Submission to Sheffield LGBCE Consultation

Introduction

This submission will outline a plan for the entire city of Sheffield, though with greater detail in some areas than others. As a former resident in west / central west Sheffield, I have greater knowledge of community links in these areas. However, I have travelled extensively throughout the city and spent time in many different districts, so have therefore sought to put forward ideas for a full ward plan.

The commission has decided that Sheffield should retain its current 84 councillors. Given that the council has not put forward plans to change its mode of election (electing in thirds), my assumption is that 28 three-member wards, the current position, is the preferred model. The ideas put forward below are done so on that assumption.

Sheffield is a city with extremely strong physical boundaries: natural boundaries such as hills and valleys, most notably the Don, Rivelin and Sheaf Valleys; but also manmade boundaries like the Midland Main Line and the A57. This limits the areas which can sensibly be moved between wards, and creates natural 'blocks'. The below submission is broken down by 'block'.

The 'block' problem

The city's 'blocks' can be of help when it comes to delineating boundaries, making solutions self-explanatory, but its physical features can also prove to be a hindrance in building a fair map. This is, unfortunately, currently the case. In particular, the south / southeast 'block' (Beauchief & Greenhill; Beighton; Birley; Graves Park; Gleadless Valley; Manor Castle; Mosborough; Park & Arbourthorne; Richmond; Woodhouse) is entitled to only 29 councillors (falling to 28.7 by 2032), not its current 30. To accommodate that, the last review managed to jam an entitlement of 10 councillors into just three poorly-drawn wards (represented by 9 councillors) in Dore & Totley, Ecclesall and Nether Edge & Sharrow.

At the 2016 review the council's submission talked about 'future-proofing'; ensuring that another review would not be necessary within a few years. And yet, just a few years later another review has been triggered. Wards in the south / southeast were deliberately left undersized, as the council claimed in their submission that they were 'almost-certain' more development than anticipated in the 2020 projections would take place. In reality, six years beyond those projections, this 'almost-certain' development is yet to materialise and these wards have continued to fall further below quota, with further falls anticipated by 2032.

It is clear, therefore, that this area of the city should have its number of councillors reduced in line with its population - requiring a ward which crosses one of the city's natural boundaries.

There are three places a crossing can be attempted. The first of these, at Bradway / Totley / Greenhill has some merit in isolation, but the knock-on effects would mean the creation of

multiple, badly-drawn wards (‘Dore & Millhouses’, ‘Greystones & Brincliffe’, etc.) in the south west, and a wholesale redrawing of existing well-drawn wards (Beauchief & Greenhill, Graves Park, etc.) in the south.

There are therefore two feasible options: linking the city centre with Park Hill and Wybourn, or joining Highfield and Lowfield with Heeley and Meersbrook. My belief, explored in later sections, is that the first of these options is superior, both on its own merits, and in terms of knock-on effects across the city. However, I have presented both below.

Crossing the ‘blocks’ - Options A and B

Option A: City Centre / Park Hill / Wybourn

The Park Hill area has a great deal more in common with the city centre than with areas to its east in the current Manor Castle ward. Just east of the ring road, a number of new apartment blocks, including student accommodation like The Pinnacles, have been built, which should very clearly share a ward with the city centre. Slightly further east, the Park Hill flats, well-known as an iconic view of central Sheffield, have long had all the characteristics of an inner city district, and the ongoing redevelopment by Urban Splash is attracting more young residents who might otherwise choose to live in the city-centre proper.

The Wybourn Estate has close links with Park Hill. Residents use the same green space, at Sky Hill playing fields, and many children attend the same schools. Furthermore, residents in both communities are a fairly short walk from ‘yellow line’ tram stops to bring them into the city centre - a clear difference from other areas currently in the Manor Castle ward which are far more linked into the south east of the city.

Whilst the city centre element would be more dominant than in the past, this would be a return to something similar to the pre-2004 Castle ward, which combined Wybourn, Park Hill and parts of the city centre. There would also be a strong argument to include Park Village, formerly Norfolk Park Student Village, in this ward.

Option B: Highfield / Lowfield / Heeley / Meersbrook

A crossing at this point makes a degree of sense, as it would allow for the retention of a dedicated City Centre ward (which would be bounded in the south by the inner ring road), and the Lowfield and Heeley communities in particular have commonalities. Though there are not many shared services between the communities on either side of the Midland Main Line, they do have similar characteristics. In so far as a crossing at any point can be seen as desirable, a ward formed roughly of polling districts AE (from Park & Arbourthorne), GB, GD (from City), OA, OB, OF, OG (from Gleadless Valley) and TE (from Nether Edge & Sharrow), plus some smaller additional parts of Sharrow, is not badly drawn. However, it would require an undesirable and somewhat arbitrary split in the Sharrow / Highfield communities, and could also require one in the Carterknowle community.

North West Sheffield (Hillsborough; Stannington; Stocksbridge & Upper Don)

Stocksbridge & Upper Don

There are no sensible, mathematically possible alternatives to this ward which do not split communities. It should thus remain unchanged.

Stannington

This ward should also remain unchanged. Maintaining the integrity of Bradfield parish (currently split between this ward and Stocksbridge & Upper Don) is desirable - breaking up the parish further than necessary would complicate governance, increasing the number of councillors needing to interact with the Parish Council. Furthermore, though not all areas of the parish have good connectivity between each other, they tend to have a similar ‘village’ character - Worrall, Loxley and Stannington villages clearly have more in common with one other than they do with adjoining areas of the city proper.

The unparished area of the current Stannington ward also fits well within the current ward, and is distinctly separate from the Malin Bridge and Walkley neighbourhoods. It is bound by the River Loxley and River Rivelin (the latter of which can only be crossed by a single-track bridge), is often colloquially known as ‘Lower Stannington’, and blends almost seamlessly into Stannington proper.

Hillsborough

The current Hillsborough ward is largely drawn sensibly, with the hard boundaries of the Sheffield-Stocksbridge railway to the north and east, the city boundary to the west, and (for the most part) the River Loxley to the south. However, in the eastern section of the ward the Loxley does not form a hard boundary, and areas on both sides identify with the Hillsborough community - indeed, the sign welcoming people to Hillsborough can be found on the south of the river, near to Morrisons. The commission recognised this in 2016, but went too far.

The far south of the current ward, roughly the portion of QI polling district west of the River Don (the areas east of the river are industrial land, and I have no view on which ward they should form a part of), encompasses part of the Philadelphia / Upperthorpe area. The residents here should be reunited with Walkley ward, where they have a much stronger community of interest - people on both sides of Infirmary Road use the same shops, share a school catchment, and are a part of the same neighbourhood. This would also aid electoral equality, removing a number of electors from Hillsborough, which is projected to reach 10% variance by 2032.

North East Sheffield (Burngreave; East Ecclesfield; Firth Park; Shiregreen & Brightside; Southey; West Ecclesfield)

East and West Ecclesfield

The East and West Ecclesfield wards should be retained as they are currently drawn. Ecclesfield parish as a whole is slightly too small for two wards, whilst the Burncross / Chapeltown / High Green area in the north (the old ‘Chapel Green’ ward) is too large for one. As such, the current east-west split is the best way to deal with the parish, avoiding splitting up any of the component villages (including Grenoside and Ecclesfield, which both retain a village ‘feel’ despite almost growing into the city), and keeping the parts of the city-proper added to either ward to a minimum. I do not have strong feelings on whether the parts of Sheffield currently added to East Ecclesfield are most appropriate, but it does seem that this is where the parish boundary is least noticeable on the ground.

Burngreave / Firth Park / Shiregreen & Brightside / Southey

I have no comments on these wards, other than to note that they form a cohesive unit, surrounded by strong boundaries on the ground; most notably two railway lines. No areas should be either added or subtracted from this existing unit.

West Sheffield (Crookes & Crosspool; Dore & Totley; Ecclesall; Fulwood)

Dore & Totley / Ecclesall

The boundary between Dore & Totley and Ecclesall in the Parkhead area should be reverted to that which was in place from 2004-16. Parkhead is an intrinsic part of Ecclesall-proper, with particularly strong links to Bents Green, where locals use the shops, and Millhouses, with which it shares a school catchment area. It was extremely regrettable that the arithmetic led to its removal from Ecclesall ward in 2016, and the opportunity should be taken to rectify this. Additionally, given Dore & Totley is oversized, removing Parkhead will move its electorate closer to target.

It is unfortunate that Whirlow, which was a part of Ecclesall prior to 2004, cannot also be added, but the numbers continue to preclude this possibility, and the connections between Dore and Whirlow proper are acceptable enough to continue justifying a shared ward.

Ringinglow

Ideally, the village of Ringinglow should be placed into Ecclesall. It clearly links best into Bents Green, along Ringinglow Road. However, being a clearly separate community, it could be placed into a different ward if electoral equality demands. In the case of this review, depending on how highly the commission prizes electoral equality within the 10% limits, that could entail its placement in Fulwood. Whilst this would be by no means ideal, it is a perfectly acceptable solution if Fulwood is in need of extra electors.

Carterknowle

Carterknowle (broadly consisting of polling districts LD and TD) was split between wards during the 2016 review, and should be reunited. The area formed an intrinsic part of Nether Edge ward for many decades prior to 2016, and the two districts of Nether Edge and Carterknowle have always formed a common community, for example sharing a school catchment area (for Mercia School), and many residents attending the same mosques.

The addition of (most of) Carterknowle to Ecclesall at the last review was enforced by maths, and now that this is no longer necessary (indeed, Ecclesall is the only currently oversized ward, and if it is to retake Parkhead then a substantial loss of territory elsewhere will be needed) it should be reversed.

Crookes & Crosspool / Fulwood

Crookes & Crosspool encompasses two separate communities. There are not brilliant links between the two neighbourhoods, but they are united through the Lydgate School catchment. Neither area naturally gels with an alternative, so the ward should be retained.

The ward is at the lower limits for electoral equality, but does not naturally have room to expand. In the north it is bounded by the Rivelin Valley and the Bolehill Recreation Ground, which provide clear natural breaks between communities. Heavygate Road to the east, whilst somewhat unassuming, is a clear boundary of community identity - those to the west identifying as Crookes and using Crookes High Street, whilst to the east, on the steep hills, people strongly identify with Walkley and shop on Howard / South Road. In the southeast the boundary is less clear, but the ward has arguably already extended too far and takes in the fringes of areas which define themselves more as Broomhill or Crookesmoor. Roads such as Conduit Road or Redcar Road would ideally be placed in a Broomhill-based ward, though are not too out of place in Crookes & Crosspool. However, moving roads south or east of these, which lie down a substantial hill and look clearly to Broomhill rather than Crookes, into Crookes & Crosspool would defy community identity.

The one community into which Crookes & Crosspool could reasonably expand would be at its western end, where Sandygate is split between this ward and Fulwood. Roads like Tom Lane and Carsick View Road could be placed in either ward. If there is a desire to achieve greater electoral equality, then this is the area which should be examined.

However, Fulwood itself would not have any obvious avenues to compensate for electors lost in the Sandygate area. It is hemmed in by the Rivelin and Porter valleys to the north and south. Given taking territory from Crookes & Crosspool would be self-defeating in this circumstance, this leaves only two options. The first is taking roads from Broomhill. This would not be sensible, as the student-dominated Broomhill community has very little in common with Fulwood, and residents of Broomhill look more to the city centre than the west. The student villages, particularly that in Endcliffe, are arguably already included in Fulwood solely for electoral equality reasons. The other option, taking in Ringinglow, as explored above, is not ideal, but would be acceptable - though the village is not a huge source of electors.

I offer no particular view of whether transferring areas in Sandygate to Crookes & Crosspool, and the possible addition of Ringinglow to Fulwood, would be desirable in the round. I simply offer it as a possibility to achieve greater electoral equality.

Central West Sheffield (Broomhill & Sharrow Vale; City; Nether Edge & Sharrow; Walkley)

Nether Edge

The old Nether Edge ward should be recreated. This was a cohesive ward, which existed for decades prior to 2016. As stated in the section above, Carterknowle and Nether Edge share a clear community of interest, and should be reunited.

All things considered, Sharrow Vale should also be placed back into Nether Edge. Though there is some community of interest between the areas around the Botanical Gardens (traditionally in Broomhill) and areas south of the Porter Brook (traditionally in Nether Edge) around Hunters Bar / Ecclesall Road, these quickly dissipate once you get to roads like Bagshot Street in the east, or Hardwick Crescent in the south of the areas added to Broomhill & Sharrow Vale in 2016. Clearly the areas in polling district EB belong in Nether Edge. On balance, due to both the historic links to Nether Edge ward and the knock-on effects at this review, I would recommend the entirety of Sharrow Vale is returned to Nether Edge - though possibly the Porter Brook is not the strongest boundary between the Hunters Bar roundabout and the Mill Pond - Sharrow Vale Road might be better.

If the commission were to choose to retain parts of Sharrow Vale within Broomhill then Nether Edge will have to retain the western edges of Sharrow, which would clearly be unideal.

If the commission were to choose to go down the route of Option B, crossing the Midland Main Line at Lowfield, the entirety of Sharrow Vale would need to be retained in Broomhill & Sharrow Vale.

Sharrow

Making the above changes to Nether Edge would allow for the reunification of the interlocking Sharrow and Highfield communities, currently split between Nether Edge & Sharrow and City wards, and allow for the recreation of something resembling the old (pre-2004) Sharrow ward. The boundary between Sharrow and Highfield is virtually non-existent on the ground, with residents using the same shops, community facilities and green spaces. Community groups also span the two communities - for instance, the Sharrow Community Forum recently funded the redevelopment of the Highfield Adventure Playground.

Due to the arithmetic, the ward would also need to cross the inner ring road. Sharrow and Highfield have almost always shared a ward with at least parts of the city centre (the pre-2004 Sharrow included areas south of Wellington Street; the 2004-16 Central included the entirety of Sharrow, Highfield and the city centre; and the current City ward includes the city centre and most of Highfield), and there are large student developments on both sides of the ring road, so crossing this boundary is not unduly troubling. If the commission chooses to retain parts of Sharrow Vale in Broomhill, thus necessitating parts of Sharrow staying in Nether Edge, the areas of the city centre added to Sharrow ward would, of course, need to be larger.

Given the large-scale recent developments, I do not have strong opinions on where is the best place to draw a boundary within the city centre.

If the commission were to choose to go down the route of Option B, crossing the Midland Main Line at Lowfield, the Highfield / Sharrow community would remain split. As large a chunk of Sharrow as possible would need to be added to ‘Heeley & Highfield’, in order to avoid a further split of a community at Carterknowle.

Broomhill

The 2016 review significantly diluted the identity of the Broomhill ward, as arithmetic enforced the additions of the Broomhall and Sharrow Vale communities. This review should go some way to reversing that, namely by removing Sharrow Vale (as argued above).

Meanwhile, fringe areas of Broomhill and Crookesmoor were added to Fulwood, Crookes & Crosspool and Walkley wards. In the case of Walkley, this can be reversed. The areas of ZC polling district south of Springvale Road, particularly Sydney and Roebuck Roads, are clearly part of Crookesmoor, with a high population of students from the University of Sheffield living in HMOs. Though this area (along with EE polling district) can look somewhat detached on a map, there is a very clear Broomhill-Crookesmoor community. These areas both have large numbers of second and third year students from the University of Sheffield, and Broomhill high street serves as a hub for residents in both areas.

Given the loss of electorate from the removal of Sharrow Vale, Broomhill should extend past the inner ring road (in addition to the Broomhall section already included). Doing this on Upper Hanover Street makes perfect sense, as the University of Sheffield buildings span both sides of the road - with University buildings as far east as Newcastle Street. Further south, roads such as West Street and Division Street are also well-utilised by students. Much of the accommodation in this area is also student accommodation - for example Westhill Hall and Portobello House - so fits well with areas in Broomhill and Crookesmoor.

Broomhall is a somewhat odd fit with the current Broomhill & Sharrow Vale, as whilst it does contain a moderately high number of student residents, it has a far more established population. However, including more areas within the ring road creates a more cohesive ward, with Broomhall feeling less out of place with these areas than the western suburbs.

As with other wards extending into the city centre, I do not have strong feelings on the exact location of where the boundary should be drawn. The newly drawn ward should probably be renamed as Broomhill & Broomhall.

If the commission were to choose to go down the route of Option B, crossing the Midland Main Line at Lowfield, Broomhill & Sharrow Vale would remain largely unchanged from the present ward, though could still take in the areas of ZC polling district outlined above.

Walkley

The current Walkley ward is coherent and should be mostly retained, with only small alterations. Walkley itself is a hilly zone of the city, with good links to nearby areas. In particular, Walkley and Langsett to its north are linked by primary school catchment areas, and are both served by the Langsett and Walkley Community Association.

There are also good links between both Walkley and Langsett with Upperthorpe. Community initiatives like the Walkley and Upperthorpe art trail, created in 2023, span the two districts, and both converge on Ruskin Park. Meanwhile, the Zest community organisation spans the Langsett, Upperthorpe and Netherthorpe communities, with a focus on tackling inequality in the area. Netherthorpe and Upperthorpe are also linked through school catchments, and many residents worship at the same mosque.

As stated in previous sections, the Philadelphia area of Hillsborough ward should be re-added to Walkley, with its strong links into Upperthorpe; whilst the small areas of Crookesmoor currently in Walkley should be removed and added to Broomhill & Broomhall. The ward should also lose those areas north and east of the Edward Street flats and inside the inner ring road. These areas are not a part of the Netherthorpe community. They are student-dominated, and look to the city centre, not to the largely residential areas contained in the Walkley ward. The same is true for the large, new student blocks between Hoyle and Sudbury Streets, just west of the ring road and next to the Shalesmoor roundabout. Removing these areas is not only desirable; it will be necessary to reduce Walkley ward below the required 10% variance.

South West Sheffield (Beauchief & Greenhill; Graves Park)

Beauchief & Greenhill

This is a sensibly drawn, coherent ward and should be retained without boundary changes. Beauchief and Greenhill are similar suburbs which identify with one another, for example through a number of joint community Facebook groups, and through a joint school catchment area. The Low Edges, Batemoor and Jordanthorpe estates are somewhat separate, though the western end of Low Edges does have a less 'hard' boundary with western Greenhill than any other part of the estates has with any other area outside them. The estates are also in the same secondary school catchment area as other parts of the ward, and have no obvious links with any other part of the city.

Graves Park

This too is a sensible ward, with communities based around Graves Park itself. The majority of the population lives in the northern areas, in Woodseats and Norton Lees, with a focal point on the shops of Chesterfield Road. This also serves as a shopping district for residents in the south of the ward, in Norton - who would be much more likely to visit Woodseats than adjoining areas like Hemsworth and Jordanthorpe - though the primary unifying factor between the north and south of the ward is the green space in Graves Park. The park serves as a hub for these communities, whereas residents in nearby areas to the east look just as often to different green spaces in south Sheffield.

Whilst Graves Park is not below quota, it will be helpful, in order to alleviate population pressures further east, for it to take a small number of roads from the present Gleadless Valley ward. There are two main areas where this is desirable. Firstly, Ashbury Drive, Ashbury Lane, Backmoor Crescent, Backmoor Road and the north side of Hemsworth Road to the west of Blackstock Road. This area is sometimes classified as Hemsworth, but is outside of the Gleadless Valley Estate, and is more often classified as Norton. For instance, the Norton History Group includes these roads as Norton, and the council's highways register classifies them as part of Norton, not Hemsworth. Secondly, in the north of the current ward, Lees Hall Place, Lees Hall Road and Upper Albert Road south of the junction with Lees Hall Road arguably look more to Norton Lees than they do to Meersbrook. On the other hand, the boundary should not be moved in the Norton Lees Road / Cliffefield Road area. This area, currently in Gleadless Valley ward, is clearly a part of Meersbrook / Meersbrook Bank, and ward boundaries should reflect that.

South East Sheffield (Beighton; Birley; Darnall; Mosborough; Woodhouse)

Darnall

Darnall ward is currently surrounded by hard boundaries: the Midland Main Line, the A57 and A630 dual carriageways, and the city boundary. The ward should remain unchanged.

Woodhouse

The entirety of the communities of Handsworth and Woodhouse should be united in one ward. They have clear boundaries, enclosed by dual carriageways. A chunk of Handsworth is currently excluded (instead forming a part of Richmond ward), due to the arithmetic at the previous review. On the current numbers, a single, cohesive ward can be drawn without splitting either community. It is self-evident that this should be done.

Birley

Birley is a sensible ward spanning several small communities (Base Green, Birley, Birley Spa, Charnock, Frecheville) which should be retained. It has strong boundaries (the A6102 dual carriageway in the southwest, Shire Brook and Normanton Spring Wood in the northeast) in all areas except Gleadless Townend. I do not have an opinion whether the boundary in this area is in precisely the correct place, though I note that some residents still identify with the old county boundary (Shire Brook), and this boundary also serves as a school catchment boundary, so returning the ward boundary to this point might have some merit. Equally, the entirety of the Gleadless Townsend area (the current Park & Arbourthorne and Richmond wards south of Hollinsend Road and west of Gleadless Primary School) could be added to Birley, which could aid electoral equality. Due to Birley's small size, Normanton Spring should be added (assuming the whole of Gleadless Townend is not). This small area could share a ward with any of Richmond, Handsworth or Frecheville, but, given Birley is the smallest ward containing one of these communities, it should be added here.

Beighton / Mosborough

Despite being made up of a number of separate housing estates, the Mosborough townships retain a cohesive collective identity. This unit should be protected as far as possible - certainly in the north where Mosborough Parkway and the Shire Brook Valley Nature Reserve form a very clear barrier with Woodhouse, and in the southwest where Sheffield Road separates the community of Birley Spa. In the northwest the boundary is less clear, and currently splits the community of Hackenthorpe. There must be some argument for reuniting this community, though those living on the western edge may arguably have more community interests with residents in Birley Spa. Given Birley is already somewhat below quota, uniting the community may not be possible anyway. I offer no comment on whether a slight move of the current boundary would be desirable, though if Beighton is expanded then this should be no further west than Cotleigh Road.

South Sheffield - Option A (Gleadless Valley; Manor Castle; Park & Arbourthorne; Richmond)

Gleadless Valley

Gleadless Valley should be retained, though with one fairly major addition. The Heeley community is currently split in two, with the eastern half in Park & Arbourthorne ward (polling district AE). With the exception of Meersbrook to the southwest, where precise boundaries are hazy, Heeley is a very clearly defined community - East Bank Road / Norfolk Park in the east, the train line in the north, the Gleadless Valley Estate in the south east. The Heeley community should be reunited.

In the south / southeast of Sheffield, the commission has often used shared green spaces as a way of uniting smaller, disparate communities. Given Sheffield's topography, this is a sensible practice which should continue. However, this should not be used to justify a split of Heeley. East and west Heeley are not separated by their proximity to Norfolk Park on the one hand and Meersbrook Park on the other. This is one community, and should be united in a single ward.

As stated above, there is not a clear split between the northern communities of Heeley and Meersbrook. They are linked with each other through green spaces, namely Meersbrook Park and the Heeley & Meersbrook allotments, whilst groups like the Heeley Trust operate across not only Heeley and Meersbrook, but also the Gleadless Valley Estate.

In the centre and south of the ward, the various parts of the Gleadless Valley estate are linked by a number of well used bus routes along the side of the valley, into Heeley, and then the centre of Sheffield. These communities are also linked with one another through shared green spaces, at Leeshall Wood and Rollestone Wood, and through school catchment areas.

The reason for the historic split of Heeley is, of course, arithmetic. Simply adding the AE polling district would again marginally push Gleadless Valley above the 10% variance threshold. However, this should be rectifiable without too much trouble. Firstly, the roads outlined in the Graves Park section should be added to that ward. Secondly, the northwest side of Norton Avenue and the Herdings View cul-de-sac should be added to the same ward as Gleadless Townsend. These two roads have little to nothing in common with the Gleadless Valley Estate, and should be removed from the ward. This should be sufficient, though if the commission wanted greater electoral equality, Herdings could be added to Birley ward. There are some links between Birley and Herdings, but keeping the Gleadless Valley Estate together is obviously preferable from a community interest point-of-view.

Intake

The present Richmond ward will need to shift west after losing Handsworth and Normanton Spring, and becoming very undersized. This should firstly be done by adding polling districts AC and AD from Park & Arbourthorne (the latter excluding Arbourthorne Road / Paddock Crescent /

Berners Road and associated cul-de-sacs). This is by no means unprecedented: the pre-2004 Intake ward also included these areas, alongside Intake and Woodthorpe.

Though this ward would cross Ridgeway Road, there are clear communities of interest. In particular, the Gleadless Townend community in the south spans both sides of the road, and is currently split between wards. Here, Ridgeway Road is less a barrier than it is a focal point, with residents on both sides utilising the tram stop and small area of shops.

Further north, communities on either side of Ridgeway Road are united by additional tram stops at Hollinsend and Manor Top, and the shared green space at Hollinsend Rec. The park has entrances on both the Intake side and the west side, and is used for both community events and regular 'Sunday league' football matches, drawing residents from either side of the road. Additionally, Gleadless Primary School serves both Intake and Gleadless Townend, in addition to areas further north in the Hurlfield community. The northern boundary should be drawn at the the edge of the Arbourthorne estate, where the character of the area clearly shifts.

I have proposed naming this ward Intake, as that is the central community in the ward, and was the name of the similar pre-2004 ward. However, I do not have strong feelings on this.

Manor & Arbourthorne

A new ward combining the Manor and Arbourthorne Estates, along with the housing in the Norfolk Park area should be created. The housing in Norfolk Park is isolated, with links into only Arbourthorne and Highfield. A crossing into Highfield was proposed at the 2016 review, but this was reversed due to community opposition. Thus, the housing in Norfolk Park must remain with Arbourthorne, with which it shares green spaces, school catchment areas and a health centre.

The linkage of Arbourthorne with Manor would combine two large housing estates, with similar character, issues and needs. This is already reflected in some services such as the local police, who have a Manor & Arbourthorne team. The issues faced by councillors in both estates will be very similar. Furthermore, Arbourthorne and the Fairleigh area of the Manor Estate have a particular community of interest: a shared school catchment, the shopping district on City Road, and the well-used tram stop at Manor Top. Residents in the entirety of the Manor Estate also share green spaces with those in eastern Arbourthorne, in the shape of Manor Fields Park.

Alternative Manor / Arbourthorne configuration

An alternative configuration could see the Manor Estate united with Woodthorpe and Richmond, whilst Intake would be added to Norfolk Park, Arbourthorne and Hurlfield. Whilst the first of these wards would have a clear community of interest, it would fall almost 10% below quota. The second ward would also have advantages, but it is arguable that Intake has less in common with Arbourthorne than with Hurlfield and Gleadless Townend. Under this configuration the entirety of Gleadless Townend (areas south of Hollinsend Road and west of Gleadless Primary) would have to be added to Birley for reasons of electoral equality.

South East Sheffield - Option B (Gleadless Valley; Manor Castle; Park & Arbourthorne; Richmond)

Manor Castle

Under this option, Manor Castle would remain largely the same as currently constituted. However, some small, newly redeveloped areas close to the city centre could be added to the City Centre ward, uniting a coherent community and aiding electoral equality.

Intake

Under this option, a new Intake ward would be created, similar to that described above. However, it might be felt that the entirety of polling district AD should be excluded for reasons of electoral equality.

Arbourthorne & Gleadless

Under this option, the Arbourthorne Estate would be united with the Gleadless Valley Estate rather than the Manor Estate. There is a similar linkage here in the characteristics of the areas being joined together, though the communities in Arbourthorne and Gleadless Valley have less in common in terms of shared services and facilities.