

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Sheffield City Council

Electoral review

March 2015

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: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England 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 2015

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Warding patterns	5
Draft recommendations	5
Final recommendations	6
Detailed wards	7
North-west	8
North-east	9
Central	10
West and south-west	13
South and south-east	15
Conclusions	17
3 What happens next?	19
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Sheffield City Council	21
B Submissions received	23
C Glossary and abbreviations	24

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Sheffield?

We are conducting an electoral review of Sheffield City Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in city council elections varies depending on where you live in Sheffield. Based on December 2012 electorate data, one ward – Central – has 43% more electors per councillor than the average for the city.

Our proposals for Sheffield

Sheffield City Council currently has 84 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that retaining this council size will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Sheffield City Council's 84 councillors should represent 28 three-member wards across the city. None of our proposed 28 wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Sheffield by 2020.

We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Sheffield.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Sheffield City Council's ('the Council's') electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the city.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 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

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held three periods of consultation, first on council size, second on warding patterns for the Council and finally on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
4 March 2014	Council size consultation
27 May 2014	Warding pattern consultation
4 August 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
21 October 2014	Draft recommendations consultation
12 January 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
23 March 2015	Publication of final recommendations

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

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 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
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors² 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.

8 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.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2013	2020
Electorate of Sheffield City	397,155	415,797
Number of Councillors	84	84
Average number of electors per councillor	4,728	4,950

10 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the city by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Sheffield.

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

Submissions received

12 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected both at our offices and those of the council. All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Electors refer to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Electorate figures

13 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 5% to 2020.

14 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

15 Prior to consultation, the Council submitted a proposal to retain the existing council size of 84 members. We received 20 submissions during our council size consultation. These were from 19 local residents and a local organisation, Sheffield for Democracy. The Council did not submit further comments during this consultation period.

16 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 any reduction could affect the Council's ability to discharge its statutory functions effectively. We were not persuaded that sufficient evidence had been provided to justify a reduction in council size. Those respondents who proposed a reduction did not, in our view, adequately justify their preferred number in the context of the size and geographical nature of the city. We therefore invited submissions for warding patterns based on a council size of 84.

17 In response to consultation on warding patterns we received no submissions in relation to council size. We therefore decided to base our draft recommendations on a council size of 84. During consultation on our draft recommendations we received one submission relating to council size. Having considered all the evidence received, we have decided to confirm the council size of 84 as final.

Warding patterns

18 We received 15 submissions during the initial consultation on warding patterns for Sheffield. The Council submitted an authority-wide proposal. We also received submissions from the Liberal Democrat and Green Party groups on Sheffield City Council, a city councillor, six local organisations, and five local residents.

Draft recommendations

19 We received 32 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. The area about which we received the most submissions was Highfield.

20 We received responses opposing our proposal to put Highfield in Park & Arbourthorne ward; 10 of the 32 submissions received specifically referenced this area. We also received comments on the Broomhall area, as well as submissions referring to other specific local areas.

Final recommendations

North-west

21 As a consequence of changes to our proposed wards in the Central area of the city, we are amending the boundary between our proposed Hillsborough and Walkley wards. Based on evidence received during consultation, we are proposing to add part of Netherthorpe to Walkley ward, removing it from our proposed City ward. As a consequence of this, and in order to achieve reasonable electoral equality, we have included some electors from our proposed Walkley ward in our Hillsborough ward.

North-east

22 Based on evidence received during the consultation, we are making a minor amendment to the boundary between our proposed Burngreave and Foxhill & Chaucer wards. This change means that Parkwood Springs will be included in Burngreave ward.

23 We are also amending the boundary between our proposed Burngreave and Firth Park wards. This is so that all of Vickers Road is included in the same ward, Burngreave. This change has a very minor impact on electoral equality.

24 We are also changing the name of Foxhill & Chaucer ward to Southey. This is based on evidence received during the consultation, stating that Southey is a more locally recognisable name for this ward.

Central

25 We received a number of submissions opposing our inclusion of Highfield in Park & Arbourthorne ward. Respondents argued that the community's strongest links were with our proposed City ward, or with our proposed Sharrow & Nether Edge ward. We consider that there is persuasive evidence to depart from our proposed wards here, and to include Highfield in City ward.

26 We are making two further changes to our proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward. These changes are to the boundaries between this ward and our proposed Gleadless Valley and Richmond wards. The changes will mean that Park & Arbourthorne ward has almost identical boundaries to the existing Arbourthorne ward. The boundary between Park & Arbourthorne and Gleadless Valley will run along Gleadless Road, rather than Derby Street, and the backs of houses on Lichford Road. The boundary between Park & Arbourthorne and Richmond wards will follow Ridgeway Road, rather than Hollinsend Road.

27 Based on evidence received during consultation, we are amending three ward names in this area. Broomhill & Botanicals will now be named Broomhill & Sharrow Vale; Crookes will now be named Crookes & Crosspool; and Sharrow & Nether Edge will now be named Nether Edge & Sharrow. We consider that these names better reflect the communities which comprise them.

28 We are also amending the boundary between our proposed Broomhill & Sharrow Vale and City wards. This will mean that Broomhall community is removed from City ward. In order to include this area in this ward, we are amending the boundary between our proposed Broomhill & Sharrow Vale and Crookes & Crosspool

wards. This will mean that electors living on roads between School Road and Crookesmoor Road will be in Crookes & Crosspool ward.

29 As mentioned above, we are including part of the Netherthorpe community in Walkley ward. This is based on evidence received during consultation, and means that City ward will have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the city average by 2020.

West and south-west

30 We received three submissions opposing our decision to include Lower Bradway in Beauchief & Greenhill ward. Evidence sent to us during the consultation on the draft recommendations argued that Lower Bradway should be in Dore & Totley ward, based on shared community interests and identities. Therefore, we are amending our proposed wards here.

31 We are also modifying the boundary between our proposed Dore & Totley and Fulwood wards, and the boundary between Dore & Totley and Ecclesall wards. Based on evidence received during our consultation, we are including the village of Ringinglow in Dore & Totley ward. We are also making a small modification to the boundary between our proposed Dore & Totley and Fulwood wards in order to include Ringinglow Gardens in Ecclesall ward.

South and south-east

32 As mentioned above, we are amending the boundary between our proposed Richmond and Park & Arbourthorne wards. This is to improve electoral equality in both wards, and provide for a stronger more identifiable boundary here.

Detailed wards

33 The tables on pages 8–16 detail our final recommendations for each area of Sheffield. Where we have moved away from our draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

North-west

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Hillsborough	3	4%	This ward comprises the urban communities of Hillsborough and Owlerton	We received two submissions relating to this area, both of which proposed a different boundary from the one we had suggested between this ward and Walkley ward. We are including an area from our proposed Walkley ward into this ward in order to improve electoral equality in both wards. This area includes parts of Neepsend and Hillfoot, on both sides of the River Don, between Langsett Road and the railway line. The new boundary will follow Infirmary Road and Langsett Road.
Stannington	3	1%	This ward comprises the rural area to the west of the city, as well as the suburban area of Stannington.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Stocksbridge & Upper Don	3	3%	This ward comprises Stocksbridge parish and Stocksbridge village, and the rural area to the north-west of the city.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Walkley	3	7%	This ward comprises the community of Walkley, as well as parts of Netherthorpe, Uppethorpe and Crookesmoor.	As mentioned above, we are modifying the boundary between this ward and Hillsborough ward. This amendment removes some electors in Neepsend and Hillfoot from the ward, allowing the addition of a significant number of electors in Netherthorpe to be added to the ward from our proposed City ward. We received submissions during the consultation which proposed alternative boundaries between this ward and Crookes & Crosspool and Broomhill & Sharrow Vale wards. We have not incorporated these in our final recommendations as they would

				cause Walkley ward to have a high electoral imbalance.
--	--	--	--	--

North-east

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Burngreave	3	5%	This ward comprises the urban communities of Burngreave, Woodside, and Grimesthorpe.	<p>We received two submissions relating to this ward, both proposing minor amendments. One submission proposed amendments to the boundaries between this ward and Firth Park and with Southey. The other submission proposed a minor amendment to the boundary of this ward and our proposed Southey ward.</p> <p>We are amending the boundary of this ward and Firth Park, in order to include all of Vickers Road in Burngreave, as we consider that this will provide for effective and convenient local government. We are also amending the boundary between this ward and our proposed Southey ward, to include all of Parkwood Springs in Burngreave. We received evidence stating that the landfill in the park was an issue of concern to Burngreave residents, and so we considered it was logical to include this area in Burngreave ward.</p>
East Ecclesfield	3	-1%	This ward comprises the eastern part of Ecclesfield, situated to the north of the city.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Firth Park	3	0%	This ward comprises the community of Firth Park and the Longley Estate.	As mentioned above, we are amending the boundary between this ward and Burngreave ward to include all of Vickers Road in Burngreave. Apart from this change we confirm the draft recommendations for the remainder of this ward as final.
Shiregreen & Brightside	3	2%	This ward comprises the communities of Shire	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our

			Green, Low Wincobank and Wincobank.	final recommendations.
Southey	3	0%	This ward comprises the communities of Southey Green, Fox Hill and Birley Carr.	As mentioned above, we are amending the boundary between this ward and Burngreave ward, which will involve including all of Parkwood Springs in Burngreave ward. Apart from this change we confirm the draft recommendations for the remainder of this ward as final.
West Ecclesfield	3	-2%	This ward comprises the western part of Ecclesfield, to the north of the city.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.

Central

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Broomhill & Sharrow Vale	3	10%	This ward comprises the communities of Broomhall, Broomhill and Sharrow Vale.	<p>We received several submissions concerning this ward. Respondents approved of our proposal to keep Broomhall community together in one ward, but they argued that the community had stronger links with the Broomhill area. We consider that the evidence received here was persuasive enough to modify our draft recommendations. This modification involves including Broomhall in our Broomhill & Sharrow Vale ward. This change will reflect community identities in the area.</p> <p>In order to accommodate this change, we are moving an area between School Road and Crookesmoor Road in the north-west of the ward into Crookes & Crosspool ward. This will ensure good electoral equality in this ward and provides a strong and identifiable boundary.</p>
City	3	-7%	This ward comprises the city centre, and the	We received several submissions in relation to this ward and its boundaries with Broomhill & Sharrow Vale and Park &

			community of Highfield.	Arbourthorne. We are proposing some modifications to this ward. As mentioned above, part of Netherthorpe will now be included in our Walkley ward. In addition, Broomhall will be entirely situated in Broomhill & Sharrow Vale. We are also including the Highfield area from our proposed Park & Arbourthorne into this ward, based on persuasive evidence received during the consultation. We consider this ward provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality and reflected evidence received.
Crookes & Crosspool	3	-1%	This ward comprises the communities of Crookes and Crosspool.	We received four submissions proposing changes to this ward. As mentioned above, we are modifying the boundary between this ward and Broomhill & Sharrow Vale, in order to provide for good electoral equality. We are also making a small amendment in the south-west of the ward, to the boundary between this ward and Fulwood. The amendment means that the houses on Sandygate Road will all be in this ward, rather than split between two wards. We consider that this amendment reflects community identities in this area.
Nether Edge & Sharrow	3	7%	This ward comprises the communities of Nether Edge, Little Sheffield and Sharrow.	We received three submissions relating to this ward, and its boundary and links with Park & Arbourthorne. Two respondents highlighted the community links between Sharrow and Highfield, and the lack of links between Highfield and the proposed Park & Arbourthorne ward. As detailed below, we are amending the boundaries of Park & Arbourthorne ward to reflect the evidence we received during the consultation. The other submission proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between this ward and our proposed Ecclesall ward, suggesting that the boundary should follow Brincliffe Edge Road. We do not consider that this represents an improvement

				<p>on our proposed boundary, and so we are not adopting this amendment in our final recommendations.</p> <p>We are making a minor amendment between this ward and City ward, based on evidence received during the consultation. This will mean the boundary runs along Denby Street, and then along Bramall Lane.</p>
Park & Arbourthorne	3	-8%	This ward comprises the communities of Arbourthorne and Commonsidge	<p>We received over 10 responses in relation to our proposals in this area. Respondents generally argued that including the community of Highfield in this ward did not reflect community identities. It was argued that a railway line and a main road separated Highfield from the rest of the ward, and as such there were few shared links between the two areas. We considered a number of options in this area, and it was particularly difficult to propose boundaries that would reflect community identities and ensure good electoral equality. In addition, we did not want to create a situation where the consequences of changing boundaries in one area to reflect evidence received would cause us to have to split communities in another area.</p> <p>We considered that the proposal to include Highfield in City ward, and amend the boundaries of this ward to include electors from Gleadless Valley and Richmond wards, would provide the best balance between our statutory criteria in this area. The boundary between City and Park & Arbourthorne wards will follow the railway line. The boundary between this ward and Gleadless Valley ward will run along Gleadless Road, rather than Derby Street, and the backs of houses on Lichford Road. Also, the boundary between this ward and Richmond ward will follow Ridgeway Road, rather than Hollinsend Road.</p>

West and south-west

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Dore & Totley	3	6%	This ward comprises the communities of Dore, Totley and Whirlow, as well as a rural area to the south-west of the city.	<p>We received three submissions specifically relating to this area during the consultation. The respondents argued that our inclusion of Lower Bradway in Beauchief & Greenhill ward did not reflect community identities and interests in this area. Respondents provided evidence of historic links between Lower Bradway and the rest of Bradway to its west. We are amending the boundaries in this area to reflect the evidence received during consultation.</p> <p>We are also modifying the boundary between this ward and our proposed Fulwood ward, to include the community of Ringinglow in this ward. The boundary between this ward and Fulwood will now follow Ringinglow Road. We consider that this change reflects community identities in this area and that it provides for a stronger boundary here.</p> <p>In addition to this, we are amending the boundary between this ward and Ecclesall ward to include Ringinglow Gardens in Ecclesall ward. This is because Ringinglow Gardens has road access into Ecclesall ward rather than Dore & Totley ward. We consider this change provides for more effective and convenient local government.</p> <p>Two submissions received proposed further amending the boundary between this ward and Ecclesall, to put part of Ecclesall Woods in this ward. However, we do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to warrant making this change.</p>

Ecclesall	3	5%	This ward comprises the communities of Ecclesall and Carter Knowle.	<p>We received two submissions specifically relating to this ward. One submission expressed a fear that house prices may rise as a result of our proposals. However, there is no indication that our boundary changes have any impact on house prices.</p> <p>The other submission, as mentioned above, proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between this ward and our proposed Nether Edge & Sharrow ward, meaning that the boundary would follow Brincliffe Edge Road. We do not consider that this represents an improvement on our proposed boundary, and so we are not adopting this amendment in our final recommendations.</p> <p>As mentioned above, we are making a small amendment between this ward and Dore & Totley ward to ensure that Ringinglow Gardens has direct road access to the rest of this ward.</p>
Fulwood	3	2%	This ward comprises the communities of Fulwood, Ranmoor and Nether Green.	<p>As mentioned above, we are amending the boundary of this ward and our proposed Dore & Totley ward.</p> <p>We received a submission proposing an amendment to the boundary of this ward and Ecclesall ward, to move the boundary to follow Porter Brook. However, we are not persuaded to amend the boundary here, as we consider that our proposed boundary is strong and identifiable.</p>

South and south-east

Ward Name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Beauchief &	3	-2%	This ward comprises the	As mentioned above, we received submissions during the

Greenhill			communities of Beauchief, Greenhill and Lowedges.	consultation on our draft recommendations proposing that Lower Bradway be moved from this proposed ward to Dore & Totley ward. We are including this amendment as part of our final recommendations. Apart from this change we confirm the draft recommendations for the remainder of this ward as final.
Beighton	3	-3%	This ward comprises the communities of Beighton, Owlthorpe and Sothall.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Birley	3	-7%	This ward comprises the communities of Base Green and Birley and is on the southern edge of the city.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Darnall	3	-6%	This ward comprises the communities of Carbrook and Darnall and is situated on the eastern edge of the city.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Gleadless Valley	3	-1%	This ward comprises the communities of Gleadless Valley, Heeley and Hemsworth.	We received two submissions relating to this ward, one of which argued that the ward's boundaries should not be changed from its existing boundaries. The other submission proposed an amendment that would move the boundary between this ward and Park & Arbourthorne to follow Derby Street, a slight adjustment to our proposed boundary. As mentioned above, we are amending our proposed boundary between this ward and Park & Arbourthorne ward so that it follows Gleadless Road. This is in order to provide for good electoral equality in this ward and Park & Arbourthorne ward. The Gleadless Valley ward that we are including in our final recommendations will have very similar boundaries to the existing Gleadless Valley ward.

Graves Park	3	-6%	This ward comprises the communities of Norton, Norton Lees and Norton Woodseats, and contains Graves Park.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Manor Castle	3	1%	This ward comprises the communities of Manor Park, Park Hill and Wybourn.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Mosborough	3	-5%	This ward comprises the communities of Mosborough and Waterthorpe, and is on the south-eastern edge of the city.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We have therefore decided to confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
Richmond	3	1%	This ward comprises the communities of Richmond and Intake, and part of the community of Handsworth.	We received one submission relating to this ward, proposing an amendment to the boundary between this ward and our proposed Woodhouse ward. We do not consider that persuasive evidence has been received to make this amendment. However, as mentioned above, we are amending the boundary between this ward and Park & Arbourthorne. Apart from this change we confirm the draft recommendations for the remainder of this ward as final.
Woodhouse	3	-6%	This ward comprises the communities of Woodhouse and Coisley Hill and part of the community of Handsworth.	As mentioned above, we received one submission relating to this ward, proposing an amendment to the boundary between this ward and our proposed Richmond ward. However, we are not making any amendments to this ward, and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.

Conclusions

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final 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	1	0

Final recommendation

Sheffield City Council should comprise 84 councillors serving 28 wards representing 28 three-member wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Sheffield. You can also view our final recommendations for Sheffield on our interactive maps at <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

3 What happens next?

35 We have now completed our review of Sheffield City Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in May 2016.

Equalities

36 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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final 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	14,229	4,743	0%	14,578	4,859	-2%
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 & Sharrow Vale	3	14,803	4,934	4%	16,356	5,452	10%
5	Burngreave	3	15,058	5,019	6%	15,523	5,174	5%
6	City	3	10,970	3,657	-23%	13,824	4,608	-7%
7	Crookes & Crosspool	3	14,256	4,752	1%	14,675	4,892	-1%
8	Darnall	3	13,502	4,501	-5%	14,024	4,675	-6%
9	Dore & Totley	3	15,156	5,052	7%	15,767	5,256	6%
10	East Ecclesfield	3	14,358	4,786	1%	14,735	4,912	-1%
11	Ecclesall	3	15,165	5,055	7%	15,648	5,216	5%

Table A1 (cont.): Final 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	14,140	4,713	0%	14,837	4,946	0%
13	Fulwood	3	14,765	4,922	4%	15,189	5,063	2%
14	Gleadless Valley	3	14,159	4,720	0%	14,681	4,894	-1%
15	Graves Park	3	13,528	4,509	-5%	13,979	4,660	-6%
16	Hillsborough	3	14,914	4,971	5%	15,514	5,171	4%
17	Manor Castle	3	13,748	4,583	-3%	15,063	5,021	1%
18	Mosborough	3	13,762	4,587	-3%	14,130	4,710	-5%
19	Nether Edge & Sharrow	3	14,812	4,937	4%	15,884	5,295	7%
20	Park & Arbourthorne	3	13,035	4,345	-8%	13,695	4,565	-8%
21	Richmond	3	14,556	4,852	3%	14,989	4,996	1%
22	Shiregreen & Brightside	3	14,640	4,880	3%	15,152	5,051	2%

Table A1 (cont.): Final 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	Southey	3	14,361	4,787	1%	14,911	4,970	0%
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	15,608	5,203	10%	15,870	5,290	7%
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	397,155	–	–	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 electoral ward varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/yorkshire-and-the-humber/south-yorkshire/sheffield-fer>

Local authority

- Sheffield City Council

Political parties

- Green Group on Sheffield City Council
- Liberal Democrat Group on Sheffield City Council

MPs

- D Blunkett MP
- P Blomfield MP

Councillors

- Councillor Jillian Creasy (Sheffield City Council)
- Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley (Sheffield City Council)
- Councillor Brian Webster (Sheffield City Council)

Local organisations

- Nine local organisations

Residents

- 16 local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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
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
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council