

# 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	8
Electoral arrangements	9
Buxton and rural area	9
Glossop and rural area	9
Gamesley, Hadfield, Padfield and Tintwistle	10
Central High Peak and Hope Valley	11
Conclusions	12
Parish electoral arrangements	13
3 What happens next?	15
4 Mapping	16
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for High Peak Borough Council	17
B Glossary and abbreviations	20



## 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 High Peak Borough Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across High Peak.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in March 2013. This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
23 July 2013	Consultation on council size
22 October 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
8 January 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 April 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
25 June 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 43 members, comprising a pattern of 15 single-member wards, 11 two-member wards and two three-member wards. Our draft recommendations for High Peak sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## Submissions received

We received nine submissions during consultation on council size. These were from two councillors, four residents, two local organisations and one political group. During consultation on warding patterns we received 19 submissions which included three borough-wide schemes. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 140 submissions. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

High Peak Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act

2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 4% over this period.

## 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 the consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. As a result, we have proposed boundary changes in Gamesley, Hadfield, Old Glossop and New Mills.

Our final recommendations for High Peak are that the Council should have 43 members comprising a pattern of 14 single-member wards, 13 two-member wards and one three-member ward. None of our wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2019.

## What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for High Peak Borough Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for High Peak Borough Council in 2015.

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](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our final recommendations for High Peak Borough Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

# 1 Introduction

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

2 We wrote to High Peak Borough Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals first on council size and then on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations. We then undertook a period of consultation which ended on 24 June 2014.

## What is an electoral review?

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

4 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 legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in High Peak?

5 We decided to conduct this review because 30% of wards in High Peak have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough. Padfield ward currently has 23% more electors than the average for High Peak.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for High Peak Borough Council ('the Council').

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for High Peak is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector's vote being worth the same as another's. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, (the 2009 Act)<sup>2</sup> 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

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

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

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

13 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the 2009 Act. The schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority ward arrangements.

14 We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review. However, principal councils have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct Community

---

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

Governance Reviews to effect changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements.

## Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited High Peak Borough Council ('the Council') and met with members, parish council representatives and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

16 We received nine submissions during consultation on council size. These were from two councillors, four residents, two local organisations and one political group. During consultation on warding patterns we received 19 submissions which included three borough-wide schemes. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 140 submissions. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

17 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 been assisted by officers at the Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

## Electorate figures

18 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period approximately five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 4% over this period.

19 We are satisfied the Council's forecasts provide a realistic projection of growth in High Peak and have used these as the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

20 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to retain the existing council size of 43 members. We received nine submissions during our council size consultation. These were from two councillors, four local residents, two local organisations and the High Peak Liberal Democrat Party. The Council did not submit further comments in this round of public consultation.

21 Councillor John Faulkner (Independent – Burbage ward) reiterated his original submission from the preliminary stage for an alternative council size of 39.

22 The High Peak Liberal Democrat Party, Harpur Hill Residents' Association, Vision Buxton and Councillor Tony Ashton (Sett ward) all supported retaining High Peak's current council size of 43, highlighting that this figure was the most appropriate to enable councillors to represent the needs of communities in High Peak.

23 Two submissions proposed a larger reduction in council size to 30 or fewer elected members. A local resident suggested that a council size of 30 would be a

preferable council size for the Council. Another local resident proposed that High Peak should be reduced to one member per ward (leading to council size of 28). He commented that High Peak had far too many councillors and proposed a series of changes which would split the three-member Whaley Bridge ward, abolish some parish councils and abolish High Peak Borough and replace it with a unitary county council instead.

24 Two submissions made comments on reducing the council size but did not put forward an alternative figure for consideration. A local resident commented that the Council is 'far too large' and that a reduction in council size would have no negative effects on democracy and would save money. Another local resident appeared to support the existing council size calling it 'reasonable' and focused on what they saw as the interests of smaller villages losing out to the larger towns of Buxton and Glossop. He further proposed splitting the existing Old Glossop ward in two as it would make representational sense to have one councillor each for Glossop and Old Glossop.

25 We carefully considered the representations received during consultation. We consider that the Council's original submission proposing a council of 43 elected members is supported by adequate evidence. We are content that the Council has sufficiently demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under the existing council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We were not persuaded that sufficient evidence had been provided to justify a reduction in council size. Those respondents who proposed a reduction did not, in our view, adequately justify their preferred number in the context of the size and geographical nature of the borough, as well as considerations of effective governance and decision-making for the authority. We therefore consulted on electoral arrangements for the borough based on a council size of 43 members.

## Electoral fairness

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

27 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (72,798 in 2013 and 75,906 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 43 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 1,693 in 2013 and 1,765 by 2019.

28 Under the final recommendations, none of the proposed 28 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the borough by 2019.

## General analysis

29 We received 19 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns for High Peak. We received three borough-wide proposals from the Council, a joint submission from the High Peak Conservative Association & Conservative Group 'the Conservatives' and High Peak Labour Group 'the Labour Group'. Further submissions were received from Andrew Bingham MP (High Peak), Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside Parish Council and 14 local residents.

30 We received 140 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These included submissions from the Council, Derbyshire County Council 'County Council', the Conservatives, the Labour Group, two borough councillors, one county councillor and 133 local residents. The majority of submissions received were in relation to our recommendations for the Gamesley, Glossop and Hadfield areas.

31 In Hadfield, we received submissions objecting to our proposed three-member Hadfield South & Gamesley ward. The Conservatives proposed an alternative in this area comprising a single-member Gamesley & The Shaw ward and a two-member Hadfield West ward. We did not receive submissions commenting on our draft recommendations from residents in the Gamesley area.

32 In Glossop, we received support for our proposed Dinting, Howard Town, Padfield and Simmondley wards. However, we received a mixture of support and objection to our proposed single-member Old Glossop and Shirebrook wards. The respondents who objected to our draft recommendations preferred a two-member ward named Old Glossop.

33 In the central area of the borough, we received proposals from the Council, the Conservatives and Labour Group to amend the ward boundary between our proposed single-member Sett ward and two-member New Mills East ward. We received support for our draft recommendations for the remainder of the central area and for Hope Valley.

34 In Buxton we received comments from the Council, the County Council and the Labour Group on our proposal to transfer an area around Burbage Primary School to Temple ward. They supported our draft recommendations for the rest of Buxton and the surrounding rural area.

35 Having considered the submissions received, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations in two areas of the borough. In the Gamesley and Hadfield areas, we propose a single-member Gamesley ward and a two-member Hadfield South ward. In Glossop town, we propose a two-member Old Glossop ward. In the centre of the borough, we propose to amend the boundary between Sett and New Mills East wards.

36 Our final recommendations would result in 43 councillors representing 14 single-member wards, 13 two-member wards and one three-member ward. None of our proposed 28 wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for High Peak by 2019.

## Electoral arrangements

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

- Buxton and rural area (page 9)
- Glossop and rural area (pages 9–10)
- Gamesley, Hadfield, Padfield and Tintwistle (pages 10–11)
- Central High Peak and Hope Valley (pages 11–12)

38 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 17–19 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### Buxton and rural area

39 As part of our draft recommendations for Buxton and the surrounding rural area, we proposed the single-member wards of Barms, Burbage, Limestone Peak and Temple and the two-member wards of Corbar, Cote Heath, Buxton Central and Stone Bench. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received four submissions.

40 Our draft recommendations for Barms, Buxton Central, Corbar, Cote Heath, Limestone Peak and Stone Bench were supported by the Council, the County Council, the Conservatives and the Labour Group. However, the Council, County Council and Labour Group expressed concern at our proposal to transfer Arbor Grove, Burbage Primary School, Cavendish Avenue and part of Macclesfield Road to Temple ward. The Council and Labour Group both proposed that the school and surrounding roads be transferred to Burbage ward. The Conservatives supported the draft recommendations in this area. We received no further comments relating to other wards in Buxton.

41 We have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. We do not consider that the evidence received is sufficiently persuasive to move away from our draft recommendations. We also consider that our warding arrangements for Burbage and Temple wards provide a good reflection of community links and provide for clearly identifiable ward boundaries.

42 Our final recommendations for Buxton and the surrounding rural area are for the single-member wards of Barms, Burbage, Limestone Peak and Temple and the two-member wards of Corbar, Cote Heath, Buxton Central and Stone Bench. These wards are projected to have 3% fewer, 7% fewer, 9% more, 3% more, 6% fewer, 8% fewer, equal to and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the average for High Peak by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

### Glossop and rural area

43 As part of our draft recommendations for Glossop and the surrounding rural area, we proposed the single-member wards of Dinting, Old Glossop, Shirebrook, St John's and Whitfield. We also recommended the two-member wards of Howard Town and Simmondley. During consultation on our draft recommendations we received

nine submissions for this area.

44 Two local residents supported our proposals for two single-member Old Glossop and Shirebrook wards. Both respondents commented that our warding arrangements would better reflect the different identities of Shirebrook to the south and Old Glossop to the north. The Conservatives also supported the draft recommendations for all wards in Glossop and the surrounding rural area.

45 The Council, the County Council and the Labour Group broadly supported the draft recommendations for this area with the exception of the proposed Old Glossop and Shirebrook wards. Three councillors also opposed our draft recommendations for these wards. Councillor Greenhalgh (Glossop & Charlesworth division), and Councillors Parvin and Webster (Old Glossop ward) commented that our proposals would divide a cohesive community which shares community and leisure facilities either side of Sheffield Road (A57). In addition, evidence from the Labour Group stated that two residents' associations in the area work across the whole of Old Glossop. The councillors, the County Council and the Labour Group proposed a two-member Old Glossop ward which, they argued, would maintain the cohesive community identity of this area.

46 After considering the submissions received, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations in Old Glossop and propose a two-member Old Glossop ward. We are persuaded by the evidence received that the Old Glossop and Shirebrook area is a cohesive community, with shared facilities and identities. A two-member Old Glossop ward would also provide for good electoral equality and would use clear and identifiable ward boundaries. We have decided to confirm as final the wards of Dinting, Howard Town, Simmondley, St John's and Whitfield which all provide for good electoral equality, while reflecting community identities.

47 Our final recommendations for Glossop and the surrounding rural area are for the three single-member wards of Dinting, St John's and Whitfield and the two-member wards of Old Glossop, Howard Town and Simmondley. These wards are projected to have 2% more, 2% fewer, 3% more, 7% more, 9% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the average for High Peak by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Gamesley, Hadfield, Padfield and Tintwistle

48 As part of our draft recommendations for this area, we proposed the single-member wards of Hadfield North, Padfield and Tintwistle and the three-member ward of Hadfield South & Gamesley. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 137 submissions relating to this area. The majority of these submissions related to our three-member Hadfield South & Gamesley ward. Our proposals for this ward were based on the principle of not dividing the Gamesley community between wards.

49 Two local residents from Hadfield supported our draft recommendations for Hadfield South & Gamesley ward. However, the Council, the County Council, the Conservatives and the Labour Group all objected to our draft recommendations for this ward. A further 130 submissions from Hadfield residents also objected to our proposed ward. The majority of the respondents who objected argued that the Gamesley estate has no community affiliation with Hadfield. We also received

evidence from some Hadfield residents that Gamesley is separated from Hadfield by a valley and the A57 road.

50 We received alternative proposals from the Labour Group and the Conservatives. The Labour Group proposed a two-member Hadfield South ward comprising the Hadfield area south of Woolley Bridge Road and that part of Gamesley which covers Edale Crescent, Cottage Lane, Litton Mews and Rowsley Mews. They also proposed a single-member Gamesley ward comprising the remainder of the Gamesley estate. The Conservatives' alternative was for a single-member Hadfield West ward comprising the Hadfield area west of Newshaw Lane. They also proposed a two-member Gamesley & The Shaw ward comprising all of the Gamesley estate with that part of the Hadfield area bounded by the railway line, Hadfield Road and the rear of properties on Newshaw Lane.

51 We also received a proposed ward name change for Hadfield South & Gamesley ward. A local resident proposed the ward be renamed Etherow, after the river which passes through Gamesley and Hadfield.

52 After carefully considering the submissions received for this area, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations in Gamesley and Hadfield. We propose a two-member Hadfield South ward and a single-member Gamesley ward. We noted both the strong opposition to our draft recommendations and the evidence put forward to justify this alternative. We are therefore persuaded that Gamesley and Hadfield should be represented in two separate wards. We propose to adopt the warding pattern of the Labour Group as described in paragraph 50 of this report. Gamesley and Hadfield South wards will provide for good electoral equality, while reflecting the evidence of community identities received during consultation.

53 We have decided to confirm as final the wards of Hadfield North, Padfield and Tintwistle which all provide the best balance between our statutory criteria.

54 We are not persuaded by the alternative proposals of the Conservatives. Although its proposed Gamesley & The Shaw and Hadfield West wards would result in good electoral equality, we consider that the proposed Gamesley & The Shaw ward would combine communities that do not share clear transport or communication links.

55 Our final recommendations for Glossop and the surrounding rural area are for the single-member wards of Gamesley, Hadfield North, Padfield and Tintwistle and a two-member Hadfield South ward. These wards are projected to have 2% more, 2% more, 3% more, 1% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the average for High Peak by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Central High Peak and Hope Valley

56 As part of our draft recommendations for the centre of the borough, we proposed the single-member wards of Chapel East, Hayfield and Sett, the two-member wards of Blackbrook, Chapel West, Hope Valley, New Mills East and New Mills West, and the three-member ward of Whaley Bridge. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received four submissions.

57 The Council, the County Council, the Conservatives and the Labour Group supported our draft recommendations for the central area and for Hope Valley ward. However, the Council, the Conservatives and the Labour Group proposed an amendment to the draft recommendations between Sett and New Mills East wards. It was proposed that properties along Oven Hill Road be transferred from New Mills East ward to Sett ward where, it was argued, there is stronger road access.

58 After consideration of the evidence received, we have decided to adopt the proposed amendment as part of our final recommendations. We are persuaded that this modification will combine areas that share strong road links. Furthermore, the properties on Oven Hill Road are of a similar rural nature to properties in Sett ward. We have also decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final for Blackbrook, Chapel East, Chapel West, Hayfield, Hope Valley, New Mills West and Whaley Bridge wards which all provide for good electoral equality.

59 Our final recommendations for the centre of High Peak and Hope Valley are for the single-member wards of Chapel East, Hayfield and Sett, the two-member wards of Blackbrook, Chapel West, Hope Valley, New Mills East and New Mills West and the three-member ward of Whaley Bridge. These wards are projected to have 2% more, 6% fewer, 4% fewer, 1% more, 1% more, 8% fewer, 7% fewer, 2% more and an equal number of electors per councillor to the average for High Peak by 2019, respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Conclusions

60 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2019 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	43	43
Number of electoral wards	28	28
Average number of electors per councillor	1,693	1,765
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	0	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Final recommendation**  
 High Peak Borough Council should comprise 43 councillors serving 28 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

62 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority ward arrangements. However, High Peak Borough 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.

63 As a result of our proposed 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 Chapel-en-le-Frith, Hayfield and New Mills parishes.

64 As result of our proposed 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 Chapel-en-le-Frith parish.

### **Final recommendation**

Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Barren Clough Combs & Whitehough (returning two members), Chapel East (returning three members), Chapel West (returning six members) and Dove Holes & Martinside (returning two members) The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

65 As a result of our proposed 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 Hayfield parish.

### **Final recommendation**

Hayfield Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hayfield Town (returning eight members) and Hayfield West (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

66 As a result of our proposed 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 New Mills parish.

### **Final recommendation**

New Mills Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Ollersett (returning five members), Thornsett (returning two members) and Whitle (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.



### 3 What happens next?

67 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for High Peak. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for High Peak Borough Council in 2015.

#### Equalities

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

## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for High Peak

69 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for High Peak Borough Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for High Peak Borough Council.

**You can also view our final recommendations for High Peak Borough Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for High Peak Borough Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Barms	1	1,582	1,582	-7%	1,714	1,714	-3%
2	Blackbrook	2	3,203	1,602	-5%	3,556	1,778	1%
3	Burbage	1	1,627	1,627	-4%	1,648	1,648	-7%
4	Buxton Central	2	3,396	1,698	0%	3,520	1,760	0%
5	Chapel East	1	1,791	1,791	6%	1,802	1,802	2%
6	Chapel West	2	3,314	1,657	-2%	3,577	1,789	1%
7	Corbar	2	3,217	1,609	-5%	3,310	1,655	-6%
8	Cote Heath	2	3,063	1,532	-10%	3,247	1,624	-8%
9	Dinting	1	1,667	1,667	-2%	1,794	1,794	2%
10	Gamesley	1	1,792	1,792	6%	1,792	1,792	2%
11	Hadfield North	1	1,795	1,795	6%	1,805	1,805	2%
12	Hadfield South	2	3,459	1,730	2%	3,657	1,829	4%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for High Peak Borough Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
13	Hayfield	1	1,632	1,632	-4%	1,668	1,668	-6%
14	Hope Valley	2	3,248	1,624	-4%	3,249	1,625	-8%
15	Howard Town	2	3,518	1,759	4%	3,842	1,921	9%
16	Limestone Peak	1	1,734	1,734	2%	1,923	1,923	9%
17	New Mills East	2	3,203	1,602	-5%	3,274	1,637	-7%
18	New Mills West	2	3,520	1,760	4%	3,598	1,799	2%
19	Old Glossop	2	3,632	1,816	7%	3,793	1,897	7%
20	Padfield	1	1,809	1,809	7%	1,826	1,826	3%
21	Sett	1	1,697	1,697	0%	1,698	1,698	-4%
22	Simmondley	2	3,564	1,782	5%	3,648	1,824	3%
23	St John's	1	1,518	1,518	-10%	1,735	1,735	-2%
24	Stone Bench	2	3,331	1,666	-2%	3,504	1,752	-1%
25	Temple	1	1,795	1,795	6%	1,818	1,818	3%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for High Peak Borough Council**

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
26 Tintwistle	1	1,658	1,658	-2%	1,783	1,783	1%
27 Whaley Bridge	3	5,243	1,748	3%	5,310	1,770	0%
28 Whitfield	1	1,790	1,790	6%	1,815	1,815	3%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>72,798</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>75,906</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,693</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,765</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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

## Appendix B

### Glossary and abbreviations

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

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary 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 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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

