

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Penwith in Cornwall

January 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 Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Penwith: Detailed Mapping	<i>27</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>29</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for the Hayle, Penzance, Perranuthnoe and St Ives areas is inserted inside the back cover of this report.

WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)
Peter Brokenshire
Kru Desai
Pamela Gordon
Robin Gray
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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, ward names and the frequency of elections. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

With effect from 1 April 2002, subject to Parliamentary approval, the Electoral Commission will assume the functions of the Local Government Commission for England and take over responsibility for making Orders putting in place the new arrangements resulting from periodic electoral reviews (powers which currently reside with the Secretary of State). As part of this transfer the Electoral Commission will set up a Boundary Committee for England which will take over responsibility for the conduct of PERs from the Local Government Commission. The Boundary Committee will conduct electoral reviews following the same rules and in the same manner as the Local Government Commission for England. Its final recommendations on future electoral arrangements will then be presented to the Electoral Commission which will be able to accept, modify or reject the Boundary Committee's findings. Under these new arrangements there will remain a further opportunity to make representations directly to the Electoral Commission after the publication of the final recommendations. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to send comments to the Electoral Commission.

SUMMARY

We began a review of Penwith's electoral arrangements on 12 June 2001.

- **This report summarises the submissions we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Penwith:

- **in nine of the 16 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and two 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 nine wards and by more than 20 per cent in four wards.**

Our main proposals for Penwith's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 66-67) are that:

- **Penwith District Council should have 35 councillors, one more than at present;**
- **there should be 17 wards, instead of 16 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 15 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In three of the proposed 17 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue with the number of electors per councillor in 16 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 for St Ives and Penzance town councils;**
- **new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Hayle Town Council and Perranuthnoe Parish Council.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 15 January 2002. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission which, subject to Parliamentary approval, with effect from 1 April 2002 will be responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also decide when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 11 March 2002:

**Review Manager
Penwith Review
LGCE
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Gulval & Heamoor	2	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Gulval & Heamoor parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
2	Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary	2	the parishes of St Erth and St Hilary; part of Perranuthnoe parish (the proposed Goldsithney parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
3	Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East	2	the parish of Gwinear-Gwithian; part of Hayle parish (the proposed Hayle East parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
4	Hayle North	2	part of Hayle parish (the proposed Hayle North parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
5	Hayle South	2	part of Hayle parish (the proposed Hayle South parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
6	Lelant & Carbis Bay	2	part of St Ives parish (the proposed Lelant & Carbis Bay parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
7	Ludgvan	2	the parishes of Ludgvan and Towednack	Map 2
8	Madron & Zennor	1	the parishes of Madron and Zennor	Map 2
9	Marazion & Perranuthnoe	1	the parishes of St Michael's Mount and Marazion; part of Perranuthnoe parish (the proposed Perranuthnoe parish ward)	Map 2
10	Morvah, Pendeen & St Just	3	the parishes of Morvah and St Just	Map 2
11	Penzance Central	2	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance Central parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
12	Penzance East	3	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance East parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
13	Penzance Promenade	2	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance Central Promenade parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
14	Penzance South	3	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance South parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
15	St Buryan	2	<i>Unchanged</i> - the parishes of Paul, St Buryan, St Levan, Sancreed and Sennen	Map 2
16	St Ives North	2	part of St Ives parish (the proposed St Ives North parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
17	St Ives South	2	part of St Ives parish (the proposed St Ives South parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A1 in Appendix A and on the large map at the back of the report.

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Penwith

	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	Gulval & Heamoor	2	2,770	1,385	-3	2,804	1,402	-2
2	Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary	2	3,055	1,528	7	3,105	1,553	9
3	Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East	2	2,992	1,496	5	3,093	1,547	8
4	Hayle North	2	2,960	1,480	3	3,062	1,531	7
5	Hayle South	2	2,712	1,356	-5	3,079	1,540	8
6	Lelant & Carbis Bay	2	2,924	1,462	2	3,022	1,543	8
7	Ludgvan	2	2,824	1,412	-1	2,873	1,437	0
8	Madron & Zennor	1	1,287	1,287	-10	1,310	1,310	-8
9	Marazion & Perranuthnoe	1	1,488	1,488	4	1,488	1,488	4
10	Morvah, Pendeen & St Just	3	3,632	1,211	-15	3,694	1,231	-14
11	Penzance Central	2	2,883	1,442	1	2,841	1,421	-1
12	Penzance East	3	4,142	1,381	-4	4,187	1,396	-2
13	Penzance Promenade	2	2,529	1,265	-12	2,712	1,352	-6
14	Penzance South	3	3,840	1,280	-11	3,886	1,298	-9
15	St Buryan	2	2,663	1,332	-7	2,817	1,409	-2
16	St Ives North	2	3,055	1,528	7	3,054	1,527	7
17	St Ives South	2	2,884	1,442	1	3,073	1,505	5
	Totals	35	48,640	-	-	50,100	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,390	-	-	1,431	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Penwith 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 proposals for the electoral arrangements for the district of Penwith in Cornwall, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the six districts in Cornwall as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Penwith. Penwith's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in 1977 (Report no. 239). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In carrying out these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
 - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
 - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Full details of the legislation under which we work are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out our approach to the reviews.

5 Our task is to make recommendations to the Electoral Commission 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 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been created locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local people are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configurations are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while also reflecting the identities and interests of local communities.

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as 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.

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any

proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do 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.

9 The review is in four stages (see Table 3).

Table 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to us
Two	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Electoral Commission

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper called *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half of the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral wards in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. The proposals were taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, states that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities' electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas, and our current *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 12 June 2001, when we wrote to Penwith District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Cornwall County Council, Devon and Cornwall Police Authority, the local authority associations, Cornwall Association of Parish and Town 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. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Penwith District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of submissions (the end of Stage One) was 3 September 2001.

12 At Stage Two we considered all the submissions received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

13 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 15 January 2002 and will end on 11 March 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore**

important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.

14 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to modify them, and submit final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order and decide when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 The district of Penwith covers an area of some 30,322 hectares in the most westerly part of Cornwall. It extends from the Atlantic to the Channel coasts and is bounded by Kerrier district to the east. Penwith has a population of 60,107, with the main town and administrative centre of the district being Penzance. There are three additional urban settlements of Hayle, St Ives and St Just. The remainder of the district is a mix of rural and coastal settlements. The district contains 20 parishes and is entirely parished.

16 The electorate of the district is 48,640 (October 2000). The Council presently has 34 members who are elected from 16 wards. Five wards cover the town of Penzance, three wards cover the town of St Ives and two wards cover the town of Hayle, with the remainder of the wards being rural and coastal. Five of the wards are each represented by three councillors, eight are each represented by two councillors and three are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

17 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'.

18 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,431 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,474 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 nine of the 16 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, two wards by more than 20 per cent and one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Hayle-Gwinear ward where the councillor represents 35 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Penwith

Table 4: 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	Hayle-Gwinear	2	3,861	1,931	35	3,901	1,951	36
2	Hayle-Gwithian	3	4,803	1,601	12	5,333	1,778	24
3	Lelant & Carbis Bay	2	3,318	1,659	16	3,545	1,773	24
4	Ludgvan	3	4,170	1,390	-3	4,254	1,418	-1
5	Marazion	1	1,214	1,214	-15	1,240	1,240	-13
6	Penzance Central	2	2,761	1,381	-4	2,730	1,365	-5
7	Penzance East	3	3,896	1,299	-9	4,079	1,360	-5
8	Penzance North	2	3,337	1,669	17	3,391	1,696	19
9	Penzance South	3	3,487	1,162	-19	3,548	1,183	-17
10	Penzance West	2	2,686	1,343	-6	2,682	1,341	-6
11	Perranuthnoe	1	1,737	1,737	21	1,741	1,741	22
12	St Erth & St Hilary	1	1,592	1,592	11	1,612	1,612	13
13	St Buryan	2	2,663	1,332	-7	2,818	1,409	-2
14	St Ives North	2	2,898	1,449	1	2,896	1,448	1
15	St Ives South	2	2,647	1,324	-8	2,708	1,354	-5
16	St Just	3	3,570	1,190	-17	3,622	1,207	-16
	Totals	34	48,640	-	-	50,100	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,431	-	-	1,474	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Penwith 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 Just ward were relatively over-represented by 17 per cent, while electors in Hayle-Gwinear ward were relatively under-represented by 35 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

19 At the start of this review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Penwith District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received four submissions during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

Penwith District Council

21 The District Council proposed a council size of 35, one more than at present, representing 19 wards, three more than at present. The Council's scheme provided for a mixed pattern of wards. It argued that the increase of one in council size would address the electoral imbalance in the Hayle area, while the new wards were created to reduce the size of some of the larger wards. The District Council proposed a reconfiguration of wards in the Penzance, Hayle and St Ives areas to improve electoral equality. It also proposed modifying all but one ward in the remainder of the district and several ward name changes in the Penzance area. The District Council also proposed consequential warding arrangements for Hayle, Perranuthnoe, Sancreed and St Just parishes. The District Council undertook a consultation exercise attracting 15 representations, copies of which were included in the District Council's submission.

22 Under the District Council's proposal, six of the proposed 19 wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average. By 2006 one ward is expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average

Parish Councils

23 We received representations from three parish councils. St Erth Parish Council supported the District Council's proposal to increase the council size from 34 to 35 and the proposal to retain the existing St Erth & St Hilary ward. The parish council also stated that it would be opposed to a three-member ward combining the existing wards of Marazion, Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary. St Hilary Parish Council expressed a preference for retaining the existing single-member St Erth & St Hilary ward and stated that it would be opposed to a three-member ward combining the existing wards of Marazion, Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary. The parish council supported the District Council's proposal to form a new Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward.

24 Sancreed Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposal to ward the parish between two district wards, arguing that it is a rural parish that identifies with the rural ward of St Buryan rather than the more urban area of St Just.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

25 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Penwith and welcome comments from all those interested relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

26 As described earlier, our primary aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Penwith is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

27 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 must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and maintaining local ties.

28 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.

29 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for an 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

30 Since 1975 there has been a 15 per cent increase in the electorate of Penwith district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3 per cent from 48,640 to 50,100 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Hayle due to significant development proposals for the harbour area. 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. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

31 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having considered at the District Council’s figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

32 As explained earlier, we start by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

33 Penwith District Council presently has 34 members. The District Council, supported by St Erth Parish Council, considered that an increase in council size to 35 members would rectify the electoral imbalance in the Hayle and Gwinear-Gwithian areas and would provide for a district warding structure that would improve levels of electoral equality. It also argued that a ratio of one councillor for every 1,431 electors is best suited in the Penwith area “due to the large areas covered by many of the rural wards and the social problems in a number of the town wards.” In preparing its proposals it consulted locally, outlining its proposed change in council size.

34 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 35 members.

Electoral Arrangements

35 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, including the district-wide scheme from the District Council. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which have assisted us in preparing our draft recommendations.

36 We considered that the District Council’s proposals would provide for an improved level of electoral equality for the district as a whole, taking into account community identities and interests. In view of the local support given to large elements of the Council’s proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we propose basing our recommendations on the District Council’s scheme. However, to improve electoral equality further and bearing in mind local community identities and interests, we are moving away from them in four areas. In particular, we propose minor boundary modifications in the north and south of the district and we propose putting forward our own proposals in the south-east and in the west of the district. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Hayle-Gwinear, Hayle-Gwithian, Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards;
- (b) St Erth & St Hilary, Marazion and Perranuthnoe wards;
- (c) Ludgvan ward;
- (d) Penzance Central, Penzance East, Penzance North, Penzance South and Penzance West wards;
- (e) St Buryan and St Just wards.

37 Details of our draft 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.

Hayle-Gwinear, Hayle-Gwithian, Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards

38 The existing wards of Hayle-Gwinear and Hayle-Gwithian are situated in the north-east of the district. Hayle-Gwinear contains the Gwinear ward of Gwinear-Gwithian parish and South ward of Hayle parish. Hayle-Gwithian contains the Gwithian ward of Gwinear-Gwithian parish and North ward of Hayle parish. Hayle-Gwinear and Hayle-Gwithian wards are represented by two and three councillors respectively and have 35 per cent and 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (36 per cent and 24 per cent more by 2006). The existing wards of Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South are situated in the north of the district and are bounded to the north by the Atlantic coast. Lelant & Carbis Bay ward is coterminous with the Lelant & Carbis Bay ward of St Ives parish. St Ives North and St Ives South wards contain the North ward of St Ives parish and the South ward of St Ives parish respectively. Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards are each represented by two councillors and currently have 16 per cent more, 1 per cent more and 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (24 per cent more, 1 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer by 2006).

39 At Stage One the District Council noted that over recent years the population in this area had grown quite considerably and that in order to address the large electoral variance an extra member would need to be added to the Hayle area. The District Council proposed a new two-member Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East ward containing the parish of Gwinear-Gwithian and a new Hayle East parish ward of Hayle parish. The Hayle East parish ward would contain 433 electors from the Loggans estate area and the part of Angarrack Village in the current Hayle-Gwithian ward, and 178 electors from the remainder of Angarrack Village and the area in and around the Wheal Alfred area from the existing Hayle-Gwithian ward. The 611 electors would therefore form part of the District Council's proposed Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East ward. The District Council proposed a further two two-member wards covering the remainder of the town of Hayle based on the existing North and South wards of Hayle Town Council. However, in order for its proposed Hayle South ward to warrant two councillors the area needed to gain some electors. The District Council therefore proposed transferring 97 electors from the existing Hayle North ward to its proposed Hayle South ward. The District Council proposed that the remaining area of the North ward of Hayle Town Council become a two-member Hayle North district ward.

40 In the St Ives area the District Council proposed largely retaining the existing wards with some boundary modifications. It considered that the existing two-member Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards, albeit with some modifications, "best suited the communities that they represented and reflected the history of the area". The District Council proposed transferring the Halsetown area containing 157 electors, currently in St Ives South ward, to a revised two-member St Ives North ward, as it considered that Halsetown has a greater sense of community and history with St Ives North ward than with St Ives South ward. Having proposed the transfer of the Halsetown area to St Ives North ward, the District Council proposed a minor boundary amendment to the existing St Ives South ward. It proposed transferring the area of Menhyr Drive and the area to the north of Counthouse Lane and The Valley, an area containing 618 electors, from the existing Lelant & Carbis Bay ward to its proposed St Ives South ward. The District Council proposed retaining the existing two-member Lelant & Carbis Bay ward, subject to the modification referred to above.

41 Under the District Council's proposals Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East, Hayle North and Hayle South wards would contain 5 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 8 per cent more by 2006). Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards would currently contain 2 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 5 per cent more by 2006).

42 We have carefully considered the evidence received during Stage One. We note the absence of local opposition to the District Council's proposals. We also note that the District Council's proposals are based on existing ward boundaries and provide for an improved level of electoral equality. We therefore propose adopting the District Council's scheme in this area in its entirety subject to two minor boundary amendments. We propose amending the boundary between the proposed St Ives South and Lelant & Carbis Bay wards. We propose amending the boundary from the end of Count House Lane so it follows the St Ives Road and then along Carbis Valley as we consider this to be a more easily identifiable boundary than that proposed by the District Council. Our proposal will affect 57 electors but will have no effect on electoral equality. We would particularly welcome further comments at Stage Three on this modification. We also propose amending the ward boundary between Hayle North ward and Hayle East parish ward. We propose moving the boundary to the west as this would provide for a more easily identifiable boundary and does not affect any electors.

43 Under our draft recommendations Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East ward would contain Gwinear-Gwithian parish and the East ward of Hayle Town Council. Hayle North and Hayle South wards would contain the North and South wards of Hayle parish respectively. Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East, Hayle North and Hayle South wards would currently contain 5 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 8 per cent more by 2006). Lelant & Carbis Bay ward would be coterminous with the Lelant & Carbis Bay ward of St Ives parish and St Ives North and St Ives South wards would contain the North and South wards of St Ives parish. Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards would currently contain 2 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 5 per cent more by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Marazion, Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary wards

44 The existing wards of Marazion and Perranuthnoe are situated in the south of the district and are bounded by the English Channel to the south. They are each represented by a single councillor. Marazion ward contains the parishes of Marazion and St Michael's Mount; Perranuthnoe ward is coterminous with Perranuthnoe parish. Marazion and Perranuthnoe wards currently contain 15 per cent fewer and 21 per cent more electors per councillor respectively than the district average (13 per cent fewer and 22 per cent more by 2006). St Erth & St Hilary ward is situated on the eastern edge of the district and extends south to the Channel coast and contains the parishes of St Erth and St Hilary. It is currently represented by a single councillor and has 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (13 per cent more by 2006).

45 At Stage One we received three submissions in relation to this area. The District Council stated that it had considered various alternative warding arrangements, including the combination of the three single-member wards to make a three-member ward. This option was, however, discounted on the grounds that there would be a loss of community identity in all three wards. The District Council therefore proposed retaining the existing single-member St Erth & St Hilary ward and proposed revised warding arrangements for Marazion and Perranuthnoe wards. The District Council considered combining the two wards to form a two-member ward, but stated, “the community of Marazion would be dominated by the Perranuthnoe ward and would lose much of its unique historical identity”. It therefore proposed warding Perranuthnoe parish, following the route of the Helston Road. This would create a Goldsithney ward of Perranuthnoe parish to the north of the road and a Perranuthnoe ward of Perranuthnoe parish to the south. The District Council proposed combining the existing Marazion ward with its proposed Perranuthnoe ward of Perranuthnoe parish to form a new single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward. It proposed a new single-member Goldsithney ward containing a new Goldsithney ward of Perranuthnoe parish. Under the District Council’s proposals Goldsithney, Marazion & Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary wards would currently contain 2 per cent more, 4 per cent more and 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4 per cent more, 4 per cent more and 13 per cent more by 2006).

46 We received a further two representation in relation to this area at Stage One. St Erth and St Hilary parish councils each expressed a preference for retaining the existing St Erth & St Hilary ward. The parish councils also stated that they would be opposed to the creation of a three-member ward combining the existing Marazion, Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary wards. St Hilary Parish Council also expressed support for the District Council’s proposal to combine Marazion and Perranuthnoe wards in a single-member ward.

47 We have carefully considered all the evidence received during Stage One. We note the local support for the District Council’s proposal to combine the existing Marazion and Perranuthnoe wards to form a new single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward. We also note that this would provide for an improved level of electoral equality and have therefore decided to adopt the District Council’s proposal as part of our draft recommendations. However, we propose departing from the District Council’s proposals in the St Erth & St Hilary and Goldsithney areas. While we note the local support for retaining the existing St Erth & St Hilary ward we have not been persuaded by the argumentation and evidence received that, given the high level of electoral inequality that would result, St Erth & St Hilary should be retained on existing boundaries. We are aware, however, of the different nature of communities residing in the area and we do not believe that a three-member ward would best reflect the coastal and rural communities in this part of the district. We therefore propose including the District Council’s proposed Goldsithney ward of Perranuthnoe parish in a new two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward. We note that the District Council’s proposed Goldsithney ward boundary, which follows the Helston Road, is a strong and easily identifiable boundary; we also note that as part of the District Council’s own consultation exercise during Stage One, Perranuthnoe parish expressed its support for the District Council’s proposal to ward the parish between two district wards. We consider that a two-member ward containing the existing St Erth & St Hilary ward and the Goldsithney ward of Perranuthnoe parish would provide for improved levels of electoral equality whilst reflecting local community identity.

48 Under our draft recommendations the single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward would contain Marazion parish and the Perranuthnoe parish ward of Perranuthnoe parish. The two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward would contain the Goldsithney ward of Perranuthnoe parish and the parishes of St Erth and St Hilary. Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary and Marazion & Perranuthnoe wards would currently contain 7 per cent more and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent more and 4 per cent more by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2, and the large map at the back of the report.

Ludgvan ward

49 The existing Ludgvan ward is situated in the centre of Penwith district and extends northwards to the Atlantic Coast and southwards to the English Channel. It contains the parishes of Ludgvan, Madron, Morvah, Towednack and Zennor and is represented by three councillors. Ludgvan ward currently has 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent fewer by 2006).

50 At Stage One we received one submission in relation to this area. The District Council stated that it was concerned about the geographical size of the existing Ludgvan ward and proposed two new wards in this area. It proposed combining the parishes of Madron and Zennor to form a new single-member Madron & Zennor ward and argued that the new warding arrangements would “give both parishes a greater sense of community”. The District Council proposed combining the parishes of Ludgvan and Towednack to form a revised two-member Ludgvan ward. It also proposed transferring Morvah parish from the existing Ludgvan ward to a revised St Just ward which will be discussed in more detail below. Under the District Council’s proposals Ludgvan and Madron & Zennor wards would currently contain 1 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (equal to the average and 8 per cent fewer by 2006).

51 We have carefully considered the evidence received during Stage One. We note that the District Council’s proposals were unopposed in this area and we also note that its proposals would provide for improved levels of electoral equality. We are content therefore to adopt the District Council’s proposals as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations Ludgvan and Madron & Zennor wards would currently contain 1 per cent and 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (equal to the average and 8 per cent fewer by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Penzance Central, Penzance East, Penzance North, Penzance South and Penzance West wards

52 The existing wards of Penzance Central, Penzance East, Penzance North, Penzance South and Penzance West are located in the south of the district and are each coterminous with the parish wards of the same name of Penzance parish. Penzance Central, Penzance West and Penzance North wards are each represented by two councillors and currently have 4 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer and 17 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer and 19 per cent more by 2006). Penzance East and Penzance South wards area each represented by three councillors and currently have 9 per cent and 19 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (5 per cent and 17 per cent fewer by 2006).

53 During Stage One we received one submission in relation to this area. The District Council stated that the existing warding arrangements in the Penzance area had “worked successfully for a number of years” and that there was “no need for a radical overhaul”. It acknowledged, however, that due to the high electoral imbalances in the Penzance North and Penzance South wards, the existing boundaries of each of the five wards would need to be modified in order to improve electoral equality. The District Council noted that the current Penzance South ward needed to gain some electors to improve electoral equality, and therefore put forward a revised three-member Penzance South ward. It proposed transferring an area containing approximately 320 electors on the Penzance side of Newlyn Coombe from Penzance Central ward to Penzance South ward. It argued that the residents in this area “have a greater affinity with the Newlyn area, rather than the Alverton or Promenade” areas of the Penzance Central ward. The District Council also proposed transferring the area in and around Trereife to the north-east of the A30, containing 26 electors, from Penzance West ward to Penzance South ward for electoral equality purposes. The District Council considered that the residents in the Trereife area “have as much ...community with the Newlyn area [as] they would with Penzance”.

54 Having proposed the transfer of part of Penzance Central ward to the revised Penzance South ward, the District Council considered ways of redressing the electoral imbalance it had created. It therefore proposed transferring 423 electors from the Chapel Street and Harbour area of Penzance East ward to a revised two-member Penzance Central ward. The District Council stated that its proposal would unite the whole of the Promenade and the Harbour areas in one ward. The District Council also proposed transferring part of the Alverton area, containing 334 electors, from Penzance Central ward to a revised two-member Penzance West ward (discussed below). The District Council acknowledged that as a result of changes to the existing Penzance Central ward, the current ward name was no longer appropriate. It therefore proposed renaming Penzance Central ward as Penzance Promenade ward.

55 To further improve the level of electoral in Penzance West ward the District Council proposed retaining the existing two-member representation and put forward a further three boundary modifications. It proposed that the rural area to the west of the A30, containing 84 electors, form part of a revised Penzance North ward, and the part of Treneere Estate in Penzance West ward, an area containing 235 electors, form part of a revised Penzance East ward. The District Council also proposed transferring 208 electors from the Manor Way area, currently in Penzance North ward, to Penzance West ward. The District Council acknowledged that as a result of changes to the existing Penzance West ward, the current ward name was no longer appropriate. It therefore proposed renaming Penzance West ward as Penzance Central ward.

56 The District Council noted that under its proposals for revised Penzance Central and Penzance West wards the whole of the Treneere Estate would be united in one ward, Penzance East. However, it also noted that in order for Penzance East ward to retain its current three-member representation, and to improve electoral equality, it would need to gain some electors. The District Council therefore proposed transferring the Chyandour and Eastern Green areas from Penzance North ward to a revised three-member Penzance East ward, affecting a total of 397 electors. Finally, the District Council noted that as a result of its proposals described above, the two-member Penzance North ward would lose the Chyandour and Eastern Green areas and the Manor Way area to its proposed Penzance East and Penzance West wards respectively. However, Penzance North ward would gain the rural area to the

west of the A30, containing 84 electors, known as the Rosehill/Castle Horneck area from the current Penzance West ward. The District Council considered that Penzance North ward should be renamed to reflect the identities of the communities contained within the ward. It therefore proposed renaming the two-member Penzance North ward as Gulval & Heamoor ward.

57 Under the District Council's proposals Gulval & Heamoor, Penzance Central, Penzance East, Penzance Promenade and Penzance South wards would currently contain 3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 4 per cent fewer, 12 per cent fewer and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent, 1 per cent, 2 per cent, 6 per cent and 9 per cent fewer by 2006).

58 We have carefully considered all the evidence received during Stage One. We note the absence of opposition to the District Council's proposals for the Penzance area and we also note the District Council's proposals are based on existing ward patterns and would not therefore require radical change. We also note the forecast improvement in electoral equality over the next five years. We are therefore content to adopt the District Council's scheme as part of our draft recommendations in the Penzance area, subject to one minor boundary modification. We propose transferring Carne Road, an area affecting nine electors and having no effect on electoral equality, from the proposed Penzance South ward to the proposed Penzance Promenade ward as we consider this to be an improvement to the boundary put forward by the District Council.

59 Under our draft recommendations the two-member Gulval & Heamoor, Penzance Central and Penzance Promenade wards would currently contain 3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent, 1 per cent and 6 per cent fewer by 2006). The proposed three-member Penzance East and Penzance South wards would currently contain 4 per cent fewer and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent and 9 per cent fewer by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

St Buryan and St Just wards

60 The existing ward of St Buryan is situated in the south-west of the district and is bounded on three sides by the sea. It contains the parishes of Paul, Sancreed, Sennen, St Buryan and St Levan and is represented by two councillors. St Just ward is situated in the west of the district and is coterminous with St Just parish and is currently represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements St Buryan and St Just wards have 7 per cent and 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent fewer and 16 per cent fewer by 2006).

61 At Stage One we received two submissions in relation to this area. The District Council proposed the creation of three new wards to replace the existing two wards. To facilitate such a change it proposed the creation of a number of parish wards. The District Council proposed a new single-member Pendeen & Morvah ward, a revised two-member St Buryan ward and a revised two-member St Just ward. Pendeen & Morvah ward would contain Morvah parish and Pendeen parish ward of Pendeen parish. St Buryan ward would contain Paul, St Buryan, St Levan and Sennen parishes and Sancreed South parish ward of Sancreed parish. St Just ward would contain St Just parish ward of St Just parish. The District Council considered that

because of the strong community identity of the St Just area it should continue to be represented by three councillors. In addition, the District Council felt that the Pendeen area should gain its own representative. Under the District Council's proposals Pendeen & Morvah, St Buryan and St Just ward would contain 13 per cent fewer, 12 per cent fewer and 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (10 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer and 10 per cent fewer by 2006).

62 We received one further representation in relation to this area during Stage One. Sancreed Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposal to ward it between the proposed St Just and St Buryan wards. The parish council stated that the town of St Just has a "decidedly more urban population" than the parish of Sancreed and therefore, the interests of the electors contained within Sancreed North parish ward would be "marginalised in the interests of the majority of the voting population of the ward" and expressed a preference for remaining in the St Buryan ward.

63 We have carefully considered all the evidence received in relation to this area during Stage One and we note the concerns of Sancreed Parish Council. After closer inspection of the District Council's proposed warding arrangements in the Sancreed area we consider the warding of Sancreed parish to be unnecessary. Although electoral equality is improved we are not persuaded that the proposals provide an improved reflection of the community identity that exists under the current warding arrangements in the St Buryan area. We therefore propose retaining the two-member St Buryan ward on existing warding arrangements and consequently are unable to adopt the District Council's proposals in the remainder of the area.

64 We therefore propose combining the District Council's proposed Pendeen & Morvah ward and the existing St Just ward in a new three-member Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward containing the parishes of Morvah and St Just. Under our proposed Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward, St Just parish would not be divided between two district wards and, in retaining Pendeen in the ward name, we consider that our proposals would reflect local community identity. While we note that under our proposals the proposed Morvah, Pendeen & St Just would contain 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006, the area has a coastal boundary thus reducing the number of options. We consider that that any alternative would result in a loss of community identity and that the imbalance is therefore outweighed by the statutory criteria. Under our draft recommendations Morvah, Pendeen & St Just and St Buryan wards would currently contain 15 per cent fewer and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (14 per cent fewer and 7 per cent fewer by 2006). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

65 At Stage One we did not receive any comments relating to the electoral cycle of the district. We therefore make no recommendation for change to the present system of elections by thirds.

Conclusions

66 Having considered all the evidence and submissions received during the first stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be an increase in council size from 34 to 35;
- there should be 17 wards, an increase of one;
- the boundaries of 15 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

67 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in the following areas:

- in the south-east of the district we propose putting forward our own proposals to improve electoral equality;
- in the west of the district we propose putting forward our own proposals on the grounds of community identity;
- in Penzance we propose putting forward the District Council's proposals subject to one minor boundary modification which has no effect on electoral equality;
- in the St Ives area we propose putting forward the District Council's proposals subject to one minor boundary modification which has no effect on electoral equality;
- there should be no change to St Buryan ward.

68 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will effect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2001 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2006.

Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	34	35	34	35
Number of wards	16	17	16	17
Average number of electors per councillor	1,431	1,390	1,474	1,431
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	9	3	9	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	2	0	4	0

69 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Penwith District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from three to one. By 2006 only one ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

Draft Recommendation
 Penwith District Council should comprise 35 councillors serving 17 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. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

70 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible 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 must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the towns of Hayle, Penzance and St Ives and the parish of Perranuthnoe to reflect the proposed district wards.

71 Hayle Town Council is currently served by 15 councillors representing two wards: North and South wards of Hayle Town Council. At Stage One the District Council advised Hayle Town Council to consider the electoral arrangements in the Hayle wards and submit its proposals to the Commission. During Stage One we received no representations in relation to the town council arrangements in Hayle. As detailed earlier we propose amending the existing Hayle district wards. We therefore propose consequential changes to the existing town wards

so that they reflect our proposed district warding arrangements in the town. We propose that Hayle Town Council be served by 15 councillors as at present, serving three parish wards. We propose that East ward be served by two town councillors; North ward served by seven town councillors; and South ward served by six town councillors.

Draft Recommendation

Hayle Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: North (returning seven councillors), South (returning six councillors) and East (returning two councillors). The boundaries between the town council wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

72 Penzance Town Council is currently served by 20 councillors representing five town council wards. At Stage One the District Council advised Penzance Town Council to consider the electoral arrangements in the Penzance wards and submit its proposals to the Commission. During Stage One we received no representations in relation to the town council arrangements in Penzance, and as a result propose no change to the current arrangements. We would however, welcome further comment at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

Penzance Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: East and South (each returning five councillors), North (returning four councillors) and Central and West (each returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

73 St Ives Town Council is currently divided into three parish wards: Lelant & Carbis Bay and North each returning five councillors and South ward returning six councillors. At Stage One the District Council advised St Ives Town Council to consider the electoral arrangements in the St Ives wards and submit its proposals to the Commission. We received no representations at Stage One in relation to the town council arrangements in St Ives, and as a result propose no change to the current arrangements. We would, however, welcome further comment at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

St Ives Town Council should comprise 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Lelant & Carbis Bay and North (each returning five councillors) and South (returning six councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

74 Perranuthnoe Parish Council is currently represented by ten councillors. At Stage One the District Council advised Perranuthnoe Parish Council to consider the electoral arrangements in Perranuthnoe and submit its proposals to the Commission. We received no representations at Stage One in relation to the parish council arrangements in Perranuthnoe and as detailed earlier we propose amending the existing Perranuthnoe district ward. We therefore propose consequential changes to the existing parish so that they reflect our proposed district warding arrangements in the town. We propose that Perranuthnoe Parish Council be served by ten councillors, as at present, representing two wards. We propose that Goldsithney ward be represented by seven councillors and Perranuthnoe ward be represented by three councillors. We would, however, welcome further comment at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

Perranuthnoe Parish Council should comprise ten parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Goldsithney (returning seven councillors) and Perranuthnoe (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries as illustrated and named on Map 2.

75 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

Draft Recommendation

Parish and town council elections should continue to take place by thirds, at the same time as elections for the district ward of which they are part.

Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Penwith

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

76 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Penwith contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 11 March 2002. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

77 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Penwith Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

www.lgce.gov.uk

78 In the light of responses received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Electoral Commission, which cannot make the Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after it receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Penwith: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Penwith 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 the large map at the back of this report.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for the Hayle, Penzance, Perranuthnoe and St Ives areas.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Penwith: Key Map

APPENDIX B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm, requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Local Government Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: LGCE compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods.
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.	We comply with this requirement.
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.	We comply with this requirement.