

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Carrick in Cornwall

*January 2002*

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	<i>27</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Carrick: Detailed Mapping	<i>29</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>35</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Falmouth and Truro, and the proposed boundary between Newlyn & Goonhavern and Perranporth wards, is inserted inside the back cover of this report.



# WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

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

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

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



## SUMMARY

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

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

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

- **in 12 of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and six wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to continue, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 11 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main proposals for Carrick's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 69-70) are that:

- **Carrick District Council should have 47 councillors, two more than at present;**
- **there should be 19 wards, one fewer than at present;**
- **the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction 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 district councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 18 of the proposed 19 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in all 19 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Falmouth and Truro;**
- **new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Chacewater, Kenwyn, St Clement and St Newlyn East;**
- **redistribution of councillors for Kea parish.**

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

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

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

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

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Arwenack	3	part of Falmouth parish (the proposed Arwenack parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
2	Boscawen	3	part of Truro parish (the proposed Boscawen parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
3	Boslowick	3	part of Falmouth parish (the proposed Boslowick parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
4	Carland	1	the parishes of St Allen and St Erme and part of St Newlyn East parish (the proposed Mitchell parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
5	Feock & Kea	3	the parishes of Feock and Kea and part of Chacewater parish (the proposed Twelveheads parish ward)	Maps 2 and A4
6	Kenwyn & Chacewater	3	part of Chacewater parish (the proposed Chacewater parish ward) and part of Kenwyn parish (the Shortlanesend and proposed Threemilestone parish wards)	Maps 2 and A4
7	Moresk	2	part of Truro parish (the proposed Moresk parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
8	Mount Hawke	2	part of St Agnes parish (the Blackwater, Mount Hawke and Porthtowan parish wards)	Maps 2 and A3
9	Mylor	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Gwennap, Mylor and Perranarworthal	Map 2
10	Newlyn & Goonhavern	2	Cubert parish, part of St Newlyn East parish (the proposed St Newlyn East parish ward) and part of Perranzabuloe parish (the Goonhavern parish ward)	Large map and Maps 2 and A2
11	Penryn	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Penryn	Map 2
12	Penwerris	3	part of Falmouth parish (the proposed Penwerris parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
13	Perranporth	2	part of Perranzabuloe parish (the Penhallow and Perranporth parish wards)	Large map and Map 2
14	Probus	3	the parishes of Cuby, Ladock, Probus, St Michael Penkevil and Tregony and part of St Clement parish (the proposed Tresillian parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
15	Roseland	2	the parishes of Gerrans, Philleigh, Ruanlanihorne, St Just in Roseland and Veryan	Map 2

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
16	St Agnes	2	part of St Agnes parish (the Mithian and St Agnes parish wards)	Maps 2 and A3
17	Tregolls	2	part of St Clement parish (the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward) and part of Truro parish (the proposed Tregolls parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
18	Trehaverne	3	part of Kenwyn parish (the proposed Gloweth parish ward) and part of Truro parish (the proposed Trehaverne parish ward)	Large map and Map 2
19	Trescobeas	2	part of Falmouth parish (the proposed Trescobeas parish ward)	Large Map and Map 2

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.*

*2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and Maps A1 – A4 in Appendix A.*

*3 We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.*

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Carrick

	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	Arwenack	3	4,320	1,440	0	4,723	1,574	4
2	Boscawen	3	4,322	1,441	0	4,718	1,573	3
3	Boslowick	3	3,927	1,309	-9	4,236	1,412	-7
4	Carland	1	1,366	1,366	-5	1,455	1,455	-4
5	Feock & Kea	3	4,297	1,432	0	4,354	1,451	-5
6	Kenwyn & Chacewater	3	4,244	1,415	-1	4,336	1,445	-5
7	Moresk	2	2,617	1,309	-9	3,213	1,607	6
8	Mount Hawke	2	2,749	1,375	-4	2,879	1,440	-5
9	Mylor	3	4,468	1,489	4	4,551	1,517	0
10	Newlyn & Goonhavern	2	2,999	1,500	5	3,080	1,540	1
11	Penryn	3	4,608	1,536	7	4,923	1,641	8
12	Penwerris	3	4,139	1,380	-4	4,251	1,417	-7
13	Perranporth	2	3,172	1,586	11	3,262	1,631	7
14	Probus	3	4,325	1,442	1	4,497	1,499	-1
15	Roseland	2	2,861	1,431	0	2,946	1,473	-3
16	St Agnes	2	2,962	1,481	3	3,095	1,548	2
17	Tregolls	2	2,668	1,334	-7	3,102	1,551	2
18	Trehaverne	3	4,446	1,482	3	4,896	1,632	7
19	Trescobeas	2	2,900	1,450	1	2,937	1,469	-3
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>67,390</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>71,454</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,434</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>-</b>

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our proposals for the electoral arrangements for the district of Carrick in Cornwall, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the six districts in Cornwall as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Carrick. Carrick's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1978 (Report no. 273). The electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council were last reviewed in November 1983 (Report no. 456). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

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

*Table 3: Stages of the Review*

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

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

11 Stage One began on 12 June 2001, when we wrote to Carrick District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Cornwall County Council, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, the local authority associations, Cornwall Association of Parish and Town Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West Region and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Carrick District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of submissions (the end of Stage One) was 3 September 2001.

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

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

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

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 The district of Carrick covers an area of 46,092 hectares, extending from the north to the south coasts across the Cornish peninsular. It is bounded by the district of Restormel to the north-east and the district of Kerrier to the south-west. The district has a population of 85,300 and is predominantly rural in character, containing some of the most beautiful coastal and countryside scenery in Cornwall. It contains three significantly populated areas, the city of Truro and the towns of Falmouth and Penryn, which account for approximately half of the district's population. The district's economy has traditionally been based on agriculture, fishing and tin mining but, as the numbers employed in these have declined, service sector industries, particularly tourism, have played an increasingly important part in the local economy. The district is entirely parished, with 27 parishes in total.

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

17 The electorate of the district is 67,390 (February 2001). The Council presently has 45 members who are elected from 20 wards. Nine of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven are each represented by two councillors and four are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

18 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,498 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,588 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration since the last review, the number of electors per councillor in 12 of the 20 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, six wards by more than 20 per cent and two wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Clement ward where the councillor represents 54 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Carrick*

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	Arwenack	2	2,728	1,364	-9	3,012	1,506	-5
2	Boscawen	3	3,914	1,305	-13	4,310	1,437	-10
3	Chacewater	1	1,176	1,176	-21	1,226	1,226	-23
4	Feock	2	2,961	1,481	-1	3,011	1,506	-5
5	Kea	1	1,203	1,203	-20	1,210	1,210	-24
6	Kenwyn	2	3,638	1,819	21	4,005	2,003	26
7	Moresk	2	2,483	1,242	-17	3,079	1,540	-3
8	Mylor	3	4,468	1,489	-1	4,551	1,517	-4
9	Newlyn	1	2,077	2,077	39	2,205	2,205	39
10	Penryn	3	4,608	1,536	3	4,923	1,641	3
11	Penwerris	3	4,105	1,368	-9	4,190	1,397	-12
12	Perranzabuloe	3	4,278	1,426	-5	4,388	1,463	-8
13	Probus	2	3,657	1,829	22	3,828	1,914	21
14	Roseland	2	2,664	1,332	-11	2,743	1,372	-14
15	St Agnes	3	5,711	1,904	27	5,974	1,991	25
16	St Clement	1	2,312	2,312	54	2,341	2,341	47
17	Smithick	3	3,848	1,283	-14	4,165	1,388	-13
18	Tregolls	2	2,981	1,491	0	3,414	1,707	8
19	Trehaverne	3	3,973	1,324	-12	4,099	1,366	-14
20	Trevethan	3	4,605	1,535	3	4,780	1,593	0
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>67,390</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>71,454</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,498</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,588</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Carrick 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 Chacewater ward were relatively over-represented by 21 per cent, while electors in St Clement ward were relatively under-represented by 54 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

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

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 23 submissions during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

#### **Carrick District Council**

21 The District Council proposed a council of 47 members, two more than at present, serving 20 wards, the same number as at present. In the urban areas, the Council proposed modifying the warding arrangements for Falmouth and Truro. In the rural areas some new groupings of parishes were proposed, along with the retention of three existing wards. Under the District Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average in one ward. By 2006 two wards were forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average.

#### **Members of Parliament**

22 Candy Atherton, MP for Falmouth and Camborne, stated that she reserved judgment on the District Council's proposals as "we feel that we have not had sufficient time to consider the proposals fully".

#### **Parish and Town Councils**

23 We received responses from seven parish and town councils. Falmouth Town Council supported the District Council's proposals for the four Falmouth wards. Mylor and Perranarworthal parish councils proposed that Mylor district ward should be left unchanged. Perranzabuloe Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposals for the two wards of Newlyn & Goonhavern and Perranporth which would place Perranzabuloe parish in both wards. It put forward an alternative warding pattern for that part of the district. St Agnes Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals to place St Agnes parish in two district wards. St Clement Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposal to ward the parish and place the proposed St Clement parish ward in Tregolls district ward. It submitted proposals for an alternative warding pattern for that part of the district, and enclosed a 138-signature petition in support of its proposals. Kea Parish Council proposed a reallocation of parish councillors for its parish wards.

#### **Other Submissions**

24 We received 14 submissions from local residents. Thirteen opposed the District Council's proposals and supported the proposals submitted by St Clement Parish Council. One local resident expressed concern about the internal arrangements of Cubert Parish Council.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

30 Since 1975 there has been a 16 per cent increase in the electorate of Carrick district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 6 per cent from 67,390 to 71,454 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Truro and Falmouth, although a significant amount is also expected in the more rural Kenwyn ward, particularly that part of the ward nearest to Truro. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

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

## **Council Size**

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

33 Carrick District Council presently has 45 members. The District Council proposed a council of 47 members representing nine three-member wards, nine two-member wards and two single-member wards. Two schemes were initially considered, one based on a council size of 38, the other on the current council size. The 38-member scheme was rejected because “some of the rural wards would be increased in size and lack a common community interest”. The Council decided to consult on a council size of 47, rather than 45, because the projected increases in the electorates in Truro and Falmouth would necessitate such an increase in the number of councillors if the current councillor:elector ratio of approximately 1:1500 were to be retained. The Council considered this ratio to be “fully justified in a predominantly rural area such as Carrick”. It further considered that retaining the current council size would “not facilitate a warding structure that achieved electoral equality or community identity within the Carrick district”.

34 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 47 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

35 We have given careful consideration to all the views which we have received during Stage One. In particular, we note that the District Council has consulted fully on its proposals and has received support from many of the parish councils in the district. We note also the cross-party support which has been given to the District Council’s proposals. We further note that Perranzabuloe and St Clement parish councils have submitted alternative proposals for their respective areas.

36 In view of the support given to large elements of the Council’s proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have based our recommendations on the District 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 bearing in mind local community identities and interests, we are moving away from the District Council’s proposals in two areas where we judge its scheme can be further improved upon. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Newlyn, Perranzabuloe and St Agnes wards;
- (b) Probus, Roseland and St Clement wards;
- (c) Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne wards;
- (d) Chacewater, Feock, Kea and Kenwyn wards;
- (e) Mylor and Penryn wards;
- (f) Arwenack, Penwerris, Smithick and Trevethan wards.

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.

## **Newlyn, Perranzabuloe and St Agnes wards**

37 These three coastal wards are situated on the north-western edge of the district. Perranzabuloe and St Agnes are three-member wards, while Newlyn is a single-member ward. The number of electors per councillor is 39 per cent above the district average (unchanged in 2006) in Newlyn ward, which comprises the parishes of Cubert and St Newlyn East; 5 per cent below (8 per cent below in 2006) in Perranzabuloe ward, which comprises the parish of Perranzabuloe, and 27 per cent above (25 per cent above in 2006) in St Agnes ward, which comprises the parish of St Agnes.

38 At Stage One the District Council proposed new warding arrangements for Newlyn and Perranzabuloe wards. It stated that as the existing over-represented Newlyn ward is located on the district border, adjacent to Restormel borough, “the options to make any major changes, without involving Perranzabuloe parish, are limited”. It therefore proposed a two-member Perranporth ward, comprising the Penhallow and Perranporth parish wards of Perranzabuloe parish. The District Council contended that it needed to ward St Newlyn East parish in the interest of electoral equality, and proposed creating two parish wards utilising “two long-standing polling districts representing the two separate communities that make up the parish”, namely St Newlyn East and Mitchell. The St Newlyn East parish ward of St Newlyn East parish would form part of a two-member Newlyn and Goonhavern ward, also comprising Cubert parish and the Goonhavern ward of Perranzabuloe parish. The District Council stated that the Goonhavern ward of Perranzabuloe parish is centred on the villages of Goonhavern and Rose, which “are both rural communities that probably have more in common with the parishes of St Newlyn East and Cubert, rather than the Perranporth ward of Perranzabuloe which is a popular seaside resort heavily involved in the tourist industry”. It proposed transferring the Mitchell parish ward of St Newlyn East parish to a new Carland ward, as detailed below.

39 The District Council noted that, although the size of the electorate of St Agnes ward entitles it to four councillors, it could not propose a four-member ward. As a consequence, it proposed that there should be two two-member district wards covering St Agnes parish, based on existing parish ward boundaries. The proposed St Agnes ward would comprise the parish wards of St Agnes and Mithian, while Mount Hawke ward would comprise the parish wards of Mount Hawke, Porthtowan and Blackwater. St Agnes Parish Council supported the District Council’s proposals for these wards.

40 Under the District Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the district average in Mount Hawke ward (5 per cent below in 2006), 5 per cent above in Newlyn & Goonhavern ward (1 per cent above in 2006), 11 per cent above in Perranporth ward (7 per cent above in 2006) and 3 per cent above in St Agnes ward (two per cent above in 2006).

41 Perranzabuloe Parish Council was opposed to the District Council’s proposals as they related to Perranzabuloe parish. It regarded the District Council’s comment that the villages of Goonhavern and Rose are predominantly rural communities as “absolute farce”, and stated

that they were “effectively suburban conurbations of Perranporth”. It pointed out that there were “in excess of ten touring and holiday parks, including Perran Sands, Cornwall’s largest holiday park” in Goonhavern parish ward. The parish council put forward alternative proposals for the area, which would entail dividing the area into two sections with one based predominantly on the coastal towns and villages, “all commonly affected by tourism and the seasonal aspects of this industry”, and the other comprising the predominantly rural communities. It proposed a Perranzabuloe ward, comprising Cubert parish and the Perranporth and Goonhavern wards of Perranzabuloe parish, and a Newlyn ward, comprising St Newlyn East, St Allen and St Erme parishes and the Penhallow ward of Perranzabuloe parish. Under Perranzabuloe Parish Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the district average in Newlyn ward (equal to the average in 2006) and 8 per cent above in Perranzabuloe ward (4 per cent above in 2006).

42 We have given careful consideration to all the representations received for this area. Having visited the area, we note that the views expressed by both the District Council and Perranzabuloe Parish Council concerning Goonhavern and Rose have some merit. The area is predominantly rural, and has a number of holiday parks. However, we concur with the District Council in its view that, although the area has holiday parks, it is predominantly rural and the main area for tourism is based on the coast at Perranporth. We have also noted that the boundary between Perranporth and Penhallow parish wards runs through the centre of the village of Bolingey, which would be divided between two district wards if we were to adopt the parish council’s proposed district ward boundary. We also understand that, in response to the District Council’s consultation procedure, Cubert Parish Council expressed a preference to remain linked with St Newlyn East parish and to being placed in the same district ward as the Goonhavern ward of Perranzabuloe parish, rather than being linked with a more urban area.

43 We also understand that, in response to the District Council’s consultation process, St Newlyn East Parish Council expressed opposition to the warding of the parish. However, it is our opinion that, as the existing Newlyn ward is at the northern extremity of the district, warding the parish in the way proposed by the District Council is necessary in order to achieve the best possible electoral equality. We note also that the District Council’s proposals for this area would secure satisfactory levels of electoral equality, while, we judge, providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. Therefore, we propose adopting the District Council’s proposals as our draft recommendations for these wards. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the district average in Mount Hawke ward (5 per cent below in 2006), 5 per cent above in Newlyn & Goonhavern ward (1 per cent above in 2006), 11 per cent above in Perranporth ward (7 per cent above in 2006) and 3 per cent above in St Agnes ward (2 per cent above in 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2, Map A2, Map A3 and the large map at the back of the report.

### **Probus, Roseland and St Clement wards**

44 These three rural wards are situated in the east of the district. Probus and Roseland are two-member wards, while St Clement is a single-member ward. The number of electors per councillor is 22 per cent above the district average (21 per cent above in 2006) in Probus ward, which comprises the parishes of Cuby, Ladock, Probus, Ruanlanihorne and Tregony; 11 per cent below (14 per cent below in 2006) in Roseland ward, which comprises the parishes of Gerrans, Pilleigh, St Just in Roseland and Veryan, and 54 per cent above (47 per cent

above in 2006) in St Clement ward, which comprises the parishes of St Allen, St Clement, St Erme and St Michael Penkevil.

45 At Stage One the District Council proposed modifying the boundaries of the under-represented Probus ward to create a three-member ward, comprising all the constituent parishes of the existing ward, except for Ruanlanihorne parish, which it proposed transferring to an enlarged two-member Roseland ward. In addition, the proposed Probus ward would include St Michael Penkivel parish and part of St Clement parish, the proposed Tresillian parish ward. The Council proposed creating two parish wards within St Clement parish, the Tresillian parish ward in the north and the Malpas & St Clement parish ward, which would comprise the polling districts of Malpas and St Clement village, in the south. In support of this proposal, the Council pointed out that Probus parish currently extends to the fringes of Tresillian village and that a few electors from Probus parish are allocated to vote there. The Council also proposed a new single-member Carland ward. This would comprise the parishes of St Allen and St Erme and the proposed Mitchell parish ward of St Newlyn East parish, three communities which “are adjacent to, and in close proximity of, each other”. It stated that Carland Cross, after which the ward would be named, would be the “central pivot” of the ward, less than two miles from each community. Under the District Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent below the district average (4 per cent below in 2006) in Carland ward, 1 per cent above (1 per cent below in 2006) in Probus ward and equal to the average (3 per cent below in 2006) in Roseland ward.

46 St Clement Parish Council was opposed to the District Council’s proposals to ward the parish, particularly relating to the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward. This is discussed in detail below. The parish council put forward alternative proposals for the area, which would enable the parish to remain unwarded, and which it considered to be “the most favourable solution”. It proposed a two-member Probus West ward, comprising the parishes of St Allen, St Clement, St Erme and Ladock, which it claimed would be served by two councillors with no conflicting interests. This would then necessitate a two-member Probus East ward, comprising the parishes of Cuby, Probus, Ruanlanihorne, St Michael Penkevil and Tregony. Under St Clement Parish Council’s proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the district average (8 per cent below in 2006) in Probus East ward and 14 per cent above (10 per cent above in 2006) in Probus West ward.

47 We understand that, in response to the District Council’s consultation procedure, St Allen and St Erme parish councils expressed support for the District Council’s proposed Carland ward, while Ladock Parish Council supported the District Council’s proposed Probus ward. In practice, St Clement Parish Council’s proposals would secure worse electoral equality than those of the District Council while, in our opinion, not providing a better reflection of community identities. In addition, the District Council proposed including the parish of Ruanlanihorne in its proposed Roseland ward, whereas St Clement Parish Council proposed placing it in Probus East ward, with the consequence that electoral equality in Roseland ward would worsen, becoming 10 per cent below the district average by 2006. We note that the District Council’s proposals would secure good levels of electoral equality in the area, while, we judge, providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. In the light of this, we propose adopting the District Council’s proposals as our draft recommendations for these wards.

48 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent below the district average (4 per cent below in 2006) in Carland ward, 1 per cent above (1 per cent below in 2006) in Probus ward and equal to the average (3 per cent below in 2006) in Roseland ward. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

### **Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne wards**

49 The district and parish boundaries of these four urban wards, which together form the city of Truro, are coterminous. Boscawen and Trehaverne wards are each represented by three members, while Moresk and Tregolls wards are each represented by two members. The number of electors per councillor is 13 per cent below the district average (10 per cent below in 2006) in Boscawen ward, 17 per cent below (3 per cent below in 2006) in Moresk ward, equal to the average (8 per cent above in 2006) in Tregolls ward and 12 per cent below (14 per cent below in 2006) in Trehaverne ward.

50 At Stage One the District Council proposed modifying all four wards in order to address their imbalances in electoral equality. It proposed modifying the boundary between the existing Trehaverne and Boscawen wards to follow the railway along the whole of the boundary by transferring the area west of the railway line centred on Dobbs Lane and Bosvean Gardens from Boscawen ward to a revised three-member Trehaverne ward. It also proposed transferring to its revised three-member Boscawen ward, from the existing Moresk ward, an area south of a line extending from the rear of Agar Road across to Paul's Terrace, contending that the electors in this area are close to the city centre with which they have a "greater affinity...than with more outer parts of Moresk ward". The Council also proposed transferring the Uplands area from the existing Tregolls ward to its revised two-member Moresk ward; in this way the whole of the boundary between the two wards would follow the A390.

51 The District Council further proposed modifying the eastern boundary of Tregolls ward by including within it part of the existing St Clement ward. As has been noted above, the Council proposed warding St Clement parish, with the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward, which comprises the polling districts of Malpas and St Clement village, becoming part of a revised two-member Tregolls ward. It considered that this part of St Clement parish was "virtually detached" from Tresillian, the main centre of population in the parish. It also stated that, as the only vehicular access to the two villages is through Tregolls ward, this was "a logical proposal". Under the District Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent below the district average (5 per cent below in 2006) in Boscawen ward, 9 per cent below (6 per cent above in 2006) in Moresk ward, 7 per cent below (2 per cent above in 2006) in Tregolls ward and 2 per cent above (1 per cent below in 2006) in Trehaverne ward.

52 St Clement Parish Council was opposed to the District Council's proposal to ward the parish and transfer part of it to Tregolls ward. It contended that the proposal "does not reflect the identities or the interests of our communities" and considered the District Council's argument concerning vehicular access to be a "flimsy pretext which local residents pour scorn on". The parish council stated that it was well served by councillors who understood their special interests and could "envisage a conflict were we to become part of Truro city". It enclosed a petition with 138 signatures in support of its views. The parish council proposed an alternative warding arrangement for the area, which has been described above.

53 We received 13 submissions from local residents who were also opposed to the District Council's proposals to transfer part of St Clement parish to Tregolls district ward. These put forward similar arguments to those of the parish council, emphasising the rural nature of the area and expressing concern that this would change should it become part of a city ward.

54 We have given careful consideration to all the representations received in relation to this area. We note the strength of feeling expressed by St Clement Parish Council and local residents and the concern that the District Council's proposals will have an adverse effect on the rural nature of the communities of Malpas and St Clement. However, having visited the area, we have noted that there is no road link between the villages and the rest of existing St Clement ward without going into Truro, and that the eastern part of the existing Tregolls ward is also of a rural nature. We note that the District Council's proposals for this part of Truro would achieve good electoral equality, and we judge that they would provide a satisfactory reflection of local community identities and secure convenient and effective local government. We therefore propose adopting the District Council's proposal for Tregolls ward as part of our draft recommendations. We also propose adopting the District Council's proposed Moresk ward as part of our draft recommendations as it would secure improved electoral equality while, in our opinion, reflecting community interests and identities.

55 However, we propose moving away from the District Council's proposals for the other two Truro wards. As a consequence of the proposal to transfer the proposed Gloweth parish ward of Kenwyn parish to Trehaverne ward, which is described below, we propose retaining the existing boundary between Trehaverne and Boscawen wards, in the interest of electoral equality, albeit with a small modification to include the whole of Merrifield Close in Trehaverne ward. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average (3 per cent above in 2006) in Boscawen ward, 9 per cent below (6 per cent above in 2006) in Moresk ward, 7 per cent below (2 per cent above in 2006) in Tregolls ward and 3 per cent above (7 per cent above in 2006) in Trehaverne ward. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

### **Chacewater, Feock, Kea and Kenwyn wards**

56 These four wards are situated in the western half of the district, the latter two bordering the city of Truro. Chacewater and Kea are single-member wards, while Feock and Kenwyn are two-member wards. The number of electors per councillor is 21 per cent below the district average (23 per cent below in 2006) in Chacewater ward, 1 per cent below (5 per cent below in 2006) in Feock ward, 20 per cent below (24 per cent below in 2006) in Kea ward and 21 per cent above (26 per cent above in 2006) in Kenwyn ward. All four district wards comprise the parishes of the same name.

57 At Stage One we received only one representation with regard to this area. The District Council proposed that Feock ward should be unchanged because of its good electoral equality. However, because of the high electoral variance in the other wards, the District Council proposed combining the existing three wards into two. It proposed enlarging the existing Kea ward by transferring to it part of the existing Chacewater ward. It regarded this as the "only feasible solution because of its location". It stated that the area of Chacewater parish in closest proximity to Kea is "clearly centred on the community of Twelveheads", and regarded the area as being some distance from Chacewater village and having "close affinity

with the areas of Baldhu and Bissoe, both of which are within the parish of Kea". It proposed creating a Twelveheads parish ward of Chacewater parish, utilising the boundaries of the existing polling district. The revised ward would return one member. The District Council further proposed creating a three-member Kenwyn & Chacewater ward by transferring the remainder of the existing Chacewater ward to the existing Kenwyn ward, as "there is an exceedingly strong case to combine these wards, which have close community links and are already incorporated within the same County Council electoral division". The proposed Chacewater parish ward of Chacewater parish would utilise the boundaries of the existing polling district. Under the District Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the district average (1 per cent below in 2006) in Feock ward, 7 per cent below (12 per cent below in 2006) in Kea ward and 9 per cent above (12 per cent above in 2006) in Kenwyn & Chacewater ward.

58 We have given careful consideration to the District Council's proposals for these wards. While we judge that the District Council's proposals would provide a satisfactory reflection of local community identities, we note that the projected elector:councillor ratio for 2006 in Kea and Kenwyn & Chacewater wards is over 10 per cent. Consequently, we do not propose adopting the District Council's proposals for this area, although we are adopting the District Council's proposed new parish warding arrangements for Chacewater parish. In order to improve electoral equality, we propose joining the existing district wards of Feock and Kea, and the proposed Twelveheads parish ward of Chacewater parish to create a three-member ward of Feock & Kea. We note that the A39 would provide a good link between the north and south of the proposed ward and that the parishes of Feock and Kea, being in the same County Council electoral division, already have close ties.

59 We also propose reducing the size of the electorate of the District Council's proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater ward by transferring part of Kenwyn parish to Trehaverne ward. In order to do this, we propose dividing the existing Chyvelah parish ward of Kenwyn parish into two parish wards, which would be based on the existing polling district boundaries. The proposed Threemilestone parish ward would comprise Kenwyn 1-T polling district, while the proposed Gloweth parish ward would comprise Kenwyn 2-T polling district. It is proposed that the existing Shortlanesend parish ward should be unchanged. We propose transferring the proposed Gloweth parish ward of Kenwyn parish to Trehaverne ward. The proposed Gloweth parish ward is linked with the existing Trehaverne ward by the A390 and contains Truro College and the Royal Cornwall Hospital (Treliske). As a consequence, the boundary between the existing Trehaverne and Boscawen wards would be modified, as described above.

60 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillors would be equal to the district average (5 per cent below in 2006) in the three-member Feock & Kea ward, comprising the parishes of Feock and Kea and the proposed Twelveheads parish ward of Chacewater parish, and 1 per cent below (5 per cent below in 2006) in the three-member Kenwyn & Chacewater ward, comprising the proposed Chacewater parish ward of Chacewater parish and the proposed Shortlanesend and Threemilestone parish wards of Kenwyn parish. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A4.

## **Mylor and Penryn wards**

61 These two three-member wards are situated towards the south of the district, west of Carrick Sounds and north of Falmouth. The number of electors per councillor is 1 per cent

below the district average (4 per cent below in 2006) in Mylor ward, which comprises the parishes of Gwennap, Mylor and Perranarworthal, and 3 per cent above (unchanged in 2006) in Penryn ward, which comprises the parish of Penryn.

62 At Stage One the District Council proposed that Mylor and Penryn wards should remain unchanged as this would secure satisfactory levels of electoral equality. Perranarworthal and Mylor parish councils supported the District Council's proposal with regard to Mylor ward. Under the District Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent above the district average (equal to the average in 2006) in Mylor ward and 7 per cent above (8 per cent above in 2006) in Penryn ward.

63 We note that the District Council's proposals would secure satisfactory electoral equality while, in our opinion, reflecting community interests and identities. In the light of this, and in response to the submissions we have received, we propose adopting the District Council's proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent above the district average (equal to the average in 2006) in Mylor ward and 7 per cent above (8 per cent above in 2006) in Penryn ward. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Arwenack, Penwerris, Smithick and Trevethan wards**

64 The district and town boundaries of these four urban wards, which together form the town of Falmouth, are coterminous. Penwerris, Smithick and Trevethan wards are each represented by three members, while Arwenack is a two-member ward. The number of electors per councillor is 9 per cent below (5 per cent below in 2006) in Arwenack ward, 9 per cent below (12 per cent below in 2006) in Penwerris ward, 14 per cent below (13 per cent below in 2006) in Smithick ward and 3 per cent above (equal to the average in 2006) in Trevethan ward.

65 At Stage One the District Council, with support from Falmouth Town Council, proposed modifying all four wards in order to address the imbalances in electoral equality between them. The District Council stated "it can be argued that the wards no longer reflect cohesive units centred on particular areas of the town, but merely mirror the manner in which development has now extended as far as the parish boundary". It proposed a revised three-member Penwerris ward, in the north-east of the town. Its western boundary would follow Dracaena Avenue southwards from the district and parish boundary to its junction with the southern boundary, which would run down the west side of Killigrew Villas before running eastwards along the backs of properties between Killigrew Street and Albany Place and then running along New Windsor Terrace, Windsor Terrace and Wellington Terrace. It would then follow the rear of properties in Vernon Place and Killigrew Street again before joining the existing ward boundary at Prince of Wales Pier. The District Council also proposed a new two-member Trescobeas ward in the north-west of Falmouth. The eastern boundary would be Dracaena Avenue, while its southern boundary would run along Trevenger Road and Penmere Hill to the railway line. The western boundary would follow the railway line northwards before running behind properties at the end of Duncannon Drive. It would then follow the route of the stream through Tregoniggie Fields to the point where it meets Bickland Hill, which it would cross to meet the district and parish boundary, which would form the rest of the ward boundary.

66 The District Council also proposed a new three-member Boslowick ward, generally covering the south-west of the town. Its boundary would follow the western boundary of Trescobeas ward, then continue along the railway line in a south-easterly direction before turning south to follow the boundary between the existing Smithick and Arwenack wards. The Council proposed that the part of the existing Arwenack ward to the south of the existing Smithick ward should be transferred to the proposed Boslowick ward. In the south-east of the town, the Council further proposed a revised three-member Arwenack ward, which would include the existing ward, less the part to be transferred to Boslowick ward, and part of the existing Smithick ward, and would border the other three proposed wards. Under the District Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average (4 per cent above in 2006) in Arwenack ward, 9 per cent below (7 per cent below in 2006) in Boslowick ward, 4 per cent below (7 per cent below in 2006) in Penwerris ward and 1 per cent above (3 per cent below in 2006) in Trescobeas ward.

67 We note that the District Council's proposals would secure satisfactory electoral equality while, in our opinion, reflecting community interests and identities. We note too the support from Falmouth Town Council. In the light of this, we are adopting the District Council's proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the district average (4 per cent above in 2006) in Arwenack ward, 9 per cent below (7 per cent below in 2006) in Boslowick ward, 4 per cent below (7 per cent below in 2006) in Penwerris ward and 1 per cent above (3 per cent below in 2006) in Trescobeas ward. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

68 At Stage One we did not receive any comments relating to the electoral cycle of the district. We therefore make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

## **Conclusions**

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

- there should be an increase in council size from 45 to 47;
- there should be 19 wards;
- the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

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

- we propose creating a three-member ward of Feock & Key, comprising the parishes of Feock and Kea and the proposed Twelveheads parish ward of Kenwyn parish;
- we propose modifying the boundary of the District Council’s Kenwyn & Chacewater ward by transferring to Trehaverne ward the proposed Gloweth parish ward of Kenwyn parish;
- we propose retaining the existing boundary between Boscawen and Trehaverne wards, albeit with a minor boundary modification to include the whole of Merrifield Close in Trehaverne ward.

71 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	45	47	45	47
Number of wards	20	19	20	19
Average number of electors per councillor	1,498	1,434	1,588	1,520
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	12	1	11	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	6	0	7	0

72 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Carrick District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 12 to one. By 2006 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 Carrick District Council should comprise 47 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

## Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

73 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Chacewater, Falmouth, Kenwyn, St Newlyn East, St Clement and Truro to reflect the proposed district wards.

74 The parish of Chacewater is currently served by 12 councillors and is not warded. In the light of our draft recommendations for district wards in this area we are proposing to create two parish wards, Chacewater and Twelveheads, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We propose that Chacewater parish ward should be represented by ten councillors and Twelveheads parish ward should be represented by two councillors.

### **Draft Recommendation**

Chacewater Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chacewater (returning ten councillors) and Twelveheads (returning two councillors). The parish ward boundary should reflect the proposed district ward boundary in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A4 in Appendix A.

75 The town of Falmouth is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Arwenack, Penwerris, Smithick and Trevethan, each represented by four councillors. In the light of our draft recommendations for district wards in this area we are proposing to create four town wards, Arwenack, Boslowick, Penwerris and Trescobeas, to reflect the proposed district ward boundaries. We note that in response to the Council's Stage One consultation, Falmouth Town Council supported the District Council's proposals and stated that it "would like the total number of town councillors to remain 16". However, it went on to say "if there is any adjustment between the Arwenack and Penwerris wards to achieve almost identical sized wards, the town council would favour the number of town councillors being increased to 17 in order to achieve more accurate proportionality of representation". In our proposed district wards, it is Boslowick and Penwerris wards which are forecast to have a similar electorate size by 2006. In the light of this and the town council's comments, we propose that Arwenack ward should be represented by five councillors, Boslowick and Penwerris wards each by four councillors and Trescobeas ward by three councillors.

### **Draft Recommendation**

Falmouth Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Arwenack (returning five councillors), Boslowick (four), Penwerris (four) and Trescobeas (three). The boundaries between the four town wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

76 The parish of Kenwyn is currently served by 14 councillors, representing two wards: Chyvelah and Shortlanesend, each represented by seven councillors. In the light of our draft recommendations for district wards in this area we are proposing to retain the existing Shortlanesend parish ward. We further propose dividing Chyvelah parish ward into two, thus creating the parish wards of Gloweth and Threemilestone, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We propose that Gloweth parish ward should be represented by three councillors, Shortlanesend parish ward by three councillors and Threemilestone parish ward by eight councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Kenwyn Parish Council should comprise 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Gloweth (returning three councillors), Shortlanesend (three) and Threemilestone (eight). The boundaries between the three parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

77 The parish of St Clement is currently served by seven councillors, and is not warded. In the light of our draft recommendations for district wards in this area we are proposing to create two parish wards, Malpas & St Clement and Tresillian, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We propose that Malpas & St Clement parish ward should be represented by two councillors and Tresillian parish ward should be represented by five councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
St Clement Parish Council should comprise seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Malpas & St Clement (returning two councillors) and Tresillian (returning five councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

78 The parish of St Newlyn East is currently served by 11 councillors, and is not warded. In the light of our draft recommendations for district wards in this area we are proposing to create two parish wards, St Newlyn East and Mitchell, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We propose that St Newlyn East parish ward should be represented by nine councillors and Mitchell parish ward should be represented by two councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
St Newlyn East Parish Council should comprise 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: St Newlyn East (returning nine councillors) and Mitchell (two). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

79 The city of Truro is currently served by 24 councillors, representing four wards; Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne. In the light of our draft recommendations for

district wards in this area we are proposing to modify the boundaries between the four city wards to reflect the proposed district ward boundaries. We propose that the revised Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne city wards should each continue to be represented by six councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**

Truro City Council should comprise 24 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne, each returning six councillors. The boundaries between the four city wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

80 The parish of Kea is currently served by 12 councillors, representing two wards: Baldhu and Kea, represented by five and seven councillors respectively. In agreement with the District Council, Kea Parish Council proposed that Baldhu parish ward should be served by four councillors, instead of the current five, and that Kea parish ward should be served by eight councillors, instead of the current seven. The overall number of parish councillors would be unchanged.

**Draft Recommendation**

Kea Parish Council should comprise 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Baldhu (returning four councillors) and Kea (returning eight councillors).

81 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 district ward of which they are part.

*Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Carrick*



## 5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

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

83 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Carrick 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](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

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



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for Carrick: Detailed Mapping**

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

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on Maps A2 – A4 and the large map at the back of this report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed warding of St Newlyn East parish.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed boundary between Mount Hawke and St Agnes district wards.

**Map A4** illustrates the proposed warding of Chacewater parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Falmouth and Truro, including the proposed warding of the parishes of Kenwyn and St Clement, and the proposed boundary between Newlyn & Goonhavern and Perranporth district wards.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Carrick: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of St Newlyn East Parish*

*Map A3: Proposed Boundary between Mount Hawke and St Agnes Wards*

*Map A4: Proposed Warding of Chacewater Parish*



## 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](http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm), requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Local Government Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

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

*Table B1: LGCE compliance with Code criteria*

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