

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council

Electoral review

April 2012

Translations and other formats

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

Tel: 020 7664 8534

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2012

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	8
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	9
Amber Valley Borough	9
Bolsover District	12
Chesterfield Borough	13
Derbyshire Dales District	15
Erewash Borough	16
High Peak Borough	17
North East Derbyshire District	19
South Derbyshire District	23
Conclusions	24
Parish electoral arrangements	25
3 What happens next?	29
4 Mapping	31
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	32
B Table B1: Draft recommendations for Derbyshire County Council	35

Summary

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

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

This review is being conducted as follows:

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

Submissions received

The Commission received two submissions on council size. Subsequently, we received four submissions for division arrangements, including county-wide schemes from the Council and, also, from the Labour Group. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

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

Council size

Derbyshire County Council's Cabinet proposed the Council comprise a council size of 64, the same as the existing number. The Labour Group proposed an increased council size of 65.

In support of a council size of 64, the Cabinet considered the Council's strategic management functions. It also outlined the representational role of members and member workload. The Labour Group broadly agreed with the Cabinet's assessment of the Council's governance arrangements. However, it argued that member workload was greater than the Cabinet had suggested. It also argued that an additional member was required to address the under-representation in South Derbyshire District.

Both the Cabinet and the Labour Group provided good evidence in regard to the Council's management and committee structures and member workload. However, beyond the allocation of an additional member for South Derbyshire District, the Labour Group did not provide a clear rationale for an increase in council size. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 64 members.

General analysis

Having considered the submissions received on division arrangements, we have developed proposals that are broadly based on those of the Council. However, in Bolsover District we have based our proposals on those of the Labour Group and in North East Derbyshire District we have proposed significant modifications to the Council's proposals. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the county.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council contained in the report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **8 June 2012**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

Review Officer
Derbyshire Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

1 Introduction

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

2 We invited Derbyshire County Council to submit proposals first on council size and then on division arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council in summer 2012.

What is an electoral review?

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

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Derbyshire?

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

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 8 June 2012. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in Summer 2012. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 29 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed division boundaries, division names and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

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

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

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

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

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

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Derbyshire County Council and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received two submissions on council size and four submissions relating to division patterns, all of which may be inspected both at our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lqbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

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

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

18 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content to use their figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

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

20 In support of a council size of 64, the Cabinet outlined governance functions of the Council in the context of its political management structure. It provided details of the composition and frequency of meetings for its committees including licensing, scrutiny, regulation and planning. The Cabinet also provided details of the Council's appointments to outside bodies. In addition, it detailed the representational role of members, particularly in the context of the county being largely parished and the working relationship members are expected to maintain with parish and town councils. The Cabinet also provided evidence of member workload.

21 The Cabinet considered the impact of both a reduction and an increase in council size. Under a reduced council size of 60, the number of appointments per councillor would marginally increase to an average of 8.4 appointments per member. This would result in an average increase of four meetings per member per year. Conversely, an increase in council size to 68 would reduce the number of appointments per councillor to an average of 7.4 appointments per member. However, based on the 2009/10 average cost per member, a council size of 68 would represent an overall increase in member allowances of approximately £45,000.

22 The Cabinet was of the view that a council size of 64 would provide effective and convenient local government with regular and adequate scrutiny. It was also confident that a council size of 64 would maintain the representational role of members.

23 The Labour Group broadly agreed with the Cabinet's assessment of the Council's governance arrangements but disagreed with the assessment of member workload.

24 The Labour Group expressed concern at the number of scrutiny committees, citing the recent reduction from four to three. The Labour Group added that should it assume the role of the majority group, it would seek to 'strengthen the role of scrutiny'. The Labour Group stated that it would seek to reinstate the fourth scrutiny committee and further engage the public in scrutiny reviews. It argued that this approach would improve governance but would also increase member workload 'beyond the point at which the current council size will be able to sustain.'

25 The Labour Group stated that it expected 'major political and organisational change' to 'further increase the governance pressures on elected members'. It argued that this might be reflected in further devolution of decision-making and a requirement for an increased scrutiny role.

26 The Labour Group considered the Cabinet's assessment of the representational role of members did not reflect member liaison with district councils, member involvement with community groups or the semi-rural geography of parts of the county.

27 Given the under-representation of South Derbyshire District, the Labour Group argued an additional member was required to address this. However, while we acknowledged the district is under-represented, this could be addressed by transferring a member from North East Derbyshire District which under a council size of 64 is over-represented.

28 Having considered both proposals for council size, we were satisfied by the evidence provided in relation to the management and committee structures and their respective workloads.

29 We considered the Cabinet's submission clearly outlined how a council size of 64 would operate in the context of the Council's political management structure. It also outlined how a council size of 64 would provide the optimum number of members for effective and convenient local government. Conversely, beyond an additional member being allocated to South Derbyshire District, we did not consider there to be a clear rationale for an additional member as proposed by the Labour Group. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 64 as part of our draft recommendations.

30 The Labour Group reiterated its proposal for a council size of 65 when submitting its proposals for a division pattern for Derbyshire. The Labour Group proposed an additional member for North East Derbyshire District as this district would lose a member to South Derbyshire District, when allocating county councillors to districts and boroughs across Derbyshire under a council size of 64. The Labour Group argued that the loss of a member from North East Derbyshire District would result in larger divisions that would not reflect community identities and interests or provide effective and convenient local government. However, we have no evidence to support this contention, and none was provided by the Labour Group. Consequently, we are content to confirm a council size of 64 as part of our draft recommendations.

Electoral fairness

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

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

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

General analysis

34 We received four submissions on division patterns for Derbyshire. The Council and the Labour Group both submitted county-wide schemes based on a uniform pattern of single-member divisions. We also received localised submissions from Codnor Parish Council and Councillor Juliette Blake (Heage division).

35 The Council's proposals were based on a council size of 64, as per our 'minded to' decision on council size. However, the Labour Group reiterated its proposal for a council size of 65. The Labour Group proposed an additional member for North East Derbyshire District given the district would lose a member to South Derbyshire District under a council size of 64. As discussed in paragraph 30 we have based our draft recommendations on a council size of 64. This provides the following allocations of members across the districts and boroughs in the county as follows:

- Amber Valley Borough – 10 members
- Bolsover District – six members
- Chesterfield Borough – nine members
- Derbyshire Dales District – six members
- Erewash Borough – nine members
- High Peak Borough – eight members
- North East Derbyshire District – eight members
- South Derbyshire District – eight members

36 Broadly speaking, the Council's and the Labour Group's proposals shared a number of similarities and would provide good electoral equality. The notable exception to this was the Labour Group's proposed Killamarsh division within North East Derbyshire District which would have 23% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

37 While the Council's and the Labour Group's respective schemes would broadly provide good electoral equality, both were supported by only limited evidence about community identity. However, where possible, both schemes used parishes as the 'building blocks' of the proposed divisions.

38 On balance, we consider the Council's proposals to provide slightly better electoral equality than the Labour Group's proposals. Consequently, and in the absence of evidence of community identities, we have broadly based our draft recommendations on the Council's division pattern in the majority of the county. However, in the district of Bolsover, we have adopted the Labour Group's division pattern as this provides a better balance between the statutory criteria.

39 We propose a number of modifications to the Council's scheme, largely to improve electoral equality where applicable, follow stronger boundaries and, where possible, further reflect apparent communities. Most notably, we have developed our own proposals for the town of Dronfield in North East Derbyshire District where we had concerns over the Council's proposed division pattern.

40 Our draft recommendations would result in 60 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table B1 (on pages 35–41) and the large maps accompanying this report.

41 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly in relation to those areas where we have modified the proposals submitted by the Council and the Labour Group. We also particularly welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

Electoral arrangements

42 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our draft recommendations for each area of Derbyshire. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Amber Valley Borough (page 9)
- Bolsover District (page 12)
- Chesterfield Borough (page 13)
- Derbyshire Dales District (page 15)
- Erewash Borough (page 16)
- High Peak Borough (page 17)
- North East Derbyshire District (page 19)
- South Derbyshire District (page 23)

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

Amber Valley Borough

44 Amber Valley is located in the east of the county. The borough is wholly parished and is semi-rural in nature with a number of small towns and settlements.

45 The existing divisions in the borough are the single-member divisions of Alfreton, Alport & Derwent, Belper, Duffield & Belper South, Greater Heanor, Heage,

Heanor Central, Horsley, Ripley and Somercotes. These divisions are projected to have 10% more, 4% more, 3% fewer, 11% more, 5% more, 9% fewer, 6% fewer, 6% more, 16% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

46 Under a council size of 64, Amber Valley is allocated 10 county councillors, the same under the existing arrangements. The Council and the Labour Group submitted similar proposals for Amber Valley Borough that were both based on an allocation of 10 members.

47 As discussed in paragraph 38, and in the absence of evidence of community identity in support of either division pattern, we have sought to propose a division pattern across the county which provides the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore broadly adopted the Council's proposals for Amber Valley Borough, subject to a few modifications.

48 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations, we also received two further submissions, from Councillor Blake and Codnor Parish Council in relation to the electoral arrangements for Amber Valley.

Codnor

49 The Council's proposed divisions in Codnor would have good electoral equality. However, we received a submission from Codnor Parish Council opposing the Council's proposal to split the parish between the proposed Ripley East & Codnor and Heanor Central divisions. The Parish Council suggested the parish should be wholly included in the Ripley East & Codnor division, as Ripley provided amenities such as shopping and leisure to the residents of Codnor parish.

50 We explored whether it was possible to include Codnor parish wholly within the proposed Ripley East & Codnor division. However, this would result in Ripley East & Codnor division having 17% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. We would only be minded to adopt such a high variance in rare and exceptional circumstances and we are therefore unable to adopt this as part of our draft recommendations. Furthermore, we note that the majority of the parish's urban settlement will be in the proposed Ripley East & Codnor division under the Council's proposals.

51 We nonetheless propose a minor modification to the boundary between the proposed Ripley East & Codnor and Heanor Central divisions. Under the Council's proposals, Codnor Parish Council would require a parish ward comprising a relatively small number of electors on Springhill Way and the surrounding streets and recreation ground. This would also result in an arbitrary division boundary running through the residential area. We do not consider this to provide effective and convenient local government and propose transferring the above area from the proposed Heanor Central division to the proposed Ripley East & Codnor division. The boundary in this area would consequently follow the Codnor parish boundary. This modification would have a minor impact on electoral equality with the proposed divisions of Ripley East & Codnor and Heanor Central having 2% more and 9% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

Alfreton & Somercotes

52 The Council's proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division would have 12% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. We sought to improve this level of electoral equality. However, there were a number of constraints in addressing this while ensuring effective and convenient local government.

53 The semi-rural nature of this area and the proximity of the proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division to the borough boundary presented us with some difficulty in developing an alternative division pattern. Furthermore, transferring electors from the proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division to the adjacent Swanwick & Riddings division would result in the arbitrary split of Somercotes parish. However, we noted the Council's proposed Swanwick & Riddings division to the south would share good communication links and an apparent commonality with the proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division.

54 Consequently, we considered a two-member division comprising the proposed divisions of Alfreton & Somercotes and Swanwick & Riddings. This would reflect the communication links in the area and would have Somercotes as the division's natural centre.

55 We therefore propose a two-member division comprising the Council's proposed Alfreton & Somercotes and Swanwick & Riddings divisions. This division would comprise the parishes of Alfreton, Ironville, Somercotes and Swanwick and the unparished area of Riddings. The proposed division would have 5% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. We propose the division be named Alfreton & Somercotes as this reflects the largest settlements in the proposed division.

56 We acknowledge that this two-member division will depart from the uniform pattern of single-member divisions submitted by the Council and the Labour Group. However, we are of the view that our recommendations provide the best division pattern available for this area on the basis of evidence received to date.

57 We consider our proposed Alfreton & Somercotes division to provide a better balance between the statutory criteria but would particularly welcome comments on our recommendations for this area during this consultation stage.

Ripley West and Heage

58 We received a submission from Councillor Blake, who proposed an alternative division name for the proposed Ripley West & Ambergate division. Councillor Blake proposed the division be named Ripley West & Heage given the village of Heage is larger than that of Ambergate. We note that Heage is indeed more populous than Ambergate and therefore propose the division name of Ripley West & Heage as part of our draft recommendations.

59 Elsewhere in the borough, we have adopted the Council's proposed division pattern for Amber Valley. These divisions would have good electoral equality and follow clear boundaries, using whole parishes where possible.

60 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, our proposed Ripley West & Heage division would have 13% more electors per councillor than the county average. We acknowledge this variance is higher than we would

normally be minded to adopt as part of our proposed electoral arrangements. However, this is forecast to improve to 10% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

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

Bolsover District

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

63 The existing divisions in the district are the single-member divisions of Barlborough & Clowne, Bolsover North West, Elmtun & Whitwell, Bolsover South West & Scarcliffe, Pinxton & South Normanton West, Shirebrook & Pleasley and South Normanton East & Tibshelf. These divisions are projected to have 11% fewer, 14% more, 1% fewer, 14% fewer, 16% more and 13% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

64 Under a council size of 64, Bolsover is allocated six county councillors, the same as under the existing arrangements. Both the Council's and the Labour Group's proposals for this area were based on an allocation of six members.

65 The Council and the Labour Group proposed different division patterns for Bolsover. Both proposals for the district provided for good electoral equality. However, we had a number of concerns about the Council's proposed division pattern.

66 The Council's proposed division pattern for Bolsover District would not provide good communication links between settlements within respective divisions. While we acknowledge the geography of the district presents a number of difficulties in developing a division pattern, we did not consider the Council's proposals would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria.

67 Conversely, we considered the Labour Group's proposed division pattern for the district provided a better balance between the statutory criteria. Despite the poor communication links in the district, we are of the view that the Labour Group's proposals provide the best reflection of communication links throughout Bolsover and would avoid arbitrary splits of parishes.

68 As discussed in paragraph 38, we have therefore broadly adopted the Labour Group's proposals for Bolsover District, subject to modifications.

Bolsover village

69 The proposed divisions of Bolsover North West, Elmton & Whitwell and Barlborough & Clowne would have 9% more and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. However, the proposed boundary between these divisions would not follow any ground detail.

70 In seeking a clear and identifiable boundary, we explored transferring the area of Old Bolsover parish that lies north of the proposed boundary from Barlborough & Clowne division to Bolsover North West, Elmton & Whitwell division. However, despite the sparsely populated settlements in this area, the division would contain too many electors to provide good electoral equality.

71 We have therefore modified the boundary between these divisions to ensure that it follows ground detail whilst not transferring a large number of electors between divisions. Consequently, the variances of the proposed Barlborough & Clowne and Bolsover North West, Elmton & Whitwell divisions would remain unchanged.

72 We also recommend name changes to the proposed divisions of Bolsover North West, Elmton & Whitwell and Bolsover South West, Elmton & Scarcliffe. We consider these proposed divisions to have over complicated names and instead recommend the divisions are named Bolsover North and Bolsover South respectively.

73 Elsewhere in the district, we have adopted the Labour Group's proposed division pattern for Bolsover. These divisions would have good electoral equality and follow clear boundaries.

74 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, no division in Bolsover would have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the county average.

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

Chesterfield Borough

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

77 The existing divisions in the borough are the single-member divisions of Ashgate, Birdholme, Brimington, Hipper, Newbold, Spire, St Mary's, Staveley North & Whittington and Staveley South. These divisions are projected to have 15% fewer, 2% more, 18% fewer, 10% fewer, 11% fewer, 8% more, 15% fewer, 1% more and 15% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

78 Under a council size of 64, Chesterfield is allocated nine county councillors, the same as it currently returns under the existing arrangements. Both the Council's and the Labour Group's proposals for this area were based on an allocation of nine members.

79 The Council's proposed divisions would provide reasonable electoral equality. The Council's proposed divisions of Staveley and Staveley North & Whittington were supported by the Labour Group.

80 While the Labour Group's proposals would largely provide good electoral equality, their proposed Ashgate and St Mary's divisions would both have 15% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. The Labour Group argued that residents in the respective divisions shared a common interest but their submission did not provide evidence of community identity to support such a high variance.

81 As discussed in paragraph 38, and in the absence of evidence of community identity in support of either division pattern, we have sought to propose a division pattern across the county which provides the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore broadly adopted the Council's proposals for Chesterfield Borough, subject to modifications.

Chesterfield town

82 The Council's proposed division pattern in Chesterfield town would provide good electoral equality with the exception of the proposed Boythorpe & Brampton South division which would have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. However, we noted a number of proposed boundaries that would not follow ground detail and would provide poor access routes within individual divisions. We therefore sought to improve the variance in the proposed Boythorpe & Brampton South division, whilst also seeking to propose boundaries that are easily identifiable and reflect access routes in divisions.

83 We considered the boundary between the proposed Boythorpe & Brampton South and Loundsley Green & Newbold divisions to be particularly unclear in the Brockwell area. We toured this area and considered the Council's proposals on the ground. We considered the allotment gardens to provide a more easily identifiable boundary than that proposed by the Council. We therefore propose modifying the boundary to follow the allotment gardens as part of our draft recommendations.

84 To the south of this area, we also propose the boundary between our proposed divisions of Boythorpe & Brampton South and Loundsley Green & Newbold divisions run along the centre of Ashgate Road rather than the backs of the properties. The transfer of electors from the proposed Loundsley Green & Newbold division to Boythorpe & Brampton South division would also improve the variance of the latter division.

85 While touring this area, we observed that the properties south of Ashgate Road appeared to have a shared focus to their north and south. However, we considered that Ashgate Road provided a clearer boundary than that proposed by the Council.

86 We also propose two minor modifications to the boundary between our proposed Boythorpe & Brampton South and Walton & West divisions to adhere to ground detail. Firstly, we propose the boundary in this area follow the backs of properties on Foljambe Avenue and Walton Road before following Hunloke Avenue.

87 Secondly, we propose including the cul-de-sacs of Alford Close, Baycliff Drive and Melrose Close in our proposed Boythorpe & Brampton South division rather than

our Walton & West division. This modification would provide access for the properties on these streets and reflect their focus towards the Boythorpe & Brampton South division to their east.

88 Consequently, our proposed divisions of Walton & West and Boythorpe & Brampton South would both have 10% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. Our proposed Loundsley Green & Newbold division would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

89 Similarly, we propose a minor modification to the proposed Loundsley Green & Newbold and Spire divisions. Where the boundary west of Sheffield Road departs from ground detail, we propose it follow Sheffield Road and run between the playing field and the bus depot before following the backs of properties on Enfield Road and latterly Highbury Road. This modification would not affect any electors.

90 Elsewhere in the borough, we have adopted the Council's proposed division pattern for Chesterfield. These divisions would have good electoral equality and have clear boundaries.

91 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, our proposed divisions of Boythorpe & Brampton South, Spire and Walton & West would have 13% fewer, 16% fewer and 11% fewer electors per councillor than the county average, respectively. We acknowledge these variances are higher than we would normally be minded to adopt. However, they are forecast to improve to 10% fewer, 8% fewer and 10% fewer by 2017, respectively.

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

Derbyshire Dales District

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

94 The existing divisions in the district are the single-member divisions of Ashbourne, Bakewell, Derwent Valley, Dovedale, Matlock and Wirksworth. These divisions are projected to have 14% more, 6% more, 1% more, 1% fewer, 1% more and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

95 Under a council size of 64, Derbyshire Dales is allocated six county councillors, the same as under the existing arrangements. Both the Council's and the Labour Group's proposals for this area were based on an allocation of six members.

96 The Council and the Labour Group submitted similar proposals for Derbyshire Dales District. However, the Council's proposals would provide slightly better levels of electoral equality. As discussed in paragraph 38, and in the absence of evidence of community identity in support of either division pattern, we have therefore adopted the Council's proposals for Derbyshire Dales District.

97 With the exception of dividing Ashbourne parish, the Council's proposals are based on whole parishes and used the best communication links available in an otherwise rural district. We explored whether it was possible to include Ashbourne parish wholly within a single division. However, the size of the electorate in the parish requires it to be split to provide good electoral equality.

98 Consequently, we have adopted the Council's proposals for Derbyshire Dales without modification as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposed divisions would have good electoral equality and reflect the apparent communities in the district.

99 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, no division in Derbyshire Dales would have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the county average.

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

Erewash Borough

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

102 The existing divisions in the borough are the single-member divisions of Breadsall & West Hallam, Breaston, Cotmanhay, Ilkeston, Kirk Hallam, Long Eaton, Petersham, Sandiacre and Sawley. These divisions are projected to have 13% fewer, 6% more, 13% more, 1% more, 8% fewer, equal to the number of, 12% fewer, 3% fewer and 11% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

103 Under a council size of 64, Erewash is allocated nine county councillors, the same as under the existing arrangements. Both the Council's and the Labour Group's proposals for this area were based on an allocation of nine members.

104 The Council and the Labour Group submitted similar proposals for Erewash with the exception of the market towns in the borough. In these areas, we considered the Council's proposed division pattern to provide a better reflection of the north-to-south geography and communication links within these areas. As discussed in paragraph 38, we have therefore broadly adopted the Council's proposals for Erewash borough, subject to modifications.

Ilkeston town

105 The unparished area of Ilkeston town is largely bound by the divisions of Breadsall and Sandiacre. The Council's proposed division pattern in this area would provide clear boundaries and good electoral equality. The proposed divisions would also reflect the communication links within the town.

106 We noted a small area west of Godfrey Drive in the unparished area of Ilkeston town would be included in the proposed Breadsall division. However, we consider that following the Dale Abbey parish boundary would provide a clearer boundary and reflect the focus of these properties. We therefore propose a minor modification to include these properties in our Ilkeston West division rather than our Breadsall division. This modification would involve a small number of electors and would not affect electoral equality.

107 Elsewhere in the borough, we have adopted the Council's proposed division pattern for Erewash. These divisions would have good electoral equality and follow clear boundaries.

108 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, no division in Erewash would have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the county average.

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

High Peak Borough

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

111 The existing divisions in the borough are the single-member divisions of Buxton North & East, Buxton West, Chapel & Hope Valley, Etherow, Glossop North & Rural, Glossop South, New Mills and Whaley Bridge & Blackbrook. These divisions are projected to have 3% fewer, 5% more, equal to the number of, 11% fewer 7% fewer, 8% fewer, 5% more and 14% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

112 Under a council size of 64, High Peak is allocated eight county councillors, the same as it currently returns under the existing arrangements. The Council and the Labour Group submitted similar proposals for High Peak borough with the majority of divisions identical. The Council's and the Labour Group's proposed division patterns were both based on an allocation of eight members. Despite the difficulties in developing a division pattern given the geography of the area, both proposals would provide reasonably good electoral equality.

Glossop town

113 Glossop town is an unparished area, surrounded by the parishes of Tintwistle and Charlesworth. The edge of the town is bound by the moorland of the National Park.

114 The Council and the Labour Group proposed single-member divisions of Etherow, Glossop North & Rural (named Glossop West under the Labour Group's proposals) and Glossop South with 10% fewer, 8% fewer and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. Under this proposed division pattern, each division would comprise an area of Glossop town. This is similar to the existing division pattern in the area.

115 We noted that the Council's and the Labour Group's proposed division pattern resulted in a 'doughnut'-shaped division centred by the proposed Glossop South division. Furthermore, the area of Glossop town included in the proposed Glossop North & Rural division would have no communication links to the east of the division.

116 We had concerns about the proposed division pattern in this area. Notwithstanding the good electoral equality, this division pattern would effectively divide what appears to be a cohesive urban community in Glossop town and provide poor communication links within the respective divisions. We therefore explored alternative division patterns that would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria. However, the National Park and the geography of this area presented a number of constraints.

117 We initially investigated whether the A624 could be used as a revised boundary between the proposed Etherow and Glossop North & Rural divisions. Using the A624 as a division boundary would require the transfer of Chisworth parish and the western area of Charlesworth parish from the proposed Glossop North & Rural division to the proposed Etherow division. This would provide a better reflection of the limited communication links in this area. However, this division pattern would result in extremely poor electoral equality for both the proposed divisions. Furthermore, this division pattern would not address the 'doughnut' of Glossop South or the split of Glossop town.

118 Consequently, we considered a two-member division comprising the proposed divisions of Glossop South and Glossop North & Rural. We noted that this division arrangement would avoid the 'doughnut' of the proposed Glossop South division and provide reasonable electoral equality of 8% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. In addition, we noted that this division arrangement would also reflect the communication links in the area, would not arbitrarily split the Glossop community, and would have Glossop town as the division's natural focus.

119 On balance, we therefore propose a two-member division comprising the proposed divisions of Glossop South and Glossop North & Rural as part of our draft recommendations. We propose the division be named Glossop & Charlesworth to reflect the main areas it comprises.

120 We acknowledge this division would comprise a mixed urban and rural geography with Glossop town and the moorland of the National Park. However, this is not uncommon in areas with as rural a geography as High Peak. We acknowledge that this two-member division will depart from the uniform pattern of single-member divisions submitted by the Council and the Labour Group. However, we consider that

our two-member Glossop & Charlesworth division provides the best balance between the statutory criteria on the basis of evidence received to date. We would particularly welcome comments on our recommendations for this area during this consultation stage.

Whaley Bridge

121 The Council's and the Labour Group's proposed Whaley Bridge division would comprise the parishes of Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside, Whaley Bridge and part of Chapel-en-le-Frith. The proposed division would have 12% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

122 This variance is slightly higher than we would normally be inclined to adopt. We therefore explored whether this could be improved by transferring electors from the adjacent proposed Chapel & Hope Valley division.

123 We investigated whether it was possible to transfer electors west of the railway in the proposed Chapel & Hope Valley division to the proposed Whaley Bridge division. However, given the number of electors in this area, this modification would result in an extremely high variance. While fewer electors could be transferred between the respective divisions to provide good electoral equality, this would require an arbitrary boundary being drawn through a compact residential area.

124 On balance, we are not minded to propose a modification in this area. While we acknowledge the variance of our proposed Whaley Bridge division is higher than we would normally be minded to adopt, we consider the proposed division pattern provides the best balance between the statutory criteria available at this time.

125 Elsewhere in the borough, we have adopted the Council's proposed division pattern for High Peak. These divisions would have good electoral equality and follow clear boundaries, using whole parishes where possible.

126 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, our proposed Whaley Bridge division would have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the county average. As discussed above, this division would have 12% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

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

North East Derbyshire District

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

129 The existing divisions in the district are the single-member divisions of Clay Cross, Dronfield North, Dronfield South, Eckington, Holymoorside & Wingerworth, Killamarsh, North Wingfield & Tupton, Stonebroom & Pilsley and Sutton. These divisions are projected to have 5% more, 7% more, 13% fewer, 4% fewer, 6% fewer,

24% fewer, 14% fewer, 12% fewer and 13% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

130 Under a council size of 64, North East Derbyshire is allocated eight county councillors, one fewer than under the existing arrangements. The Council's proposed division pattern for North East Derbyshire allocated the area eight members. However, as discussed in paragraph 35, the Labour Group proposed a council size of 65 with nine members being returned to North East Derbyshire as under the existing arrangements.

131 The Labour Group acknowledged that under a council size of 64, North East Derbyshire should be allocated eight county councillors. However, the Group was concerned that eight members would result in larger divisions than under the existing division pattern. The Labour Group contended the larger divisions would not adequately reflect community identities and interests or provide effective and convenient local government.

132 The Labour Group's proposed division pattern in this area would also include one division, Killamarsh, with 23% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. This is an extremely high variance that we would only consider in very rare and exceptional circumstances.

133 We do not consider there to be any evidence to suggest that larger divisions were unable to reflect community identities and interests in North East Derbyshire. Consequently, we propose North East Derbyshire District return eight members as proposed by the Council. With the exception of modifications in Dronfield town, we have based our proposed division pattern in the district on the Council's proposals.

Dronfield town

134 The Council's proposed division pattern in Dronfield town would provide good electoral equality. The Council's proposed Apperknowle, Dronfield East and Dronfield West & Walton divisions would have 2% fewer, 8% more and 2% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. However, we had a number of concerns regarding the proposed division pattern in this area.

135 We did not consider the Council's proposed division pattern to provide effective and convenient local government and considered that poor communication links would exist between settlements within the respective divisions. We also considered the proposed division pattern to provide a poor split of Dronfield town that would not reflect apparent communities.

136 The Council's proposed Dronfield West & Walton division would comprise the rural parishes of Barlow, Brampton, Holmesfield and Holymoorside & Walton plus the south-western area of Dronfield parish broadly south of Carr Lane/Stubley Lane and west of Dronfield town centre. However, we did not consider this division pattern would adequately reflect the communities in this area of Dronfield town. Furthermore, we were concerned that the proposed boundary in this area would be unclear.

137 To the east of this area, we also had concerns with regard to the unusual 'bottleneck' shape within the proposed Dronfield East division. We also noted the poor communication links within the proposed Apperknowle division between the area of Dronfield parish that would lie within the proposed division and the remaining settlements to the east.

138 Consequently, we explored an alternative division pattern for Dronfield town and its hinterland that would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

139 We first considered the proposed Dronfield West & Walton division and the Council's proposed boundary that would run through Dronfield town. We toured this area and noted that reasonable communication links existed within the area of Dronfield town that would lie within the proposed Dronfield West & Walton division. However, the division pattern would nonetheless split the Woodhouse area between the proposed Dronfield West & Walton and Dronfield East divisions. This resulted in the area of Dronfield Woodhouse that would be within the proposed Dronfield East division having poor communication links with the remainder of the division.

140 Conversely, we considered the A61 to provide a clearer boundary within Dronfield town. This would reflect the apparent communities in the area as the parishes and the settlements to the west of the A61 have reasonable communication links to the south via a number of minor roads and the B6056 and B6054. The A61 would also provide a stronger boundary in dividing Dronfield town and would avoid a split of the Dronfield Woodhouse area. During our tour of the area, we also noted the A61 would not split residential communities beneath the by-pass.

141 We therefore propose adopting the A61 as the boundary in this area with the remainder of the proposed Dronfield West & Walton division as proposed by the Council. We consider this division pattern to provide a better reflection of communities and communication links in this area and would result in a clearer divide of Dronfield town.

142 We then considered the proposed Dronfield East and Apperknowle divisions. We toured this area and noted the communication links would mean the Coal Aston area to the north-east of Dronfield town largely looked eastwards towards the Eckington area. Under the Council's proposals, Eckington would lie within the proposed Apperknowle division while Coal Aston would lie within the proposed Dronfield East division.

143 Conversely, the Council's proposed Apperknowle division included the Holmesdale area to the south-east of Dronfield town. However, the Holmesdale area would not have clear communication links with the remainder of the proposed Apperknowle division.

144 During our tour of the area, we considered the Holmesdale area to have a clear focus to its west and its north rather than to the east. We therefore considered this area should be included within the proposed Dronfield East division. Consequently, we considered the Coal Aston area north of Holmesdale should be included within the proposed Apperknowle division, with the B6056 providing a clear communication link between the respective areas. However, this modification would result in the proposed Dronfield East division having 11% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. This would be a slightly higher variance than we would normally be minded to adopt.

145 We explored an alternative division pattern to address this variance. We considered including the area of Coal Aston that lies north of Eckington Road in the proposed Dronfield East division. This would result in Dronfield East division having 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. However, despite

the improved variance, this would split the village of Coal Aston and would not provide good communication links between this area and the remainder of the proposed Dronfield East division.

146 During our tour of the area, we noted that the area of Coal Aston that lies north of Eckington Road has a clear focus to its south. This also reflects the access routes in this area via Dyche Lane and Eckington Road and the streets to the south. Consequently, we do not propose this area be included in the Dronfield East division. We consider this modification would not provide for effective and convenient local government and would arbitrarily split the Coal Aston community.

147 While including the Coal Aston area wholly within the proposed Apperknowle division would result in the proposed Dronfield East division having 11% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, on balance, we consider this to provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

148 We also propose a minor modification to the boundary between the proposed Apperknowle and Killamarsh & Spinkhill divisions. This modification is to follow ground detail and involves a small number of electors.

149 Our proposed division pattern of Apperknowle, Dronfield East and Dronfield West & Walton divisions would have 11% more, 11% fewer and 9% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. We acknowledge the variances for the proposed Apperknowle and Dronfield East divisions are slightly higher than we would normally be minded to accept. However, we are confident our proposed division pattern provides the best balance between the statutory criteria.

Wingerworth & Shirland

150 The Council's proposed division pattern in the south of the district would largely have good electoral equality. However, the Council's proposed Wingerworth & Shirland division would have 11% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

151 We acknowledge this variance is slightly higher than we would normally be inclined to adopt. However, with the exception of Wingerworth parish, this division is based on whole parishes and covers a largely rural area. Improving this variance would require transferring electors from adjacent areas with a similarly rural geography that would result in arbitrary boundaries. On balance, we do not consider an alternative division pattern would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria. We therefore propose this division as part of our draft recommendations.

152 Elsewhere in the district, we have adopted the Council's proposals subject to a minor modification to the boundary between the proposed Clay Cross South and Sutton divisions. This modification is to follow ground detail and does not involve any electors.

153 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, our proposed divisions of Apperknowle, Dronfield West & Walton and Wingerworth & Shirland would have 14% more, 12% more and 15% more electors per councillor than the county average, respectively. We acknowledge these variances are higher than we would normally be minded to adopt as part of our proposed electoral

arrangements. However, these are forecast to improve to 11% more, 9% more and 11% more by 2017, respectively.

154 Table B1 (on pages 35–41) provides details of the electoral variances for all of our proposed divisions in North East Derbyshire. The draft recommendations for North East Derbyshire are shown on Map 1, Map 2a, Map 3a and Map 4b accompanying this report.

South Derbyshire District

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

156 The existing divisions in the district are the single-member divisions of Aston & Melbourne, Hatton & Hilton, Linton & Church Gresley, Midway & Hartshorne, Newhall & Seales, Repton & Willington and Swadlincote Central & Woodville. These divisions are projected to have 5% more, 38% more, 21% more, 7% fewer, equal to the number of, 21% more and 13% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

157 Under a council size of 64, South Derbyshire is allocated eight county councillors, one more than it currently returns under the existing arrangements. The Council and the Labour Group proposed different division patterns for South Derbyshire. However, both proposals were based on an allocation of eight members.

158 As discussed in paragraph 38, and in the absence of evidence of community identity in support of either division pattern, we have sought to propose a division pattern across the county which provides the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore broadly adopted the Council's proposals for South Derbyshire District, subject to modifications.

Swadlincote town

159 The Council's proposed division pattern in Swadlincote town would provide good electoral equality. The proposed divisions of Swadlincote Central, Swadlincote North and Swadlincote South would have 1% fewer, 3% fewer and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively. The proposed division pattern would provide clear boundaries with few exceptions where we propose minor modifications to follow ground detail.

160 Firstly, we propose a minor modification to the boundary between the proposed Linton and Swadlincote North divisions. This modification would follow field boundaries and Park Road and would not affect any electors.

161 Secondly, we propose a minor modification to the boundary between the proposed Swadlincote South and Swadlincote Central divisions. We propose the boundary follow the backs of properties on Civic Way and Hill Street. South of this area, we propose a similar modification for the boundary to adhere to ground detail south of Pool Street. The proposed modification would involve the transfer of a small number of electors and have a minor impact on electoral equality. Consequently, our proposed Swadlincote South and Swadlincote Central divisions would have 4% fewer

electors and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

Repton

162 The Council’s proposed Etwall & Repton division would have 1% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017. The division is based on whole parishes with the exception of Repton parish which is split between the proposed Etwall & Repton division and the adjacent Aston division via an arbitrary boundary.

163 Under the Council’s proposed division pattern in this area, the village of Milton, a settlement of Repton parish, would be included in the proposed Aston division. In avoiding a split of Repton parish, we therefore recommend the village of Milton be included in the proposed Etwall & Repton division. Consequently, the divisions of Etwall & Repton and Aston would have 3% more and 8% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017, respectively.

164 Elsewhere in the district, we have adopted the Council’s proposed division pattern for South Derbyshire. These divisions would have good electoral equality and follow clear boundaries.

165 We have been mindful to provide good electoral equality where possible in time for the next scheduled county elections in 2013. Based on the 2011 electorate, the proposed Swadlincote South division would have 12% fewer electors per councillor than the county average. We acknowledge this variance is slightly higher than we would normally be minded to adopt as part of our proposed electoral arrangements. However, as discussed in paragraph 161, this is forecast to improve to 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

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

Conclusions

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2011	2017
Number of councillors	64	64
Number of electoral divisions	62	62
Average number of electors per councillor	9,414	9,751
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	10	4
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Draft recommendation

Derbyshire County Council should comprise 64 councillors serving 62 divisions, as detailed and named in Table B1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

170 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Codnor, Dale Abbey, Dronfield, Eckington, Grassmoor, Hartington Upper Quarter, Hasland & Winswick, North Wingfield, Ockbrook & Borrowash, Old Bolsover, South Normanton and Staveley. We would particularly welcome comments on these proposals from the parish councils concerned and local residents during this consultation stage.

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

Eckington Parish Council should return 17 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Bramley (returning four members), Eckington Central (returning four members), Renishaw (returning three members), Ridgeway & Marsh Lane (returning three members) and Southgate (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3a.

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

South Normanton Parish Council should return 14 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: East (returning six members), Central (returning two members) and West (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5a.

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

Draft recommendation

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

3 What happens next?

182 There will now be a consultation period of 10 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Derbyshire County Council contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 8 June 2012. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

183 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Derbyshire and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed division boundaries, number of councillors, division names and parish electoral arrangements. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during the consultation. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

184 Express your views by writing directly to:

Review Officer
Derbyshire Review
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, www.lgbce.org.uk or by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk

185 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all Stage Three representations will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of Derbyshire County Council and at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

186 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

187 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

188 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Derbyshire County Council in 2013.

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

4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for Derbyshire

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

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

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

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

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision-making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

Appendix B

Table B1: Draft recommendations for Derbyshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Amber Valley Borough								
1	Alfreton & Somercotes	2	19,955	9,978	6%	20,386	10,193	5%
2	Alport & Derwent	1	9,647	9,647	2%	9,749	9,749	0%
3	Belper	1	8,935	8,935	-5%	9,439	9,439	-3%
4	Duffield & Belper South	1	9,146	9,146	-3%	9,343	9,343	-4%
5	Greater Heanor	1	9,600	9,600	2%	10,269	10,269	5%
6	Heanor Central	1	10,361	10,361	10%	10,612	10,612	9%
7	Horsley	1	10,059	10,059	7%	10,309	10,309	6%
8	Ripley East & Codnor	1	9,652	9,652	3%	9,912	9,912	2%
9	Ripley West & Heage	1	10,629	10,629	13%	10,754	10,754	10%

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

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	
Bolsover District								
10	Barlborough & Clowne	1	8,827	8,827	-6%	9,092	9,092	-7%
11	Bolsover North	1	10,415	10,415	11%	10,679	10,679	10%
12	Bolsover South	1	9,967	9,967	6%	10,529	10,529	8%
13	Shirebrook & Pleasley	1	8,889	8,889	-6%	9,213	9,213	-6%
14	South Normanton & Pinxton	1	9,915	9,915	5%	10,258	10,258	5%
15	Tibshelf	1	9,950	9,950	6%	10,421	10,421	7%
Chesterfield Borough								
16	Birdholme	1	8,852	8,852	-6%	8,775	8,775	-10%
17	Boythorpe & Brampton South	1	8,164	8,164	-13%	8,751	8,751	-10%
18	Brimington	1	9,813	9,813	4%	9,889	9,889	1%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
19	Loundsley Green & Newbold	1	9,265	9,265	-2%	9,413	9,413	-3%
20	St Mary's	1	9,691	9,691	3%	9,722	9,722	0%
21	Spire	1	7,883	7,883	-16%	8,959	8,959	-8%
22	Staveley	1	9,317	9,317	-1%	9,344	9,344	-4%
23	Staveley North & Whittington	1	9,686	9,686	3%	9,812	9,812	1%
24	Walton & West	1	8,362	8,362	-11%	8,741	8,741	-10%
Derbyshire Dales District								
25	Ashbourne	1	9,471	9,471	1%	9,583	9,583	-2%
26	Bakewell	1	10,256	10,256	9%	10,375	10,375	6%
27	Derwent Valley	1	9,599	9,599	2%	9,855	9,855	1%
28	Dovedale	1	9,529	9,529	1%	9,637	9,637	-1%
29	Matlock	1	8,762	8,762	-7%	9,856	9,856	1%
30	Wirksworth	1	10,290	10,290	9%	10,427	10,427	7%

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

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Erewash Borough							
31 Breadsall	1	9,214	9,214	-2%	9,318	9,318	-4%
32 Breaston	1	10,236	10,236	9%	10,343	10,343	6%
33 Ilkeston East	1	9,745	9,745	4%	10,179	10,179	4%
34 Ilkeston South	1	8,863	8,863	-6%	9,098	9,098	-7%
35 Ilkeston West	1	9,248	9,248	-2%	9,784	9,784	0%
36 Long Eaton	1	9,235	9,235	-2%	9,791	9,791	0%
37 Petersham	1	9,635	9,635	2%	9,937	9,937	2%
38 Sandiacre	1	9,303	9,303	-1%	9,493	9,493	-3%
39 Sawley	1	9,316	9,316	-1%	9,461	9,461	-3%
High Peak Borough							
40 Buxton North & East	1	8,906	8,906	-5%	9,678	9,678	-1%
41 Buxton West	1	9,672	9,672	3%	10,060	10,060	3%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
42	Chapel & Hope Valley	1	9,225	9,225	-2%	9,514	9,514	-2%
43	Etherow	1	8,507	8,507	-10%	8,777	8,777	-10%
44	Glossop & Charlesworth	2	17,451	8,726	-7%	17,997	8,999	-8%
45	New Mills	1	9,889	9,889	5%	10,201	10,201	5%
46	Whaley Bridge	1	8,345	8,345	-11%	8,608	8,608	-12%
North East Derbyshire District								
47	Apperknowle	1	10,728	10,728	14%	10,782	10,782	11%
48	Clay Cross North	1	8,699	8,699	-8%	9,605	9,605	-2%
49	Clay Cross South	1	9,591	9,591	2%	9,975	9,975	2%
50	Dronfield East	1	8,541	8,541	-9%	8,673	8,673	-11%
51	Dronfield West & Walton	1	10,562	10,562	12%	10,597	10,597	9%
52	Killamarsh & Spinkhill	1	9,979	9,979	6%	10,110	10,110	4%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
53	Sutton	1	9,837	9,837	4%	10,023	10,023	3%
54	Wingerworth & Shirland	1	10,802	10,802	15%	10,871	10,871	11%
South Derbyshire District								
55	Aston	1	8,932	8,932	-5%	10,532	10,532	8%
56	Etwall & Repton	1	9,386	9,386	0%	10,053	10,053	3%
57	Hilton	1	9,300	9,300	-1%	9,482	9,482	-3%
58	Linton	1	8,620	8,620	-8%	9,442	9,442	-3%
59	Melbourne	1	8,805	8,805	-6%	9,209	9,209	-6%
60	Swadlincote Central	1	9,397	9,397	0%	9,552	9,552	-2%
61	Swadlincote North	1	9,353	9,353	-1%	9,475	9,475	-3%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
62	Swadlincote South	1	8,257	8,257	-12%	9,361	9,361	-4%
	Totals	64	602,466	–	–	624,085	–	–
	Averages	–	–	9,414	–	–	9,751	–

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

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