

Errors / Inconsistencies in LGBCE Report for Derbyshire Dales

Errors of Data

Ward Numbers and Variances

Assuming that the **maps** are the definitive statement of which civil parishes are in which District Wards then close examination of the data supplied by DDDC and published by you as 'Electoral Figures' in 'Warding arrangements' we believe will show the following

Ashbourne North will have an electorate of only 3,165 (not 3,444). This is a **12.4% variance** so over the limit prescribed. LGBCE have appeared to have included in their total the parishes of Fenny Bentley and Thorpe, which on the map they have allocated to Dovedale, Parwich and Brassington.

Hulland will have an electorate of only 1571 (not 1638). This is a **13% variance** so over the limit prescribed. LGBCE have appeared to have included the parish of Mercaston, which on the map they have allocated to Brailsford.

Brailsford will have an electorate of 1950 (not 1883). LGBCE have appeared to have **not** included the parish of Mercaston, which is allocated to this ward on the map.

Wirksworth and Carsington Water will have an electorate of 5206 (not 4982). LGBCE have appeared to have **not** included the parish of Hognaston, which is allocated to this ward on the map.

These errors alone should, we believe, require the withdrawal of the report subject to correction and revision.

However we would also draw your attention to the following incorrect statements within the report that you may wish to take the opportunity to correct.

Errors of statement

Para 61 Ashbourne The report reads "We were also alerted by the Council to an error in its electorate forecast with regard to the allocation of housing growth between two polling districts in Ashbourne, which was corrected. This correction *negated* the need to transfer the area between Sturston Road, Compton Street, Park Road and the Shawcroft Centre car park from Ashbourne South to Ashbourne North, as in our draft recommendations, and also the need to make changes to parish wards".

It does not. The original error in projected numbers concerned polling districts BAS & BAH which are both in Ashbourne South. It had no bearing on District Wards.

It is probable that the transfer described above **will** need to occur to rescue the excessive variance for Ashbourne North.

Errors in Rebuttal of joint submission.

We also wish to challenge some of the assertions made in the report with respect to our 'Joint Submission'

Para 36 You suggest that our proposal for Darley Dale Ward has a 17% variance and (Paras 55 & 56), that our proposals for Matlock West and Matlock East & Tansley are flawed due to having non-contiguous areas.

We believe these assertions are simply not correct. Considering them in detail;

Darley Dale We cannot see where you have obtained your figure of a 17% variance. In our joint submission we give a total of 5084 for what is essentially the existing Darley Dale Ward plus Northwood and Tinkersley less the 440 residents of the Morledge estate.

This will give a 6.2% variance.

Matlock East and Tansley Our proposal was the existing Matlock St Giles ward plus your new 'Cuckoostone'. These are contiguous and easily accessed via Chesterfield Road. It is your idea to move Chesterfield Road East into 'Matlock West'.

Matlock West Our proposal was the existing Matlock All Saints ward less your new 'Cuckoostone' plus the Morledge estate (currently part of Darley Dale) and (ideally part of) Oker Parish. This is entirely contiguous and served by roads within the ward.

We can only conclude that you have misinterpreted our suggestions. This is unfortunate and we would appreciate a correction being issued.

Extent of Changes from the Draft Proposals

The radical changes from your draft proposals also raise several issues.

- There are examples of wards containing both Peak District National Park and Urban areas (Bonsall). This was deemed undesirable in the draft proposals.
- The large Youlgrave, two councillor, ward seems rather unwieldy.
- The possibility of creating ward boundaries that cross existing civil parish boundaries has been abandoned without apparent explanation.

A withdrawal of the report would also afford an opportunity for people to be able to comment on warding structures that are essentially completely new and yet (apparently) there is no further consultation.

Beyond 2026

It is regretted that the recommendations made in this report will almost certainly require a similar exercise to be carried out within a few years. It was flagged up in our 'joint submission' that certain areas will receive the bulk of the housing development planned for the district. Three of these areas have been given allocations that deliver the highest positive variance in the proposed scheme. This does not seem sensible and it was not necessary, as our proposals largely avoided it.

Peter Dobbs, Cllr David Hughes
5th July 2021