

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Kerrier in Cornwall

Report to the Electoral Commission

*June 2002*

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 293

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	11
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	13
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	17
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	19
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	21
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	43
APPENDIX	
Final Recommendations for Kerrier: Detailed Mapping	45

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



# WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

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



## SUMMARY

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

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

We found that the existing arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in 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 12 wards and by more than 20 per cent in seven wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 114 –115) are that:

- **Kerrier District Council should have 44 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 20 wards, instead of 22 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of two, and six wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 17 of the proposed 19 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in only one ward, St Day, Lanner & Carharrack, expected to vary by 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.**

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

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

*Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary*

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

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.*

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

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

Table 2: Final Recommendations for 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, Gweek & Mawnan	2	3,139	1,570	-4	3,144	1,572	-8
6	Grade-Ruan & Landewednack	1	1,524	1,524	-7	1,538	1,538	-10
7	Helston North	3	4,483	1,494	-9	4,901	1,634	-4
8	Helston South	2	3,195	1,598	-3	3,583	1,792	5
9	Illogan North	3	5,560	1,853	13	5,584	1,861	9
10	Illogan South	3	5,269	1,756	7	5,632	1,877	10
11	Mabe & Budock	2	3,265	1,633	-1	3,610	1,805	6
12	Meneage	1	1,734	1,734	6	1,756	1,756	3
13	Mullion	1	1,715	1,715	5	1,679	1,679	-2
14	Porthleven & Sithney	2	3,156	1,578	-4	3,159	1,580	-7
15	Redruth North	3	4,833	1,611	-2	4,972	1,657	-3
16	Redruth South	3	4,575	1,525	-7	4,760	1,587	-7
17	St Day, Lanner & Carharrack	3	4,398	1,466	-11	4,493	1,498	-12
18	St Keverne	1	1,646	1,646	0	1,686	1,686	-1
19	Stithians	1	1,612	1,612	-2	1,617	1,617	-5
20	Wendron	1	1,682	1,682	2	1,683	1,683	-1
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>72,210</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>75,119</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,641</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,707</b>	<b>-</b>

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

2 Kerrier's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1978 (Report no. 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 making final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 The district of 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. 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.

11 The district is wholly parished and contains 32 parishes. Camborne and Redruth together form approximately 34 per cent of the district's total electorate.

12 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.

13 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, the LGCE 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 calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

14 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 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	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
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>72,210</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>75,119</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,641</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,707</b>	<b>-</b>

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 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

15 During Stage One the LGCE received 16 representations, including a district-wide scheme from Kerrier District Council, and representations from 11 parish and town councils, two district councillors and six local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Kerrier in Cornwall*.

16 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the District Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a pattern of three-member wards in the towns of Camborne and Redruth, and a mix of single-, two- and three-member wards in the rest of the district. However, the LGCE noted that these proposals, based on a reduction in council size of one, from 44 to 43, would result in the under-representation of the northern part of the district by one councillor both now and in 2006. It therefore proposed retaining the existing council size of 44 members, basing its draft recommendations on the District Council's scheme while allocating an extra member to the northern area. This would entail the retention of the slightly over-represented, three-member St Day & Lanner ward on its existing boundaries. The LGCE also moved away from the District Council's scheme in a number of other areas, affecting eight wards, putting forward its own proposals. It proposed that:

- Kerrier District Council should continue be served by 44 councillors, representing 19 wards, three fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 17 of the existing wards should be modified, while five wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for the towns of Camborne and Redruth, and the parishes of Carn Brea, Illogan, Sithney and Wendron.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Kerrier District Council should comprise 44 councillors, serving 19 wards. The whole council should continue to be elected every four years.

17 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 17 of the 19 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only St Day & Lanner ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2006.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

18 During the consultation on its draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 19 representations. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Kerrier District Council.

### **Cornwall County Council**

19 Cornwall County Council made a number of criticisms of the review process and commented upon the forthcoming review of its own electoral arrangements. It proposed that the existing two-member Breage & Germoe and single-member Crowan wards be substantially retained, suggesting that electoral equality in both wards could be improved by the inclusion of part of Crowan parish in Breage & Germoe ward. The County Council also noted the concern of a Camborne county councillor that the proposed inclusion of the East Hill area of Carn Brea parish in Camborne North ward would cause unnecessary confusion. However, it considered that electoral variances in this part of the district meant that some boundary changes would be unavoidable.

### **Parish and Town Councils**

20 We received responses from 11 parish and town councils. Redruth Town Council opposed the proposed boundary amendments between Redruth North and Redruth South wards. It considered that these changes would lead to confusion, and proposed the retention of the existing “sensible” boundary. The Town Council also proposed that the Sandy Lane/South Downs area of Lanner parish, contiguous with Redruth town, be included in a revised Redruth South ward, as proposed by the District Council at Stage One. It considered that this would better reflect community identities and interests in this area. The Town Council also proposed that this part of Lanner parish be transferred to Redruth town boundary, however we have no power to recommend such changes. Carharrack, Lanner and St Day Parish Councils all supported the retention of the existing St Day & Lanner ward, as proposed in the draft recommendations. St Day Parish Council also supported the retention of the existing council size, while Carharrack Parish Council proposed the ward name ‘St Day, Lanner and Carharrack’.

21 Carn Brea Parish Council opposed the inclusion of the East Hill area of the parish in Camborne North ward. It put forward a revised four-member Illogan South ward comprising all of Carn Brea parish and the Tehidy ward of Illogan parish. Illogan Parish Council supported the proposed changes to its own electoral arrangements and noted the remainder of the draft recommendations. Breage Parish Council supported the proposed three-member Breage & Crowan ward, while Crowan Parish Council opposed it, arguing that the existing single-member Crowan ward provided effective and convenient local government. Gweek Parish Council opposed the proposed two-member Constantine & Mawnan ward. It argued that the existing single-member Constantine & Gweek ward reflected community identities and interests and provided effective and convenient local government. Should the draft recommendations nonetheless be adopted, the Parish Council proposed that ‘Gweek’ be included in the name of the ward.

22 As at Stage One, Sithney Parish Council opposed the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward, and reiterated its preference for being included in a ward with other rural parishes. It also opposed the inclusion of the Lowertown area of the parish in Helston North ward, considering that there was no link between Lowertown village and Helston town. Grade-Ruan Parish Council opposed the proposed two-member Mullion & The Lizard ward, considering that it would not provide effective representation for the parish electorate. It proposed that the ward either be divided into two single-member wards or represented by three members. The Parish Council also proposed that ‘Grade-Ruan’ be included in the name of any proposed ward.

## **Kerrier District Council Senior Administrative Officer**

23 The District Council did not respond to the draft recommendations. However, a Senior Administrative Officer in the Chief Executive's Department of Kerrier District Council stated that, in general terms, members of the council seemed satisfied with the draft recommendations, particularly the proposals to retain 44 members and the existing St Day & Lanner ward.

## **Other Representations**

24 A further six representations were received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from district councillors and local residents. Councillor Barnes (Redruth North ward) supported Redruth Town Council's proposals. He also proposed that the Carn Brea Village area of Carn Brea parish be included in Redruth for district warding purposes, rather than in Illogan South ward. Councillor Page and Councillor Thomas (both St Day & Lanner ward) and a Lanner resident supported the proposed retention of the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward. The Lanner resident also supported the proposed boundary amendments between Redruth North and Redruth South wards. Councillor Hatton (Constantine & Gweek ward) and a Constantine resident opposed the proposed two-member Constantine & Mawnan ward. They shared the view of Gweek Parish Council that the existing single-member Constantine & Gweek ward reflected community identities and interests and provided effective and convenient local government. The Constantine resident also supported the retention of whole-council elections.

## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

27 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.

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

29 Since 1975 there has been a 22 per cent increase in the electorate of Kerrier district. At Stage One the District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately four 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.

30 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 to changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over the next five years. No such provision exists for longer-term electoral forecasts. However, in the light of the Parish Council’s comments, the LGCE asked officers at the District Council to revisit their projections in Budock parish. The Council indicated that it was satisfied that its original projections remained the best estimates for change in electorate over the five-year period. Having accepted that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having considered the data provided by the District Council, the LGCE stated in its

draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

31 No comments were received on the Council's electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and we remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates currently available.

## **Council Size**

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

33 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE proposed to retain the existing council size of 44. Examining the District Council's 43-member scheme, it noted that it did not provide the correct allocation of councillors for each part of the district. The northern part of the district (including the urban area of Camborne and Redruth) would be allocated one councillor less (23 members) than the electorate merited both now and in 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 in 2006).

34 In seeking to address this issue, the LGCE looked at alternative arrangements based on the proposed council size of 43 members, as well as alternative council sizes of 42 or 44 members, both of which would provide for an improved allocation of councillors. However, it stated that it was unable to identify an alternative scheme on a council size of 43 that would achieve good electoral equality, sufficiently reflect community identities and interests, and secure effective and convenient local government. While the LGCE noted that both a 42- and 44-member council would provide an improved allocation of councillors, it considered that a 44-member council would have other advantages. It noted 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 it considered best met the objectives of the review in that area, despite that ward's slight over-representation. The LGCE also noted that most of the District Council's proposed wards would continue to provide good electoral equality under a 44-member council.

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

36 At Stage Three, a Senior Administrative Officer in the Chief Executive's Department at Kerrier District Council stated that, in general terms, members of the Council seemed satisfied with the draft recommendations, in particular the retention of the existing council size. We have confirmed with the officer that he is content for his observations to be recorded in this report. St Day Parish Council also supported a 44-member council. We received no further comments regarding the most appropriate council size for Kerrier and have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

37 The LGCE gave careful consideration to the submissions received at Stage One, including the district-wide scheme submitted by the District Council. It noted that the District Council had undertaken a consultation exercise on its proposals, involving parish and town councils in the district, and that its scheme had received the support of a majority of councillors voting. In comparison with the current arrangements, the LGCE considered that these proposals would generally provide a better balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government. It therefore based its recommendations on the District Council's scheme. However, to improve electoral

equality further, and better reflect local community identities and interests, and in light of its proposals for a 44-member council, the LGCE proposed amendments to the District Council's proposals in a number of areas.

38 In response to the draft recommendations, a number of submissions from respondents in St Day & Lanner ward were received, as well as from Breage Parish Council, supporting the LGCE's proposals. However, submissions were also received opposing parts of the draft recommendations from Cornwall County Council, six parish and town councils (Carn Brea, Crowan, Grade-Ruan, Gweek, Redruth and Sithney), two district councillors and a local resident. The majority of these respondents proposed that an existing ward or wards be retained without amendment. Although no comments were received from Kerrier District Council, a Senior Administrative Officer in the Chief Executive's Department wrote stating that in general terms members seemed satisfied with the draft recommendations, particularly the proposals to retain 44 members and the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward.

39 After due consideration of the representations received, we propose that the LGCE's draft recommendations be substantially confirmed, as we consider that they best meet the statutory criteria. However, we are adopting an amendment in the south of the district, which would divide the proposed two-member Mullion & The Lizard ward into two single-member wards. In the north of the district, we have also decided to retain a greater part of the existing boundary between the wards of Redruth North and Redruth South. On the basis of the evidence received, we consider that both these amendments would facilitate a more effective and convenient warding structure. Three proposals for alternative ward names were also received at Stage Three, and we have incorporated two of these into our final recommendations.

40 At Stage One, the LGCE noted that seven respondents had expressed concern regarding the achievement of electoral equality at the expense of community identities in rural areas, and the maintenance of an appropriate ward size. At Stage Three similar views were expressed by Cornwall County Council, Crowan, Gweek and Sithney parish councils, Councillor Hatton (Constantine & Gweek ward) and a local resident. With the exception of the County Council, these respondents commented upon proposals in part of the district rather than the district as a whole, and we have sought to address their concerns. Generally, while we acknowledge the views expressed, there remains no provision in legislation for us to allow for an element of over-representation in rural areas, i.e. a rural weighting, as stated in the LGCE's draft recommendations. Cornwall County Council also considered that there had been a lack of public consultation and insufficient time allowed for consultation at Stage Three of the review.

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

- (a) 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 final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

### **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 under its proposed council size of 43.

45 The LGCE based its draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals, noting that they would substantially reduce the over-representation of the existing Meneage and Mullion wards. It further noted that, under its proposals to retain a 44-member (rather than 43-member) council, the electoral equality achieved by the proposed Mullion & The Lizard and St Keverne wards would improve slightly, with a slight depreciation in the proposed Meneage ward. The LGCE considered that, as the parishes of Grade-Ruan, Landewednack and Mullion were well connected via the A3083 and B3296, the proposed Mullion & The Lizard ward appeared to reflect community identities reasonably well. It also considered that the proposed Meneage ward would contain parishes of similar geographical size and electorate situated to the south of the Helford River and the town of Helston. Finally, in view of the good electoral equality already provided, the LGCE adopted the District Council's proposal to retain St Keverne ward on its existing boundaries.

46 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations the proposed Meneage ward (comprising the parishes of Cury, Gunwalloe, Manaccan, Mawgan-in-Meneage, St Anthony-in-Meneage and St Martin-in-Meneage) 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 ward (comprising the parishes of Grade-Ruan, Landewednack and Mullion) and St Keverne ward (comprising the parish of the same name) would have 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than and equal to the district average respectively (6 per cent and 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

47 At Stage Three, Grade-Ruan Parish Council opposed the proposed two-member Mullion & The Lizard ward. It considered that the parish electorate would be marginalized in such a ward, stating that based on past experience the Parish Council was "particularly sensitive to the danger of exclusion". The Parish Council also expressed concern that the larger Mullion electorate could effectively elect both district councillors without reference to Grade-Ruan or Landewednack. It therefore expressed a preference for one of two options. Firstly, the Parish Council proposed that Mullion parish form a separate single-member ward, and the existing single-member Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward be retained. Alternatively, it proposed that three district councillors represent the three parishes, although it did not provide any details of how this was to be achieved. The Parish Council also suggested that 'Grade-Ruan' be included in the name of any proposed ward containing the parish.

48 Under Grade-Ruan Parish Council's proposals for two single-member wards, Grade-Ruan & Landewednack and Mullion wards would have 7 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (10 per cent and 2 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

49 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the proposed Meneage and St Keverne wards. We are satisfied that they would provide good electoral equality, reflect community identities and interests and provide effective and convenient local government.

50 However, we have decided to move away from the draft recommendations and modify the proposed Mullion & The Lizard ward. Examining Grade-Ruan Parish Council's proposals, we note that in a 44-member council, the parishes of Grade-Ruan, Landewednack and Mullion are jointly entitled to two district councillors both now and in 2006. We would therefore not seek to allocate three councillors to this area. Instead, we considered the Parish Council's alternative proposal to retain the existing single-member Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward and create a single-member Mullion ward comprising the parish of the same name. We note that the District Council supported a two-member Mullion & The Lizard ward at Stage One by arguing that, under its proposed 43-member council, the existing Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward would be slightly over-represented. However, this is not the case under our proposals to retain the existing 44-member council.

51 We do not accept Grade-Ruan Parish Council's argument that a numerically larger Mullion electorate would be sufficiently organised as to 'outvote' electors in the other two parishes when electing district councillors. Elected representatives are expected to represent all of their constituents. Nonetheless, we note the preference of the Parish Council for separate representation from Mullion and its view that this would provide more effective and convenient local government for the parish electorate. We consider that under the proposed 44-member council, the Parish Council's proposed wards would, given the nature of the area, have acceptable electoral equality, and also note that this modification would not affect the achievement of the statutory criteria elsewhere in the district. On this basis, we have decided to adopt Grade Ruan Parish Council's proposed single-member Grade-Ruan & Landewednack and Mullion wards as part of our final recommendations.

52 Under our final recommendations, the proposed Meneage and St Keverne wards would have 6 per cent more electors per councillor than and equal to the average number of electors per councillor respectively (3 per cent more and 1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Grade-Ruan & Landewednack and Mullion wards (each comprising the parish or parishes of the same names) would have 7 per cent fewer and 5 per cent more than the district average (10 per cent and 2 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Helston North and Helston South wards**

53 The two-member 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 ward is forecast to have 32 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. 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).

54 At Stage One, the District Council proposed retaining the existing Helston South ward, arguing that it would provide good electoral equality on its proposed 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. 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 Gweek/Wendron parish boundary.

55 The LGCE based its draft recommendations for this area on the District Council's proposals. It considered that the District Council's scheme, under a 44-member (rather than a 43-member) council, would lead to a substantial improvement in electoral equality in Helston North ward and provide the correct allocation of councillors for the town. On the existing council size of 44, Helston is currently entitled to 4.5 councillors, and to 4.8 councillors by 2006. The LGCE noted that the proposals also enabled 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. Further, the LGCE considered that, while the small villages of Trewennack and Lowertown are separate settlements, Lowertown is almost contiguous with Helston and Trewennack is approximately 1 km to the east along the A394. It noted that the transfer of this area to Helston North ward would enable the remainder of Wendron parish to form a single-member district ward, as described in the following section, which it considered would meet the statutory criteria.

56 However, the LGCE proposed one amendment to the District Council's scheme. It noted that, as the Sithney/Wendron parish boundary bisects the village of Lowertown, the District Council's proposals would have divided the village between separate district wards. Seeking an alternative arrangement that would keep both parts of the village together in the same ward, the LGCE proposed that Helston North ward be further expanded to include that part of Lowertown in Sithney parish. This amendment would lead to a further slight improvement in electoral equality in Helston North ward, and a slight deterioration in variance in the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward, which would nonetheless remain below 10 per cent.

57 The proposed district ward boundary would therefore continue from the Sithney/Wendron parish boundary west along the disused railway line to the north of Lowertown. It would then head south directly to the west of Gwavas Farm, then run south-east across fields to the River Cober and the Sithney/Helston parish boundary. The LGCE noted that this amendment would not reflect the preference of Sithney Parish Council, which opposed any combination with the town of Helston. However, it considered that the division of the village between wards would not provide effective and convenient local government for residents. The LGCE further noted that, while Wendron parish could be split between three district wards, Helston North, Porthleven & Sithney and Wendron, to include all of Lowertown in the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward, it did not consider that this would provide effective and convenient local government for the Wendron electorate. It also considered that Lowertown was more closely linked to Helston than to Porthleven. The LGCE therefore considered that the District Council's proposals, thus amended, would provide the best balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests, and providing effective and convenient local government.

58 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Helston North ward (comprising parts of the parishes of Helston, Sithney and Wendron) and Helston South ward (comprising part of Helston parish) 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).

59 At Stage Three, Sithney Parish Council opposed the proposed inclusion of part of the parish in Helston North ward. It stated that, "the attempts to suggest that there is any linking, or perceived linking, between Lowertown and Helston is strongly disputed" and asked that this claim be substantiated. The Parish Council remained of the view, expressed at Stage One, that the inclusion of the parish in a ward with Helston or Porthleven would neither reflect the rural identity and interests of the parish nor provide effective and convenient local government. It

expressed its disappointment that “little heed appears to have been taken of the view that Sithney, wholly rural in nature, should be grouped with other similar and neighbouring parishes.”

60 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received at Stage Three, and note the concerns expressed by Sithney Parish Council. However, we have received no substantive evidence as to why the inclusion of both parts of Lowertown in a single district ward would not reflect community identities and interests, or facilitate effective and convenient local government. Additionally, we note that no alternative proposals have been received which would unite both parts of the village in another district ward while meeting our statutory criteria. There has been no challenge to the view expressed in the draft recommendations that it would not be effective and convenient to divide Wendron parish between three district wards to place all of Lowertown in Porthleven & Sithney ward. In the circumstances, we have been unable to accommodate Sithney Parish Council’s preferences.

61 We concur with the view expressed in the draft recommendations that Lowertown and Helston are linked by their proximity, the former being almost contiguous with the latter. In the absence of alternative proposals which would address Sithney Parish Council’s concerns while also providing that the village of Lowertown is united in a single ward, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of Helston North and Helston South as final. Our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

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

62 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).

63 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 parishes of Porthleven and 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 other part of Wendron parish would then form a single-member Wendron ward.

64 The LGCE based its draft recommendations for the area on the District Council’s proposals. It considered that this scheme, under a 44-member council, would reduce the levels of under- and over-representation in the area. The LGCE also considered that the proposed wards would reflect community identities and interests and provide effective and convenient local government. The LGCE noted Germoe Parish Council’s support for the proposed Breage & Crowan ward, and considered that the constituent parishes of this ward contain similar-sized rural communities that are reasonably well-linked by road. It was therefore content to put forward this ward for consultation.

65 The LGCE considered that the District Council's proposed Wendron ward would cover a sparsely populated area in the centre of the district linked by the north-south axis of the B3297. As previously stated, it noted that the area of Wendron parish to be included in Helston North parish constitutes the northern and eastern rural periphery of the town and, as such, arguably relates more clearly to Helston than to the northern part of the parish. The LGCE therefore considered that this warding pattern would reflect local community identities and interests and provide effective and convenient local government. It also noted that the transfer of this area enabled the remainder of the parish to be retained as a single district ward providing good electoral equality.

66 The LGCE recognised that the configuration of electorates in this part of the district limited the number of suitable district warding options, particularly for the parish of Porthleven. While it noted that Sithney Parish Council had opposed the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward, it stated that it had been unable to identify an alternative pattern of wards that would better meet the statutory criteria, nor had any such warding pattern been proposed by Stage One respondents. The LGCE considered 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. It therefore put the ward forward for consultation as part of its draft recommendations. However, as previously stated, the LGCE proposed one amendment to the District Council's scheme, transferring that part of the village of Lowertown in the parish of Sithney to a revised Helston North ward, in order to prevent the division of the village between two district wards.

67 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Breage & Crowan ward (comprising the parishes of Breage, Crowan and Germoe) and Porthleven & Sithney ward (comprising the parish of Porthleven and part of Sithney parish) 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 (comprising part of the parish of Wendron) would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

68 At Stage Three Breage Parish Council supported the proposed three-member Breage & Crowan ward. However, Crowan Parish Council proposed that the existing single-member Crowan ward, comprising the parish of the same name, be retained. It considered that the existing ward was effective and convenient for the parish electorate, as its district councillor was "aware of the requirements of each village". The Parish Council stated that the proposed three-member ward placed too much emphasis on the achievement of electoral equality at the expense of "the needs of the electorate in terms of representation on the District Council". It also expressed concern that Crowan parish could be left without a resident ward councillor under the proposed warding arrangements.

69 Cornwall County Council stated that the local county councillor endorsed the opposition of Crowan Parish Council to the draft recommendations, and proposed that the existing arrangements be substantially retained. The County Council suggested that this could best be achieved by including the southern part of Crowan parish in a revised two-member Breage & Germoe ward in order to improve electoral equality in both existing wards.

70 As previously stated, Sithney Parish Council opposed the proposed inclusion of part of the parish in Helston North ward, proposing that all of the parish remain within a single district ward. The Parish Council also opposed the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward. It remained of the view, expressed at Stage One, that the inclusion of the parish in a ward with Helston or Porthleven would neither reflect the rural identity and interests of the parish nor provide effective and convenient local government. It expressed its disappointment that "little heed appears to have been taken of the view that Sithney, wholly rural in nature, should be grouped with other similar and neighbouring parishes."

71 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received, and have decided first to endorse the LGCE's draft recommendations for the proposed single-member Wendron ward. We are content that it would provide good electoral equality, reflect community identities and interests and provide effective and convenient local government. Second, we examined the proposal by Crowan Parish Council to retain the existing wards of Crowan and Breage & Germoe. While we acknowledge the concerns expressed, we remain of the view that the electoral variance in these wards should be addressed as part of this review, there being no provision in legislation for us to disregard existing levels of under- and over-representation. We therefore gave consideration to Cornwall County Council's proposals to include part of Crowan parish in a revised Breage & Germoe ward in order to improve electoral equality.

72 However, we received neither details of how the warding of Crowan parish between district wards would be achieved, nor evidence of how this would be more effective and convenient than the proposed three-member Breage & Crowan ward. Examining the southern part of Crowan parish, we note that the village of Townshend borders Breage parish, but contains too few electors to enable acceptable electoral equality to be achieved in Breage & Germoe ward by 2006. We were unable to identify a means of including further electors from Crowan parish, which would also sufficiently reflect community identities and interests, and provide effective and convenient local government. We note the support of Breage Parish Council for the proposed Breage & Crowan ward (and the support of Germoe Parish Council at Stage One), and propose that the draft recommendations in this area be confirmed as final.

73 Finally, we also noted the opposition of Sithney Parish Council to the proposed Helston North and Porthleven & Sithney wards. Its comments regarding the proposed Helston North ward have been addressed in the previous section. We note that we have received no new evidence from the Parish Council regarding the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward, nor have we received details of an alternative warding pattern for this part of the district that would meet both our statutory criteria and its preferences. While we accept that the small town of Porthleven is larger than the villages of Sithney parish, we concur with the view expressed in the draft recommendations report that the configuration of electorates in this area limits the number of suitable warding options, particularly for Porthleven parish. Taking the above points into consideration, we believe that the proposed Porthleven & Sithney ward would provide the best available balance in this part of the district between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government.

74 Our final recommendations for the wards of Breage & Crowan, Porthleven & Sithney and Wendron will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations, and are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

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

75 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 ward 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 district average respectively (7 per cent more and 5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

76 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 under its proposed council size of 43.

77 In the LGCE's draft recommendations report, it based its draft recommendations for the area on the District Council's proposals. It considered that this scheme, under a 44-member (rather than a 43-member) council, would resolve the problem of under-representation in the existing Mabe & St Gluvias and Mawnan & Budock wards, while the existing Stithians ward would continue to provide good electoral equality. Under a 44-member council, electoral equality would improve slightly in the District Council's proposed Constantine & Mawnan and Stithians wards, with only a slight depreciation in the proposed Mabe & Budock ward.

78 While the LGCE noted the preference of Budock, Constantine and Gweek parish councils for the existing warding arrangements, it commented that it had been unable to identify a warding pattern that would both meet the objectives of the review and reflect these local preferences. The LGCE noted the acceptable variance in the existing Constantine & Gweek ward, but observed that it was required to achieve good electoral equality across the district as a whole. In this case, a realignment of wards, affecting the existing Constantine & Gweek ward, would remove the high under-representation of the wards directly to its east, as outlined earlier. The LGCE also considered that the proposed Constantine & Mawnan ward would have the merit of retaining the parishes of Constantine and Gweek in the same district ward, reflecting the preference of their respective parish councils.

79 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Constantine & Mawnan ward (comprising the parishes of Constantine, Gweek and Mawnan) and Mabe & Budock ward (comprising the parishes of Budock, Mabe and St Gluvias) 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 (comprising the parish of the same name) would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

80 At Stage Three Gweek Parish Council opposed the proposed two-member Constantine & Mawnan ward, arguing that the proposed changes were unnecessary. It considered that the draft recommendations did not address the problems that would be caused by the increased size of the proposed ward, and sacrificed "the identity, interests and needs of the local rural community to achieve a numerical balance in the number of electors represented by each District Councillor". Councillor Hatton (Constantine & Gweek ward) and a Constantine resident supported the views expressed by Gweek Parish Council. The resident also considered that the size and rural character of the proposed ward would make canvassing and other political activities difficult. Should the proposed Constantine & Mawnan ward be confirmed in the final recommendations, Gweek Parish Council requested that it be renamed to include the name of the parish.

81 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the proposed wards of Constantine & Mawnan, Mabe & Budock and Stithians. We acknowledge the concerns expressed by respondents, and recognise the difficulties that exist in sparsely populated rural areas. We note that the existing Constantine & Gweek ward is forecast to have good electoral equality by 2006 and appears to meet our other statutory criteria on the basis of the evidence received. However, as stated in the draft recommendations, we are unable to consider Constantine & Gweek ward in isolation from the rest of the district. Rather, we seek to propose a warding pattern for this part of Kerrier that

achieves the best overall balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests, and providing effective and convenient local government.

82 We note that the east of the district currently contains two of Kerrier's most under-represented wards (Mawnan & Budock and Mabe & St Gluvias), and have received no alternative proposals at Stage Three suggesting how this under-representation might be addressed while also retaining the existing Constantine & Gweek ward. We therefore consider that the LGCE's draft recommendations for this area would secure the best balance between the above objectives, not least because they do not disrupt existing community links between the communities of Constantine and Gweek. However, we have decided that Constantine & Mawnan ward should be renamed 'Constantine, Gweek & Mawnan', in order to better reflect the character of the proposed ward. Our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations, and are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Illogan North and Illogan South wards**

83 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).

84 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 from 44 to 43, 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.

85 In the LGCE's draft recommendations report, it adopted the District Council's proposal to retain the existing Illogan North ward. As previously discussed, it proposed to retain a 44-member council, and noted that under this council size the existing Illogan North ward would provide good electoral equality. However, the LGCE considered that the electoral variance in the existing Illogan South ward would, under a council size of 43 or 44 members, slightly exceed that which it would normally seek to recommend. It concurred with the District Council's assessment that removing the villages of Brea or Carn Brea from Illogan South ward to improve electoral equality would not provide effective and convenient local government, as this would produce an over-represented parish ward. Instead, the LGCE proposed an alternative boundary amendment to improve electoral equality while avoiding the creation of a significantly over-represented parish ward.

86 The LGCE proposed that a residential area centred on the A3047 East Hill road, which is contiguous with Camborne town but separated to its east from Pool and Illogan Highway (the main urban areas of Carn Brea parish) by a large commercial and industrial area, be included in a revised Camborne North ward. The LGCE considered that this would better reflect community identity and interests in this area and improve electoral equality. While it would be necessary to recommend the creation of a parish ward in this area to facilitate the division of Carn Brea parish between district wards, the LGCE considered that the East Hill area has a sufficiently large electorate to reduce the parish warding problems discussed above. Under the LGCE's proposals, the remainder of Carn Brea parish would continue to form a three-member Illogan South ward. 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.

87 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, Illogan North ward (comprising the parishes of Illogan and Portreath) and Illogan South ward (comprising part of the parish of Carn Brea) 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).

88 At Stage Three, Carn Brea Parish Council opposed the proposal to include the East Hill area of the parish in Camborne North ward. Instead, it proposed a four-member Illogan South ward comprising all of Carn Brea parish and the Tehidy ward of Illogan parish, currently in Illogan North district ward. Under Carn Brea Parish Council's proposals, the four-member Illogan South ward would have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (2 per cent more than the average by 2006). Its proposed two-member Illogan North ward would have 36 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (32 per cent more than the average by 2006).

89 Cornwall County Council stated that a Camborne county councillor had expressed concern that the inclusion of the East Hill area of Carn Brea parish in Camborne North ward would lead to unnecessary confusion. However, the County Council considered that existing electoral inequality in the Camborne and Carn Brea areas meant that some changes to the current boundaries were unavoidable. Councillor Barnes (Redruth North ward) proposed that the Carn Brea Village area of Carn Brea parish be included in Redruth for district warding purposes. He stated that only a stream separated this area from the town of Redruth, whereas Carn Brea hill separated it from the rest of Carn Brea parish.

90 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of Illogan North and Illogan South. We are content that these proposals provide the best available balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government. We note the representations of Carn Brea Parish Council and Cornwall County Council. However, we do not consider that we have received sufficient substantive evidence as to why the inclusion of the East Hill area of Carn Brea parish in Camborne North ward (rather than Illogan South ward) would not meet our statutory criteria. We also consider that a four-member Illogan South ward, as proposed by Carn Brea Parish Council, could result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate, and would lead to the under-representation of Illogan North ward. We therefore do not propose that it be adopted.

91 We also note the proposal by Councillor Barnes to include the Carn Brea Village area of Carn Brea parish in a district ward with part of Redruth. However, we consider that this proposal would require the creation of a significantly over-represented parish ward to facilitate the further division of Carn Brea parish between district wards. We concur with the view expressed by the District Council at Stage One that this would not provide effective and convenient local government. We further note that Carn Brea Village is linked to other residential areas in Carn Brea parish via the A3047. We are therefore not convinced on the basis of the evidence received that its inclusion with Redruth would better reflect community identities and interests than the existing arrangements. Consequently, our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of this report.

### **Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West wards**

92 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).

93 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 under a council size of 43. As previously stated, in the LGCE's draft recommendations report, it proposed to retain a 44-member council, as a result of which Camborne South ward would remain relatively under-represented. The LGCE therefore proposed to reduce electoral variance through a more equitable distribution of the electorate between the three Camborne district wards, allowing for the inclusion of the East Hill area of Carn Brea parish in Camborne North ward, as discussed in the previous section. For the most part, the LGCE's proposals retained the integrity of the existing ward pattern, as proposed by the District Council.

94 The LGCE's proposed boundary between Camborne West and Camborne South wards would move from the middle of the B3303 Pendarves Road, upon entering the town, to behind properties on its east side. It would then follow the London to Penzance railway 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. The LGCE considered that the area transferred to Camborne West ward as a result of these proposals had only limited links with the majority of Camborne South ward to the south of the London to Penzance railway line, but more apparent ones with the area to its north. It took the view that the London to Penzance railway line would form a stronger boundary than the B3303.

95 The LGCE also proposed that the part of Camborne North ward bounded by Union Street, Cross Street, Trevenson Street and Tolcarne Street be transferred to Camborne West ward. It noted that that the area to be transferred would be bordered by the proposed Camborne West ward on three sides, and therefore considered it would relate well to and improve communications within the 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, the LGCE proposed to transfer them to Camborne South ward. It considered that its proposals for Camborne would improve electoral equality, reducing the under-representation of Camborne South ward, while also reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government.

96 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Camborne North ward (comprising part of Camborne town and part of Carn Brea parish), Camborne South ward (comprising part of Camborne town) and Camborne West ward (comprising part of Camborne town) would be 3 per cent, 6 per cent and 8 per cent more than the district average respectively (7 per cent, 7 per cent and 9 per cent more than the average by 2006).

97 As previously stated, at Stage Three Carn Brea Parish Council opposed the inclusion of the East Hill area of Carn Brea parish in Camborne North ward. Cornwall County Council also stated, as discussed in the previous section, that one of the Camborne County councillors had expressed concern about the inclusion of this area in Camborne North ward. It had been suggested that this proposal would cause confusion. However, the County Council considered that existing electoral inequality in the Camborne and Carn Brea areas meant that some changes to the current boundaries were unavoidable.

98 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the wards of Camborne North, Camborne South and Camborne West as final. As discussed in the previous section, we do not consider that we have received sufficient substantive evidence to revise our draft recommendations in the East Hill area of Carn

Brea parish. We concur with the LGCE that this area should be included in Camborne North ward. Consequently our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of this report.

### **Redruth North, Redruth South and St Day & Lanner wards**

99 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 and south. 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 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 per councillor than the district average (12 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

100 At Stage One the District Council proposed retaining the existing three-member Redruth North ward without amendment. It considered that this ward would retain good electoral equality under its proposed council size of 43. The District Council and Councillor Thomas (St Day & Lanner ward) also proposed transferring a small part of Lanner parish to a revised three-member Redruth South ward. The new ward boundary would run from the Redruth/Lanner parish boundary at Sandy Lane south along this road, to the east of Beauchamps Meadow and across the fields to Carn Marth Lane. It would then return along the middle of the A393 South Downs until the roundabout and head west to rejoin the town boundary. 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 District Council acknowledged that this ward would be under-represented, but argued that, bearing in mind local opinion and the location of the parishes on the edge of the district, bordered by Redruth, an exception should be made.

101 The LGCE's draft recommendations in this area broadly reflected the warding pattern proposed by the District Council. However it proposed several amendments, most significantly the retention of the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward on its existing boundaries. The LGCE noted that the part of Lanner parish which the District Council proposed to include in Redruth South ward, is relatively distinct from Lanner village and contiguous with Redruth town. It therefore acknowledged that the District Council's proposals would sufficiently reflect community identities and interests in this part of the district. However, the LGCE also noted that this proposal would create a two-member St Day & Lanner ward with a higher level of electoral variance than the existing three-member ward. Under its proposals to retain a 44-member council, the proposed ward would have 26 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (22 per cent more than the average by 2006).

102 The LGCE therefore examined the possibility of reducing the under-representation of the proposed two-member ward by transferring part to another ward. However, it concurred with the views expressed by respondents from St Day & Lanner ward. They addressed a more radical option for warding Lanner parish initially considered by the District Council, which would have entailed the division of Lanner village between district wards. It was stated that the three parishes of the existing ward have a common identity and close ties, and that the division of Lanner would neither reflect community identities and interests nor provide effective and convenient local government at district or at parish level. The LGCE stated that, given the configuration of electorates in the three parishes, it was unable to identify any other area for inclusion in Redruth South ward that would enable the creation of a two-member St Day & Lanner ward meeting the objectives of the review. The LGCE also noted that the location of the parishes of Carharrack, Lanner and St Day in the north-east of the district meant that there were

few means of expanding the existing three-member ward to reduce its slight over-representation. It considered that assigning part of Carn Brea parish or Redruth town to St Day & Lanner ward would not reflect the community identities and interests of affected electors, while the inclusion of Stithians parish would not lead to an improvement in electoral equality.

103 Having carefully considered all the available options, the LGCE considered that the existing, slightly over-represented St Day & Lanner ward would achieve the best balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests, and providing effective and convenient local government. As previously discussed, it also proposed to retain a 44-member council by allocating an extra councillor to the north of the district. The LGCE therefore considered that retaining the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward, rather than a modified two-member ward as proposed by the District Council, would also enable it to obtain a more equitable distribution of councillors overall. Finally, it considered that on the basis of evidence provided by submissions from St Day & Lanner ward, the retention of the current ward would command local support.

104 Consequently, the LGCE proposed 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 ward boundary would run from the town boundary behind properties north of the A3047 roundabout, then proceeding east 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 east 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. This would for the most part retain the existing ward pattern as proposed by the District Council and Redruth Town Council. The LGCE considered that these proposals would provide a better balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government than the existing arrangements. It considered in particular that the area from the A3047 roundabout to Hoskings Row is separated from other residential developments in Redruth North ward and would relate more clearly to that part of Redruth South ward directly to its south.

105 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Redruth North and Redruth South wards (each comprising part of Redruth town) 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 (comprising the parishes of Carharrack, Lanner and St Day) would have 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (12 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

106 At Stage Three, a Senior Administrative Officer in the Chief Executive's Department of Kerrier District Council stated that in general terms members seemed satisfied with the draft recommendations, particularly the proposals to retain the existing St Day & Lanner ward. Carharrack, Lanner and St Day parish councils, Councillors Page and Thomas (both St Day & Lanner ward) and a Lanner resident all supported the proposal to retain the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward. Councillor Thomas and Lanner Parish Council reiterated the view, expressed at Stage One, that the existing ward reflected community identities and interests and provided effective and convenient local government. Carharrack Parish Council also proposed that the ward should be renamed 'St Day, Lanner & Carharrack', considering that "this new title reflects fairly the contribution made by Carharrack to the old mining villages local community". The Lanner resident also supported the "sensible", proposed boundary between Redruth North and Redruth South wards. Lanner Parish Council stated that it would oppose changes to the parish's external boundaries that would lead to a significant reduction in the parish electorate; however, we have no power to recommend changes to administrative boundaries as part of this review.

107 However, Redruth Town Council and Councillor Barnes (Redruth North ward) opposed the draft recommendations in this area. The Town Council stated that the proposed boundary amendments between Redruth North and Redruth South wards would lead to confusion and consequently “turn people off local government”. Councillor Barnes considered that this was particularly likely for electors in the Miners Court residential home for the elderly. It was therefore proposed that the existing boundary be retained, which was considered to be sensible and clearly defined.

108 The Town Council and Councillor Barnes also proposed that the District Council and Councillor Thomas’s Stage One proposal to include part of Lanner parish in Redruth South ward be adopted. As stated above, the new ward boundary would run from the Redruth/Lanner parish boundary at Sandy Lane south along this road, to the east of Beauchamps Meadow and across the fields to Carn Marth Lane. It would then return along the middle of the A393 South Downs until the roundabout and head west to rejoin the existing town boundary. The Town Council considered that “it seems crazy that the boundary ... is halfway down the main road into the town”. It stated that the A393 roundabout formed a ‘gateway’ to Redruth town, which should therefore be included in Redruth South ward. The Town Council also proposed that the town council boundaries be modified to include this area; however, we have no power to recommend changes to administrative boundaries as part of this review. Councillor Barnes argued that the inclusion of this area in Redruth South ward would improve electoral equality without the need for boundary amendments with Redruth North ward. As discussed in the previous section, he also proposed the inclusion of the Carn Brea Village area of Carn Brea parish in Redruth for district warding purposes.

109 Under Redruth Town Council’s proposals, the proposed Redruth North and Redruth South wards would have 1 per cent more and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (equal to the average and 6 per cent fewer by 2006).

110 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the retention of the existing three-member St Day & Lanner ward. However, we are proposing that it be renamed ‘St Day, Lanner & Carharrack’, at the request of Carharrack Parish Council. We note the proposal of Redruth Town Council and Councillor Barnes to include part of Lanner parish in Redruth South ward, as put forward by the District Council at Stage One. As stated in the draft recommendations, we consider that this proposal would sufficiently reflect community identities and interests in the affected part of the parish, which geographically may be said to belong to the Redruth urban area. However, the electoral inequality this would produce in the remainder of St Day & Lanner ward is such that we share the LGCE’s serious reservations as to this proposal. We have neither received new suggestions as to how to how this problem might be addressed, nor do we consider that we have received sufficient new substantive evidence to warrant a departure from the draft proposals in this area. We note the comments by Redruth Town Council and Lanner Parish Council regarding external town and parish boundaries but have no power to recommend changes to them. Such a review lies within the District Council’s remit to undertake, and need not necessarily be determined by our proposed district warding arrangements.

111 We also considered the view expressed by Redruth Town Council and Councillor Barnes that the existing boundary between Redruth North and Redruth South wards is clearer and therefore more effective than the two amendments proposed. As stated in the draft recommendations report, we note that the amendment in the west of the town, moving the boundary from the centre of Blowinghouse Hill and West End to the rear of properties to the north, includes an area in Redruth South ward which is separate from other residential developments in Redruth North. We therefore concur with the LGCE that the draft proposals provide a more effective and convenient boundary. However, we are proposing to reverse the proposed amendment in the centre of Redruth. This would entail retaining the boundary on Higher Fore Street and East End, rather than moving it to the rear of properties on Miners Court to the north. We note that the affected area has adequate links with other properties in Redruth

North ward, in which it is to be retained. Although this would lead to a slight increase in electoral variance in Redruth South ward, we consider in the light of evidence received that a better balance between the statutory criteria would be attained as a result.

112 Under our final recommendations, Redruth North and Redruth South wards would have 2 per cent and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent and 7 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). St Day & Lanner ward would have 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (12 per cent fewer than the average by 2006). Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of this report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

113 At Stage Three a local resident supported the retention of the present system of whole-council elections every four years. Unlike our predecessor organisation, the LGCE, by virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning the electoral cycle.

## **Conclusions**

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

- in the south of the district, we propose that the proposed two-member Mullion & The Lizard ward be divided into two single-member wards, the existing Grade-Ruan & Landewednack ward, and a new Mullion ward, comprising the parish of the same name, in order to provide more effective and convenient local government;
- in Redruth, we propose that a boundary amendment put forward in the centre of the town between Redruth North and Redruth South wards be reversed, as we have been persuaded on the basis of further evidence received that the existing boundary remains more effective and convenient in that area;
- we propose changing the names of the proposed Constantine & Mawnan and St Day & Lanner wards to Constantine, Gweek & Mawnan and St Day, Lanner & Carharrack respectively.

115 We conclude that, in Kerrier:

- A council of 44 members should be retained;
- there should be 20 wards, two fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

*Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	44	44	44	44
Number of wards	22	20	22	20
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

117 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 14 to two, with no wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2006, with only one ward, St Day, Lanner & Carharrack, varying by more than 10 per cent from the average, at 12 per cent. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

**Final Recommendation**

Kerrier District Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A including the large map inside the back cover.

**Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

118 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable 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 should also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. In the LGCE's draft recommendations report it proposed consequential changes to the 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 the LGCE also proposed an amendment to its own internal warding arrangements.

119 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 its draft recommendations in this area, the LGCE proposed to modify the boundaries between the town council wards to reflect the new district warding. It did not propose to modify the level of representation of any of the wards concerned.

120 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, no comments were received from the District Council or the Town Council. In the light of the confirmation of the proposed district

wards in the area, we are confirming the draft recommendation for warding Camborne town as final.

**Final 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 this report.

121 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. In the light of its draft recommendations in this area, the LGCE proposed to modify the boundaries between the town council wards to reflect the new district warding. It did not propose to modify the level of representation of any of the wards concerned. The LGCE noted the comments of Redruth Town Council, but considered that by proposing relatively minor changes to the existing boundaries, improved electoral equality could be achieved for the district ward of Redruth South.

122 In response to the LGCE’s consultation report, Redruth Town Council opposed the proposed town warding arrangements. As detailed in the section on district warding arrangements, it considered that the existing town and district ward boundaries were effective and convenient, and should therefore be retained

123 Having considered all the evidence received, we are confirming the draft recommendation for warding Redruth town as final, subject to a further modification of the boundaries between the town council wards. This amendment reflects the retention of the existing district ward boundary between Redruth North and Redruth South on East End and Higher Fore Street, as previously discussed. We are not proposing to modify the level of representation of any of the wards concerned as a result of this change.

**Final 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 this report.

124 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 the LGCE’s draft recommendations in this area, it proposed 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. The LGCE also proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between the existing parish wards of Barncoose and Pool to better reflect ground detail. It also proposed 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. The LGCE proposed that Barncoose, Four Lanes and Pool wards should each continue to return five councillors while East Hill should return one councillor.

125 In response to the LGCE’s consultation report, Carn Brea Parish Council opposed the proposal to include the East Hill area of the parish in Camborne North ward. However, having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district

wards in the area, we are confirming the draft recommendation for warding Carn Brea parish as final.

**Final 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.

126 The parish of Sithney is currently served by nine councillors and is not warded. In the light of the LGCE's draft recommendations in this area, it proposed 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. The LGCE proposed that the new Lowertown ward should return one councillor and the new Sithney ward return eight councillors.

127 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Sithney Parish Council opposed the warding of the parish. However, having considered all the evidence received, and in the light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we are confirming the draft recommendation for warding Sithney parish as final.

**Final Recommendation**

Sithney Parish Council should comprise nine 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.

128 The parish of Wendron is currently served by 15 councillors and is not warded. In the light of the LGCE's draft recommendations in this area, it proposed 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. The LGCE proposed that the new Trewennack ward should return two councillors and the new Wendron ward return 13 councillors.

129 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, no further comments were received from the District Council or the Parish Council. In the light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we are confirming the draft recommendation for warding Wendron parish as final.

**Final 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.

130 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. Noting that the proposed district warding arrangements would result in no change to this area, the LGCE was content to put forward the Parish Council's proposal for consultation.

131 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Illogan Parish Council supported the proposals for its own warding arrangements. Having considered all the evidence received, and in the light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we are confirming the draft recommendation for warding Illogan parish as final.

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

*Map 2: Final Recommendations for Kerrier*

## 6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

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

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

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

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



# APPENDIX A

## **Final 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 proposed warding arrangements for Camborne and Redruth.

*Map A1: Final Recommendations for Kerrier: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Sithney and Wendron Parishes*