

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Caradon in Cornwall

Report to the Electoral Commission

June 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Boundary Committee 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 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 283

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	11
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	13
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	17
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	19
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	21
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	35
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Caradon: Detailed Mapping	37

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Saltash and Torpoint is inserted inside the back cover of this report.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to the Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No 3692). The Order also transferred to the Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Kru Desai
Robin Gray
Joan Jones
Ann M Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Caradon in Cornwall.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Caradon's electoral arrangements on 12 June 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 27 November 2001, after which it undertook an eight-week period of consultation. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us, the Boundary Committee for England, to complete the work of the LGCE and submit final recommendations to the Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations received by the LGCE during consultation on its draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission.**

We found that the existing arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Caradon:

- **in 17 of the 30 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and eight wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 19 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 11 wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 81 - 82) are that:

- **Caradon District Council should have 42 councillors, one more than at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards, instead of 30 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of eight wards, and four wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each district councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 17 of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in 21 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Liskeard and Saltash;**
- **an increase in the number and redistribution of councillors serving Torpoint Town Council, and revised warding arrangements;**
- **a reduction in the number of councillors serving Pelynt Parish Council.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 18 July 2002:

**The Secretary
Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1 Callington	3	<i>unchanged</i> - the parish of Callington	Map 2
2 Calstock	3	the parish of Calstock	Map 2
3 Deviock & Sheviock	1	the parishes of Deviock and Sheviock	Map 2
4 Dobwalls & District	2	the parishes of Dobwalls & Trewidland, Morval, St Keyne and St Pinnock	Map 2
5 Duloe, Lansallos & Pelynt	2	the parishes of Duloe, Lanreath, Lansallos and Pelynt	Map 2
6 Landrake & St Dominick	2	the parishes of Botus Fleming, Landrake with St Erney, Landulph, Pillaton, St Dominick and St Mellion	Map 2
7 Lanteglos & St Veep	1	the parishes of Broadoak, Boconnoc, Lanteglos ,St Veep and St Winnow	Map 2
8 Liskeard North	3	the proposed Liskeard North parish ward of Liskeard parish	Map A2
9 Liskeard South	2	the proposed Liskeard South parish ward of Liskeard parish	Map A2
10 Looe & St Martin	3	the parishes of Looe and St Martin-by-Looe	Map 2
11 Lynher	1	<i>unchanged</i> - the parishes of Linkinhorne and South Hill	Map 2
12 Menheniot & St Ive	2	the parishes of Menheniot and St Ive	Map 2
13 Millbrook	1	<i>unchanged</i> - the parish of Millbrook	Map 2
14 Rame Peninsula	1	the parishes of Antony, Maker and St John	Map 2
15 St Cleer & St Neot	2	the parishes of St Cleer, St Neot and Warleggan	Map 2
16 St Germans	1	the parishes of Quethiock and St Germans	Map 2
17 Saltash Burraton	2	the proposed Saltash Burraton parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
18 Saltash Essa	2	<i>unchanged</i> - Saltash Essa parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
19 Saltash Pill	2	the proposed Saltash Pill parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
20 Saltash St Stephens	2	the proposed Saltash St Stephens parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
21 Torpoint East	2	the proposed Torpoint East parish ward of Torpoint parish	Large map
22 Torpoint West	2	the proposed Torpoint West parish ward of Torpoint parish	Large map

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 in Appendix A.

Table 2: Final Recommendations for Caradon

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Callington	3	3,714	1,238	-19	4,651	1,550	-5
2	Calstock	3	4,899	1,633	7	5,144	1,715	5
3	Deviock & Sheviock	1	1,718	1,718	13	1,792	1,792	10
4	Dobwalls & District	2	2,987	1,494	-2	3,054	1,527	-6
5	Duloe, Lansallos & Pelynt	2	3,287	1,644	8	3,373	1,687	3
6	Landrake & St Dominick	2	3,277	1,639	7	3,411	1,706	4
7	Lanteglos & St Veep	1	1,610	1,610	5	1,694	1,694	4
8	Liskeard North	3	3,544	1,181	-23	4,686	1,562	-4
9	Liskeard South	2	3,098	1,549	1	3,223	1,612	-1
10	Looe & St Martin	3	4,560	1,520	0	4,812	1,604	-2
11	Lynher	1	1,635	1,635	7	1,673	1,673	2
12	Menheniot & St Ive	2	3,096	1,548	1	3,166	1,583	-3
13	Millbrook	1	1,648	1,648	8	1,741	1,741	7
14	Rame Peninsula	1	1,527	1,527	0	1,558	1,558	-5
15	St Cleer & St Neot	2	3,552	1,776	16	3,650	1,825	12
16	St Germans	1	1,511	1,511	-1	1,551	1,551	-5
17	Saltash Burraton	2	3,151	1,576	3	3,151	1,576	-3
18	Saltash Essa	2	3,192	1,596	5	3,208	1,604	-2
19	Saltash Pill	2	2,500	1,250	-18	3,331	1,666	2
20	Saltash St Stephens	2	3,180	1,590	4	3,233	1,617	-1
21	Torpoint East	2	3,237	1,619	6	3,237	1,619	-1
22	Torpoint West	2	3,198	1,599	5	3,226	1,613	-1
	Totals	42	64,121	-	-	68,565	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,527	-	-	1,633	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Caradon District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor 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.

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Caradon in Cornwall. The six districts in Cornwall have now been reviewed as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England started by the LGCE in 1996. We have inherited that programme, which we currently expect to complete in 2004.

2 Caradon's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1979 (Report no. 375). The electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council were last reviewed in November 1983 (Report no. 456). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

3 In making final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - c) achieve equality of representation.
- 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Caradon was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition, published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 The LGCE were not prescriptive on council size. Insofar as Caradon is concerned, it started from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but was willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, the LGCE found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and that any proposal for an increase in council size would need to be fully justified. In particular, it did not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 12 June 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Caradon District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Cornwall County Council, Devon and Cornwall Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Cornwall Association of Parish & Local Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West region, and the headquarters of the main political

parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 3 September 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 27 November 2001 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Caradon in Cornwall*, and ended on 28 January 2002. During this period it sought comments from the public and any other interested parties on its preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four it reconsidered its draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations agreed by the LGCE. We are content to adopt these final recommendations as our own.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 The district of Caradon is located in south-east Cornwall, the most easterly of the six Cornish districts. It lies immediately across the River Tamar from the city of Plymouth. The district is entirely parished (41 in total), covers an area of 66,407 hectares and has a population of 76,516. The area has five principle settlements, the rural towns of Callington, Liskeard, Looe, Saltash and Torpoint. It has a strong rural character, with the Fowey, Lynher and Tamar rivers running down from deep wooded valleys through a farmed landscape to the coast. The four main supports for Caradon's economy are agriculture, tourism, defence and related industries, and the economy of Plymouth.

11 The electorate of the district is 64,121 (February 2001). The Council presently has 41 members who are elected from 30 wards, nine of which are relatively urban, with the remainder being mainly rural. Two of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven are each represented by two councillors and 21 are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

12 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,564 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,672 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration since the last review, the number of electors per councillor in 17 of the 30 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, eight wards by more than 20 per cent and seven wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Cleer ward where the councillor represents 70 per cent more electors than the district average.

13 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated, in percentage terms, the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the district average. In the text which follows, this figure may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Caradon

Table 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Burraton	2	4,121	2,061	32	4,800	2,400	44
2 Callington	2	3,714	1,857	19	4,651	2,326	39
3 Calstock & Harrowbarrow	1	1,872	1,872	20	1,914	1,914	14
4 Chilsworthy & Delaware	1	1,591	1,591	2	1,713	1,713	2
5 Dobwalls & Trewidland	1	1,553	1,553	-1	1,576	1,576	-6
6 Donderry	1	1,374	1,374	-12	1,438	1,438	-14
7 Essa	2	3,192	1,596	2	3,208	1,604	-4
8 Gunnislake	1	1,436	1,436	-8	1,517	1,517	-9
9 Landrake	1	1,874	1,874	20	1,960	1,960	17
10 Lansallos	1	1,354	1,354	-13	1,377	1,377	-18
11 Lanteglos	1	887	887	-43	927	927	-45
12 Liskeard North	2	3,349	1,675	7	4,491	2,246	34
13 Liskeard South	2	3,293	1,647	5	3,418	1,709	2
14 Looe	3	4,313	1,438	-8	4,549	1,516	-9
15 Lynher	1	1,635	1,635	5	1,673	1,673	0
16 Maker	1	844	844	-46	853	853	-49
17 Menheniot	1	1,477	1,477	-6	1,503	1,503	-10
18 Millbrook	1	1,648	1,648	5	1,741	1,741	4
19 Morval	1	1,452	1,452	-7	1,505	1,505	-10
20 Pill	2	2,592	1,296	-17	2,744	1,372	-18
21 St Cleer	1	2,651	2,651	70	2,701	2,701	62
22 St Dominick	1	1,403	1,403	-10	1,451	1,451	-13
23 St Germans	1	1,350	1,350	-14	1,390	1,390	-17
24 St Ive	1	1,780	1,780	14	1,824	1,824	9
25 St Neot & Warleggan	1	901	901	-42	949	949	-43
26 St Stephens	2	2,118	1,059	-32	2,171	1,086	-35
27 St Veep	1	1,237	1,237	-21	1,297	1,297	-22
28 Sheviock	1	1,274	1,274	-19	1,322	1,322	-21

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
29 Torpoint	3	6,435	2,145	37	6,463	2,154	29
30 Trelawny	1	1,401	1,401	-10	1,439	1,439	-14
Totals	41	64,121	-	-	68,565	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,564	-	-	1,672	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Caradon District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in St Stephens ward were relatively over-represented by 32 per cent, while electors in Torpoint ward were significantly under-represented by 37 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

14 During Stage One the LGCE received two representations, a district-wide scheme from Caradon District Council and a representation from Saltash Parish Council. The District Council forwarded 17 responses to its proposals. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Caradon in Cornwall*.

15 The draft recommendations were based on the District Council's proposals, which achieved improved electoral equality, provided a pattern of three-member wards in Callington, Calstock and Looe and St Martin, and a mix of single- and two-member wards in the rest of the district. It adopted the District Council's scheme in its entirety, subject to some minor modifications to boundaries to tie them to ground detail, affecting no electors. It proposed that:

- Caradon District Council should be served by 42 councillors, compared with the current 41, representing 22 wards, eight less than at present;
- the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified, while four wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Liskeard and Saltash, a reduction in the number of councillors serving Pelynt Parish Council and revised warding arrangements and an increase in the number and redistribution of councillors serving Torpoint Town Council.

Draft Recommendation

Caradon District Council should comprise 42 councillors, serving 22 wards. The whole council should continue to be elected every four years.

16 The proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 17 of the 22 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only Fowey Moor ward having a variance of more than 10 per cent from the average in 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

17 During the consultation on its draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 13 representations. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Caradon District Council.

Caradon District Council

18 The District Council resolved to support the draft recommendations, but requested the alternative spelling of Rame Peninsula ward.

Cornwall County Council

19 Cornwall County Council expressed support for the views of County Councillor Mepsted, who opposed the proposed boundary between Saltash St Stephens and Saltash Burraton wards as it would place the village of Burraton and its primary school in Saltash St Stephens ward, while placing rural areas linked to St Stephens in Saltash Burraton ward, and divide the new housing development of Latchbrook. The councillor also proposed that Saltash Town Council's Stage One submission be reconsidered. Cornwall County Council acknowledged that addressing these issues "would require more radical changes in the boundaries between the two current wards than is presently suggested".

South East Cornwall Conservative Association

20 The South East Conservative Association proposed that the boundary between Liskeard North and Liskeard South wards "run down Castle Hill from Castle Street and up Market Street and Pike Street and along West Street". It proposed that the current wards of Dobwalls & Trewidland and Morval be maintained, and that a two-member ward be created comprising the parishes of Lansallos, Pelynt, Lanreath and St Pinnock.

Tamar Valley Branch Labour Party

21 Tamar Valley Branch Labour Party opposed the recommendation to join the three single-member wards of Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware and Gunnislake in a three-member Calstock ward.

Parish Councils

22 Representations were received from seven parish councils. Calstock Parish Council argued that electors within the parish would be better represented by maintaining the three single-member ward pattern. Pelynt Parish Council supported the recommendation to reduce its council size from twelve to ten, but opposed the proposed Duloe, Lansallos and Trelawny ward for its size and proposed name. Pillaton Parish Council proposed that the rural areas should be over-represented to account for the size of the rural wards. Saltash Town Council submitted that it wished to make no further comment. Shevioc Parish Council opposed the proposed Whitsands ward in terms of its composition and proposed name. St Neot Parish Council opposed the proposed Fowey Moor ward, while St Cleer Parish Council opposed the proposed name.

Other Representations

23 A representation was received from a local resident suggesting that the recommendations incorrectly allocate councillors to the towns of Liskeard, Torpoint and Saltash.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

24 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Caradon is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended) – the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

25 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

26 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

27 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate Forecasts

28 Since 1975 there has been just under a 30 per cent increase in the electorate of Caradon district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 6 per cent from 64,121 to 68,565 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in the wards of Callington, Liskeard North and Burraton. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

29 The LGCE received no comments on the Council’s electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and we remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

30 As already explained, the LGCE started its review by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although was willing to carefully look at arguments why this might not be the case.

31 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE adopted the Council’s proposal for a council of 42-members as it considered that, having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate,

the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 42 members. In particular, the increase of one in council size facilitates the correct distribution of councillors between the five more urban settlements and the rural area of Caradon.

32 At Stage Three no specific comments were received regarding council size. We are therefore confirming the draft recommendation for a council size of 42.

Electoral Arrangements

33 The LGCE gave careful consideration to the views that it received during Stage One, including the district-wide scheme received from the District Council. It noted that there was some support and limited opposition to the District Council's scheme as a whole. It also noted that the District Council's scheme avoids the need for parish warding and that it secures improved levels of electoral equality across the district. Therefore, it proposed adopting the District Council's scheme in its entirety, subject to some minor modifications to boundaries to tie them to ground detail, affecting no electors.

34 In response to the draft recommendations report, Cornwall County Council expressed the opinion that "there is an imbalance in current reviews between the emphasis placed on numbers on the one hand, and community on the other". We note these concerns. However, we are required to make recommendations for any changes to the electoral arrangements having regard to the need to: reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure effective and convenient local government. We will only recommend the retention of substantial imbalance where it can be demonstrated to us that no other option is feasible. Departures from the principle of electoral equality therefore need to be fully justified. We do not consider that there is sufficient evidence to warrant this in Caradon.

35 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. We are of the view that the draft recommendations secure good levels of electoral equality, while having regard to local community identities and interests. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Saltash (four wards);
- (b) Liskeard (two wards);
- (c) Callington and Torpoint wards;
- (d) Looe ward;
- (e) Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware, Landrake, Gunnislake and St Dominick wards;
- (f) Menheniot, St Germans and St Ive wards;
- (g) Maker, Millbrook and Sheviocock wards;
- (h) Dobwalls & Trewidland, Dowderry and Morval wards;
- (i) Lansallos, Lanteglos, St Veep and Trelawny wards;
- (j) Lynher, St Cleer and St Neot & Warleggan wards.

36 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Saltash (four wards)

37 The town of Saltash is located in the east of the district. Burraton ward is currently 32 per cent under-represented (44 per cent by 2006). Essa ward is currently 2 per cent under-represented (4 per cent over-represented by 2006). Pill ward is currently 17 per cent over-represented (18 per cent by 2006). St Stephens ward is currently 32 per cent over-represented (35 per cent by 2006).

38 The District Council proposed no change for Essa ward and proposed a modified Burraton ward, additionally including Homer Park, but excluding the area south of Prospect Lane and west of Fairmead Road, and the area of development to the south-east of Saltash Industrial Estate. It further proposed that the area of development would then form part of an enlarged Pill ward, while the area to the south and west of Prospect Lane and Fairmead Road would be included in a modified St Stephens ward. It also proposed prefixing all the wards with 'Saltash'.

39 Saltash Town Council objected to these proposals and submitted alternative warding arrangements. However, the LGCE considered that there was insufficient evidence to justify the poor levels of electoral equality that they would produce, particularly the resulting 17 per cent over-representation for Saltash St Stephens by 2006.

40 In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals for these wards as part of its draft recommendations. Under the draft recommendations Saltash Burraton ward would be 3 per cent under-represented (3 per cent over-represented by 2006). Saltash Essa ward would be 5 per cent under-represented (2 per cent over-represented by 2006). Saltash Pill ward would be 18 per cent over-represented (2 per cent under-represented by 2006). Saltash St Stephens ward would be 4 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006).

41 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. The County Council made a number of comments with regards the draft recommendations. First it suggested that the village of Burraton and its primary school should be in Burraton ward, not St Stephens ward and that "the rural areas that relate to St Stephens should be in St Stephens ward". Finally, it stated that the "relatively new housing development of Latchbrook should all be in one ward". County Councillor J Mepsted made broadly similar comments to those of the County Council. She also asked that we reconsider the submission from Saltash Town Council. Saltash Town Council stated that "the Town Council note [the] recommendations and wish to make no further comment".

42 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. As was stated in the draft recommendations report, we consider there is insufficient evidence to justify the poor levels of electoral equality that Saltash Town Council's proposals would produce, particularly the resulting 17 per cent over-representation for Saltash St Stephens ward by 2006. We also examined the possibility of a rural single-member ward, but consider that there are insufficient electors in the rural part of the parish to warrant a whole councillor. In addition, Saltash Town Council has not objected to the draft recommendations. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final. The levels of electoral equality would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Liskeard (two wards)

43 The two two-member wards of Liskeard North and Liskeard South cover Liskeard town and are currently 7 per cent under-represented (34 per cent by 2006) and 5 per cent under-represented (2 per cent by 2006) respectively.

44 The District Council proposed that Liskeard North ward be represented by an additional third councillor, while Liskeard South ward remain a two-member ward. It also proposed that the Plymouth Road continue to be utilised as the boundary between the district wards, but that it be extended to the roundabout and junction with Liskerrett Road and Charter Way. Under these proposals Liskeard North ward would initially be significantly over-represented, but substantial housing developments, planned for a number of sites, would reduce this imbalance by 2006. The LGCE examined a number of alternative arrangements to reduce the 2001 variances, but concluded that these would significantly worsen the electoral equality in 2006. Liskeard Town Council supported the proposed allocation of an additional councillor to Liskeard North ward.

45 In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals for these wards as part of its draft recommendations. Under the draft recommendations the wards of Liskeard North and Liskeard South would be 23 per cent over-represented (4 per cent by 2006) and 1 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006) respectively.

46 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. The South East Cornwall Conservative Association proposed an amendment to the boundary between Liskeard North and Liskeard South wards, to "tidy up the boundary significantly, making it more identifiable". No other comments were received on the draft recommendations for these wards.

47 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We note the comments of the South East Cornwall Conservative Association. However, the LGCE considered a broadly similar boundary at Stage One, but concluded that this would divide the town centre in two. We concur with this view and consider that it would be better to place the town centre in single ward. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final. The levels of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2 and Map A2.

Callington and Torpoint wards

48 These two wards represent relatively urban areas of the district. The two-member Callington ward comprises the parish of the same name and is currently 19 per cent under-represented (39 per cent by 2006). Torpoint ward has three councillors and comprises the parish of the same name. It is currently 37 per cent under-represented (29 per cent by 2006).

49 The District Council proposed that Callington ward should be represented by an additional third member, but did not propose any change to its boundaries. It proposed that Torpoint Parish should be represented by an additional fourth councillor and be divided into two two-member district wards using the parish ward boundary, which is due to come into effect in 2003 under the Parish of Torpoint (Wards) Order 2000. It proposed a slight amendment to the district boundary line in the south of the ward creating two two-member wards of Torpoint East and Torpoint West.

50 In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals for these wards, with a minor amendment to provide a more identifiable boundary, but without affecting the wards electoral variances. Under the draft recommendations Callington ward would be 19 per cent over-represented (5 per cent by 2006), while the wards of Torpoint East and Torpoint West would be 6 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006) and 5 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006) respectively.

51 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. A resident of Torpoint stated that the draft recommendations incorrectly allocated councillors to the towns of Liskeard, Saltash and Torpoint. However, we note that this assertion was based on population, not electorate figures. The LGCE's allocations were correct and based on electorate, not population figures. No other comments were received on the draft recommendations for these wards. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final. The levels of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2. The recommendations for Torpoint are also illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Looe ward

52 Looe ward is currently represented by three-member ward situated on the south coast, comprising the parish of the same name. It is currently 8 per cent over-represented (9 per cent by 2006).

53 The District Council proposed that Looe parish be combined with St Martin-by-Looe parish to create a three-member Looe & St Martin ward. Looe Town Council supported the District Council's proposal to combine it with St Martin-by-Looe; however, St Martin-by-Looe and Devoick parish councils both objected to the proposals. The LGCE noted these objections and examined other options. However, it concluded that the alternatives would necessitate parish warding and that the only suitable boundary that would reflect community identity, the river Looe, would not result in acceptable electoral variances.

54 In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals as part of its draft recommendations. Under the draft recommendations Looe & St Martin ward would have a variance of zero per cent in 2001 (2 per cent over-represented by 2006).

55 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. No other comments were received on the draft recommendations for these wards. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this ward as final. The level of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for this ward is illustrated and named on Map 2.

Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware, Landrake, Gunnislake and St Dominick wards

56 These five single-member wards are situated in the north-east of the district. Calstock & Harrowbarrow ward is currently 20 per cent under-represented (14 per cent by 2006), Chilsworthy & Delaware ward is currently 2 per cent under-represented (2 per cent by 2006), while Gunnislake ward is currently 8 per cent over-represented (9 per cent by 2006). Together, these three wards cover the parish of Calstock. Landrake ward comprises the parishes of Botusfleming, Landrake-with-St Erney and Landulph, and is currently 20 per cent under-represented (17 per cent by 2006). St Dominick ward comprises the parishes of Pillaton, St Dominick and St Mellion and is currently 10 per cent over-represented (13 per cent by 2006).

57 The District Council proposed that the three single-member wards of Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware and Gunnislake should be combined to create a new three-member Calstock ward. It proposed combining the wards of St Dominick and Landrake to form a two-member Landrake & St Dominick ward. Calstock and St Dominick parish councils both objected to the District Council's proposals. No other comments were received. The LGCE noted these objections, but concluded that there would need to be substantial re-warding to achieve greater equality under a pattern of single-member wards, and that the communities would be adequately represented in a multi-member ward, as it would comprise a single parish.

58 In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals for these wards. Under the draft recommendations Calstock ward would be 7 per cent under-represented (5 per cent by 2006) and Landrake & St Dominick ward would be 7 per cent under-represented (4 per cent by 2006).

59 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. Calstock Parish Council objected to the creation of a three-member Calstock ward, stating that it "would be better represented by maintaining the three single-member wards which currently exist". It added "given the number of diverse communities which make up the parish the electorate would be better represented by having one district member who they could identify with, than having three who would be responsible for a larger area". The Tamar Valley Branch Labour Party also

objected to the draft recommendations for a new Calstock ward. Referring to the existing wards, it stated that the “three areas have distinct and separate histories and identities [...] there is an overwhelming need for each of them to be represented by their own councillor who has an intimate knowledge of his or her area”. In addition, it added that “whilst multi-member wards are suitable for urban areas of Caradon they will not meet the needs of a rural community such as Calstock [and] it would mean that people within a single ward could be faced with a journey of many miles to discuss an issue with a councillor”. No comments were received on the proposals for a new Landrake & St Dominick ward.

60 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. However, given the current high electoral variances in Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware and Gunnislake, we are unable to retain the existing ward boundaries. Therefore, any new proposals for single member wards would not cover the three area’s “distinct and separate histories and identities” as defined by the current wards. We have examined alternatives, but concluded it is not possible to improve electoral equality without significantly altering the existing ward pattern. In addition, we do not consider that the proposed ward is too large, or that electors would be inadequately represented in a multi-member ward. Therefore, given this, and the lack of comments with regards the proposed Landrake & St Dominick ward, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final. The level of electoral equality would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Menheniot, St Germans and St Ive wards

61 These three single-member wards are situated in the centre of the district. Menheniot ward comprises the parish of Menheniot and the Bethany parish ward of St Germans parish, and is currently 6 per cent over-represented (10 per cent by 2006). St Germans ward comprises the parish of Quethiock, and the Polbathic, St Germans and Tideford parish wards of St Germans parish, and is currently 14 per cent over-represented (17 per cent by 2006). St Ive ward comprises the parish of St Ive and is currently 14 per cent under-represented (9 per cent by 2006).

62 The District Council proposed that the parish of St Ive be combined with the parish of Menheniot to create a two-member Menheniot & St Ive ward. It proposed combining the parishes of Quethiock and St Germans to form a single-member St Germans ward. No other comments were received concerning these proposals. In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council’s proposals. Under the draft recommendations Menheniot & St Ive ward would be 1 per cent under-represented (3 per cent over-represented by 2006), and St Germans ward would be 1 per cent over-represented (5 per cent by 2006).

63 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. No other comments were received on the draft recommendations for these wards. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final. The level of electoral equality would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Maker, Millbrook and Sheviock wards

64 The three single-member wards of Maker, Millbrook and Sheviock are situated in the south-east of the district. Maker ward comprises the parish of Maker-with-Rame and is currently 46 per cent over-represented (49 per cent by 2006). Millbrook ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 5 per cent under-represented (4 per cent by 2006). Sheviock ward comprises the parishes of Antony, St John and Sheviock, and is currently 19 per cent over-represented (21 per cent by 2006).

65 The District Council proposed no change to Millbrook ward, but proposed the creation of a new single-member Rame Peninsula ward, comprising the parishes of Antony, Maker-with-Rame and St Johns. Shevioc parish would become part of a new Whitsands ward and is discussed below. No other submissions were received concerning these wards. In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals. Under the draft recommendations Millbrook ward would be 8 per cent under-represented (7 per cent by 2006) and Rame Peninsular ward would have a variance of zero per cent (5 per cent over-represented by 2006).

66 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. However, it requested that the name Rame Peninsula ward be used, rather than Rame Peninsular ward. No other comments were received on the draft recommendations for these wards. We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards, subject to the name change described above, as final. The level of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Dobwalls & Trewidland, Donderry and Morval wards

67 These three single-member wards stretch southward from Liskeard to the coast. Dobwalls & Trewidland ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 1 per cent over-represented (6 per cent by 2006). Donderry ward comprises the parishes of Deviock and St Martin-by-Looe, and is currently 12 per cent over-represented (14 per cent by 2006). Morval ward comprises the parishes of Duloe, Morval and St Keyne, and is currently 7 per cent over-represented (10 per cent by 2006).

68 The District Council proposed that Dobwalls & Trewidland ward be expanded to additionally include the parishes of Morval, St Keyne and St Pinnock, to create a new two-member Dobwalls & District ward. In addition, it proposed the creation of a new single-member Whitsands ward, comprising the parishes of Deviock and Shevioc. Duloe parish would become part of a new Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward and is discussed below. Deviock and Dobwalls & Trewidland parish councils objected to these proposals. However, given consideration for the district as a whole, and support from St Keyne and St Pinnock parish councils, the LGCE were satisfied to endorse them as part of its draft recommendations. Under the draft recommendations Dobwalls & District ward would be 2 per cent over-represented (6 per cent by 2006), while Whitsands ward would be 13 per cent under-represented (10 per cent by 2006).

69 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. The South East Cornwall Conservative Association suggested an alternative scheme for the proposed Dobwalls & District and Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny wards (discussed below). With regard Dobwalls & District ward, it stated "if we look at the identities of the local communities contained therein, we see two very differing communities [...] with very different interests and issues" adding "the issues that surround Dobwalls and its national traffic problem bear little relation to the rural nature of the parishes of St Keyne, St Pinnock and Morval". It therefore proposed retaining the existing Dobwalls & Trewidland and Morval wards, while creating a new two-member Lansallos, Pelynt, Lanreath and St Pinnock ward. This would provide improved electoral equality. Shevioc Parish Council objected to the proposed Whitsands ward, stating that "Deviock parish will be too dominant", adding "we have always had close association with the parishes of Anthony, St John and other parishes in the Rame Peninsula". In addition, it objected to the proposed name of Whitsands as this refers to an area further down the coast, on the Rame Peninsula.

70 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We note the South East Cornwall Conservative Association's proposals. However, while its proposals secure good levels of electoral equality we do not consider that there is sufficient evidence of local consultation on them; additionally, while Dobwalls & Trewidland Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposals (those subsequently adopted by the LGCE) at Stage One, it

should be noted that Lansallos, St Keyne and St Pinnock parish councils all supported them. We also note the concerns of Shevioc Parish Council. However, we cannot consider any area in isolation and note that transferring the parish to an adjacent ward would seriously impact on electoral equality in the area. We do however recognise their concerns about the proposed ward name and therefore propose changing Whitsands ward to Devioc & Shevioc ward. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards, subject to the name change described above, as final. The level of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Lansallos, Lanteglos, St Veep and Trelawny wards

71 These four single-member wards are situated in the south-west of the district. Lansallos ward comprises the parish of the same name and is currently 13 per cent over-represented (18 per cent by 2006). Lanteglos ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 43 per cent over-represented (45 per cent by 2006). St Veep ward comprises the parishes of Boconnoc, Broadoak, St Pinnock, St Veep and St Winnow, and is currently 21 per cent over-represented (22 per cent by 2006). Trelawny ward comprises the parishes of Lanreath and Pelynt, and is currently 10 per cent over-represented (14 per cent by 2006).

72 The District Council proposed that Lansallos and Trelawny wards should be combined with Duloe parish to create a new two-member Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward. It proposed combining Lanteglos ward with the parishes of Boconnoc, Broadoak, St Veep and St Winnow to form a new single-member Lanteglos & St Veep ward. St Pinnock would become part of Dobwalls & District ward and is discussed above. Lansallos Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals. No other comments were received concerning these wards.

73 In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals. Under the draft recommendations Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward would be 8 per cent under-represented (3 per cent by 2006) and Lanteglos & St Veep ward would be 5 per cent under-represented (4 per cent by 2006).

74 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. As stated above, the South East Cornwall Conservative Association suggested an alternative scheme for the proposed Dobwalls & District and Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny wards. It proposed the creation of a new two-member Lansallos, Pelynt, Lanreath and St Pinnock ward, stating that "all these parishes are ostensibly rural in their outlook and we feel [...] that the interests and identities of these local communities are better served by not being combined with the Dobwalls ward". Pelynt Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations, stating that "the proposals [...] will only result in the diminution of local parish representation". It also objected to the proposed ward name, preferring instead to include the names of the constituent parishes within the title.

75 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We note the South East Cornwall Conservative Association's proposals. However, while its proposals secure good levels of electoral equality we do not consider that there is sufficient evidence of consultation. We also note the concerns of Pelynt Parish Council. However, it should be noted that Lansallos, St Keyne and St Pinnock parish councils all supported the District Council's proposals at Stage One. We do, however, recognise Pelynt Parish Council's concerns about the proposed ward name and therefore propose changing Duloe, Lansallos and Trelawny to Duloe, Lansallos and Pelynt ward. We have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for these wards, subject to the name change described above, as final. The level of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Lynher, St Cleer and St Neot & Warleggan wards

76 These three single-member wards cover the north and north-west of the district and include the district's most under-represented ward. Lynher ward comprises the parishes of Linkinhorne and South Hill, and is currently 5 per cent under-represented (zero per cent by 2006). St Cleer ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 70 per cent under-represented (62 per cent by 2006). St Neot & Warleggan ward comprises the parishes of St Neot and Warleggan, and is currently 42 per cent over-represented (43 per cent by 2006).

77 The District Council proposed no change to the existing Lynher ward, but did propose combining St Cleer and St Neot & Warleggan wards to create a new two-member Fowey Moor ward. Linkinhorne Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals for retaining the current Lynher ward. St Neot Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposals to create a new Fowey Moor ward, considering that St Cleer parish would be too dominant. The LGCE noted that the District Council's proposals would result in a high variance in the proposed Fowey Moor ward. It therefore examined alternatives, including those suggested by St Neot Parish Council. However, it was concerned that the alternatives would not provide significantly better electoral equality overall, worsening it in neighbouring wards. In light of the evidence, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals. Under the draft recommendations Fowey Moor ward would be 16 per cent under-represented (12 per cent by 2006) and Lynher ward would be 7 per cent under-represented (2 per cent by 2006).

78 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. St Neot Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations, stating that "it does seem quite unacceptable that a situation should be created, whereby one parish could not fail to be dominant over lesser-populated parishes in the same electoral ward". It requested that its Stage One proposals be reconsidered. St Cleer Parish Council objected to the name Fowey Moor, requesting that "the name St Cleer is retained or at the very least an arrangement with St Neot is agreed". No other comments were received on the draft recommendations for these wards.

79 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We note the concerns of St Neot Parish Council, but would concur with the LGCE's conclusion that the alternatives would not provide significantly better electoral equality overall, worsening it in neighbouring wards. We do however accept St Cleer Parish Council's concerns regarding the name Fowey Moor. We therefore propose changing this to St Cleer and St Neot ward, reflecting the two largest constituent parishes. We propose confirming the draft recommendations for these wards, subject to the name change described above, as final. The level of electoral equality would therefore be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

80 In conducting its review the LGCE sought views in relation to the electoral cycle of the district. However, by virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

Conclusions

81 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to the LGCE's consultation report, we have decided to endorse those draft recommendations, subject to name changes for three wards

82 We conclude that, in Caradon:

- there should be an increase in council size from 41 to 42;

- there should be 22 wards, eight fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified.

83 Table 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	41	42	41	43
Number of wards	30	22	30	22
Average number of electors per councillor	1,564	1,527	1,672	1,633
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	17	5	19	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	8	1	11	0

84 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 17 to five, with one wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2006, with only one ward, St Cleer & St Neot ward, varying by more than 10 per cent from the average, at 12 per cent. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation

Caradon District Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 22 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A including the large map inside the back cover.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

85 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards, it should also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. In the LGCE's draft recommendations report it proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for the parishes of Liskeard, Saltash and Torpoint to reflect the proposed district wards.

86 The parish of Liskeard is currently served by 16 councillors, representing two wards: Liskeard North and Liskeard South. At Stage One, the District Council put forward proposals for the district warding of Liskeard, which were supported by the Town Council.

87 The LGCE adopted the proposed Liskeard North and Liskeard South wards as part of its draft recommendations. Under its proposals each ward would return eight councillors. It did not, however, propose any other alternative electoral arrangements for Liskeard Town Council.

88 At Stage Three no further comments were received from the District Council or the Town Council.

89 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Liskeard parish as final.

Final Recommendation
Liskeard Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Liskeard North and Liskeard South, each returning eight councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

90 The parish of Saltash is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Burraton, Essa, Pill and St Stephens. At Stage One, the District Council put forward proposals for district warding for Saltash. Saltash Town Council objected to these proposals and put forward alternative arrangements.

91 The Town Council's proposals would not provide good levels of electoral equality and the LGCE therefore adopted the District Council's proposed Saltash Burraton, Saltash Essa, Saltash Pill and Saltash St Stephens wards, each to return four councillors, as part of its proposals. Accordingly, it proposed alternative boundaries between the parish wards of Saltash Burraton, Saltash Pill and Saltash St Stephens. It did not, however, propose any other alternative electoral arrangements for Saltash Town Council.

92 At Stage Three no further comments were received from the District Council or the Town Council.

93 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Saltash parish as final.

Final Recommendation
Saltash Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Saltash Burraton, Saltash Essa, Saltash Pill and Saltash St Stephens, each returning four councillors. The boundary between the four parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

94 The parish of Torpoint is currently served by 15 councillors and is not warded. In agreement with the District Council, Torpoint Town Council proposed that Torpoint parish should be served by 16 councillors representing two parish wards, and that the current Torpoint district ward be divided into two district wards reflecting the parish ward boundary, which is due to come into effect in 2003 under the Parish of Torpoint (Wards) Order 2000. This proposal has already been subject to detailed consultation during the 1998 parish boundary review and the LGCE were therefore content to recommend it as part of its draft recommendations, subject to two minor amendments. In consultation with Ordnance Survey, it proposed a minor modification to include

33 Trevol Road and 93 Carbeile Road in Torpoint East ward, to provide a clearer boundary. It therefore proposed that Torpoint parish be divided into two parish wards, Torpoint East and Torpoint West, coterminous with the proposed district wards of the same names.

95 At Stage Three no further comments were received from the District Council or the Town Council.

96 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Torpoint parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Torpoint Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, instead of the existing 15, representing two wards: Torpoint East and Torpoint West, each returning eight councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

97 The parish of Pelynt is currently served by 12 councillors and is not warded. In agreement with the District Council, Pelynt Parish Council proposed that Pelynt parish should be served by 10 councillors, instead of the existing 12. The LGCE's proposed district warding arrangements would result in no change to this area and it was content to put forward the Parish Council's proposal for consultation.

98 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Pelynt Parish Council supported the proposals. No further comments were received from the District Council.

99 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Pelynt parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Pelynt Parish Council should comprise 10 parish councillors, instead of the current 12.

Map 2: Final Recommendations for Caradon

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

100 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in Caradon and submitted our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692).

101 It is now up to the Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 18 July 2002.

102 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary
Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW

APPENDIX A

Final Recommendations for Caradon: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Caradon area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on Maps A2 and the large map at the back of this report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Liskeard parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for the parishes of Saltash and Torpoint.

Map A1: Final Recommendations for Caradon: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Liskeard Parish