

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Restormel

Report to the Electoral Commission

*June 2002*

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report No: 286

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	13
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	19
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	21
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	23
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	35
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Restormel: Detailed Mapping	37
A large map illustrating the proposed warding arrangements for Newquay, St Austell and St Columb.	



## WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

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



## SUMMARY

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

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

The LGCE found that the existing 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;**
- **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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 76-77) 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 would the number of electors per councillor vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast 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 council electoral arrangements which provide for:

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

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

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

*Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary*

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
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	Gover	2	St Mewan ward (part); Poltair ward (part); Trevarna ward (part); part of Treverbyn parish (the proposed Trethewel parish ward)	Large map
8	Lostwithiel	2	<i>Unchanged</i> (the parishes of Lanlivery, Lostwithiel and Luxulyan)	Map 2
9	Mevagissey	2	The parishes of Mevagissey, St Goran and St Michael Caerhays; St Ewe ward (part)	Maps 2 and A3
10	Mount Charles	3	Crinnis ward (part); Poltair ward (part); Trevarna ward (part)	Large map
11	Poltair	2	Poltair ward (part); Trevarna ward (part); part of Treverbyn parish (the proposed Carclaze parish ward)	Large map
12	Rialton	3	Part of Newquay parish (the proposed Rialton parish ward); the parish of Colan	Map 2
13	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
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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
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
18	St Stephen	3	Part of St Mewan parish (the proposed Trewoon parish ward); part of Stephen-In-Brannel parish (the proposed St Stephen-In-Brannel parish ward)	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 and Maps A1, A2, A3 and the large map in the back of the report, illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Table 2: Final 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	5,054	1,685	-3
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 & 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	Gover	2	3,359	1,680	4	3,451	1,726	0
8	Lostwithiel	2	3,470	1,735	8	3,569	1,785	3
9	Mevagissey	2	3,185	1,593	-1	3,274	1,637	-6
10	Mount Charles	3	4,558	1,519	-6	5,229	1,743	1
11	Poltair	2	2,975	1,488	-8	3,464	1,732	0
12	Rialton	3	4,809	1,603	-1	5,398	1,799	4
13	Rock	3	4,533	1,511	-6	4,732	1,574	-9
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	3	5,278	1,759	9	5,464	1,821	5
19	Treverbyn	2	3,416	1,708	6	3,813	1,907	10
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>75,595</b>	-	-	<b>77,977</b>	-	-
	<b>Averages</b>	-	-	<b>1,613</b>	-	-	<b>1,733</b>	-

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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Restormel. Restormel's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 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 later this year.

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

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

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Restormel was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fifth edition published in October 2001). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

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

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

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

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 12 June 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Restormel Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Cornwall County Council, Cornwall Police Authority, the local authority associations, Cornwall Association of Parish & Town Councils, parish and town councils in the borough, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage

One, was 3 September 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 27 November 2001 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Restormel*, and ended on 28 January 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and other interested parties on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we considered the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

## **2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS**

10 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.

11 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.

12 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'.

13 The electorate of the borough is 75,595 (February 2001). The Council presently has 44 members who are elected from 18 wards, four of which are relatively urban in Crinnis, Edgcumbe, 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.

14 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 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	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 Ender	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
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>75,595</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>77,977</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,650</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,772</b>	<b>-</b>

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 borough. 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 significantly under-represented by 28 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

15 During Stage One 12 representations were received, including a borough-wide scheme from Restormel Borough Council, and representations from four parish councils, five borough councillors and two local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions that were set out in a report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Restormel*.

16 The draft recommendations were based on the Borough Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a pattern of single and multi-member wards. However, it moved away from the Borough Council's scheme in a number of areas, affecting seven wards. It proposed that:

- Restormel Borough Council should be served by 45 councillors, compared with the current 44, representing 19 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, while two wards should retain their existing boundaries;

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Restormel Borough Council should comprise 45 councillors, serving 19 wards. The Council should continue to hold whole council elections every four years.

17 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in none of the 19 wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2006.



## **4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION**

18 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 31 representations from 26 respondents. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Restormel Borough Council.

### **Restormel Borough Council**

19 The Borough Council supported the draft recommendations but proposed modifications in five areas. It proposed a modified one-member Fowey ward and the creation of a new two-member Rashleigh ward. It also proposed minor boundary modifications for both Mount Charles ward and St Stephen-In-Brannel ward, in addition to ward name changes for St Stephen-In-Brannel ward and St Austell West ward.

### **Cornwall County Council**

20 The County Council questioned the proposed boundary between the proposed wards of St Columb Major and St Enoder.

### **Political Groups**

21 The Truro and St Austell Liberal Democrats supported the Borough Council's Stage Three proposals for the Fowey and Tywardreath area.

### **Parish Councils**

22 Mevagissey Parish Council, Newquay Town Council and Roche Parish Council all supported the draft recommendations.

23 Fowey Town Council, St Blaise Parish Council and St Sampson Parish Council all opposed the draft recommendations for the Fowey and Tywardreath area for community identity reasons. St Stephen-In-Brannel Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations for its parish for community identity reasons, while Treverbyn Parish Council also opposed the draft recommendations.

### **Other Representations**

24 A further 21 representations from 18 respondents were received in response to the draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations, councillors and residents.

25 The ABC Residents Association opposed the draft recommendations for St Austell, while Pentewan Residents Association were concerned at not being consulted during Stage One. Port Fowey Chamber of Commerce opposed the draft recommendations for Fowey and Tywardreath for community identity reasons. Councillor Brown supported the draft recommendations but proposed alternative ward names for Bethel ward, Edgcumbe North ward and Edgcumbe South ward. Councillor Boosey opposed both the draft recommendations and the Borough Council's Stage Three submission for Fowey parish, while Councillors Carter, Foster, Ryde and Wellman also opposed the draft recommendations for this area for community identity reasons. Councillor Wellman further questioned the Borough Council's electorate projections for Fowey. Councillor Budge generally supported the draft recommendations but opposed the proposed St Stephen-In-Brannel ward for community identity reasons. Ten local residents also opposed the draft recommendations for the Fowey and Tywardreath area.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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 within the next five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

30 Since 1975 there has been a 30 per cent increase in the electorate of Restormel borough. At Stage One the Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately seven per cent from 75,595 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. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

31 During Stage Three a number of respondents expressed concern that so-called ‘holiday/second homes’ and the extra workload they present to councillors, were not accounted for as part of the review process. While we acknowledge the difficulties that they may present, as stated in the *Guidance*, we cannot provide for over-representation on the grounds of extra workload for councillors. Nor can we take into account the issue of second homes, and can only use the current and projected electorate as a basis for our recommendations. Consequently we remain satisfied that the Borough Council’s electorate forecasts represent the best estimates currently available.

## **Council Size**

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

33 During Stage One the Borough Council proposed maintaining the current council size of 44 members and allocated 10 councillors to the St Austell area. However, the LGCE noted that under a 44-member council, the St Austell area would be allocated one less councillor than it merited. To achieve a fair balance of representation for the St Austell area, the LGCE proposed an additional councillor for the proposed Bethel ward.

34 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE, having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 45 members.

35 During Stage Three the Borough Council supported the proposed 45-member council size. Given that no further representations were received, we are confirming this recommendation as final.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

36 As set out in the draft recommendations report, the LGCE carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the borough-wide scheme from the Borough Council. In view of the degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council's proposals, it was concluded that the draft recommendations should be based on the Borough Council's scheme. However, in order to put forward electoral arrangements which would achieve even better electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria, the LGCE proposed moving away from the Council's proposals with regards to the proposed wards of Bethel, Crinnis, Edgumbe South, Gannel, Mount Charles, Poltair and St Austell West.

37 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations report, the Borough Council and a number of respondents expressed the view that the proposed Fowey & Tywardreath ward did not respect community identity and was an unacceptable proposal.

38 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- a) The North-West area – Edgumbe, 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.

39 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, 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**

40 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).

41 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).

42 At Stage One 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. 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. The Council also 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 two-member St Enoder ward, and St Wenn parish, whose electors would transfer to a modified Rock ward.

43 After careful consideration the LGCE adopted the Borough Council's proposals for this area as part of its 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 the LGCE proposed extending the boundary to meet the existing Colan parish boundary.

44 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be in both Edgcumbe North ward and Edgcumbe South ward 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).

45 At Stage Three both the Borough Council and Newquay Town Council supported the draft recommendations for this area. No other representations were received.

46 Given the level of support the draft recommendations for this area received during Stage Three, we have decided to confirm them as final. The levels of electoral equality would remain the same as under the draft recommendations. Details of our recommendations for these wards can be found 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**

47 These four wards are centred on 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).

48 At Stage One 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. 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. The southern part of St Mewan ward, namely those electors in and around the villages of Polgooth and Sticker would also be parish warded and included in a modified St Ewe ward. The Council proposed that St Mewan ward be further divided and cease to exist, with the unparished area north of the A390 road forming part of the proposed St Austell West ward. The remaining southern part of the existing St Mewan ward would form part of a modified St Ewe ward.

49 The Borough Council also proposed at Stage One that the current Treverbyn ward be modified. It proposed that the new two-member St Austell West ward 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 would form part of the new warding arrangements for St Austell, would form the proposed Treverbyn parish ward in a rural two-member Treverbyn ward.

50 After careful consideration the LGCE adopted the Borough Council's proposals for this area as part of the draft recommendations, except for some minor amendments to the proposed boundary between the modified Treverbyn ward and St Austell.

51 Under the draft recommendations 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 above the borough average in Treverbyn ward (10 per cent by 2006).

52 At Stage Three the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations but proposed a minor modification to the proposed boundary between Rock ward and St Stephen-In-Brannel ward, drawing it a little further south to apply it to firmer ground detail. It also proposed that St Stephen-In-Brannel ward be renamed St Stephen ward. Roche Parish Council also supported the draft recommendations. Treverbyn Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations and proposed no change to the current arrangements, as did St Stephen-In-Brannel Parish Council. Councillor Budge also opposed the draft recommendations for this area and proposed that the whole of St Mewan parish be placed in a modified St Ewe ward.

53 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We concur with the Borough Council that St Stephen-In-Brannel ward should be renamed St Stephen ward and that its proposed boundary with Rock ward should be slightly modified to enhance its identification. We have noted Councillor Budge's concern but as no evidence was

presented in support of his proposal we have not been persuaded to adopt this proposal as part of our final recommendations. We have also noted the concerns of both St Stephen-In-Brannel Parish Council and Treverbyn Parish Council, but we cannot view an area in isolation and cannot preserve the status quo as it would not provide for reasonable electoral equality.

54 Given the level of support the draft recommendations received during Stage Three, we have decided to confirm them as final. However, we have decided to rename St Stephen-In-Brannel ward as St Stephen ward. The levels of electoral equality would remain the same as under the draft recommendations. Details of our recommendations for these wards can be found on Map 2 and 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**

55 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).

56 At Stage One the Borough Council 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. 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 Trethewel. It would also include part of the existing Poltair ward, and part of 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 part of the existing Crinnis ward. Mount Charles ward would also comprise part of the existing Poltair ward. Its southern boundary with the modified St Ewe ward would follow Sawles Road.

57 The Borough Council, as mentioned previously, only allocated the St Austell area ten councillors, resulting in a consequentially high level of under-representation. Although 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, the LGCE concluded that the St Austell area, in particular, and the borough in general, would be entitled to an additional councillor.

58 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 the draft recommendations for St Austell on the Council's proposals, the LGCE proposed slightly moving away from them in Bethel ward, Crinnis ward, Mount Charles ward, Poltair ward and St Austell West ward.

59 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Bethel ward would be 7 per cent below the borough average (2 per cent by 2006), Crinnis ward would be 6 per cent below the borough average (1 per cent by 2006), Mount Charles ward would be 6 per cent below the borough average (equal to the average by 2006), Poltair ward would be 8 per cent below the borough average (equal to the average the average by 2006) and St Austell West ward would be 4 per cent above the borough average (equal to the average by 2006).

60 At Stage Three the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations but proposed a minor boundary modification and ward name change. It proposed that the boundary between the wards of Bethel and Mount Charles be modified slightly so that those electors in the Holmbush area, approximately 36, transfer from Mount Charles ward to Bethel ward to enhance community identity. It also proposed that St Austell West ward be renamed Gover ward to reflect local community identity. Councillor Brown proposed that Bethel ward be renamed Bethel and Boscoppa ward, and that the boundary between Mount Charles ward and Bethel ward be modified slightly. The ABC Residents Association and one local resident opposed the draft recommendations for community identity reasons.

61 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period. We concur with both of the Borough Council proposals to modify the boundary between Bethel ward and Mount Charles ward, and to rename St Austell West ward as Gover ward and we have adopted them as part of our final recommendations. However, we have not adopted Councillor Brown's proposed ward name change as we were not persuaded that it would receive local support.

62 Given the level of support the draft recommendations received during Stage Three, we have decided to confirm them as final, but, as stated above, subject to renaming St Austell West ward as Gover ward and the adoption of the Borough Council's boundary modification. The levels of electoral equality would remain the same as under the draft recommendations for the wards of Crinnis, Gover and Poltair. However, due to our minor modifications the number of electors per councillor in Bethel ward would be 7 per cent below the borough average (3 per cent by 2006) and 6 per cent below the borough average in Mount Charles ward (1 per cent above by 2006). Details of our recommendations for these wards can be found on Map 2 and the large map inserted in the back of this report.

## **The Southern Rural Area**

### **Mevagissey and St Ewe wards**

63 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 an unparished area of St Austell. It is currently over-represented, with an electoral variance of 20 per cent (21 per cent by 2006).

64 At Stage One 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. It also proposed that the two-member St Ewe ward's northern boundary be extended to include the southern part of the existing St Mewan ward, thereby creating the proposed parish ward of Polgooth & Sticker.

65 After careful consideration the LGCE adopted the Borough Council's proposals for this area as part of its draft recommendations. Under the draft recommendations 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).

66 At Stage Three both the Borough Council and Mevagissey Parish Council supported the draft recommendations. No other representations were received.

67 Given the level of support the draft recommendations received during Stage Three, we have decided to confirm them as final. The levels of electoral equality would remain the same as under the draft recommendations. Details of our recommendations for these wards can be found on Map 2 and Map A3 in Appendix A.

## **The Eastern Rural and Coastal Area**

### **Fowey, Lostwithiel, St Blaise and Tywardreath wards**

68 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).

69 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed no change to the existing Lostwithiel ward and existing St Blaise ward. 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.

70 After careful consideration of all the representations received, the LGCE adopted as part of its draft recommendations 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. The LGCE noted the opposition to a possible combination of the existing Fowey and Tywardreath wards into a single ward. However, it was presented with the choice of retaining the status quo or parish warding the area, neither of which would have significantly improved electoral equality or enhanced community identity. Having visited the area it was not convinced that combining the two wards would be detrimental to the maintenance of effective and convenient local government or to community identity. The LGCE therefore proposed that Fowey ward be combined with Tywardreath ward in a new three-member Fowey & Tywardreath ward.

71 Under the draft recommendations 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).

72 At Stage Three the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations for the wards of St Blaise and Lostwithiel. However, it opposed the proposed Fowey & Tywardreath ward, as it did not reflect community identity. The Council proposed instead a modified one-member Fowey ward for the urban area of Fowey town and a two-member Rashleigh ward comprising the rural part of Fowey parish, St Sampson parish and Tywardreath parish. This would necessitate the parish warding of Fowey parish and would result in an electoral variance for Fowey ward equal to the borough average by 2006 and 12 per cent by 2006 for Rashleigh ward. Fowey Parish Council and St Sampson Parish Council both opposed the draft recommendations, as did Councillors Boosey and Wellman. Ten local residents also opposed the draft recommendations on the grounds of community identity.

73 We have noted the opposition to the draft recommendations for this area and acknowledge the concern expressed at our proposal to combine the parishes of Fowey, St Sampson and

Tywardreath in a single district ward. However, the status quo could not remain unaltered given the considerable current level of electoral inequality in this area. We have not been persuaded by the evidence provided that the Borough Council's Stage Three submission offers a better alternative to the draft recommendations as it neither improves electoral equality, better reflects community identity, nor has it been significantly consulted on. Furthermore, as stated above, it would involve the parish warding of Fowey parish. We have not been persuaded that such a change would either improve electoral equality or enhance community identity.

74 Given that we have not been persuaded to change the draft recommendations, we confirm them as final. The levels of electoral equality would remain the same as under the draft recommendations. Details of our recommendations for these wards can be found on Map 2.

## **Electoral Cycle**

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

## **Conclusions**

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

- St Austell West ward should be renamed Gover ward;
- St Stephen-In-Brannel ward should be renamed St Stephen ward;
- the boundaries of Mount Charles ward and St Stephen ward should be modified.

77 We conclude that, in Restormel:

- there should be a increase in council size from 44 to 45;
- there should be 19 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	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

79 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from seven to none, with no wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the borough average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

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

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

80 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards, it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. In the LGCE’s draft recommendations report it proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for the parishes of Newquay, St Columb, St Mewan, St Stephen-In-Brannel and Treverbyn to reflect the proposed borough wards.

81 As part of the draft recommendations the LGCE proposed that Newquay Town Council comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards, an increase of one: Edgcumbe North ward (returning four councillors); Edgcumbe South ward (returning four councillors); Gannel ward (returning six councillors) and Rialton ward (returning six councillors). In response to the consultation report both the Borough Council and Newquay Town Council supported the draft recommendations for parishing arrangements for Newquay parish. No other representations were received.

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

**Final Recommendation**

Newquay Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Edgcumbe North ward (returning four councillors), Edgcumbe South ward (returning four councillors), Gannel ward (returning six councillors) and Rialton ward (returning six councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

83 As part of the draft recommendations the LGCE proposed that St Columb Major Town Council comprise 14 councillors, an increase of two, representing three wards, as at present; North ward (returning two councillors); South ward (returning three councillors) and Town ward (returning nine councillors). In response to the consultation report the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations for parishing arrangements for St Columb Major parish. No other representations were received.

84 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding St Columb Major parish as final.

**Final 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 borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

85 As part of the draft recommendations the LGCE recommended the parish warding of St Mewan parish to accommodate its borough ward proposals while retaining the current number of 13 councillors. It proposed the creation of Trewoon parish ward (returning four councillors) and the creation of Polgooth & Sticker ward (returning nine councillors) to reflect the proposals at borough ward level. In response to the consultation report the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations for parishing arrangements for St Mewan parish.

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

**Final Recommendation**

St Mewan Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Trewoon ward (returning four councillors) and Polgooth & Sticker ward (returning nine councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

87 As part of the draft recommendations the LGCE recommended the parish warding of St Stephen-In-Brannel parish to accommodate our borough ward proposals while retaining the current number of 15 councillors. It proposed the creation of St Stephen-In-Brannel parish ward (returning 14 councillors) and the creation of Whitemoor parish ward (returning one councillor) to reflect our proposals at borough ward level. In response to the consultation report

the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations for parishing arrangements for St Stephen-In-Brannel parish, but proposed, as described earlier, that the proposed Whitemoor parish ward should have its boundary extended southwards to remain contiguous with the proposed St Stephen borough ward. St Stephen-In-Brannel Parish Council expressed concern at our draft proposals and questioned the electorate projections for the parish. However, detailed evidence was not submitted in support and we have not been persuaded to alter the draft recommendations in this instance.

88 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm, with one minor modification, the draft recommendation for warding St Stephen-In-Brannel parish as final.

**Final Recommendation**  
St Stephen-In-Brannel Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: St Stephen-In-Brannel ward (returning 14 councillors) and Whitemoor ward (returning one councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

89 As part of the draft recommendations the LGCE recommended the parish warding of Treverbyn parish to accommodate our borough ward proposals while retaining the current number of 15 councillors. It proposed the creation of Boscoppa parish ward (returning two councillors), Carclaze parish ward (returning two councillors), Treverbyn ward (returning 10 councillors) and Trethowel ward (returning one councillor). In response to the consultation report the Borough Council supported the draft recommendations for parishing arrangements for Treverbyn parish. Treverbyn Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations but proposed no alternative arrangements. No other representations were received.

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

**Final Recommendation**  
Treverbyn Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Boscoppa ward (returning two councillors), Carclaze ward (returning two councillors), Treverbyn ward (returning 10 councillors) and Trethowel ward (returning one councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted in the back of this report.

*Map 2: Final Recommendations for Restormel*

## 6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

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

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

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

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



## APPENDIX A

### **Final Recommendations for 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 proposed warding arrangements for Newquay, St Austell and St Columb.

*Map A1: Final 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*