

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Penwith 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: 292

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	
Final Recommendations for Penwith: Detailed Mapping	37

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for the Hayle, Penzance, Perranuthnoe and St Ives areas 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 Melors

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 Penwith in Cornwall.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Penwith's electoral arrangements on 12 June 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 15 January 2002, 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 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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 65–66) 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 district councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 14 of the proposed 17 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in only one ward, Morvah, Pendeen & St Just, expected to vary by 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:

- **new warding arrangements for Penzance and St Ives town councils;**
- **new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Hayle Town Council and Perranuthnoe Parish Council.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Electoral Commission, to arrive no later than 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	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
2	Gulval & Heamoor	2	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Gulval and Heamoor parish wards)	Map 2 and Large Map
3	Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East	2	the parish of Gwinear-Gwithian; part of Hayle parish (the proposed East parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
4	Hayle North	2	part of Hayle parish (the proposed North parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
5	Hayle South	2	part of Hayle parish (the proposed 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	Newlyn & Mousehole	3	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Newlyn & Mousehole parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
12	Penzance Central	2	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance Central parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
13	Penzance East	3	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance East parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
14	Penzance Promenade	2	part of Penzance parish (the proposed Penzance Promenade 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 Map 2 and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Table 2: Final 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	Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary	2	3,055	1,528	7	3,105	1,553	9
2	Gulval & Heamoor	2	2,770	1,385	-3	2,804	1,402	-2
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	Newlyn & Mousehole	3	3,850	1,283	-10	3,896	1,298	-9
12	Penzance Central	2	2,883	1,442	1	2,841	1,421	-1
13	Penzance East	3	4,142	1,381	-4	4,187	1,396	-2
14	Penzance Promenade	2	2,519	1,260	-12	2,702	1,352	-6
15	St Buryan	2	2,663	1,332	-7	2,817	1,409	-2
16	St Ives North	2	3,075	1,538	7	3,074	1,537	7
17	St Ives South	2	2,864	1,432	1	3,053	1,527	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 final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Penwith 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 Penwith's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in September 1977 (Report no. 239). 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.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Penwith 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 was not prescriptive on council size. Insofar as Penwith 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 Penwith 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 & 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. 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 15 January 2002 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Penwith in Cornwall*, and ended on 11 March 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 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 coast 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.

11 The electorate of the district is 48,640 (February 2002). 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 the remaining three are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

12 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, the LGCE 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 calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

13 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 and other changes over the past two decades, 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 each of the two councillors represents 35 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Penwith

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	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 Buryan	2	2,663	1,332	-7	2,818	1,409	-2
13	St Erth & St Hilary	1	1,592	1,592	11	1,612	1,612	13
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 significantly under-represented by 35 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

14 During Stage One the LGCE received four representations, including a district-wide scheme from Penwith District Council, and representations from three parish councils. 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 Penwith in Cornwall*.

15 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the District Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a mixed pattern of wards across the district. However, it moved away from the District Council's scheme in a number of areas, affecting five wards, combining elements of the District Council's proposals with its own proposals. It proposed that:

- Penwith District Council should be served by 35 councillors, compared with the current 34, representing 17 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 15 of the existing wards should be modified, while one ward should retain its existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for St Ives and Penzance town councils;
- there should be new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Hayle Town Council and Perranuthnoe Parish Council.

Draft Recommendation

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

16 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 14 of the 17 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 ward, Morvah, Pendeen & St Just, varying by 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 Penwith District Council.

Penwith District Council

18 The District Council expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. It proposed two minor boundary modifications in the Penzance and St Ives areas, both of which have no effect on electoral equality. It also proposed amending the draft recommendations in the St Erth and St Hilary areas and reiterated its Stage One proposal for single-member St Erth & St Hilary and Goldsithney wards. The District Council also proposed warding the Gulval & Heamoor ward for town council purposes.

Cornwall County Council

19 Cornwall County Council argued that the draft recommendations give “insufficient weight” to community issues and place an “over-emphasis on the numbers game”. It asked that the Boundary Committee have regard to submissions it received in relation to the Goldsithney, Hayle and Penzance areas.

St Just and District Labour Party

20 The Labour Party submitted two representations, each opposing the draft proposal for a three-member Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward. In its first submission, the Labour Party expressed a preference for the District Council’s Stage One proposal for a single-member Pendeen & Morvah ward on the grounds of community identity. In its second submission, the Labour Party provided supplementary evidence of community identity in Pendeen and proposed an alternative configuration of parishes in the area.

Parish Councils

21 At Stage Three representations were received from three parish councils and four town councils. The draft recommendations were broadly supported by Gwinear-Gwithian and Ludgvan parish councils and St Ives, St Just-in-Penwith and Penzance town councils. The draft recommendations were broadly opposed by St Erth Parish Council and Hayle Town Council.

Other Representations

22 A further two representations were received in response to the LGCE’s draft recommendations. County Councillor Ewer and Pendeen Residents’ Association each opposed the draft recommendations for a three-member Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward and expressed support for the District Council’s Stage One proposal in this area.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

23 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Penwith 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”.

24 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.

25 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.

26 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

27 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.

28 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

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

30 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE adopted the District Council’s proposal for a council of 35-members as it considered that the achievement of the statutory criteria would best be met by a council size of 35.

31 The LGCE received no comments regarding council size during Stage Three, and we remain satisfied that the statutory criteria would best be met by a council size of 35. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendation for a council size of 35 as final.

Electoral Arrangements

32 At Stage One the LGCE received one district-wide scheme from the Council. The LGCE considered that the Council's proposals provided for an improved level of electoral equality for the district as a whole, taking into account community identities and interests. It also noted local support given to large elements of the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties. The LGCE proposed basing its draft recommendations on the District Council's scheme. However, to improve electoral equality further and bearing in mind local community identities and interests, it moved away from them in four areas. In particular, it proposed minor boundary modifications in the north and south of the district and it put forward its own proposals in the south-east and in the west of the district.

33 At Stage Three the LGCE's draft recommendations received a degree of local support and we propose that they should be substantially confirmed, subject to several minor amendments. In the light of evidence received, the draft recommendations have been reviewed and we have decided to move away from the LGCE's draft recommendations in four areas to better reflect the statutory criteria. For borough 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) Marazion, Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary wards;
- (c) Ludgvan ward;
- (d) Penzance Central, Penzance East, Penzance North, Penzance South and Penzance West wards;
- (e) St Buryan and St Just wards.

34 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.

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

35 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).

36 At Stage One the LGCE received one representation in relation to this 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 and 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. In the St Ives area the District Council proposed largely retaining the existing wards with some boundary modifications. The District Council proposed a revised two-member St Ives North ward including the Halsetown area currently in the St Ives South ward and a revised two-member Lelant & Carbis Bay ward, less an area transferred to its proposed two-member St Ives South ward.

37 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE noted the absence of local opposition to the District Council's proposals. It also noted that the proposed wards would be based on existing ward boundaries and would provide for an improved reflection of the statutory criteria. The LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposals in this area as part of its draft recommendations subject to two minor modifications to provide for better boundaries. Under the LGCE's 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).

38 At Stage Three the LGCE received four submissions in relation to this area. The District Council expressed broad support for the draft recommendations in the Hayle area. It also expressed support for the proposed Lelant & Carbis Bay ward. The District Council expressed broad support for the draft recommendations in the St Ives area and put forward one minor boundary modification having no effect on electoral equality. It proposed transferring from the St Ives South ward the Higher Burrow Close area, containing 20 electors, to the proposed St Ives North ward. Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council expressed broad support for the draft recommendations in its area and stated that it "strongly supports the retention of the recommended" Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East ward. St Ives Town Council expressed its broad support for the draft recommendations in its area. Hayle Town Council opposed the creation of a new Hayle East ward of Hayle parish and stated that a third town ward would "incur unnecessary additional expenses". Cornwall County Council stated that it "does not have a clear view" on the Hayle area, but requested that "careful consideration" be given to the representations received in relation to this area.

39 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm, as final, the LGCE's draft recommendations for Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East and Lelant & Carbis Bay wards as they would achieve reasonable electoral equality and have received some local support. While we note the views of Hayle Town Council, we have not been persuaded by the evidence received to modify the draft recommendations. We also note the support of the District Council and Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council. We therefore confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East and Lelant & Carbis Bay wards as final. However, we have decided to move away from the draft recommendations and modify the proposed boundary between St Ives North and St Ives South wards as proposed by the District Council. We consider the District Council's proposal would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the draft recommendations. We therefore confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of St Ives North and St Ives South as final, subject to transferring Higher Burrow Close to St Ives North ward.

40 Under our final recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East, Hayle North, Hayle South, Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South wards would be 5 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 1 per cent more than the district average respectively (8 per cent, 7 per cent, 8 per

cent, 8 per cent, 7 per cent and 5 per cent more by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Marazion, Perranuthnoe and St Erth & St Hilary wards

41 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 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).

42 At Stage One the District Council proposed retaining the existing single-member St Erth & St Hilary ward and revised warding arrangements for Marazion and Perranuthnoe wards. It proposed warding the parish of Perranuthnoe and creating two parish wards, the Goldsithney and Perranuthnoe parish wards. The Council proposed a single-member Goldsithney ward, coterminous with the Goldsithney parish ward, and a single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward containing the existing Marazion ward and the new Perranuthnoe parish ward. We received a further two representations 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 and stated that each would be opposed to the creation of a three-member ward combining the existing Marazion, Perranuthnoe, St Erth and St Hilary wards. St Hilary Parish Council also expressed support for the District Council's proposal to create a single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward.

43 In its draft recommendations report, the LGCE noted the local support for the District Council's proposed single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward. It also noted that the new ward would provide for an improved reflection of the statutory criteria. It therefore decided to adopt the District Council's proposed Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward as part of its draft recommendations. In the remainder of the area, the LGCE decided to move away from the District Council's proposals and put forward a two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward containing the parishes of St Erth and St Hilary and the Goldsithney parish ward. The LGCE stated that, although it noted the local support for retaining the existing St Erth & St Hilary ward, it had 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. The LGCE expressed some reservations that a three-member wards in this area would result in a loss of community identity, given the different natures of the coastal and rural communities in this part of the district. However, it considered that a two-member ward would provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria and put it forward as part of its draft recommendations.

44 Under the LGCE's 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).

45 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations the District Council expressed broad support for the proposed Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward but opposed the two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward. The Council stated that, whilst it acknowledged the LGCE's proposals did improve electoral equality and that there is "a certain amount of

community” between the Goldsithney and St Hilary areas, there is “little or none” between the Goldsithney and St Erth areas and reiterated its Stage One proposal for single-member Goldsithney and St Erth & St Hilary wards. St Erth Parish Council also expressed its opposition to the LGCE’s proposed two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward. The parish council stated that it was “not convinced” that the LGCE’s draft recommendations would provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria and that it was “not of the opinion that a high level of electoral inequality” would result by 2006. St Erth Parish Council expressed its preference for single-member St Erth & St Hilary and Goldsithney wards.

46 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We note the District Council’s support for a single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward and confirm as final, the draft recommendation for this ward. While we note the District Council and St Erth Parish Councils’ comments, we have not been persuaded by the evidence and argumentation received to move away from the LGCE’s draft proposals for two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary and single-member Marazion & Perranuthnoe wards. In particular, we note that the District Council acknowledged that the LGCE’s proposals did improve electoral equality in the area. We remain of the opinion that, given the high level of electoral equality that would result, the St Erth & St Hilary ward should not be retained on its existing boundaries, and we continue to consider that the draft proposal for a two-member Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward provides a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the District Council’s proposals.

47 Under our final recommendations 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 final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Ludgvan ward

48 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).

49 At Stage One the LGCE received one submission in relation to this area. The District Council, concerned by the geographical size of the existing ward, proposed a two-member Ludgvan ward containing the parishes of Ludgvan and Towednack, and a single-member Madron & Zennor ward containing the parishes of Madron and Zennor. In the remainder of the area, the District Council proposed transferring Morvah parish from Ludgvan ward to its proposed Pendeen & Morvah ward (discussed in more detail below). In preparing its draft recommendations in this area, the LGCE noted that the District Council’s proposals were unopposed. It also noted that the Council’s proposals would provide for an improved reflection of the statutory criteria and therefore decided to adopt the District Council’s proposals. Under the LGCE’s 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).

50 At Stage Three the District Council expressed broad support for the proposed Ludgvan and Madron & Zennor wards. Ludgvan Parish Council also expressed broad support for the proposed Ludgvan ward.

51 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period and, in the light of the local support given to the LGCE’s draft proposals, we have decided to confirm them as final. Under our final 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 Penzance parish wards of the same name. 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 are 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 At Stage One the LGCE received one submission in relation to this area. The District Council stated that the existing warding arrangements in the Penzance wards had “worked successfully for a number of years” and that there was “no need for a radical overhaul”. It did acknowledge, however, that the current level of electoral inequality would result in changes to each of the existing Penzance wards. The District Council proposed two-member Gulval & Heamoor, Penzance Central and Penzance Promenade wards based on the existing Penzance North, Penzance West and Penzance Central wards and three-member Penzance Central and Penzance East wards based on the existing Penzance West and Penzance East wards.

54 In preparing its draft recommendations in this area, the LGCE noted that the District Council’s proposals were unopposed. It also noted that the Council’s proposals were based on existing wards and would provide for an improved reflection of the statutory criteria. The LGCE decided to adopt the District Council’s proposals in the Penzance area subject to one minor modification to provide a better boundary. Under the LGCE’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).

55 At Stage Three the LGCE received three submissions in relation to the Penzance area. The District Council expressed broad support for the proposed Penzance Central and Penzance East wards but proposed one minor boundary amendment affecting the proposed Penzance Promenade and Penzance South wards. The District Council proposed that the whole of Carne Road should be included in one ward, rather than “the road being split between two wards, thereby forcing electors who live opposite each other to approach different councillors”. The District Council stated that the area of Carne Road is considered to be in the Newlyn area rather than Penzance, and therefore proposed including it with the remainder of Newlyn which is in the proposed Penzance South ward. The District Council also expressed broad support for the proposed Gulval & Heamoor ward but proposed an amendment to town council warding arrangements, discussed in more detail below. Penzance Town Council also expressed broad support for the LGCE’s draft recommendations in the Penzance area but proposed an alternative ward name in the proposed Penzance South ward. The town council proposed renaming it Newlyn & Mousehole ward and argued that the new ward name “could help achieve inclusiveness” and improve community identity. Penzance Town Council also expressed support for the District Council’s proposed amendment to town council warding arrangements, discussed in more detail below. Cornwall County Council noted that the District Council had put forward amendments affecting the LGCE’s proposed Penzance wards and asked that the LGCE give “weight” to these amendments.

56 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period and, in the light of the local support given to the LGCE's draft proposals, we have decided to confirm them as final. We are, however, moving away from the LGCE's draft recommendations in two areas. We note the District Council's comments in relation to the Carne Road area and have been persuaded by the evidence and argumentation received to adopt the proposal to transfer the remainder of the Carne Road area from Penzance Promenade ward to Penzance South ward. We also note Penzance Town Council's proposals to rename the proposed Penzance South ward as Newlyn & Mousehole ward and consider this to better reflect the communities contained within the ward than the LGCE's proposed ward name. We therefore confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of Penzance, subject to these two amendments detailed above.

57 Under our final recommendations Gulval & Heamoor, Newlyn & Mousehole, Penzance Central, Penzance East and Penzance Promenade wards would currently contain 3 per cent fewer, 10 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 4 per cent fewer and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent, 9 per cent, 1 per cent, 2 per cent and 6 per cent fewer by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

St Buryan and St Just wards

58 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).

59 At Stage One the LGCE received two submissions in relation to this area. The District Council proposed the creation of three new wards to replace the existing two wards. It proposed a new single-member Pendeen & Morvah ward and revised two-member St Buryan and St Just wards. Pendeen & Morvah ward would contain Morvah parish and Pendeen parish ward of St Just 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 and Sancreed North parish ward of Sancreed parish. 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). Sancreed Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposals to ward it between two district wards and expressed a preference for remaining in the St Buryan ward.

60 In formulating its draft recommendations, the LGCE considered that the District Council's proposed warding arrangements in the Sancreed area were unnecessary. While noting that although electoral equality was improved, the LGCE was not persuaded that the proposals provided a better reflection of community identity than the current warding arrangements in the St Buryan area. The LGCE therefore proposed retaining the existing two-member St Buryan ward as part of its draft recommendations and consequently was unable to adopt the District Council's proposals in the remainder of the area. The LGCE proposed a three-member Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward combining the District Council's proposed Pendeen & Morvah ward and the existing St Just ward. The LGCE noted that, although its proposed Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward 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 available in the area. Under the LGCE's 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 2 per cent fewer by 2006).

61 At Stage Three the LGCE received six submissions in relation to this area. The District Council expressed broad support for the LGCE's proposed Morvah, Pendeen & St Just and St Buryan wards. St Just-in-Penwith Town Council also expressed its support for the proposed Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward and stated that it "would reflect local community identity".

62 St Just and District Labour Party submitted two representations, each opposing the LGCE's proposed three-member Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward. The Labour Party argued that a single-member Pendeen & Morvah ward, as proposed by the District Council at Stage One, would better reflect local community interests and identities than the LGCE's proposed ward. In its second submission, the Labour Party put forward an alternative warding pattern in the St Buryan and St Just areas which would facilitate the creation of a single-member Pendeen & Morvah ward. One county councillor also opposed the three-member Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward and expressed a preference for single-member Pendeen & Morvah and two-member St Just wards, arguing that the two communities, St Just and Pendeen, are "separate [and] distinctive" in nature. Pendeen Residents' Association also opposed the Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward. It stated that the proposed three-member ward "does not reflect the two distinct communities involved" and expressed a preference for a single-member Pendeen & Morvah ward.

63 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period and, have decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final. While we note the Labour Party, a county councillor and Pendeen Residents' Association's support for a single-member ward, we have not been persuaded by the evidence and argumentation received to move away from the draft recommendations. We also note that the District Council and St Just-in-Penwith Town Council support the draft recommendations which we continue to consider would provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria. However, there does appear to be a separate sense of community identity within the Pendeen area which could be addressed through parish level representation for the residents in the area. This could be undertaken by the District Council in a separate parish review under the local Government and Rating Act 1997 following this PER. Under our final 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 2 per cent fewer by 2006). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

64 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

65 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to the LGCE's consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse its draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- in Penzance we propose a minor boundary modification to better reflect the statutory criteria;
- we propose renaming Penzance South ward as Newlyn & Mousehole to better reflect community identity;
- in St Ives we propose a minor boundary amendment to better reflect the statutory criteria.

66 We conclude that, in Penwith:

- there should be a increase in council size from 34 to 35;
- there should be 17 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 15 the existing wards should be modified, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries.

67 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	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

68 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 nine to three, with no 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, Morvah, Pendeen & St Just, varying by more than 10 per cent from the average, at 14 per cent. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final 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, in Appendix A and the large map inside the back cover.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

69 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 towns of Hayle, Penzance and St Ives and the parish of Perranuthnoe to reflect the proposed district wards.

70 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 LGCE. However, during Stage One no representations were received in relation to the town council arrangements in Hayle. As detailed earlier the LGCE proposed amending the existing Hayle district wards. It therefore proposed consequential changes to existing town wards so that they reflected the proposed district warding arrangements. The LGCE proposed that Hayle Town Council be served by 15 councillors as at present, serving three parish wards. It proposed that East ward be served by two town councillors; North ward served by seven town councillors; and South ward served by six town councillors.

71 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Hayle Town Council opposed the creation of a third town council ward but did not provide any alternative warding arrangements.

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

Final 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.

73 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 LGCE. However, during Stage One no representations were received in relation to the town council arrangements in Penzance. As detailed earlier the LGCE proposed amending the existing Penzance district wards. It therefore proposed consequential changes to existing town wards so that they reflected the proposed district warding arrangements. The LGCE proposed that Penzance Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing five wards. It proposed that East and South wards be served by five councillors; Gulval & Heamoor ward served by four councillors; and Central and Promenade wards served by three councillors.

74 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, the District Council, supported by Penzance Town Council, proposed the creation of an additional town council ward. In its Stage Three submission, the District Council noted that the Gulval area had its own community of interest and identity, but the District Council also noted that the creation of a Gulval district ward would be "impractical" because of the size of the electorate. It therefore proposed dividing the proposed Gulval & Heamoor district ward to create a Gulval town council ward served by one councillor and a Heamoor town council ward served by three councillors. The Council argued that this proposal would "address the concerns of the residents of Gulval by giving them direct representation" on Penzance Town Council. As detailed earlier, Penzance Town Council also put forward a ward name change to the proposed Penzance South ward. The Town Council proposed renaming it Newlyn & Mousehole ward.

75 Having considered all the evidence and argumentation received, and in the light of the level of local support, we have been persuaded to amend the LGCE's draft recommendations in two areas. We have decided to adopt the District Council's proposal for new Gulval and Heamoor town wards, and in order to reflect the amendment detailed earlier to the Penzance South district ward, we are proposing to rename the Penzance South town ward as Newlyn & Mousehole town ward. We therefore propose that Penzance Town Council be served by 20

councillors, as at present, representing six town wards, one more than at present. We propose that Gulval ward be served by one councillor; Central, Heamoor and Promenade wards each to be served by three councillors; and East and Newlyn & Mousehole each to be served by five councillors. We confirm the draft recommendation for warding Penzance parish as final, subject to the two amendments detailed above.

Final Recommendation
Penzance Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing six wards, one more than at present: East and Newlyn & Mousehole (each returning five councillors), Central, Heamoor and Promenade (each returning three councillors) and Gulval (returning one councillor). 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.

76 St Ives Town Council is currently divided into three parish wards: Lelant & Carbis Bay and North ward 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 LGCE. However, during Stage One no representations were received in relation to the town council arrangements in St Ives. As detailed earlier the LGCE proposed amending the existing St Ives district wards. It therefore proposed consequential changes to existing town wards so that they reflected the proposed district warding arrangements. The LGCE proposed that St Ives Town Council should comprise 16 councillors as at present, representing three wards, as at present. It proposed that Lelant & Carbis Bay and North wards each be served by five town councillors and South ward served by six town councillors.

77 In response to the LGCE’s consultation report, St Ives Town Council expressed its broad support for the draft recommendations for the warding arrangements in St Ives parish.

78 Having considered all the evidence received and in the light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding St Ives parish as final.

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.

79 Perranuthnoe Parish Council is currently represented by 10 councillors. At Stage One the District Council advised Perranuthnoe Council to consider the electoral arrangements in the Perranuthnoe ward and submit its proposals to the LGCE. However, during Stage One no representations were received in relation to the parish council arrangements in Perranuthnoe. As detailed earlier the LGCE proposed amending the existing Perranuthnoe district ward. It therefore proposed consequential changes to the existing parish so that they reflected the proposed district warding arrangements. The LGCE proposed that Perranuthnoe Parish Council be served by 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards. It proposed that Goldsithney ward be served by seven parish councillors and Perranuthnoe ward served by three parish councillors.

80 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, no representations were received in relation to the warding of Perranuthnoe parish.

81 In the light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendations for warding Perranuthnoe parish as final.

Draft Recommendation

Perranuthnoe Parish Council should comprise 10 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 on the large map at the back of this report.

Map 2: Final Recommendations for Penwith

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

82 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in Penwith 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).

83 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.

84 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be sent to the Electoral Commission at the address below, to arrive no later than 18 July 2002:

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

APPENDIX

Final 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 maps at the back of this report.

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

Map A1: Final Recommendations for Penwith: Key Map