

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Restormel Borough Council

November 2001

© Crown Copyright 2001

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?	v
SUMMARY	vii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	5
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	9
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	11
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	25
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Restormel: Detailed Mapping	27
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	31

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Newquay, St Austell and St Columb is inserted inside the back cover of the 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 to the Government on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

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, and the number of councillors, ward names and the frequency of elections. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

SUMMARY

We began a review of the electoral arrangements for Restormel 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 Restormel:

- **in seven of the 18 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and four wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **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 five wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 74-75) are that:

- **Restormel Borough Council should have 45 councillors, one more than at present;**
- **there should be 19 wards, instead of 18 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In none of the proposed 19 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to continue with the number of electors per councillor in no ward expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the re-distribution of councillors for the parishes of Newquay, St Columb, St Mewan, St Stephen-in-Brannel and Treverbyn.**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for nine weeks from 28 November 2001. 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. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 28 January 2002:

**Review Manager
Restormel 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: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1 Bethel	3	Crinnis ward (part); Poltair ward (part); part of Treverbyn parish (the proposed Boscoppa parish ward)	Large map
2 Crinnis	1	Crinnis ward (part)	Large map
3 Edgcumbe North	2	part of Newquay parish (the proposed Edgcumbe North parish ward)	Large map
4 Edgcumbe South	2	part of Newquay parish (the proposed Edgcumbe South parish ward)	Large map
5 Fowey & Tywardreath	3	the parishes of Fowey, St Sampson and Tywardreath	Map 2
6 Gannel	3	part of Newquay parish (the proposed Gannel parish ward); the parish of Crantock	Map 2
7 Lostwithiel	2	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Lanlivery, Lostwithiel and Luxulyan)	Map 2
8 Mevagissey	2	the parishes of Mevagissey, St Goran and St Michael Caerhays; St Ewe ward (part)	Maps 2 and A3
9 Mount Charles	3	Crinnis ward (part); Poltair ward (part); Trevarna ward (part)	Large map
10 Poltair	2	Poltair ward (part); Trevarna ward (part); part of Treverbyn parish (the proposed Carclaze parish ward)	Large map
11 Rialton	3	part of Newquay parish (the proposed Rialton parish ward); the parish of Colan.	Map 2
12 Rock	3	the parishes of Roche, St Dennis and St Wenn; part of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish (the proposed Whitemoor parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
13 St Austell West	2	St Mewan ward (part); Poltair ward (part); Trevarna ward (part); part of Treverbyn parish (the proposed Trethowel parish ward)	Large map
14 St Blaise	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (St Blaise ward)	Map 2
15 St Columb	2	the parish of St Mawgan-in-Pydar; part of St Columb parish (the proposed North and Town parish wards)	Large Map
16 St Enoder	2	St Enoder ward; part of St Columb parish (the proposed South parish ward)	Map 2
17 St Ewe	2	Crinnis ward (part); the parishes of St Ewe and Grampond with Creed; St Mewan parish (the proposed Polgooth & Sticker parish ward); Trevarna ward (part)	Maps 2 and A3

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
18	St Stephen-In-Brannel	3	part of St Mewan parish (the proposed Trewoon parish ward); part of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish (the proposed St Stephen-in-Brannel parish)	Maps 2 and A2
19	Treverbyn	2	part of Treverbyn parish (the proposed Treverbyn parish ward)	Large Map

Notes: 1 The borough is part parished and part unparished.

2 Map 2, Maps A1, A2, A3 and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Table 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Restormel

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 Bethel	3	4,480	1,493	-7	5,090	1,697	-2
2 Crinnis	1	1,516	1,516	-6	1,707	1,707	-1
3 Edgcumbe North	2	3,422	1,711	6	3,539	1,770	2
4 Edgcumbe South	2	3,431	1,716	6	3,538	1,769	2
5 Fowey and Tywardreath	3	4,629	1,543	-4	4,766	1,589	-8
6 Gannel	3	4,913	1,638	2	5,345	1,782	3
7 Lostwithiel	2	3,470	1,735	8	3,569	1,785	3
8 Mevagissey	2	3,185	1,593	-1	3,274	1,637	-6
9 Mount Charles	3	4,558	1,519	-6	5,193	1,731	0
10 Poltair	2	2,975	1,488	-8	3,464	1,732	0
11 Rialton	3	4,809	1,603	-1	5,398	1,799	4
12 Rock	3	4,533	1,511	-6	4,723	1,574	-9
13 St Austell West	2	3,359	1,680	4	3,451	1,726	0
14 St Blaise	3	4,860	1,620	0	5,146	1,715	-1
15 St Columb	2	3,559	1,780	10	3,770	1,885	9
16 St Enoder	2	3,052	1,526	-5	3,376	1,688	-3
17 St Ewe	2	3,150	1,575	-2	3,351	1,676	-3
18 St Stephen-In-Brannel	3	5,278	1,759	9	5,464	1,821	5
19 Treverbyn	2	3,416	1,708	6	3,813	1,907	10
Totals	45	75,595	-	-	77,977	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,613	-	-	1,733	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Restormel Borough Council's submission.

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 borough of Restormel 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 currently expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Restormel. Restormel's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1979 (Report no. 348). The electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council were last reviewed in November 1983 (Report no. 456). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

3 In undertaking 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 the county council would be elected, and so on. In unitary authority areas the White Paper proposed elections by thirds. 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 and three-member wards in unitary authority 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 and our current *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 12 June 2001, when we wrote to Restormel Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Cornwall County Council, Cornwall Police Authority, the local authority associations, Cornwall Association of Parish and Town Councils, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests 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 Restormel Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, 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 27 November 2001 and will end on 28 January 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. It will then be for it to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order. The Electoral Commission will determine when any changes come into effect.

15 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 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. The Boundary Committee's 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, as was previously the case with the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to send comments to the Electoral Commission.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The borough of Restormel is located in mid-Cornwall and extends from the Atlantic to the Channel coasts of the county. The borough covers an area of 45,160 hectares and has a population of 93,100. Restormel borough has six main areas of settlement in St.Austell, Newquay, Fowey, Lostwithiel, St.Columb Major and the St.Blazey area.

17 The borough contains 24 parishes, but St.Austell town itself is unparished. St Austell comprises approximately 13 per cent of the borough's total electorate.

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

19 The electorate of the borough is 72,595 (February 2001). The Council presently has 44 members who are elected from 18 wards, four of which are relatively urban in Crinnis, Edgumbe, Poltair and Trevarna, and the remainder being predominantly rural. Nine of the wards are each represented by three councillors, eight are each represented by two councillors and there is one single-member ward. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,650 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,772 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 seven of the 18 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, four wards by more than 20 per cent and one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Fowey ward where the councillor represents 37 per cent fewer electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Restormel

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 Crinnis	2	3,367	1,684	2	4,095	2,048	16
2 Edgcumbe	3	6,347	2,116	28	6,571	2,190	24
3 Fowey	2	2,087	1,044	-37	2,204	1,102	-38
4 Gannel	3	5,205	1,735	5	5,637	1,879	6
5 Lostwithiel	2	3,470	1,735	5	3,570	1,785	1
6 Mevagissey	2	2,993	1,497	-9	3,084	1,542	-13
7 Poltair	3	5,310	1,770	7	5,345	1,782	1
8 Rialton	3	5,023	1,674	1	5,612	1,871	6
9 Rock	2	3,931	1,966	19	4,113	2,057	16
10 St Blaise	3	4,860	1,620	-2	5,146	1,715	-3
11 St Columb	2	4,162	2,081	26	4,392	2,196	24
12 St Enoder	2	2,717	1,359	-18	3,031	1,516	-14
13 St Ewe	1	1,324	1,324	-20	1,393	1,393	-21
14 St Mewan	3	5,313	1,771	7	5,596	1,865	5
15 St Stephen- in-Brannel	3	4,877	1,626	-1	5,009	1,670	-6
16 Trevarna	3	4,520	1,507	-9	5,134	1,711	-3
17 Treverbyn	3	4,547	1,516	-8	5,484	1,828	3
18 Tywardreath	2	2,542	1,271	-23	2,560	1,280	-28
Totals	44	72,595	–	–	77,977	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,650	–	–	1,772	

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Restormel Borough 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 Fowey ward were relatively over-represented by 37 per cent, while electors in Edgcumbe ward were relatively under-represented by 28 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

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

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers from the Borough Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 12 representations during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the Borough Council, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the Borough Council.

Restormel Borough Council

23 The Borough Council proposed a borough-wide scheme, based on a council of 44 members. It proposed an increase in the number of wards, from 18 to 19, and the retention of the existing pattern of single- and multi-member wards. It also proposed new parish warding arrangements for the parishes of St Columb, St Mewan, St Stephen-In-Brannel and Treverbyn.

24 The proposals would result in improvements in electoral equality. However, by 2006 four wards were forecast to have electoral variances of 10 per cent or more from the borough average.

Parish and Town Councils

25 Fowey Town Council proposed no change to the existing arrangements for Fowey Parish. St Mewan Parish Council proposed no change to the existing St Mewan borough ward. St Wenn Parish Council proposed no change to the existing St Columb ward. Tywardreath & Par Parish Council opposed being linked with the parishes of Fowey and St Sampson, proposing instead the enlargement of the existing Tywardreath ward.

Other Representations

26 We received a further seven representations from five local councillors and two from local residents. Borough Councillor Brown, member for Poltair ward, broadly supported the Borough Council's proposals, but proposed one single-member ward and one two-member ward for the Eastern Rural and Coastal area. Borough Councillor Budge, on behalf of the St Austell Forum, generally supported the Borough Council proposals for St Austell but opposed the inclusion of part of the rural Treverbyn ward. Borough Councillor Hooper, member for Tywardreath ward, proposed a two-member Tywardreath ward and a single-member Fowey ward. Councillor Stewart, member for Crinnis ward, proposed that Crinnis ward remain a two-member ward. Councillor Wellman, member for Fowey ward, proposed a modified two-member Fowey ward and a modified single-member Tywardreath ward. One local resident proposed that the current Fowey ward remain unchanged, while one other local resident offered a critique of the current council's role.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

27 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Restormel 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.

28 As described earlier, our prime aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Restormel 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 to 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”.

29 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 to maintaining local ties.

30 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.

31 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

32 Since 1975 there has been an 30 per cent increase in the electorate of Restormel borough. The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of seven per cent from 72,595 to 77,977 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in the Treverbyn ward. 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.

33 Fowey Town Council argued that the Borough Council had under-estimated the growth forecast for Fowey town. However, no evidence was provided to substantiate its claim.

34 We know that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having looked at the Borough Council’s figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

Council Size

35 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.

36 Restormel Borough Council presently has 44 members. The Borough Council proposed a council of 44 members, which it argued would continue to represent effectively “the different geographical and community interests within the borough”.

37 Having considered the electoral arrangements carefully, we note that under a 44-member council, the St Austell area of the borough would be allocated one less councillor than the electorate merited. Under the Borough Council’s proposed 44-member scheme St Austell would be entitled to 11 councillors. However, its scheme only allocated St Austell ten councillors, resulting in a consequential high level of under-representation in the proposed Bethel, Crinnis, Mount Charles, Poltair and St Austell West wards.

38 While the Borough Council’s scheme would achieve reasonably good electoral equality overall, its proposed allocation of councillors would not provide for a fair balance of representation in St Austell. In view of this imbalance of representation, we concluded that the proposed Bethel ward, in particular, and the borough in general, would be entitled to an additional councillor.

39 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 45 members.

Electoral Arrangements

40 The Borough Council proposed a mixture of two- and three-member wards, with one single-member ward, but did not offer a proposal for the Eastern and Coastal Rural area. However, Fowey Town Council, Tywardreath & Par Parish Council and Borough Councillors Brown, Hooper and Wellman proposed warding arrangements for this area.

41 In view of the degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council’s proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have based our recommendations on the Borough Council’s scheme. We consider that this scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the Borough Council’s proposals in two areas. For Borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) The North-West area - Edgcumbe, Gannel, Rialton, St Columb and St Enoder wards
- (b) The China Clay area - Rock, St Mewan, St Stephen-in-Brannel and Treverbyn wards

- (c) The St Austell area - Crinnis, Poltair and Trevarna wards
- (d) The Southern Rural area - Mevagissey and St Ewe wards
- (e) The Eastern Rural and Coastal area - Fowey, Lostwithiel, St Blaise and Tywardreath wards

42 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.

North -West area

Edgcumbe,Gannel, Rialton, St Columb and St Enoder wards

43 These five wards are situated in that part of the borough that lies near or borders the Atlantic Ocean. The existing three-member borough wards of Edgcumbe, Gannel and Rialton cover the town of Newquay. Gannel ward also includes Crantock Parish, while Rialton ward also includes Colan Parish. Each of these wards are currently under-represented with Edgcumbe ward having an electoral variance of 28 per cent (24 per cent by 2006), Gannel ward an electoral variance of 5 per cent (6 per cent by 2006) and Rialton ward an electoral variance of 1 per cent (6 per cent by 2006).

44 The existing two-member borough ward of St Columb comprises the parishes of Mawgan-In-Pydar, St Columb Major and St Wenn. It is currently under-represented with an electoral variance of 26 per cent (24 per cent by 2006). The existing two-member borough ward of St Enoder is coterminous with the parish of the same name and is currently over-represented with an electoral variance of 18 per cent (14 per cent by 2006).

45 The Borough Council proposed a modified Edgcumbe ward, whereby it would be divided into a two-member Edgcumbe North ward and a two-member Edgcumbe South ward. Its proposed Edgcumbe North ward should comprise those electors north of the main railway line, north of Robartes Road and those electors east of Silverdale Court Road. The Council further proposed that Edgcumbe North ward have its northern boundary slightly modified to include those electors in Henvy Road, who currently form part of the existing Rialton ward. Its proposed Edgcumbe South ward should comprise the remainder of the existing Edgcumbe ward. However, the Council further proposed that the western boundary of Edgcumbe South ward with the existing Gannel ward be modified so that it would follow the A392 to the south, the eastern and southern edge of the Allotment Gardens to the west, and Mount Wise Road to the north.

46 The Borough Council proposed a modified two-member St Columb ward to exclude those electors in the South parish ward of St Columb Major, who would transfer to a modified St Enoder ward, and St Wenn parish, whose electors would transfer to a modified Rock ward, as detailed later. The modified St Enoder ward would remain a two-member ward under the Council's proposals.

47 Under these proposals, and under a council size of 44, the number of electors per councillor in both Edgcumbe North ward and Edgcumbe South ward would be 4 per cent above the average (equal to the borough average by 2006), 1 per cent below the average in Gannel ward (1 per cent above the borough average by 2006), 3 per cent below the average in Rialton ward (2 per cent above the borough average

by 2006), 8 per cent above the borough average in St Columb ward (6 per cent by 2006), and 8 per cent below the borough average in St Enoder ward (5 per cent by 2006).

48 St Wenn Parish Council proposed that the existing arrangements for its area be retained and opposed the Borough Council's scheme. However, the current levels of electoral inequality in the current St Columb ward is unacceptable at 26 per cent and having visited the area, we are content that the Council's proposals would not be detrimental to community identity.

49 After careful consideration we are adopting the Borough Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations, with only a minor amendment to the proposed Edgcumbe South ward's southern boundary with the proposed Gannel ward. To provide coterminosity of district and parish wards we propose extending the boundary to meet the existing Colan parish boundary. Our draft recommendations are based on a 45-member council size and the number of electors per councillor in both Edgcumbe North ward and Edgcumbe South ward would be 6 per cent above the borough average (2 per cent by 2006), 2 per cent above the borough average in Gannel ward (3 per cent by 2006), 1 per cent below the borough average in Rialton ward (4 per cent above by 2006), 10 per cent above the borough average in St Columb ward (9 per cent by 2006) and 5 per cent below the borough average in St Enoder ward (3 per cent by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

The China Clay area

Rock, St Mewan, St Stephen-In-Brannel and Treverbyn wards

50 These four wards are centred around the China Clay area in the central part of the borough. The existing two-member Rock ward comprises the parishes of Roche and St Dennis and is currently 19 per cent under-represented (16 per cent by 2006). The existing three-member St Mewan ward, comprising both the unwarded parish of St Mewan and an unparished area approximate to the town of St Austell, is currently 7 per cent under-represented (5 per cent by 2006). The existing three-member St Stephen-In-Brannel ward is coterminous with St Stephen-In-Brannel parish, and is currently 1 per cent over-represented (6 per cent by 2006). The existing three-member Treverbyn ward is coterminous with Treverbyn parish, and is currently 8 per cent over-represented (3 per cent under-represented by 2006).

51 The Borough Council proposed a modified Rock ward to include the parishes of Roche, St Dennis, St Wenn and the proposed Whitemoor parish ward of St Stephen-In-Brannel parish, comprising those electors generally in and around Whitemoor Village (polling district 4-FF). St Stephen-In-Brannel ward would be further modified to include the proposed Trewoon parish ward of St Mewan parish, comprising those electors in and around Trewoon Village (polling district JJ-5089). The southern part of St Mewan ward, namely those electors in and around the villages of Polgooth and Sticker (polling districts BB-5065 and GG-5078), would also be parish warded and included in a modified St Ewe ward, as detailed later. The Council proposed that St Mewan ward be further divided and cease to exist, with the unparished area north of the A390 road in polling district 1E forming part of the proposed St Austell West ward. The remaining southern part of polling district 1E would form part of a modified St Ewe ward.

52 The Borough Council also proposed that the current Treverbyn ward be modified. It stated that the southern part of Treverbyn parish which is "generally speaking on the south facing slopes" looks towards St Austell and is of a different character. It added that "a significant portion of it forms part of

the built-up area of St Austell itself”, while to the north, “through the china clay workings, is an area of continuous development” which looks away from St Austell and shares a strong community identity. Consequential to the Council’s intention to separate those communities that identify with the clay country from those more identified with the St Austell area, it proposed that the new two-member St Austell West ward would incorporate that part of the existing Treverbyn ward south of the 4-II and 5-II polling districts, incorporating the hamlet of Trethowel in a proposed Trethowel parish ward. The remaining area of Treverbyn parish, except for those areas approximately south of the A391 that should form part of the new warding arrangements for St Austell, (as detailed later in the chapter), would form the proposed Treverbyn parish ward in a rural two-member Treverbyn ward.

53 Under these proposals, and under a council size of 44, the number of electors per councillor in the three-member Rock ward would be 8 per cent below the borough average (11 per cent by 2006), 7 per cent above the borough average in the three-member St Stephen-in-Brannel ward (3 per cent by 2006) and 4 per cent above the borough average in the two-member Treverbyn ward (8 per cent in 2006).

54 After careful consideration we are adopting the Borough Council’s proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations, except for some minor amendments to the proposed boundary between the modified Treverbyn ward and St Austell.(As discussed later in the chapter). We concur with the Council’s aims in this area, particularly those that would allow a clearly distinct representation for the more rural parts. We note that parish warding is often not a popular option but would argue that the Council’s scheme offers the best available balance between the statutory criteria and electoral equality.

55 Our draft recommendations are based on a 45-member council size and the number of electors per councillor in Rock ward would be 6 per cent below the borough average (9 per cent by 2006), 9 per cent above the borough average in St Stephen-in-Brannel ward (5 per cent by 2006) and 6 per cent in Treverbyn ward (10 per cent by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2, Map A2 in Appendix A and the large map inserted in the back of this report.

The St Austell area

Crinnis, Poltair and Trevarna wards

56 These three wards cover the town of St Austell, which is currently unparished. The existing two-member Crinnis ward is currently under-represented, with an electoral variance of 2 per cent (16 per cent by 2006), while the existing three-member Poltair ward is also currently under-represented, with an electoral variance of 7 per cent (1 per cent by 2006). The existing three-member Trevarna ward is currently over-represented, with an electoral variance of 9 per cent (3 per cent by 2006).

57 The Borough Council proposed a reconfiguration of warding for St Austell. To provide more clearly defined urban areas, it proposed the creation of two new wards for the area, the modification of the existing Poltair ward and the parish warding of Treverbyn parish to accommodate urban overspill. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, the Council proposed a new two-member St Austell West ward to cover the predominantly urban part of the existing St Mewan ward, the area generally around Trethowel. It would also include that area south of Tremena Road and east of Bodmin Road from the existing Poltair ward, and that area east of South Street from the existing Trevarna ward, which would cease to exist. The remainder of Trevarna ward would form part of a proposed three-member Mount Charles ward along with that part of the existing Crinnis ward east of Polmear Road. Mount Charles ward would also comprise that part of the existing Poltair ward north of Sandy Hill Road, bordered to

the east by Slades Road, and bordered approximately to the west by Penhaligon Way and Park Way. Its southern boundary with the modified St Ewe ward would follow Sawles Road.

58 Poltair ward would be further modified and its northern boundary extended to include part of Treverbyn parish, the proposed Carclaze parish ward. The Council also proposed a new two-member Bethel ward, bordered to its west by the proposed Mount Charles ward along Daniels Lane and the modified Poltair ward, approximately west of Polmarth Close. It would also comprise that part of the existing Crinnis ward between the A391 to the north and east, Brockstone Road to the west and Hill Crest Road to the south. To the north, the proposed Bethel ward would include that part of the existing Treverbyn ward south of the A391, creating the proposed Boscoppa parish ward. The Council further proposed that Crinnis ward become a single-member ward, with its boundaries modified in all areas except the north and the east. As previously outlined, its western boundary would now meet the eastern boundaries of the proposed Bethel ward and proposed Mount Charles ward. Its southern boundary with the modified St Ewe ward would now run approximately north of Porthpean Beach Road, with those electors in the coastal area being combined with the unparished area of the modified St Ewe ward.

59 Under these proposals, and under a council size of 44, the number of electors per councillor in Bethel ward would be 5 per cent above the borough average (15 per cent by 2006), Crinnis ward would be 6 per cent above the borough average (10 per cent by 2006), Mount Charles ward would be 1 per cent above the borough average (6 per cent by 2006), Poltair ward would be 4 per cent below the borough average (2 per cent above the average by 2006) and St Austell West ward would be 6 per cent above the borough average (2 per cent by 2006).

60 Councillor Brown, member for Poltair ward, broadly welcomed the Borough Council's proposals for the St Austell area, particularly its modified single-member Crinnis ward. Councillor Budge, on behalf of the St Austell Forum, generally welcomed the Council's proposals, except in the north-west of St Austell where he argued that "a rural part of the Treverbyn ward is included which should remain with Treverbyn". Councillor Stewart, member for Crinnis ward, opposed the Council's proposals for a single-member Crinnis ward, arguing that it would not receive effective representation. Councillor Stewart instead proposed a scheme for St Austell that would allow a modified Crinnis ward to remain a two-member ward, alongside a modified Poltair ward and a new Mount Charles ward.

61 Under the Borough Council's proposed 44-member scheme, St Austell would be entitled to eleven councillors by 2006. However, the Council had only allocated St Austell ten councillors, resulting in a consequentially high level of under-representation in the St Austell area. While the Council's scheme would achieve reasonably good electoral equality overall, its proposed allocation of councillors would not provide for a fair balance of representation in St Austell. In view of this imbalance of representation, we concluded that the St Austell area, in particular, and the borough in general, would be entitled to an additional councillor.

62 While the allocation of an additional councillor to the proposed Bethel ward would provide for a fair balance of representation in the area overall, further modifications to the Council's proposals in St Austell would provide for better electoral equality. To achieve this, while broadly basing our draft recommendations for St Austell on the Council's proposals, we propose slightly moving away from them in Bethel ward, Crinnis ward, Mount Charles ward, Poltair ward and St Austell West ward.

63 We propose modifying the boundary between St Austell West ward and Poltair ward. We propose running the boundary along North Street, Church Street and the southern end of High Cross Street,

before running it in a southerly direction along Beech Lane to meet the Borough Council's proposed boundary on East Hill Road. We further propose modifying the Council's proposed boundary between Poltair ward and Bethel ward. We propose utilising Slades Road, that part north of Gwallon Road and that area approximately behind St Piran's Close as the boundary. We would also use Phernyssick Road as the northern boundary between these two wards. We also propose utilising Sandy Hill as the boundary between Bethel ward and Mount Charles ward, and propose modifying Mount Charles ward's south-eastern boundary with Crinnis ward to improve electoral equality. We propose transferring those electors between the Porthmeor Road area and Polmear Road of the existing Crinnis ward into the proposed Mount Charles ward.

64 Our draft recommendations are based on a 45-member council size and the number of electors per councillor in the three-member Bethel ward would be 7 per cent below the borough average (2 per cent by 2006), in the single-member Crinnis ward 6 per cent below the borough average (1 per cent by 2006), in the three-member Mount Charles ward 6 per cent below the borough average (equal to the average by 2006), in the two-member Poltair ward 8 per cent below the borough average (equal to the average by 2006) and in the two-member St Austell West Ward 4 per cent below the borough average (equal to the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

The Southern Rural area

Mevagissey and St Ewe wards

65 These two wards are situated in the southern part of the borough, towards the Channel coast. The existing two-member Mevagissey ward comprises the parishes of Mevagissey, St Goran and St Michael Caerhays. It is currently over-represented, with an electoral variance of 9 per cent (13 per cent by 2006). The existing single-member St Ewe ward comprises the parishes of Grampound With Creed and St Ewe, and the unparished area of St Austell. It is currently over-represented, with an electoral variance of 20 per cent (21 per cent by 2006).

66 The Borough Council proposed the modification of both Mevagissey ward and St Ewe ward. It proposed the transfer of those electors from the coastal village of Pentewan, in the unparished area of the existing St Ewe ward, to a two-member Mevagissey ward to improve electoral equality. Its proposed boundary would lie to the north of Pentewan Village and run approximately from the coastal area of Porthtawan to Peruppa Farm. It further proposed that the two-member St Ewe ward's northern boundary be extended to include the southern part of polling district 1E of the existing St Mewan ward, thereby creating the proposed parish ward of Polgooth & Sticker.

67 Under these proposals, and under a council size of 44, the number of electors per councillor in Mevagissey ward would be 3 per cent below the borough average (8 per cent by 2006) and 5 per cent below the borough average in St Ewe ward (both initially and in 2006). No further representations were received concerning this area.

68 After careful consideration we are adopting the Borough Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. However, under our proposed 45-member council the number of electors per councillor in the two-member Mevagissey ward would be 1 per cent below the borough average (6 per cent by 2006) and 2 per cent below the borough average in the two-member St Ewe ward (3 per cent

below the borough average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and MapA3 in Appendix A.

The Eastern Rural And Coastal area

Fowey, Lostwithiel, St Blaise and Tywardreath wards

69 These four wards cover that part of the borough to the east and north east of St Austell. The existing two-member Fowey ward comprises the parishes of Fowey and St Sampson. It is currently over-represented with an electoral variance of 37 per cent (38 per cent by 2006). The existing two-member Lostwithiel ward comprises the parishes of Lanlivery, Lostwithiel and Luxulyan and is currently under-represented, with an electoral variance of 5 per cent (1 per cent by 2006). The existing three-member St Blaise ward is coterminous with St Blaise parish and is currently over-represented, with an electoral variance of 2 per cent (3 per cent by 2006). The existing two-member Tywardreath ward is coterminous with Tywardreath parish and is currently over-represented, with an electoral variance of 23 per cent (28 per cent by 2006).

70 The Borough Council proposed no change to the existing Lostwithiel ward and existing St Blaise ward, given their excellent electoral equality. The Council offered no proposals for the wards of Fowey and Tywardreath but were opposed to any potential parish warding of St Blaise to improve the electoral equality in these two wards. Both Fowey Town Council and Tywardreath & Par Parish Council proposed that the existing wards remain unaltered for reasons of community identity. Councillor Brown, representing Poltair ward, proposed that Fowey parish and Tywardreath parish be warded separately. Councillor Hooper, representing Tywardreath ward, proposed a scheme for the area based on a modified two-member Tywardreath ward, comprising electors from the existing Tywardreath ward, part of St Blaise parish and St Sampson parish, and a modified one-member Fowey ward. Councillor Wellman, representing Fowey ward, proposed a modified two-member Fowey ward based on its existing boundaries, but with the addition of part of the Par area from the existing Tywardreath ward, if the status quo could not be retained. One local resident proposed that Fowey ward remain unchanged, or as an alternative, the village of Par from the existing Tywardreath ward be included in a modified Fowey ward.

71 After careful consideration of all the representations received, we propose endorsing the Borough Council's proposals for no change to the existing Lostwithiel ward and the existing St Blaise ward given the good level of electoral equality achieved. We have noted the opposition to a possible combination of the existing Fowey and Tywardreath wards into a single ward. However, we have been presented with the choice of retaining the status quo or parish warding the area, neither of which would significantly improve electoral equality or enhance community identity. Having visited the area we have not been convinced that combining the two wards would be detrimental to the maintainance of effective and convenient local government or to community identity. We therefore propose that Fowey ward be combined with Tywardreath ward in a new three-member Fowey & Tywardreath ward.

72 Our draft recommendations are based on a 45-member council size and the number of electors per councillor in the three-member Fowey & Tywardreath ward would be 4 per cent below the borough average (8 per cent by 2006), in the two-member Lostwithiel ward 8 per cent above the borough average (3 per cent by 2006) and in the three-member St Blaise ward equal to the borough average (1 per cent below the average by 2006) Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

73 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed no change to the current cycle of whole-council elections. Fowey Town Council also proposed no change to the existing arrangements, while no other submissions regarding the electoral cycle were received. We therefore make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

Conclusions

74 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be an increase in council size from 44 to 45;
- there should be 19 wards;
- the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one ward, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council every four years.

75 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- we propose that the council size should be 45 rather than 44;
- the boundaries of Crinnis ward, Bethel ward, Edgcumbe South ward, Gannel ward, Mount Charles ward, Poltair ward and St Austell West ward should be modified;
- that Bethel ward should be represented by three councillors instead of two.

76 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	44	45	44	45
Number of wards	18	19	18	19
Average number of electors per councillor	1,650	1,613	1,772	1,733
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	7	0	9	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	4	0	5	0

77 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Restormel Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from seven to none. By 2006 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

Draft Recommendation

Restormel Borough Council should comprise 45 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, Appendix A and the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole council elections every four years.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

78 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 provides 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 parishes of Newquay, St Columb, St Mewan, St Stephen-in-Brannel and Treverbyn to reflect the proposed district wards.

79 The parish of Newquay is currently served by 20 councillors representing three wards: Edgcumbe ward (returning eight councillors); Gannel ward (returning six councillors) and Rialton ward (returning six councillors). Restormel Borough Council proposed the creation of two new four-member parish wards, Edgcumbe North ward and Edgcumbe South ward, to replace the existing Edgcumbe ward in line with its proposed borough warding. Both Gannel ward and Rialton ward should return six

councillors as at present. We concur with this proposal, but would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

Newquay Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Edgumbe North ward (returning four councillors), Edgumbe South ward (returning four councillors), Gannel ward (returning six councillors) and Rialton ward (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 inserted at the back of this report.

80 The parish of St Columb Major is currently served by 12 councillors representing three wards: North ward (returning two councillors); South ward (returning three councillors) and Town ward (returning seven councillors). Restormel Borough Council proposed that the existing number of parish councillors remain unchanged, stating that North ward should return one councillor, a decrease of one; South ward should return two councillors, a decrease of one; and Town ward should return nine councillors, an increase of two. We concur with their proposal to increase representation for Town ward, but disagree with their recommendation to decrease representation for North ward and South ward. We propose instead that their current level of representation continue, but would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

St Columb Major Town Council should comprise 14 councillors, an increase of two, representing three wards: North ward (returning two councillors); South ward (returning three councillors); and Town ward, (returning nine councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

81 The parish of St Mewan is currently served by 13 councillors and is unwarded. Restormel Borough Council proposed the creation of a new four-member Trewoon parish ward comprising that part of St Mewan parish which they proposed transferring into St Stephen-in-Brannel district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter. It also proposed the creation of a new nine-member Polgooth & Sticker parish ward comprising that part of St Mewan parish which they proposed transferring into St Ewe district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter. We concur with this proposal, but would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

St Mewan Parish Council should comprise 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Trewoon ward (returning four councillors); and Polgooth & Sticker ward (returning nine councillors).

82 The parish of St Stephen-in-Brannel is currently served by 15 councillors and is currently unwarded. Restormel Borough Council proposed the creation of a new single-member parish ward comprising that part of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish which they proposed transferring into Rock district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter. It also proposed the creation of a new 14-member St Stephen-in-Brannel parish ward comprising that part of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish which will remain in St Stephen-in-Brannel district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter. We concur with these proposals, but would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

St Stephen-in-Brannel Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: St Stephen-in-Brannel ward (returning 14 councillors); and Whitemoor ward (returning one councillor).

83 The parish of Treverbyn is currently served by 15 councillors and is currently unwarded. Restormel Borough Council proposed the creation of four new parish wards: a two-member Boscoppa parish ward comprising that part of Treverbyn parish which they proposed transferring into Bethel district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter; a two-member Carclaze parish ward comprising that part of Treverbyn parish which they proposed transferring into Poltair ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter; a ten-member Treverbyn parish ward comprising that part of Treverbyn parish which will remain in Treverbyn district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter; and a single-member Trethewel parish ward comprising that part of Treverbyn parish which they proposed transferring into St Austell West district ward, as outlined earlier in the chapter. We concur with these proposals, but would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

Treverbyn Parish Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Boscoppa ward (returning two councillors); Carclaze ward (returning two councillors); Treverbyn ward (returning ten councillors); and Trethewel ward (returning one councillor).

84 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 every four years, at the same time as elections for the borough ward of which they are part.

Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Restormel

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

85 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Restormel contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 28 January 2001. Any received after this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the Borough Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

86 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Restormel 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

87 In the light of representations 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 Restormel: Detailed Mapping

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

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 and A3 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed boundary between Mevagissey ward and St Ewe ward.

The large map inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Newquay, St Austell and St Columb.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Restormel: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of St Stephen-in-Brannel Parish

Map A3: Proposed Boundary Between Megavissey ward and St Ewe ward

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, 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.
<i>Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.</i>	<i>We comply with this requirement.</i>