

## 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](mailto: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:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
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](http://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](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

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

## Why are we conducting a review in 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://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’),<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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](http://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](mailto: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](http://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**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
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**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
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%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>397,154</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>415,797</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,728</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,950</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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

Ward	A specific area of a district or 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
------	---