



**FOR PUBLICATION**

**DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**WEDNESDAY, 27 MARCH 2024**

**Report of the Managing Director**

**Derbyshire Electoral Boundary Review – Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Draft Proposals for Derbyshire**

**1. Purpose**

- 1.1 To update Full Council on the Derbyshire Electoral Division Boundary Review and to seek approval to submit the Derbyshire County Council Response to the draft Electoral Divisional Arrangements proposed by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).

**2. Information and Analysis**

**2.1 Background**

In April 2022, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) initiated an Electoral Division Boundary Review of Derbyshire. Electoral Reviews can be initiated for a number of reasons as follows:

- At the request of the local authority
- Electoral imbalance, if either:
  - One electoral ward / division has a +/-30% variance with the local authority electorate average
  - Or, 30% or more of the electoral wards/divisions have a +/-10% variance from the local authority average
- Time period since the previous review, which is normally between 12 and 16 years or every two to three electoral cycles

- As a result of structural change – for example in an area where local government reorganisation is taking place
- 2.2 A report to Full Council on 15 February 2023 confirmed that the Review in Derbyshire had been initiated primarily as a result of the passage of time, it being 12 years since the previous Electoral Division Boundary Review had taken place. The report also confirmed that one of the Council's 61 electoral divisions, Etwall and Repton, had reached an electoral imbalance with the rest the county in 2021, having a 33% variance above the Derbyshire average number of electorate per electoral division.
- 2.3 The latest timescales for the Electoral Boundary Review process are outlined in Appendix 2 to this report. Comprise of five key stages as follows:
- Preliminary Phase – Information gathering and electoral forecasts
  - Phase 1 – Council size i.e. proposals for the total number of councillors/electoral divisions
  - Phase 2 – Consultations on draft proposals and divisional arrangements i.e. proposals for revised boundaries and names of electoral divisions
  - Phase 3 - Parliamentary approval of recommendations
  - Phase 4 - Implement new electoral arrangements
- 2.4 At its meeting on 15 February 2023, Full Council were updated on work undertaken as part of the Preliminary Phase of the Review, specifically in respect of setting out projected electoral forecasts for the County, and work undertaken on Phase 1 proposals relating to Council Size. Full Council subsequently approved:
- The Authority's Council Size Submission, recommending a Council Size of 64 based on the projected electoral forecasts to 2029.
  - Proposals to formally request that the LGBCE delay the start of Phase 2 consultation, originally scheduled to take place between 21 March and 29 May 2023, to take into account challenges of district and borough council elections taking place across the County at the same time.
  - Proposals to make a formal request to the LGBCE to undertake a Single Member Review as part of the Phase 2 consultation process.
- 2.5 The Council Size Submission document and the formal requests as outlined above were submitted to the LGBCE for consideration following Full Council. The LGCBE agreed the council's representations and

released its recommendation on the council size remaining at 64 on 9 May 2023, marking the start of the Formal Review Process.

2.6 The Formal Review Process covers Phase 2 of the Boundary Review and consists of two rounds of ten-week consultations with the first consultation running from 9 May to 17 July 2023 reviewing the divisional arrangements including the names and patterns of 64 electoral divisions and officially ends when the LGCBE release their Final Recommendations which is currently scheduled for 2 July 2024.

2.7 At its meeting on 12 July 2023, Full Council were appraised of the significant work undertaken on the first round of LGCBE consultation on the divisional arrangements as part of the Phase Two of the Review. This particularly covered an update in respect of recommending 64 single member divisions and revised boundaries and/or name changes in all but 13 of the current electoral divisions, the DCC submission from which being agreed at Council on 12 July 2023. Full Council also approved proposals to:

- reduce the number electoral divisions in Chesterfield by one
- increase the number electoral divisions in South Derbyshire by one
- formally request the LGBCE to delay the start of the Phase 2 consultation period to take into account challenges completing the consultation over the Christmas period and to align with the current Full Council meeting schedule

## 2.8 **Phase 2 Update**

The first consultation period asked all interested parties such as residents, community groups, Councillors, Political Groups and Councils for their views on which communities should be part of the same division asking about:

- shared facilities i.e. parks, leisure centres, schools and shopping areas.
- common issues faced by neighbouring communities such as high numbers of visitors or heavy traffic.
- new housing or commercial developments that have changed the focus of communities.
- natural or manmade boundaries or features that people believe form strong boundaries between neighbourhoods i.e. roads, rivers, railways.

2.9 All interested parties could make a submission for council size and again for the divisional pattern arrangements on whole or parts of Derbyshire and all proposals made carried equal weight. The LGCBE

received no significant comments on council size other than the council submission and 74 representations<sup>1</sup> relating to pattern arrangements, eight from Political groups, one from an MP, five individual responses from Councillors, eight from Parish and Town Councils, one from a local organisation and 50 proposals sent by members of the public. Only two submissions covered the whole of the county, the council and Labour Group submissions, the remaining covering parts of divisions, districts, parishes or wards, with only those relating to the electoral divisions being considered.

- 2.10 The LGCBE must abide by certain rules set out in law<sup>2</sup> when drawing up proposals for new electoral division boundaries and each submission's evidence will be considered in light of these criteria before making any final recommendations. The three statutory criteria applied are that:
- the new wards deliver electoral equality for voters.
  - they reflect community interests.
  - they promote effective local government.
- 2.11 Occasionally, it will not be possible for the LGCBE to put forward a boundary proposal that clearly meets all these principles. In fact, the statutory criteria can sometimes contradict each other, for example where a proposed division might reflect the shape of local communities but delivers poor levels of electoral equality. In these cases, the LGCBE will use its discretion and the quality of the evidence presented in each submission to come to a conclusion. As part of the draft recommendations the LGCBE proposals see change to all but six of the existing divisions, with major changes occurring to split existing two-member divisions, remove a division from Chesterfield, add a division to South Derbyshire and rebalance electorates in every district. These draft proposals contain seven electoral divisions which are forecast to result in poor electoral equality by 2029, outweighing the criteria of existing boundaries and community interests above electoral parity, these LGCBE proposals for each electoral division are available in Appendix 3.
- 2.12 The proposals provided have been devised solely by the LGCBE after considering all of the relevant representations made. These proposals have used elements of the submissions in conjunction with each other, in their entirety for some areas or have rejected all submissions in favour of their own recommendations. In some cases, adopting a few division boundaries within a district from one submission means having to adopt the majority if not all of the boundaries within that district from

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/derbyshire>

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

the same submission in order to balance the electorate and adhere to the statutory criteria as set out in section 2.10 above.

- 2.13 The second round of consultation, instigated by the release of the LGCBEs proposed divisional arrangements began on 23 January 2024 and will run until 1 April 2024.
- 2.14 During the second consultation period the LGBCE will be gathering views on their proposed boundaries, names, locations and councillor numbers, with the final set of electoral division boundaries due to be released on 2 July 2024. Further rounds of consultation may be required following representations made during this consultation period. Whilst this has not been required in previous Derbyshire Reviews it is not uncommon for county councils to have additional consultation on specific areas and will cover changes proposed to specific electoral divisions rather than a district or the county as a whole.
- 2.15 In order to develop the council's response to the LGCBEs proposals and accept or recommend divisional arrangements and name changes to the proposals for the 64 Electoral Divisions, significant work has been undertaken to review the LGCBE proposed divisional arrangements. This has considered and taken account of electoral inequality and coterminous boundaries and providing strong evidence to underpin the council's response to ensure electoral parity moving forward. Officer and Member views have been sought via presentations and drop-in sessions to capture their views and local knowledge and to support the process of identifying community areas and identities.
- 2.16 The LGCBE have acknowledged and adhered to the council's request for a single member review, maintaining a council size of 64, to remove one seat from Chesterfield and add one seat to South Derbyshire throughout their proposals. The evidence to support these recommendations for the council were submitted and approved at full council on 12 February 2023 and 15 July 2023. The council has maintained these proposed divisional arrangements throughout the review process and is detailed in the Response submission document which is attached at Appendix 5 to this report.
- 2.17 It should be noted, that whilst approved by the LGBCE, the proposed Council Size of 64, will not be formalised until the Final Recommendations are agreed and published on 2 July 2024 and may change by +/- 1 from the initial recommendation if it is felt that modifying the number of councillors may provide a pattern of electoral divisions that better reflects the three statutory criteria of Strategic Leadership, Accountability and Community Leadership.

2.18 Having reviewed the LGBCE's draft recommendations for Derbyshire, the organisation advises that that 50 of the proposed divisions represent a good balance of the commissions criteria, creating 64 single-member divisions with improved electoral equality, reasonable coterminosity to parishes and district wards, and good representations of the communities they contain. However, the LGCBEs proposals for the remaining fourteen Electoral Divisions, from the perspective of the organisation, do not represent the best possible balance of those criteria, with some proposed divisions still containing high levels of electoral inequality and others not offering the best representation of the distinct communities within the county.

2.19 In order to ensure electoral parity within each district and with the Derbyshire average, the Council's Submission, attached at Appendix 5 to this report, recommends that across the 64 electoral divisions the Council:

- Keeps the recommended council size at 64
- Upholds the single-member review by the creation of 64 electoral divisions
- Loses one seat from Chesterfield
- Gains one seat in South Derbyshire
- Accepts the LGCBEs proposed divisional arrangements across four districts and boroughs, those being Amber Valley (10), Bolsover (6), Chesterfield (8) and South Derbyshire (9)
- Accepts the recommendations proposed by LGCBE that fifty of the LGCBEs proposed divisional arrangements require no change at the current time
- Recommends minor changes to nine divisions where there is a small to moderate change required to the existing polling district or proposed electoral boundaries; and
- Recommends major changes or the redrawing of the boundaries in their entirety of five divisions, all of which would require a name change to better reflect the communities characteristics and identities.

2.20 Council are now asked to approve the Council's Response to the LGCBEs Draft Proposals for Divisional Arrangements Submission document which sets out revised Electoral Division proposals, for consideration by the LGBCE as part of the continued Phase 2 consultation process.

## 2.21 Next Steps

Following the closure of the current Phase 2 consultation process on 1 April 2024, the LGCBE will review all submissions that it receives from the council and other interested parties, subsequently making their recommendations on the final set of Divisional Arrangements and Electoral Division names public on 2 July 2024. This will mark the end of the Formal Review Process unless it has been deemed necessary to conduct further rounds of consultation on divisions of interest.

- 2.22 After the end of the Formal Review Process the LGCBE will seek formal parliamentary approval of their final recommendations at the latter end of 2024 and once approved, will notify the council's Managing Director and key officers. The LGCBE will also inform the electoral officers from district and borough councils of the statutory instruments and powers to enact the changes to polling districts, parishes and electoral divisions by May 2025.

## 3. Consultation

- 3.1 Details of consultation activity undertaken as part of the development of the Divisional Arrangements submission are outlined within the main body of the report.

## 4. Alternative Options Considered

- 4.1 Option 1 Accepting the LGCBEs proposals for all Electoral Divisions – in reviewing all of the proposed divisional arrangements the council considers that 14 of the proposed divisions do not represent the best possible balance of the commissions criteria, with some having higher levels of variance than would be optimal and others not representing communities as well as could be achieved. With this in mind the council has made alternative proposals for those 14 divisions and has not taken this option to its full extent.
- 4.2 Option 2 Reducing the number of electoral divisions in High Peak by one and increasing the number of electoral divisions in South Derbyshire by a further one electoral division – Removing one electoral division from High Peak and adding an additional tenth electoral division to South Derbyshire was also again considered as an option as it was in the previous round of consultation, as like Chesterfield, the electorate ratio in High Peak is reducing compared with the County average and is forecast to be -8% by 2029. This option was not deemed appropriate at this time as the imbalance within South Derbyshire would be too great.

However, this may be a consideration in future Boundary Reviews taking place across the County.

## **5. Implications**

- 5.1 Appendix 1 sets out the relevant implications considered in the preparation of the report.

## **6. Background Papers**

- 6.1 Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Council Briefing.
- 6.2 Council Size Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Electoral Boundary Review Report - Full Council 15 February 2023.
- 6.3 Divisional Arrangements Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Electoral Boundary Review Report - Full Council 12 July 2023

## **7. Appendices**

- 7.1 Appendix 1 – Implications
- 7.2 Appendix 2 – Electoral Boundary Review Timetable 2024
- 7.3 Appendix 3 – LGCBE proposed Electoral Division boundaries
- 7.4 Appendix 4 – Council Proposed Electoral Division boundaries
- 7.5 Appendix 5 - County Council Response to the LGCBE Draft Divisional Arrangements Proposals for Derbyshire Submission

## **8. Recommendation(s)**

That Council:

- a) Approve the submission of the council's response to the LGCBEs draft proposals for divisional arrangements, attached at Appendix 5 to the report, which sets out revised Electoral Division proposals, for consideration by the LGBCE.
- b) Note the revised indicative timescales for undertaking the key stages of the Electoral Boundary Review 2024 process, as outlined in the report.



c) Note the possibility of further LGCBE consultation in Electoral Divisions of interest.

## **9. Reasons for Recommendation(s)**

- 9.1 The approval of the council's response to the LGCBE Draft Divisional Arrangements Proposals for Derbyshire Submission document will support greater electoral parity, whilst enabling fair and equal representation across the County for the future electorate and also maintaining and strengthening community ties and identities.
- 9.2 To ensure that there is a shared understanding of the milestones for completing future Phases of the Review process and to ensure that Elected Members continue to be appraised of progress.
- 9.3 To ensure that, in the eventuality of additional consultation, Elected Members continue to engage with the Boundary Review process and work with officers to establish appropriate and timely responses to any such consultation during the Formal Review Process.

**Report Author:** Mel Turvey

**Contact details:** Mel.Turvey@derbyshire.gov.uk

## Implications

### **Financial**

- 1.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the County Council response to the LGCBE draft divisional arrangements proposals for Derbyshire submission. The Submission agrees with the LGCBEs recommendations of 64 single member divisions, therefore maintaining the current Council Size at 64, ensuring no additional costs are incurred as a result of recommended proposals within the response submission should they be approved by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).

### **Legal**

- 2.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England are empowered to conduct a boundary review as per the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. The legislation states that 'the total number of members of the council' forms part of an authority's electoral arrangements. The Commission refers to this more simply as 'council size'. The legislation does not set out how many members (or councillors) each authority (or type of authority) should have. It is the Commission's responsibility to determine the appropriate number of councillors for each authority. The Commission will always recommend a council size that, in its judgement, enables the council to take its decisions effectively, to discharge the business and responsibilities of the council successfully, and provides for effective community leadership and representation.
- 2.2 Section 57 of the 2009 Act enables any local authority that elects the whole council every four years, or has resolved to do so, to request that the LGBCE conduct an electoral review and make recommendations for single-member wards or divisions. The LGBCE expect that this is submitted at the same time that the authority makes its submission regarding the number of councillors to be elected to the Council. This is because it is important that anyone wishing to make a submission is aware of the grounds under which the review is being conducted should the request be agreed. A Council wishing to make a request should communicate this to the LGBCE formally. While the legislation does not require a resolution from a meeting of full council, the LGBCE will wish to see evidence that the request has been formally agreed through the normal decision-making processes of the authority as detailed in its constitution. The LGBCE will normally endeavour to meet such

requests. If the LGBCE decline a Council's request for such a review they will always give their reasons for doing so.

- 2.3 If the LGBCE do conduct a single-member warding review, they are not obliged to recommend a uniform pattern of single-member wards or divisions. The LGBCE are specifically required to have regard to the desirability of securing single-member electoral areas. However, this requirement does not override statutory criteria. This means that whilst the LGBCE will endeavour to recommend single-member wards, they may include one or more two or three member wards if a uniform pattern of single-member wards would result in the following:
- Community identity and interests would not be reflected; and/or
  - That obstacles to the effectiveness and convenience of local government in the area would be created; and/or
  - That resultant electoral variances would be such that the LGBCE would normally consider an electoral review of the area
- 2.4 Schedule 2 - Electoral change in England of the 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act applies where the LGBCE makes recommendations under section 56 in relation to the electoral arrangements for the area of a county council. The recommendations must secure the following results:
- An electoral area of the county council must not fall partly inside and partly outside any district
  - Every ward of a parish having a parish council (whether separate or common) must lie wholly within a single electoral area of the county council, and
  - Every parish which is not divided into parish wards must lie wholly within a single electoral area of the county council
- 2.5 In making recommendations the LGCBE must have regard to:
- Securing the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of members of the county council to be elected is, as nearly as possible, the same in every electoral area of the council
  - Reflecting the identities and interests of local communities and in particular:
    - The desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable, and
    - The desirability of not breaking local ties when fixing boundaries
  - Securing effective and convenient local government, and
  - The boundaries of the electoral areas of any district council whose area is within the area of the county council.

- 2.6 The LGCBE must also have regard to any change in the number or distribution of local government electors in the area of the county council which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the making of the recommendations.

### **Human Resources**

- 3.1 There are no direct workforce implications resulting from the County Council response to the LGCBE draft divisional arrangements proposals for Derbyshire submission.

### **Information Technology**

- 4.1 There are no direct Information Technology implications resulting from the County Council response to the LGCBE draft divisional arrangements proposals for Derbyshire submission.

### **Equalities Impact**

- 5.1 The Council's commitment to enhancing the wellbeing of communities and individuals and to promoting equality and diversity has been embedded throughout the County Council response to the LGCBE draft divisional arrangements proposals for Derbyshire submission process.

### **Corporate objectives and priorities for change**

- 6.1 The County Council response to the LGCBE draft divisional arrangements proposals for Derbyshire submission clearly supports the Council's ambition, outcomes, decision making processes, accountability and scrutiny and priorities to ensure the continued effective representation of Derbyshire.

### **Other (for example, Health and Safety, Environmental Sustainability, Property and Asset Management, Risk Management and Safeguarding)**

- 7.1 There are no other direct implications resulting from the County Council response to the LGCBE draft divisional arrangements proposals for Derbyshire submission.

**2024 Electoral Boundary Review Timetable**

The following sets out the current timescales for undertaking the review

Preliminary Period (Information Gathering)	May 2022 – 31 January 2023
Phase 1 – Council Size	September 2022 – January 2023
LGBCE makes council size decision	21 March 2023
Phase 2 – Divisional arrangements	
Consultation on division patterns	9 May 2023 - 17 July 2023
Publication of draft proposals	23 January 2024
Consultation on draft proposals	23 January 2024 – 1 April 2024
Publication of final recommendations	2 July 2024
Phase 3 - Parliamentary approval of recommendations	Winter/Spring 2024
Phase 4 - Implementation of new electoral arrangements	May 2025

## Appendix 3

### LGCBE Proposed Electoral Division Boundaries

See the table below for the electorate for each proposed division.

The numbers included within this Appendix are taken from the LGCBCE's Draft Recommendations report. Due to this, there may be discrepancies between the figures included within this Appendix and other sections of this report which have been calculated by the council.

Name	Cllr	2022 Electorate	% variance from Derbyshire	2029 Electorate	% variance from Derbyshire	Change	Name Change
<b>Derbyshire</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>621,414</b>	<b>9,710</b>	<b>679,510</b>	<b>10,617</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Amber Valley</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>99,751</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>109,985</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
1 Alfreton and Somercotes	1	10,211	5%	10,967	3%	Major	
2 Alport and Duffield	1	9,358	-4%	11,461	8%	Major	Yes
3 Codnor, Aldercar, Langley Mill and Loscoe	1	10,273	6%	11,046	4%	Major	Yes
4 Heanor	1	10,530	8%	11,220	6%	Major	Yes
5 Horsley	1	10,055	4%	11,157	5%	Major	
6 North Belper	1	9,356	-4%	10,221	-4%	Major	Yes
7 Ripley East	1	10,056	4%	11,379	7%	Minor	Yes
8 Ripley West and Crich	1	10,543	9%	11,352	7%	Minor	Yes
9 South Belper and Holbrook	1	9,356	-4%	10,219	-4%	Major	Yes
10 Swanwick and Riddings	1	10,013	3%	10,963	3%	Major	Yes
<b>Bolsover</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>60,541</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>66,738</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
11 Barlborough and Clowne	1	10,412	7%	11,170	5%	Minor	
12 Bolsover	1	9,242	-5%	10,939	3%	Major	Yes
13 Elmton with Creswell and Whitwell	1	9,541	-2%	10,431	-2%	Major	Yes
14 Hardwick	1	10,579	9%	11,430	8%	No	Yes
15 Shirebrook and Pleasley	1	10,569	9%	11,799	<b>11%</b>	Minor	
16 South Normanton and Pinxton	1	10,198	5%	10,969	3%	No	
<b>Chesterfield</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>78,053</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>83,238</b>	<b>-2.0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>
17 Brimington	1	9,226	-5%	9,627	-9%	Minor	
18 Dunston	1	9,066	-7%	10,145	-4%	Major	Yes
19 Hasland and Rother	1	10,696	<b>10%</b>	10,991	4%	Major	Yes
20 Linacre and Loundsley Green	1	9,917	2%	10,472	-1%	Major	Yes
21 Spire	1	9,335	-4%	10,192	-4%	Major	
22 Staveley	1	9,560	-2%	10,411	-2%	Minor	
23 Staveley North and Whittington	1	10,179	5%	10,902	3%	Minor	
24 Walton, Brampton and Boythorpe	1	10,074	4%	10,498	-1%	Major	Yes
<b>Derbyshire Dales</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>57,624</b>	<b>-1.1%</b>	<b>60,904</b>	<b>-4.4%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
25 Ashbourne South	1	9,065	-7%	9,674	-9%	Major	Yes
26 Bakewell	1	11,208	<b>15%</b>	11,621	9%	Major	
27 Derwent Valley	1	9,164	-6%	9,685	-9%	Major	
28 Dovedale and Ashbourne North	1	9,455	-3%	9,848	-7%	Major	Yes
29 Matlock	1	9,132	-6%	10,085	-5%	Minor	
30 Wirksworth	1	9,600	-1%	9,991	-6%	Minor	
<b>Erewash</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>86,663</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>	<b>93,045</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>
31 Breadsall and West Hallam	1	8,585	<b>-12%</b>	10,515	-1%	Minor	
32 Breaston	1	10,266	6%	10,661	0%	No	
33 Ilkeston Central	1	10,543	9%	10,957	3%	Major	Yes
34 Ilkeston North	1	10,302	6%	11,168	5%	Major	Yes
35 Ilkeston South and Kirk Hallam	1	8,674	<b>-11%</b>	9,701	-9%	Major	Yes
36 Long Eaton	1	9,260	-5%	9,586	<b>-10%</b>	Minor	
37 Petersham	1	10,023	3%	10,429	-2%	Minor	
38 Sandiacre	1	9,209	-5%	9,828	-7%	No	
39 Sawley	1	9,801	1%	10,200	-4%	Minor	

Name	Cllr	2022 Electorate	% varianc e from Derbys hire	2029 Electorate	% variance from Derbyshire	Chang e	Name Chang e
<b>Derbyshire</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>621,414</b>	<b>9,710</b>	<b>679,510</b>	<b>10,617</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>High Peak</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>72,412</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>78,102</b>	<b>-8.0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
40 Buxton North and East	1	8,722	-10%	9,534	-10%	Major	
41 Buxton South and West	1	8,544	-12%	9,716	-8%	Major	Yes
42 Chapel and Hope Valley	1	9,367	-4%	9,892	-7%	Major	
43 Etherow	1	9,180	-6%	9,833	-7%	Minor	
44 Glossop North and Bamford	1	9,090	-6%	9,713	-9%	Major	Yes
45 Glossop South	1	8,915	-8%	9,621	-9%	Major	Yes
46 New Mills and Hayfield	1	9,787	1%	10,401	-2%	No	Yes
47 Whaley Bridge	1	8,807	-9%	9,392	-12%	No	
<b>North East Derbyshire</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>82,315</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>87,327</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
48 Clay Cross and Tupton	1	10,638	10%	11,631	10%	Major	Yes
49 Dronfield and Unstone	1	11,206	16%	11,521	9%	Major	Yes
50 Dronfield Woodhouse and Walton	1	10,509	8%	10,762	1%	Major	Yes
51 Eckington and Coal Aston	1	10,445	8%	10,729	1%	Major	Yes
52 Killamarsh and Renishaw	1	9,288	-4%	9,550	-10%	Major	Yes
53 North Wingfield, Pilsley and Morton	1	9,600	-1%	10,443	-2%	Major	Yes
54 Shirland and Wingerworth South	1	10,651	10%	11,575	9%	Major	Yes
55 Sutton	1	9,978	3%	11,116	5%	Major	
<b>South Derbyshire</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>84,055</b>	<b>-3.8%</b>	<b>100,171</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>
56 Aston	1	7,854	-19%	10,773	1%	Major	
57 Etwall and Findern	1	8,714	-10%	10,738	1%	Major	Yes
58 Hilton	1	9,804	1%	11,115	5%	Minor	
59 Linton	1	8,344	-14%	10,992	4%	Minor	
60 Melbourne and Woodville	1	9,779	1%	10,979	3%	Major	Yes
61 Repton and Stenson	1	10,441	8%	11,972	13%	Major	Yes
92 Swadlincote East	1	9,482	-2%	11,254	6%	Major	Yes
63 Swadlincote South	1	9,811	1%	11,139	5%	Minor	
64 Swadlincote West	1	9,826	1%	11,209	6%	Major	Yes

### Council Proposed Electoral Division Boundaries

See the table below for the electorate for each proposed division





**2029 Electorate Forecasts by council proposed Electoral Division**  
Divisions showing the variance in the electorate from the Derbyshire and district average and indicating changes from the LGCBE proposals.

Name	2029 Electorate	Cllr	% variance from Derbyshire	% variance from District	Change from LGCBE proposal	Name Change
<b>Derbyshire</b>	<b>679,484</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>10,617</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Amber Valley</b>	<b>109,985</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>10,999</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
A01 Alfreton and Somercotes	10,967	1	3.3%	-0.3%	No	No
A08 Alport and Duffield	11,461	1	7.9%	4.2%	No	No
A03 Codnor, Aldercar, Langley Mill and Loscoe	11,046	1	4.0%	0.4%	No	No
A04 Heanor	11,220	1	5.7%	2.0%	No	No
A05 Horsley	11,157	1	5.1%	1.4%	No	No
A06 North Belper	10,221	1	-3.7%	-7.1%	No	No
A10 Ripley East	11,379	1	7.2%	3.5%	No	No
A09 Ripley West and Crich	11,352	1	6.9%	3.2%	No	No
A07 South Belper and Holbrook	10,219	1	-3.8%	-7.1%	No	No
A02 Swanwick and Riddings	10,963	1	3.3%	-0.3%	No	No
<b>Bolsover</b>	<b>66,738</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>11,123</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
B01 Barlborough and Clowne	11,170	1	5.2%	0.4%	No	No
B02 Bolsover	10,939	1	3.0%	-1.7%	No	No
B03 Elmton with Creswell and Whitwell	10,431	1	-1.8%	-6.2%	No	No
B05 Hardwick	11,430	1	7.7%	2.8%	No	No
B04 Shirebrook and Pleasley	11,799	1	<b>11.1%</b>	6.1%	No	No
B06 South Normanton and Pinxton	10,969	1	3.3%	-1.4%	No	No
<b>Chesterfield</b>	<b>83,238</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>-2.0%</b>	<b>10,405</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
C03 Brimington	9,627	1	-9.3%	-7.5%	No	No
C04 Dunston	10,145	1	-4.4%	-2.5%	No	No
C08 Hasland and Rother	10,991	1	3.5%	5.6%	No	No
C05 Linacre and Loundsley Green	10,472	1	-1.4%	0.6%	No	No
C07 Spire	10,192	1	-4.0%	-2.0%	No	No
C01 Staveley	10,411	1	-1.9%	0.1%	No	No
C02 Staveley North and Whittington	10,902	1	2.7%	4.8%	No	No
C06 Walton, Brampton and Boythorpe	10,498	1	-1.1%	0.9%	No	No
<b>Derbyshire Dales</b>	<b>60,908</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>-4.4%</b>	<b>10,151</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
D01 Ashbourne South	9,674	1	-9%	-4.7%	No	No
D06 Bakewell	11,190	1	5%	<b>10.2%</b>	Yes	No
D05 Derwent Valley	9,639	1	-9%	-5.0%	Yes	No
D02 Dovedale and Ashbourne North	9,848	1	-7%	-3.0%	No	No
D04 Matlock	10,674	1	1%	5.1%	Yes	No
D03 Wirksworth	9,883	1	-7%	-2.6%	Yes	No
<b>Erewash</b>	<b>93,048</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>-2.6%</b>	<b>10,339</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
E05 Breadsall and West Hallam	10,515	1	-1%	1.7%	No	No
E07 Breaston	10,661	1	0%	3.1%	No	No
E01 Ilkeston East	10,539	1	-1%	1.9%	Yes	Yes
E02 Ilkeston South	10,925	1	3%	5.7%	Yes	Yes
E03 Ilkeston West	10,365	1	-2%	0.3%	Yes	Yes
E06 Long Eaton	9,586	1	<b>-10%</b>	-7.3%	No	No
E09 Petersham	10,429	1	-2%	0.9%	No	No
E04 Sandiacre	9,828	1	-7%	-4.9%	No	No
E08 Sawley	10,200	1	-4%	-1.3%	No	No

Name	2029 Electorate	Cllr	% variance from Derbyshire	% variance from District	Change from LGBCE proposal	Name Change
<b>Derbyshire</b>	<b>679,484</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>10,617</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>High Peak</b>	<b>78,106</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>-8.0%</b>	<b>9,763</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
H01 Buxton North and East	9,646	1	-9%	-1.2%	Yes	No
H02 Buxton South and West	9,608	1	<b>-10%</b>	-1.6%	Yes	No
H05 Chapel and Hope Valley	9,748	1	-8%	-0.2%	Yes	No
H08 Etherow	9,833	1	-7%	0.7%	No	No
H07 Glossop North and Bamford	9,857	1	-7%	1.0%	Yes	No
H06 Glossop South	9,621	1	-9%	-1.5%	No	No
H04 New Mills and Hayfield	10,401	1	-2%	6.5%	No	No
H03 Whaley Bridge	9,392	1	<b>-12%</b>	-3.8%	No	No
<b>North East Derbyshire</b>	<b>87,290</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>10,911</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
N06 Clay Cross North and Tupton	10,857	1	2%	-0.5%	Yes	Yes
N07 Clay Cross South and North Wingfield	11,407	1	7%	4.5%	Yes	Yes
N03 Dronfield and Unstone	11,521	1	9%	5.6%	No	No
N04 Dronfield Woodhouse and Walton	10,762	1	1%	-1.4%	No	No
N02 Eckington and Coal Aston	10,729	1	1%	-1.7%	No	No
N01 Killamarsh and Renishaw	9,550	1	<b>-10%</b>	<b>-12.5%</b>	No	No
N05 Shirland and Wingerworth South	11,348	1	7%	4.0%	Yes	No
N08 Sutton	11,116	1	5%	1.9%	No	No
<b>South Derbyshire</b>	<b>100,171</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>11,130</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
S08 Aston	10,773	1	1%	-3.2%	No	No
S07 Etwall and Findern	10,738	1	1%	-3.5%	No	No
S06 Hilton	11,115	1	5%	-0.1%	No	No
S01 Linton	10,992	1	4%	-1.2%	No	No
S09 Melbourne and Woodville	10,979	1	3%	-1.4%	No	No
S05 Repton and Stenson	11,972	1	<b>13%</b>	7.6%	No	No
S04 Swadlincote East	11,254	1	6%	1.1%	No	No
S02 Swadlincote South	11,139	1	5%	0.1%	No	No
S03 Swadlincote West	11,209	1	6%	0.7%	No	No