

[REDACTED]

From: Alan W Graves (Cllr) <Alan.Graves@derby.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 June 2022 09:32
To: reviews
Subject: Derby Boundary Review
Attachments: Local Government Boundary Commission Derby Labour changes.docx

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Please find my submission to the current boundary alteration suggestions

Regards

Cllr Alan Graves
Reform Derby Leader
Change Derby Politics for Good through Reform

[REDACTED]
If you wish to be removed from the emailing list please let me know



To view Derby City Council Privacy Notices please visit derby.gov.uk/privacy-notice

The views expressed in this email are personal and may not necessarily reflect those of Derby City Council, unless explicitly stated otherwise. This email, and any files transmitted with it, are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you should not copy it for any purpose, or disclose its contents to any other person. Senders and recipients of email should be aware that under the Data Protection Act 2018 and Freedom of Information Act 2000, the contents may have to be disclosed. This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by Microsoft Office 365 for the presence of computer viruses. However, we cannot accept liability for viruses that may be in this email. We recommend that you check all emails with an appropriate virus scanner.



Local Government Boundary Commission

Statement by Cllr Alan Graves leader of Reform Derby on Derby City Council

This statement is my personal view on the Local Government Boundary review

If I may refresh the last contribution my party put to you.

1. Number of councillors per ward – we agreed 3
2. Additional Wards – we agreed to keep to 17

Back in September Reform Derby replied to the document and made the points that all 4 parties Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrats and Reform came to a consensus that we would keep to the prerequisite number of councillors per ward at three. There was a cross party meeting between the leaders of the each group and that was agreed by all of us.

You may recall that the other parties wanted to increase the number of councillors by a further 6, something we disagreed with and the Boundary Commission decided that 51 (the original number) was in fact just about right.

These new proposals seem to have come after all parties agreed to keeping to 3 member wards. Almost as if someone within the Labour hierarchy realised a potential to surreptitiously rearrange the basic ward structure to increase their numbers on the council. The two main areas that would suffer are Alvaston and Chaddesden. Polling data shows that there are polling areas that favour a Labour outcome. The current ward boundaries realise Reform as victors in Alvaston and the Conservatives as victors in Chaddesden.

It is therefore, quite clear that the Labour proposals have absolutely nothing to do with serving the people better. It is gerrymandering at the highest level.

The council on the other hand offered marginal improvements to the existing wards to better fit with population numbers. Up until the council meeting where this was agreed, The Labour group had shown signs of agreement. At this meeting they had changed their minds.

The Labour party hold just under a third of all seats and to make the changes they suggest would probably increase their seat numbers from 16 to 20+. It is obvious that their proposal is to gain political advantage.

I believe, and the Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and Reform, the council proposal is by far the most sensible suggestion and it keeps all wards to their 3 councillor wards. Something the Labour group agreed to originally.

I refer to the Reform Derby response to explain that the Labour proposal does not in fact bring together local communities any better than the council proposal.

Yours faithfully

Cllr Alan Graves – Leader of Reform Derby