

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
North west	8
North east and Central	11
Swadlincote town and rural south	13
Conclusions	16
Parish electoral arrangements	16
3 What happens next?	18
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	20
B Code of practice on written consultation	24
C Table C1: Final recommendations for South Derbyshire	26
D Additional legislation to which we have had regard	28

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 South Derbyshire to ensure that the authority has appropriate electoral arrangements that reflect its functions and political management structure.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Boundary Committee for England commenced the review in 2009. However, on 1 April 2010 the Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee and is now conducting the review. It therefore falls to us to complete the work of the Boundary Committee.

This review was conducted in four stages:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
One	27 October 2009	Submission of proposals to the Boundary Committee
Two	19 January 2010	Boundary Committee's analysis and deliberation
Three	25 May 2010	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	20 July 2010	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

The Boundary Committee proposed a council size of 36 comprising a pattern of seven three-member wards, seven two-member wards and one single-member ward. The proposals were broadly based on the South Derbyshire District Council Labour Group's and Mark Todd MP's authority-wide schemes with some modifications. The draft recommendations would provide good levels of electoral equality.

Submissions received

During Stage Three the Commission received 27 submissions, including submissions from the majority Conservative Group on South Derbyshire District Council, the Labour Group on the District Council and Heather Wheeler MP (South Derbyshire). The remainder of the submissions received were localised comments, predominantly from parish councils and members of the public. Some alternative proposals to the draft

recommendations were put forward relating to the proposed wards in the Swadlincote area, and in the north west of the district. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk.

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

South Derbyshire District Council submitted electorate forecasts for December 2013, a period five years on from the December 2008 electoral roll. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% over this period. Although we have some concern that this level of growth appears somewhat high, we note that during the period 2004–08 the electorate in South Derbyshire increased by approximately 6%.

Following recent changes in legislation, we also need to have regard to a five-year forecast from the date of the publication of our final recommendations. We therefore requested that the Council provide a forecast for 2015. These result in a relatively small increase in electorate when compared to the 2013 figures. Given the number of projected development areas in the north of the district, we are satisfied that the Council's projections are the most accurate electorate figures that can be provided at this time.

General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during Stage Three, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during Stage Three. We have moved away from the draft recommendations in two areas in the south of the district to reflect the evidence received.

Our final recommendations for South Derbyshire are that the Council should have 36 members, with seven three-member wards, seven two-member wards and one single-member ward. Only one ward would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2015.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for South Derbyshire District Council. 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 Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for South Derbyshire District Council, in 2011.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk.

1 Introduction

1 The Electoral Commission directed the Boundary Committee for England to conduct a review of South Derbyshire District Council on 11 March 2009. The review started on 27 October 2009 when the Boundary Committee wrote to South Derbyshire District Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on the appropriate council size and warding arrangements for the Council.

2 On 1 April 2010, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee. It has therefore fallen to us to complete the work of the Boundary Committee

3 The submissions received during Stage One of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Derbyshire District Council*, which were published on 25 May 2010. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 20 July 2010.

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 achieve good 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.

6 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 South Derbyshire?

7 In March 2009, the Electoral Commission directed the Boundary Committee to undertake the review because, based on the December 2008 electorate figures, 35% of wards had electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average. Most notably, the existing Woodville ward had 41% more electors per councillor than the average for the district.

8 Following the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) assuming the functions of the Boundary Committee, the Commission is now conducting the review. It therefore falls to us to complete the work of the Boundary Committee

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

How will our recommendations affect you?

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

10 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)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL (Deputy Chair)
Jane Earl
Joan Jones CBE
Professor Colin Mellors

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

11 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for South Derbyshire District Council.

12 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for South 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 2009² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- 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

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

14 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. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

15 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of South Derbyshire or the external boundaries or names of parish or town councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that our recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our 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.

16 We are also aware of the impact South Derbyshire’s relative geographic position has on expected growth in the area. There are several large settlements close to the district, including Burton-on-Trent, Derby, Nottingham and Birmingham, and it is bordered by four counties. In particular, the district is potentially subject to the pressures of further development from Derby to its north, which will see a significant increase in housing stock in the coming years. It is therefore important to highlight the fact that the district’s current and future population is influenced by some external factors, and we have, so far as is possible, taken these factors in to account when considering the best way to ensure proper representation for all those living in the district.

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

Submissions received

17 Prior to and during the initial stages of the review, members and officers of the Boundary Committee visited South Derbyshire and met with officers, members and parish and town councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. Twenty-six representations were received during Stage One and 27 during Stage Three, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of the South Derbyshire District Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk.

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

Electorate figures

19 As part of this review, South Derbyshire District Council initially submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2013, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% over the five-year period from 2008 to 2013. As a consequence of new legislation which requires that we have regard for forecasts made for five years after the end of the review, we requested that they submit further electorate forecasts for the year 2015.

20 Over the seven-year period between 2008 and 2015 the Council projected an increase in electorate of 10%. We had some concerns about whether this rate of growth would be realised. However, during the five-year period 2003–08, the electorate of South Derbyshire increased by approximately 6% and we note that the district is one of the fastest growing in England. We noted in our draft recommendations that there was some uncertainty in respect of one planned development in the north of the district. However, in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, we are satisfied with the methodology provided by the District Council and are therefore content to accept their revised forecasts and use them as the basis for our final recommendations.

Council size

21 The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) completed a Periodic Electoral Review of the district in 1998 which recommended a council size of 36 members elected from 17 district wards. The District of South Derbyshire (Electoral Changes) Order 1999 implemented the LGCE's recommendations.

22 During the initial stage of the review, the Boundary Committee received proposals for two different council sizes, of 36 and 39 elected members. The District Council proposed a council size of 39 members, as did the South Derbyshire Conservative Association. The Labour Group proposed a 36-member council, as did the former MP for South Derbyshire, Mark Todd.

23 The Committee considered that the Council's proposal did not provide sufficient evidence to justify an increase in council size from 36 to 39 members. The proposal mainly

focused on the projected increase in electorate in the district, and argued that this increase would necessitate a commensurate increase in councillor representation. As indicated in our guidance on electoral reviews, we do not accept that increases in electorate should automatically result in an increase in council size. The Committee therefore proposed retaining the existing council size of 36 elected members.

24 At Stage Three we received little comment on the proposed council size. South Derbyshire District Council did not submit a response, but the two political groups on the council both responded.

25 The majority Conservative Group expressed the view in its submission that a 36-member council, 'forced wardings which created inappropriate groupings of disparate communities'. The Labour Group noted that 'to increase the number of elected members on [the Council] is unnecessary and, if adopted, would have been a further burden on the public purse'. We received one other comment on the council size, from Etwall Parish Council, which stated that the decision to retain 36 members was 'correct'.

26 Based on the evidence received we have decided to confirm a council size of 36 elected members for South Derbyshire as part of our final recommendations. We are of the view that a council size of 36 members would provide for effective and convenient local government in the context of the District Council's internal political management structure and will facilitate the representational role of councillors.

Electoral fairness

27 As discussed in the introduction to this report, the prime aim of an electoral review is to achieve electoral fairness within a local authority.

28 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 will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

29 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (70,214 in December 2008 and 78,105 by December 2015) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 36 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 1,950 in 2008 and 2,170 by 2015.

30 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in one of the 15 wards will vary by more than 10% from the average across the authority by 2015. Overall, we are satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our final recommendations for South Derbyshire.

General analysis

31 As indicated above, our draft recommendations were based broadly on the proposals of the District Council's Labour Group with two modifications to reflect

comments received during consultation. Their proposals were also reflected in the former MP Mark Todd's submission.

32 During Stage Three, the draft recommendations were generally well-received, with several respondents endorsing the warding pattern for their respective area. The Conservative Group stated their opposition to our proposed 36-member scheme. They considered that having 36 members 'forced wardings which created inappropriate groupings of disparate communities'. However, their submission also stated that they make 'no reference' to some of our proposed wards. The Group 'has no strong objection or comment' to these wards. The Labour Group and Mark Todd supported the draft recommendations but made additional comments relating to several discrete areas.

33 We received some opposition to the draft recommendations, most notably in the areas of Smisby and Hartshorne. We considered that there was sufficient evidence provided in the representations received to warrant us moving away from our draft recommendations in these areas.

34 Our final recommendations are for a pattern of seven three-member wards, seven two-member wards and one single-member ward. We consider our recommendations to provide good electoral equality while providing an accurate reflection of community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

35 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on pages 26–27) and Map 1.

Electoral arrangements

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

North west (pages 8 -11)

North east and central (pages 11-13)

Swadlincote town and rural south (pages 13-15)

37 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 26-27, and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

38 It should be noted that our draft recommendations report used forecast electorate variances for 2013. All forecast variances in our final recommendations are 2015 figures.

North west

39 The north western part of South Derbyshire consists of largely rural parishes with some scattered urban settlements. Derby City lies immediately to the north of the district.

40 During Stage One, in addition to district-wide proposals discussed above, eight submissions were received in relation to this area from six parish councils, and two district councillors.

41 During Stage Three we received 12 submissions in relation to this area from six parish councils, one district councillor, a local community organisation and four members of the public. The majority of these submissions focused on the proposed Hilton and Hatton wards.

42 Our draft recommendations were based largely on the Labour Group's proposals for this area. However, we had moved away from its proposals in Hatton ward, where we proposed to move Hatton Parish Council's North ward into a revised three-member Hilton district ward, rather than ward it with the more urban Hatton south area. We adopted the Labour Group's proposed two-member Etwall ward and two-member Willington & Findern ward without amendment as part of our draft recommendations.

Hatton area

43 Our draft recommendations were for a single-member ward for Hatton, and a three-member Hilton ward comprising several parishes in the north west of the district.

44 At Stage Three, the Conservative Group put forward some amendments to our draft recommendations for these wards, namely that Foston & Scropton parish be warded with Hatton on grounds of shared community interests. Hatton Parish Council accepted our draft recommendations, and offered no further comment. We received no other comments relating to this ward at Stage Three.

45 The Conservative Group's proposal for Hatton would result in an electoral variance for the proposed ward of 15% by 2015. We are not persuaded that we have received sufficient evidence to support such levels of electoral inequality. Moreover, we note that this proposal has received no further support locally.

46 We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendations for a single-member Hatton ward which would contain 8% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. This ward can be seen in detail on Map 2A accompanying this report.

Hilton area

47 Our draft recommendations for the Hilton area were for a three-member ward which would comprise the large village of Hilton and several less-populated rural parishes in the north west of the district. As mentioned above, this is broadly the ward which the Labour Group proposed at Stage One, with one amendment: the inclusion of Hatton parish's North ward.

48 At Stage Three, we received five submissions which mentioned our proposed Hilton ward. The Conservative Group noted that Hilton 'shares few interests or affinities' with the majority of the parishes with which it was warded in the draft recommendations.

49 Other respondents expressed concern about the rural/urban mix in the proposed ward. Church Broughton Parish Council and two members of the public expressed concern that the rural areas of this ward may have their interests overlooked at the expense of the urban area of Hilton.

50 Councillor Plenderleith (Hilton ward) proposed a two-member ward based on Hilton parish and argued that this should increase to a three-member ward once planned

development in Hilton took place. Hilton Parish Council proposed retaining the existing ward, except that it should return three councillors, again to anticipate future growth in the area.

51 We noted the concerns expressed by some respondents with regard to this proposed ward. However, as mentioned in our draft recommendations, given the distribution of electors in this area, and the sparsely populated nature of parishes in the north west of the district there is little scope for establishing smaller wards while also ensuring good electoral equality.

52 While noting the proposal of Hilton Parish Council, we are not persuaded that the proposal was supported by sufficient evidence of community identities and consider it would have a consequential effect on the warding arrangements for the wider area. In addition, the electorate projection figures received from the District Council do not reflect the view that the existing Hilton will have sufficient electors by 2015 to require a third councillor.

53 Consequently we confirm as final the draft recommendations for a three-member Hilton ward which will contain 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Etwall area

54 At Stage One, submissions were received from parish councils in the area concerned with the District Council's proposal to create a large North West ward comprising 13 parishes. This ward would not, in the parishes' view, reflect community identities there. Etwall, Egginton and Burnaston parish councils provided evidence of community links between them, including cultural and ecclesiastical links.

55 In our draft recommendations we proposed a two-member ward for Etwall which was based on the Labour Group's proposed ward. This ward contains a mix of rural parishes to the north and some more urban settlements around Etwall village.

56 At Stage Three, Etwall and Egginton parish councils expressed their support for the proposed ward, and we received submissions from two members of the public who also supported the draft recommendations.

57 In light of the support for this proposed ward, and with no evidence to the contrary, we confirm as final our draft recommendation for the proposed two-member Etwall ward. This ward would have 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Willington and Findern area

58 Our draft recommendations for this area were for a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Willington and Findern. This was based on the Labour Group's proposal to retain the existing warding arrangements.

59 At Stage Three, we received two submissions relating to this area, from Findern Parish Council and Findern Village Institute. Findern Parish Council supported the draft

recommendations, while Findern Village Institute considered that any change to the existing arrangements would not have a significant impact on the Institute.

60 We consider that the proposed two-member ward would reflect community identities and interests and note the measure of local support. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendations for a two-member Willington & Findern ward. This ward would have 10% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

North east and central

61 The north east of the district comprises the parishes on the eastern edge of Derby City, with the county of Leicestershire to its east. The central area is largely rural with several scattered settlements.

62 During Stage One, in addition to district-wide proposals five specific comments in relation to this area were received from parish councils. At Stage Three we received seven submissions relating to this area, three from parish councils and four from members of the public, including former MP Mark Todd.

Stenson area

63 As part of our draft recommendations we proposed a two-member Stenson ward based on the Labour Group's proposal at Stage One. The proposed ward comprises Stenson Fields and Twyford & Stenson parishes.

64 At Stage Three, we received two submissions relating to this ward, from Barrow upon Trent and Stenson Fields parish councils. Barrow upon Trent Parish Council endorsed the draft recommendations and re-stated their view that the parish has stronger links with parishes to its east in our proposed Aston ward than with the more urban Stenson Fields parish. Stenson Fields Parish Council also supported our draft recommendations, which would retain the status quo for Stenson ward.

65 Barrow upon Trent Parish Council expressed a desire to alter its parish boundary with Stenson Fields parish. However, this is not within our remit, and is a matter which would need to be considered by South Derbyshire District Council as part of a Community Governance Review.

66 On the basis of the representations received, we have decided to confirm as final our draft recommendation for the two-member Stenson ward. This ward would have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Aston area

67 Our draft recommendations for the Aston area departed from the Labour Group's proposals. The Group proposed a two-member Aston ward and a single-member Boulton Moor ward. It was envisaged that housing development in and around Boulton Moor would mean that Boulton Moor could be a viable single-member ward. However, based on our visit to the area and information provided by the District Council, we considered there was a likelihood that this housing development may not be substantially in progress within the 5-year timescale of this review.

68 As mentioned above, Barrow upon Trent Parish Council supported our proposed wards for Stenson and for Aston. The District Council had proposed at Stage One that the parish be warded with Stenson. However, evidence from the Parish Council persuaded us that warding it with Aston better reflected community links in the area. We therefore proposed a three-member ward for Aston, which was based on the existing district ward.

69 At Stage Three a member of the public from Barrow upon Trent supported our proposed Aston ward on the grounds that residents in Barrow had concerns over issues such as flooding and gravel extraction which were in common with those of other adjacent rural parishes. We did not receive any other comments on these wards.

70 On the basis of the representations received we have decided to confirm as final our draft recommendation for a three-member Aston ward. This ward would have 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the large map accompanying this report.

Melbourne area

71 Our draft recommendation for Melbourne was for a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Melbourne and Stanton-by-Bridge. This was based on the Labour Group's proposal at Stage One.

72 At Stage Three, we received no submissions specifically about this area except for the Conservative Group which stated that it accepted the draft recommendations for this ward. In light of this, we therefore confirm as final the draft recommendations for a two-member Melbourne ward. This ward would have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Repton area

73 In our draft recommendations, we proposed a two-member ward for Repton, which was broadly based on the Labour Group's submission. However, we moved away from the Labour Group's proposals in one respect and did not include Smisby parish in the proposed ward.

74 At Stage Three, we received submissions from Heather Wheeler MP (South Derbyshire), the Conservative Group, the Labour Group and former MP Mark Todd who all expressed a preference for Smisby parish being warded with Repton rather than with the Woodville area. The Labour Group and Mark Todd also noted that Smisby village even has more links to Ashby de la Zouch, which is outside of the district, than with Woodville.

75 Smisby Parish Council highlighted evidence of community links between it and the neighbouring Ticknall parish, and with other rural parishes to its north west. We were informed that Smisby and Ticknall parish councils have worked together on an anti-speeding campaign on the B5006 road. Smisby Parish Council also highlighted the lack of links between Smisby and Woodville, noting that children do not attend school in Woodville.

76 In our draft recommendations, we considered that Smisby parish had little connection with the proposed Repton ward, and so decided to ward it with Woodville. However, we are persuaded that we have received sufficient evidence at Stage Three to move away from our draft recommendations in this area. We therefore recommend that Smisby parish be included in the proposed Repton ward. This would result in the revised two-member Repton ward containing 5% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. This ward can be seen on Map 1 which accompanies this report. Our final recommendations for Woodville ward are discussed in detail below.

Swadlincote town and rural south

77 Swadlincote is the largest settlement in South Derbyshire, and is situated towards the south of the district. The area to its south and west is mainly rural, with several small villages and settlements.

78 During Stage One, in addition to the district-wide schemes put forward, four submissions were received in relation to this area, two from parish councils and two from members of the public. At Stage Three, in addition to district-wide schemes, we received six submissions regarding this area, one from a parish council and five from members of the public, one of whom sent in two submissions.

79 Our final recommendations for this area have only one amendment to our draft recommendations, which is to adopt an amended boundary between Midway and Woodville wards and, as stated above, transfer Smisby parish into a revised two-member Repton ward.

Woodville and Midway wards

80 Our draft recommendations for Woodville and Midway wards were broadly based on the Labour Group's proposals at Stage One, and were both three-member wards. We proposed a different boundary between Midway and Newhall & Stanton wards in order to achieve good electoral equality.

81 At Stage Three, the Conservative Group opposed the draft recommendations for this area. It argued that Hartshorne village 'shares very little or no community affinity' with the Woodville area and has greater ties with more rural parishes such as Ticknall.

82 We received five further submissions specifically relating to this area, all of whom disagreed with our proposed boundary between Woodville and Midway wards. A local resident noted that there is no direct link between Lower Midway and Hartshorne village, a view echoed by Hartshorne Parish Council that said that the part of Hartshorne in the proposed Midway ward 'has no affinity with Lower Midway and Midway'.

83 Both the local resident and Hartshorne Parish Council suggested the same boundary amendment. This boundary would follow the stream running to the west from Broomy Furlong farm. This would mean all of Goseley and Hartshorne villages would be in Woodville ward. Hartshorne Parish Council stated that 'to split Main Street and Woodville Road in two wards would cause confusion amongst residents in the area, particularly at election time'. This ward boundary can be seen in detail on Map 3 which accompanies this report.

84 We note the views expressed with regard to the rural nature of Hartshorne parish. However, we are not persuaded the whole of the parish should be warded with more rural areas to its north and east. We consider that Hartshorne, while not an integral part of the built-up area, effectively constitutes a ribbon of development flowing from the urban area. This was evident to us when we visited the area. Moreover, such a change would have a significant consequential effect on the warding arrangements for the south of the borough and we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been received to justify such a change.

85 We note the views in regard to the proposed boundary between Woodville and Midway wards and agree that with the road link provided by the A514, Hartshorne village is better connected to Woodville rather than to Midway

86 We have therefore decided to move away from our draft recommendations in this area and to adopt the revised boundary proposed by Hartshorne Parish Council and the local resident. We consider that this modification will better reflect community identities, provide a more clearly defined ward boundary and maintain good levels of electoral equality. With this amendment, our final recommendation for a three-member Midway ward would result in there being 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. For the three-member Woodville ward, taking in to account this boundary amendment and the removal of Smisby parish from the ward (as discussed earlier), there would be 10% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the large maps accompanying this report.

Swadlincote

87 Our draft recommendation for Swadlincote ward was for a three-member ward, which was based on the Labour Group's submission at Stage One.

88 We proposed warding Swadlincote Woodlands area with Swadlincote, rather than retaining it within Woodville ward, as part of our draft recommendations. This was proposed by the Labour Group at Stage One. The Conservative Group's submission at Stage Three argued that our draft recommendations outlined no evidence to suggest that Swadlincote Woodlands looks to Swadlincote more than to Woodville. We note there is a road from the main housing area into Swadlincote ward, but not to Woodville, where only a footpath links the estate to the rest of Woodville ward.

89 Given the above, we consider that our proposed boundary reflects the community and transport links in this area and ensures good electoral equality. Consequently, we confirm as final the draft recommendations for a three-member Swadlincote ward. This ward would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average in 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Church Gresley

90 Our draft recommendations for Church Gresley was for a three-member ward, which was broadly based on the Labour Group's submission. At Stage One it proposed two boundary alterations to the existing warding arrangements, and we adopted one of these as part of our draft recommendations.

91 As mentioned in paragraphs 19-20, at Stage Three, we received revised

electorate forecasts for the district from South Derbyshire District Council. This was due to a change in the legislation which meant we had to have regard for forecasts made for five years after the completion of the review, which would be the year 2015. The revised forecast meant that our proposed Church Gresley ward would have 14% fewer electors than the district average by 2015, which is a higher variance than we would normally accept in the absence of robust supporting evidence.

92 We considered an alternative boundary to address this high electoral variance. However, any amendment to the proposed boundary would not, in our view, reflect community identities and would result in a somewhat arbitrary ward boundary. We are satisfied that the electoral variance that would result is justifiable, given the need to provide warding arrangements that best reflect our statutory criteria. Furthermore, during Stage Three, we did not receive any alternative proposals to amend this boundary. Consequently, we confirm as final our draft recommendations for the three-member Church Gresley ward. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Newhall & Stanton ward

93 As part of our draft recommendations we proposed a three-member ward which differed from the Labour Group's proposed ward. Our proposed ward was similar to the existing ward, except with an alteration to the boundary with Midway ward in order to facilitate our proposed warding arrangements in adjoining areas.

94 At Stage Three, our proposed Newhall & Stanton ward was specifically mentioned in two submissions. Former MP Mark Todd re-iterated the view he expressed at Stage One, that Stanton village, which abuts the district boundary should be part of a three-member ward based on communities on the edge of Swadlincote along the A444 road. However, he provided no further evidence which persuaded us to alter our proposed ward. The other submission was from a local couple who supported our proposed ward, agreeing that Stanton 'has stronger connections to the urban area' and that it should remain part of the Newhall & Stanton ward.

95 Consequently, we confirm as final our draft recommendation for a three-member Newhall and Stanton ward. This ward would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Linton and Seales ward

96 As part of our draft recommendations, we proposed a two-member Linton and a two-member Seales ward. This reflected both the status quo, and matched the proposal of the Labour Group.

97 We received no comments on either of these two wards at Stage Three. Therefore, we are content to confirm as final our draft recommendations for these wards. The two-member Linton ward and the two-member Seales ward would have 6% more and 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2015. The final recommendations for this area are shown on the maps accompanying this report.

Conclusions

98 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 26-27, and illustrated on a number of large maps we have produced. The outline map which accompanies this report shows our final recommendations for the whole authority. It also shows a number of boxes for which we have produced more detailed maps. These maps are also available to be viewed on our website.

99 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements based on 2008 and 2015 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2008	2015
Number of councillors	36	36
Number of electoral wards	15	15
Average number of electors per councillor	1,950	2,170
Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	6	1
Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation

South Derbyshire District Council should comprise 36 councillors serving 15 wards, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

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

101 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, South Derbyshire District Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

102 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Hartshorne.

103 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Hartshorne parish to reflect our proposed district warding arrangements. As a consequence, we recommend that the parish of Hartshorne should be divided into two parish wards: Hartshorne & Goseley (returning nine members) and Lower Midway (returning six members).

Final recommendation

Hartshorne Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hartshorne & Goseley (returning nine members) and Lower Midway (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3.

3 What happens next?

104 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for South Derbyshire District Council. 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 Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for South Derbyshire District Council in 2011.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for South Derbyshire District Council

105 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for South Derbyshire District Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for South Derbyshire District Council.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2A** illustrates the proposed wards in the Hatton area.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2B** illustrates the proposed wards in Swadlincote town.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3** illustrates the proposed wards in the Hartshorne area.

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
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Boundary Committee's functions were assumed by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
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 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 Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections

Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Local Government Boundary Commission for England (or LGBCE)	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 12 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 Committee 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

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Written Consultation* (November 2000) (http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/servicefirst/2000/consult/code/_consultation.pdf) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
<p>Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.</p>	<p>We comply with this requirement.</p>
<p>It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.</p>	<p>We comply with this requirement.</p>
<p>A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.</p>	<p>We comply with this requirement.</p>
<p>Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.</p>	<p>We comply with this requirement</p>
<p>Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation</p>	<p>We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.</p>
<p>Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.</p>	<p>We comply with this requirement.</p>
<p>Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.</p>	<p>We comply with this requirement.</p>

Appendix C

Table C1 : Final recommendations for South Derbyshire District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Aston	3	5,110	1,703	-13%	6,810	2,270	5%
2	Church Gresley	3	4,714	1,571	-19%	5,615	1,872	-14%
3	Etwall	2	4,330	2,165	11%	4,453	2,226	3%
4	Hatton	1	1,986	1,986	2%	1,999	1,999	-8%
5	Hilton	3	6,209	2,070	6%	6,794	2,265	4%
6	Linton	2	3,854	1,927	-1%	4,580	2,290	6%
7	Melbourne	2	3,938	1,969	1%	4,242	2,121	-2%
8	Midway	3	6,438	2,146	10%	6,084	2,028	-7%
9	Newhall & Stanton	3	6,258	2,086	7%	6,472	2,157	-1%
10	Repton	2	3,882	1,941	0%	4,118	2,059	-5%
11	Seales	2	4,096	2,048	5%	4,197	2,099	-3%
12	Stenson	2	3,341	1,671	-14%	4,511	2,256	4%

Table C1 (cont.): Final recommendations for South Derbyshire District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13	Swadlincote	3	6,015	2,005	3%	6,330	2,110	-3%
14	Willington & Findern 2	2	3,451	1,726	-12%	4,767	2,384	10%
15	Woodville	3	6,592	2,197	13%	7,135	2,378	10%
	Totals	36	70,214	-	-	78,105	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,950	-	-	2,170	-

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

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

Appendix D

Additional legislation to which we have had regard

Equal opportunities

In preparing this report we have had regard to the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination
- promote equality of opportunity
- promote good relations between people of different racial groups

National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Broads

We have also had regard to:

- Section 11A (2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as inserted by Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in a National Park, any relevant authority shall have regard to the Park's purposes. If there is a conflict between those purposes, a relevant authority shall attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park.
- Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of the AONB.
- Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act (as inserted by Section 97 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in the Broads, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purposes of the Broads.

