

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Wednesday 26 November 2014 at 4.00 pm

**To be held at the Town Hall, Pinstone
Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

Membership

Councillors Chris Weldon (Chair), Sue Alston, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Fox, Gill Furniss, Alan Law, Bryan Lodge, Cate McDonald, Pat Midgley, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur, Sarah Jane Smalley and Cliff Woodcraft

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee comprises the Chairs and Deputy Chairs of the four Scrutiny Committees. Councillor Chris Weldon Chairs this Committee.

Remit of the Committee

- Effective use of internal and external resources
- Performance against Corporate Plan Priorities
- Risk management
- Budget monitoring
- Strategic management and development of the scrutiny programme and process
- Identifying and co-ordinating cross scrutiny issues

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk. You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. on Friday. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked * on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Scrutiny Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Scrutiny Committee meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Committee may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

If you require any further information about this Scrutiny Committee, please contact Emily Standbrook-Shaw, Policy and Improvement Officer, on 0114 27 35065 or email emily.standbrook-shaw@sheffield.gov.uk.

FACILITIES

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA
26 NOVEMBER 2014**

Order of Business

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest**
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meeting**
To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24th September, 2014
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Electoral Review of Sheffield - Update**
Report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Communications
- 8. Annual Scrutiny Reporting Process**
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Work Programme 2014/15**
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 10. Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, 28th January, 2015, at 4.00 pm, in the Town Hall

This page is intentionally left blank

ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
 - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
 - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
 - the landlord is your council or authority; and
 - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
 - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
 - (b) either -
 - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
 - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Interim Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Meeting held 24 September 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Chris Weldon (Chair), Sue Alston, Steve Ayriss, Denise Fox, Gill Furniss, Alan Law, Cate McDonald, Pat Midgley, Mick Rooney, Sarah Jane Smalley and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ian Auckland, Cate McDonald and Jackie Satur

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where a resolution may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4.1 The minutes of the previous meetings of the Committee held on 19 February and 4 June 2014 were approved as correct records.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of the Scrutiny Review

Mr Alan Kewley referred to a question he had asked at the meeting of the Committee in April which enquired when the public and community groups would have the opportunity to be involved in the Scrutiny Review. James Henderson, Director of Policy, Performance and Communications had previously stated that the intention was to engage with the public and community groups further into the process.

The Leader of the Council had also previously emphasised the important role that Local Area Partnerships (LAPs) could play in public engagement. However, Mr Kewley believed that the LAPs were not working as they had been intended to. Therefore, there was a gap in how the public could be engaged with the Council.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Access to Information

Alan Kewley asked how public access to information could be improved. He commented that most of the time members of the public had to undertake a lot of work to get access to the information they required. When they did manage to

access the information it was often too little or too much. Information published also needed to contain more plain English language as it was often difficult to understand. Mr Kewley finally asked if it was within the remit of the newly appointed Head of Communications at the Council to improve communications with the public.

The Chair of the Committee, Councillor Chris Weldon, requested that answers to the questions be provided under item 8 'Scrutiny Review – Progress Report' and a written response be provided and circulated to members of the Committee.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Scrutiny Review

Mr Nigel Slack, speaking on behalf of Sheffield for Democracy, commented that the group had submitted information in the early stages of the Scrutiny Review. He welcomed the latest report, on the agenda for the meeting under item 8, particularly paragraphs 2.5 and 3.4. However, there were some concerns over community engagement. Mr Slack asked why the public were not more engaged with the LAPs. Mr Slack also questioned whether the membership of Scrutiny Committees could be revised, particularly where there was evidence of a Member conflict of interest. Mr Slack concluded by urging the Committee to ensure the Scrutiny Review was a continuing process and was regularly reviewed to enable Scrutiny to respond to current issues such as the Jay report. Mr Slack also made a plea that word documents were not uploaded in the doc.x format as this made them unable to be downloaded for users of older word formats.

Councillor Weldon asked that the issues be addressed under the Scrutiny Review Progress Report item.

6. **SCRUTINY REVIEW - PROGRESS REPORT**

- 6.1 The Director of Policy, Performance and Communications submitted a report in relation to progress in respect of the Scrutiny Review. During 2013/14 a review of the Council's Scrutiny function was undertaken, with the aim of improving the impact and effectiveness of Scrutiny. The report outlined progress on implementing the review's recommendations.
- 6.2 Michael Bowles, Head of Elections, Equalities and Involvement introduced the report. He commented that the comments of Scrutiny had been fed into the report submitted to Cabinet. The Review itself was done. The Action Plan was submitted to this meeting and was not done fully and Members were able to add to it as issues emerged. This would hopefully address issues raised by Mr Slack and enable Scrutiny to respond to issues such as the Jay report.
- 6.3 Engagement with the public was a key aspect of the Action Plan. One of the biggest developments was the use of Task and Finish Groups where public engagement was key such as the recent Cycling Inquiry which involved substantial public involvement. Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees had also been in a number of reviews which involved going out of the Town Hall such as at St. Luke's Hospice.

- 6.4 There had been some engagement with outside bodies and some agreements had been reached for outside bodies to report back to Scrutiny such as a report back from a member of the Police and Crime Panel.
- 6.5 It was acknowledged that there was the potential for a conflict of interest for a Member, particularly if they were a member of other Scrutiny Committees. However, Members were aware of the boundaries and the principles of public life and this shouldn't exclude them when they may have a valuable contribution to make to a discussion.
- 6.6 In terms of public involvement in the Scrutiny Review, although the Review itself was completed, the Implementation Plan wasn't. Members of the public therefore had opportunities to become involved. Further work needed to be undertaken in respect of the public's involvement in LAPs. However, they didn't have a formal governance role within the Council.
- 6.7 Services were always encouraged to try to use plain English in reports. If the public had examples of where this wasn't the case, Scrutiny Officers should be informed.
- 6.8 The important role Scrutiny had to play was not just restricted to the formal meeting itself. Examples such as Task and Finish Groups and Walkabouts showed the importance of public involvement. The critical issue was around meaningful engagement and what it was the Council really wanted to know from people.
- 6.9 The report submitted to this meeting was not the end of the story. The most visible change arising from the Review thus far was the change to the membership of this Committee. Chair's were encouraged to share experiences and work programmes.
- 6.10 Members made comments and asked a number of questions and officers provided responses as follows:-
- The question to be asked around LAPs was whether issues raised there were suitable to be raised at Scrutiny Committees. LAPs were not the place to discuss strategic issues.
 - The Action Plan for the Review would be circulated to Members.
 - Scrutiny Committees had an important role in seeking further evidence from services to support their comments.

Members then made further comments as follows:-

- Further clarity on what was meant by public involvement would be welcomed. There needed to be a sense of realism of what was being asked given the level of resources available. Members needed to be bold enough on occasions to say that things just weren't possible. Given the cuts to resources things could not be expected to remain the same.

- The Chair of the Committee commented that the Action Plan was a work in progress. The Chair's and Deputy Chair's had a responsibility to take this back to their own Committees. The Work Programmes should stay within individual Committees rather than be dictated to by this Committee. Some Committees had invited other Members and Committees to attend their meetings when discussing relevant issues and this should be encouraged.
- Scrutiny had tried to look at different ways of engaging the public such as taking meetings out of the Town Hall. The recent review of the Lettings Policy had invited a call for evidence and invited community groups to express their views which were incorporated into the final report.

RESOLVED: That (a) the above comments be taken into consideration when progressing the action plan for the Scrutiny Review; and (b) a further progress report be submitted to the Committee at a future date.

7. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2014/15, MONTH 3

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report setting out the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme monitoring month 3 position inviting comment and discussion from the Scrutiny Committee.
- 7.2 Andy Eckford, Interim Director of Finance, presented the report. He commented that officers had had early sight of the figures for Month 5 and the £11.5m overspend looked to be reduced to around £5m. This was no different to the pattern in 2013/14 and officers were working on getting best estimates sooner. The figures would be much clearer in Month 6.
- 7.3 In terms of capital, the Bus Rapid Transit North was a major project which had uncovered a number of issues which officers couldn't have foreseen. There was a forecast underspend in housing as a result of a major project planned for 2014/15 for removing and replacing roofing.
- 7.4 Members made a number of comments and asked questions and officer's responded as follows:-
- The surplus in housing was ring-fenced and would be used in future years for the Housing Investment Programme.
 - The overspend in Learning Disabilities was caused by taking a longer time to move towards budget due to the sensitivities involved.
 - Officers would raise the issue of how useful the Cabinet report was for Scrutiny after it had been approved by Cabinet.
 - The transition to academies was undoubtedly a pressure on the budget. Officers were working on the implications if the Council was unable to financially support academies in the future.

- Every time a school became an academy the Council lost money. The Council was still responsible for children's educational outcomes even when they were at academies.

7.5 Members then made further comments as follows:-

- Members should consider whether in future they Scrutinised the budget itself or the consequences for people as a result of the budget and follow through the implications for people. Consideration should be given to this in the Scrutiny Review Action Plan.
- The Chair, Councillor Chris Weldon, commented that he had sat on Scrutiny Committees a number of times where the budget had been presented in this format. Officers would note the comments made by Members. It would be a decision for the Committee how they wanted the information presented and how they wished to Scrutinise the budget.

7.6 **RESOLVED:** That the report, now submitted, be noted.

(Note. Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley did not support the decision to note the report as she did not believe she had all the information available to her and asked for this to be recorded).

8. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FOR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - QUARTER 1 2014/15

8.1 The Director of Policy, Performance and Communications submitted a report outlining the performance management framework for the Council. He outlined the current performance challenges facing the Council and identified by EMT as follows:- (1) Assessments and Reviews in Adult Social Care, (2) NHS Policies and Pathways Impacting on Adult Social Care, (3) Sickness Absence Rates, (4) Agency Spend, (5) City Centre Vibrancy, (6) Capital Programme Profiling and (7) Educational Attainment.

8.2 In presenting the report, James Henderson, Director of Policy, Performance and Communications, commented that the report focused on the key challenges facing the Council rather than a comprehensive overview of performance at the Council. There was an emerging challenge of fixed term exclusions in schools which may be included in future reports.

8.3 Members then asked a number of questions and answers were received as follows:-

- Discussions were ongoing as to the need for performance management statistics of external contractors such as AMEY.
- Officers were aware that statistics in relation to exclusions were being skewed by one particular school and discussions were being held in that respect with management at the school.

- Further discussions would be held between officers as to the most appropriate format to present performance management reports to future meetings of the Committee.

8.4 **RESOLVED:** That the report, now submitted, be noted.

9. UPDATE ON SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMMES

9.1 The Head of Elections, Equalities and Involvement submitted a report outlining the current work programmes of all the Scrutiny Committees.

9.2 Emily Standbrook-Shaw, Policy and Improvement Officer, presented the report and asked the Committee to identify any further opportunities for joint working or issues that should be picked up by a specific Committee.

9.2 Members then made a number of comments as follows:-

- The Chair commented that he had requested that the work programmes be submitted to this Committee in response to suggestions that this Committee may want to consider managing the work programmes of the Scrutiny Committees. He did not believe that this was the role of this Committee and gaining an overview of the work programmes and identifying opportunities for joint working was the way forward.
- Good examples of joint working between Committees had already taken place and opportunities for this would continue to be examined in the future.

9.3 **RESOLVED:** That the work programmes for the Scrutiny Committees, now submitted, be noted.

10. DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15

10.1 The Head of Elections, Equalities and Involvement submitted a report outlining the current work programme for the Scrutiny Committee for the municipal year 2014/15.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That (a) the report be noted; and (b) consideration be given to the inclusion of an item on Voter Registration following the Police and Crime Commissioner election.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

11.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday 26 November 2014 at 4.00p.m. at the Town Hall.



Report to Scrutiny Management Committee

26th November 2014

Report of: Director of Policy, Performance and Communications

Subject: Report on the current stage of the electoral review of Sheffield, being carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Author of Report: Victoria Penman, Policy and Improvement Officer
0114 27 34755
victoria.penman@sheffield.gov.uk

Summary:

Sheffield City Council is currently the subject of an electoral review being carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission. The Commission is currently consulting on their draft recommendations for ward boundaries and names, and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee has asked for an update on the progress of the review to inform the present meeting to which members of the public have been invited to give evidence to inform the Council's response.

This report gives an update on the electoral review so far.

Type of item:

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	X

Scrutiny Management Committee:

- i. is asked to note and approve the contents of the report;
 - ii. is asked to provide any views or comments on the Commission's approach or draft recommendations.
-

Background Papers:

New electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council, LGBCE. <https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/yorkshire-and-the-humber/south-yorkshire/sheffield-fer>.

Category of Report: OPEN

Sheffield City Council electoral review: update on review preparation and discussion paper on Council size

1. Purpose

1.1. This report provides the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with an update on the electoral review of Sheffield currently being carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, with a particular focus on the consultation on draft recommendations which is currently in progress. It is accompanied by the Commission's report on their draft recommendations (at Annex 1).

2. Summary

2.1. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having decided that Sheffield City Council shall continue to be made up of 84 councillors, has consulted on warding arrangements and has now published draft recommendations as to the warding arrangements for Sheffield. These are largely similar to the proposals put forward by Sheffield City Council, with one problematic difference which would increase the size of Central ward, and a number of smaller differences. The Council will be responding to this stage of the consultation.

3. Introduction

3.1. Sheffield City Council is currently the subject of an electoral review. This has been called by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (the Commission) because the electorate of Central ward is now 43% larger than the Sheffield ward average. This variation in ward size reflects the very high level of development which took place over a short period of time in the city centre, as well as increases in student numbers at the universities and changes in the nature of student accommodation, amongst other factors.

3.2. The review takes place in two stages, both run by the Commission. The first stage took place between January 2014 and May 2014 and will consider the number of councillors to be returned to the Council, and the second stage, taking place between May 2014 and April 2015 considers the ward boundaries and names.

- 3.3. Prior to the first stage of the review, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee held an evidence gathering session to seek the views of residents and interested groups on the size of the Council. This informed the Council's submission to the Commission on Council size. The Commission decided in May 2014 that Sheffield should continue to be represented by 84 councillors.
- 3.4. Immediately following the decision on Council size, a six week period of consultation on warding arrangements took place during which the Council and members of the public were invited by the Commission to put forward their views on communities and proposed ward boundaries and names. This very short period between decision on council size and required submission of a draft scheme of wards has been challenging for both the Council and for communities.
- 3.5. The Commission is now consulting on their draft recommendations to Parliament on ward boundaries and names for the city. The Council will be responding to the Commission and is currently developing its proposals. The evidence provided before the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee will inform the Council's proposals.
- 3.6. The Commission was invited to attend the present meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to hear the evidence put to it and to answer questions on their proposals, but declined to attend.

4. Requirements to be taken into consideration in developing a scheme of wards

- 4.1. The Commission's report outlines the criteria which it must take into consideration in developing a scheme of wards. It is required to have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, 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.
- 4.2. As Sheffield elects by thirds, the Commission is also bound by law to seek to achieve a pattern of three member wards, although in the event that a pattern of three member wards which meets the above requirements cannot be achieved the law permits the Commission to vary this.
- 4.3. The Commission develops boundaries based on an electoral forecast for 2020 provided by the Council which meets the Commission's requirements.

5. Sheffield City Council's approach to developing a scheme of wards

5.1. Developing a scheme of wards is a complex process, particularly in a city the size of Sheffield and with Sheffield's topography. In developing its proposed scheme of wards during the previous round of consultation, the Council worked to achieve a scheme of wards which met the Commission's criteria. In addition to the Commission's criteria, the Council used three further principles:

- a) That Sheffield should retain a single ward covering the city centre rather than splitting the city centre between a number of separate wards (as had been the case before the last review). This decision reflects the concerns that were put forward by elected members about the difficulty experienced in the past of representing wards which included both city centre and suburbs. It was proposed to use the inner ring road as the boundary as far as possible, in line with the Commission's preference for easily recognisable boundaries.
- b) That the existing warding pattern was thought to work well overall, and there was not a compelling case for change except where necessary because of electoral inequality.
- c) That the warding pattern should be 'future-proofed' as far as possible. Practically this means that we have not generally suggested wards with variances of more than 5% and have tried to take into account the potential for future development even where this is not reflected in the electorate forecasts. Future-proofing was particularly relevant in the city centre to account for continued anticipated growth in residential accommodation in the city centre and surrounding area to minimise the chances of an early electoral review

5.2. In order to inform the development of draft boundaries, the Council was required to submit an electoral forecast for the city's electorate in 2020. The Commission require this to be at household level, pinpointing the location of each dwelling in 2020, and the predicted number of electors at each dwelling. Although the Council has a city centre masterplan, and a strategic housing land availability assessment which indicate the potential locations of dwellings, these cannot be taken into consideration in developing the forecast because we do not have a clear indication of when any development of these sites will come to fruition. Therefore, the forecast was developed using current planning permissions, which was provided to the Commission with a health warning that the Council anticipates that there is a high chance that the electorate in Central will continue to grow at a fast rate, and disproportionately to the rest of the city.

5.3. In light of this concern, the Council has sought to keep the size of the city centre ward as close to the lower level of the permitted variance as possible.

5.4. The Council developed a proposed scheme of boundaries which it felt best met these criteria. Some consultation was carried out with communities which would be significantly affected by the proposals and efforts were made to find alternative proposals to address concerns raised, but without success, and communities were encouraged to make their views known to the Commission to inform their development of draft proposals.

6. The Commission's draft proposals

- 6.1. The Commission's draft proposals can be found in their report *New electoral arrangement for Sheffield City Council* which is appended to this document at Annex 1. For best understanding, this is best read in conjunction with the maps produced by the Commission which are available at Sheffield libraries and online on the Commission's website at <https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/yorkshire-and-the-humber/south-yorkshire/sheffield-fer>.
- 6.2. The Commission has accepted the Council's approach and proposals in the main, but has made a number of amendments across the city which the Council is currently considering. The most notable of these is the proposal to include all of Broomhall in City ward in recognition of community concern about the proposal to use the Inner Ring Road as a boundary and split Broomhall. This change has led to a number of knock on changes in neighbouring wards (most noticeably to the proposed Park & Arbourthorne and Broomhill wards, but also to a much lesser degree affecting Walkley and Crookes). The proposals here would leave the proposed City ward at 2% smaller than the ward average in 2020, rather than -7.98% as the Council's proposals would have created, and gives significant cause for concern that City will soon become too large and give rise to a further electoral review. The cost and disruption of an unnecessarily early electoral review is something which the Council is keen to avoid.
- 6.3. A full comparison of the proposals can be found at Appendix A, including the Commission's reasoning where it has been made available.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1. The Council is particularly concerned about the proposal currently working to develop its response to all of the Commission's proposals.
- 7.2. Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee has requested that members of the public are invited to give their evidence to the Committee in order to inform the Council's response to the Commission. Their evidence will be taken into consideration alongside the other factors which need to be taken into consideration to enable the Council to make coherent proposals for a city wide warding scheme. Any evidence submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee will also be made available to the Commission.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1. Scrutiny Management Committee is asked to:
- i. note and approve the contents of the report;

- ii. provide any views or comments on the Commission's approach or draft recommendations.

Appendix - Comparison of Local Government Boundary Commission draft recommendations with Sheffield City Council proposals

General commentary

The Commission has accepted the Council's approach and proposals in the main, but has made a number of amendments across the city which the Council is currently considering.

The most notable of these is the proposal to include all of Broomhall in City ward in recognition of community concern about the proposal to use the Inner Ring Road as a boundary and split Broomhall. This change has led to a number of knock on changes in neighbouring wards (most noticeably to the proposed Park & Arbourthorne and Broomhill wards, but also to a much lesser degree affecting Walkley and Crookes). The proposals here would leave the proposed City ward at 2% smaller than the ward average in 2020, rather than -7.98% as the Council's proposals would have created, and gives significant cause for concern that City will soon become too large.

Seven wards remain unchanged from the current ward boundaries. These are: East Ecclesfield; West Ecclesfield; Stannington (the Commission have rejected the proposal to move the boundary from the river to the road); Stocksbridge and Upper Don; Shiregreen and Brightside; Manor Castle; and Mosborough.

Other changes affecting individual wards are listed below, listed by alphabetical order by the Commission's proposed wards.

Beauchief and Greenhill Ward

The boundaries proposed by the Council have been accepted in part, with changes to three areas being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The Abbeydale Road South and Abbey Lane road junction has been included in Beauchief and Greenhill ward. This includes Abbey Lane Dell, Abbey Crescent, Abbey Croft, Abbey Grange and Sherwood Glen. The Commission accepted Liberal Democrat submissions that this area of Abbeydale has strong communication links along Abbey Lane to the rest of the ward.
- B. Lower Bradway has been included in Beauchief and Greenhill ward instead of being moved into Dore and Totley as proposed by the Council. This includes Elwood Road, Hemper Lane from Fox Lane to Bradway Road, Fox Lane around Edmund Drive, Edmund Avenue (odd numbers) and Edmund Drive. The Commission that the stronger links for Elwood Road and the properties on Hemper Lane were to the east rather than with communities in Dore & Totley ward to the west. This conflicts with cross party agreement in the Council proposal and representations made by the community and it is presumed that the proposal seeks to reduce the variance of Beauchief and Greenhill and Dore and Totley.
- C. The ward boundary has been amended at the junction of Archer Road and Hutcliffe Wood Road, and again along the line of the footpath at Periwood Lane. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	14422
Variance 2013	2%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14766
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-1%
Change A – Elector number change	+ 413
Change B – Elector number change	+ 198
Change C – Elector number change	0

Beighton Ward

The boundaries proposed have been accepted.

Electorate 2013	13955
Variance 2013	-2%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14359
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-3%

Birley Ward

The boundaries proposed have been accepted.

Electorate 2013	13036
Variance 2013	-8%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	13739
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-7%

Broomhill and Botanicals Ward

The Council proposed boundaries have been accepted in part, with changes to five areas being made in the Boundary Commission draft recommendations. The Commission has also proposed a name change to Broomhill and Botanicals. There continues to be uncertainty over the best name for the ward and this will be considered further once the Council's response to the draft recommendations has been agreed.

Change B, at Broomhall, is the main change, which has triggered the knock on changes across the ward and elsewhere in the city. Problems with the proposals are discussed in more detail in the City ward notes. This change is the most problematic for the council and the proposal runs the risk of triggering a further early electoral review if implemented in its current form.

- A. The area bounded by Barber Road (to the junction with Crookes Valley Road), Oxford Street, crossing Crookesmoor Road and following Roebuck Road to meet the junction of Springhill Road and Barber Road has been moved from Walkey ward into Broomhill and Botanicals ward. This change has been made in order to achieve good electoral equality in this area following the Broomhall change.

- B. The Broomfield area, bordered by Glossop Road to the north, Hanover Way to the east, Eccelsall Road to the south and going through the centre of Broomhall Place, Wharnccliffe Road and between Collegiate Crescent, Holberry Gardens and Gloucester Crescent before joining at the junction of Glossop and Clarkehouse Road, has been moved from Broomhill and Botanicals ward into City ward. This follows the line of the current ward boundary. The Commission accepted submissions from the community that community ties spanned Hanover Way. Submissions also mentioned the shared community facilities and shared problems with crime and poverty across the community and raised concerns about splitting the community.
- C. The ward boundary has been amended at the junctions of Psalter Lane with Kenwood Bank, Cherry Tree Road, Clifford Road, Williamson Road, Kingfield Road, Brincliffe Crescent, Osborne Road and Brincliffe Gardens to bring the boundary in line with the road end or mid-line of the road. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- D. An area of Endcliffe Avenue and a further area of the adjoining road Endcliffe Crescent have been moved from Broomhill and Botanicals ward into Fulwood ward. A resident proposed this change to be more reflective of community identity in the area.
- E. The area bordered by Embankment Road, Crookesmoor Road, Spring Hill, School Road and running along the back of properties on Glebe Road and Reservoir Road has been moved from Crookes ward into Broomhill and Botanicals ward. This change has been made in order to achieve good electoral equality in this area following the Broomhall change and follows the current ward boundary.

Electorate 2013	13306
Variance 2013	-6%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	13995
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-6%
Change A - Elector number change	+ 548
Change B – Elector number change	- 2143
Change C – Elector number change	0
Change D – Elector number change	- 15
Change E – Elector number change	+ 512

Burngreave Ward

The boundaries proposed have been accepted in the most part, with one change being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The Parkwood Springs area of open ground bounded by the railway line to the west, the Sheffield Ski Village site to the south and Shirecliffe to the north and east, and including the landfill site has been moved from Burngreave ward into Foxhill and Chaucer ward. This proposal has been made because the Commission needed to find a fixed boundary which features on Ordinance Survey maps. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	14913
Variance 2013	5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15376
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	4%
Change A – Elector number change	0

City Ward

The Council proposed boundaries have been partially accepted, with changes to three areas being made in the Boundary Commission draft recommendations.

Change B is the main change which has triggered change A, as well as changes across other wards.

- A. The area to the south of A61 St Mary's Gate at Bramall Lane roundabout, including the Forge student flats, has been moved from City ward into Park and Arbourthorne ward. This includes Boston Street (from London Road to Bramall Lane), Arleys Street (St Mary's Gate to Denby Lane), Hermitage Street, Sheldon Street, Denby Street (north side only from Hill Street to Bramall Lane), London Road (east side only from St Mary's Gate to Hill Street), Hill Street (north side only from London Road to Denby Street). The Council proposals kept this area in City ward as the student accommodation fits well with the rest of City ward.
- B. The Broomfield area, bordered by Glossop Road to the north, Hanover Way to the east, Ecclesall Road to the south and going through the centre of Broomhall Place, Wharncliffe Road and between Collegiate Crescent, Holberry Gardens and Gloucester Crescent before joining at the junction of Glossop and Clarkehouse Road,

has been moved from Botanicals ward into City ward. The Commission accepted submissions by community organisations which highlighted community ties which spanned Hanover Way. Submissions also mentioned the shared community facilities and shared problems with crime and poverty across the community. This change increases the size of City ward significantly and even with the proposal to make change A leaves City ward at only -2% variance from the ward average. Given the likely level of development in the ward over the next 10 years, this gives us serious cause for concern that a further boundary review could be triggered early.

- C. The ward boundary has been amended at Shalesmoor roundabout into the centre of the roundabout rather than following the road line. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	11678
Variance 2013	-18%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14596
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-2%
Change A - Elector number change	-1440
Change B – Elector number change	+2143
Change C – Elector number change	0

Crookes Ward

The Council's proposed boundaries proposed have been accepted in the main, with one Council proposal not being accepted.

- A. The Commission has not accepted the proposal to move the area bordered by Embankment Road, Crookesmoor Road, Spring Hill, School Road and running along the back of properties on Glebe Road and Reservoir Road has been moved from Broomhill into Crookes. This change has been made in order to achieve good electoral equality in this area following the proposed inclusion of Broomhall in City ward and means that the current ward boundary is maintained at this point.

Electorate 2013	13763
Variance 2013	-3%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14177
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-5%
Change A – Elector number change	-512

Darnall Ward

The boundaries proposed by the Council have been accepted.

Electorate 2013	13502
Variance 2013	-5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14024
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-6%

Dore and Totley Ward

The boundaries proposed by the Council have been accepted in part, with changes to six areas being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. An additional area of woodland to the east of Moor Cottage on Ringinglow Road has been moved into Dore and Totley ward from Fulwood ward. This follows the existing ward boundary line. There is no impact on elector numbers.

- B. The boundary at Fenney Lane and Coit Lane has been changed to follow the field boundary to the south of Whirlow Hall Farm. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- C. The boundary at Broad Elms Lane has been moved from Ecclesall ward into Dore and Totley ward, all properties on this road are now included in Dore and Totley ward.
- D. The area of Ecclesall Woods to the south of Abbey Lane, extending to Abbeydale Road South and following Limb Brook to Ran wood and to the rear of the properties on Whirlow Park Road has been moved from Dore and Totley ward into Ecclesall ward. There is no impact on elector numbers. Councillors are asked to consider whether there are likely to be any casework concerning the woods which mean it would be helpful for the woods to be included in more both adjoining wards.
- E. The roads on the northern side of Abbeydale Road South and Abbey Lane road junction has been included in Beauchief and Greenhill ward. This includes Abbey Lane Dell, Abbey Crescent, Abbey Croft, Abbey Grange and Sherwood Glen. The Commission accepted Liberal Democrat submissions that this area of Abbeydale has strong communication links along Abbey Lane to the rest of the ward.
- F. Lower Bradway has been included in Beauchief and Greenhill ward instead of being moved into Dore and Totley as proposed by the Council. This includes Elwood Road, Hemper Lane from Fox Lane to Bradway Road, Fox Lane around Edmund Drive, Edmund Avenue (odd numbers) and Edmund Drive. The Commission that the stronger links for Elwood Road and the properties on Hemper Lane were to the east rather than with communities in Dore & Totley ward to the west. This conflicts with cross party agreement in the Council proposal and representations made by the community and it is presumed that the proposal seeks to reduce the variance of Beauchief and Greenhill and Dore and Totley.

Electorate 2013	14483
Variance 2013	2%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15096
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	2%
Change A – Elector number change	0
Change B – Elector number change	0
Change C – Elector number change	+ 10
Change D – Elector number change	0
Change E – Elector number change	- 413
Change F – Elector number change	- 198

East Ecclesfield Ward

The boundaries proposed by the Council have been accepted. This means that the ward boundaries will not change from the current boundaries.

Electorate 2013	14358
Variance 2013	1%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14735
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-1%

Ecclesall Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have been accepted in the main, with minor changes to three areas being made in the draft recommendations and affecting no electors.

- A. The area of Ecclesall Woods to the south of Abbey Lane, extending to Abbeydale Road South and following Limb Brook to Ran wood and to the rear of the properties on Whirlow Park Road has been moved from Dore and Topley ward into Ecclesall ward. There is no impact on elector numbers. Councillors are asked to consider whether any potential casework concerning the woods means it is preferable to include part of the woods in both wards.
- B. The boundary line at Thryft House Farm and Silverdale School has been moved to follow the field boundary line. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- C. The boundary line at Meadow Farm has been changed to follow Trap Lane. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	15565
Variance 2013	10%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	16048
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	8%
Change A – Elector number change	0
Change B – Elector number change	0
Change C – Elector number change	0

Firth Park Ward

The boundaries proposed have been accepted.

Electorate 2013	14284
Variance 2013	1%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14985
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	1%

Foxhill and Chaucer Ward

The Council proposed boundaries have been partially accepted, with a change to one area being made in the Boundary Commission draft recommendations.

- A. The Parkwood Springs area of open ground bounded by the railway line to the west, the Sheffield Ski Village site to the south and Shirecliffe to the north and east, and including the landfill site has been moved from Burngreave ward into Foxhill and Chaucer ward. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	14361
Variance 2013	1%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14911
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	0%
Change A - Elector number change	0

Fulwood Ward

The Council proposed boundaries have been accepted in the main, with changes to five areas being made in the Boundary Commission draft recommendations. Only one of these changes has any impact on electors.

- A. An area of Endcliffe Avenue and a further area of the adjoining road Endcliffe Crescent have been moved from Broomhill and Botanicals ward into Fulwood ward. A resident proposed this change to be more reflective of community identity in the area.
- B. The boundary line at Meadow Farm has been changed to follow Trap Lane. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- C. The boundary line at Thryft House Farm and Silverdale School has been moved to follow the field boundary line. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- D. The boundary at Fenney Lane and Coit Lane has been changed to follow the field boundary to the south of Whirlow Hall Farm. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- E. An additional area of woodland to the east of Moor Cottage on Ringinglow Road has been moved into Dore and Totley ward from Fulwood ward. This follows the existing ward boundary line. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	14905
Variance 2013	5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15331
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	3%
Change A - Elector number change	+15
Change B – Elector number change	0
Change C – Elector number change	0
Change D – Elector number change	0
Change E – Elector number change	0

Gleadless Valley Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have been accepted.

Electorate 2013	14918
Variance 2013	5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15459
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	4%

Graves Park Ward

The boundaries proposed by the Council have been accepted in the main, with one minor change being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The ward boundary has been amended at the junction of Archer Road and Hutcliffe Wood Road, and again along the line of the footpath at Periwood Lane. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	13528
Variance 2013	-5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	13979
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-6%
Change A – Elector number change	0

Hillsborough Ward

The boundaries proposed have been largely accepted, with changes to one area being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The area bounded by Livesey Street, Owlerton Green and Bradfield Road has been moved from Walkley ward into Hillsborough ward. This is in line with the proposals put forward by the Liberal Democrat group.

Electorate 2013	14360
Variance 2013	1%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14927
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	1%
Change A – Elector number change	+277

Manor Castle Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have been accepted. This means that there would be no change from the current ward boundaries.

Electorate 2013	13748
Variance 2013	-3%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15063
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	1%

Mosborough Ward

The boundaries proposed have been accepted. This means that there would be no change from the current boundaries.

Electorate 2013	13762
Variance 2013	-3%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14130
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-5%

Park & Arbourthorne Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have not been largely accepted, with changes to two areas being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The area to the south of A61 St Mary's Gate at Bramall Lane roundabout, including the Forge student flats, has been moved from City ward into Park and Arbourthorne ward. This includes Boston Street (from London Road to Bramall Lane), Arleys Street (St Mary's Gate to Denby Lane), Hermitage Street, Sheldon Street, Denby Street (north side only from Hill Street to Bramall Lane), London Road (east side only from St Mary's Gate to Hill Street), Hill Street (north side only from London Road to Denby Street). The Council proposals kept this area in City ward as the student accommodation fits well with the rest of City ward. This proposal has been made due to changes proposed to Central and Broomhill.
- B. The area directly adjoining area A bounded by Denby Street, Bramall Lane and Hill Street has been moved from Sharrow and Nether Edge ward into Park and Arbourthorne ward.

Electorate 2013	14872
Variance 2013	5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15961
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	7%
Change A – Elector number change	+1440
Change B – Elector number change	+7

Richmond Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have predominantly been accepted, with one small changes being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The boundary has been changed to follow the back of the properties on Richmond Park Road and Holyoake Avenue and meeting Richmond Road at the point it crosses the A57. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	15407
Variance 2013	9%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15861
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	7%
Change A – Elector number change	0

Sharrow & Nether Edge Ward

The boundaries proposed have been largely accepted, changes to two areas have been made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The ward boundary has been amended at the junctions of Psalter Lane with Kenwood Bank, Cherry Tree Road, Clifford Road, Williamson Road, Kingfield Road, Brincliffe Crescent, Osborne Road and Brincliffe Gardens to bring the boundary in line with the road end or mid-line of the road. There is no impact on elector numbers.
- B. The area bounded by Denby Street, Bramall Lane and Hill Street has been moved from Sharrow and Nether Edge ward into Park and Arbourthorne ward.

Electorate 2013	14808
Variance 2013	4%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15880
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	7%
Change A – Elector number change	0
Change B – Elector number change	-7

Shiregreen & Brightside Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have been accepted. This means that there would be no change from the current ward boundaries.

Electorate 2013	14640
Variance 2013	3%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15152
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	2%

Stannington Ward

The boundaries proposed have predominantly been accepted with one small change made in the draft recommendations. This means that there would be no change from the current boundaries.

- A. The boundary to the southeast of the ward is proposed to run along the River Loxley following the current ward boundary. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	14418
Variance 2013	2%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14927
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	1%
Change A – Elector number change	0

Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward

The boundaries proposed by the council have been accepted. This means that there would be no change from the current boundaries.

Electorate 2013	14524
Variance 2013	2%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	15254
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	3%

Walkley Ward

The boundaries proposed have been accepted in part, with changes to three areas being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The area bounded by Livesey Street, Owlerton Green and Bradfield Road has been moved from Walkley ward into Hillsborough ward.
- B. The area bounded by Barber Road (to the junction with Crookes Valley Road), Oxford Street, crossing Crookesmoor Road and following Roebuck Road to meet the junction of Springhill Road and Barber Road has been moved from Walkley ward into Broomhill and Botanicals ward. This change has been made in order to achieve good electoral equality in this area following the Broomhall change.
- C. The boundary to the west and north of the ward are proposed to run along the River Loxley. This follows the current ward boundary in the west and the Council proposed ward boundary in the north. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	13940
Variance 2013	-2%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14573
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-2%
Change A – Elector number change	-277
Change B – Elector number change	-548
Change C – Elector number change	0

West Ecclesfield Ward

The boundaries proposed by the Council have been accepted. This means that there would be no change from the current ward boundaries.

Electorate 2013	14192
Variance 2013	0%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	14572
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-2%

Woodhouse Ward

The boundaries proposed have predominantly been accepted, with one small changes being made in the draft recommendations.

- A. The boundary has been changed to follow the back of the properties on Richmond Park Road and Holyoake Avenue and meeting Richmond Road at the point it crosses the A57. There is no impact on elector numbers.

Electorate 2013	13505
Variance 2013	-5%
Draft recommendations Electorate 2020	13924
Draft recommendations Variance 2020	-6%
Change A – Elector number change	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Evidence submitted by members of the public to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee concerning the Local Government Boundary Commission's draft recommendations for Sheffield City Council

Evidence will be provided to the Commission in person by:

- Mr Jack Carrington
- Chris Morgan, Chair of Bradway Action Group
- Mr Alan Kewley (resident of Bradway)
- Mr Jonathan Harston
- The Reverend Julian Sullivan, St Mary's Church, Bramall Lane

Evidence provided in writing is detailed below.

Mr Jonathan Harston

Walkley/Broomhill:

At Sydney/Roebuck triangle, consider either:

- running boundary consistently so both sides of Roebuck Road are in Walkley or
- running boundary consistently along centre of road from Roebuck Road via Sydney Road to Commonsides

Crookes/Fulwood:

At Carsick Hill top:

- As per my first submission, tweak the boundary between Snaithing Lane and Pitchford Lane so that the properties on Sandygate Road are in Crookes ward.

Fulwood/Ecclesall:

At High Storrs the boundary can be a lot tidier, Highcliffe Road bridge to Bents Green: either:

- run boundary along Porter Brook and then stream running through Bluebell Wood to junction of Common Lane and Cottage Lane or
- run boundary along Porter Brook to Ivy Cottage Lane bridge, then via Ivy Cottage Lane to join proposed boundary along stream through Whiteley Wood.

Fulwood/Dore & Totley:

Should Whirlow Hall Farm be in Dore & Totley along with the rest of Whirlow?

Dore & Totley/Ecclesall:

Ecclesall Woods boundary is unnecessarily weird. It should run along Abbey Lane between Whirlow and Abbeydale

Ecclesall/Sharrow & Nether Edge:

Boundary along Brincliffe Edge should run along northern boundary wall of allotments/boundary wall of Brincliffe Edge Road as this is a much harder boundary (steep cliff) than the back of the houses on Bannerdale Road (pierced by many footpaths to allotments)

Park & Arbourthorne/Gleadless Valley:

Derby Street: boundary should continue along footpath between Litchford Road and Heeley Green, putting all of Derby Street properties in Gleadless Valley

Should examine putting Olive Grove in Park & Arbourthorne, though the addition of the student flats at Boston Street probably now makes this numerically impossible.

Richmond/Woodhouse

Between Handsworth Road and A57: follow rear of properties on Richworth Road to subway under A57 to make a neater shape.

Foxhill & Chaucer/Burngreave:

Between Herries Road and railway, run boundary along rear of properties on Penrith Road to footpath opposite Teynham Road south-west to railway line, to make a neater shape

Names:

- Sharrow & Nether Edge - should be Nether Edge & Sharrow
- Park & Arbourthorne - should be Arbourthorne & Park or Arbourthorne & Highfield
- Foxhill & Chaucer - should be Southey & Foxhill or Southey & Chaucer.

This preserves the ward name sorting order, preserves statistical continuity, and avoids problems that occurred in 2004 when some electors were sent incorrect polling cards for the ward that used to have their new ward's prefix code. (As I remember it, electors in ward T (Shiregreen) were sent polling cards for the old ward T (Sharrow).)

Mr Anthony Smith

My name is Anthony V. Smith, and I am a resident of Bradway, Sheffield.

My comments are in regard to Bradway. Bradway is an ancient community, first mentioned in 1200. It is a linear community along an ancient highway and consists mainly of Upper Bradway and Lower Bradway. I attach an extract from the 1898 Ordnance Survey showing Bradway at that time. This illustrates how Bradway was one community, the nearest settlement was Greenhill, separated by nearly a mile of green fields. In the 1930s there was ribbon housing development along Hemper Lane which disguised the division between the two communities. It is understandable today that anyone without historical knowledge of the area will not appreciate that Bradway and Greenhill are still two separate areas, and Lower Bradway is still very much part of the rest of Bradway. The whole of Bradway was in the same Dore Ward until about 10 years ago. When without any effective public consultation we found that Bradway had been split apart, with the smaller section, Lower Bradway, being put into Beauchief. Two or three of us found out at the last minute and wrote objecting, I received a reply that it was too late to comment.

Recently I and a few other people wrote to the Council, urging that Bradway be united once again into the same Ward. I was grateful to the Council for understanding the request and recommending that Bradway should again be united.

It is with dismay therefore I find that the Boundary Commission states that there should be no change. It states that our links in Lower Bradway are to the east, that is Greenhill. This is utter rubbish, our links are with the rest of Bradway, I live in Lower Bradway. My children went to Bradway School. My wife is on the Committee of Bradway Community Hall. All our shopping is in the Bradway Shops only a short distance away. We are naturally members of BAG, (Bradway Action Group, which represents the people of Bradway). I have lived in Lower Bradway for 50 years, I know many people here and almost without exception they think that our connections are to the west, the rest of Bradway.

You will probably think that I am a fairly lone voice in writing about our Bradway, I don't think I am, it is because I ask other people in Lower Bradway if they have heard about these present boundary matters, no-one has heard anything about the review.

I do make a plea to the members of the Boundary Commission to think again and reunite all of ancient Bradway and have regard to our historical boundaries and not just look at these divisions as lines on a map. And to accept the recommendations the Council made with local knowledge.'

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft recommendations



New electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council

October 2014

Translations and other formats

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

Tel: 020 7664 8534

Email: publications@lgbce.org.uk

© The Local Government Boundary Commission for England 2014

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

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2014

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft 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	9
Central	10
West and south-west	12
South and south-east	13
Conclusions	15
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Sheffield City Council	20
B Glossary and abbreviations	23

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that 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 Sheffield City Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in February 2014.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
4 March 2014	Consultation on council size
27 May 2014	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
4 August 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
21 October 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
12 January 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Submissions received

We received 20 submissions during our consultation on council size, and 14 submissions during our consultation on warding arrangements.

All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

Sheffield City Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 5% over this period. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

Sheffield City Council currently has a council size of 84. The Council proposed that it should retain its current council size. During consultation, we did not receive persuasive evidence in support of any other council size for Sheffield. We have therefore adopted a council size of 84 as part of our draft recommendations.

General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during consultation on warding arrangements, we have developed proposals based on a combination of the submissions received. In general, we have based our draft recommendations on the scheme developed by the Council. We have proposed amendments to the scheme, notably in the centre and south-west of the city in order to provide draft recommendations which better reflect our statutory criteria.

Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the district.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council contained in the report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **12 January 2015**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

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

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

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

You can also view our draft recommendations for Sheffield City 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 Sheffield City 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 Sheffield City Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during the consultation on warding patterns informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council*.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council in spring 2015.

What is an electoral review?

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

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

Why are we conducting a review in Sheffield?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on December 2013 electorate data, one ward – Central – has an electoral variance of 43%.

How will the recommendations affect you?

7 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 or town council wards you vote in. Your 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

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

as a result of our recommendations.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until **12 January 2015**. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in spring 2015. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 17 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
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 draft recommendations

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

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Sheffield 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’),² 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

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

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

14 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 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.

15 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Sheffield City 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

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

constituency boundaries and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

16 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Sheffield City Council ('the Council') and met with members, and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

17 We received 20 submissions during consultation on council size. These were from 19 local residents and a local organisation, Sheffield for Democracy. During consultation on warding patterns we received 14 submissions. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

18 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, 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 5% over this period. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

19 The Council submitted a proposal to retain the existing council size of 84 members. We were persuaded that the Council had provided strong evidence to justify this proposal based on both the governance and decision-making role of the authority and the workload of elected members. We therefore consulted on a council size of 84 members.

20 In response, we received 20 submissions. These were from 19 local residents and a local organisation, Sheffield for Democracy. The Council did not submit further comments during this consultation period.

21 Of the 19 local residents, 14 favoured some form of reduction in council size. These ranged from a reduction of one, to 83, down to 28 – which would mean one member for each of the existing wards. Some respondents proposed halving the council to 42 members, while others favoured similar reductions in council size. Some residents favoured a reduction in council size but did not specify a figure.

22 The submissions favouring a reduction tended to be based on assertion rather than containing substantial evidence.

23 Three local residents (two of whom are former city councillors) favoured retaining the existing council size of 84. They focused on the workload of members operating in a large city, arguing that 84 was the best council size for the authority.

24 The local organisation, Sheffield for Democracy, proposed either retaining 84 councillors, or increasing the council size. It argued that with the abolition of Sheffield's Community Assemblies, workloads for councillors would increase so the council size should not be reduced.

25 Having carefully considered the evidence received, we are of the view that the Council's proposal to retain the existing council size would ensure both effective and convenient local government and effective representation of local residents. We considered that a more substantial reduction could affect the Council's ability to discharge its statutory functions effectively. We therefore consulted on warding arrangements based on a council size of 84 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 city average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the city (397,154 in 2013 and 415,797 by 2020) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 84 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 4,728 in 2013 and 4,950 by 2020.

28 Under the draft recommendations, none of our proposed 28 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the city by 2020.

General analysis

29 We received 14 submissions during consultation on warding arrangements for Sheffield. These were a city-wide proposal from Sheffield City Council, the Green Group on Sheffield City Council, a city councillor, six local organisations, and five local residents. The submission from the Council also contained a response from the Council's Liberal Democrat Group, commenting on the Council's proposals. One of the local residents also commented on the Council's city-wide scheme and proposed amendments to its proposals in some areas.

30 Sheffield City Council proposed a pattern of 28 three-member wards across the city. The proposed wards in the north of the city were largely identical to the existing wards. The Council proposed changes to the existing wards in the centre and south of the city. This was largely due to the fact that on its present boundaries Central ward would have 63% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

31 Three local organisations based in Broomhall opposed the Council's proposal to use the A61 Hanover Way dual carriageway as a boundary between its proposed City and Botanicals wards. The organisations argued that there are strong

community ties across the dual carriageway, and that the existing ward boundaries should be retained in this area.

32 St Mary's Church and Community Centre opposed the Council's inclusion of the Highfield area in its proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward. The Centre argued that Highfield has stronger links with the existing Central ward, and that there was a clear barrier of the railway line between Highfield and the rest of the Council's proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward.

33 The Council's proposals comprised a uniform pattern of 28 three-member wards. Its proposals provided for good electoral equality across the city with evidence that it reflected community identity and would provide for effective and convenient local government. Our draft recommendations reflect the Council's proposals. However, we have made modifications most noticeably in the central, Abbeydale and Lower Bradway areas but also in other parts of the city in order to achieve a better balance between our statutory criteria.

34 The Council stated in its submission that there is further housing development forecast beyond 2020. However, the Council was not able to supply us with precise details of potential development sites. As we cannot take into account growth beyond our five-year forecast we have not considered this in the formulation of our draft recommendations.

35 Our draft recommendations are for 28 three-member wards. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2020.

Electoral arrangements

36 This section of the report details the submissions received, our consideration of them and our draft recommendations for each area of Sheffield. The following areas are considered in turn:

- North-west (pages 8–9)
- North-east (pages 9–10)
- Central (pages 10–12)
- West and south-west (pages 12–13)
- South and south-east (pages 13–14)

37 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 20–2 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

North-west

38 The north-west area of the city has boundaries with Derbyshire and Barnsley, and contains the main rural area of the authority. It comprises the areas of Hillsborough, Stannington, Stocksbridge, and Walkley.

39 Our proposed Stocksbridge & Upper Don ward is identical to the existing ward here. It contains Stocksbridge parish and Stocksbridge village, and is a largely rural

area. We have chosen to retain this ward as part of our draft recommendations because it has good electoral equality, and clear boundaries. Under our draft recommendations, Stocksbridge & Upper Don ward would have 3% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2020.

40 We are also proposing to retain the existing Stannington ward as part of our draft recommendations. Our proposed Stannington ward broadly comprises the rural area to the west of the city, as well as the suburban area of Stannington. The ward has good electoral equality, and we received no evidence in favour of amending it. Under our draft recommendations, Stannington ward would have 1% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2020.

41 Our proposed Hillsborough ward covers the community of Hillsborough, on the northern edge of the city's urban area. We are proposing to largely retain the ward's existing boundaries. The ward will have a railway line as its eastern boundary, and Bradfield parish to the west. We received a submission from a local resident proposing that the boundary with Walkley run along the River Loxley. We consider that this represents a strong boundary, and so are including it as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations, Hillsborough ward would have 1% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2020.

42 Our proposed Walkley ward has the River Loxley as its northern boundary, as mentioned above, and our proposed ward is similar to the existing ward. We are using Rivelin Valley as the western boundary between this ward and Stannington ward. In the south-west of the ward, the boundary will run along Heavycgate Road and Barber Road, and then along Crookes Valley Road until it joins the A61 Netherthorpe Road. Under our draft recommendations, this ward would have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2020.

43 Our draft recommendations for the north-west of Sheffield are for the three-member wards of Hillsborough, Stannington, Stocksbridge & Upper Don, and Walkley. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2020. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

North-east

44 The north-east of the authority is largely bounded by the M1 to its east and is largely suburban in character. The south and south-east of this area is bounded by the lower Don Valley railway line.

45 Our proposed West Ecclesfield and East Ecclesfield wards are identical to the existing wards of the same name. The wards comprise the communities of Ecclesfield, Grenoside and High Green. The two wards also cover the area of Ecclesfield parish. We consider that the existing wards provide good electoral equality, and broadly reflect community identities in this area. Our draft recommendations for this area would result in East Ecclesfield and West Ecclesfield wards with 1% fewer and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020 respectively.

46 To the south-east of Ecclesfield is our proposed Shiregreen & Brightside ward. The ward is bounded to its east by the M1 and to the south by the Lower Don Valley railway line. Under our draft recommendations, Shiregreen & Brightside ward would have 2% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

47 Our proposed Firth Park ward is to the west of Shiregreen & Brightside, and largely follows the existing ward boundaries. The northern boundary of the ward will follow Tongue Gutter, rather than Deerlands Avenue as it does currently. In the south-east of the ward, the boundary will run along the middle of Herries Road, rather than partially following the rear of properties as it does currently. Under our draft recommendations, Firth Park ward would have 1% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

48 To the west of our proposed Firth Park ward is our proposed Foxhill & Chaucer ward. This ward is almost identical to the existing Southey ward. Part of its boundary with Firth Park will follow Tongue Gutter, as mentioned above. In the south of the ward, the boundary will follow the railway line rather than the rear of properties on the northern side of Penrith Road. Under our draft recommendations, Foxhill & Chaucer ward would have an equal number of electors per councillor when compared with the city average by 2020.

49 The final ward we are proposing in this area of the city is Burngreave ward. This ward is very similar to the existing Burngreave ward. However, we propose that its boundary with Foxhill & Chaucer ward follow the railway line and its boundary with Firth Park follow the centre of Herries Road. Our proposed Burngreave ward is projected to have 4% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

50 Our draft recommendations for the north-east part of Sheffield are for the three-member wards of Burngreave, East Ecclesfield, Firth Park, Foxhill & Chaucer, Shiregreen & Brightside, and West Ecclesfield. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2020. Our draft recommendations can be seen in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Central

51 The centre of Sheffield comprises the central area broadly to the west of Sheffield railway station, and the areas further west up to the Broomhill and Crookes communities.

52 The existing Central ward is forecast to have 63% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. This means that it is necessary to amend its boundaries and the boundaries of wards around it to ensure good electoral equality. We have also sought to reflect community identities, and provide for effective convenient local government.

53 We received evidence from community groups in the Broomhall area highlighting shared community interests within the existing Central ward. We also received two submissions which opposed the Council's proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward, which included the community of Highfield. The submissions favoured retaining Highfield in ward with the central area of the city.

54 Given the large increase in electors forecast for the central area of the city, it is not possible to include both Highfield and Broomhall in a ward with the rest of the city centre. We have sought to provide a pattern of wards in the city centre which reflects the strength of evidence that we received. We considered that the evidence provided by respondents from Broomhall clearly demonstrated a higher level of community identities and interests with adjoining communities in the centre of Sheffield. We received evidence showing that splitting the Springfield Estate, to the east of Hanover Way, from the rest of Broomhall could have a detrimental effect the community, which has shared needs and priorities with the Broomhall community. We considered that retaining Broomhall in a ward with the city centre would reflect community identities and provide for effective and convenient local government.

55 The Council's proposed City ward was broadly based on the existing Central ward. The Council proposed that the ward's western boundary follow the A61 Hanover Way. We received strong community identity evidence from organisations in the Broomhall area, highlighting community ties which spanned Hanover Way. Submissions also mentioned the shared community facilities and shared problems with crime and poverty across the community.

56 We also note the Council's comment in its submission that further development is proposed in this ward beyond 2020, which is outside of the five-year electorate forecast that we are required to take into account.

57 We are proposing to use the existing eastern boundary of Central ward (although the ward will be called City under our draft recommendations) to ensure that the Broomhall community retains its links with the central area of the city. However, we are proposing a different boundary between this ward and our proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward. Our boundary will follow the A61 to the north of the area of student accommodation around Boston Street. Our proposed City ward would have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

58 As a consequence of our proposed inclusion of the Broomhall area in City ward, we have included an area of houses between School Road and Crookesmoor Road in our proposed Broomhill & Botanicals ward. This area is in the existing Broomhill ward. We have also included an area of houses between Barber Road and Roebuck Road in this ward, in order to achieve good electoral equality in this area.

59 The Council proposed that this ward be named Botanicals, but we consider that this name does not reflect the communities contained within it. Therefore, we have decided to name it Broomhill & Botanicals. Our proposed ward would have 6% fewer electors than the city average by 2020.

60 To the north and west of our proposed Broomhill & Botanicals is our proposed Crookes ward. This ward is bounded by the River Rivelin in the north and follows Redmires Road and Carsick Hill Road in the south-west. Our proposed Crookes ward would have 5% fewer electors than the city average by 2020.

61 To the south-east of our proposed City ward is our proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward. This ward incorporates the community of Highfield with communities across the railway line. We received some submissions which objected

to this proposal, arguing that there is little shared community identity between the Highfields and Arbourthorne areas. While we acknowledge these concerns, in order to ensure good electoral equality we consider that the proposed ward is the only solution that would address the high levels of electoral inequality that would otherwise arise.

62 We have included an area of mainly student flats in our proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward, as mentioned at paragraph 42. This means that the north-western corner of the ward will follow the A61, continuing east along this road at the roundabout at the top of Bramall Lane. Our proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward will have 7% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

63 To the south-west of City ward is our proposed Sharrow & Nether Edge ward. As mentioned above, given the high electoral variance in the existing Central ward, significant amendments are needed to existing ward boundaries in this area. Our proposed Sharrow & Nether Edge ward contains a large portion of the existing Central ward. The ward's northern boundary follows Porter Brook, before joining Ecclesall Road and then St Mary's Gate, before following the centre of London Road and Denby Street. The boundary then goes south along Bramall Lane before joining the railway line.

64 The ward name Sharrow & Nether Edge reflects the major communities in this ward. This ward is projected to have 7% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. Our draft recommendations can be seen in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

West and south-west

65 The west and south-west of Sheffield consists of the suburban Fulwood and Ecclesall areas, as well as the communities of Dore and Totley which are towards the edge of the authority.

66 In our draft recommendations, the proposed Ecclesall ward is significantly different from the existing arrangements. The Carter Knowle area is included in our proposed Ecclesall ward. Parkhead, which is in the south of the existing Ecclesall ward, will be included in our proposed Dore & Totley ward to the south. In the west of this ward, our proposed boundary follows Cottage Lane, and then a stream through Whiteley Wood, before joining Ivy Cottage Lane. This ward also includes all of Ecclesall Woods.

67 We have also included the Abbeydale area in our proposed Beauchief & Greenhill ward. We consider that this area has strong communication links along Abbey Lane to the rest of the ward.

68 We consider that our proposed Ecclesall ward will ensure good electoral equality, and have strong boundaries. Under our draft recommendations, this ward will have 8% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

69 To the south of our proposed Ecclesall ward is our proposed Dore & Totley ward. This ward is almost identical to the existing arrangements, subject to the

transfer of Ecclesall Woods into Ecclesall ward. We have also included an area of Lower Bradway, Elwood Road and some houses on Hemper Lane in our proposed Beauchief & Greenhill ward. In its proposals, the Council had included this small area in its proposed Dore & Totley ward; however, we consider that its strongest links are to the east, rather than with communities in Dore & Totley ward to the west.

70 Under our draft recommendations this ward is projected to have 2% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

71 Fulwood ward covers the suburban area of Fulwood, and the rural area at the edge of the Peak District. The southern boundary of our proposed ward is significantly different from the existing one. While the current boundary follows Porter Brook, we recommend that it follow Ringinglow Road, and then Limb Brook, before joining Broad Elms Lane and heading north to re-join Ringinglow Road.

72 A local resident proposed that the boundary between Fulwood and our proposed Broomhill & Botanicals ward follow the rear of houses on Endcliffe Crescent and Endcliffe Avenue, rather than the centre of these roads. We consider that following the rear of properties here would be more reflective of community identity in the area.

73 Our proposed Fulwood ward is projected to have 3% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. Our draft recommendations can be seen in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

South and south-east

74 The south-east of Sheffield contains various communities on the edge of the city, including Darnall, Norton, Richmond and Mosborough.

75 Our proposed Darnall ward uses strong boundaries throughout. Its eastern boundary is the authority boundary, its western boundary follows the Lower Don Valley railway line, and its southern boundary is formed by the A57 dual carriageway. These are strong, identifiable boundaries which we consider are an improvement on the existing ones. This ward would have 6% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

76 To the south of Darnall ward is our proposed Manor Castle ward. Like Darnall ward, this ward has strong boundaries following the A57 in the north and the railway in the west. We have decided to retain the existing Manor Castle ward as part of our draft recommendations. This ward would have 1% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

77 East of Manor Castle is our proposed Woodhouse ward. We have retained much of the existing ward, with the exception of the transfer of some electors from Darnall ward. We have also transferred some electors into our proposed Richmond ward, to provide for good electoral equality. Under our draft recommendations, Woodhouse ward is projected to have 6% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

78 As mentioned above, we have decided to transfer an area of the existing Woodhouse ward into our proposed Richmond ward. On a visit to the city, we noted that this area along Richmond Road has an obvious link with the remainder of our proposed Richmond ward, and so we are content to include it as part of our draft recommendations.

79 The southern boundary of the ward runs down the middle of Seagrave Crescent, and then along Shire Brook, before joining Linley Lane. Our proposed Richmond ward would have 7% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

80 To the south of our proposed Richmond ward are our proposed Beighton and Birley wards. Our recommendations are very similar to the existing wards in this area. We are proposing that part of the boundary between these wards run along Dyke Vale Road. We visited this area as part of our tour of Sheffield. We considered that, while it was unclear whether this boundary would divide the community, it follows a main road, and therefore provides a clear and identifiable ward boundary. We considered the possibility of including Dyke Vale Avenue and the streets running off it in Beighton ward. However, this would result in a worsening of the electoral equality in Birley ward, so we have therefore chosen not to pursue this.

81 Our proposed Beighton and Birley wards are projected to have 3% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the city average by 2020.

82 In the south-east corner of the city is our proposed Mosborough ward. We are proposing to retain the existing ward as part of our draft recommendations. This ward would have 5% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

83 To the west of Birley ward is our proposed Gleadless Valley ward. Our draft recommendations are broadly similar to the existing ward. The north-eastern boundary of our proposed ward follows Derby Street and the rear of properties on Lichford Road and Newfield Green Road. The boundary between this ward and Graves Park ward partially follows Norton Lees Road, and then follows the rear of properties on Crawford Road before following Chesterfield Road. This ward is projected to have 4% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

84 Neighbouring Gleadless Valley ward is our proposed Graves Park ward. This ward uses part of the authority's boundary as its southern boundary, and the A61 dual carriageway as part of its western boundary. The minor changes to the existing ward boundaries are covered in paragraphs 68 and 70. Our proposed Graves Park ward would have 6% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

85 Our proposed Beauchief & Greenhill ward is largely similar to the existing ward. We have included Strelley Avenue and Strelley Road in this ward, as well as the cemetery and wooded area to its north. This ward will have good electoral equality and have strong boundaries. Under our draft recommendations, this ward will have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020. Our draft recommendations can be seen in detail on the large map accompanying this report.

Conclusions

86 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2020 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2013	2020
Number of councillors	84	84
Number of electoral wards	28	28
Average number of electors per councillor	4,728	4,950
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	1	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Draft recommendation

Sheffield City Council should comprise 84 councillors serving 28 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

3 What happens next?

87 There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council contained in this report. We will fully take into account all submissions received by **12 January 2015**. Any submissions received after this date may not be taken into account.

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

89 Express your views by writing directly to:

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

reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

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

91 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, irrespective of whom they are from.

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

93 After the publication of our final recommendations, the review will be implemented by order subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. When made, the draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Sheffield City Council in 2016.

Equalities

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

4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for Sheffield

95 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Sheffield City Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Sheffield City Council.

You can also view our draft recommendations for Sheffield City Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Sheffield City Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Beauchief & Greenhill	3	14,422	4,807	2%	14,766	4,922	-1%
2	Beighton	3	13,955	4,652	-2%	14,359	4,786	-3%
3	Birley	3	13,036	4,345	-8%	13,739	4,580	-7%
4	Broomhill & Botanicals	3	13,306	4,435	-6%	13,995	4,665	-6%
5	Burngreave	3	14,913	4,971	5%	15,376	5,125	4%
6	City	3	11,678	3,893	-18%	14,596	4,865	-2%
7	Crookes	3	13,763	4,588	-3%	14,177	4,726	-5%
8	Darnall	3	13,502	4,501	-5%	14,024	4,675	-6%
9	Dore & Totley	3	14,483	4,828	2%	15,096	5,032	2%
10	East Ecclesfield	3	14,358	4,786	1%	14,735	4,912	-1%
11	Ecclesall	3	15,565	5,188	10%	16,048	5,349	8%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Sheffield City Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12	Firth Park	3	14,284	4,761	1%	14,985	4,995	1%
13	Foxhill & Chaucer	3	14,361	4,787	1%	14,911	4,970	0%
14	Fulwood	3	14,905	4,968	5%	15,331	5,110	3%
15	Gleadless Valley	3	14,918	4,973	5%	15,459	5,153	4%
16	Graves Park	3	13,528	4,509	-5%	13,979	4,660	-6%
17	Hillsborough	3	14,360	4,787	1%	14,927	4,976	1%
18	Manor Castle	3	13,748	4,583	-3%	15,063	5,021	1%
19	Mosborough	3	13,762	4,587	-3%	14,130	4,710	-5%
20	Park & Arbourthorne	3	14,872	4,957	5%	15,961	5,320	7%
21	Richmond	3	15,407	5,136	9%	15,861	5,287	7%
22	Sharrow & Nether Edge	3	14,808	4,936	4%	15,880	5,293	7%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Sheffield City Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
23	Shiregreen & Brightside	3	14,640	4,880	3%	15,152	5,051	2%
24	Stannington	3	14,418	4,806	2%	14,927	4,976	1%
25	Stocksbridge & Upper Don	3	14,524	4,841	2%	15,254	5,085	3%
26	Walkley	3	13,940	4,647	-2%	14,573	4,858	-2%
27	West Ecclesfield	3	14,192	4,731	0%	14,572	4,857	-2%
28	Woodhouse	3	13,505	4,502	-5%	13,924	4,641	-6%
	Totals	84	397,154	-	-	415,797	-	-
	Averages	-	-	4,728	-	-	4,950	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Sheffield City 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 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 www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

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

Ward	A specific area of a district or district, 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 borough or district council
------	---



Report to Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee 26th November 2014

Report of: Head of Elections, Equalities and Involvement

Subject: Annual Scrutiny Reporting Process

Author of Report: Emily Standbrook-Shaw, Policy & Improvement Officer
emily.standbrook-shaw@sheffield.gov.uk
0114 2735065

Summary:

Historically, a report has been presented to Full Council in January giving an overview of the work undertaken by the Council's Scrutiny Committee.

This reports seeks approval to change the reporting process to align with the municipal year, allowing us to present a 'full year' picture of Scrutiny activity, achievements and impact.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Agree to align the annual scrutiny reporting process with the municipal year as outlined in the report.
-

Category of Report: OPEN

Report of the Head of Elections, Equality and Involvement

Annual Scrutiny Reporting Process

1. Context

- 1.1 Historically, a 6 month Scrutiny update has been presented to the January full council meeting. This report has given an overview of the work that Scrutiny Committees have undertaken and are planning to undertake, and presented a picture of scrutiny impact, effectiveness and achievements.
- 1.2 As the municipal year runs from May, the January report is only able to give a half year update on Scrutiny activity. The period January – April is not currently reported anywhere. As the second part of the year is when in depth, task and finish work is most likely to conclude we are missing out on reporting some of Scrutiny's most important work.
- 1.3 To keep to the current January reporting timetable we could produce a full calendar year report. However such a report would be disjointed, spanning the work of two Committees – as Committee chairs, membership and work programmes may well have changed significantly in May. This would fail to capture the whole year achievements of each Scrutiny Committee.
- 1.4 Officers therefore feel that the most appropriate way to comprehensively report Scrutiny activity and achievements is to produce an annual scrutiny report at the end of the municipal year, to be presented to full council at its first appropriate meeting of the new municipal year.

2 Proposed process

- 2.1 In collaboration with Committee Chairs, Policy and Improvement Officers will draft the annual report. Each Chair will have responsibility for 'signing off' their Committee's section of the report in April.
- 2.2 The annual report will be presented at Council by Committee Chairs. In the case of a change in Chair, the new Chair will present the report on behalf of the Committee.
- 2.3 Policy & Improvement Officers will share the report with external partner organisations and individuals who have been involved in scrutiny work over the year; as well as look at how we can use the annual report to increase public awareness of Scrutiny.

3 The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

Agree to align the annual scrutiny reporting process with the municipal year as outlined in the report.



Report to Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee 26th November 2014

Report of: Head of Elections, Equalities & Involvement

Subject: Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Work Programme 2014/2015

Author of Report: Emily Standbrook-Shaw, Policy & Improvement Officer,
0114 27 35065

Summary:

Scrutiny of city wide cross cutting issues, and scrutiny of internal corporate issues (for example Human Resources, Equalities, Communications, use of resources) fall under the remit of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

The draft OSMC work programme is attached, and the Committee is asked to identify and discuss corporate and city wide issues that it may wish to consider during the year. These could take the form of agenda items, or more detailed task and finish work. The resourcing of the work programme will need to be taken into account during these discussions.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	x

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Consider and develop the OSMC Work Programme

OSMC Draft Work Programme

It is proposed that the OSMC hold the following meetings in 2014-15.

Month	Topics to cover	Expected Outcomes
26 th November 2014 (Papers – 18 th Nov)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary Review Following Boundary Commission consultation. • Annual Scrutiny Report Process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSMC considers the Boundary Review proposals. Discussion will inform the Council's response to the consultation. • Agree approach to reporting Scrutiny work and achievements to full Council.
28 th January 2015 (Papers – 20 th Jan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance & budget monitoring • Ethical Procurement Referred following notice of motion at full council • Scrutiny Review Action Plan • Electoral registration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of key performance and budget information – including external contractors as requested Sept 14 • Consideration of Council's approach to ethical procurement. • Consider progress on action plan and identify areas for further work. • Consider and comment on activity taking place re electoral registration.
11 th February 2015 (10am)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget 2015/16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSMC provides feedback on the proposed budget for 2015/16