

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Carrick

Report to The Electoral Commission

June 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 298

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	11
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	13
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	17
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	19
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	21
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	39
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Carrick: Detailed Mapping	41

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Truro, Falmouth and Perranzabuloe parish is inserted inside the back cover of this report.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

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

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Carrick's electoral arrangements on 12 June 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 15 January 2002, after which it undertook an eight-week period of consultation. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us, the Boundary Committee for England, to complete the work of the LGCE and submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

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

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

- **in 12 of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and six wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 11 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 95-96) are that:

- **Carrick District Council should have 47 councillors, two more than at present;**
- **there should be 19 wards, one fewer than at present;**
- **the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 17 of the proposed 19 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

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

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, to arrive no later than 18 July 2002.

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

Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary

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

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

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

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

Table 2: Final Recommendations for Carrick

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Arwenack	3	4,320	1,440	0	4,723	1,574	4
2	Boscawen	3	4,279	1,426	-1	4,675	1,558	3
3	Boslowick	3	3,927	1,309	-9	4,236	1,412	-7
4	Carland	1	1,366	1,366	-5	1,455	1,455	-4
5	Feock & Kea	3	4,297	1,432	0	4,354	1,451	-5
6	Kenwyn & Chacewater	3	4,244	1,415	-1	4,336	1,445	-5
7	Moresk	2	2,660	1,330	-7	3,256	1,628	7
8	Mount Hawke	2	2,749	1,375	-4	2,879	1,440	-5
9	Mylor	3	4,468	1,489	4	4,551	1,517	0
10	Newlyn & Goonhavern	2	2,999	1,500	5	3,080	1,540	1
11	Penryn	3	4,608	1,536	7	4,923	1,641	8
12	Penwerris	3	4,139	1,380	-4	4,251	1,417	-7
13	Perranporth	2	3,172	1,586	11	3,262	1,631	7
14	Probus	3	4,590	1,530	7	4,762	1,587	4
15	Roseland	2	2,861	1,431	0	2,946	1,473	-3
16	St Agnes	2	2,962	1,481	3	3,095	1,548	2
17	Tregolls	2	2,403	1,202	-16	2,837	1,419	-7
18	Trehaverne & Gloweth	3	4,446	1,482	3	4,896	1,632	7
19	Trescobeas	2	2,900	1,450	1	2,937	1,469	-3
	Totals	47	67,390	-	-	71,454	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,434	-	-	1,520	-

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

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

1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 Carrick District Council's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1978 (Report no. 273). The electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council were last reviewed in November 1983 (Report no. 456). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

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

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - c) achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Carrick was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition, published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

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

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

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

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 12 June 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Carrick District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Cornwall County Council, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, the Local Government Association, Cornwall Association of Parish & Town Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West region, and the headquarters of the main political

parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 3 September 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 15 January 2002 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Carrick in Cornwall*, and ended on 11 March 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

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

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

Map 1: Existing Wards in Carrick

Table 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Arwenack	2	2,728	1,364	-9	3,012	1,506	-5
2 Boscawen	3	3,914	1,305	-13	4,310	1,437	-10
3 Chacewater	1	1,176	1,176	-21	1,226	1,226	-23
4 Feock	2	2,961	1,481	-1	3,011	1,506	-5
5 Kea	1	1,203	1,203	-20	1,210	1,210	-24
6 Kenwyn	2	3,638	1,819	21	4,005	2,003	26
7 Moresk	2	2,483	1,242	-17	3,079	1,540	-3
8 Mylor	3	4,468	1,489	-1	4,551	1,517	-4
9 Newlyn	1	2,077	2,077	39	2,205	2,205	39
10 Penryn	3	4,608	1,536	3	4,923	1,641	3
11 Penwerris	3	4,105	1,368	-9	4,190	1,397	-12
12 Perranzabuloe	3	4,278	1,426	-5	4,388	1,463	-8
13 Probus	2	3,657	1,829	22	3,828	1,914	21
14 Roseland	2	2,664	1,332	-11	2,743	1,372	-14
15 St Agnes	3	5,711	1,904	27	5,974	1,991	25
16 St Clement	1	2,312	2,312	54	2,341	2,341	47
17 Smithick	3	3,848	1,283	-14	4,165	1,388	-13
18 Tregolls	2	2,981	1,491	0	3,414	1,707	8
19 Trehaverne	3	3,973	1,324	-12	4,099	1,366	-14
20 Trevethan	3	4,605	1,535	3	4,780	1,593	0
Totals	45	67,390	-	-	71,454	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,498	-	-	1,588	-

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Chacewater ward were relatively over-represented by 21 per cent, while electors in St Clement ward were relatively under-represented by 54 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

14 During Stage One the LGCE received 23 representations, including a district-wide scheme from Carrick District Council, and representations from the Member of Parliament for Falmouth and Cambourne, seven parish and town councils and fourteen local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Carrick in Cornwall*.

15 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the District Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards across the district. However, it moved away from the District Council's scheme in a number of areas, affecting four wards. It proposed that:

- Carrick District Council should be served by 47 councillors, compared with the current 45, representing 19 wards, one less than at present;
- the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, while two wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Falmouth and Truro;
- new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Chacewater, Kenwyn and St Newlyn East;
- a redistribution of councillors for Kea parish.

Draft Recommendation

Carrick District Council should comprise 47 councillors, serving 19 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections every four years.

16 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 18 of the 19 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

17 During the consultation on its draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 90 representations. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Carrick District Council.

Carrick District Council

18 The District Council resolved to support the LGCE's draft recommendations where they matched the District Council's Stage One submission. However, it opposed the proposals for creating a Gloweth parish ward to form part of the proposed Trehaverne ward and the proposed three-member Feock & Kea ward.

Cornwall County Council

19 Cornwall County Council made general comments regarding the reviews of electoral arrangements for the western districts of Cornwall. It responded to the review of Carrick District Council by objecting to the proposed wards of Carland, Penwerris, Feock & Kea, Tregolls, Moresk and Trehaverne.

20 The LGCE also received submissions from County Councillors Rowe (Kenwyn division), who opposed the warding of Chacewater parish, Biscoe (Truro East division), who proposed an amendment to the boundary between Moresk and Boscawen wards, and Mennear (Probus division), who opposed the warding of St Clement parish.

Member of Parliament for Truro and St Austell

21 Matthew Taylor MP represented the concerns of residents of the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward and requested that they be taken into account. He also drew attention to Perranzabuloe Parish Council's objection to the LGCE's proposals for their area.

Parish Councils

22 Six representations were received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from parish councils. The parishes of Cubert and St Allen supported the proposals for their respective areas. The parishes of Kenwyn, Perranzabuloe and St Clement objected to the proposals for their respective areas and proposed alternative warding arrangements. Truro City Council proposed an amendment to the boundary between Moresk and Boscawen wards and supported the inclusion of Gloweth parish ward in Trehaverne ward. However, it objected to the inclusion of Malpas & St Clement parish ward in Tregolls ward.

Other Representations

23 A further 78 representations were received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations, district councillors and residents.

24 Councillor Brinton (Trehaverne ward) expressed support for the draft recommendations. Councillor May (Feock ward) opposed the increase in council size and suggested that the large geographical area of some of the proposed wards might hinder effective representation. Councillor Dyer (Kenwyn ward) objected to the proposal to combine part of Kenwyn parish with the proposed Trehaverne ward. Councillor Vella (Trehaverne ward) supported the draft recommendations in regard to Truro, but proposed an alternative distribution of city councillors. The Trevethan Conservative Group of Falmouth & Cambourne Conservative Association

expressed its support of the draft recommendations, in particular with regard to the proposed warding of Falmouth.

25 Malpas & St Clement Residents' Association, 65 local residents and a resident of Bristol objected to the LGCE's proposal to combine part of St Clement parish with the proposed Tregolls ward. Five local residents objected to the proposal to combine part of Kenwyn parish with the proposed Trehaverne ward. A former Electoral Services Officer, who undertook much of the preliminary work in producing the District Council's Stage One scheme, proposed renaming the proposed wards of Tregolls and Trehaverne and put forward an amendment to the boundary between the proposed wards of Perranporth and Newlyn & Goonhavern. A local resident suggested that a tier of local government be removed as part of the review.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

Electorate Forecasts

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

31 The LGCE received no comments on the Council’s electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and we remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

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

33 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE adopted the District Council’s proposal for a council of 47-members. Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, it concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met

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

34 At Stage Three Councillor May stated that in his view the council “was already too big”. He argued that “electors do not want to pay more for the mechanics of representation” and therefore “an opportunity to downsize the council has been missed”.

Electoral Arrangements

35 The LGCE gave careful consideration to all the views it received during Stage One. In particular, it noted that the District Council had consulted fully on its proposals and received support from many of the parish councils in the district. The LGCE noted also the cross-party support which had been given to the District Council’s proposals. In view of the support given to large elements of the Council’s proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, the LGCE based its recommendations on the District Council’s scheme. It considered that the scheme would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than the current arrangements.

36 In response to the LGCE’s draft recommendations report, a number of respondents expressed the view that the proposal for the parish ward of Malpas & St Clement to form part of the proposed Tregolls ward would not have regard to local community identities and interests, nor secure convenient and effective local government. Eight submissions were also received expressing the view that the proposal for Gloweth parish ward to form part of the proposed Trehaverne ward would not have regard for local community identities. Councillor Biscoe and Truro City Council proposed a boundary amendment in Truro. Perranzabuloe Parish Council opposed the proposed warding of the parish to form the proposed district wards of Perranporth and Newlyn & Goonhavern. The District Council supported the draft recommendations, but opposed the proposed wards of Trehaverne and Feock & Kea.

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

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

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

Newlyn, Perranzabuloe and St Agnes wards

39 These three coastal wards are situated on the north-western edge of the district. Perranzabuloe and St Agnes are three-member wards, while Newlyn is a single-member ward. Newlyn, Perranzabuloe and St Agnes wards have 39 per cent more, 5 per cent fewer and 27 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (39 per cent more, 8 per cent fewer and 25 per cent more by 2006).

40 At Stage One the District Council proposed new warding arrangements for Newlyn and Perranzabuloe wards. It stated that “the options to make any major changes, without involving Perranzabuloe parish, are limited”. It proposed a two-member Perranzabuloe ward and a two-member Newlyn & Goonhavern ward. The proposed Perranzabuloe ward would comprise the Penhallow and Perranzabuloe parish wards of Perranzabuloe parish. The proposed Newlyn & Goonhavern ward would comprise the St Newlyn East parish ward of St Newlyn East parish, Cubert parish and the Goonhavern parish ward of Perranzabuloe parish. It proposed transferring the Mitchell parish ward of St Newlyn East parish to a new Carland ward, as detailed below. The District Council proposed that there should be two two-member district wards covering St Agnes parish, based on existing parish ward boundaries. The proposed St Agnes ward would comprise the parish wards of St Agnes and Mithian, while Mount Hawke ward would comprise the parish wards of Mount Hawke, Porthtowan and Blackwater. St Agnes Parish Council supported the District Council’s proposals for these wards.

41 Perranzabuloe Parish Council was opposed to the District Council’s proposals. It regarded the District Council’s comment that the villages of Goonhavern and Rose are predominantly rural communities as “absolute farce”, and stated that they were “effectively suburban conurbations of Perranzabuloe”. The parish council put forward alternative proposals for the area, which would entail dividing the area between the coastal towns and villages, and the rural communities.

42 The LGCE gave careful consideration to all the representations received for this area. It noted that the views expressed by both the District Council and Perranzabuloe Parish Council concerning Goonhavern and Rose had some merit. However, the LGCE concurred with the District Council in its view that, although the area has holiday parks, it is predominantly rural and the main area for tourism is based on the coast at Perranzabuloe. The LGCE also noted Cubert Parish Council’s support to the District Council’s proposals and opposition to Perranzabuloe Parish Council’s scheme.

43 The LGCE considered that the District Council’s proposals for this area would secure improved levels of electoral equality, while providing a satisfactory reflection of local community identities. The LGCE therefore adopted the District Council’s proposals as its draft recommendations for these wards.

44 At Stage Three the District Council supported the proposals for this area. Perranzabuloe Parish Council proposed that the existing district warding arrangements be maintained for the parish, as this would secure an electoral variance of below 10 per cent. It argued that the parish “will suffer detrimental effects to accommodate smaller parishes in the Carrick area”. The Parish Council considered that as the majority of the holiday accommodation lies within the Goonhavern parish ward, it should remain in a single district ward with the rest of Perranzabuloe parish.

45 Cubert Parish Council supported the proposed Newlyn & Goonhavern ward arguing that the parishes of Cubert and St Newlyn East “have long standing historic and family ties and noted that Goonhavern parish ward “is much more rural than urban”. A former Electoral Services Officer of Carrick District Council proposed that the boundary between the proposed Perranzabuloe and Newlyn & Goonhavern ward be amended to include the holiday park of Perranzabuloe.

Sands and stated that this would ensure that “this major holiday amenity is contained within the proposed Perranporth district ward”.

46 We have carefully considered all the representations and evidence received. We have considered the proposal of Perranzabuloe Parish Council that it comprise a single district ward, but note that the proposed Newlyn & Goonhavern ward has received support from Cubert Parish Council. We also note that whilst the proposal would secure an acceptable level of electoral equality for the proposed Perranzabuloe ward it would result in high levels of electoral inequality in the proposed Newlyn & Goonhavern ward.

47 We have considered the proposed boundary amendment, but we note that the Parish Council proposed a ward comprising the whole of the parish and consider that amending the boundary between the proposed wards of Perranporth and Newlyn & Goonhavern would not sufficiently address its concerns. We note Perranzabuloe Parish Council’s alternative proposal, but we consider that the draft recommendations secure better levels of electoral equality and that they have received support.

48 In light of this we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Perranporth and Newlyn & Goonhavern wards as final. No further specific comments concerning the proposed wards of St Agnes and Mount Hawke were received and we therefore confirm the draft recommendations for St Agnes and Mount Hawke wards as final.

49 Under our final recommendations Mount Hawke ward, Newlyn & Goonhavern ward, Perranporth ward and St Agnes ward would have 4 per cent fewer, 5 per cent more, 11 per cent more and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 2 per cent more by 2006). Our final proposals are illustrated on Map 2, Map A2, Map A3 and the large map at the back of the report.

Probus, Roseland and St Clement wards

50 These three rural wards are situated in the east of the district. Probus and Roseland are two-member wards, while St Clement is a single-member ward. Probus ward, comprising the parishes of Cuby, Ladock, Probus, Ruanlanihorne and Tregony, has 22 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (21 per cent more by 2006). Roseland ward, comprising the parishes of Gerrans, Philleigh, St Just in Roseland and Veryan, has 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (14 per cent fewer by 2006). St Clement ward, comprising the parishes of St Allen, St Clement, St Erme and St Michael Penkevil, has 54 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (47 per cent more by 2006).

51 At Stage One the District Council proposed modifying the boundaries of Probus ward to create a three-member ward, comprising all the constituent parishes of the existing ward, except for Ruanlanihorne parish, which it proposed transferring to an enlarged two-member Roseland ward. The proposed Probus ward would include St Michael Penkivel parish and part of St Clement parish, the proposed Tresillian parish ward. The Council proposed creating two parish wards within St Clement parish, the Tresillian parish ward in the north and the Malpas & St Clement parish ward in the south. In support of this proposal, the Council pointed out that Probus parish currently extends to the fringes of Tresillian village and that a few electors from Probus parish are allocated to vote there. The Council also proposed a new single-member Carland ward. This would comprise the parishes of St Allen and St Erme and the proposed Mitchell parish ward of St Newlyn East parish, three communities which “are adjacent to, and in close proximity of, each other”. It stated that Carland Cross, after which the ward would be named, would be the “central pivot” of the ward, less than two miles from each community.

52 St Clement Parish Council was opposed to the District Council’s proposals to ward the parish, particularly relating to the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward. The parish

council put forward alternative proposals for the area, which would enable the parish to remain unwarded, and which it considered to be “the most favourable solution”. It proposed a two-member Probus West ward, comprising the parishes of St Allen, St Clement, St Erme and Ladock, and a two-member Probus East ward, comprising the parishes of Cuby, Probus, Ruanlanihorne, St Michael Penkevil and Tregony. Under St Clement Parish Council’s proposals Probus East ward and Probus West would have 6 per cent fewer electors and 14 per cent more per councillor than the district average currently (8 per cent fewer and 10 per cent more by 2006).

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

54 Under the LGCE’s draft recommendations Carland ward, Probus ward and Roseland ward would have 5 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and an equal amount of electors per councillor than the district average currently (4 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer and 3 per cent fewer by 2006).

55 In response to the draft recommendations the District Council supported the LGCE’s proposals. Councillor May (Feock ward) was concerned that the geographical size of the proposed Probus ward would hinder councillors in their effective representation of the electorate. St Allen Parish Council submitted that it “will be happy to work within (the) recommendations” with regard to the proposed Carland ward. Cornwall County Council proposed that the proposed Mitchell parish ward be “defined as tightly as possible around the village of Mitchell so that all the Newlyn Downs area remains within the Newlyn & Goonhavern ward”.

56 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received. We note in particular that St Allen Parish Council supported the proposed Carland ward. We have considered the County Council’s proposal, but we judge that to amend the boundary in this manner would create a virtually detached area of Carland ward. Nor would it contain sufficient electors to make a Mitchell parish ward viable. As a consequence of our decision to move away from the draft recommendations in the St Clement parish area (combing the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward, with the proposed Tregolls district ward) described in detail below, we propose that the whole of St Clement parish form part of the proposed Probus ward. We note that this would secure an acceptable level of electoral equality and we have been persuaded that it would better reflect community identities and interests. We therefore propose to move away from the draft recommendation for the Probus ward and propose that the whole of St Clement parish form part of the proposed Probus ward. We consider this would provide the best balance between that the statutory criteria.

57 No submissions were received regarding the proposed ward of Roseland, and we therefore confirm the proposed ward as final. Consequently our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations in both Carland and Roseland wards. Under our final recommendations the proposed ward of Probus would have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (4 per cent more by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2. Our final recommendations for the area

surrounding the villages of Malpas and St Clement are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne wards

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

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

60 The District Council further proposed modifying the eastern boundary of Tregolls ward by including within it part of the existing St Clement ward. The Council proposed warding St Clement parish, with the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward becoming part of a revised two-member Tregolls ward. It considered that this part of St Clement parish was "virtually detached" from Tresillian, the main centre of population in the parish. It also stated that, as the only vehicular access to the two villages is through Tregolls ward, this was "a logical proposal".

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

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

63 The LGCE gave careful consideration to all the representations received in relation to this area. It noted the strength of feeling expressed by St Clement Parish Council and local residents and its concern that the District Council's proposals would have an adverse effect on the rural nature of the communities of Malpas and St Clement. However, having visited the area, it noted that there is no road link between the villages and the rest of existing St Clement ward without going into Truro, and that the eastern part of the existing Tregolls ward is also of a rural nature. The LGCE noted that the District Council's proposals for this part of Truro would achieve good electoral equality, and judged that they would provide a satisfactory reflection of local community identities and secure convenient and effective local government. The LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposal for Tregolls ward as part of its draft recommendations. It decided to adopt the District Council's proposed Moresk ward as part of its

draft recommendations as it would secure improved electoral equality while reflecting community interests and identities.

64 However, the LGCE proposed to move away from the District Council's proposals for the other two Truro wards. As a consequence of the proposal to improve the electoral equality of the District Council's proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater, as described below, the LGCE proposed to transfer the proposed Gloweth parish ward of Kenwyn parish to Trehaverne ward. In order to do this, it proposed dividing the existing Chyvelah parish ward of Kenwyn parish into two parish wards, which would be based on the existing polling district boundaries. The proposed Threemilestone parish ward would comprise Kenwyn 1-T polling district, while the proposed Gloweth parish ward would comprise Kenwyn 2-T polling district. The LGCE proposed that the existing Shortlanesend parish ward should be unchanged. The proposed Gloweth parish ward is linked with the existing Trehaverne ward by the A390 and contains Truro College and the Royal Cornwall Hospital (Treliske). As a consequence of this proposal the LGCE proposed to retain the existing boundary between Trehaverne and Boscawen wards, in the interest of electoral equality, albeit with a small modification to include the whole of Merrifield Close in Trehaverne ward. Under the LGCE's draft recommendations the proposed wards of Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne would have equal to, 9 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (3 per cent more, 6 per cent more, 2 per cent more and 7 per cent more by 2006).

65 At Stage Three, Councillor Biscoe (Truro East division) objected to the proposed boundary between the proposed wards of Moresk and Boscawen and proposed an amendment. Truro City Council proposed the same amendment. Councillor Biscoe proposed that the boundary follow St Austell Street, St Clement Street and Oak Way as this "is a distributor route which is heavily trafficked" and represents a "significant physical boundary between the residential area of Moresk to the North and Boscawen ward to the South. It is a natural ward boundary". He argued that the proposed boundary would divide communities which have a common identity and interest, placing them with a commercial area with a separate identity and interest. Councillor Biscoe noted that the proposed boundary would place Daubuz Court in Boscawen ward while Benson Gardens, Elm Court and Benson House would remain in Moresk ward. He argued that this populated area shares a "clear community of interest". Cornwall County Council gave details of Councillor Biscoe's proposals in their submission.

66 Councillor Vella (Trehaverne ward) supported the draft recommendations affecting the four Truro wards and the proposed inclusion of Gloweth parish ward in Trehaverne ward, as did Truro City Council. However, Councillor Vella proposed an alternative distribution of city councillors representing the city wards. This is discussed in more detail below.

67 The District Council objected to the draft recommendation that the proposed Gloweth parish ward be included in the proposed Trehaverne ward. Both Kenwyn Parish Council and Councillor Dyer (Kenwyn ward) argued that the community comprising the Gloweth parish ward looks to Threemilestone for its services and shares its identity and interests with Kenwyn parish, which are separate from those of Trehaverne ward. Both argued that the proposal would not secure effective and convenient local government as it would create confusion for the electorate due to a change of representation at district level. Both supported the District Council's Stage One proposal for a three-member Kenwyn & Chacewater ward, comprising the whole of Kenwyn parish and the proposed Chacewater parish ward of Chacewater parish. Five local residents made submissions supporting the argument that Gloweth parish ward shares links as well as identity and interests with Threemilestone rather than Truro. Two of the residents argued that the proposal would not secure a level of representation as effective as their current representation by Kenwyn district councillors. A former Electoral Services Officer proposed to rename Trehaverne ward 'Trehaverne & Gloweth' ward so that Gloweth parish ward is "recognised as being a separately defined area within this proposed revised ward".

68 Seventy-one submissions were received in response to the draft recommendation that the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward of St Clement parish be included in the proposed Tregolls ward. Cornwall County Council, Councillor Biscoe and Truro City Council also commented on the draft recommendation for this area. Matthew Taylor MP made a representation on behalf of his constituents, who opposed the proposal, detailing their concerns and asking that their views be taken into account. Cornwall County Council, Councillor Biscoe, Councillor Mennear (Probus division), St Clement Parish Council and Malpas Resident's Association opposed the proposal and argued that it would not secure effective representation for the proposed parish ward. They argued that the rural area of the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward has separate community identities and interests from the urban area of Tregolls, which the proposal does not reflect. They proposed that the whole of St Clement parish form part of the proposed Probus ward, which they argued would secure acceptable levels of electoral equality, convenient and effective local government and reflect community identity and interests. Councillor Biscoe argued that although "access is gained to both villages through Truro (this) does not make them part of Truro", while Malpas Residents' Association argued that this limited access emphasised the area's "rurality" rather than justifying its grouping with an urban ward. Truro City Council opposed the inclusion of part of St Clement parish within the proposed Tregolls ward.

69 Sixty-five local residents and a resident of Bristol opposed the proposal for Malpas & St Clement parish ward to form part of the proposed Tregolls ward. They argued that the rural nature of the ward and its community identities and interests make it distinct and separate from the urban area of Tregolls ward. They argued that they share their identity with the other rural villages of St Clement parish. This distinction would not be effectively represented if they were to be grouped with an urban area, contending that their identity and interests would be better represented in a district ward comprising rural parishes. 17 of the residents specifically supported Malpas Residents' Association's proposal, 2 residents specifically supported the Parish Council's proposal, one of whom supported the Parish Council's Stage One proposal and 6 residents made their own proposal for the whole of St Clement parish to be included in the proposed Probus ward.

70 A former Electoral Services Officer noted that the villages of Malpas and St Clement "from a communication aspect are vitually 'detached' from the Tresillian village which adjoins the parish of Probus" and are "located barely ½ mile from the eastern boundary of Tregolls ward". From this perspective placing the area with Tregolls ward would provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria. However, he proposed that the ward be renamed 'Tregolls & Malpas' to recognise the two distinct areas.

71 We have carefully considered the representations received during Stage Three. We note Councillor Biscoe's and Truro City Council's proposed amendment to the boundary between the proposed wards of Moresk and Boscawen. However, we note that the amendment would result in an electoral variance of 19 per cent in Moresk ward. This would necessitate consequential changes to the boundary of Moresk ward to secure an acceptable level of electoral equality. We do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence to make such consequential amendments. We also note that amending the boundary of Moresk ward would result in the same problem the respondents argue affects the boundary between Moresk and Boscawen: dividing residential communities. However, we are minded to agree with the argument that Daubuz Court would be isolated from the other estates in Moresk ward. Therefore, we have decided to amend the boundary to include this area within Moresk ward. Subject to this amendment, we confirm the proposed wards of Moresk and Boscawen as final

72 We have carefully considered the submissions regarding Gloweth parish ward. We note that to include Gloweth parish ward with the proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater ward would result in an unacceptable level of electoral inequality, which was the reason that the LGCE did not adopt the District Council's proposed three-member Kenwyn & Chacewater ward in its draft recommendations. We have not been persuaded that the District Council's Stage One proposal

would best reflect the statutory criteria, nor do we consider that we have received sufficient evidence or alternative proposals to put forward consequential modifications to the wards west of Truro to achieve acceptable levels of electoral equality. However, we have been persuaded that Trehaverne ward be renamed Trehaverne & Gloweth ward to better reflect the two constituent parish areas. Subject to this amendment, we confirm the proposed Trehaverne & Gloweth ward as final.

73 We have considered the evidence received concerning the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward. We consider the evidence of the area's community identity and interest to be of a high quality, suggesting that being part of an urban ward would not effectively represent the distinction between the rural and urban communities. We are still concerned that the area has limited access to the rest of St Clement parish and the proposed ward of Probus, but we have been persuaded by the evidence received that the identity and interests they share is a more important factor when considering the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We note that eleven respondents have proposed an alternative arrangement for the whole of St Clement parish to form part of the proposed Probus ward, and that this proposal has received widespread support. We note that this proposal would secure an acceptable level of electoral equality and we have been persuaded that this proposal would provide a better reflection of the statutory criteria. We therefore intend to move away from the draft recommendations for this area to propose that the whole of St Clement parish form part of the proposed Probus ward.

74 Under our final recommendations the proposed wards of Boscawen, Moresk, Trehaverne & Gloweth and Tregolls would have 1 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more and 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (3 per cent more, 7 per cent more, 7 per cent more and 7 per cent fewer by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Chacewater, Feock, Kea and Kenwyn wards

75 These four wards are situated in the western half of the district, the latter two bordering the city of Truro. Chacewater and Kea are single-member wards, while Feock and Kenwyn are two-member wards. All four district wards comprise the parishes of the same name. Chacewater ward, Feock ward, Kea ward and Kenwyn ward have 21 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer, 20 per cent fewer and 21 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (23 per cent fewer, 5 per cent fewer, 24 per cent fewer and 26 per cent more by 2006).

76 At Stage One the LGCE received only one representation with regard to this area. The District Council proposed that Feock ward should be unchanged because of its good electoral equality. However, because of the high electoral variance in the other wards, the District Council proposed combining the existing three wards into two. It proposed enlarging the existing Kea ward by transferring to it part of the existing Chacewater ward. It regarded this as the "only feasible solution because of its location". It stated that the area of Chacewater parish in closest proximity to Kea is "clearly centred on the community of Twelveheads", and regarded the area as being some distance from Chacewater village and having "close affinity with the areas of Baldhu and Bissoe, both of which are within the parish of Kea". It proposed creating a Twelveheads parish ward of Chacewater parish, utilising the boundaries of the existing polling district. The revised ward would return one member. The District Council further proposed creating a three-member Kenwyn & Chacewater ward by transferring the remainder of the existing Chacewater ward to the existing Kenwyn ward, as "there is an exceedingly strong case to combine these wards, which have close community links and are already incorporated within the same County Council electoral division". The proposed Chacewater parish ward of Chacewater parish would utilise the boundaries of the existing polling district.

77 The LGCE gave careful consideration to the District Council's proposals for these wards. It judged that the District Council's proposals would provide a satisfactory reflection of local community identities, but noted that the projected elector:councillor ratio for 2006 in Kea and

Kenwyn & Chacewater wards was over 10 per cent. Consequently, the LGCE did not propose adopting the District Council's proposals for this area, although it did adopt the District Council's proposed new parish warding arrangements for Chacewater parish. In order to improve electoral equality, the LGCE proposed to join the existing district wards of Feock and Kea, and the proposed Twelveheads parish ward of Chacewater parish to create a three-member ward of Feock & Kea. It noted that the A39 would provide a good link between the north and south of the proposed ward and that the parishes of Feock and Kea, being in the same County Council electoral division, already have close ties.

78 The LGCE also proposed to reduce the size of the electorate of the District Council's proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater ward by transferring part of Kenwyn parish to Trehaverne ward, as described above. The proposed Gloweth parish ward is linked with the existing Trehaverne ward by the A390 and contains Truro College and the Royal Cornwall Hospital (Treliske).

79 At Stage Three the District Council, Cornwall County Council, Kenwyn Parish Council, Councillor Dyer and five local residents opposed the draft recommendation to include part of Kenwyn parish, the proposed Gloweth parish ward, with the proposed Trehaverne ward (as detailed earlier). Kenwyn Parish Council proposed an alternative distribution of parish councillors among the three parish wards, which is discussed in more detail below.

80 The District Council and Cornwall County Council opposed the proposed three-member Feock & Kea ward. Cornwall County Council argued that the two comprising parishes of Kea and Feock have very different characters as Feock parish "contains several medium-size villages whereas Kea, with only one significant village, is much more rural". The County Council proposed that Feock should be retained as a two-member ward and a single-member Kea ward "with as much of Chacewater parish as is necessary to generate the requisite electorate number".

81 County Councillor Rowe (Kenwyn division) opposed the proposal to create the Twelveheads parish ward of Chacewater parish and argued that the area has a "close affinity to Chacewater and not to Baldhu and Bissoe". She proposed that the whole of Chacewater parish should form the proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater ward.

82 We have carefully considered the representations received during the consultation period. We note the District Council and Cornwall County Council's objection to the proposed three-member Feock & Kea ward and recognise their concerns. However, we consider that the District Council's Stage One proposal does not secure an acceptable level of electoral equality in the proposed Kea ward. We do not consider that sufficient evidence has been received to justify us moving away from the proposed Feock & Kea ward. We note that increasing the size of Twelveheads parish ward would deteriorate the electoral equality in the proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater ward. We also consider that we have not received sufficient evidence to propose that the whole of Chacewater parish form part of the proposed Kenwyn & Chacewater ward. Therefore we confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of Kenwyn & Chacewater and Feock & Kea as final.

83 Under our final recommendations the proposed wards of Feock & Kea and Kenwyn & Chacewater would have equal to and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent fewer and 5 per cent fewer by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A4.

Mylor and Penryn wards

84 These two three-member wards are situated towards the south of the district, west of Carrick Sounds and north of Falmouth. Mylor ward, comprising the parishes of Gwennap, Mylor and Perranarworthal, has 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average

currently (4 per cent fewer by 2006). Penryn ward, comprising the parish of Penryn, has 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average both now and by 2006.

85 At Stage One the District Council proposed that Mylor and Penryn wards should remain unchanged as this would secure satisfactory levels of electoral equality. Perranarworthal and Mylor parish councils supported the District Council's proposal with regard to Mylor ward.

86 The LGCE noted that the District Council's proposals would secure satisfactory electoral equality while reflecting community interests and identities. In the light of this, and in response to the submissions received, it proposed to adopt the District Council's proposals for these wards as part of their draft recommendations. Under the LGCE's draft recommendations the proposed wards of Mylor and Penryn would have 4 per cent more and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (equal to and 8 per cent more by 2006).

87 No responses were received during the consultation period concerning these two wards. We therefore confirm the draft recommendations as final. Consequently our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

Arwenack, Penwerris, Smithick and Trevethan wards

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

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

90 The District Council also proposed a new three-member Boslowick ward, generally covering the south-west of the town. Its boundary would follow the western boundary of Trescobeas ward, then continue along the railway line in a south-easterly direction before turning south to follow the boundary between the existing Smithick and Arwenack wards. The Council proposed that the part of the existing Arwenack ward to the south of the existing Smithick ward should be transferred to the proposed Boslowick ward. In the south-east of the town, the Council further proposed a revised three-member Arwenack ward, which would include the existing ward, less the part to be transferred to Boslowick ward, and part of the existing Smithick ward, and would border the other three proposed wards.

91 The LGCE noted that the District Council's proposals would secure satisfactory electoral equality while reflecting community interests and identities. It noted too the support from Falmouth Town Council. In the light of this, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposals for these wards as part of their draft recommendations. Under the LGCE's draft recommendations the proposed wards of Arwenack, Boslowick, Penwerris and Trescobeas would have equal to, 9 per cent fewer, 4 per cent fewer and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (4 per cent more, 7 per cent fewer, 7 per cent fewer and 3 per cent fewer by 2006).

92 At Stage Three the District Council supported the proposals. Cornwall County Council proposed that a ward "as similar as possible to the existing Penwerris ward should be retained". It argued that the existing Penwerris ward "is considered to have distinct characteristics compared with the rest of Falmouth". Trevethan Conservatives supported the proposed electoral arrangements for Falmouth Town Council and the proposed names of Boslowick and Trescobeas as they "clearly reflect well-known and easily identifiable areas of Falmouth".

93 We note Cornwall County Council's objection to the proposed Penwerris ward. However, the County Council has not provided a detailed alternative to the draft recommendation, which was proposed by the District Council and supported by Falmouth Town Council, nor has it provided sufficient evidence explaining the existing Penwerris ward's distinction from the rest of Falmouth. Accordingly, we are not persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations for Penwerris ward. We also note Trevethan Conservatives' support for the proposals for Falmouth. We therefore confirm the proposed warding arrangements for Falmouth as final. Our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

94 By virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

Conclusions

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

- in Truro City we propose a boundary amendment to include Daubuz Court in Moresk ward;
- the proposed ward of Trehaverne should be renamed Trehaverne & Gloweth ward;
- the proposed Malpas & St Clement parish ward become a constituent part of the proposed Probus ward.

96 We conclude that, in Carrick:

- there should be a increase in council size from 45 to 47;
- there should be 19 wards, one less than at present;
- the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	45	47	45	47
Number of wards	20	19	20	19
Average number of electors per councillor	1,498	1,434	1,588	1,520
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	12	2	11	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	6	0	7	0

98 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 12 to 2, with no wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2006, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation
 Carrick District Council should comprise 47 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A including the large map inside the back cover.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

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

100 The parish of Chacewater is currently served by 12 councillors and is not warded. The LGCE in its draft recommendations proposed to create two parish wards, Chacewater and Twelveheads, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. The LGCE proposed that Chacewater parish ward should be represented by ten councillors and Twelveheads parish ward should be represented by two councillors.

101 During Stage Three County Councillor Rowe (Kenwyn division) opposed the proposed warding of Chacewater parish arguing “Twelveheads is very closely associated with the village of Chacewater”. As stated earlier, we are confirming the LGCE’s draft recommendations as final. We also propose that the parish council’s electoral arrangements reflect our proposed district wards. Therefore, having considered the evidence received, and in light of the

confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Chacewater parish as final.

Final Recommendation

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

102 The town of Falmouth is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Arwenack, Penwerris, Smithick and Trevethan, each represented by four councillors. The LGCE in their draft recommendations proposed to create four town wards, Arwenack, Boslowick, Penwerris and Trescobeas, to reflect the proposed district ward boundaries. The LGCE noted that in response to the Council's Stage One consultation, Falmouth Town Council supported the District Council's proposals and stated that it "would like the total number of town councillors to remain 16". However it stated that if Arwenack and Penwerris town wards were to become similar in size then it would favour a council size of 17 to achieve equality of representation. In the LGCE's proposed district wards, it is Boslowick and Penwerris wards which are forecast to have a similar electorate size by 2006. In the light of this and the town council's comments, the LGCE proposed that Arwenack ward should be represented by five councillors, Boslowick and Penwerris wards each by four councillors and Trescobeas ward by three councillors.

103 We did not receive any further submissions concerning this area at Stage Three. In light of this, we are confirming the LGCE's draft recommendations for Falmouth Town Council as final.

Final Recommendation

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

104 The parish of Kenwyn is currently served by 14 councillors representing two wards: Chyvelah and Shortlanesend, each represented by seven councillors. The LGCE proposed, in the light of their draft recommendations for district wards in this area, to retain the existing Shortlanesend parish ward. It further proposed to divide Chyvelah parish ward into two, thus creating the parish wards of Gloweth and Threemilestone, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. The LGCE proposed that Gloweth parish ward should be represented by three councillors, Shortlanesend parish ward by three councillors and Threemilestone parish ward by eight councillors.

105 In response to the LGCE's consultation document, Kenwyn Parish Council opposed the division of Chyvelah parish ward to create a new parish ward of Gloweth, proposing to "continue to use the two ward system". The Parish Council also proposed a redistribution of councillors as an alternative to the draft recommendations to achieve better equality of representation. It proposed that Shortlanesend parish ward return four councillors, "to ensure fairer representation of the physically large Shortlanesend parish ward", and an undivided Chyvelah parish ward return 10 councillors.

106 We note the Kenwyn Parish Council's opposition to the proposed parish ward. However, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972

Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district.

107 Therefore as a consequence of our proposed Trehaverne & Gloweth ward we are required to create a parish ward. We also note the Parish Council’s proposal for Shortlanesend to return four councillors. However we consider that equality of representation is best achieved by the LGCE’s proposed distribution of parish councillors.

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

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

109 The parish of St Newlyn East is currently served by 11 councillors, and is not warded. The LGCE proposed to create two parish wards, St Newlyn East and Mitchell, to reflect the proposed district ward boundary. The LGCE proposed that St Newlyn East parish ward should be represented by nine councillors and Mitchell parish ward should be represented by two councillors.

110 In response to the LGCE’s consultation document Cornwall County Council proposed that “the proposed Carland ward is defined as tightly as possible around the village of Mitchell”. However, we note that we have not received any other submissions concerning the proposed boundary. We also note that to implement this proposal would result in a virtually detached area of Carland ward that would not constitute a viable parish ward. Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding St Newlyn East parish as final.

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

111 The city of Truro is currently served by 24 councillors, representing four wards; Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne. The LGCE, in the light of their draft recommendations for district wards in this area, proposed to modify the boundaries between the four city wards to reflect the proposed district ward boundaries. The LGCE proposed that the revised Boscawen, Moresk, Tregolls and Trehaverne city wards should each continue to be represented by six councillors.

112 In response to the LGCE’s consultation document Councillor Vella (Trehaverne ward) proposed an alternative distribution of councillors for Truro City Council. Councillor Vella proposed Boscawen and Trehaverne city wards return seven councillors and Moresk and Tregolls city wards return five councillors.

113 Although we concur that this proposal would achieve greater equality of representation across the parish, we note that it has not received support from the City Council who are “of the opinion that the recommendations would not effect the electorate per councillor”. Moreover, we are not required by statute to have regard for electoral equality at parish and town council level. Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Truro City Council as final.

Final Recommendation

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

114 The parish of Kea is currently served by 12 councillors, representing two wards: Baldhu and Kea, represented by five and seven councillors respectively. At Stage One Kea Parish Council, in agreement with the District Council, proposed that Baldhu parish ward should be served by four councillors, instead of the current five, and that Kea parish ward should be served by eight councillors, instead of the current seven. The overall number of parish councillors would be unchanged. The LGCE proposed this redistribution of councillors as part of its draft recommendations.

115 We did not receive any submissions regarding this proposal and therefore confirm the LGCE’s draft recommendations as final.

Final Recommendation

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

Map 2: Final Recommendations for Carrick

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

Final Recommendations for Carrick: Detailed Mapping

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

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

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

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

Map A4 illustrates the proposed warding of Chacewater parish.

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

Map A1: Final Recommendations for Carrick: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of St Newlyn East Parish

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

Map A4: Proposed Warding of Chacewater Parish