four years; and they shall retire on the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in the year of retirement and the newly elected councillors shall come into office on the day on which their predecessors retire.
- (3) The term of office of every parish councillor elected on the ordinary day of election of councillors in *insert year* for the parishes of *insert name(s)* shall be three years [*use this paragraph (3) and (4) below where you are cutting short the term of office of parish councillors where elections have been held*].
- (4) Elections of all parish councillors for the parishes of *insert names as above* shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in *establish new year that elections will be held* and every fourth year after *same year*.
- (5) The ordinary elections of parish councillors for the parishes of *insert names* in *enter year elections are due to take place* shall not take place; and any such parish councillor holding office immediately before *enter the usual retirement date* who would, but for this paragraph, have retired on that date shall, unless he resigns his office or it otherwise becomes vacant, continue to hold office until the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in *enter year*.
- (6) Elections of all parish councillors for the parish of *insert names* shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004, 2006 and every fourth year after 2006.
- (7) The term of office of every parish councillor elected on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004 for the parish of *insert names as above* shall be two years; and each such councillor shall, unless he resigns his office or it otherwise becomes vacant, continue to hold office until the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2006.
- (8) Where any provision of an Order made before the making of this Order requires an election of parish councillors for a parish mentioned in paragraphs *insert relevant paragraphs that establishes an election date for a parish(es)* to be held on a date other than that for which that paragraph provides, it shall cease to have effect to that extent.
- (9) Rule 8 of the Local Elections (Parishes and Communities) Rules 1986(a) (filling of casual vacancies) shall have effect, in the case of a casual vacancy occurring before *insert date 4 days after election date* in the office of a parish councillor for the parishes of *insert names of parishes* as if the references in paragraphs (1) and (4) of that rule to the day on which that councillor would regularly have retired were a reference to *insert same date as above*.

(a) S.I. 1986/2215, to which there are amendments not relevant to this Order.

Maps

13. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council shall make a print of the map marked “Map referred to in the Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Changes) Order 2003” available for inspection at its offices by any member of the public at any reasonable time.

Electoral registers

14. The Electoral Registration Officer(a) for the borough shall make such rearrangement of, or adaptation of, the register of local government electors as may be necessary for the purposes of, and in consequence of, this Order.

Revocation

15. The Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979(b) is revoked, save for articles 8 and 9(7).

Sealed with the seal of the Electoral Commission on the day of 2003

Chairman of the Commission

Secretary to the Commission

SCHEDULE 1

article 3

NAMES OF WARDS

Anston and Woodsetts	Maltby	Swinton
Boston Castle	Rawmarsh	Valley
Brinsworth and Catcliffe	Rotherham East	Wales
Dinnington	Rotherham West	Wath
Holderness	Rother Vale	Wickersley North
Hooper	Silverwood	Wickersley South
Keppel	Sitwell	Wingfield

(a) As to electoral registration officers and the register of local government electors, *see* sections 8 to 13 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2).

(b) S.I. 1979/1323.

SCHEDULE 2

article 6

WARDS OF THE PARISH OF BRAMLEY

NAMES AND AREAS OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<i>(1)</i> <i>Name of Ward</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Area of Ward</i>	<i>(3)</i> <i>Number of Councillors</i>
Bramley Central	So much of the borough ward of Wickersley North as comprises the parish of Bramley	7
Bramley North	So much of the borough ward of Silverwood as comprises the parish of Bramley	2
Bramley South	So much of the borough ward of Wickersley South as comprises the parish of Bramley	6

SCHEDULE 3

article 7

WARDS OF THE PARISH OF DALTON

NAMES AND AREAS OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<i>(1)</i> <i>Name of Ward</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Area of Ward</i>	<i>(3)</i> <i>Number of Councillors</i>
Dalton East	So much of the borough ward of Silverwood as comprises the parish of Dalton	2
Dalton South	So much of the borough ward of Wickersley North as comprises the parish of Dalton	7
Dalton West	So much of the borough ward of Valley as comprises the parish of Dalton	7

SCHEDULE 4

article 8

WARDS OF THE PARISH OF MALTBY

NAMES AND AREAS OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<i>(1)</i> <i>Name of Ward</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Area of Ward</i>	<i>(3)</i> <i>Number of Councillors</i>
Maltby East	So much of the borough ward of Maltby as comprises the parish of Maltby	13
Maltby West	So much of the borough ward of Wickersley South as comprises the parish of Maltby	5

SCHEDULE 5

article 9

WARDS OF THE PARISH OF THRYBERGH

NAMES AND AREAS OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<i>(1)</i> <i>Name of Ward</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Area of Ward</i>	<i>(3)</i> <i>Number of Councillors</i>
Thrybergh North	So much of the borough ward of Silverwood as comprises the parish of Thrybergh	8
Thrybergh South	So much of the borough ward of Valley as comprises the parish of Thrybergh	7

SCHEDULE 6

article 10

WARDS OF THE PARISH OF THURCROFT

NAMES AND AREAS OF WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<i>(1)</i> <i>Name of Ward</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Area of Ward</i>	<i>(3)</i> <i>Number of Councillors</i>
Thurcroft North	So much of the borough ward of Rother Vale as comprises the parish of Thurcroft	15
Thurcroft South	So much of the borough ward of Dinnington as comprises the parish of Thurcroft	3

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(This note is not part of the Order)

This Order gives effect, [with modifications], to recommendations by the Boundary Committee for England, a committee of the Electoral Commission, for electoral changes in the borough of Rotherham.

The modifications are *indicate the modifications*.

The changes have effect in relation to local government elections to be held on and after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004.

Article 3 abolishes the existing wards of the borough and provides for the creation of 21 new wards. That article and Schedule 1 also make provision for the names and areas of, and numbers of councillors for, the new wards.

Article 4 makes provision for a whole council election in 2004 and for reversion to the established system of election by thirds in subsequent years.

Articles 5 to 11 make electoral changes in the parishes of Aston cum Aughton, Bramley, Dalton, Maltby, Thrybergh, Thurcroft and Wickersley.

[Article 12 provides for elections of [certain] parish councils in the borough.]

Article 14 obliges the Electoral Registration Officer to make any necessary amendments to the electoral register to reflect the new electoral arrangements.

Article 15 revokes the Borough of Rotherham (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979, with the exception of articles 8 and 9(7).

The areas of the new borough and parish wards are demarcated on the map described in article 2. Prints of the map may be inspected at all reasonable times at the offices of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and at the principal office of the Electoral Commission at Trevelyan House, Great Peter Street, London SW1P 2HW.