

Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Cornwall County Council

February 2004

© Crown Copyright 2004

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.

Contents

	page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	15
2 Current electoral arrangements	19
3 Submissions received	23
4 Analysis and draft recommendations	25
5 What happens next?	45
Appendices	
A Draft recommendations for Cornwall: Detailed mapping	47
B Code of practice on written consultation	49

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
Robin Gray
Joan Jones CBE
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 the number of councillors elected to the council, division boundaries and division names.

Summary

We began a review of the electoral arrangements for Cornwall County Council on 11 March 2003.

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

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Cornwall County Council:

- **In 44 of the 79 divisions, each of which are currently represented by a single councillor, the number of electors varies by more than 10% from the average for the county and 18 divisions vary by more than 20%.**
- **By 2007 this situation is expected to continue, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 46 divisions and by more than 20% in 23 divisions.**

Our main proposals for Cornwall County Council's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 100–101) are:

- **Cornwall County Council should have 82 councillors, three more than at present, representing 70 divisions.**
- **As the divisions are based on district wards, which have themselves been changed as a result of recent district reviews, the boundaries of all divisions, except St Blaise and Penryn, will be subject to change.**

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

- **In 46 of the proposed 70 divisions, the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve with the number of electors per councillor in 49 divisions expected to vary by no more than 10% from the average for the county by 2007.**

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 Bude-Stratton, Helston and Newquay.**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 24 February 2004. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, which will then be responsible for implementing change to the local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also decide when any changes will come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 26 April 2004.

**The Team Leader
Cornwall County Council Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Draft recommendations: Summary

	Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Constituent district wards
Caradon district			
1	Burraton & Landulph	1	Part of Landrake & St Dominick ward (the parishes of Botusfleming, Landrake with St Erney, Landulph and Pillaton); Saltash Burraton ward
2	Callington	1	Callington ward; part of Landrake & St Dominick ward (the parishes of St Dominick and St Mellion)
3	Calstock	1	Calstock ward
4	Lanreath	1	Duloe, Lansallos & Pelynt ward; Lanteglos & St Veep ward
5	Liskeard	2	Dobwalls & District ward; Liskeard North ward; Liskeard South ward
6	Looe	1	Looe & St Martin ward
7	Menheniot	1	Menheniot & St Ive ward; St Germans ward
8	Rame	1	Deviock & Sheviok ward; Millbrook ward; Rame Peninsula ward
9	Saltash	2	Saltash Essa ward; Saltash Pill ward; Saltash St Stephens ward
10	St Cleer	1	Lynher ward; St Cleer & St Neot ward
11	Torpoint	1	Torpoint East ward; Torpoint West ward
Carrick district			
12	Chacewater, Shortlanesend & Threemilestone	1	Kenwyn & Chacewater ward
13	Falmouth East & North	2	Boslowick ward; Penwerris ward; Trescobeas ward
14	Falmouth South	1	Arwenack ward
15	Feock & Kea	1	Feock & Kea ward
16	Mylor	1	Mylor ward
17	Penryn	1	Penryn ward
18	Perranporth	1	Perranporth ward; part of Newlyn & Goonhavern ward (the parish of Cubert and Goonhavern parish ward of Perranzabuloe parish)
19	Probus	1	Carland ward; part of Newlyn & Goonhavern ward (St Newlyn East parish ward of the parish of St Newlyn East); part of Probus ward (the parishes of Ladock and Probus)
20	Roseland	1	Roseland ward; part of Probus ward (the parishes of Cuby, St Clement, St Michael Penkevil and Tregoney)
21	St Agnes	1	Mount Hawke ward; St Agnes ward
22	Truro East	2	Boscawen ward; Moresk ward; Tregolls ward
23	Truro West	1	Trehaverne & Gloweth ward
Kerrier district			
24	Breage & Crowan	1	Breage & Crowan ward
25	Camborne North	1	Camborne North ward
26	Camborne South	1	Camborne South ward
27	Camborne West	1	Camborne West ward
28	Carn Brea	1	Illogan South ward

	Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Constituent district wards
29	Constantine	1	Constantine, Gweek & Mawnan ward; part of Mabe & Budock ward (the parishes of Budock and Mabe)
30	Helston North	1	Helston North ward
31	Illogan & Portreath	1	Illogan North ward
32	Meneage & South Helston	1	Meneage ward; part of Helston South ward (the Helston East parish ward of Helston parish)
33	Porthleven	1	Porthleven & Sithney ward; part of Helston South ward (the Helston West parish ward of Helston parish)
34	Redruth North	1	Redruth North ward
35	Redruth South	1	Redruth South ward
36	St Day, Lanner & Carharrack	1	St Day, Lanner & Carharrack ward
37	St Keverne	1	Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward; Mullion ward; St Keverne ward
38	Stithians	1	Stithians ward; Wendron ward; part of Mabe & Budock ward (the parish of St Gluvias)
North Cornwall district			
39	Altarnun	1	Altarnun ward; part of South Petherwin ward (the parishes of Lewannick and Trewen) part of Tremaine ward (the parishes of Egloskerry, Laneast, Tresmeer, Tremaine, Treneglos, and Warbstow)
40	Bodmin St Mary's	1	Bodmin St Mary's ward
41	Bodmin St Petroc	1	Bodmin St Petroc ward
42	Bude	1	Bude ward; part of Poughill & Stratton ward (the proposed Flexbury parish ward of Bude-Stratton parish)
43	Camelford	1	Camelford ward; part of Tremaine ward (the parishes of Advent, Davidstow and Otterham); part of Valency ward (the parishes of Lesnewth, St Gennys and St Juliot)
44	Helland	1	Blisland & St Breward ward; Lanivet ward
45	Launceston North, South & Stokeclimsland	2	Launceston ward; Stokeclimsland ward; part of South Petherwin ward (the parishes of South Petherwin and Lawhitton Rural)
46	North Petherwin & Week St Mary	1	North Petherwin ward; part of Marhamchurch ward (the parish of Poundstock); Week St Mary & Whitstone ward
47	Padstow	1	Padstow & District ward
48	Stratton	1	Grenville ward; part of Poughill & Stratton ward (the proposed Poughill & Stratton parish ward of Bude-Stratton parish); part of Marhamchurch ward (the parishes of Launcells and Marhamchurch)
49	Tintagel	1	Camelot ward; part of Valency ward (the parishes of Forrabury & Minster and Trevalga)
50	Wadebridge & St Minver	2	Allan; St Endellion & St Kew ward; St Minver ward; Wadebridge ward
Penwith district			
51	Hayle-Gwinear	2	Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East ward; Hayle North ward; Hayle South ward
52	Ludgvan	1	Ludgvan ward; Madron & Zennor ward; part of St Buryan ward (the parishes of Paul and Sancreed)
53	Marazion	1	Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary ward; Marazion & Perranuthnoe ward
54	Penzance	3	Gulval & Heamoor ward; Penzance South ward; Penzance Central ward; Penzance East; Penzance Promenade ward
55	St Ives	2	Lelant & Carbis Bay ward; St Ives North ward; St Ives South ward

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Constituent district wards
56 St Just	1	Morvah, Pendeen & St Just ward; part of St Buryan ward (the parishes of St Buryan, St Levan and Sennen)
Restormel borough		
57 Fowey & Lostwithiel	1	Part of Fowey & Tywardreath ward (the parishes of Fowey and St Sampson); part of Lostwithiel ward (the parish of Lostwithiel)
58 Grampound	1	Mevagissey ward; part of St Ewe ward (the parishes of Grampound with Creed and St Ewe and the unparished area of the ward)
59 Luxulyan Valley	1	Part of Fowey & Tywardreath ward (the parish of Tywardreath); part of Lostwithiel ward (the parishes of Lanlivery and Luxulyan)
60 Newquay Central	1	Edgcumbe South ward; part of Edgcumbe North ward (the proposed Edgcumbe West parish ward of Newquay parish)
61 Newquay North	1	Part of Edgcumbe North ward (Edgcumbe East parish ward); part of Rialton ward (the proposed Newquay North parish ward of Newquay parish)
62 Newquay West	1	Gannel ward
63 Roche	1	Part of Rock ward (the parishes of Roche and St Dennis and Whitemoor parish ward of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish)
64 St Mewan	2	Gover ward; Poltair ward; part of St Ewe ward (Polgooth & Sticker parish ward of St Mewan parish); part of St Stephen ward (Trewoon parish ward of St Mewan parish)
65 Mount Charles	1	Mount Charles ward
66 St Blaise	1	St Blaise ward
67 St Columb	1	St Columb ward; part of Rock ward (the parish of St Wenn); part of St Enoder ward (the St Columb Major South parish ward of St Columb Major parish)
68 St Enoder & Colan	1	Part of Rialton ward (the parish of Colan and the proposed Rialton South parish ward of Newquay parish); part of St Enoder ward (the parish of St Enoder)
69 St Stephen	1	Part of St Stephen ward (the St Stephen-in-Brannel parish ward of St Stephen-in-Brannel parish)
70 Treverbyn	2	Bethal ward; Crinnis ward; Treverbyn ward

Notes:

1. *The constituent district wards are those resulting from the electoral reviews of the Cornwall County Council districts/borough which were completed in 2002. Where whole district wards do not form the building blocks, constituent parishes and parish wards are listed.*
2. *The large map inserted at the back of the report illustrates the proposed divisions outlined above and the maps in Appendix A illustrate some of the proposed boundaries in more detail.*

Table 2: Draft recommendations for Cornwall

Division name (by district council name)	Number of councillors	Electorate (2002)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Caradon district							
1 Burraton & Landulph	1	5,374	5,374	13	5,384	5,384	8
2 Callington	1	4,665	4,665	-2	5,353	5,353	7
3 Calstock	1	4,936	4,936	4	5,240	5,240	5
4 Lanreath	1	4,903	4,903	3	4,966	4,966	-1
5 Liskeard	2	9,698	4,849	2	10,468	5,234	5
6 Looe	1	4,559	4,559	-4	4,678	4,678	-6
7 Menheniot	1	4,556	4,556	-4	4,546	4,546	-9
8 Rame	1	4,871	4,871	2	5,105	5,105	2
9 Saltash	2	8,818	4,409	-7	9,814	4,907	-2
10 St Cleer	1	5,179	5,179	9	5,141	5,141	3
11 Torpoint	1	6,192	6,192	30	6,125	6,125	23
Carrick district							
12 Chacewater, Shortlanesend & Threemilestone	1	4,351	4,351	-9	4,313	4,313	-14
13 Falmouth East & North	2	11,009	5,505	16	11,398	5,699	14
14 Falmouth South	1	4,594	4,594	-3	4,762	4,762	-5
15 Feock & Kea	1	4,335	4,335	-9	4,300	4,300	-14
16 Mylor	1	4,483	4,483	-6	4,461	4,461	-11
17 Penryn	1	4,661	4,661	-2	5,024	5,024	1
18 Perranporth	1	5,210	5,210	9	5,305	5,305	6
19 Probus	1	5,123	5,123	8	5,241	5,241	5
20 Roseland	1	4,669	4,669	-2	4,694	4,694	-6
21 St Agnes	1	5,652	5,652	19	5,667	5,667	13
22 Truro East	2	9,441	4,721	-1	10,592	5,296	6
23 Truro West	1	4,566	4,566	-4	5,363	5,363	7
Kerrier district							
24 Breage and Crowan	1	4,754	4,754	0	4,822	4,822	-3
25 Camborne North	1	5,113	5,113	7	5,690	5,690	14
26 Camborne South	1	5,266	5,266	11	5,426	5,426	9
27 Camborne West	1	5,263	5,263	11	5,209	5,209	4
28 Carn Brea	1	5,405	5,405	14	5,698	5,698	14
29 Constantine	1	5,305	5,305	11	5,390	5,390	8
30 Helston North	1	4,428	4,428	-7	4,557	4,557	-9
31 Illogan & Portreath	1	5,521	5,521	16	5,523	5,523	11

	Division name (by district council name)	Number of councillors	Electorate (2002)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
32	Meneage & South Helston	1	3,764	3,764	-21	4,680	4,680	-6
33	Porthleven	1	4,204	4,204	-12	4,218	4,218	-16
34	Redruth North	1	4,861	4,861	2	4,982	4,982	0
35	Redruth South	1	4,754	4,754	0	5,092	5,092	2
36	St Day, Lanner & Carharrack	1	4,454	4,454	-6	4,550	4,550	-9
37	St Keverne	1	4,789	4,789	1	4,946	4,946	-1
38	Stithians	1	4,556	4,556	-4	4,614	4,614	-8
North Cornwall district								
39	Altarnun	1	3,751	3,751	-21	3,909	3,909	-22
40	Bodmin St Mary's	1	5,026	5,026	6	5,321	5,321	7
41	Bodmin St Petroc	1	4,780	4,780	0	5,307	5,307	6
42	Bude	1	5,477	5,477	15	5,862	5,862	17
43	Camelford	1	3,508	3,508	-26	3,940	3,940	-21
44	Helland	1	3,893	3,893	-18	3,974	3,974	-20
45	Launceston North, South & Stokeclimsland	2	8,398	4,199	-12	9,455	4,728	-5
46	North Petherwin & Week St Mary	1	4,413	4,413	-7	4,557	4,557	-9
47	Padstow	1	5,055	5,055	6	5,188	5,188	4
48	Stratton	1	4,596	4,596	-3	4,680	4,680	-6
49	Tintagel	1	4,283	4,283	-10	4,450	4,450	-11
50	Wadebridge & St Minver	2	10,614	5,307	11	10,970	5,485	10
Penwith district								
51	Hayle-Gwinear	2	8,779	4,390	-8	9,351	4,676	-6
52	Ludgvan	1	4,903	4,903	3	4,981	4,981	0
53	Marazion	1	4,548	4,548	-4	4,655	4,655	-7
54	Penzance	3	16,450	5,483	15	16,843	5,614	12
55	St Ives	2	8,953	4,477	-6	9,332	4,666	-7
56	St Just	1	5,777	5,777	21	5,978	5,978	20
Restormel borough								
57	Fowey & Lostwithiel	1	4,246	4,246	-11	4,466	4,466	-11
58	Grampound	1	4,550	4,550	-4	4,616	4,616	-8
59	Luxulyan Valley	1	3,928	3,928	-17	4,008	4,008	-20
60	Newquay Central	1	4,975	4,975	5	5,303	5,303	6
61	Newquay North	1	5,518	5,518	16	5,582	5,582	12
62	Newquay West	1	4,829	4,829	1	5,195	5,195	4
63	Roche	1	4,320	4,320	-9	4,526	4,526	-9

Division name (by district council name)	Number of councillors	Electorate (2002)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
64 Mount Charles	1	4,533	4,533	-5	4,869	4,869	-3
65 St Blaise	1	4,847	4,847	2	5,066	5,066	1
66 St Columb	1	4,231	4,231	-11	4,415	4,415	-12
67 St Enoder & Colan	1	4,031	4,031	-15	5,233	5,233	5
68 St Mewan	2	8,729	4,365	-8	9,084	4,542	-9
69 St Stephen	1	4,751	4,751	-4	4,700	4,700	-6
70 Treverbyn	2	9,531	4,766	0	10,503	5,252	5
Totals	82	390,325	-	-	409,656	-	-
Averages	-		4,760	-		4,996	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Cornwall County 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 county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Please note that the 2002 figures differ slightly between the County Council's proposed wards and the existing wards. However, this does not have a substantive effect on our proposals. This is due to rounding.

1 Introduction

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

2 In carrying out these county reviews, we must have 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:
 - reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - achieve equality of representation:
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972
- The general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to:
 - eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
 - promote equality of opportunity; and
 - promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

3 Details of the legislation under which we work are set out in The Electoral Commission's *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Periodic Electoral Reports* (published by the EC in July 2002). This *Guidance* sets out our approach to the reviews.

4 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of electoral divisions. In each two-tier county, our approach is first to complete the PERs of all the constituent districts and, when the Orders for the resulting changes in those areas have been made, then to commence a PER of the county council's electoral arrangements. Orders were made for the new electoral arrangements in the districts in Cornwall in October 2002 and we are now embarking on our county review in this area.

5 Prior to the commencement of Part IV of the Local Government Act 2000, each county council division could only return one member. This restraint has now been removed by section 89 of the 2000 Act, and we may now recommend the creation of multi-member county divisions. In areas where we are unable to identify single-member divisions that are coterminous with ward boundaries and provide acceptable levels of electoral equality we will consider recommending multi-member divisions if they provide a better balance between these two factors. However, we do not expect to recommend large numbers of multi-member divisions other than, perhaps, in the more urban areas of a county.

6 Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 sets out the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements*. These statutory rules state that each division should be wholly contained within a single district and that division boundaries should not split unwarded parishes or parish wards.

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

8 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equal representation across the local authority as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral

imbalance of over 10% in any division will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20% or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

9 Similarly, we will seek to ensure that each district area within the county is allocated the correct number of county councillors with respect to the district's proportion of the county's electorate.

10 The *Rules* provide that, in considering county council electoral arrangements, we should have regard to the boundaries of district wards. We attach considerable importance to achieving coterminosity between the boundaries of divisions and wards. The term 'coterminosity' is used throughout the report and refers to situations where the boundaries of county electoral divisions and district wards are the same, that is to say where county divisions comprise either one or more whole district wards.

11 We recognise, however, that it is unlikely to be possible to achieve absolute coterminosity throughout a county area while also providing for the optimum level of electoral equality. In this respect, county reviews are different from those of districts. We will seek to achieve the best available balance between electoral equality and coterminosity, taking into account the statutory criteria. While the proportion of electoral divisions that will be coterminous with the boundaries of district wards is likely to vary between counties, we would normally expect coterminosity to be achieved in a significant majority of divisions. The average level of coterminosity secured under our final recommendations for the first 11 counties that we have reviewed (excluding the Isle of Wight) is 70%. We would normally expect to recommend levels of coterminosity of around 60% to 80%.

12 Where coterminosity is not possible in parished areas, and a district ward is to be split between electoral divisions, we would normally expect this to be achieved without dividing (or further dividing) a parish between divisions. There are likely to be exceptions to this, however, particularly where larger parishes are involved.

13 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that whatever council size interested parties may propose to us they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

14 A further area of difference between county and district reviews is that we must recognise that it will not be possible to avoid the creation of some county divisions which contain diverse communities, for example, combining rural and urban areas. We have generally sought to avoid this in district reviews in order to reflect the identities and interests of local communities. Some existing county council electoral divisions comprise a number of distinct communities, which is inevitable given the larger number of electors represented by each councillor, and we would expect that similar situations would continue under our recommendations in seeking the best balance between coterminosity and the statutory criteria.

15 As a part of this review we may also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the county. However, we made some

recommendations for new parish electoral arrangements as part of our district reviews. We therefore expect to put forward such recommendations during county reviews only on an exceptional basis. In any event, we are *not* able to review administrative boundaries *between* local authorities or parishes, or consider the establishment of new parish areas as part of this review.

The review of Cornwall

16 We completed the reviews of the six district and borough council areas in Cornwall in June 2002 and Orders for the new electoral arrangements have since been made. This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council. The last such review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in November 1983 (Report No. 456).

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

Table 3: Stages of the review

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

18 Stage One began on 11 March 2003, when we wrote to Cornwall County Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the six district/borough councils in the county, Devon & Cornwall Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Cornwall Association of Parish and Town Councils, parish and town councils in the county, Members of Parliament with constituencies in the county, 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 Cornwall County Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of submissions (the end of Stage One) was 7 July 2003.

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

20 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 24 February 2004 and will end on 26 April 2004, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

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

Equal opportunities

22 In preparing this report the Committee has had regard to the general duty under section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 to promote racial equality and to the approach set out in BFCE (03) 35, *Race Relations Legislation*, which the Committee considered and agreed at its meeting on 9 April 2003.

2 Current electoral arrangements

23 The county of Cornwall comprises the six districts/boroughs of Caradon, Carrick, Kerrier, North Cornwall, Penwith and Restormel. Covering an area of 354,810 hectares, Cornwall is situated in the south west of England and is surrounded by sea, except in the east where the River Tamar divides the county from Devon. The physical features of the county are quite distinctive, with a long indented coastline and granite moorlands. Over the past century tourism in Cornwall has grown and continues to grow. The economy is also supported through mining and the developing manufacturing industry, but it remains predominantly rural. Due to its climate and location Cornwall is also renowned for its wildlife habitats and boasts areas of archaeological and historical interest.

24 The current electorate of Cornwall County Council is 390,343 (2002 figures) which is expected to increase by 5% (19,290) to 409,633 by 2007. There are 209 parishes in the county. The Council presently has 79 members, with one member elected from each division.

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

26 At present, each councillor represents an average of 4,941 electors, which the County Council forecasts will increase to 5,185 by the year 2007 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration over the last two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 44 of the 79 divisions varies by more than 10% from the district average, 18 divisions by more than 20% and two divisions by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in the St Stephen division where the councillor represents 55% more electors than the county average.

27 As detailed previously, in considering the County Council's electoral arrangements, we must have regard to the boundaries of district wards. Following the completion of the reviews of district warding arrangements in Cornwall, we are therefore faced with a new starting point for considering electoral divisions. Our proposals for county divisions will be based on the new district wards as opposed to those, which existed prior to the recent reviews. In view of the effect of these new district wards and changes in the electorate over the past 20 years, which have resulted in electoral imbalances across the county, changes to most if not all of the existing county electoral divisions are inevitable.

Table 4: Existing electoral arrangements

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate 2002	Variance from average %	Electorate 2007	Variance from average %
Caradon					
1 Callington	1	5,383	9	6,067	17
2 Calstock	1	4,936	0	5,240	1
3 Dobwalls	1	3,920	-21	3,919	-24
4 Lanreath	1	4,378	-11	4,428	-15
5 Liskeard	1	6,744	36	7,538	45
6 Looe	1	4,315	-13	4,436	-14
7 Menheniot	1	3,484	-29	3,482	-33
8 Rame	1	3,790	-23	3,895	-25
9 Saltash East	1	5,861	19	6,893	33
10 Saltash West	1	6,121	24	6,102	18
11 St Cleer	1	4,776	-3	4,742	-9
12 St Germans	1	3,851	-22	3,930	-24
13 Torpoint	1	6,192	25	6,125	18
Carrick					
14 Falmouth Arwenack	1	5,790	17	6,365	23
15 Falmouth Penwerris	1	4,054	-18	3,993	-23
16 Falmouth Smithick	1	5,759	17	5,802	12
17 Feock & Kea	1	4,209	-15	4,176	-19
18 Kenwyn	1	5,026	2	5,793	12
19 Mylor	1	4,483	-9	4,461	-14
20 Penryn	1	4,661	-6	5,024	-3
21 Perranporth	1	6,347	28	6,505	25
22 Probus	1	5,080	3	5,123	-1
23 Roseland	1	3,575	-28	3,612	-30
24 St Agnes	1	5,652	14	5,667	9
25 Truro East	1	5,515	12	6,369	23
26 Truro South	1	3,926	-21	4,223	-19
27 Truro West	1	4,017	-19	4,007	-23
Kerrier					
28 Breage	1	4,754	-4	4,822	-7
29 Camborne North	1	5,043	2	5,620	8
30 Camborne South	1	5,553	12	5,712	10
31 Camborne West	1	4,827	-2	4,775	-8
32 Constantine	1	4,264	-14	4,338	-16
33 Helston North	1	6,235	26	6,394	23
34 Illogan North	1	5,521	12	5,523	7
35 Illogan South	1	5,624	14	5,916	14
36 Meneage & South Helston	1	4,093	-17	5,009	-3
37 Porthleven	1	3,982	-19	3,996	-23
38 Redruth North	1	4,722	-4	4,845	-7
39 Redruth South	1	4,893	-1	5,229	1

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate 2002	Variance from average %	Electorate 2007	Variance from average %
40 St Day & Lanner	1	4,454	-10	4,550	-12
41 Stithians	1	3,683	-25	3,722	-28
42 St Keverne	1	4,789	-3	4,946	-5
North Cornwall					
43 Altarnun	1	4,655	-6	4,828	-7
44 Bodmin St Mary's	1	4,754	-4	5,053	-3
45 Bodmin St Petroc	1	5,052	2	5,575	8
46 Bude	1	6,138	24	6,525	26
47 Camelford	1	4,559	-8	5,015	-3
48 Helland	1	4,121	-17	4,261	-18
49 Launceston	1	5,530	12	6,508	26
50 Padstow	1	5,055	2	5,188	0
51 St Kew	1	3,697	-25	3,759	-28
52 Stokeclimsland	1	5,107	3	5,218	1
53 Stratton	1	5,084	3	5,237	1
54 Tintagel	1	4,127	-16	4,288	-17
55 Wadebridge	1	5,933	20	6,158	19
Penwith					
56 Hayle North	1	5,368	9	5,634	9
57 Hayle South	1	5,330	8	5,692	10
58 Ludgvan	1	5,960	21	5,989	16
59 Marazion	1	4,548	-8	4,655	-10
60 Penzance East	1	5,544	12	5,743	11
61 Penzance South	1	5,041	2	5,133	-1
62 Penzance West	1	4,340	-12	4,456	-14
63 St Ives North	1	3,458	-30	3,542	-32
64 St Ives South	1	4,107	-17	4,391	-15
65 St Just	1	5,714	16	5,905	14
Restormel					
66 Biscovey	1	5,709	16	6,315	22
67 Fowey & Lostwithiel	1	4,620	-6	4,857	-6
68 Grampond	1	4,561	-8	4,634	-11
69 Newquay Central	1	6,261	27	6,361	23
70 Newquay North	1	5,107	3	6,330	22
71 Newquay West	1	5,223	6	5,583	8
72 Poltair	1	5,165	5	5,087	-2
73 Roche	1	5,032	2	5,263	1
74 St Austell West	1	5,056	2	5,167	0
75 St Blazey	1	5,232	6	5,278	2
76 St Columb	1	4,231	-14	4,415	-15
77 St Stephen	1	7,672	55	8,084	56

Division name (by district council area)	Number of councillors	Electorate 2002	Variance from average %	Electorate 2007	Variance from average %
78 Trevarna	1	4,475	-9	4,747	-8
79 Treverbyn	1	4,495	-9	5,445	5
Totals	79	390,343	-	409,633	-
Averages		4,941		5,185	

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Cornwall County Council.

Note: Each division is represented by a single councillor, and the electorate columns denote the number of electors represented by each councillor. The 'variance from average' column shows how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors represented by each councillor varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2002, electors in St Ives North division in Penwith were relatively over-represented by 30%, while electors in St Stephen division in Restormel were relatively under-represented by 55%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 Submissions received

28 At the start of this review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Cornwall County Council.

29 During this initial stage of the review, officers from The Boundary Committee visited the area and met officers and members of the County Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 22 submissions including the county-wide scheme from Cornwall County Council during Stage One, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the County Council.

Cornwall County Council

30 The County Council proposed a council of 82 members. Three more councillors than at present, serving 80 divisions. This is compared to the existing 79 councillors, representing 79 single-member divisions. Under its proposals the Borough of Restormel would receive two additional councillors and North Cornwall would receive one additional councillor. Under the Council's proposals 36 divisions would initially have an electoral variance of over 10% and 12 divisions would have an electoral variance of more than 20%. By 2007 35 divisions would vary by more than 10% while ten divisions would vary by more than 20%. The County Council's proposals would provide for a level of coterminosity of 37%.

District and borough councils

31 Caradon District Council supported the County Council's proposals in full. Restormel Borough Council stated that members were unlikely to unanimously support the County Council's proposals. As part of Restormel Borough Council's submission, Councillor Boosey opposed the County Council's proposals for the Fowey and Tywardreath area, and proposed maintaining the status quo or including all the Fowey River wards in one division. Councillor Chapman had no objection to combining Fowey and Tywardreath and suggested that the change was in keeping with new district wards. Councillor Cole stated that parishes should provide the basis for divisions, in order to better represent communities. He opposed including part of Newquay in a division with St Enoder/Colan. The Borough Council's Newquay and St Columb Area Committee made a separate submission, stating strongly that rural and urban areas should be in separate divisions.

Parish and town councils

32 We received responses from 16 parish and town councils. Ladock Parish Council supported the County Council and requested that the status quo be maintained and that all single-member divisions be maintained. Morwenstow Parish Council requested that it be part of a single division based on rural parishes and separate from Bude. Stoke Climsland Parish Council made proposals for a South division to represent large rural parishes, and a separate Launceston division. St Endellion Parish Council stated that it would prefer to be in a division with other rural parishes rather than in a mixed urban and rural division. Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council opposed any proposals for a two-member division for Hayle and Gwinear-Gwithian and any proposals for splitting Gwinear-Gwithian between wards, citing the parish's distinct rural character. It made two proposals for a division based on Gwinear-Gwithian and Hayle East. Hayle Town Council supported two of the County Council's proposals for two divisions in Hayle, based on the Hayle South and Hayle North district wards. St Sampson Parish Council argued that St Sampson has more in common with Fowey than Lanlivery and Lostwithiel and should remain in a division with Fowey. St Wenn Parish Council argued that St Wenn should not be part of a division with Rock ward, as its

links are with St Columb and its identity is rural. St Mawgan Parish Council argued that St Columb should not be combined with Newquay, as the areas have different interests and St Columb has strong links to its surrounding area. Lanlivery Parish Council opposed the County Council's proposals for the area, but supported proposals to join the parish of Fowey with the parishes of Lostwithiel and St Sampson and the parish of Lanlivery with the parishes of Tywardreath and Luxulyan. Tywardreath and Par Parish Council expressed the same view as Lanlivery Parish Council. St Stephen-in-Brannel Parish Council stated that the County Council's proposals for the area were an improvement on existing arrangements.

33 Liskeard Town Council recommended that Liskeard North and Liskeard South wards be combined with Dobwalls & District ward in a two-member division. Porthleven Town Council argued that the size of the County Council should be increased in order to help those members who currently represent very geographically large divisions. St Columb Major Town Council argued that the existing county boundaries should be maintained and St Columb should not be combined with Newquay, as the areas face different problems. Fowey Town Council argued that Fowey should not be combined with Tywardreath but should remain with Lostwithiel and St Sampson, as the three parishes co-operate and have a 'similar ethos'.

Other representations

34 Councillor Currie, the Leader of the Conservatives on Cornwall County Council, opposed the County Council's proposals and expressed concern that Feock & Kea ward might seem 'attractive for a complete carve up' and questioned electorate projections in his own division.

35 County Councillors Mepsted and Preston asked for Saltash's geographical, social and organisational cohesion to be reflected in our draft recommendations.

36 Helston and District Chamber of Trade & Commerce opposed the loss of any councillors representing Helston and argued that Helston should have more councillors in order to gain equal representation with the northern parts of the district.

4 Analysis and draft recommendations

37 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Cornwall County Council and welcome comments from all those interested relating to the proposed division boundaries, number of councillors and division names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

38 As with our reviews of districts, our primary aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Cornwall is 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, and 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 division of the county’.

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

40 We have discussed in Chapter One the additional parameters which apply to reviews of county council electoral arrangements and the need to have regard to the boundaries of district wards in order to achieve coterminosity. In addition, our approach is to ensure that, having reached conclusions on the appropriate number of councillors to be elected to the county council, each district council area is allocated the number of county councillors to which it is entitled.

41 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every division of a county.

42 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for an authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, especially when also seeking to achieve coterminosity in order to facilitate convenient and effective local government, so 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. Accordingly, 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 the boundaries of district wards and community identity. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be taken into account and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

43 The recommendations do not affect county, district or parish external boundaries, local taxes, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that these recommendations will have an adverse effect on house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary boundaries, and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations that are based on these issues.

Electorate forecasts

44 Since 1975 there has been a 28% increase in the electorate of Cornwall County Council. The County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2007, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 5% from 390,343 to 409,633 over the five-year period from 2002 to 2007. It expects most of the growth to be in Restormel, although a significant amount is also expected in North Cornwall district. 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 County Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to division boundaries has been obtained.

45 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having considered all the evidence received concerning electorate forecasts, we accept that the County Council's figures are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council size

46 As explained earlier, we now require justification for any council size proposed, whether it is an increase, decrease or retention of the existing council size.

47 Cornwall County Council presently has 79 members. The County Council proposed a council of 82 members, an increase of three members. We have examined the County Council's proposals and note that under the Council's proposals all the districts would get the correct allocation of councillors. The County Council established a politically balanced County Electoral Review panel and the Council's submission was based on the recommendations from the panel after a full consultation process with the public. The County Council, in its proposals for an 82-member council, had regard for the traditional functions of a councillor and the new political management structure in Cornwall implemented as a result of the Local Government Act 2000. It also considered the implication of allocation of councillors to a fast-growing electorate. Two of the additional councillors would be allocated to the borough of Restormel, which has a projected increase of electorate of more than 4,000 over the next five years, and one councillor to the district of North Cornwall, that has the largest problem of rural areas. It stated that if the council size stayed at 79, then the district of Kerrier would lose a councillor which was not considered to be conducive to effective and convenient local government. The County Council, supported by the evidence of the members' survey, also submitted that the workload of its members had increased during modernisation and that remaining as a 79-member council 'would make it impossible for some Members to fulfill their three traditional roles effectively'. The Council also stated that the roles and activities of councillors had increased under modernisation and that councillor participation on external bodies was substantial and increasing.

48 After considering the evidence received on council size we did not consider that we had sufficient evidence and argumentation to make a decision on the most appropriate council size for Cornwall County Council. We therefore asked the respondents who had initially provided some detailed evidence regarding council size to provide further argumentation to fully justify why Cornwall County Council would function more effectively under a council size of 82 rather than under the existing size of 79.

49 Determining the council size that will secure effective and convenient local government for Cornwall is the starting point of this electoral review since it determines the optimum councillor:elector ratio to be achieved across all divisions in the county, against which levels of electoral imbalance are measured. We have carefully considered the further evidence and have been persuaded that a council size of 82 would secure the most effective and

convenient local government for Cornwall. We have been persuaded that the County Council has developed its proposed council size in the context of a review of its internal political management and the role of the councillors in the new structures. We have been persuaded that the three basic functions of the councillors, those of representing the interests of residents, formulating and monitoring the local authority's policies and priorities, and representing the interests both of residents and the authority on and to a wide range of external bodies, would be effectively fulfilled under this council size.

50 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that a council of 82 members would best meet the statutory criteria.

Electoral arrangements

51 We have given careful consideration to the views received during Stage One. We received one county-wide scheme from Cornwall County Council. We note that the County Council's proposals secured poor levels of coterminosity and electoral equality. This is due to the problematic nature of the county itself. The County Council stated that striking the balance between coterminosity and electoral equality had been difficult due to the geography of the county. The county has the smallest average of electors per county councillor than any other county, proving it hard to achieve coterminosity when having to divide district wards. Additionally, certain areas on the peninsula, moorland and estuaries of Cornwall have made boundaries difficult to achieve. The council experienced some difficulty respecting community identity while combining rural areas with towns in order to achieve coterminosity.

52 The County Council expressed a wish to retain single-member divisions 'unless there is clear evidence of local preference for multi-member divisions or electoral numbers are such that this is unavoidable'. Two-member divisions are contained within its proposals.

53 Given the evidence available to us, we propose basing our draft recommendations on the proposals of the County Council. We are proposing a number of modifications to its proposals in all of its districts/boroughs to better reflect the statutory criteria and provide for improved levels of coterminosity and electoral equality.

54 We have carefully considered all the representations received, including the county-wide scheme from the County Council. The County Council's proposals would increase the council size from 79 to 82. The Council's proposals would improve electoral equality, compared to the existing arrangements, with the number of divisions in which the number of electors would vary by more than 10% from the county average reduced from 44 to 36. The County Council's proposals overall would achieve a level of coterminosity of 37% between county divisions and district ward boundaries.

55 Our proposals would also involve warding or re-warding a number of parishes in order to facilitate a balance between electoral equality and community identity. Our draft recommendations overall would achieve a level of coterminosity of 60% between county divisions and district ward boundaries.

56 For county division purposes, the six district areas in the county are considered in turn, as follows:

- i. Caradon district; (pages 28 & 29)
- ii. Carrick district; (pages 30 & 31)
- iii. Kerrier district; (pages 32 & 33)
- iv. North Cornwall; (pages 33, 34 & 35)
- v. Penwith district; (pages 35 & 36)

vi. Restormel borough; (pages 37, 38 & 39)

57 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and on the large maps inserted at the back of this report.

Caradon district

58 Under the current arrangements, the district of Caradon is represented by 13 county councillors serving 13 divisions. The divisions of Dobwalls, Lanreath, Looe, Menheniot, Rame, St Cleer and St Germans currently have 21%, 11%, 13%, 29%, 23%, 3%, and 22% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (24%, 15%, 14%, 33%, 25%, 9% and 24% fewer by 2007). The divisions of Callington, Calstock, Liskeard, Saltash East and Saltash West and Torpoint currently have 9%, 0%, 36%, 19%, 24% and 25% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (17%, 1%, 45%, 33%, 18% and 18% more by 2007).

59 At Stage One the County Council proposed 13 single-member divisions, to which the district is entitled under a council size of 82. Its proposals for this area would achieve 62% coterminosity. Its proposed Callington division would comprise the new district ward of Callington and part of the new Landrake & St Dominick district ward (the parishes of St Mellion and St Dominick). Its proposed Calstock division would comprise the new district ward of Calstock. Its proposed Lanreath division would comprise the new district wards of Duloe, Lansallos & Pelynt and Lanteglos & St Veep. Its proposed Liskeard North division would comprise the new district ward of Liskeard North. Its proposed Liskeard South division would comprise the new district wards of Liskeard South and Dobwalls & District (except the parish of Morval). Its proposed Looe division would comprise the new district ward of Looe & St Martin ward. Its proposed Menheniot division would comprise the new district wards of Menheniot & St Ive, part of the Dobwalls & District ward (the parish of Morval) and part of the Lynher ward (the parish of South Hill). Its proposed Rame division would comprise the new district wards of Deviock & Sheviock, Millbrook and Rame Peninsula. Its proposed Saltash East division would comprise the new district wards of Saltash Essa and Saltash Pill. Its proposed Saltash West division would comprise the new district wards of Saltash Burraton and Saltash St Stephens. Its proposed St Cleer division would comprise the new district ward of St Cleer & St Neot and part of the Lynher district ward (the parish of Linkinhorne). Its proposed St Germans and Landulph division would comprise the new district ward of St Germans and part of the Landrake & St Dominick district ward (the parishes of Pillaton, Landulph, Botus Fleming and Landrake with St Erney). Its proposed Torpoint division would comprise the new district wards of Torpoint East and Torpoint West.

60 The County Council noted that within the proposed Caradon district the electoral variance would vary by more than 10% in seven out of the 13 divisions. The County Council argued generally throughout the county that a 'degree of imbalance is unavoidable' due to 'being a maritime county with many deep estuaries and extensive areas of moorland, our geography limits the options for alternative new electoral divisions much more than would be the case in an inland area of similar population'. The proposed Saltash division has suffered some controversy as disagreements have arisen between the County and District Councils over their strategic planning policies and uncertainty as to how much development will occur in the future. There is also 'strong local opposition to combining part of the Town with adjacent rural parishes'. Therefore, the County Council has opted to keep two single-member divisions despite the high electoral variances. Liskeard Town has been divided into two divisions each returning one county councillor, as the growth in this particular area has been significant and one county councillor would not suffice. However, these divisions also have high electoral variances. In the proposed Torpoint division the electoral variance would initially be 30%, but the County Council argued that since 'little development is envisaged in the town in the near future and the electorate should fall a little by 2007'. It therefore proposed that the town continued to be represented in one single-member division.

61 Under the County Council's proposals the divisions of Callington, Liskeard North, Looe, Menheniot and St Germans & Landulph would initially have 2%, 26%, 4%, 16% and 22% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (7% more, 15% fewer, 6% fewer, 20% fewer and 26% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Calstock, Lanreath, Liskeard South, Rame, Saltash East, Saltash West, St Cleer and Torpoint would initially have 4%, 3%, 18%, 2%, 21%, 31%, 0% and 30% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (5% more, 1% fewer, 14% more, 2% more, 36% more, 24% more, 5% fewer and 23% more by 2007).

62 Liskeard Town Council argued that Liskeard North and Liskeard South wards be combined with Dobwalls & District ward in a two-member division. County Councillors Mepsted and Preston asked for Saltash's geographical, social and organisational cohesion to be reflected in our draft recommendations. Caradon District Council supported Cornwall County Council's Stage One proposals.

63 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One. We note that the County Council's proposals secure reasonable levels of coterminosity. Therefore, we propose basing our recommendations on them. However, we propose six amendments in order to improve the levels of electoral equality and coterminosity in the district. We note that the County Council's proposed Saltash East, Saltash West and St Germans & Landulph divisions would have very high electoral variances by 2007. We are of the view that these high variances in neighbouring divisions are unacceptable and have therefore looked at a number of alternative options. We propose that Saltash Burraton ward be combined with the parishes of Botus Fleming, Landrake with St Erney, Landulph and Pillaton to form a revised Burraton & Landulph division while the wards of Saltash St Stephen, Saltash Essa and Saltash Pill be combined to form a two-member Saltash division. We propose that St Germans ward be transferred from the proposed St Germans & Landulph division to a revised Menheniot division. We are of the view that these proposals would secure improved levels of electoral equality and coterminosity reflecting the statutory criteria. We note that our proposed Burraton & Landulph division would combine an urban area with a more rural area. However we note that the areas are well linked. We propose that the parish of South Hill be transferred from Menheniot to St Cleer division and that the parish of Morval be transferred to our proposed Liskeard division. We propose combining the Liskeard North and Liskeard South divisions to form a two-member Liskeard division. We considered proposing a two-member division combining the County Council's Torpoint and Rame divisions, however this would require a large rural area to be combined with an urban area on the peninsula. These proposals improve the coterminosity of Caradon from eight out of 13 divisions under the County Council's proposals with 62% coterminosity, to nine out of 11 divisions with 82% coterminosity. Further, the amendments improve electoral equality in the district from seven out of 13 divisions varying by more than 10% from the County average by 2007, to one division out of 12 varying by more than 10% by 2007.

64 Our draft recommendations would achieve a level of coterminosity of 82% between county divisions and district ward boundaries. The district is entitled to 13 councillors under a council size of 82. Under our draft recommendations the divisions of Callington, Looe, Menheniot and Saltash would initially have 2%, 4%, 4% and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (7% more, 6% fewer, 9% fewer and 2% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Calstock, Lanreath, Liskeard, Rame, St Cleer, Burraton & Landulph and Torpoint would initially have 4%, 3%, 2%, 2%, 9%, 13% and 30% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (5% more, 1% fewer, 5% more, 2% more, 3% more, 8% more and 23% more by 2007). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Carrick district

65 Under the current arrangements, the district of Carrick is represented by 14 county councillors serving 14 divisions. The divisions of Falmouth Penwerris, Feock & Kea, Mylor, Penryn, Roseland, Truro South and Truro West currently have 18%, 15%, 9%, 6%, 28%, 21% and 19% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (23%, 19%, 14%, 3%, 30%, 19% and 23% fewer by 2007). The divisions of Falmouth Arwenack, Falmouth Smithick, Kenwyn, Perranporth, Probus, St Agnes and Truro East currently have 17%, 17%, 2%, 28%, 3%, 14% and 12% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (23%, 12%, 12%, 25%, 1% (fewer), 9% and 23% more by 2007).

66 At Stage One the County Council proposed 14 single-member divisions, to which the district is entitled to under a council size of 82. Its proposals for this area would achieve 36% coterminosity. Its proposed Chacewater, Shortlanesend & Threemilestone division would comprise the new district wards of Kenwyn & Chacewater and part of Feock & Kea ward (the parish ward of Twelveheads). Its proposed Falmouth North division would comprise the new district ward of Penwerris and part of Trescobeas ward (polling district F1N). Its proposed Falmouth South division would comprise the new district ward of Arwenack. Its proposed Falmouth West division would comprise the new district ward of Boslowick and part of Trescobeas district ward (polling district F2N). Its proposed Feock & Kea division would comprise the new district ward of Feock & Kea ward (except the parish ward of Twelveheads). Its proposed Mylor division would comprise the new district ward of Mylor. Its proposed Penryn division would comprise the new district ward of Penryn. Its proposed Perranporth division would comprise the new district wards of Newlyn & Goonhavern, Perranporth and part of Carland district ward (the parish ward of Mitchell). Its proposed Probus division would comprise the new district ward of Carland (except the parish ward of Mitchell) and part of Probus ward (the parishes of St Clement, St Michael Penkevil, Probus and Ladock). Its proposed Roseland division would comprise the new district ward of Roseland, and part of the new Probus district ward (the parishes of Tregoney and Cuby). Its proposed St Agnes division would comprise the new district wards of Mount Hawke and St Agnes. Its proposed Truro East division would comprise the new district wards of Moresk and Tregolls, and part of Boscawen ward (polling district T4KK). Its proposed Truro South division would comprise the new district ward of Boscawen (except polling district T4KK). Its proposed Truro West division would comprise the new district ward of Trehaverne & Gloweth.

67 The County Council noted that the proposed Perranporth and Roseland divisions would have variances of 30% and 28% respectively by 2007. It argued that the existing Roseland division is a very rural area that contains seven parishes and 'although its electorate is low, the County Council believes that its boundaries should be unchanged'. There does not seem to be an alternative which meets the coterminosity criteria and the only adjoining parish, Probus, is large and unwarded'. In respect of the proposed Perranporth division the County Council stated that to maintain the status quo of Roseland it 'makes good sense for the remainder of the district to continue to have two electoral divisions, Probus with six parishes and Perranporth with the three parishes at the north west end of the district which have strong similarities with their dependence on tourism and agriculture'. It argued that their proposals for the proposed Feock & Kea division attempt to address the issue of parishes being spilt between district wards and further argued that, in terms of community identity, the village of Twelveheads should stay in the same division as the rest of Chacewater parish. In the proposed Falmouth divisions the County Council stated that the town needs three electoral divisions for the four new district wards, and that there is 'no evidence of support for multi-member divisions here'. It states that, to meet the requirement of coterminosity, it based two divisions on the new district wards of Boslowick and Penwerris and split only one district ward of Trescobeas. Under the County Council's proposals for Truro it is argued that the existing Truro East division should 'remain unchanged' due to the fact that 'considerable concern was expressed by electors in the area that was transferred from Moresk to Boscawen under the district ward changes about the new voting

arrangements'. It stated that the proposed Truro South division has a small electorate, creating an electoral variance of 15% below the county average by 2007 but stated that major development is forecast.

68 Under the County Council's proposals the divisions of Chacewater, Shortlanesend & Threemilestone, Falmouth South, Feock & Kea, Mylor, Penryn, Roseland, Truro South and Truro West would initially have 6%, 3%, 12%, 6%, 2%, 25%, 18% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (11%, 5%, 16%, 11%, 1% (more), 28%, 15% and 7% (more) fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Falmouth North, Falmouth West, Perranporth, Probus, St Agnes and Truro East would initially have 17%, 15%, 33%, 7%, 19% and 16% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (9%, 19%, 30%, 3%, 13% and 27% more by 2007).

69 County Councillor Currie expressed concern that Feock & Kea ward might seem 'attractive for a complete carve up' due to incorrect projection figures for the Feock & Kea division. Ladock Parish Council requested that the status quo be maintained across Cornwall and stated it felt it essential to maintain single-member divisions.

70 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note that the County Council's proposals secure poor levels of coterminosity in this district. We propose basing our draft recommendations on the County Council's proposals for this area with five amendments in order to improve levels of electoral equality and coterminosity. Given that the County Council's proposed Truro East and Truro South divisions are not coterminous and do not secure good levels of electoral equality we propose combining Truro East and Truro South divisions to form a two-member Truro East division. We propose transferring the parishes of St Clement and St Michael Penkevil from Probus division to the proposed Roseland division in order to provide for an improved level of electoral equality. We propose the transfer of St Newlyn East parish from Perranporth division to Probus division in order to improve the high level of electoral inequality in the proposed Perranporth division. In order to provide for an improved level of coterminosity and electoral equality we propose combining the Falmouth North and Falmouth West divisions to form a two-member Falmouth East & North division. We considered a proposed three-member division for the Falmouth area. However, we did not feel that this could be justified in this particular area. This area is particularly difficult as it is based on the peninsula with tight urban boundaries. We propose that the whole of Feock & Kea ward form a revised Feock & Kea division. These amendments have been made in order to provide the best balance between the statutory criteria and to improve the level of coterminosity from five out of 14 divisions at 36% under the County Council's proposals to nine out of 12 divisions being coterminous at 75% under our own. Additionally, electoral equality has improved under our proposals from nine divisions varying by more than 10% by 2007 under the County Council's proposals to five divisions varying by more than 10% by 2007 under our revised proposals

71 Our draft recommendations would achieve a level of coterminosity of 75% between county divisions and district ward boundaries. The district is entitled to 14 councillors under a council size of 82. Under the draft recommendations the divisions of Chacewater, Shortlanesend & Threemilestone, Falmouth South, Feock & Kea, Mylor, Penryn, Roseland, Truro East and Truro West would initially have 9%, 3%, 9%, 6%, 2%, 2%, 1% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (14% fewer, 5% fewer, 14% fewer, 11% fewer, 1% more, 6% fewer, 6% more and 7% more by 2007). The proposed divisions of Falmouth East & North, Perranporth, Probus and St Agnes would initially have 16%, 9%, 8%, and 19% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (14%, 6%, 5% and 13% more by 2007). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Kerrier district

72 Under the current arrangements, the district of Kerrier is represented by 15 county councillors serving 15 divisions. The divisions of Breage, Camborne West, Constantine, Meneage & South Helston, Porthleven, Redruth North, Redruth South, St Day & Lanner, St Ithians and St Keverne currently have 4%, 2%, 14%, 17%, 19%, 4%, 1%, 10%, 25% and 3% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (7%, 8%, 16%, 3%, 23%, 7%, 1% (more) 12%, 28% and 5% fewer by 2007). The divisions of Camborne North, Camborne South, Helston North, Illogan North and Illogan South currently have 2%, 12%, 26%, 12% and 14% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (8%, 10%, 23%, 7% and 14% more by 2007).

73 At Stage One the County Council proposed 15 single-member divisions, which the district is entitled to under a council size of 82. Its proposals for this area would achieve 67% coterminosity. Its proposed Breage & Crowan division would comprise the new district ward of Breage & Crowan. Its proposed Camborne North division would comprise the new district ward of Camborne North. Its proposed Camborne South division would comprise the new district ward of Camborne South. Its proposed Camborne West division would comprise the new district ward of Camborne West. Its proposed Carn Brea division would comprise the new district ward of Illogan South. Its proposed Constantine division would comprise the new district wards of Constantine, Gweek & Mawnan ward and part of Mabe & Budock district ward (the parishes of Budock and Mabe). Its proposed Helston North division would comprise the new district ward of Helston North (except the part in Sithney parish, Lower Town parish ward). Its proposed Illogan & Portreath division would comprise the new district ward of Illogan North. Its proposed Meneage & South Helston division would comprise the new district wards of Meneage and part of Helston South ward (polling district S1P). Its proposed Porthleven division would comprise the new district ward of Porthleven & Sithney, part of the new Helston South district ward (polling district S2P) and part of the new Helston North district ward (the part in Sithney parish, the parish of Sithney). Its proposed Redruth North division would comprise the new district ward of Redruth North. Its proposed Redruth South division would comprise the new district wards of Redruth South. Its proposed St Day, Lanner & Carharrack division would comprise the new district ward of St Day, Lanner & Carharrack. Its proposed St Keverne division would comprise the new district wards of Grade-Ruan & Landewednack, Mullion and St Keverne. Its proposed Stithians division would comprise the new district wards of Stithians, Wendron and part of the Mabe & Budock ward (the parish of St Gluvias).

74 The County Council proposed that Meneage & South Helston division comprise the six parishes to the south of Helford river and part of Helston Town, it argued that these parishes should be kept within one electoral division. It stated that 'it would be logical to continue to have an electoral division which combines those rural parishes with part of the town'. This would entail dividing the Helston South district ward between the proposed Meneage & South Helston division and the proposed Porthleven divisions. The proposed Porthleven division would also comprise part of the Helston North ward, the part in Sithney parish. While retaining a coterminous Breage & Crowan division the Council stated that 'the remaining eight parishes to the north and east of Helston need to be divided into two divisions'. It further argued that in order to maintain community identity, the district ward of Mabe & Budock needed to be divided between the Constantine and Stithians electoral divisions.

75 Under the County Councils proposals the divisions of Helston North, Meneage & South Helston, Porthleven, St Day, Lanner & Carharrack and Stithians would initially have 9%, 14%, 16%, 6% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (11%, 0%, 20%, 9% and 8% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Breage & Crowan, Camborne North, Camborne South, Camborne West, Carn Brea, Constantine, Illogan & Portreath, Redruth North, Redruth South and St Keverne would initially have 0%, 7%, 11%, 11%, 14%, 11%, 16%, 2%, 0% and 1% more electors per councillor than the county

average respectively (3% (fewer), 14%, 9%, 4%, 14%, 8%, 11%, 0%, 2%, 1% (fewer) more by 2007).

76 Porthleven Town Council argued that the size of the County Council should be increased in order to help those members who currently represent very large divisions. Helston & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce opposed the loss of any councillors from Helston and argued that Helston should have more councillors in order to gain equal representation with the northern parts of the district.

77 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note that the County Council secured reasonable levels of coterminosity with reasonable levels of electoral equality. We propose adopting the County Council's proposals with two amendments. We propose the whole of Helston North ward form a Helston North division in order to improve the level of coterminosity in the district. We propose transferring part of Helston South polling district S1P from the proposed Meneage & South Helston division to the proposed Porthleven division. In order to address the unbalanced levels of electoral equality in the divisions of Porthleven and Meneage & South Helston proposed by the County Council we looked at a number of alternatives in these areas. In particular we looked at combining Porthleven and Meneage & South Helston to form a two-member division. However, this would encompass large rural areas with more urban areas and we considered that this would be inappropriate in terms of community identity and ensuring good links in the division. We feel that the above amendments provide the best balance of our statutory criteria. In this district the County Council secured ten out of 15 divisions that were coterminous with district wards, a level of 67% coterminosity. Our amendments have improved coterminosity and ensured an improved level of electoral equality with only four divisions varying by more than 10% by 2007.

78 Our draft recommendations would achieve a level of coterminosity of 73% between county divisions and district ward boundaries. The district is entitled to 15 councillors under a council size of 82. Under the draft recommendations the divisions of Helston North, Meneage & South Helston, Porthleven, St Day Lanner & Carharrack and Stithians would initially have 7%, 21%, 12%, 6% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (9%, 6%, 16%, 9% and 8% by 2007). The proposed divisions of Breage & Crowan, Camborne North, Camborne South, Camborne West, Carn Brea, Constantine, Illogan & Portreath, Redruth North, Redruth South and St Keverne would initially have 0%, 7%, 11%, 11%, 14%, 11%, 16%, 2%, 0% and 1% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (3% (fewer), 14%, 9%, 4%, 14%, 8%, 11%, 0%, 2%, 1% (fewer) more by 2007). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

North Cornwall district

79 Under the current arrangements, the district of North Cornwall is represented by 13 county councillors serving 13 divisions. The divisions of Altarnun, Bodmin St Mary's, Camelford, Helland, St Kew and Tintagel currently have 6%, 4%, 8%, 17%, 25% and 16% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (7%, 3%, 3%, 18%, 28% and 17% fewer by 2007). The divisions of Bodmin St Petroc, Bude, Launceston, Padstow, Stokeclimsland, Stratton and Wadebridge currently have 2%, 24%, 12%, 2%, 3%, 3% and 20% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (8%, 26%, 26%, 0% 1%, 1% and 19% more by 2007).

80 At Stage One the County Council proposed 12 single-member divisions and one two-member division, to which the district is entitled under a council size of 82. Its proposals for this area would achieve 23% coterminosity. Its proposed Altarnun division would comprise the new district ward of Altarnun, part of the new South Petherwin district ward (the parishes of Lewannick and Trewen) and part of the new Tremaine district ward (the parishes of Egloskerry, Laneast, Treneglos, Tresmeer and Tremaine). Its proposed Bodmin St Mary's

division would comprise the new district ward of Bodmin St Mary's. Its proposed Bodmin St Petroc division would comprise the new district ward of Bodmin St Petroc. Its proposed Bude division would comprise the new district wards of Bude and part of the new Poughill & Stratton district ward (polling district 2-G). Its proposed Camelford division would comprise the new district ward of Camelford, part of the new Tremaine district ward (the parishes of Advent, Davidstow, Otterham and Warbstow) and part of the new Valency district ward (the parishes of Lesnewth, St Gennys and St Juliot). Its proposed Helland division would comprise the new district wards of Blisland & St Breward, Lanivet and part of the new Allan district ward (the parishes of St Mabyn and St Tudy). Its proposed Launceston North division would comprise part of the new district ward of Launceston (north of the A30). Its proposed Launceston South & Stokeclimsland division would comprise the new district ward of Stokeclimsland, part of the new Launceston district ward (south of the A30) and part of the new South Petherwin district ward (the parishes of South Petherwin and Lawhitton Rural). Its proposed North Petherwin & Week St Mary division would comprise the new district wards of North Petherwin, Week St Mary & Whitstone ward and part of the new Marhamchurch district ward (the parish of Poundstock). Its proposed Padstow division would comprise the new district ward of Padstow & District. Its proposed Stratton division would comprise the new district wards of Grenville, part of the new Marhamchurch district ward (the parishes of Marhamchurch and Launcells) and part of Poughill & Stratton district ward (except polling district 2-G). Its proposed Tintagel division would comprise the new district ward of Camelot and part of the new Valency district ward (the parishes of Forrabury & Minster and Trevalga). Its proposed Wadebridge & St Minver division would comprise the new district wards of St Endellion & St Kew, St Minver, Wadebridge and part of the new Allan district ward (the parishes of Egloshayle and St Breock).

81 The County Council proposed a two-member division for the Wadebridge area. This is due to electorate growth and in order to maintain community identity with adjacent parishes. In its proposals for Bude division it wished to maintain a single-member division while ensuring electoral equality. It considered the Flexbury polling district of Poughill & Stratton parish ward is best placed in the Bude division. The remainder of Poughill & Stratton would be contained within the Stratton division. The County Council also proposed the Launceston area, which is entitled to two county councillors, continue to be single-member divisions with the A30 used as a boundary. It stated that there is no 'evidence of demand for a two member division' and the area is not warded at district level. Additionally it argued that the projected electorate growth would be significant. Because North Cornwall is very rural and has a large moorland area, the County Council's proposals 'relate much better to the road network and other geographical factors than existing boundaries do' it considers its proposals to be the most appropriate for the area.

82 Under the County Council's proposals the divisions of Altarnun, Camelford, Launceston South & Stokeclimsland, North Petherwin & Week St Mary, Stratton and Tintagel would initially have 29%, 18%, 32%, 7%, 3% and 10% fewer electors per councillor respectively (30%, 13%, 29%, 9%, 6% and 11% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Bodmins St Mary's, Bodmin St Petroc, Bude, Helland, Launceston North, Padstow and Wadebridge & St Minver would initially have 6%, 0%, 15%, 2%, 8%, 6% and 1% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (7%, 6%, 17%, 1%, 18%, 4% and 1% (fewer) more by 2007).

83 Morwenstow Parish Council requested that it be part of a single division based on rural parishes and separate from Bude. Stoke Climsland Parish Council made proposals for a South division to represent large rural parishes, and a separate Launceston division. St Endellion Parish Council stated that it would prefer to be in a division with other rural parishes than in a mixed urban and rural division.

84 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note that the County Council's proposals secure poor levels of coterminosity and also provide poor electoral variances in two of the divisions. However, we note that it has not proven easy to

put together a scheme and, given the difficulties in the district we consider that the County Council has provided a good basis for our proposals, subject to three modifications to provide for an improved level of electoral equality and coterminosity. We propose to transfer the parishes of St Mabyn and St Tudy from the division of Helland to the division of Wadebridge & Minver. We propose to combine the County Council's proposed Launceston North and Launceston South divisions to form a two-member Launceston North, South & Stokeclimsland division in order to avoid dividing Launceston parish between two divisions. We propose the transfer of the parish of Warbstow from the division of Camelford to the division of Altarnun. We looked at a number of other alternatives to address the electoral imbalances in the district. However, we are of the view that the alternative proposals would significantly impact on community identity of the rural areas or create large unwieldy divisions. Our amendments would improve the level of coterminosity from three out of 13 divisions at 23% to five out of 12 divisions at 42%. Additionally, the electoral equality has improved under our proposals from six divisions varying by more than 10% from the county average by 2007 to four divisions varying by more than 10% by 2007.

85 Our draft recommendations would achieve a level of coterminosity of 42% between county divisions and district ward boundaries. The district is entitled to 14 councillors under a council size of 82. Under the draft recommendations the divisions of Altarnun, Camelford, Helland, Launceston North South & Stokeclimsland, North Petherwin & Week St Mary, Stratton and Tintagel would initially have 21%, 26%, 18%, 12%, 7%, 3% and 10% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (22%, 21%, 20%, 5%, 9%, 6% and 11% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Bodmin St Mary's, Bodmin St Petroc, Bude, Padstow and Wadebridge & Minver would initially have 6%, 0%, 15%, 6% and 11% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (7%, 6%, 17%, 4% and 10% more by 2007). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Penwith district

86 Under the current arrangements, the district of Penwith is represented by 10 county councillors serving 10 divisions. The divisions of Marazion, Penzance West, St Ives North and St Ives South currently have 8%, 12%, 30% and 17% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (10%, 14%, 32% and 15% fewer by 2007). The divisions of Hayle North, Hayle South, Ludgvan, Penzance East, Penzance South and St Just currently have 9%, 8%, 21%, 12%, 2% and 16% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (9%, 10%, 16%, 11%, 1% (fewer) and 14% more by 2007).

87 At Stage One the County Council proposed 9 single-member divisions and one two-member division, which the district is entitled to under a council size of 82. Its proposals for this area would achieve 22% coterminosity. Its proposed Hayle-Gwinear division would comprise the new district wards of Hayle South and part of the new Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East district ward (Gwinear-Gwithian parish polling district 3-L and Hayle parish polling districts 1 and 2-K). Its proposed Hayle-Gwithian division would comprise the new district wards of Hayle North and part of the new Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East district ward (Gwinear-Gwithian parish polling districts 1 and 2-L and Hayle parish polling district 3-K). Its proposed Ludgvan division would comprise the new district wards of Ludgvan & Towednack, Madron & Zennor and part of the new St Buryan district ward (the parish of Sancreed). Its proposed Marazion division would comprise the new district wards of Goldsithney, St Erth & St Hilary and Marazion & Perranuthnoe. Its proposed Penzance Central division would comprise the new district wards of Penzance Central, part of the new Gulval & Heamoor district ward (polling districts 3 and 4-LL) and part of the new Penzance Promenade district ward (polling districts 1 and 4-JJ). Its proposed Penzance East division would comprise the new district wards of Penzance East and part of the new Gulval & Heamoor district ward (polling districts 1 and 2-LL). Its proposed Penzance South division would comprise the new district wards of Penzance South, part of the new Penzance Promenade district ward (polling districts 2 and 3-JJ) and part of the new St Buryan district

ward (the parish of Paul). Its proposed St Ives division would comprise the new district wards of Lelant & Carbis Bay, St Ives North and St Ives South. Its proposed division of St Just would comprise the new district wards of Morvah, Pendeen & St Just and part of the new St Buryan district ward (the parishes of Buryan, St Levan and Sennen).

88 The County Council proposed a two-member division for the St Ives area. The parishes of Gwinear-Gwithian and Hayle are entitled to two county councillors although the County Council argued that there was no support for a two-member division. Due to 'the likely new polling district boundaries which are in an advanced state of preparation', it stated that the 'best approach' was to divide the Gwinear-Gwithian & Hayle East district ward. This proposal was also supported by Hayle Town Council. The County Council noted that its proposals in the Penzance area divided new district wards. However, it contends that this is necessary to maintain community identity and provide divisions with good electoral equality.

89 Under the County Council's proposals, the divisions of Hayle-Gwinear, Hayle-Gwithian, Ludgvan, Marazion and St Ives would initially have 11%, 4%, 1%, 4% and 6% fewer electors per councillor respectively (9%, 4%, 4%, 7% and 7% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Penzance Central, Penzance East, Penzance South and St Just would initially have 21%, 23%, 6% and 21% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (17%, 21%, 2% and 20% more by 2007).

90 Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council opposed any proposals for a two-member division for Hayle and Gwinear-Gwithian and any proposals for splitting Gwinear-Gwithian between divisions, citing the parish's distinct rural character. It suggested two alternative options it preferred for the Hayle and Gwinear-Gwithian divisions.

91 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We noted that the County Council's proposals secured a very low level of coterminosity. However, we consider that its proposals generally reflect community identity in the district and we therefore propose basing our draft recommendations on its proposals, subject to three amendments to improve on the levels of electoral equality and coterminosity. We propose combining the County Council's proposed Hayle-Gwinear and Hayle-Gwithian divisions to form a two-member Hayle-Gwinear division. We note the proposals of the County Council, Hayle Town Council and Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council. However, these proposals would split wards within the divisions and would require further parish warding, which would not best reflect the statutory criteria. We also propose that the Penzance area form a three-member Penzance division. We propose transferring the parish of Paul from the County Council's proposed Penzance South division to the proposed Ludgvan division. We looked at various options for the Penzance area given the high levels of electoral inequality and low level of coterminosity. We considered the transfer of part of Penzance to the surrounding rural areas. However, we did not consider that the mix of rural and urban areas would best reflect the statutory criteria, particularly considering our proposal for a three-member division would avoid the necessity of dividing the Penzance area. These proposals improve the level of coterminosity in Penwith from two out of nine divisions at 22% to four out of six divisions being coterminous at 67%. Further, the amendments improve the level of electoral equality from three out of nine divisions varying by more than 10% from the county average by 2007, to two divisions out of six varying by more than 10% by 2007.

92 Our draft recommendations would achieve a level of coterminosity of 67% between county divisions and district ward boundaries. The district is entitled to 10 councillors under a council size of 82. Under the draft recommendations the divisions of Hayle-Gwinear, Marazion and St Ives would initially have 8%, 4% and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (6%, 7% and 7% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Ludgvan, Penzance and St Just would initially have 3%, 15% and 21% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (0%, 12% and 20% more by 2007). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Restormel borough

93 Under the current arrangements, the borough of Restormel is represented by 14 county councillors serving 14 divisions. The divisions of Fowey & Lostwithiel, Grampound, St Columb, Trevarna and Treverbyn currently have 6%, 8%, 14%, 9% and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (6%, 11%, 15%, 8% and 5% (more) fewer by 2007). The divisions of Biscovey, Newquay Central, Newquay North, Newquay West, Poltair, Roche, St Austell West, St Blazey and St Stephen currently have 16%, 27%, 3%, 6%, 5%, 2%, 2%, 6% and 55% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (22%, 23%, 22%, 8%, 2% (fewer) 1%, 0%, 2% and 56% more by 2007).

94 At Stage One the County Council proposed 16 single-member divisions, which the borough is entitled to under a council size of 82. Its proposals would achieve 13% coterminosity. Its proposed Fowey & Lostwithiel division would comprise part of the new borough ward of Fowey & Tywardreath (the parishes of Fowey and St Sampson) and part of the new Lostwithiel borough ward (the parish of Lostwithiel). Its proposed Grampound division would comprise part of the new borough ward of Mevagissey (the parishes of St Goran and St Michael Caerhays), part of the new St Ewe borough ward (the parishes of Grampound with Creed, St Ewe and St Mewan) and part of the new St Stephen borough ward (the parish of St Mewan). Its proposed Luxulyan Valley division would comprise part of the new borough wards of Fowey & Tywardreath (the parish of Tywardreath) and part of the new Lostwithiel borough ward (the parishes of Lanlivery and Luxulyan). Its proposed Newquay Central division would comprise the new borough ward of Edgcumbe South and part of the new Edgcumbe North ward (to the east of Edgcumbe Avenue and east of and including Hillgrove Road). Its proposed Newquay North division would comprise part of the new borough ward of Edgcumbe North (polling districts 2 and 5-QQN) and part of the new Rialton borough ward (that part of Newquay parish to the north of and including the A3058 to the junction with the A3059 where the boundary would continue along the A3059 to the parish boundary). Its proposed Newquay West division would comprise the new borough ward of Gannel. Its proposed Roche division would comprise the new borough ward of Rock (except the parish of St Wenn). Its proposed St Austell Bay division would comprise the new borough wards of Crinnis, part of the new Bethel district ward (polling districts 1 and 2-PPT), part of the new Mount Charles borough ward (polling district 5-GT) and part of the new St Ewe borough ward (the unparished area in the east). Its proposed St Austell North division would comprise part of the new borough wards of Bethel (polling districts 3-5 PPT) and part of the new Poltair borough ward (not including that part of Treverbyn parish). Its proposed St Austell South division would comprise part of the new borough ward of Gover (polling districts 3 and 4-ET), part of the new Mount Charles borough ward (polling district 5-GT) and part of new Poltair borough ward (polling district 4-FT). Its proposed St Austell West & Mevagissey division would comprise part of the new borough ward of Gover (polling districts 1 and 2-ET), part of the new Mevagissey borough ward (the parish of Mevagissey and the unparished area to the north), part of the new St Ewe borough ward (polling districts SST and the western part of 2 D-T). Its proposed St Blaise division would comprise the new borough ward of St Blaise. Its proposed St Columb division would comprise the new borough ward of St Columb, part of the new Rock borough ward (the parish of St Wenn) and part of the new St Enoder borough ward (the parish of St Columb Major). Its proposed St Enoder & Colan division would comprise part of the new borough wards of Rialton (the parish of Colan and that part of Newquay parish to the south of of the A3058 and A3059) and part of the new St Enoder borough ward (the parish of St Enoder). Its proposed St Stephen division would comprise part of the new borough ward of St Stephen (the parish of St Stephen). Its proposed Treverbyn division would comprise the new borough ward of Treverbyn, part of the new Bethel borough ward (the part in Treverbyn parish), part of the new Gover borough ward (the part in Treverbyn parish) and part of the new Poltair borough ward (the part in Treverbyn parish).

95 The County Council contend that the proposals for the borough of Restormel had been difficult to undertake due to the various electorate sizes within the existing divisions of the

borough. These were difficult to combine to find suitable divisions that ensured electoral equality. The Council proposed two additional divisions in the borough of Restormel. The Newquay area has been the fastest growing town in Cornwall. The County Council would like to retain single-member divisions, but not that to do this it has been necessary to split borough ward boundaries in their proposals. Regarding the St Austell area, the County Council contend that the electorates of the new borough wards in the unparished areas had made it difficult to 'define electoral divisions that relate well to them' and therefore its proposals are similar to the existing boundaries.

96 Under the County Councils proposals the divisions of Fowey & Lostwithiel, Grampound, Luxulyan Valley, Roche, St Austell Bay, St Austell South, St Austell West Mevagissey, St Columb, St Enoder & Colan, St Stephen and Treverbyn would initially have 11%, 4%, 17%, 9%, 17%, 4%, 1%, 11%, 15%, 4% and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (11%, 7%, 20%, 9%, 13%, 3%, 12%, 5% (more), 6% and 9% (more) fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Newquay Central, Newquay North, Newquay West, St Austell North and St Blaise would initially have 5%, 16%, 1%, 6% and 2% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (6%, 12%, 4%, 0% and 1% more by 2007).

97 Restormel Borough Council stated that members were unlikely to unanimously support the County Council's proposals. As part of Restormel Borough Council's submission Councillor Boosey opposed the County Council's proposals for the Fowey and Tywardreath area, and proposed maintaining the status quo or including all the Fowey River wards in one division. Councillor Chapman had no objection to combining Fowey and Tywardreath and suggested that the change was in keeping with new district wards. Councillor Cole stated that parishes should provide the basis for divisions and not divided between divisions, in order to better represent communities. He opposed including part of Newquay in a division with St Enoder & Colan. The Borough Council's Newquay and St Columb Area Committee made a separate submission stating strongly that rural and urban areas should be in separate divisions. St Sampson Parish Council argued that St Sampson has more in common with Fowey than Lanlivery and Lostwithiel and should remain in a division with Fowey. St Columb Major Town Council argued that the existing county boundaries should be maintained and St Columb should not be combined with Newquay, as the areas face different problems. St Wenn Parish Council argued that St Wenn should not be part of a division with Rock ward, as its links are with St Columb and its identity is rural. St Mawgan Parish Council argued that St Columb should not be combined with Newquay, as the areas have different interests and St Columb has strong links to its surrounding area. Fowey Town Council argued that Fowey should not be combined with Tywardreath but should remain with Lostwithiel and St Sampson, as the three parishes co-operate and have a 'similar ethos'. Lanlivery Parish Council supported the County Council's proposals to join the parish of Fowey with the parishes of Lostwithiel and St Sampson and the parish of Lanlivery with the parishes of Tywardreath and Luxulyan. Tywardreath and Par Parish Council expressed the same view as Lanlivery Parish Council. St Stephen-in-Brannel Parish Council stated that the County Council's proposals for the area were an improvement on existing arrangements.

98 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We noted that although the County Council's proposals secure acceptable levels of electoral equality, they did not secure good levels of coterminosity in the borough. However, we consider that its proposals provided a good basis upon which to base our proposals subject to four amendments in order to provide for an improved level of electoral equality and coterminosity. We propose combining the wards of Bethel, Crinnis and Treverbyn to form a two-member Treverbyn division. While we would prefer to avoid the creation of a two-member division in the area, we note that it is necessary in order to secure an improved level of coterminosity while reflecting the statutory criteria. We propose combining the wards of Gover and Poltair with the parish of St Mewan to form a two-member St Mewan division. We propose combining the ward of Mevagissey with part of St Ewe ward (the parishes of Grampound with Creed and St Ewe) to form a single-member Grampound division. We also

propose that Mount Charles ward form a Mount Charles county division. We looked at various options to improve the extremely low level of coterminosity in the borough. In the Newquay area we noted that the town is isolated on the coast and surrounded by a rural area. We found that, in order to reflect the statutory criteria as a whole, it was inevitable that parts of urban and rural areas would be combined. Overall, coterminosity has been improved from 13% under the County Council's proposals to 29% under our draft recommendations with four divisions varying by no more than 10% from the county average by 2007.

99 Our draft recommendations would achieve a level of coterminosity of 29% between county divisions and borough ward boundaries. The borough is entitled to 16 councillors under a council size of 82. Under the draft recommendations the divisions of Fowey & Lostwithiel, Grampound, Luxulyan Valley, Roche, St Mewan, Mount Charles, St Columb, St Enoder & Colan and St Stephen would initially have 11%, 4%, 17%, 9%, 8%, 5%, 11%, 15% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the county average respectively (11%, 8%, 20%, 9%, 9%, 3%, 12%, 5% (more) and 6% fewer by 2007). The proposed divisions of Newquay Central, Newquay North, Newquay West, St Blaise and Treverbyn would initially have 5%, 16%, 1%, 2% and 0% more electors per councillor than the county average respectively (6%, 12%, 4%, 1%, and 5% more by 2007). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Conclusions

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

- There should be an increase in council size from 79 to 82.
- The boundaries of all divisions, except St Blaise and Penryn, will be subject to change as the divisions are based on district wards which have themselves changed as a result of the district reviews.

101 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the County Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in some areas to improve electoral equality and coterminosity.

- In Caradon district we propose basing our draft recommendations on the majority of the County Council's proposals. However, we propose six amendments to improve the level of electoral equality and coterminosity.
- In Carrick district we propose basing our draft recommendations on the majority of the County Council's proposals. However, we propose five amendments to improve the level of electoral equality and coterminosity.
- In Kerrier district we propose adopting the majority of the County Council's proposals. However, we propose two amendments to improve the level of electoral equality and coterminosity.
- In North Cornwall district we propose adopting the majority of the County Council's proposals. However, we propose three amendments to improve the level of electoral equality and coterminosity.
- In Penwith district we propose adopting the majority of the County Council's proposals. However, we propose three amendments to improve the level of electoral equality and coterminosity.
- In Restormel borough we propose basing our draft recommendations on the majority of the County Council's proposals. However, we propose four amendments to improve the level of electoral equality and coterminosity.

102 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will affect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2002 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2007.

Table 5: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2002 electorate		2007 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	79	82	79	82
Number of divisions	79	70	79	70
Average number of electors per councillor	4,941	4,760	5,185	4,996
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	44	24	46	21
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	18	5	23	3
Level of coterminosity	37%	60%	37%	60%

103 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Cornwall County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 44 to 24. By 2007 only 21 divisions are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%.

Draft recommendation

Cornwall County Council should comprise 82 councillors serving 70 divisions, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated in Appendix A, and on the large map inside the back cover.

Parish and town council electoral arrangements

104 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 county divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division of the county. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Newquay, Bude-Stratton and Helston to reflect the proposed county divisions in those areas.

105 The parish of Newquay is currently served by 20 councillors representing four wards: Edgcumbe North (returning four councillors), Edgcumbe South (returning four councillors), Gannel (returning six councillors) and Rialton ward (returning six councillors).

106 In order to reflect our proposed county divisions in the area, we propose that Newquay Parish should be divided into six parish wards. We propose no change to Gannel parish ward, which would be contained in the proposed Newquay West division and would continue to be represented by six parish councillors. The proposed Edgcumbe West parish ward and Newquay South parish ward would comprise the Newquay Central division, represented by two and four parish councillors respectively. The proposed Newquay North division would comprise the proposed Edgcumbe East parish ward and Newquay North parish ward, represented by two and four parish councillors respectively. The remaining Rialton South parish ward would lie in the proposed St Enoder & Colan division, represented by two parish councillors.

Draft recommendation

Newquay Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Edgcumbe East (returning two councillors), Edgcumbe West (returning two councillors), Gannel (returning six councillors), Newquay South (returning four councillors), Newquay North (returning four councillors) and Rialton South (returning two councillors). The boundary between the six parish wards should reflect the proposed county division boundary, as illustrated and named on Map 3 in Appendix A.

107 The parish of Bude-Stratton is currently served by 18 councillors representing two wards, Bude and Poughill & Stratton, each returning nine councillors.

108 In order to reflect our proposed county divisions in the area, we propose that Bude-Stratton parish should be divided into three parish wards. The current Bude parish ward would be maintained and a new Flexbury parish ward and Poughill & Stratton parish ward be established represented by nine, four and five parish councillors respectively. Flexbury and Bude parish wards would form part of the proposed Bude division. Poughill & Stratton would form part of the proposed Stratton division.

Draft recommendation

Bude-Stratton Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Bude (returning nine councillors), Flexbury (returning four councillors) and Poughill & Stratton (returning five councillors). The boundary between the three parish wards should reflect the proposed county division boundary, as illustrated and named on Map 1 in Appendix A.

109 The town of Helston is currently served by 12 councillors representing two wards, Helston North and Helston South, each returning six councillors.

110 In order to reflect our proposed county divisions in the area, we propose that Helston South should be divided into two parish wards, Helston East and Helston West represented by four and two councillors respectively. Helston East parish ward would form part of the proposed Meneage & South Helston division. Helston West parish ward would form part of the proposed Porthleven division. Helston North would remain unchanged.

Draft recommendation

Helston Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Helston East (returning four councillors), Helston North (returning six councillors) and Helston West (returning two councillors). The boundary between the three parish wards should reflect the proposed county division boundary, as illustrated and named on Map 2 in Appendix A.

5 What happens next?

111 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Cornwall County Council contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 26 April 2004. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses (including names and addresses of respondents unless specified otherwise) may be inspected at our offices and those of the County Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

112 Express your views by writing directly to us:

**The Team Leader
Cornwall County Council Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

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

Appendix A

Draft recommendations for Cornwall County Council: **Detailed mapping**

The following maps illustrate our proposed division boundaries for Cornwall County Council area.

Map 1 illustrates, the proposed divisions in North Cornwall district. Bude and Stratton divisions.

Map 2 illustrates the proposed divisions in Kerrier District. Meneage and South Helston and Porthleven divisions.

Map 3 illustrates the proposed divisions in Restormel borough. Newquay Central, Newquay North, Newquay West and St Enoder and Colan divisions.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Cornwall, including constituent district wards and parishes.

Appendix B

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, <http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/regulation/Consultation/Code.htm> requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as The Boundary Committee for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

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

Table B1: The Boundary Committee for England's compliance with Code criteria

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