

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for the
City of Plymouth

May 2001

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, and the number of councillors and ward names.

© Crown Copyright 2001

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper. ♻️

CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|-----------|
| SUMMARY | <i>v</i> |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | <i>1</i> |
| 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS | <i>5</i> |
| 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED | <i>9</i> |
| 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS | <i>11</i> |
| 5 NEXT STEPS | <i>31</i> |
| | |
| APPENDICES | |
| A Draft Recommendations for Plymouth: Detailed Mapping | <i>33</i> |
| B Proposed Electoral Arrangements from: – Plymouth City Council – Plymouth Unitary Labour Party | <i>39</i> |
| C The Statutory Provisions | <i>43</i> |
| D Code of Practice on Written Consultation | <i>47</i> |

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Plymouth city centre is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Plymouth on 28 November 2000.

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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Plymouth:

- **in 10 of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city, and two wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2005 this unequal representation is not expected to improve, 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 three wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 94 – 95) are that:

- **Plymouth City Council should have 57 councillors, three fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 20 wards, as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified;**
- **whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each city councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In all of the proposed 20 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the city average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all 20 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the city in 2005.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 15 May 2001. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. 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 and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 9 July 2001:

**Review Manager
Plymouth 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
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Constituent areas | Map reference |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1 Budshead | 3 | Budshead ward (part); Estover ward (part); Southway ward (part) | Maps A2, A3 and Large map |
| 2 Compton | 3 | Compton ward (part); Drake ward (part); Efford ward (part); Mount Gould ward (part) | Large map |
| 3 Devonport | 3 | Keyham ward (part); St Peter ward (part); Stoke ward (part) | Large map |
| 4 Drake | 2 | Drake ward (part); Mount Gould ward (part) | Large map |
| 5 Efford & Lipson | 3 | Efford ward (part); Mount Gould ward (part) | Large map |
| 6 Egguckland | 3 | Egguckland ward (part); Honicknowle ward (part) | Large map |
| 7 Ham | 3 | Ham ward (part); Trelawny ward (part) | Large map |
| 8 Honicknowle | 3 | Budshead ward (part); Honicknowle ward (part) | Large map |
| 9 Moor View | 3 | Egguckland ward (part); Estover ward (part) | Map A3 and Large map |
| 10 Peverell | 3 | Compton ward (part); Drake ward (part); Trelawny ward (part) | Large map |
| 11 Plympton Chaddlewood | 2 | Plympton Erle ward (part); Plympton St Mary ward (part) | Map A4 |
| 12 Plympton Erle | 2 | Plympton Erle ward (part) | Maps 2 and A4 |
| 13 Plympton St Mary | 3 | Plympton Erle ward (part); Plympton St Mary ward (part) | Maps 2 and A4 |
| 14 Plymstock Dunstone | 3 | Plymstock Dunstone ward (part) | Maps 2 and A5 |
| 15 Plymstock Radford | 3 | Plymstock Dunstone ward (part); Plymstock Radford ward | Maps 2 and A5 |
| 16 St Budeaux | 3 | Ham ward (part); St Budeaux ward | Large map |
| 17 Southway | 3 | Southway ward (part) | Maps A2, A3 and Large map |
| 18 Stoke | 3 | Drake ward (part); Keyham ward (part); St Peter ward (part); Stoke ward (part) | Large map |

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Constituent areas | Map reference |
|----|----------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 19 | Sutton & Mount Gould | 3 | Mount Gould ward (part); Sutton ward (part) | Large map |
| 20 | Waterfront | 3 | St Peter ward (part); Sutton ward (part) | Large map |

Notes: 1 The city contains no parishes.

2 Map 2 and Appendix A, including the large map in the back of the report, illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

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.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Plymouth

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Budshead | 3 | 9,974 | 3,325 | 2 | 10,128 | 3,376 | 2 |
| 2 Compton | 3 | 9,625 | 3,208 | -1 | 9,735 | 3,245 | -2 |
| 3 Devonport | 3 | 9,777 | 3,259 | 0 | 9,818 | 3,273 | -1 |
| 4 Drake | 2 | 6,381 | 3,191 | -2 | 6,544 | 3,272 | -1 |
| 5 Efford & Lipson | 3 | 9,905 | 3,302 | 2 | 10,009 | 3,336 | 1 |
| 6 Eggbuckland | 3 | 9,608 | 3,203 | -1 | 10,211 | 3,404 | 3 |
| 7 Ham | 3 | 9,890 | 3,297 | 1 | 9,933 | 3,311 | 0 |
| 8 Honicknowle | 3 | 10,458 | 3,486 | 7 | 10,458 | 3,486 | 5 |
| 9 Moor View | 3 | 9,823 | 3,274 | 1 | 10,137 | 3,379 | 2 |
| 10 Peverell | 3 | 9,783 | 3,261 | 0 | 9,783 | 3,261 | -2 |
| 11 Plympton Chaddlewood | 2 | 6,624 | 3,312 | 2 | 6,627 | 3,314 | 0 |
| 12 Plympton Erle | 2 | 6,600 | 3,300 | 2 | 6,685 | 3,343 | 1 |
| 13 Plympton St Mary | 3 | 9,891 | 3,297 | 1 | 10,012 | 3,337 | 1 |
| 14 Plymstock Dunstone | 3 | 10,153 | 3,384 | 4 | 10,220 | 3,407 | 3 |
| 15 Plymstock Radford | 3 | 9,265 | 3,088 | -5 | 9,605 | 3,202 | -3 |
| 16 St Budeaux | 3 | 9,655 | 3,218 | -1 | 9,800 | 3,267 | -1 |
| 17 Southway | 3 | 9,617 | 3,206 | -1 | 9,715 | 3,238 | -2 |
| 18 Stoke | 3 | 9,615 | 3,205 | -1 | 9,705 | 3,235 | -2 |
| 19 Sutton & Mount Gould | 3 | 9,517 | 3,172 | -2 | 9,979 | 3,326 | 0 |
| 20 Waterfront | 3 | 9,125 | 3,042 | -6 | 9,810 | 3,270 | -1 |
| Totals | 57 | 185,286 | - | - | 188,914 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 3,251 | - | - | 3,314 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Plymouth City Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. 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 draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the City of Plymouth on which we are now consulting. We reviewed the district of South Hams in 1997 and the seven districts in Devon in 1999. We are currently reviewing the unitary authorities of Plymouth and Torbay as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Plymouth. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1978 (Report No. 294). We undertook a structural review of local government in Devon in 1994, which resulted in Plymouth becoming a unitary authority in 1998. As part of this review, no changes were made to the electoral arrangements of Plymouth City Council.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie 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 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the City Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

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

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equality of representation across the district as a whole. Having regard to the statutory criteria, our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. 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 general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that district 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 a district’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a district council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

| Stage | Description |
|-------|---|
| One | Submission of proposals to the Commission |
| Two | The Commission’s analysis and deliberation |
| Three | Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them |
| Four | Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State |

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *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, ie in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half the county council would be elected, and so on. In unitary authority areas the White Paper proposed elections by thirds. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas and three-member wards in unitary authority areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral wards in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. The proposals have been taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, provides that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities’ electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation and our present *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 28 November 2000, when we wrote to Plymouth City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, the local authority associations, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city, 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 the

City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 19 February 2001.

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

13 Stage Three began on 15 May 2001 and will end on 9 July 2001. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations 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 our draft recommendations.***

14 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an Order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 The City of Plymouth, in south-west Devon, is the largest city on the south coast of England. It is a largely urban area, with some smaller, more rural settlements on its outskirts. At present the city has a population of some 255,000, covering an area of nearly 8,000 hectares. Plymouth is home to the largest naval dockyard in western Europe, and it also has busy passenger and cargo terminals and an international airport. It is linked to Cornwall and the rest of the country by rail and by the A38, which traverses the city from east to west. The city was granted unitary status in 1998, and has no parishes.

16 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 city average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

17 The electorate of the city is 185,286 (February 2000). The Council presently has 60 members who are elected from 20 three-member wards. The city is divided by the A38 Parkway which runs from east to west, and by the River Plym which runs from north to south. Four of the 20 wards lie to the east of the river, and in the west, five wards lie to the north of the A38 and 11 wards to the south. Whole-council elections are held every four years. Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in Plymouth, with around 8 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments in the city.

18 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,088 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 3,149 by the year 2005 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 10 of the 20 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the city average, in two wards by more than 20 per cent and in one ward by more than 40 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Plympton Erle ward where each of the three councillors represents 43 per cent more electors than the city average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Plymouth

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Budshead | 3 | 8,617 | 2,872 | -7 | 8,710 | 2,903 | -8 |
| 2 Compton | 3 | 8,688 | 2,896 | -6 | 8,767 | 2,922 | -7 |
| 3 Drake | 3 | 10,782 | 3,594 | 16 | 10,943 | 3,648 | 16 |
| 4 Efford | 3 | 8,915 | 2,972 | -4 | 8,989 | 2,996 | -5 |
| 5 Egguckland | 3 | 9,948 | 3,316 | 7 | 10,044 | 3,348 | 6 |
| 6 Estover | 3 | 11,916 | 3,972 | 29 | 12,291 | 4,097 | 30 |
| 7 Ham | 3 | 7,597 | 2,532 | -18 | 7,638 | 2,546 | -19 |
| 8 Honicknowle | 3 | 9,261 | 3,087 | 0 | 9,768 | 3,256 | 3 |
| 9 Keyham | 3 | 7,942 | 2,647 | -14 | 7,984 | 2,661 | -15 |
| 10 Mount Gould | 3 | 7,855 | 2,618 | -15 | 8,375 | 2,792 | -11 |
| 11 Plympton Erle | 3 | 13,266 | 4,422 | 43 | 13,354 | 4,451 | 41 |
| 12 Plympton St Mary | 3 | 9,849 | 3,283 | 6 | 9,970 | 3,323 | 6 |
| 13 Plymstock Dunstone | 3 | 10,650 | 3,550 | 15 | 10,906 | 3,635 | 15 |
| 14 Plymstock Radford | 3 | 8,768 | 2,923 | -5 | 8,919 | 2,973 | -6 |
| 15 St Budeaux | 3 | 8,883 | 2,961 | -4 | 9,033 | 3,011 | -4 |
| 16 St Peter | 3 | 8,076 | 2,692 | -13 | 8,565 | 2,855 | -9 |
| 17 Southway | 3 | 9,738 | 3,246 | 5 | 9,836 | 3,279 | 4 |
| 18 Stoke | 3 | 9,106 | 3,035 | -2 | 9,202 | 3,067 | -3 |
| 19 Sutton | 3 | 7,990 | 2,663 | -14 | 8,181 | 2,727 | -13 |
| 20 Trelawny | 3 | 7,439 | 2,480 | -20 | 7,439 | 2,480 | -21 |
| Totals | 60 | 185,286 | - | - | 188,914 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 3,088 | - | - | 3,149 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Plymouth City 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 city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2000, electors in Trelawny ward were relatively over-represented by 20 per cent, while electors in Plympton Erle ward were relatively under-represented by 43 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

19 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Plymouth City Council.

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received six representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council and Plymouth Unitary Labour Party, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission.

Plymouth City Council

21 The City Council proposed a council of 57 members, three fewer than at present, serving 23 wards, compared to 20 at present. The Council put forward a mixed pattern of two and three-member wards across the city. Under its proposals the area to the west of the River Plym and south of the A38 Parkway would be allocated a total of 29 councillors, four fewer than at present, and the area to the east of the River Plym and north of the A38 Plympton bypass would have seven councillors, one more than at present.

22 The City Council stated that it had carried out a comprehensive consultation exercise in Plymouth, and had held a public display of both the majority group's proposals (which form the Council's official proposal) and an alternative consultation scheme (upon which the Labour Party's proposals are based).

23 Under the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in all 23 proposed wards would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the city average, both now and in five years' time. The Council's proposal is summarised in Appendix B.

Plymouth Unitary Labour Party

24 Plymouth Unitary Labour Party ('the Labour Party') also proposed a council size of 57, serving a total of 20 wards. The south-western part of the city would be allocated a total of 29 members under the Labour Party's proposals, and the north-eastern area would have seven councillors. The Labour Party stated that its proposals were broadly based on a scheme originally prepared by officers at the Council which had been widely publicised as part of the Council's consultation process, with some amendments in the Plymstock area and more significant modifications in the south-west of the city. Its proposals were broadly similar to the Council's scheme in the Plympton and Plymstock areas, with more substantial modifications to ward boundaries west of the River Plym.

25 The number of electors per councillor in all 20 of the Labour Party's proposed wards would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the city average, both now and in five years' time. The Labour Party's proposal is summarised in Appendix B.

Other Representations

26 We received four further representations from councillors, local community organisations and residents of Plymouth. On behalf of the councillors for the Plymstock area, Councillor Patrick Nicholson (Plympton St Mary ward) put forward a further amendment to the proposed boundary between Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards. Mutley Community Association requested that Mutley be linked with the Greenbank area for city warding purposes, arguing that the two areas are partners in regeneration projects.

27 A resident of West Hoe argued that the area has more in common with the Hoe and the city centre than with Millbay Docks and the rest of the current St Peter's ward. He stated that the area's guesthouses, hotels and flats have different problems from the deprived parts of the current ward, and proposed transferring the West Hoe area to another ward. A resident of Plymouth supported a reduction in council size to 45 members representing 15 three-member wards.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

28 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Plymouth 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 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

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

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

31 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective 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 start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five year period.

Electorate Forecasts

32 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2005, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 2 per cent from 185,286 to 188,914 over the five-year period from 2000 to 2005. It expects most of the growth to be in Mount Gould and St Peter wards, although a significant amount is also expected in Honicknowle ward. The Council has 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 City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

33 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the City Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

34 As already explained, the Commission’s starting point is to assume 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.

35 Plymouth City Council presently has 60 members. Both the City Council and the Labour Party proposed a council of 57 members, a reduction of three councillors. The Council stated that it had divided the city between four zones, defined by the A38 Parkway which runs from east to west across the city and by the River Plym which runs from north to south. It proposed redistributing councillors between these four areas in order to provide a more appropriate allocation of members, and noted that this approach was supported by the two political parties represented on the Council. It argued that, based on the five-year forecast electorate for the city, a small reduction in council size to 57 would provide “the best fit as regards to the councillor:elector ratio”. Under the Council’s proposals, the area to the west of the River Plym and south of the A38 Parkway would be allocated a total of 29 councillors, four fewer than at present, and the area to the east of the River Plym and north of the A38 Plympton bypass would have seven councillors, one more than at present.

36 The Labour Party also proposed a reduction in council size to 57 members, arguing that “57 members will adequately enable the representative, scrutiny and managerial functions of the council to be carried out”. It also proposed allocating an additional member to the north-eastern part of the city and four fewer councillors to the city centre area in the south-west of the city. A resident of Plymouth proposed reducing the size of the council to 45 members, but provided no argumentation or evidence to support his proposal.

37 We note that there is consensus between the political parties in Plymouth as to the most appropriate number of councillors for the city and the allocation of those councillors between the four main areas of the city. At present, based on a council size of 60, the north-eastern part of the city is represented by six councillors, but is entitled to approximately 7.5 councillors. Conversely, the south-western part of the city has 33 councillors, but is only entitled to 30. Under a council size of 57 each of the four areas would be allocated the number of councillors to which it is entitled. While the north-western and south-eastern areas would retain 15 and six councillors respectively, the south-western part of the city would be entitled to a total of 29 councillors, and the north-eastern area would be entitled to seven councillors.

38 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 57 members.

Electoral Arrangements

39 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the two city-wide schemes for electoral arrangements in Plymouth. From these representations, a number of considerations have emerged. As detailed above, both of the city-wide schemes which we

received at Stage One were based on a small reduction in council size to 57 members. Our proposals are based on a council size of 57, which we consider to be the most appropriate council size for the city, having regard to the evidence submitted and to the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area. Both city-wide schemes have also proposed allocating four fewer councillors to the south-western part of the city and an additional councillor to the north-eastern area. We consider that this proposed allocation would provide appropriate levels of representation for each of the four areas of the city.

40 We also note that there are some areas of consensus between the two proposals regarding the extent of community boundaries in Plymouth, and we have attempted to reflect these areas of agreement in our proposals. In particular, we note that the two proposals are identical in the Plympton area and very similar in Plymstock. We have put forward our own proposals for warding arrangements in the area to the north of the A38 and west of the River Plym, which are based on parts of both the Council's proposals and the scheme put forward by the Labour Party. Finally, in the area to the south of the A38, we have proposed broadly basing our draft recommendations on the proposals put forward by the Labour Party, with a number of small amendments to provide for clearer and more easily identifiable boundaries. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Plympton Erle and Plympton St Mary wards;
- (b) Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards;
- (c) Eggbuckland and Estover wards;
- (d) Budshead, Honicknowle and Southway wards;
- (e) Ham, St Budeaux and Trelawny wards;
- (f) Compton and Drake wards;
- (g) Efford, Mount Gould and Sutton wards;
- (h) Keyham, St Peter and Stoke wards.

41 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Plympton Erle and Plympton St Mary wards

42 The wards of Plympton Erle and Plympton St Mary lie to the east of the River Plym and north of the A38 Plympton Bypass, and are each represented by three councillors. Plympton St Mary ward lies broadly to the north of the Plymouth to Totnes railway line, but also includes the Moorland Road, Westfield and Hemerdon Heights areas. Plympton Erle ward comprises the areas of Underwood, Plympton Chaddlewood and Plympton St Maurice. As result of development which has taken place in Plympton since the last review, Plympton Erle ward is significantly under-represented, with 43 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average. Electoral equality is not expected to improve significantly over the next five years, and Plympton Erle ward is forecast to have 41 per cent more electors per councillor than the average by 2005. Plympton St Mary ward has 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average, and this level of variance is not forecast to improve over the next five years.

43 The City Council and the Labour Party put forward identical proposals for this area of the city. In order to address the level of electoral inequality in Plympton Erle ward, they proposed

creating a new two-member Plympton Chaddlewood ward. The Council noted that the Chaddlewood area has largely been developed over the last 25 years, and has “developed its own sense of community as evidenced by two community centres”. Under both schemes this new ward would comprise the part of Plympton Erle ward to the north of Ridgeway, Meadow Rise, Lower Farm Way, Maddock Drive and Danum Drive and east of Tuxton Close. Plympton Chaddlewood ward would also include the part of Plympton St Mary ward to the east of Kingston Drive, while the part of Plympton Erle ward to the west of Downfield Drive would be transferred to the revised Plympton St Mary ward.

44 Based on a council size of 57, the revised three-member Plympton St Mary ward would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average, both now and in five years’ time. The new Plympton Chaddlewood ward and the revised Plympton Erle ward, each represented by two councillors, would both have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the average initially, improving to equal to the average and 1 per cent more than the average respectively by 2005.

45 Having carefully considered the schemes put forward by the City Council and the Labour Party, we propose adopting the proposed Plympton Chaddlewood, Plympton Erle and Plympton St Mary wards as part of our draft recommendations, without amendment. We note that there is significant cross-party consensus regarding community boundaries in this area, and we are content that the proposals would reflect local identities and interests well. We also note that the proposals would provide improved levels of electoral equality in Plympton, with further improvements forecast over the next five years. Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Plympton St Mary ward would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average, both now and in five years’ time. The two-member Plympton Chaddlewood and Plympton Erle wards would each have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to equal to the city average and 1 per cent more than the average respectively by 2005. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A4 in Appendix A.

Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards

46 Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards lie to the east of the River Plym and south of the A38 Plympton Bypass, and are each represented by three councillors. Plymstock Dunstone ward lies broadly to the east of Colesdown Hill, Stentaway Road, Church Road and Goosewell Road, and also includes the Reddicliffe Close and Southgate Avenue areas. To the west, Plymstock Radford ward includes the settlements of Turnchapel and Hooe. Plymstock Dunstone ward is relatively under-represented at present, with 15 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (unchanged in five years’ time). Plymstock Radford ward has 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average (6 per cent fewer by 2005).

47 At Stage One the City Council proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards in order to address the relatively high level of electoral inequality in the current Plymstock Dunstone ward. Under its proposals the part of Plymstock Dunstone ward to the west of Holmwood Avenue, Stockingway Close and Foxwood Gardens would be transferred to a revised three-member Plymstock Radford ward. Based on a council size of 57, the Council’s three-member Plymstock Dunstone ward would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 3 per cent more than the

average by 2005. Plymstock Radford ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average initially, improving to 3 per cent fewer by 2005.

48 The Labour Party proposed more substantial amendments to the boundary between Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards. Under its proposals, the part of Plymstock Radford ward to the south of Burrow Hill and Underlane and north of Green Park Road would be transferred to a revised Plymstock Dunstone ward. The parts of the current Plymstock Dunstone ward to the west of Southgate Avenue, Stockingway Close and Foxwood Gardens, and to the north of Stanborough Road and west of Whitehall Drive and Misterton Close, would be transferred to the revised Plymstock Radford ward. The Labour Party's Plymstock Radford ward would also include those properties on the western side of Colesdown Hill. Under the Labour Party's proposals, the revised Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards, each represented by three councillors, would have 1 per cent more and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially. By 2005, each ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as a whole.

49 We received one further representation in relation to this area. On behalf of the councillors for the Plymstock area, Councillor Patrick Nicholson (Plympton St Mary ward) put forward an alternative boundary between Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards. He proposed transferring the part of Plymstock Dunstone ward to the south of Elburton Road, west of Southway and north of Cross Road and Stanborough Road to a revised Plymstock Radford ward. Under his proposals the parts of Plymstock Radford ward to the south of Church Lane and east of Furzehatt Road, and to the east of Southgate Avenue, would be transferred to the revised Plymstock Dunstone ward. Based on a council size of 57, Councillor Nicholson's proposed Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards would have 1 per cent more and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to equal to the average for the city in both wards by 2005.

50 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. Notwithstanding the excellent levels of electoral equality achieved by all three proposals, we consider that the City Council's proposals would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in Plymstock. We note that the Council's proposals would largely utilise the existing ward boundary, which we consider forms a strong and easily identifiable community boundary in this area. We are content to put forward the Council's Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards as part of our draft recommendations, subject to one amendment. We consider that the Southgate Avenue area shares greater community ties with the Holmwood Avenue area than with Reddicliffe Close to the west, and propose retaining Southgate Avenue within the proposed Plymstock Dunstone ward. In particular, we note that Southgate Avenue is accessible only from Holmwood Avenue, and shares no communication links with the development to its west. In order to provide acceptable levels of electoral equality in both wards, we also propose transferring the part of the current Plymstock Dunstone ward to the west of Goosewell Road and north of Holmwood Avenue to the revised Plymstock Radford ward. Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards would have 4 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 3 per cent more and 3 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2005. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A5 in Appendix A.

Eggbuckland and Estover wards

51 Eggbuckland and Estover wards lie to the north of the A38 Parkway and west of the River Plym, and are each represented by three councillors. Eggbuckland ward is bounded by the A386 Tavistock Road to the west, and Fort Austin Avenue, Novorossiysk Road and Plymbridge Road to the north. Estover ward lies directly to the north of Eggbuckland ward and abuts the north-east boundary of the city. At present Estover ward is significantly under-represented, with 29 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average. This level of electoral inequality is not expected to improve over the next five years, and Estover ward is forecast to have 30 per cent more electors per councillor than the average by 2005. Eggbuckland ward has 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average, improving slightly to 6 per cent more by 2005.

52 At Stage One the City Council proposed combining the part of Eggbuckland ward to the east of the B3413 Valley Road with the part of Estover ward broadly to the east of Blunts Lane and south of Penrith Gardens, Patterdale Close, Rothbury Close and Plymouth Airport, to form a revised two-member Estover ward. It noted that the City Council had “planned and constructed a city centre for the smaller estates of Estover, Leigham and Mainstone”, and argued that its proposals would reinforce these links. The remaining part of Eggbuckland ward would be combined with the part of Estover ward to the east of Budshead Way and the A386 Tavistock Road and south of Brest Road and the part of Honicknowle to the east of St Peter’s Road and Hardy Crescent to form a revised three-member Eggbuckland ward. The Council argued that residents in the Manadon area to the west of the A386 “gravitate towards Crownhill Village for their shopping, business, health, social and other needs”. The remaining part of the current Estover ward would be combined with part of Southway ward to form a new Derriford ward, as detailed below. Based on a council size of 57, the Council’s proposed Eggbuckland and Estover wards would have 1 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, 3 per cent more and 3 per cent fewer than the average by 2005.

53 The Labour Party also proposed transferring the part of Eggbuckland ward to the east of the B3413 Valley Road to a revised Estover ward, which it proposed renaming Moor View ward. The new three-member Moor View ward would also include the part of the current Estover ward to the east of the A386 Tavistock Road and north of Brest Road. Under its proposals the remaining part of Eggbuckland ward would be combined with the part of Estover ward to the east of Elgin Crescent, Kirkwall Road and Quarry Wood and south of Looseleigh Lane to form a new three-member Crownhill ward. The new Crownhill and Moor View wards would each have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (1 per cent and 2 per cent more than the average by 2005).

54 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. While we note that both sets of proposals would provide excellent levels of electoral equality, both now and in five years’ time, we have not been persuaded that either of the two schemes would appropriately reflect local community identities and interests. We therefore propose basing our draft recommendations for this part of the city on a combination of the City Council’s proposals and the Labour Party’s scheme, with some further amendments to ward boundaries.

55 We note that both the City Council and the Labour Party proposed utilising Valley Road as the eastern boundary of a revised Eggbuckland ward, and we are content that the Leigham area

shares stronger community ties with the Mainstone area to its north than with Eggbuckland to the west. However, we also note that the Council's proposals would divide the Estover and Mainstone areas between two wards. We consider that the area to the east of the A386 Tavistock Road forms a distinct and homogenous community which is linked by Novorossiysk Road, and we have not been persuaded that the Council's proposals would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area. We are content to largely adopt the Labour Party's three-member Moor View ward, although we propose one minor amendment to the western boundary of the ward in order to better reflect community identities and interests. While we note that the A386 forms a strong community boundary in this area, we consider that the properties on the eastern side of the road, adjacent to Plymouth City Airport, share greater community links with areas to the west of Tavistock Road. We therefore propose that the western boundary of Moor View ward should run to the rear of these properties before rejoining Tavistock Road to the north of Plymbridge Lane.

56 To the south of Moor View ward, we propose a revised three-member Eggbuckland ward, broadly based on the City Council's Eggbuckland ward. We consider that the Labour Party's proposed Crownhill ward would combine a number of disparate and diverse communities in a single ward, and would not reflect local community identities and interests well. In particular, we note that the Leatfield Drive area to the south of Looseleigh Lane has few significant communication links with the remaining part of the proposed ward, and shares greater community ties with the Looseleigh Lane and Powisland Drive areas. We consider that the City Council's proposed Eggbuckland ward would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area and propose broadly basing our draft recommendations on the Council's proposals. However, we note that the Crownhill area is physically separated from the area to the south of Fort Austin Avenue by the Plumer House and Crownhill Court offices, and consider that it shares greater community ties with the Budshead Road area to the west of the A386. We therefore propose amending the northern boundary of the revised Eggbuckland ward to run along the centre of Fort Austin Avenue and Crownhill as far as St Peter's Road. In order to provide improved electoral equality, we also propose amending the Council's Eggbuckland ward to include the part of Honicknowle ward to the east of Sheridan Road and south of Chaucer Way.

57 Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Eggbuckland ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, 3 per cent more than the average by 2005. Moor View ward, also represented by three councillors, would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially (2 per cent more by 2005). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A3 in Appendix A, and on the large map inside the back cover of this report.

Budshead, Honicknowle and Southway wards

58 Budshead, Honicknowle and Southway wards lie to the north of the A38 Parkway, and broadly to the west of the A386 Tavistock Road, and are each represented by three councillors. Currently, Honicknowle ward, which lies broadly to the south of Woodland Wood, covers the Manadon, Honicknowle and West Park areas. Budshead ward comprises the Whitleigh and Ernesettle communities, and lies adjacent to the River Tamar. Southway ward lies to the west of the A386 Tavistock Road and broadly to the north of Dunraven Drive, and also contains the

settlement of Tamerton Foliot. At present Budshead and Southway wards have 7 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (8 per cent fewer and 4 per cent more than the average by 2005). Honicknowle ward currently has equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as a whole, and is forecast to have 3 per cent more than the average in five years' time.

59 At Stage One, the City Council proposed a new three-member Derriford ward, comprising the part of the current Estover ward to the north of Brest Road, west of Blunts Lane and south of Penrith Gardens, Patterdale Close, Rothbury Close and Plymouth Airport, together with the part of the current Southway ward to the east of Lulworth Drive, Butler Close and Barningham Gardens. The remaining part of Southway ward, less the part to the south of Tamerton Foliot Road, would form a revised two-member Southway ward. The Council noted that its proposals would "ensure that existing links between Southway and the ancient Village of Tamerton Foliot are maintained". The proposed Derriford ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as a whole, while Southway ward would have 4 per cent more than the average. By 2005, the Council's Derriford and Southway wards are forecast to have 2 per cent and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the average respectively.

60 The City Council proposed transferring the part of the current Southway ward to the south of Tamerton Foliot Road, comprising Whitleigh Wood Nature Reserve and the Lake View Close area, to a revised two-member Budshead ward. Its proposed Budshead ward would also include the part of the current Budshead ward to the east of Budshead Creek, the part of Estover ward to the west of Quarry Wood and north of Oak Drive, and the part of Honicknowle ward to the north of Crownhill Road and east of Cheriton Close and Woodbury Gardens. Finally, the Council proposed combining the remaining parts of Budshead and Honicknowle wards to form a revised three-member Honicknowle ward. It argued that "Ernesettle is separated from its neighbouring estate of Whitleigh by significant woodland" and that "its more natural linkage is to the Honicknowle ward". Based on a council size of 57, the proposed Budshead ward would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average, both now and in five years' time. Honicknowle ward would also have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the average initially, improving to 2 per cent more by 2005.

61 The Labour Party proposed less substantial change to warding arrangements in this area. It proposed a revised three-member Southway ward comprising the current ward, less the Tamerton Foliot area to the west of Coombe Lane, together with the part of Estover ward to the north of Looseleigh Lane and west of the A386 Tavistock Road. The Tamerton Foliot area would be combined with the current Budshead ward, less Agaton Fort Road, Kinsale Road and the part of Budshead Road to the west of Ringmore Way, to form a revised three-member Budshead ward. Honicknowle ward would be expanded to include the Agaton Fort Road area from the current Budshead ward, and the Kirkwall Road area from Estover ward, and would continue to be represented by three councillors. Under a council size of 57, the Labour Party's proposed Budshead ward would have 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 3 per cent more over the next five years. Honicknowle ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average, while Southway ward would have 2 per cent more than the average (3 per cent and 1 per cent more than the average by 2005).

62 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. As discussed previously, we have not been persuaded that either of the two city-wide schemes for the northern part of Plymouth would appropriately reflect local community identities and interests in their entirety. In particular, we note that the Labour Party's proposed Budshead ward would combine the Whitleigh development with the Ernesettle area to its south and the Tamerton Foliot settlement to the north. We note that Whitleigh shares no direct communication links with the Ernesettle area, and consider that while the Tamerton Foliot area forms a relatively self-contained settlement, it shares more significant links with the Southway area to its east than with Whitleigh. We also consider that the City Council's proposed Derriford ward would combine a number of distinct and diverse communities which share few community links and, as detailed above, we have not adopted its proposals for this area.

63 We are therefore putting forward our own proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations for Plymouth, drawing on some part of each of the two schemes. We consider that the current three-member Southway ward reflects local community identities and interests well, and note that it also provides a reasonable level of electoral equality. We propose one minor amendment to Southway ward, transferring the Lake View Close area to a revised Budshead ward, as detailed below. As discussed previously, we note that the Ernesettle area shares no direct communication links with the Whitleigh development, and we propose transferring Ernesettle from the current Budshead ward to a revised Honicknowle ward. The remaining part of Budshead ward, to the north of Budshead Creek, would be combined with the Looseleigh Lane area to the west of the A386 Tavistock Road, and the Crownhill area to the south of Brest Road and north of Fort Austin Avenue, to form a revised three-member Budshead ward. Finally, we propose a revised three-member Honicknowle ward, comprising the Ernesettle area from Budshead ward and the part of the current Honicknowle ward to the west of St Peter's Road, Chaucer Way and Sheridan Road.

64 Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Budshead ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average, both now and in five years' time. Honicknowle ward, also represented by three councillors, would have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the average initially, and 5 per cent more than average by 2005. The three-member Southway ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (2 per cent fewer than the average by 2005). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A3 in Appendix A, and on the large map inside the back cover of this report.

Ham, St Budeaux and Trelawny wards

65 Ham, St Budeaux and Trelawny wards lie to the north and west of Plymouth city centre, south of the A38 Parkway, and are each represented by three councillors at present. St Budeaux ward lies broadly to the north of Weston Mill Lake and Fletemoor Road, and contains the communities of Barne Barton, St Budeaux and King's Tamerton. Ham ward lies to the east of the A3064 Wolseley Road, and broadly to the north of Beacon Park Road. Trelawny ward also lies to the east of the A3064, and to the north of Outland Road, Burleigh Lane and Tor Road. Ham and Trelawny wards are relatively over-represented at present, with 18 per cent and 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average. These levels of electoral equality are not expected to improve over the next five years, with Ham and Trelawny wards forecast to have 19 per cent and 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively by 2005. St

Budeaux ward has 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average at present, unchanged by 2005.

66 At Stage One, the City Council proposed enlarging St Budeaux ward to include the part of Ham ward to the north of Church Way and the Hamoaze Avenue and Harbour Avenue area to the west of Wolseley Road. The part of Ham ward to the east of Orchard Road, Merrivale Road and Ham Lane would be transferred to a revised Trelawny ward, and the revised Ham ward would be represented by two councillors, rather than three as at present. To the south, the Council's proposed Trelawny ward would also comprise the part of Drake ward to the north of Jefferson Walk, Barn Park Road and Holland Road, and the part of Compton ward to the west of Tor Road, Tor Lane and Hartley Road. Based on a council size of 57, the Council's three-member St Budeaux ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, both now and in five years' time. Trelawny ward, also represented by three councillors, would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the average initially, and 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2005. Ham ward would have 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (4 per cent fewer by 2005).

67 The Labour Party also proposed enlarging St Budeaux ward, to include the part of Ham ward to the north of Rodney Street, Church Way and Bridwell Road. The revised Ham ward would be enlarged to include the parts of Trelawny ward to the west of West Down Road and Furneaux Road, and to the north of Beacon Park Road, Recreation Road, Ham Drive and Outland Road. Under the Labour Party's proposals the remaining part of the current Trelawny ward would form part of a new three-member Peverell ward, as detailed below. The Labour Party's proposed three-member Ham ward would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to equal to the average by 2005. St Budeaux ward, also represented by three councillors, would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average, both now and in five years' time.

68 Having carefully considered the evidence and representations received at Stage One, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this part of Plymouth on the proposals put forward by the Labour Party. While we note that both city-wide schemes would provide excellent levels of electoral equality, we have not been persuaded that the City Council's proposals would appropriately reflect local community identities and interests in this area. In particular, we note that the Council's proposed Trelawny ward would divide the distinct and close-knit Peverell Park Road community.

69 However, we note that there are some similarities between the two city-wide schemes in relation to the revised St Budeaux ward, and we are content to reflect these areas of agreement in our draft recommendations. We propose that the boundary between St Budeaux and Ham wards should follow the A3064 St Budeaux bypass south from the A38 Parkway and run to the rear of properties on the south side of Weston Mill Hill, Fletemoor Hill and Cardinal Avenue, before rejoining the current ward boundary to the west of Rodney Street. We propose adopting the Labour Party's three-member Ham ward as part of our draft recommendations, subject to one minor amendment. We propose that the Corporation Road and Harnorlen Road area should be transferred from Ham ward to the new Peverell ward, as detailed below. These two roads are accessible only from Ham Drive, and we consider that the area shares stronger community ties with the Ham Drive area to its south than with Pennycross to the north.

70 Under our draft recommendations, the three-member St Budeaux ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, both now and in five years' time. Ham ward, also represented by three councillors, would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to equal to the average by 2005. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map inside the back cover of this report.

Compton and Drake wards

71 Compton and Drake wards cover the northern parts of Plymouth city centre, and are each represented by three councillors. Drake ward lies to the north of the city's commercial centre, and contains the Ford Park and Peverell communities and also Central Park, home to Plymouth Argyle Football Club. Compton ward is bounded by the Plymouth to Totnes railway line to the south and the A38 Parkway to the north, and contains both Higher Compton and Lower Compton areas. At present, Compton ward has 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average (7 per cent fewer than the average by 2005). Drake ward is relatively under-represented, with 16 per cent more electors per councillor than the average, both now and in five years' time.

72 At Stage One the City Council proposed a revised two-member Drake ward, comprising the part of the existing Drake ward to the north of North Road East and east of Central Park Avenue, Barn Park Road and Holland Road, together with the part of Compton ward to the west of Mannamead Road and Thorn Park. The remaining parts of the current Drake ward would be transferred to a new St Andrew ward and revised Mount Gould and Stoke wards, as detailed below. The Council also proposed a revised three-member Compton ward, comprising the part of the current ward to the east of Tor Road, Tor Lane, Hartley Gardens, Mannamead Road and Thorn Park, together with the part of Efford ward to the north of Landford Road and west of Dartmeet Avenue, Efford Cemetery, Donnington Drive and Hawthorn Way. Compton ward would also include the part of Mount Gould ward to the north of Furzehill Road. Under the Council's proposals, Compton and Drake wards would have 1 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively. By 2005, the Council's Compton ward is forecast to have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average, while Drake ward would have 4 per cent fewer than the average.

73 As detailed above, the Labour Party proposed transferring the part of the current Trelawny ward to the east of West Down Road and Furneaux Road and south of Beacon Park Road, Recreation Road, Ham Drive and Outland Road to a new three-member Peverell ward. The proposed Peverell ward would also include the part of Drake ward to the north of Jefferson Walk and Ford Park Road, and to the west of Ford Park Lane, and the part of Compton ward to the west of Mannamead Road, Hartley Road and Vapron Road, and to the south of Mutley Road. The part of the current Drake ward to the south of Central Park Avenue, Jefferson Walk and Ford Park Road, west of Pentile Road and south of Chester Place would be combined with the part of Mount Gould ward to the west of Woodside Lane and north of Lipson Road to form a revised two-member Drake ward.

74 The Labour Party proposed a revised three-member Compton ward, comprising the remaining part of the current Compton ward, together with the part of Efford ward to the west of Carlton Close, north of Landford Road and west of Dartmeet Avenue, Efford Cemetery and Egguckland Road. The revised Compton ward would also include the part of Drake ward to the

east of Pentillie Road and north of Chester Place, and Moor View Terrace and Alexandra Place, currently in Mount Gould ward. Based on a council size of 57, the Labour Party's proposed Compton and Drake wards would have 1 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, and 2 per cent and 1 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2005. The proposed Peverell ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as a whole (2 per cent fewer than the average by 2005).

75 We received one further representation in relation to this area at Stage One. Mutley Community Association proposed linking the Mutley area with the Greenbank area for city warding purposes, arguing that the two areas are "partners in regeneration for the area and there are also many family and student links". The Community Association also argued that "residents either side of Mutley Plain belong to the same community", which has more in common with Greenbank than with the Peverell, Compton or Mount Gould areas.

76 Having carefully considered the evidence and representations received at Stage One, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this part of Plymouth on the proposals put forward by the Labour Party. While we note that both city-wide schemes would provide excellent levels of electoral equality, we have not been persuaded that the City Council's proposals would appropriately reflect local community identities and interests in this area. As detailed above, we note that the Council's proposed Trelawny ward would divide the Peverell Park Road community, and we consider that the Labour Party's proposed Peverell ward would better reflect the focus of the communities which surround the northern part of Central Park. We propose adopting the Labour Party's three-member Peverell ward, subject to one minor amendment to retain those properties on the northern side of Mutley Road within Peverell ward.

77 We have not been persuaded that the City Council's proposed Drake ward would appropriately reflect community identities and interests in the area to the east of Central Park. In particular we note that the two-member Drake ward, which would contain the remaining part of the Peverell Park community, would continue to utilise Mutley Plain as a boundary, and would not address the concerns raised by Mutley Community Association. We consider that the Labour Party's proposed Drake ward would better reflect the identities and interests of the area to the north of the commercial centre of the city (in particular transferring the area to the west of Mutley Plain to a revised Compton ward, as detailed below), and are content to put it forward as part of our draft recommendations, subject to one minor boundary amendment. We propose retaining Napier Terrace, Houndiscombe Road and Chester Place within the revised two-member Drake ward, and utilising the Plymouth to Totnes railway line as the boundary between Drake and Compton wards.

78 We note that there are some similarities between the two city-wide proposals for the revised Compton ward, particularly in relation to the eastern boundary of the proposed ward. However, we consider that the Labour Party's proposed Compton ward would better reflect community identities and interests in the south of the ward, and are content to largely adopt the three-member ward as part of our draft recommendations. We note that the Labour Party's proposals would unite both sides of the Mutley Plain community within Compton ward, addressing some of the concerns raised by Mutley Community Association. We have considered transferring Mutley to the proposed Drake ward, thereby uniting the community with the Greenbank area, but have been unable to identify alternative proposals which would provide acceptable levels of electoral

equality. However, we would welcome any further views and alternative proposals in relation to this area at Stage Three. We propose putting forward the Labour Party's three-member Compton ward as part of our draft recommendations, subject to the two amendments to the western boundary of the ward detailed above.

79 Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Compton ward would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, while Peverell ward, also represented by three councillors, would have equal to the average for the city as a whole. Each ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average by 2005. Drake ward, represented by two councillors, would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2005. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map inside the back cover of this report.

Efford, Mount Gould and Sutton wards

80 The three-member Efford, Mount Gould and Sutton wards cover the area to the north and east of Plymouth city centre, and are bounded by the A38 Parkway in the north and by the River Plym in the east. Efford ward lies broadly to the north of the Plymouth to Totnes railway line, while to the south of the railway line Mount Gould ward contains the Mount Gould and Lipson communities. Sutton ward covers the commercial centre of Plymouth and also includes the Coxside and St Jude's areas. Efford ward has 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average at present, and is forecast to have 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2005. Mount Gould and Sutton wards are more significantly over-represented, with 15 per cent and 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively. These levels of electoral equality are expected to improve marginally over the next five years, with Mount Gould and Sutton wards forecast to have 11 per cent and 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average by 2005.

81 As detailed above, the City Council proposed transferring part of the current Efford ward to a revised Compton ward. Under its proposals the remaining part of Efford ward, less the part to the south of Old Laira Road, would form a revised two-member Efford ward. The part of Efford ward to the south of Old Laira Road would form part of a revised three-member Mount Gould ward, comprising the current Mount Gould ward, less the parts to the north of Furzehill Road and south of Beaumont Road, Craven Avenue and Edith Avenue, together with the part of Drake ward to the east of North Hill and Tavistock Place. The Council proposed combining the part of the current Mount Gould ward to the south of Beaumont Road, Craven Avenue and Edith Avenue with the part of Sutton ward to the east of Lipson Road, Harbour Avenue and North Quay Marina to form a revised two-member Sutton ward. The remaining part of the current Sutton ward would form part of a new two-member St Andrew ward, as detailed below. Under the Council's proposals, Efford and Sutton wards would have 3 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 2 per cent and 1 per cent more than the average respectively by 2005. Mount Gould ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average initially, improving to equal to the average by 2005.

82 Under the Labour Party's proposals, the part of Efford ward to the east of Carlton Close, south of Landford Road and east of Dartmeet Avenue, Efford Cemetery and Egguckland Road

would be combined with the part of Mount Gould ward to the east of Moor View Terrace and north of Queen's Gate, Lipson Road and Ladysmith Road to form a new three-member Efford & Lipson ward. The part of the current Mount Gould ward to the west of Woodside Lane and Lipson Road would be transferred to a revised Drake ward, as detailed above. The Labour Party proposed combining the remaining part of Mount Gould ward with the part of Sutton ward to the east of Lipson Road, Harbour Avenue and North Quay Marina to form a new three-member Sutton & Mount Gould ward. The remaining part of the current Sutton ward would form part of a new Waterfront ward, as detailed below. Based on a council size of 57, the Labour Party's proposed Efford & Lipson ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 1 per cent more than the average by 2005. Sutton & Mount Gould ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average initially, equal to the average in five years' time.

83 Having carefully considered the evidence and representations received at Stage One, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this part of Plymouth on the proposals put forward by the Labour Party. While we note that both city-wide schemes would provide excellent levels of electoral equality, we have not been persuaded that the City Council's proposals would appropriately reflect local community identities and interests in this area. In particular we note that, under the Council's proposals, the area to the south of Old Laira Road would be relatively isolated from the remaining part of the proposed Mount Gould ward and separated by the Plymouth to Totnes railway line. We also note that the Salisbury Road area to the west of Mount Gould would be divided between the revised Mount Gould and Sutton wards under the Council's proposals.

84 We are content that the Labour Party's proposed Efford & Lipson and Sutton & Mount Gould wards would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area, and propose adopting them as part of our draft recommendations for Plymouth, without amendment. We recognise that the proposed Efford & Lipson ward would also combine areas either side of the Plymouth to Tones railway line, but consider that Lipson Road forms a significant communication link between the two areas. We also note that the proposed Sutton & Mount Gould ward would include the primarily residential St Jude's area, currently combined with the commercial centre of the City in Sutton ward. Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Efford & Lipson ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 1 per cent more than the average by 2005. Sutton & Mount Gould ward, also represented by three councillors, would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average, improving to equal to the city average by 2005. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map inside the back cover of this report.

Keyham, St Peter and Stoke wards

85 The three-member Keyham, St Peter and Stoke wards lie to the west of the city centre, broadly to the south-west of the A3064 Wolseley Road. Stoke ward, to the north of Paradise Road and Victoria Park, covers the Ford and Stoke areas, and has 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average (3 per cent fewer than the average by 2005). St Peter ward lies to the west of the commercial centre of the city, and includes the Stonehouse and Mount Wise areas, while Keyham ward comprises the communities of Keyham and Devonport. St Peter and

Keyham wards are relatively over-represented at present, with 13 per cent and 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average (9 per cent and 15 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2005).

86 At Stage One, the City Council proposed a new two-member St Andrew ward comprising the part of the current Sutton ward to the west of Lipson Road, Harbour Avenue and North Quay Marina and the part of St Peter ward to the east of Stonehouse Creek, south of Union Street and east of Cecil Street and Archer Terrace. The new St Andrew ward would also include the part of Drake ward to the west of Tavistock Place and North Hill and south of North Road. The remaining part of the current St Peter ward would be combined with the part of Keyham ward to the south of St Levan Road and the part of Stoke ward to the west of Havelock Terrace and Devonport Road, to form a new three-member St Aubyn ward.

87 Under the City Council's proposals the remaining part of the current Keyham ward would be combined with the part of Stoke ward to the north of Pasley Street East, Ford Hill and St Levan Road to form a revised two-member Keyham ward. The remaining part of Stoke ward would form a revised two-member Stoke ward, which would also include the part of Drake ward to the south of Jefferson Walk and west of Central Park Avenue. The Council's proposed St Aubyn ward would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to equal to the city average by 2005. Stoke ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as a whole, while Keyham and St Andrew wards would have 3 per cent and 4 per cent fewer than the average (1 per cent fewer, 4 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more than the average respectively by 2005).

88 The Labour Party proposed combining the part of St Peter ward to the east of Stonehouse Creek and south of Devonport High School for Boys with the part of Sutton ward to the west of Lipson Road, Harbour Avenue and North Quay Marina to form a new three-member Waterfront ward. It also proposed a new three-member Devonport ward, comprising the current Keyham ward less that part to the east of Anson Place and Victoria Place, together with the part of St Peter ward to the west of Stonehouse Creek and King Road and the part of Stoke ward to the south of the Plymouth to St Budeaux railway line and west of Devonport Road. Finally, the Labour Party proposed a revised three-member Stoke ward, comprising the remaining part of the current ward together with the part of Keyham ward to the east of Anson Place and Victoria Place, the part of St Peter ward to the east of King Road and north of Waterloo Yard Flats and Valletort Flats, and the part of Drake ward to the south of Jefferson Walk and west of Central Park Avenue. Under the Labour Party's proposals, Devonport ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as a whole (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2005). The proposed Stoke and Waterfront wards would have 1 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average initially (2 per cent and 1 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2005).

89 We received one further representation in relation to this area at Stage One. A resident of West Hoe argued that the area shares greater community links with the city centre and the remaining part of the Hoe than with the other areas of St Peter ward. He argued that West Hoe is physically separated from the rest of the ward by Millbay Docks and that the area's "guest houses, hotels and flats have different problems from the deprived nature of the rest of the ward".

90 Having carefully considered the evidence and representations received at Stage One, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this part of Plymouth on the proposals put forward by the Labour Party. While we note that both city-wide schemes would provide excellent levels of electoral equality, we have not been persuaded that the City Council's proposals would appropriately reflect local community identities and interests in this area. In particular we note that the Council's proposed St Aubyn ward would place part of the city centre area in a ward which primarily covers the shoreline of the River Tamar. We also note that the southern part of the Ford area would be divided between the proposed Stoke and Keyham wards.

91 On balance, we consider that the Labour Party's proposals would provide the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in this area, and we are content to put forward its proposals without amendment. We consider that the proposed three-member Waterfront ward would reflect the identities and interests of the communities which surround the commercial centre of the city, while the proposed Devonport ward would cover the areas surrounding the dockyards on the River Tamar. Under our draft recommendations, the three-member Waterfront ward would have 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average initially, improving to 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2005. Devonport ward, also represented by three councillors, would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city as whole, while the three-member Stoke ward would have 1 per cent fewer than the average (1 per cent and 2 per cent fewer than the average by 2005). Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map inside the back cover of this report.

Electoral Cycle

92 We received two representations regarding the City Council's electoral cycle. The City Council itself supported retaining the present cycle of whole-council elections every four years. The Labour Party proposed adopting a system of elections by thirds, stating that "it has long been the policy of Plymouth Labour Party to move from the system of whole-council elections every four years".

93 We have carefully considered all representations. We note that, at present, there appears to be no clear cross-party support for a change to the present electoral cycle. We have therefore not been persuaded to propose any change to the current electoral cycle of whole-council elections for the City Council.

Conclusions

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

- there should be a reduction in council size from 60 to 57;
- there should be 20 wards;
- the boundaries of all 20 of the existing wards should be modified;
- whole-council elections should continue to be held every four years.

95 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on a combination of the City Council's proposals, the scheme put forward by the Labour Party and our own proposals. We propose departing from the Council's proposals and the scheme put forward by the Labour Party in the following areas:

- In Plymstock we propose amending the Council's proposed Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards to retain Southgate Avenue within Plymstock Dunstone ward and transfer Foxwood Gardens and Stockingway Close to Plymstock Radford ward.
- We propose amending the western boundary of the Labour Party's proposed Moor View ward to run to the rear of properties on the eastern side of the A386 Tavistock Road.
- We propose broadly retaining the existing Southway ward, and propose revised Budshead and Honicknowle wards.
- We propose amending the boundary between the Labour Party's proposed St Budeaux and Ham wards to follow the A3064 St Budeaux bypass south from the A38 Parkway and run to the rear of properties on the south side of Weston Mill Hill, Fletemoor Hill and Cardinal Avenue, before rejoining the current ward boundary to the west of Rodney Street.
- We propose transferring the Corporation Road and Harnorlen Road area from the Labour Party's proposed Ham ward to the new Peverell ward.
- We propose retaining the properties on the northern side of Mutley Road within the Labour Party's proposed Peverell ward.
- We propose retaining Napier Terrace, Houndiscombe Road and Chester Place within the Labour Party's revised two-member Drake ward.

96 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2000 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2005.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

| | 2000 electorate | | 2005 forecast electorate | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Current arrangements | Draft recommendations | Current arrangements | Draft recommendations |
| Number of councillors | 60 | 57 | 60 | 57 |
| Number of wards | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Average number of electors per councillor | 3,088 | 3,251 | 3,149 | 3,314 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average | 10 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

97 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Plymouth City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the city average from 10 to none. By 2005 no ward is forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city.

Draft Recommendation
 Plymouth City Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 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.

98 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Plymouth and welcome comments from the City Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Plymouth

5 NEXT STEPS

99 We are putting forward draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for consultation. We will take fully into account all representations received by 9 July 2001. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the City Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

100 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

www.lgce.gov.uk

101 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Plymouth: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Plymouth area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the city and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2 to A5 and the large map at the back of the report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed boundary between Budshead and Southway wards.

Map A3 illustrates the proposed boundary between Budshead, Moor View and Southway wards.

Map A4 illustrates the boundary of the proposed Plympton Chaddlewood ward.

Map A5 illustrates the proposed boundary between Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford wards.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Plymouth city centre.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Plymouth: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Boundary between Budshead and Southway Wards

Map A3: Proposed Boundary between Budshead, Moor View and Southway Wards

Map A4: Proposed Boundary of Plympton Chaddlewood Ward

Map A5: Proposed Boundary between Plymstock Dunstone and Plymstock Radford Wards

APPENDIX B

Plymouth City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B1: Plymouth City Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Budshead | 2 | 6,770 | 3,385 | 4 | 6,863 | 3,432 | 4 |
| Compton | 3 | 9,648 | 3,216 | -1 | 9,758 | 3,253 | -2 |
| Derriford | 3 | 9,797 | 3,266 | 0 | 10,159 | 3,386 | 2 |
| Drake | 2 | 6,382 | 3,191 | -2 | 6,387 | 3,194 | -4 |
| Efford | 2 | 6,699 | 3,350 | 3 | 6,742 | 3,371 | 2 |
| Eggbuckland | 3 | 9,642 | 3,214 | -1 | 10,246 | 3,415 | 3 |
| Estover | 2 | 6,346 | 3,173 | -2 | 6,406 | 3,203 | -3 |
| Ham | 2 | 6,321 | 3,161 | -3 | 6,332 | 3,166 | -4 |
| Honicknowle | 3 | 10,174 | 3,391 | 4 | 10,174 | 3,391 | 2 |
| Keyham | 2 | 6,328 | 3,164 | -3 | 6,377 | 3,189 | -4 |
| Mount Gould | 3 | 9,310 | 3,103 | -5 | 9,986 | 3,329 | 0 |
| Plympton Chaddlewood | 2 | 6,624 | 3,312 | 2 | 6,627 | 3,314 | 0 |
| Plympton Erle | 2 | 6,600 | 3,300 | 2 | 6,685 | 3,343 | 1 |
| Plympton St Mary | 3 | 9,891 | 3,297 | 1 | 10,012 | 3,337 | 1 |
| Plymstock Dunstone | 3 | 10,126 | 3,375 | 4 | 10,192 | 3,397 | 3 |
| Plymstock Radford | 3 | 9,292 | 3,097 | -5 | 9,633 | 3,211 | -3 |
| St Andrew | 2 | 6,225 | 3,113 | -4 | 6,782 | 3,391 | 2 |
| St Aubyn | 3 | 9,820 | 3,273 | 1 | 9,945 | 3,315 | 0 |
| St Budeaux | 3 | 9,588 | 3,196 | -2 | 9,736 | 3,245 | -2 |
| Southway | 2 | 6,751 | 3,376 | 4 | 6,801 | 3,401 | 3 |
| Stoke | 2 | 6,477 | 3,239 | 0 | 6,537 | 3,269 | -1 |

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Sutton | 2 | 6,655 | 3,328 | 2 | 6,682 | 3,341 | 1 |
| Trelawny | 3 | 9,820 | 3,273 | 1 | 9,852 | 3,284 | -1 |
| Totals | 57 | 185,286 | – | – | 188,914 | – | – |
| Averages | – | – | 3,251 | – | – | 3,314 | – |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Plymouth City Council's submission.

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

Plymouth Unitary Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B2: Plymouth Unitary Labour Party's Proposal: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

| Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2000) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2005) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Budshead | 3 | 10,127 | 3,376 | 4 | 10,221 | 3,407 | 3 |
| Compton | 3 | 9,625 | 3,208 | -1 | 9,735 | 3,245 | -2 |
| Crownhill | 3 | 9,881 | 3,294 | 1 | 10,019 | 3,340 | 1 |
| Devonport | 3 | 9,777 | 3,259 | 0 | 9,818 | 3,273 | -1 |
| Drake | 2 | 6,381 | 3,191 | -2 | 6,544 | 3,272 | -1 |
| Efford & Lipson | 3 | 9,905 | 3,302 | 2 | 10,009 | 3,336 | 1 |
| Ham | 3 | 9,890 | 3,297 | 1 | 9,933 | 3,311 | 0 |
| Honicknowle | 3 | 9,694 | 3,231 | -1 | 10,200 | 3,400 | 3 |
| Moor View | 3 | 9,827 | 3,276 | 1 | 10,140 | 3,380 | 2 |
| Peverell | 3 | 9,783 | 3,261 | 0 | 9,783 | 3,261 | -2 |
| Plympton Chaddlewood | 2 | 6,624 | 3,312 | 2 | 6,627 | 3,314 | 0 |
| Plympton Erle | 2 | 6,600 | 3,300 | 2 | 6,685 | 3,343 | 1 |
| Plympton St Mary | 3 | 9,891 | 3,297 | 1 | 10,012 | 3,337 | 1 |
| Plymstock Dunstone | 3 | 9,837 | 3,279 | 1 | 9,900 | 3,300 | 0 |
| Plymstock Radford | 3 | 9,581 | 3,194 | -2 | 9,925 | 3,308 | 0 |
| St Budeaux | 3 | 9,653 | 3,218 | -1 | 9,801 | 3,267 | -1 |
| Southway | 3 | 9,951 | 3,317 | 2 | 10,066 | 3,355 | 1 |
| Stoke | 3 | 9,615 | 3,205 | -1 | 9,705 | 3,235 | -2 |
| Sutton & Mount Gould | 3 | 9,517 | 3,172 | -2 | 9,979 | 3,326 | 0 |
| Waterfront | 3 | 9,125 | 3,042 | 6 | 9,810 | 3,270 | -1 |
| Totals | 57 | 185,284 | - | - | 188,912 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 3,251 | - | - | 3,314 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on Plymouth City Council's submission.

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

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;

- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.

APPENDIX D

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

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

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

Table D1: Commission compliance with Code criteria

| Criteria | Compliance/departure |
|--|---|
| Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage | The Commission complies with this requirement |
| It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose | The Commission complies 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 | The Commission complies 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 | The Commission complies 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 | The Commission consults 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 | The Commission complies with this requirement |
| Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated | The Commission complies with this requirement |