

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Kerrier in Cornwall

January 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	<i>33</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Kerrier: Detailed Mapping	<i>35</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>39</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Camborne and Redruth is inserted inside the back cover of this report.

WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Commission:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

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

SUMMARY

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

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

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

- **in 14 of the 22 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and six wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in twelve wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main proposals for Kerrier's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 101-102) are that:

- **Kerrier District Council should have 44 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 19 wards, instead of 22 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 17 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three, and five wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 17 of the proposed 19 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in 18 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements for the towns of Camborne and Redruth;**
- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Carn Brea and Illogan;**
- **new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Sithney and Wendron.**

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

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

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

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

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Breage & Crowan	3	the parishes of Breage, Crowan and Germoe	Map 2
2	Camborne North	3	part of Camborne parish (the proposed North town ward) and part of Carn Brea parish (the proposed East Hill parish ward)	Large map
3	Camborne South	3	part of Camborne parish (the proposed South town ward)	Large map
4	Camborne West	3	part of Camborne parish (the proposed West town ward)	Large map
5	Constantine & Mawnan	2	the parishes of Constantine, Gweek and Mawnan	Map 2
6	Helston North	3	part of Helston parish (the proposed North town ward), part of Sithney parish (the proposed Lowertown parish ward), part of Wendron parish (the proposed Trewennack parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
7	Helston South	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – part of Helston parish (the proposed South town ward)	Map 2
8	Illogan North	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Illogan and Portreath	Map 2 and large map
9	Illogan South	3	part of Carn Brea parish (the proposed Barncoose, Four Lanes and Pool parish wards)	Map 2 and large map
10	Mabe & Budock	2	the parishes of Budock, Mabe and St Gluvias	Map 2
11	Meneage	1	the parishes of Cury, Gunwalloe, Manaccan, Mawgan-in-Meneage, St Anthony-in-Meneage and St Martin-in-Meneage	Map 2
12	Mullion & The Lizard	2	the parishes of Grade-Ruan, Landewednack and Mullion	Map 2
13	Porthleven & Sithney	2	the parish of Porthleven, part of Sithney parish (the proposed Sithney parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
14	Redruth North	3	Part of Redruth parish (the proposed North town ward)	Large map
15	Redruth South	3	Part of Redruth parish (the proposed South town ward)	Large map
16	St Day & Lanner	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Carharrack, Lanner and St Day	Map 2 and large map
17	St Keverne	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of St Keverne	Map 2
18	Stithians	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Stithians	Map 2
19	Wendron	1	part of Wendron parish (the proposed Wendron parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A, and the large map at the back of the report.

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

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Kerrier

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Breage & Crowan	3	4,758	1,586	-3	4,819	1,606	-6
2	Camborne North	3	5,087	1,696	3	5,465	1,822	7
3	Camborne South	3	5,238	1,746	6	5,472	1,824	7
4	Camborne West	3	5,341	1,780	8	5,566	1,855	9
5	Constantine & Mawnan	2	3,139	1,570	-4	3,144	1,572	-8
6	Helston North	3	4,483	1,494	-9	4,901	1,634	-4
7	Helston South	2	3,195	1,598	-3	3,583	1,792	5
8	Illogan North	3	5,560	1,853	13	5,584	1,861	9
9	Illogan South	3	5,269	1,756	7	5,632	1,877	10
10	Mabe & Budock	2	3,265	1,633	-1	3,610	1,805	6
11	Meneage	1	1,734	1,734	6	1,756	1,756	3
12	Mullion & The Lizard	2	3,239	1,620	-1	3,217	1,609	-6
13	Porthleven & Sithney	2	3,156	1,578	-4	3,159	1,580	-7
14	Redruth North	3	4,670	1,557	-5	4,805	1,602	-6
15	Redruth South	3	4,738	1,579	-4	4,927	1,642	-4
16	St Day & Lanner	3	4,398	1,466	-11	4,493	1,498	-12
17	St Keverne	1	1,646	1,646	0	1,686	1,686	-1
18	Stithians	1	1,612	1,612	-2	1,617	1,617	-5
19	Wendron	1	1,682	1,682	2	1,683	1,683	-1
	Totals	44	72,210	-	-	75,119	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,641	-	-	1,707	-

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

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

1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Kerrier. Kerrier's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1978 (Report no. 278). The electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council were last reviewed in November 1983 (Report no. 456). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 3: Stages of the Review

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

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

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

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

13 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 15 January 2002 and will end on 11 March 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

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

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 The district of Kerrier covers an area of approximately 47,000 hectares and lies in the west of Cornwall. It borders the districts of Carrick to the east and Penwith to the west, while its northern and southern boundaries are formed by the Atlantic Ocean and the English Channel respectively. The main urban area is situated in the north and is primarily composed of the towns of Camborne and Redruth, which together form approximately 34 per cent of the district's total electorate. Apart from the town of Helston in the west, the remainder of the district is predominantly rural, large parts of which are designated as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The district is wholly parished and contains 32 parishes.

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

17 The electorate of the district is 72,210 (February 2001). The Council presently has 44 members who are elected from 22 wards, nine of which are relatively urban in Camborne, Carn Brea, Illogan, Redruth and Helston, with the remainder being mainly rural. Eight of the wards are each represented by three councillors, six are each represented by two councillors and eight are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

18 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,641 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,707 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration since the last review, the number of electors per councillor in 14 of the 22 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, six wards by more than 20 per cent and two wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Mawnan & Budock ward where the councillor represents 49 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Kerrier

Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Breage & Germoe	2	2,820	1,410	-14	2,869	1,435	-16
2	Camborne North	3	4,988	1,663	1	5,367	1,789	5
3	Camborne South	3	5,519	1,840	12	5,788	1,929	13
4	Camborne West	3	4,906	1,635	0	5,095	1,698	-1
5	Constantine & Gweek	1	1,856	1,856	13	1,835	1,835	7
6	Crowan	1	1,938	1,938	18	1,950	1,950	14
7	Grade-Ruan & Landewednack	1	1,524	1,524	-7	1,538	1,538	-10
8	Helston North	2	4,099	2,050	25	4,518	2,259	32
9	Helston South	2	3,195	1,598	-3	3,583	1,792	5
10	Illogan North	3	5,560	1,853	13	5,584	1,861	9
11	Illogan South	3	5,522	1,841	12	5,885	1,962	15
12	Mabe & St Gluvias	1	2,103	2,103	28	2,231	2,231	31
13	Mawnan & Budock	1	2,445	2,445	49	2,688	2,688	57
14	Meneage	1	1,243	1,243	-24	1,240	1,240	-27
15	Mullion	2	2,206	1,103	-33	2,195	1,098	-36
16	Porthleven	2	2,620	1,310	-20	2,632	1,316	-23
17	Redruth North	3	4,980	1,660	1	5,123	1,708	0
18	Redruth South	3	4,428	1,476	-10	4,609	1,536	-10
19	St Day & Lanner	3	4,398	1,466	-11	4,493	1,498	-12
20	St Keverne	1	1,646	1,646	0	1,686	1,686	-1
21	Stithians	1	1,612	1,612	-2	1,617	1,617	-5
22	Wendron & Sithney	2	2,602	1,301	-21	2,593	1,297	-24
	Totals	44	72,210	-	-	75,119	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,641	-	-	1,707	-

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Mullion ward were relatively over-represented by 33 per cent, while electors in Mawnan & Budock ward were relatively under-represented by 49 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

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

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 16 submissions during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

Kerrier District Council

21 The District Council proposed a reduction in council size of one, from 44 to 43, serving 19 wards, three fewer than at present. Under their proposals, electoral equality would improve, with only two wards, St Day & Lanner and Illogan South, varying by more than 10 per cent from the district average by 2006. The District Council proposed modifying 13 out of 22 wards in the district.

22 As a consequence of its proposals for a revised pattern of wards in the Helston and Redruth areas, the District Council also proposed new warding arrangements for the parishes of Wendron and Lanner respectively.

Parish and Town Councils

23 We received responses from 11 parish and town councils. Germoe Parish Council supported the proposed Breage & Crowan ward. Redruth Town Council, Constantine Parish Council and Gweek Parish Council all proposed retaining their existing district and parishing arrangements. Budock Parish Council opposed the proposed Mabe & Budock ward, supporting the retention of the existing Mawnan & Budock ward, while Sithney Parish Council opposed being combined with the towns of Helston or Porthleven for district warding purposes. Illogan Parish Council proposed the creation of a new ward of Illogan parish in the Park Bottom area. Portreath Parish Council enquired as to the possibility of a stricter residency requirement for parish councillors, a matter which does not fall within the remit of this review.

24 Carharrack, Lanner and St Day Parish Councils wrote to oppose the division of Lanner parish between Redruth South and St Day & Lanner wards, considered by the District Council while formulating its proposals, but rejected in favour of a smaller transfer of electors from Lanner to Redruth South. They argued that the division of the village would not reflect community identity and interests, or provide effective and convenient government at district or parish level. St Day Parish Council also opposed the proposed reduction in representation for the ward from three to two members, and opposed the reduction in council size proposed by the District Council. Lanner and Carharrack Parish Councils supported the retention of the existing St Day & Lanner ward, but also put forward alternative schemes for this area combining whole parishes with polling districts from Redruth South ward.

Other Submissions

25 We received a further four submissions from two district councillors and local residents. Councillor Page (St Day & Lanner ward) opposed any division of Lanner parish and a corresponding reduction in the representation of St Day & Lanner ward from three to two councillors. She argued that the parishes of the existing ward share a common identity, and that dividing Lanner parish would make no sense. Councillor Thomas (St Day & Lanner ward) and six Lanner residents opposed the proposal, considered but not put forward by the District Council, to divide the parish between Redruth South and St Day & Lanner ward. However, Councillor Thomas also proposed a smaller transfer of electors from Lanner parish to Redruth South ward identical to that put forward by the District Council, considering it to be an acceptable compromise between the desire to retain the current arrangements and the achievement of electoral equality. One of the above Lanner residents also proposed a boundary amendment similar to that proposed by the District Council and Councillor Thomas.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

28 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.

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

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

Electorate Forecasts

31 Since 1975 there has been a 22 per cent increase in the electorate of Kerrier district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 4 per cent from 72,210 to 75,119 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Helston North ward, although a significant amount is also expected in the wards of Camborne North, Camborne South, Helston South, Illogan South and Mawnan & Budock. 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.

32 At Stage One Budock Parish Council queried the use of five-year projections only. It asked, “Given that the new boundaries are simply based on a set number of electors, how will provision be made when the numbers alter?” The parish council referred to a possible

development of 500 properties in the parish detailed in the Kerrier Local Plan. Under Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, we are obliged to have regard for changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over the next five years. No such obligation exists for longer-term electoral forecasts. We asked officers at the District Council to revisit their projections in Budock parish. They indicated that they remained satisfied that their original projections remained the best estimates for change in electorate over the five-year period. We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having looked at the District Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

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

34 Kerrier District Council presently has 44 members. The District Council proposed a reduction in council size of one, from 44 to 43, serving 19 wards, three fewer than at present. St Day Parish Council opposed this reduction in council size.

35 We consider that the District Council's scheme generally provides a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and note that it was consulted upon locally and supported by a majority of councillors voting. However, we also note that it did not provide the correct allocation of councillors for each part of the district. Under the Council's proposals, the northern part of the district (including the urban area of Camborne and Redruth) would be allocated one less councillor (23 members) than the electorate merited both now and by 2006. The part of the district to the west of, and including the parishes of Helston and Wendron, would have a slight over-allocation of 0.7 councillors (0.6 by 2006).

36 In seeking to address this issue, we first looked at alternative arrangements based on the proposed council size of 43 members, that would both provide a more equal allocation and retain the merits of the District Council's proposals. However, no alternative could be identified which would achieve good electoral equality, sufficiently reflect community identities and interests, and secure effective and convenient local government. In particular, we consider that there is a difference in character between the more urban north and the rural parishes in the centre of the district, and that this boundary should not be breached for district warding purposes.

37 We therefore considered alternative council sizes of 42 or 44 members, as both would provide for an improved allocation of councillors. The retention of the existing 44-member council would mean that the northern area would, if allocated 24 councillors as at present, be under-represented by only 0.6 councillors both now and by 2006. The western area would be over-represented by only 0.5 councillors (0.4 by 2006). We also consider that a 44-member council would have other advantages. We note that allocating an extra councillor to the north of the district would enable the retention of the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward, which we consider provides the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in that area, despite its slight over-representation. We also note that most of the District Council's proposed wards would continue to provide good electoral equality in a 44-member council.

38 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we therefore conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by retaining a council of 44 members.

Electoral Arrangements

39 We have carefully considered the representations received during Stage One, including the district-wide scheme submitted by the District Council.

40 The District Council, Budock, Gweek, St Day and Sithney parish councils, and Councillors Page and Thomas (both representing St Day & Lanner ward) all expressed concern regarding the achievement of electoral equality in rural areas at the expense of rural identity or the maintenance of an appropriate ward size. The District Council formally objected to the fact that the Commission was “unwilling, as opposed to unable” to take such matters into account. We are sympathetic to the nature of the concerns expressed, and recognise the difficulty that exists, particularly in rural areas which are sparsely populated. While our *Guidance* states that there is no provision in legislation for us to allow for an element of over-representation in rural areas, it adds “we need to consider carefully the extent to which electoral equality can be achieved, having regard to the statutory criteria.” We therefore seek to recommend wards that not only provide an acceptable level of electoral equality, *but also* reflect community identities and interests and provide effective and convenient local government for electors.

41 Examining the District Council’s submission, we note that it had undertaken a consultation exercise on its proposals, involving parish and town councils in the district, and was supported by a majority of councillors voting. As stated previously, we consider that its scheme, based on a council size of 43 members, would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements. We have therefore based our recommendations on the District Council’s scheme. However, to improve electoral equality further and bear in mind local community identities and interests, and in light of our proposals for a 44-member council, we are moving away from the District Council’s proposals in a number of areas. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Grade-Ruan & Landewednack, Meneage, Mullion and St Keverne wards;
- (b) Helston North and Helston South wards;
- (c) Breage & Germoe, Crowan, Porthleven and Wendron & Sithney wards;
- (d) Constantine & Gweek, Mabe & St Gluvias, Mawnan & Budock and Stithians wards;
- (e) Illogan North and Illogan South wards;
- (f) Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West wards;
- (g) Redruth North, Redruth South and St Day & Lanner wards.

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

Grade-Ruan & Landewednack, Meneage, Mullion and St Keverne wards

43 The wards of Grade-Ruan & Landewednack, Meneage, Mullion and St Keverne occupy the district's southern peninsula. The single-member Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward contains the parishes of Grade-Ruan and Landewednack, while the two-member Mullion ward comprises the parishes of Cury, Gunwalloe and Mullion. The single member Meneage ward comprises the parishes of Manaccan, Mawnan-in-Meneage, St Anthony-in-Meneage and St Martin-in-Meneage, while the single-member St Keverne ward is coterminous with the parish of St Keverne. Currently, Meneage and Mullion wards are relatively over-represented, with 24 and 33 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively. Electoral equality is not expected to improve over the next five years, with Meneage and Mullion wards forecast to have 27 and 36 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively by 2006. At present, Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward has 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (10 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). St Keverne ward currently has equal to the average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

44 At Stage One, the District Council proposed that the existing Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward be combined with the parish of Mullion to form a new two-member Mullion & The Lizard ward. It argued, "Alone, the current ward of Grade-Ruan & Landewednack would have insufficient electors." The District Council also proposed that the remainder of Mullion ward (the parishes of Cury and Gunwalloe) be combined with the existing Meneage ward to form a revised single-member Meneage ward. It stated, "Although geographically large, the current electorate [of the existing Meneage ward] is well below the figure required." Finally, the District Council proposed retaining the existing single-member St Keverne ward, arguing that it would retain good electoral equality with a council size of 43. We received no further comments in relation to this area.

45 Under the District Council's proposals for a council size of 43 members, Meneage ward would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent more by 2006). Mullion & The Lizard and St Keverne wards would have 4 per cent and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively (8 per cent fewer and 3 per cent fewer by 2006).

46 We have given careful consideration to the District Council's proposals in this area. As previously discussed, we are proposing to retain a 44-member council, and note that this council size would improve slightly the electoral equality achieved by the proposed Mullion & The Lizard and St Keverne wards, with a slight depreciation in Meneage ward. We note that the District Council's proposed Mullion & The Lizard ward would substantially reduce the current level of over-representation in the existing Mullion ward and that, as the constituent parishes are well connected via the A3083 and B3296, a merger would appear to reflect community identities reasonably well. We therefore propose adopting the District Council's proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

47 Further, we note that the District Council's proposal would substantially reduce the current level of over-representation in the existing Meneage ward. The enlarged ward would combine parishes of similar geographical size and electorate situated directly south of the Helford River and the town of Helston. Consequently, we are adopting the District Council's proposed scheme for this ward. Finally, in view of the good electoral equality already

provided, we are also proposing to retain St Keverne ward on its existing boundaries, as proposed by the District Council.

48 Under our draft recommendations, Meneage ward would have 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent more than the average by 2006). Mullion & The Lizard and St Keverne wards would have 1 per cent fewer than and equal to the average respectively (6 per cent and 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Helston North and Helston South wards

49 Helston North and Helston South wards cover the town of Helston in the west of the district and are coterminous with North and South wards of Helston Town respectively. At present, Helston North ward is significantly under-represented, with 25 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average. Electoral equality in Helston North ward is expected to deteriorate further over the next five years, and the two-member ward is forecast to have 32 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. The two-member Helston South ward currently has 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent more than the average by 2006).

50 At Stage One the District Council proposed retaining the existing two-member Helston South ward, arguing that it would provide good electoral equality on a council size of 43. It also proposed enlarging the existing Helston North ward to include the part of Wendron parish directly to the north and east of the town, including the village of Trewennack and part of the village of Lowertown. The revised ward would be represented by three councillors. Under the District Council's proposals for a council of 43 members, the proposed Helston North ward would have 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 8 per cent fewer by 2006. The proposed Helston South ward would have 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent more than the average by 2006).

51 We received one further submission in relation to this area. Sithney Parish Council opposed a combination for district warding purposes of Sithney parish and Helston or Porthleven, arguing that being attached to a town would neither reflect the rural identity and interests of the parish nor provide effective and convenient local government.

52 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received at Stage One. We note first that on the existing council size of 44 members, the town of Helston is entitled to 4.5 councillors (4.8 by 2006) and is therefore under-represented. We consider that the District Council's scheme would lead to a substantial improvement in electoral equality in the proposed Helston North ward. Under our proposal to retain a 44-member council, its scheme would provide the correct allocation of councillors for the town; electoral equality in Helston North ward would continue to improve, while that of Helston South ward would depreciate only slightly by 2006. The District Council's proposals would also enable the retention of the strong existing boundary between Helston North and Helston South wards, running along the centre of the A394, Monument Road, Coinagehall Street, Market Place, Wendron Street and Godolphin Road before rejoining the A394.

53 The part of Wendron parish to be included in the District Council's proposed Helston North ward would consist of the northern and eastern periphery of Helston town. While the small villages of Trewennack and Lowertown are separate settlements, we note that Lowertown is almost contiguous with Helston, while Trewennack is approximately 1 km to the east along the A394. The transfer of this area would also enable the remainder of Wendron parish to form a single-member district ward providing good electoral equality and meeting the statutory criteria, as discussed in the following section.

54 We therefore intend adopting the District Council's proposed Helston North and Helston South wards subject to one amendment. As the Sithney/Wendron parish boundary bisects Lowertown, the District Council's proposals would divide the village between separate district wards. Seeking an alternative arrangement that would keep both parts of the village together, we therefore propose that Helston North ward be further expanded to include that part of Lowertown in Sithney parish, as described in the following section. This amendment would lead to a further slight improvement in electoral equality in Helston North ward. We consider that the District Council's proposals, thus amended, would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in the area, although we would welcome further views on this issue from local residents and other interested parties at Stage Three.

55 Under our draft recommendations, Helston North and Helston South wards would have 9 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2, and Map A2 in Appendix A.

Breage & Germoe, Crowan, Porthleven and Wendron & Sithney wards

56 Breage & Germoe, Crowan, Porthleven and Wendron & Sithney wards are situated in the west and centre of the district. The wards of Breage & Germoe, Porthleven and Wendron & Sithney are represented by two councillors, and Crowan ward is represented by one councillor. Crowan ward and Porthleven ward are coterminous with the parishes of Crowan and Porthleven respectively. Breage & Germoe ward contains the parishes of Breage and Germoe, while Wendron & Sithney ward contains the parishes of Sithney and Wendron. Breage & Germoe ward and Porthleven ward currently have 14 per cent and 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (16 per cent and 23 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Wendron & Sithney ward is also relatively over-represented, with 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (24 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). At present, Crowan ward has 18 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (14 per cent more than the average by 2006).

57 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the existing Breage & Germoe and Crowan wards be combined to form a new three-member Breage & Crowan ward. It also proposed that the parish of Porthleven and the parish of Sithney, currently in the ward of Wendron & Sithney, form a new two-member Porthleven & Sithney ward. The District Council stated that "the current ward of Porthleven has too many electors for one member but too few for two but combined with the adjoining parish of Sithney there would be sufficient electors for two [members]." As detailed in the previous section, it also proposed that part of the parish of Wendron bordering Helston be included in an enlarged three-member Helston North ward. The new district ward boundary would run to the north of the village of Lowertown, and then east traversing the B3297 and A394, between the small villages of

Trevenen and Trewennack, before turning south-east to meet the parish boundary. The other part of Wendron parish would then form a single-member Wendron ward.

58 Under the District Council's proposals for a council of 43 members, Breage & Crowan and Porthleven & Sithney wards would have 6 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent and 7 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Wendron ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor, and 4 per cent fewer than the average by 2006.

59 We received two further submissions in relation to this area. Germoe Parish Council supported the proposed Breage & Crowan ward, Sithney Parish Council opposed a combination for district warding purposes of Sithney and Porthleven or Helston, arguing that being attached to a town would neither reflect the rural identity and interests of the parish nor provide effective and convenient local government. As previously discussed, it also expressed reservations regarding the achievement of electoral equality in rural areas, stating, "the Council feels that small rural parishes should be treated as unique entities and grouped accordingly with similar adjoining areas and not just as numbers of electors".

60 We carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note first that that the District Council's scheme would reduce the levels of under- and over-representation in the area. As previously discussed, we are proposing to retain a 44-member council, which would improve slightly the electoral equality achieved by the District Council's proposals in the area. We note Germoe Parish Council's support for the proposed Breage & Crowan ward, and consider that the constituent parishes of this ward contain similar-sized rural communities that are reasonably well-linked by road. Therefore, we are content to put forward this ward for consultation as part of our draft recommendations.

61 We also considered the District Council's proposal to transfer part of Wendron parish containing the villages of Lowertown and Trewennack to Helston North ward, with the remainder forming a single-member district ward. This proposed Wendron ward would have good electoral equality and cover a sparsely populated area in the centre of the district, linked by the north-south axis of the B3297. As detailed in the last section, we note that the area to be transferred to Helston North ward constitutes the northern and western periphery of Helston, Lowertown in particular being almost contiguous with the town. As such, it would arguably relate more clearly to Helston than to the northern part of Wendron, and also enables the rest of the parish to be retained as a single entity for district warding purposes. We therefore consider that such a ward pattern would also reflect local community identities and interests and provide effective and convenient local government.

62 While Sithney Parish Council has argued that the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward does not meet the statutory criteria, we recognise that the configuration of electorates in this area restricts the number of suitable district warding options, particularly for the parish of Porthleven. Further, we note that no alternative warding proposals have been put forward in this part of the district and that, while Porthleven has a larger electorate than Sithney, the villages of the latter are relatively close to Porthleven town and linked to it by the A394 and B3304. We were therefore unable to identify an alternative pattern of wards which would provide a better balance between achieving electoral equality on the one hand, and reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government

on the other. We would welcome further views on this issue from local residents and other interested parties at Stage Three.

63 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we therefore propose basing our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals with one amendment. As mentioned in the previous section, we propose transferring that part of Lowertown in the parish of Sithney to the proposed Helston North ward, in order to prevent the division of the village between two district wards. We consider that this would not provide effective and convenient local government for village residents. The proposed district ward boundary would run along the disused railway line to the north of Lowertown, head south directly to the west of Gwavas Farm, then run south-east across fields to the River Cober and the parish boundary. As a result there would be a slight deterioration in electoral equality in the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward, which would none the less remain below 10 per cent.

64 We note that this proposal does not reflect the preference of Sithney Parish Council, which opposed any combination with the town of Helston. However, looking at the evidence received, we do not consider that the division of Lowertown by the District Council's proposals could be resolved through the retention of the existing Wendron & Sithney ward, which is over-represented both now and in 2006. Lowertown, we consider, is more closely linked to Helston than to Porthleven, indeed is almost contiguous with Helston. Further, dividing Wendron parish a third time to include all of Lowertown in the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward would not, in our view, facilitate effective and convenient local government. We consider that the District Council's proposals, thus amended, would provide the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria in the area, although we would welcome further views on this issue from local residents and other interested parties at Stage Three.

65 Under our draft recommendations, Breage & Crowan and Porthleven & Sithney wards would have 3 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent and 7 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Wendron ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the average (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

Constantine & Gweek, Mabe & St Gluvias, Mawnan & Budock and Stithians wards

66 The single-member wards of Constantine & Gweek, Mabe & St Gluvias, Mawnan & Budock and Stithians are situated in the east of the district, the latter three wards lying adjacent to the boundary with Carrick district. Constantine & Gweek ward contains the parishes of Constantine and Gweek, Mabe & St Gluvias ward contains the parishes of Mabe and St Gluvias and Mawnan & Budock ward contains the parishes of Mawnan & Budock. Stithians ward is coterminous with the parish of Stithians. Currently, Mabe & St Gluvias ward and Mawnan & Budock ward are significantly under-represented, with 28 per cent and 49 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively. Electoral equality is not expected to improve in these wards over the next five years, with Mabe & St Gluvias ward forecast to have 31 per cent more, and Mawnan & Budock 57 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. At present, Constantine & Gweek and Stithians wards have 13 per cent more and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively (7 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

67 At Stage One the District Council proposed combining the parish of Mawnan with the existing Constantine & Gweek ward to form a new two-member Constantine & Mawnan ward. It also proposed that Budock parish be combined with the existing Mabe & St Gluvias ward to form a new two-member Mabe & Budock ward. The District Council considered that its proposals would lead to improved electoral equality in this part of the district. Finally, the District Council proposed retaining the existing single-member Stithians ward, arguing that it would retain good electoral equality on a council size of 43. Under these proposals, Mabe & Budock and Stithians wards would have 3 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent more and 7 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Constantine & Mawnan ward would have 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (10 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

68 We received three further submissions in relation to this area. Budock Parish Council opposed the proposed wards of Constantine & Mawnan and Mabe & Budock. It argued that the parish had “always been grouped with the North Helford group of parishes [Constantine and Mawnan], with whom there is a natural affinity in terms of the leisure and farming industries”, unlike the proposed ward of Mabe & Budock, in which it would share a common border with only one of the other two constituent parishes. The parish council also queried the use of five-year electorate projections only. It proposed retaining existing warding arrangements except where there was an obvious need. Constantine Parish Council and Gweek Parish Council both proposed the retention of the existing Constantine & Gweek ward and opposed any change to their parishing arrangements. Gweek Parish Council argued that Constantine and Gweek have strong community and ecclesiastical links. As previously stated, Budock and Gweek parish councils also expressed reservations regarding the achievement of electoral equality in rural areas.

69 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received at Stage One. We note first that the District Council’s proposal would resolve the issue of under-representation in the existing Mabe & St Gluvias and Mawnan & Budock wards. As previously discussed, we are proposing to retain a 44-member council, and this council size would slightly improve the electoral equality achieved by the District Council’s proposals in in Constantine & Mawnan and Stithians wards, with only a slight depreciation in Mabe & Budock ward. While we note the preference of Budock Parish Council for the retention of the existing Mawnan & Budock ward, we would seek to improve upon its high level of electoral variance. No alternative proposals were received for this area, and we were unable to identify a warding pattern that would maintain the link between Mawnan and Budock while at the same time achieving good electoral equality and meeting the statutory criteria. We are therefore putting forward the proposed Mabe & Budock ward as part of our draft recommendations.

70 Similarly, while we note the comments of Constantine and Gweek parish councils, we must bear in mind the requirement to achieve good electoral equality across the district as a whole. In this case, a realignment of wards, affecting the existing Constantine & Gweek ward despite its acceptable electoral variance, would remove high under-representation in wards directly to its east, as outlined above. We consider that the District Council’s proposed Constantine & Mawnan ward also has the merit of retaining both parishes in the same district ward without parish warding, as requested, and are therefore content to put it forward for consultation as part of our draft recommendations. Finally, in view of the good electoral

equality already provided, we are also proposing to retain Stithians ward on its existing boundaries, as proposed by the District Council.

71 Under our draft recommendations, Constantine & Mawnan and Mabe & Budock wards would have 4 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent fewer and 6 per cent more than the average by 2006). Stithians ward would have 2 per cent fewer than the average (5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Illogan North and Illogan South wards

72 Illogan North and Illogan South wards are situated in the north of the district, between the towns of Camborne and Redruth. The three-member Illogan North ward comprises the parishes of Illogan and Portreath, while the three-member Illogan South ward is coterminous with the parish of Carn Brea. At present, the wards of Illogan North and Illogan South have 13 per cent and 12 per cent more electors than the district average respectively (9 per cent and 15 per cent more than the average by 2006).

73 At Stage One the District Council proposed retaining the existing three-member wards without amendment. It considered first that, as a result of the proposed reduction in council size, electoral equality in Illogan North ward would sufficiently improve as to make change unnecessary. Second, the District Council considered that, although the proposed Illogan South ward would be relatively under-represented on a council size of 43 by 2006, an exception should be made for this ward. It argued that dividing the parish of Carn Brea between district wards, by including the villages of Brea or Carn Brea in Camborne South or Redruth South wards respectively, would fragment the parish, produce over-represented parish wards, and lead to under-representation in Camborne South ward.

74 Under the District Council's proposed council size of 43, Illogan North and Illogan South wards would each have 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (7 and 12 per cent more than the average by 2006).

75 We received two further submissions in relation to this area. Illogan Parish Council proposed changes to its parish warding arrangements as detailed later in this report. Portreath Parish Council enquired as to the possibility of stricter residency requirements for parish councillors, which does not fall within the remit of this review.

76 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received at Stage One. As previously discussed, we are proposing to retain a 44-member council, and on this council size the existing Illogan North ward would provide good electoral equality. We are therefore proposing to retain this ward on its existing boundaries as proposed by the District Council. However, the electoral variance in the existing Illogan South ward would, on a council size of 43 or 44 members, slightly exceed that which we would normally seek to recommend. We concur with the District Council's assessment that, although transferring the villages of Brea or Carn Brea would lead to an improvement in electoral equality, it would also result in the over-representation of the small parish wards thereby created, should the current parish council size be retained. We do not consider that either of these options would facilitate effective and convenient local government.

77 Nevertheless, we also consider that maintaining the current boundary is inconsistent with our aim of achieving electoral equality and therefore propose retaining the existing Illogan South ward subject to the following amendment. We note that Carn Brea is a multi-centred parish containing both the urban areas of Illogan Highway, Pool and Tolskithy in the north and a number of villages including Brea, Carn Brea, Carnkie and Four Lanes in the south. In the urban part of the parish we note that a small residential area centred on the A3047 East Hill road is contiguous with Camborne, yet separated from Pool and Illogan Highway to its east by a large commercial and industrial area. Having visited the area, we consider that community identity and interests in this area would be better reflected, and electoral equality improved, by including this area in Camborne North ward, although we would welcome further views on this issue from local residents and other interested parties at Stage Three. We also note that the 'East Hill' area has a sufficiently large electorate to reduce the parish warding problems discussed above, although it would remain slightly over-represented at parish level. The proposed district ward boundary would run behind properties on the north side of East Hill, past the junction with Tolvaddon Road to include five properties on Trevenson Road, before returning west to the Camborne parish boundary, running south of Rose Cottages, Pengelly's Row, Primitive Row, and properties on the east side of Chapel Road.

78 Under our draft recommendations, Illogan North and Illogan South wards would have 13 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (9 per cent and 10 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West wards

79 Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West wards cover the town of Camborne in the north-west of the district. They are each represented by three councillors, and are coterminous with the North, South and West wards of Camborne Town respectively. At present, Camborne North ward has 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent more than the average by 2006), while Camborne West ward has equal to the average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent fewer than the district average by 2006). Camborne South ward is currently under-represented, with 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (13 per cent more than the average by 2006).

80 At Stage One the District Council proposed retaining the existing three-member wards without amendment. It stated that no change was necessary, as all three wards would have good electoral equality on a council size of 43. Under its proposed council size of 43, Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West wards would have 1 per cent fewer, 10 per cent more and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent and 10 per cent more, and 3 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). We received no other submissions in relation to this area.

81 We have given careful consideration to the District Council's proposals in this area. While we note that its 43-member scheme would satisfactorily reduce the level of electoral variance in the existing Camborne South ward, as previously discussed we are proposing to retain a 44-member council. Consequently, Camborne South ward would remain relatively under-represented, which we propose to address by obtaining a more equitable distribution of the electorate between the three Camborne district wards. Since we are also proposing to transfer

the East Hill area of Carn Brea parish to Camborne North ward, in order to improve electoral equality in Illogan South ward, as discussed in the previous section, this would entail a movement of electors from both wards to Camborne West ward.

82 We propose that the boundary between Camborne West and Camborne South wards be moved from the middle of the B3303 Pendarves Road, upon entering the town, to run behind properties on its east side until reaching the London to Penzance railway line. It would then follow the line east to Stray Park Road, where it would run north along the middle of the road to rejoin the existing Camborne North ward boundary at the Trevenson Street/Centenary Street junction. We also propose that the part of Camborne North ward bounded by Union Street, Cross Street, Trevenson Street and Tolcarne Street be transferred to Camborne West ward. Finally, considering that properties on the east side of Foundry Road, to the north of the railway line, are separated from the rest of Camborne North ward by a non-residential area, we propose to transfer them to Camborne South ward.

83 We consider that these proposals would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the existing arrangements, although we would welcome further views from local residents and other interested parties at Stage Three on these amendments. For the most part we have retained the integrity of the existing ward pattern as preferred by the District Council. We note in particular that the under-representation of Camborne South ward would be reduced, the area to be transferred having only limited links with the majority of the ward to the south of the London to Penzance railway line, but more apparent ones with the area to its north. We therefore consider in this instance that the railway line forms a stronger ward boundary than that of the B3303. The inclusion of a small part of Camborne North in Camborne West ward would, we consider, facilitate a more equal distribution of electorates between the three wards. We also note that the area to be transferred is bordered by the proposed Camborne West ward on three sides and would relate well to Camborne West while improving communications within the ward.

84 Under our draft recommendations, Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West wards would have 3 per cent, 6 per cent and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (7 per cent, 7 per cent and 9 per cent more than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

Redruth North, Redruth South and St Day & Lanner wards

85 Redruth North and Redruth South wards cover the town of Redruth in the north-east of the district, while St Day & Lanner ward is located directly to its east. Redruth North and Redruth South wards are each represented by three councillors and are coterminous with North and South wards of Redruth town respectively. St Day & Lanner ward comprises the parishes of Carharrack, Lanner and St Day, and is also represented by three councillors. At present, Redruth North ward has 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to equal to the district average by 2006. Redruth South ward has 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average both now and in five years' time. St Day & Lanner ward has 11 per cent fewer electors than the district average (12 per cent fewer than the district average by 2006).

86 At Stage One the District Council proposed retaining the existing three-member Redruth North ward without amendment, as it considered that it would retain good electoral equality

on a council size of 43. It also proposed transferring a small part of Lanner parish to a revised three-member Redruth South ward. The remainder of the existing St Day & Lanner ward, the parishes of St Day and Carharrack together with the majority of Lanner parish, would form a revised two-member St Day & Lanner ward. The new ward boundary would then run from the Redruth/Lanner parish boundary south along Sandy Lane, to the east of Beauchamps Meadow and across the fields to Carn Marth Lane, before returning along the middle of the A393 South Downs until the roundabout and heading west to rejoin the existing district ward and parish boundary.

87 The District Council acknowledged that its proposals would result in the under-representation of St Day & Lanner ward, but considered that the option put forward better reflected community identities in the rural area to the east of Redruth. It stated, “local Members and Parishes in the area ... are very anxious that the three parishes which comprise the old mining villages of St Day, Carharrack and Lanner remain as far as possible in the same District ward.” The District Council argued that, bearing in mind local opinion and the location of the above parishes on the edge of the district, bordered by Redruth, an exception should be made for this proposed ward.

88 Under the District Council’s proposals for a 43-member council, Redruth North and Redruth South wards would have 1 and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 and 6 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). St Day & Lanner ward would have 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the average (19 per cent more by 2006).

89 We received eight further submissions in relation to this area. Redruth Town Council proposed retaining the existing district and town warding arrangements for Redruth, Carharrack, Lanner and St Day parish councils, Councillor Page and Councillor Thomas (both representing St Day & Lanner ward), and six local residents opposed a more radical option for warding Lanner parish initially considered by the District Council. This would have entailed the division of Lanner village between Redruth South ward and a reduced two-member St Day & Lanner ward. St Day Parish Council and Councillor Page also argued that the ward should retain three members.

90 In the above submissions from St Day & Lanner ward it was stated that the division of Lanner village would not reflect communities in the area, adversely affecting the common identity and close ties of the three parishes, all former mining villages. Lanner Parish Council and the six local residents argued that residents in the Pennance area of the parish, who they considered likely to be transferred to Redruth South ward under this option, identified strongly with the village rather than the town. It was also considered by respondents that this scheme would not provide effective and convenient local government at either district or parish level. It was argued that the division of the village between district wards would cause confusion and not provide effective representation for those village electors placed with Redruth town. It was also put to us that the effectiveness of the parish council would suffer as a result, adversely affecting parish organisations and the cross-parish Mining Villages Regeneration Group. Lanner Parish Council expressed concern that the parish ward boundary would in time become the new parish boundary between Lanner and Redruth. St Day Parish Council and Councillors Page and Thomas all expressed concern regarding the achievement of electoral equality in rural areas.

91 Of the alternative schemes put forward, Carharrack Parish Council, Councillor Page, Councillor Thomas and five local residents all expressed an explicit preference for the retention of the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward. However, Councillor Thomas also put forward proposals identical to the District Council, considering them an acceptable compromise between the wish to retain the current arrangements and the objective of electoral equality. One local resident commented that, as the village of Lanner “ends naturally at the top of Lanner Hill”, the area to be transferred to Redruth South ward should therefore be bounded by either Sandy Lane or Carn Marth Lane. Such a parish ward would closely resemble that put forward by the District Council. Lanner Parish Council proposed that, “if it is considered essential to re-arrange wards”, then Carharrack and Lanner parishes should be combined with 2H and 3H polling districts of Redruth South ward, and St Day parish with 1H polling district of Redruth South ward. It argued that two new wards could then be formed without requiring the sub-division of any existing polling district or parish. Similarly, Carharrack Parish Council commented, “If a numerical balance has to be achieved, the inclusion of [part of] Redruth South in this ward would not be objected to.”

92 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received at Stage One. Having visited the area, we note that the part of Lanner parish that the District Council has proposed to include in Redruth South ward is relatively distinct from Lanner village and contiguous with Redruth. However, while we consider that the District Council’s proposal would sufficiently reflect community identity in this part of the district, we also note that it would create a two-member St Day & Lanner ward with a higher level of electoral variance than the existing three-member ward.

93 Consequently, we sought alternative warding arrangements. We concur with the view expressed by the District Council and respondents from St Day & Lanner ward that including a considerably larger part of Lanner parish in Redruth South would neither reflect community identities and interests nor provide effective and convenient local government. Given the configuration of electorates in the three parishes, we were also unable to identify any other area for inclusion in Redruth South, which would both enable the creation of a two-member St Day & Lanner ward with good electoral equality and also meet the statutory criteria. This includes the proposal by Lanner Parish Council to combine whole parishes and Redruth polling districts.

94 We also examined the possibility of retaining three members for this area while reducing the current level of over-representation through the inclusion of another part of the district. We note that, as argued by the District Council, the location of St Day, Lanner and Carharrack parishes restricts the number of available options. However, we do not consider that assigning part of Carn Brea or Redruth parishes to the existing St Day & Lanner ward would reflect the community identities and interests of those concerned, while the inclusion of Stithians parish in a three-member ward would not lead to an improvement in electoral equality. We note that while Redruth parish also has rural areas, those bordering St Day & Lanner ward have too few electors to facilitate parish warding given the overall size of the Redruth electorate.

95 Having carefully considered all the available options, we noted that none would provide as good a balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria as the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward, despite its slight over-representation. As previously discussed, we are proposing to retain a 44-member council by allocating an extra councillor to

the north of the district. Retaining the three-member St Day & Lanner ward on its existing boundaries, rather than a modified two-member ward as proposed by the District Council, would therefore enable us to obtain a more equitable distribution of councillors overall as well as improve electoral equality locally. On the basis of the evidence provided by submissions from St Day & Lanner ward, we also consider that the current ward reflects community identities and interests well, and provides effective and convenient local government. We are therefore content to put it forward for consultation as part of our draft recommendations.

96 As a result of this departure from the District Council's scheme, we propose to improve electoral equality in Redruth South ward not by the inclusion of part of Lanner parish, but by two boundary amendments with Redruth North ward. The new boundary would run behind properties north of the A3047 roundabout, then proceeding to the rear of properties on West Park, Blowinghouse Hill, Penventon Terrace, Hoskings Row and West End. It would rejoin the existing boundary on West End shortly before the junction with Chapel Street and Penryn Street. The current boundary would be retained until reaching the London to Penzance railway line, where it would then run behind properties in Higher Fore Street, East End, Middleton Row, Miners Court and Miners Row. It would then rejoin the existing boundary on East End just prior to the junction with School Lane.

97 We consider that these proposals would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the existing arrangements, although we would welcome further views on these amendments from local residents and other interested parties at Stage Three. For the most part we have retained the integrity of the existing ward pattern as preferred by the District Council and Redruth Town Council. We consider in particular that the area from the A3047 roundabout to Hoskings Row is separated from other residential development in Redruth North ward and would, we consider, relate more clearly to that part of Redruth South ward directly to its south.

98 Under our draft recommendations, Redruth North and Redruth South wards would have 5 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent and 4 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). St Day & Lanner ward would have 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (12 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

99 At Stage One the District Council stated that it had not as yet given consideration to the possibility of a change in its electoral cycle, although there had never been any suggestion that it should move to elections by thirds. We received no further comments regarding this issue.

100 At present, the majority view appears to be that the present electoral cycle should be retained and we therefore propose no change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

Conclusions

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

- a council of 44 members should be retained;
- there should be 19 wards;
- the boundaries of 17 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three, and five wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

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

- we propose retaining the existing council size of 44 rather than one of 43, as put forward by the District Council, to obtain the correct allocation of councillors in the northern part of the district;
- to that end, we propose that the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward be retained.
- in Camborne and Carn Brea parish, we propose amending the boundaries between the wards of Camborne North, Camborne West, Camborne South and Illogan South;
- in Redruth, we propose two amendments to the boundary between Redruth North and Redruth South wards.
- north of Helston, we propose amending the boundaries between the wards of Helston North and Porthleven and Sithney to ensure that the village of Lowertown lies within a single ward.

103 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will affect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2001 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2006.

Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	44	44	44	44
Number of wards	22	19	22	19
Average number of electors per councillor	1,641	1,641	1,707	1,707
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	14	2	12	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	6	0	7	0

104 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Kerrier District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 14 to two. By 2006 only one ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

Draft Recommendation

Kerrier District Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

105 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the towns of Camborne and Redruth and the parishes of Carn Brea, Sithney and Wendron to reflect the proposed district wards. At the request of Illogan Parish Council, we are also proposing an amendment to its own internal warding arrangements.

106 The town of Camborne is currently served by 18 councillors representing three wards: North ward, South ward and West ward, each represented by six councillors. In the light of our draft recommendations in this area, we are proposing to modify the boundaries between the town council wards to reflect the new district warding. We are not proposing to modify the level of representation of any of the wards concerned.

Draft Recommendation

Camborne Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: North, South and West, each returning six councillors. The boundaries between the three town council wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

107 The town of Redruth is currently served by 14 councillors representing two wards: North ward and South ward, each represented by seven councillors. At Stage One, Redruth Town Council proposed that the existing town warding arrangements be retained.

108 In the light of our draft recommendations in this area, we are proposing to modify the boundaries between the town council wards to reflect the new district warding. We are not proposing to modify the level of representation of any of the wards concerned. While we note the comments of Redruth Town Council, we consider that, by proposing relatively minor changes to the existing boundaries, improved electoral equality can be achieved for the district ward of Redruth South.

Draft Recommendation

Redruth Town Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: North and South, each returning seven councillors. The boundary between the two town council wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

109 The parish of Carn Brea is currently served by 15 councillors representing three wards: Barncoose ward, Four Lanes ward, and Pool ward, each represented by five councillors. In the light of our draft recommendations in this area, we are proposing to create a new East Hill parish ward, to be included in the proposed Camborne North ward. The proposed boundary between the parish wards of East Hill and Pool would reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We have also proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between the existing parish wards of Barncoose and Pool to better reflect ground detail. Further, we are proposing to modify the level of representation of the wards to reflect the new configuration, thereby increasing the number of councillors representing the parish from 15 to 16. We propose that Barncoose, Four Lanes and Pool wards should each continue to return five councillors while East Hill should return one councillor. We would welcome views on our proposals for Carn Brea parish at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation

Carn Brea Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, one more than at present, representing four wards: Barncoose, Four Lanes and Pool, each returning five councillors, and East Hill, returning one councillor. The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

110 The parish of Sithney is currently served by 9 councillors and is not warded. In the light of our draft recommendations in this area, we are proposing to create two new parish wards, Lowertown ward and Sithney ward, to facilitate the division of the parish between the proposed Helston North and Porthleven & Sithney district wards. The boundary between the proposed Lowertown and Sithney parish wards would reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We propose that the new Lowertown ward should return one councillor and the new Sithney ward return eight councillors.

111 While we note that Sithney Parish Council opposed its inclusion in a ward with part of Helston, as previously stated, we consider that community identities in the area could be better reflected by unifying the village of Lowertown in a single ward, as proposed. We would welcome views on our proposals for Sithney parish at Stage Three.

Draft Recommendation
Sithney Parish Council should comprise 9 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Lowertown, returning one councillor, and Sithney, returning eight councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

112 The parish of Wendron is currently served by 15 councillors and is not warded. In the light of our draft recommendations in this area, we are proposing to create two new parish wards, Trewennack ward and Wendron ward, to facilitate the division of the parish between the proposed Helston North and Wendron district wards. The boundary between the proposed Trewennack and Wendron parish wards would reflect the proposed district ward boundary. We propose that the new Trewennack ward should return two councillors and the new Wendron ward return 13 councillors.

Draft Recommendation
Wendron Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Trewennack, returning two councillors, and Wendron, returning 13 councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

113 The parish of Illogan is currently divided into two parish wards, Illogan ward, represented by nine councillors, and Tehidy ward, represented by three councillors. Illogan Parish Council proposed the creation of a new Park Bottom parish ward, and the modification of the level of representation of the wards to reflect the new configuration. It proposed that Illogan ward should return nine councillors, Park Bottom ward two councillors, and Tehidy ward three councillors. Our proposed district warding arrangements would result in no change to this area and we are content to put forward the parish council’s proposal for consultation.

Draft Recommendation

Illogan Parish Council should comprise 14 parish councillors, representing three wards: Illogan (returning nine councillors), Park Bottom (two councillors), and Tehidy (three councillors).

114 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

Draft Recommendation

Parish and town council elections should continue to take place every four years, at the same time as elections for the district ward of which they are part.

Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Kerrier

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

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

116 Express your views by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

www.lgce.gov.uk

117 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 Kerrier: Detailed Mapping

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

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

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Sithney and Wendron parishes.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Camborne and Redruth.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Kerrier: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Sithney and Wendron Parishes

APPENDIX B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

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

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

Table B1: LGCE compliance with Code criteria

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.