

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

ELECTORAL REVIEW

**LABOUR GROUP RESPONSE TO LGBCE
DRAFT PROPOSALS**

June 2012

Introduction

The Derbyshire County Council Labour Group (DCCLG) welcomes this opportunity to comment upon the Commission's draft proposals.

We note that the Commission has reaffirmed its original intention to propose a 64 member authority for Derbyshire and our comments are based on the premise that the Commission is now unlikely to resile from that position.

We acknowledge the efforts of the Commission to balance the statutory criteria and overall we are supportive of the Commission's proposals. Indeed, in the Bolsover and Derbyshire Dales District Council areas we support the Commission's proposals in their entirety and we make no comment on the proposals for these two areas other than to express our support.

Our comments on the Commission's proposals for the Amber Valley, Chesterfield, High Peak and South Derbyshire areas are all very similar. In each case we propose minor changes to the Commission's draft proposals, suggesting amendments based on local knowledge of the areas concerned, that transfer relatively small numbers of electors between two or three of the proposed divisions in each area. As well as achieving greater community identity and interests our proposals secure greater effective and efficient local government and have either a modest impact on the equality of representation or secure greater equality of representation than the Commission's current draft proposals.

We note that in two of these areas, Amber Valley and High Peak, the Commission has proposed the creation of multi-member divisions. Whilst initially taken by surprise by these proposals we welcome the idea of multi-member divisions as an imaginative answer when balancing the conflicting demands of the statutory criteria.

Indeed, not only do we welcome the idea of multi-member divisions but their proposed introduction in to Derbyshire has allowed us to reflect on the draft proposals for the two remaining district council areas and to put forward alternative boundaries to those proposed by the Commission that involve the creation of multi-member divisions.

In the North East Derbyshire District Council area we do not support the Commission's proposals and have grave concerns that in attempting to secure electoral equality the draft proposals fail to adequately reflect the community identity and interests of that area and are damaging to effective and efficient local government to many of the communities in North East Derbyshire. In particular, we are aware that the Commission's draft proposals have generated widespread community concern where they split civil parish council areas between different divisions and result in consequential re-warding of those parish councils. We are, therefore, proposing the creation of two multi-member divisions in this area. This solution avoids the need to divide communities, achieves a very high degree of coterminosity and produce divisions with electorates that are closer to the county average than the draft proposals.

We are also proposing the creation of a multi-member division based on the town of Ilkeston in the Erewash Borough Council area. However, our proposal in this case involves the creation of a three member division based on that town. This solution results in a division with an average electorate per member that is closer to the county average than the Commission's own draft proposals. It also avoids the need to create artificial boundaries to divide that community, something that is the inevitable consequence of any proposal based on single member divisions, and avoids the arbitrary division of the Kirk Hallam housing estate proposed by the Commission in its draft proposals.

1. Amber Valley

- 1.1 The DCCLG welcomes the Commission's proposals for the Amber Valley Borough Council area and is supportive of the draft proposal to create a two-member division in the Alfreton/Somercotes area as a creative answer to the difficult task of balancing the statutory criteria when drafting boundaries.
- 1.2 The DCCLG supports in their entirety the Commission's proposed boundaries for the divisions Alfreton & Somercotes, Alport & Derwent, Belper, Duffield & Belper South, Greater Heanor, Horsley and Ripley West & Heage
- 1.3 We do not, however, support the proposed boundaries for the two remaining divisions of Heanor Central and Ripley East & Codnor and would reiterate the comments in our original submission that the community of Waingroves (polling district CDW) should be included in the Ripley East & Codnor division rather than in the proposed Heanor Central division.
- 1.4 Waingroves is a parish ward within the Ripley Town Council area and the proposal to include it within the Heanor Central division involves an unnecessary division of that Parish, adding a complexity to the electoral arrangements for that area. It would mean that the Ripley Town Council area is divided between three county divisions whereas our proposal would mean that Ripley would be contained within two divisions. The member for Heanor Central, representing only 792 electors, less than 5%, of Ripley's 16,980 electors would have an additional and unnecessary burden added to their workload were the Commission to confirm its draft proposal for this area.
- 1.5 As part of the town council area of Ripley, residents of Waingroves look towards Ripley rather than Heanor as their shopping, leisure and administrative centre as well as for their secondary schooling. The A610 provides excellent internal road links for this division and acts as the main access route into and out of Waingroves.
- 1.6 We understand that our proposal has the support of Ripley Town Council, Codnor Parish Council and Heanor & Loscoe Town Council.
- 1.7 The resulting Ripley East & Codnor division would have an electorate in 2017 of 10,704 making it 10% larger than the county average. The Heanor Central division without polling district CDW would, in 2017, have an electorate of 9,820, 1% above the county average. The effect of the DCCLG proposal on electoral equality is minimal, both divisions being within acceptable limits. However, the impact on efficient and effective local government and upon securing divisions that reflect community identity and interests are substantial.

Proposals:

1. Alfreton & Somercotes as per Commission's two-member division draft proposal.
2. Alport & Derwent as per Commission's draft proposal.
3. Belper as per Commission's draft proposal.
4. Duffield & Belper South as per Commission's draft proposal.
5. Greater Heanor as per Commission's draft proposal.
6. Horsley as per Commission's draft proposal.
7. Ripley West & Heage as per Commission's draft proposal.
8. Heanor Central - see below:
9. Ripley East & Codnor - see below:

DCCLG Proposed Divisions				LGBCE Draft Proposal		
Proposed division	Constituent parts	Electorate 2017	Variance from average	Proposed draft division	Proposed draft electorate	Variance from average
Heanor Central	Commission's proposed Heanor Central division minus polling district CDW	9,820	1%	Heanor Central	10,612	9%
Ripley East & Codnor	Commission's proposed Ripley East & Codnor division plus polling district CDW	10,704	10%	Ripley East & Codnor	9,912	2%

Summary of DCCLG proposals

- The DCCLG proposal avoids splitting Ripley Town Council between three divisions and, therefore, secures greater coterminosity with parish/town councils and would provide effective local government.
- The effect on securing greater equality of representation is minimal; both divisions are within acceptable levels.
- The DCCLG proposal achieves greater community interests and identity by recognising that Waingroves residents see Ripley as their main centre for shopping, leisure and community facilities.
- The DCCLG proposal achieves greater coterminosity with parish council boundaries, has excellent internal road links and reduces the workload on the

member for Heanor Central who would not have to represent less than 5% of the electorate of the Ripley Town Council area.

2. Bolsover

2.1 The DCCLG welcomes the Commission's proposals for the Bolsover District Council area and supports the draft boundaries in their entirety.

3. Chesterfield

- 3.1 The DCCLG welcomes the Commission's proposals for the Chesterfield Borough Council area. We support in their entirety the proposed boundaries for the seven divisions of Birdholme, Boythorpe & Brampton South, Brimington, St. Mary's, Staveley, Staveley North & Whittington and Walton & West.
- 3.2 We would, however, propose one minor change to the proposed boundaries of the Loundsley Green & Newbold division and the Spire division to better reflect the community interest and identity of the area and secure more efficient and effective local government.
- 3.3 The Commission's draft proposals involve splitting polling district PA1 between the two divisions with 631 electors included in the Loundsley Green & Newbold division and 534 included in the Spire division.
- 3.4 We would propose that the whole of polling district PA1 is included in the Loundsley Green & Newbold division and that polling district PA3 is included in the Spire division. Our proposed Loundsley Green & Newbold division would have an electorate in 2017 of 9,049, 7% below the county average whilst our proposed Spire division would have an electorate in 2017 of 9,323, 4% smaller than the county average. This compares to the Commission's proposals which result in corresponding electorates of 9,413 and 8,959 with variations from the county average of -3% and -8%.
- 3.5 Whilst polling districts aren't always good evidence of communities polling district PA1 covers the housing area known locally as the Highbury estate and we would urge the Commission to avoid the unnecessary splitting of this estate when our alternative proposal has minimal effect on electoral equality.
- 3.6 The main road access to the whole of the Highbury estate tends to be via Newbold Road to the west, which, under the Commission's draft proposals forms the boundary between these two divisions, and so communication links for the 631 electors in the Loundsley Green & Newbold division would be via the part of polling district PA1 in the Spire division.
- 3.7 Similarly, polling district PA3 covers what is locally known as the Peveril estate. The main road access for the 898 electors living within this polling district is from Sheffield Road to the east which forms one of the main highway links within the Spire division.
- 3.8 This minor change better reflects the local community identity in this area of Chesterfield than the Commission's draft proposals as well as securing more efficient and effective local government by following the natural road links and vehicular movements of the community. In addition it avoids an unnecessary splitting of an existing polling district which has the potential to cause confusion amongst the local electorate.

DCCLG Proposed Divisions				LGBCE Draft Proposal		
Proposed division	Constituent parts	Electorate 2017	Variance from average	Proposed draft division	Proposed draft electorate	Variance from average
Newbold & Loundsley Green	Commission's proposed Newbold & Loundsley Green division plus the whole of polling district PA1 minus the whole of polling district PA3	9,066	-7%	Newbold & Loundsley Green	9,413	-3%
Spire	Commission's proposed Spire division minus polling district PA1 (part) plus polling district PA3	9,323	-4%	Spire	8,959	-8%

Summary

Our proposal:

- Has minimal impact on electoral equality
- Avoids an unnecessary split in a polling district
- Better reflects the community identity of the areas involved by keeping communities/housing estates whole
- Follows the natural vehicular movements and access links within these two electoral divisions thereby improving internal road links

4. Derbyshire Dales

- 4.1 The DCCLG welcomes the Commission's proposals for the Derbyshire Dales District Council area and supports the draft boundaries in their entirety.

5. Erewash

- 5.1 The DCCLG welcomes the decision of the Commission to allocate 9 divisions to the Erewash Borough Council area.
- 5.2 We are in agreement with much of the Commission's proposals for this area and support fully the proposals for the six divisions of Breadsall, Breaston, Long Eaton, Petersham, Sandiacre and Sawley.
- 5.3 We do not, however, support the proposals for the town of Ilkeston. As the Commission recognises, Ilkeston is the largest market town in the Borough. It is unparished and whilst it has a number of sub-communities such as Cotmanhay and Kirk Hallam these are based on the housing estates radiating out from the town centre, built as the population of Ilkeston expanded. Residents of the town identify themselves with Ilkeston as a whole rather than with these smaller sub-communities, a factor recognised by the Commission's own proposals to rename all three divisions by including the town name in each one.
- 5.4 Residents in all three of the proposed divisions shop in the town centre and use the same leisure and communal facilities. Many of the community organisations such as the Rotary Club, Round Table and Ladies Circle are town wide bodies that include the word Ilkeston in their name. The town has its own football club, Ilkeston Town FC, and a town wide newspaper, the Ilkeston Advertiser. Communication links between all areas of the town are excellent with a good road network and public transport links that connect all areas of the town with each other and with the town centre. It is the contention of the DCCLG that all of these factors evidence the assertion that the town of Ilkeston has a strong sense of community identity and interest.
- 5.5 Whilst using existing district council wards as basic building blocks for the proposed division achieves a strong degree of coterminosity the way the Commission has configured those wards into the new divisions fails to take account of the geography of the town. The Commission's proposals for the town centre, for example, split it between the East and West divisions.
- 5.6 More seriously, the Commission's proposal to divide the Kirk Hallam housing estate in two fails to adequately reflect local community identity and interests or secure effective and efficient local government in that area. Situated in the south western corner of Ilkeston, Kirk Hallam is separated from the rest of the town by the Nutbrook Canal. The Commission's draft proposal places polling district FA in the Ilkeston West division whilst the other half of this housing estate, covered by polling district GA, is included in the Ilkeston South division. The proposed boundary between the Ilkeston West and South divisions runs, in part, down the centre of the A6096 Ladywood Road and Stanton Road meaning that it is not possible to travel from the northern corner of the Ilkeston West division to the south western corner without leaving the division.

- 5.7 Similarly, although less serious, the Commission's draft proposals split the Little Hallam area in two with one half being in the proposed Ilkeston West division and the other half being in the proposed Ilkeston South division.
- 5.8 The Commission's proposals to create multi-member divisions in other areas of the County provide an opportunity to revisit the proposals for Ilkeston and design boundaries that better reflect the statutory criteria. With a population of 29,061 in 2017 it is the view of the DCCLG that the town of Ilkeston lends itself to the creation of a single, three member division that covers the whole of the town. Such a solution produces a division that is 1% smaller than the county average, significantly closer to the average for two of those divisions than the Commission's draft proposals. It also avoids the other weaknesses in those proposals detailed above.
- 5.9 As well as securing greater equality of representation a three member division produces a division with clear boundaries that will be long standing. Although numerically larger than any other division the resulting Ilkeston division is geographically smaller than the neighbouring Breadsall division.

Proposals

1. Breadsall as per Commission's draft proposal
2. Breaston as per Commission's draft proposal
3. Long Eaton as per Commission's draft proposal
4. Petersham as per Commission's draft proposal
5. Sandiacre as per Commission's draft proposal
6. Sawley as per Commission's draft proposal
7. Ilkeston see below

Proposed division	Number of councillor	DCCLG Proposed Divisions				LGBCE Draft Proposal		
		Constituent parts	Electorate 2017	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average	Proposed draft division	Proposed draft electorate	Variance from average
Ilkeston	3	Proposed Ilkeston East, Ilkeston South & Ilkeston West divisions	29,061	9,687	-1%	Ilkeston East	10,179	4%
						Ilkeston South	9,098	-7%
						Ilkeston West	9,784	0%

Summary

The DCCLG proposals:

- Secures greater electoral equality than the Commission's draft proposals
- Avoids dividing the Kirk Hallam estate in an artificial manner

- Produces clear and long lasting boundaries
- Produces a division with a coherent internal road network
- Recognises the community identity of the town of Ilkeston

-

6. High Peak

- 6.1 DCCLG is largely supportive of the Commission's proposals for the High Peak area.
- 6.2 We support in their entirety the proposed boundaries for the divisions Chapel & Hope Valley, New Mills and Whaley Bridge.
- 6.3 We also support the proposed boundaries for the Etherow division but propose that the division be renamed Glossop West so as to better reflect the communities represented by this division. The name Etherow has little resonance in the area and whilst the communities within the division may have their own strong sense of identity all see themselves as part of the Glossopdale community and as being a part of the town of Glossop.
- 6.4 We have no comment on the proposed two member division for Glossop & Charlesworth.
- 6.5 We are not supportive of the proposed boundaries for the Buxton North & East division and the Buxton West division on the ground that in attempting to secure greater electoral equality too little weight is attached to the other statutory criteria and in particular they fail to secure effective and convenient local government in the area.
- 6.6 Based on the 2017 projections the Commission's proposed boundaries for the Buxton North & East division include 184 electors in polling district BU4. This area, known as Sterndale Moor, is part of the Hartington Upper Quarter Parish Council area and the Burbage district council ward. The rest of this Parish Council area and district council ward is included in the Buxton West division. It is the contention of the DCCLG that the boundaries of these two divisions should remain unchanged and that the Commission's proposals to divide this Parish Council area and district council wards is an unnecessary complication to the electoral arrangements in this area.
- 6.7 Were the Commission to adopt our proposals and leave the current boundaries of these two divisions unchanged by including polling district BU4 in the Buxton West divisions the projected electorate in 2017 would be 10,244, some 5% larger than the county average. The resultant Buxton North & East Division, without polling district BU4, would have a projected electorate in 2017 of 9,494, some 3% smaller than the county average. The difference between these figures and the Commission's proposed boundaries is marginal, both are well within acceptable levels of variance and results in clear, long lasting boundaries.

Proposals

1. Buxton North & East see below
2. Buxton West see below
3. Chapel & Hope Valley as per Commission's draft proposal
4. Glossop West as per Commission's draft proposal subject to name change
5. Glossop & Charlesworth as per Commission's draft proposal
6. New Mills as per Commission's draft proposal
7. Whaley Bridge as per Commission's draft proposal

DCCLG Proposed Divisions				LGBCE Draft Proposal		
Proposed division	Constituent parts	Electorate 2017	Variance from average	Proposed draft division	Proposed draft electorate	Variance from average
Buxton North & East	Commission's proposed Buxton North & East division minus polling district BU4	9,494	-3%	Buxton North & East	9,678	-1%
Buxton West	Commission's proposed Buxton West division plus polling district BU4	10,244	5%	Buxton West	10,060	3%

Summary

The DCCLG proposals:

- Have minimal impact on securing electoral equality
- Achieve more efficient and effective local government by avoiding the need to divide the Burbage district council ward and the Hartington Upper Quarter Parish Council area and the consequential warding of that parish area
- Better reflect the community identity and interests of the area by keeping the rural area of Hartington Upper Quarter within the same division

7. North East Derbyshire

- 7.1 The DCCLG recognise that the Commission is unlikely to change the view in its draft proposals allocating the North East Derbyshire area eight members, one fewer than at present.
- 7.2 However, we maintain our assertion that the Council's proposals, now adopted by the Commission as its draft proposals, fail to reflect the community identity and interests within this district or secure efficient and effective local government. The Commission acknowledges that parish council areas are a good indication of communities and recognises that NED is a wholly parished, largely rural area, yet the draft proposals divide six parishes (Eckington, Dronfield, Wingerworth, Clay Cross, Grassmoor and North Wingfield) between different divisions. Each of these communities are distinct villages/towns, separated from the next community by open fields. Each has its own parish church, local primary school, shopping centre, community/village hall, park and doctors surgery. Residents in each of these communities tend to use facilities within their own village rather than travelling to neighbouring villages and see themselves as coming from that village.
- 7.3 In Eckington for example the Commission is proposing to create a new Southgate parish council ward. We estimate this parish council ward will contain approximately 600 electors and will encompass Eckington town centre including its main shopping area, library, community centre and leisure centre. This area will be included in the Killamarsh and Spinkhill division and yet with the exception of the swimming pool (Killamarsh has its own leisure centre which does not include a swimming pool) none of these facilities are used by residents of Killamarsh. The main residential estates in Eckington, with a population of over 5,000 adults, who uses these facilities in Eckington town centre, are, however, included in the proposed Apperknowle division. The Commission gives no commentary on why it believes this proposal reflects the identity and interests of this community and so it is difficult to be sure that we have addressed the relevant points. However, should the Commission be minded to confirm its draft proposals for Eckington we would invite it to visit Eckington town centre to see for itself the consequences of its proposals.
- 7.4 A similar outcome is proposed for the community of Clay Cross where the Commission's proposals to split the village in two with the village centre, including its main shopping centre, community hall, leisure centre, doctors and dentist in the Clay Cross North division whereas the predominantly residential area of the Clay Cross South district ward is included in the proposed Clay Cross South division.
- 7.5 The Commission's commentary contained in its draft fails to recognise either of these two consequences or provide any indication of the Commission's thinking for having the residential areas of a community in one division and the communal facilities of that community in another.
- 7.6 The Commission's technical guidance expresses a preference for achieving coterminosity not just with parish council boundaries but also with district council ward boundaries. Coterminosity is seen as a prima facie means of

complying with the statutory criteria of securing effective and efficient local government although the guidance does state that these electoral boundaries can be split where it is necessary to comply with the two other statutory criteria. The Commission's draft proposals split six district council wards (Eckington South, Coal Aston, Dronfield Woodhouse, Gosforth Valley, North Wingfield and Grassmoor) and also results in the need to create additional parish council wards with some, such as the Bowshaw ward and the Coal Aston West ward in Dronfield, being particularly small in size when compared to the remaining town council wards in Dronfield.

- 7.7 It is the contention of the DCCLG that this lack of coterminosity with district council wards together with the need to divide so many civil parish council areas between different divisions is in itself evidence of the inherent weakness of the draft proposal in achieving effective and efficient local government and securing divisions that reflect community identity and interests.
- 7.8 We would also draw the Commission's attention to potential problems with communication links between two of its proposed divisions. Communications between the two population centres in the proposed Wingerworth & Shirland division, the villages of Wingerworth and Stonebroom, is along the A61. Whilst this road links the two communities it is not possible to travel from one of these villages to the other using the A61 without leaving the division and passing through the divisions of Clay Cross North and Clay Cross South.
- 7.9 A similar problem exists with the proposed Clay Cross South division which splits in half the village of North Wingfield linking the southern half with the Clay Cross South district council ward. Access between the villages of North Wingfield and Clay Cross is via the A6175. However, this road leads into the Clay Cross North district council ward which is included in the proposed Clay Cross North division and so communication links within this division would be by unclassified roads and involve a route that no local resident would use.
- 7.10 We see the Commission's proposal to create multi-member divisions in other district council areas as an opportunity to look afresh at the proposed boundaries for North East Derbyshire. We are, therefore, proposing the creation of two multi-member divisions and four single member divisions for the North East Derbyshire District Council area.
- 7.11 The consequence of this proposal is that all but two of the proposed divisions are coterminous with district council boundaries with only the Gosforth Valley ward and the Brampton & Walton ward not being coterminous. The only parish/town council not to be included within a single division would be Dronfield and the only consequential change to town/parish council wards being the Commission's proposed split of the Gosforth Valley ward in the Dronfield Town Council area.
- 7.12 Whereas the Commission's draft proposals have three divisions varying from the county average by more than 10%, our proposals achieve a greater electoral equality with only two divisions, the Dronfield West & Walton division at 11% above the county average and the proposed Grassmoor, Tupton & Wingerworth division at 12%, deviating from the average by more than 10%.

Proposals

1. Eckington & Killamarsh division

- 7.13 We would propose the creation of a two member division based on the district council wards of Killamarsh East & West, Eckington North & South, Renishaw, Ridgeway & Marsh Lane and Coal Aston.
- 7.14 The electorate for this division, at 19,623 in 2017, would create a division with a 1% variance from the county average. Geographically, the size of this division is on a par with those being proposed by the Commission.
- 7.15 We would maintain our assertion that the two communities of Killamarsh and Eckington are separate communities with their own interests and identities and we believe that the parish councils for the two communities are making their own submissions to support this assertion and will be providing supporting evidence. The Commission has already established the need to link these two communities in order to achieve greater equality of representation and our proposal allows this to happen without the damage to effective and efficient local government in the area that would result from the dividing of the Eckington South ward in the way proposed by the Commission.
- 7.16 The Commission has also established the principle of linking the community of Coal Aston with the community of Eckington. Our proposal adopts the Commission's suggestion but amends it slightly to include the whole of the Coal Aston ward. This results in greater equality of representation both in our proposed Eckington & Killamarsh division and in our proposed Dronfield East & Unstone division. It also avoids the need to sub-divide the Coal Aston district council ward into Coal Aston East and Coal Aston West town council wards, the latter of which would be a relatively small ward of approximately 200 electors. Our proposal thereby secures greater effective and efficient local government.

2. Dronfield East & Unstone division

- 7.17 This would be a single member division comprising the district council wards of Dronfield North, Dronfield South and Unstone together with polling district LC in the Gosforth Valley ward. This polling district was originally part of the Dronfield South district council ward until the last district council boundary review. With an electorate of 9,726 in 2017 this division does not deviate from the county average. It endorses the Commission's proposals to include the Dronfield North and South wards which straddle the B6057 together with polling district LC in the Gosforth Valley ward but also includes the ward of Unstone.
- 7.18 The main community within the Unstone ward, which accounts for two-thirds of the residents of this ward, also sits astride the B6057. The B6057 was the original main Sheffield/Chesterfield road before the construction of the A61 Unstone/Dronfield by-pass and provides excellent communication links within this division with a regular bus services, namely the 43, 43A, 44 & 44A, between the two communities of Dronfield and Unstone. There are no shops,

doctors or dentists located in Unstone and so Dronfield acts as the main centre for these facilities for many Unstone residents whilst the Dronfield Leisure Centre, located in Dronfield South ward, serves the Unstone community. Unstone primary school pupils transfer to The Dronfield School to undertake their secondary education. Whilst Unstone has its own parish church it has no cemetery and so Unstone Parish Council and Dronfield Town Council jointly administer the cemetery situated on Cemetery Road in the Dronfield South ward through the Dronfield & Unstone Joint Burial Committee.

- 7.19 Whereas there are strong community and communication links between the main population centre in Unstone and Dronfield there are no similar links between Unstone and Eckington. Highway links are via unclassified roads and there are no public transport links between the two communities. Residents of Unstone have little cause to use community facilities in Eckington.
- 7.20 One other variation between our proposal for this area and the Commission's is that the DCCLG proposal avoids the need to split the Dronfield Woodhouse district council ward and the consequential creation of the Bowshaw town council ward, a ward we believe will have just over 100 electors. We make this proposal in the belief that coterminosity of district wards and county division boundaries best achieves efficient and effective local government.

3. Dronfield West & Rural division

- 7.21 This division is almost identical to the Commission's own proposal and comprises the Dronfield Woodhouse ward, Barlow & Holmesfield ward, polling districts LA & LB in the Gosforth Valley ward and the whole of the Brampton & Walton ward except for polling district CF. The principal difference, therefore, is our proposal has greater coterminosity with district council wards and avoids the need to create the consequential Bowshaw Dronfield Town Council ward. With an electorate of 10,813 in 2017 it would vary from the county average by 11%.
- 7.22 We do, however, propose a slightly different name for this division to reflect the fact that it incorporates a number of rural communities.

4. Grassmoor, Tupton & Wingerworth division.

- 7.23 This would be a single member division and comprises the Grassmoor, Tupton & Wingerworth district council wards together with polling district CF in the Brampton & Walton ward. With an electorate of 10,912 in 2017 it would vary from the council average by 12%.
- 7.24 Although not entirely coterminous with the district council wards we note that the Commission's draft proposal also involves splitting polling district CF from the rest of the district council ward of Brampton & Walton. However, by including this polling district in this division our proposal unites all of the wards within the parish council area of Wingerworth within the same division. It is, therefore, comprised entirely of three parish council areas -Grassmoor, Tupton & Wingerworth- and so achieves effective and efficient local government, keeping those communities whole. In particular our proposal avoids the need to split the village of Grassmoor between two divisions. We understand that the Commission did not visit this village prior to agreeing its

draft proposal. The current draft boundaries in Grassmoor fail to follow clear and recognisable boundaries running in part down the boundary fences of peoples back gardens. If the Commission is proposing to go ahead with its draft recommendations for the village of Grassmoor we would urge it to visit this community to better understand the consequences of its proposal.

- 7.25 This proposal unites within one division the Avenue reclamation scheme on the eastern side of the A61. This site is one of the largest reclamation schemes in the country, covers land in all three parishes, and is currently split between 2 county divisions.
- 7.26 Each of the three villages in the division have their own parish church, village hall, primary school(s), pub, pharmacy and doctors and so interaction between these communities in terms of use of these facilities is limited. However, primary school pupils from all three villages transfer to Tupton Hall Secondary School. The villages of Wingerworth & Tupton sit either side of the A61 which provides excellent communication links between the two communities which share bus service 51. Residents of Wingerworth use the road network linking Tupton and Grassmoor as their most direct route to the M1 and so internal road links within this proposed division are excellent.
- 7.27 We understand that Grassmoor Parish Council is opposed to any proposal that splits that village between different divisions and will be making a submission accordingly with supporting evidence and, that together with Tupton Parish Council, endorses this proposal.

5. North Wingfield & Sutton division.

- 7.28 This is a single member division comprised of the three district council wards of North Wingfield Central, Holmewood & Heath and Calow. With an electorate of 10,751 in 2017 it varies from the county average by 10%.
- 7.29 It has the advantage of avoiding the need to further split the current North Wingfield Central ward and is coterminous with the district council wards and the civil parish council areas.
- 7.30 All of the villages within this division are self-contained, with their own parish church, community hall, primary school, shops, pubs and parks. There is no community interaction between the communities in the Calow ward and the remaining two wards in terms of community use of these facilities.
- 7.31 The villages of North Wingfield and Holmewood & Heath lie along the A6175 which provides excellent transport links and a common interest between these communities in terms of similar highway issues. Highway links with the Calow ward within the division are less good but still adequate.
- 7.32 Part of the North Wingfield civil parish area, the North Wingfield East parish council ward is included in the Holmewood & Heath district council ward and residents in this area use the community facilities in both Holmewood & North Wingfield.
- 7.33 We understand that North Wingfield Parish Council opposes the current draft proposals on the grounds that it splits the village in two thereby dividing the

community and denying it an effective voice and that they support a proposal that keeps their community whole.

6. Clay Cross, Pilsley & Stonebroom division

- 7.34 This division is a two member division and includes the district council wards of Ashover, Clay Cross North, Clay Cross South, Pilsley & Morton and Shirland. With an electorate of 18,811 in 2017 it is 4% smaller than the county average.
- 7.35 It has the advantage of being coterminous with district council wards and with the civil parish council areas within its boundaries. In particular, it avoids the need to split the parish of Clay Cross which is a consequence of the Commission's current draft proposal. It does, therefore, secure effective and efficient local government.
- 7.36 Clay Cross is by far the largest community in the southern half of the North East Derbyshire District Council area. Whilst all of the parishes within this division have their own parish church, village shops, village hall, park and pub, Clay Cross acts as a central hub for other facilities such as the large supermarket, outdoor market, library, council area housing office, leisure centre and dentist. It also houses the local community hospital, police and fire station.
- 7.37 The A61 runs through the heart of this division and provides excellent access to all of the villages in this division with the exception of Pilsley, although that village does have a direct road link with Clay Cross.
- 7.38 We understand that Clay Cross Parish Council are opposed to the Commission's current draft on the ground that it splits their community between two divisions, failing to secure efficient and effective local government or reflect community identity and interest. We also understand that Shirland and Higham Parish Council oppose the Commission's proposals for their community and in particular, the proposal to link it with Wingerworth.

Division name	Constituents parts	Number of councillors	Electorate (2011)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Eckington & Killamarsh	Eckington North & South wards, Killamarsh East & West wards, Renishaw ward, Ridgeway & Marsh Lane ward & Coal Aston ward	2	19,442	9,721	3%	19,623	9,811	1%
Dronfield East & Unstone	Dronfield North ward, Dronfield South ward, Unstone ward, part Gosforth Valley ward (LC)	1	9,698	9,698	3%	9,726	9,726	0%
Dronfield West & Rural	Dronfield Woodhouse ward, part Gosforth Valley ward (LA & LB) Barlow & Holmesfield ward, part Brampton & Walton ward (CA, CB, CC, CD, & CE)	1	10,664	10,664	13%	10,813	10,813	11%
Grassmoor, Tupton & Wingerworth	Grassmoor ward, Tupton ward, Wingerworth ward, part Brampton & Walton ward (CF)	1	10,854	10,854	15%	10,912	10,912	12%
North Wingfield & Sutton	Holmewood & Heath ward, North Wingfield ward, Sutton ward	1	10,523	10,523	12%	10,751	10,751	10%
Clay Cross, Pilsley & Stonebroom	Ashover ward, Clay Cross North ward, Clay Cross South ward, Pilsley & Morton ward, Shirland ward	2	17,552	8,776	-7%	18,811	9,405	-4%

8. South Derbyshire

- 8.1 The DCCLG welcomes the decision of the Commission to allocate one extra member to the South Derbyshire DC area.
- 8.2 We support the Commission's proposed boundaries for the divisions of Hilton, Linton, Swadlincote Central, Swadlincote North and Swadlincote South.
- 8.3 However, we do not support the boundaries for the proposed divisions of Aston, Etwall & Repton and of Melbourne on the grounds that they do not best take account of the statutory criteria.
- 8.4 Our objection to the Commission's proposed boundaries for these three divisions is based upon the inclusion of the parishes of Foremark, Ingleby and Stanton by Bridge in the proposed Aston division. These three parishes are south of the River Trent and as such are isolated from the rest of the Aston division which is to the north of that river. The Commission's own published guidance states that it will not normally create divisions that straddle major rivers and, therefore, it is surprising that the Commission is now proposing that these three parishes, with a combined electorate of 317 people accounting for only 3% of this proposed division, are included in the Aston division.
- 8.5 Instead, we would propose that these three parishes are taken out of the proposed area of the Aston division so that it only includes the proposed area north of the River Trent. That would result in the Aston division having an electorate of 10,245 in 2017, 5% above the county average and, therefore, closer to that figure than the draft proposals
- 8.6. We would also propose that the draft Aston division is renamed Aston and Stenson division so as to better reflect the two main communities within that division.
- 8.7 We would propose that the Stanton by Bridge parish, with its 190 electors in 2017, is included within the boundaries of the proposed Melbourne division. This parish is part of the Melbourne district council ward and so this proposal achieves greater coterminosity of boundaries and helps secure efficient and effective local government in the area. The communities of Stanton by Bridge and Melbourne are connected by public transport and are served by the same schools and so have greater community identity and interests with the community of Melbourne than with the area north of the River Trent.
- 8.8 The electorate for our proposed Melbourne division in 2017 would be 9,399, 4% smaller than the county average and, therefore our proposal achieves greater electoral equality than the Commission's current draft
- 8.9 We propose that the two parishes of Foremark and Ingleby, with a combined electorate of 97 in 2017, are included in the Commission's proposed Etwall & Repton division. These two parishes are currently included in the Repton district council ward and so this proposal achieves greater coterminosity of boundaries helping to secure efficient and effective local government in the area.

8.10. The electorate for our proposed Etwall & Repton division in 2017 would be 10,150, 4% above the county average, marginally more than the Commission's own proposal and well within accepted limits.

8.11 Our proposals also mean that the Repton district council ward will only be divided between two county council divisions whereas the Commission's proposals result in a three way division of that ward. The DCLG proposal does, therefore, secure a greater degree of coterminosity of boundaries, thereby strengthening effective and efficient local government in that area.

Proposal

1. Hilton as Commission's draft proposal
2. Linton as Commission's draft proposal
3. Swadlincote Central as Commission's draft proposal
4. Swadlincote North as Commission's draft proposal
5. Swadlincote South as Commission's draft proposal
6. Aston & Stenson see below
7. Etwall & Repton see below
8. Melbourne see below

DCCLG Proposed Divisions				LGBCE Draft Proposal		
Proposed division	Constituent parts	Electorate 2017	Variance from average	Proposed draft division	Proposed draft electorate	Variance from average
Aston & Stenson	Commission's proposed Aston division minus Foremark CP, Ingleby CP & Stanton by Bridge CP	10,245	5%	Aston	10,532	8%
Etwall & Repton	Commission's proposed Etwall & Repton division plus Foremark CP and Ingleby CP	10,150	4%	Etwall & Repton	10,053	3%
Melbourne	Commission's proposed Melbourne division plus Stanton by Bridge CP	9,399	-4%	Melbourne	9,209	-6%

Summary

The Commission's draft proposals for the Aston and Melbourne divisions:

- Fail to secure the greatest equality of electorate
- Split existing district council wards and so fails to achieve coterminosity
- Create a division that straddles the River Trent with 317 electors in the proposed Aston division being south of the river
- Fail to reflect community identity and interests

The DCCLG proposals propose to rectify these issues by:

- Securing greater equality of representation
- Using the River Trent as a natural boundary between divisions
- Avoiding splitting the Melbourne district council thereby achieving greater coterminosity of boundaries.
- Avoiding an unnecessary split in the Repton district council ward thereby achieving greater coterminosity of boundaries.
- Reflecting the natural transport, road and community links in this area of South Derbyshire

Appendix

	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	9,574	9,574	2%	9,820	9,820	1%
7	Horsley	1	10,059	10,059	7%	10,309	10,309	6%
8	Ripley East & Codnor	1	10,439	10,439	11%	10,704	10,704	10%
9	Ripley West & Heage	1	10,629	10,629	13%	10,754	10,754	10%
Bolsover District								
10	Balborough & 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%
19	Loundsley Green & Newbold	1	8,981	8,981	-5%	9,066	9,066	-7%
20	St. Mary's	1	9,691	9,691	3%	9,722	9,722	0%
21	Spire	1	8,167	8,167	-13%	9,323	9,323	-4%
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%
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	3	27,856	9,285	-1%	29,061	9,687	-1%
34	Long Eaton	1	9,235	9,235	-2%	9,791	9,751	0%
35	Petersham	1	9,635	9,635	2%	9,937	9,937	2%
36	Sandiacre	1	9,303	9,303	-1%	9,493	9,493	-3%
37	Sawley	1	9,316	9,316	-1%	9,461	9,461	-3%

High Peak Borough								
38	Buxton North & East	1	8,727	8,727	-7%	9,494	9,494	-3%
39	Buxton West	1	9,851	9,851	5%	10,244	10,244	5%
40	Chapel & Hope Valley	1	9,225	9,225	-2%	9,514	9,514	-2%
41	Glossop West	1	8,507	8,507	-10%	8,777	8,777	-10%
42	Glossop & Charlesworth	2	17,451	8,726	-7%	17,997	8,999	-8%
43	New Mills	1	9,889	9,889	5%	10,201	10,201	5%
44	Whaley Bridge	1	8,345	8,345	-11%	8,608	8,608	-12%
North East Derbyshire District								
45	Eckington & Killamarsh	2	19,442	9,721	3%	19,623	9,811	1%
46	Dronfield East & Unstone	1	9,698	9,698	3%	9,726	9,726	0%
47	Dronfield West & Rural	1	10,664	10,664	13%	10,813	10,813	11%
48	Grassmoor, Tupton & Wingerworth	1	10,854	10,854	15%	10,912	10,912	12%
49	North Wingfield & Sutton	1	10,523	10,523	12%	10,751	10,751	10%
50	Clay Cross, Pilsley & Shirland	2	17,552	8,776	-7%	18,811	9,405	-4%
South Derbyshire District								
51	Aston & Stenson	1	8,616	8,616	-8%	10,245	10,245	5%
52	Etwall & Repton	1	9,513	9,513	1%	10,150	10,150	3%
53	Hilton	1	9,300	9,300	-1%	9,482	9,482	-3%
54	Linton	1	8,620	8,620	-8%	9,442	9,442	-3%
55	Melbourne	1	8,994	8,994	-4%	9,399	9,399	-4%
56	Swadlincote Central	1	9,397	9,397	0%	9,552	9,552	-2%
57	Swadlincote North	1	9,353	9,353	-15	9,475	9,475	-3%
58.	Swadlincote South	1	8,257	8,257	-12%	9,361	9,361	-4%