

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Great Yarmouth in Norfolk

Report to The Electoral Commission

July 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 309

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?	41
APPENDIX	
A Final recommendations for Great Yarmouth: Detailed mapping	43

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Great Yarmouth is inserted at the back 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 councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Great Yarmouth in Norfolk.

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Great Yarmouth's electoral arrangements on 31 July 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 26 February 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 during consultation on the LGCE's draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

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

- **In 18 of the 21 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the borough and 10 wards vary by more than 20%;**
- **By 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 19 wards and by more than 20% in 10 wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 111-112) are that:

- **Great Yarmouth Borough Council should have 39 councillors, nine fewer than at present;**
- **There should be 17 wards, instead of 21 as at present;**
- **The boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of four, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**

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

- **In 15 of the proposed 17 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in only two wards, Lothingland and Southtown & Cobholm, expected to vary by more than 10% from the average for the borough in 2006.**

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

- **Revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Bradwell, Caister-on-Sea and Hopton-on-Sea;**
- **An increase in the number of councillors for Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby Parish Council.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 10 September 2002:

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

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Bradwell North	3	part of Bradwell parish (the proposed Bradwell North parish ward)	Large map
2	Bradwell South & Hopton	3	part of Bradwell parish (the proposed Bradwell South parish ward); part of Hopton-on-Sea parish (the proposed South parish ward)	Large map
3	Caister North	2	part of Caister-on-Sea parish (the proposed North parish ward)	Large map
4	Caister South	2	the parish of West Caister; part of Caister-on-Sea parish (the proposed South parish ward)	Large map
5	Central & Northgate (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	part of Northgate ward; part of Regent ward	Large map
6	Claydon (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	part of Claydon ward; part of Magdalen East ward; part of Magdalen West ward; part of St Andrews ward	Large map
7	East Flegg	2	the parishes of Hemsby, Somerton and Winterton-on-Sea	Map 2
8	Fleggburgh	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Filby, Fleggburgh, Mautby and Stokesby with Herringby	Map 2
9	Gorleston (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	part of Hopton-on-Sea parish (the proposed North parish ward); part of Gorleston ward; part of Magdalen West ward; part of St Andrews ward	Large map
10	Lothingland	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Belton with Browston, Burgh Castle and Fritton & St Olaves	Large map and Map 2
11	Magdalen (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	part of Gorleston ward; part of Magdalen East ward; part of Magdalen West ward	Large map
12	Nelson (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	part of Regent ward; Nelson ward	Large map
13	Ormesby	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby and Ormesby St Michael	Map 2
14	St Andrews (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	part of Claydon ward; part of Gorleston ward; part of St Andrews ward	Large map
15	Southtown & Cobholm (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	part of Claydon ward; Lichfield & Cobholm ward	Large map
16	West Flegg	2	the parishes of Ashby with Oby, Martham, Repps with Bastwick, Rollesby and Thurne	Map 2
17	Yarmouth North (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	part of Northgate ward; Yarmouth North ward	Large map

Notes: 1 Great Yarmouth town is unparished and comprises the eight wards indicated above.

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

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

Table 2: Final recommendations for Great Yarmouth

	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	Bradwell North	3	5,026	1,675	-6	5,266	1,755	-4
2	Bradwell South & Hopton	3	4,770	1,590	-11	5,272	1,757	-4
3	Caister North	2	3,713	1,857	4	3,731	1,866	2
4	Caister South	2	3,571	1,786	0	3,795	1,898	4
5	Central & Northgate (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	5,524	1,841	3	5,484	1,828	0
6	Claydon (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	5,632	1,877	5	5,586	1,862	2
7	East Flegg	2	3,572	1,786	0	3,769	1,885	3
8	Fleggburgh	1	1,814	1,814	1	1,816	1,816	0
9	Gorleston (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	3,598	1,799	0	3,792	1,896	4
10	Lothingland	2	4,257	2,129	19	4,209	2,105	15
11	Magdalen (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	5,560	1,853	3	5,504	1,835	1
12	Nelson (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	5,265	1,755	-2	5,180	1,727	-5
13	Ormesby	2	3,454	1,727	-4	3,453	1,727	-5
14	St Andrews (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	3,529	1,765	-1	3,618	1,809	-1
15	Southtown & Cobholm (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	3,224	1,612	-10	3,168	1,584	-13
16	West Flegg	2	3,723	1,862	4	3,911	1,956	7
17	Yarmouth North (in Gt Yarmouth)	2	3,607	1,804	1	3,556	1,778	-2
	Totals	39	69,839	-	-	71,110	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,791	-	-	1,823	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Great Yarmouth Borough 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 borough. 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 borough of Great Yarmouth in Norfolk. The seven districts in Norfolk 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 Great Yarmouth's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1979 (Report no. 314). The electoral arrangements of Norfolk County Council were last reviewed in June 1984 (Report no. 472). 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 Great Yarmouth 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 councils in the borough.

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

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

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 31 July 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Great Yarmouth Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Norfolk County Council, Norfolk Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Norfolk County Association of Parish & Town Councils, parish councils in the borough, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the borough, the Members of the European Parliament for the Eastern region, the headquarters of the main political parties and residents'

associations and main community groups in the borough. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 22 October 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 26 February 2002 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Great Yarmouth in Norfolk*, and ended on 22 April 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 borough of Great Yarmouth is located on the east coast of Norfolk, bordered by the North Sea, with the districts of Broadland, North Norfolk and South Norfolk to the west, and the district of Waveney in the county of Suffolk to the south. The borough covers an area of around 17,300 hectares and has a population of 89,300. Although the town and resort of Great Yarmouth constitutes the main urban settlement, the borough also includes the towns of Belton, Bradwell, Caister-on-Sea, Hemsby, Hopton-on-Sea, Martham and Ormesby St Margaret. There are also substantial rural areas to the north-west and south-west, which incorporate part of the renowned Norfolk Broads network of rivers and waterways.

11 The borough contains 21 civil parishes, but Great Yarmouth town itself is unparished. Great Yarmouth town comprises 50% of the borough's total electorate.

12 The electorate of the borough is 69,839 (February 2001). The Council presently has 48 members who are elected from 21 wards, 14 of which (the 10 wards of Great Yarmouth plus Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton, Caister North and Caister South) are predominantly urban, with the remainder being mainly or partly rural. Eleven of the wards are each represented by three councillors, five are represented by two councillors and five are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

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 borough 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 1,455 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,481 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 18 of the 21 wards varies by more than 10% from the borough average, in 10 wards by more than 20% and in 5 wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Bradwell North ward where each of the councillors represents 78% more electors than the borough average.

Map 1: Existing wards in Great Yarmouth

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	Bradwell North	2	5,182	2,591	78	5,418	2,709	83
2	Bradwell South & Hopton	2	4,914	2,457	69	5,413	2,707	83
3	Caister North	2	4,364	2,182	50	4,368	2,184	47
4	Caister South	2	2,920	1,460	0	3,158	1,579	7
5	Claydon (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,561	1,187	-18	3,719	1,240	-16
6	Fleggburgh	1	1,814	1,814	25	1,816	1,816	23
7	Gorleston (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,870	1,290	-11	3,801	1,267	-14
8	Hemsby	1	2,281	2,281	57	2,467	2,467	67
9	Lichfield & Cobholm (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,185	1,062	-27	3,129	1,043	-30
10	Lothingland	3	4,257	1,419	-2	4,209	1,403	-5
11	Magdalen East (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,324	1,108	-24	3,253	1,084	-27
12	Magdalen West (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,435	1,145	-21	3,678	1,226	-17
13	Martham	1	2,446	2,446	68	2,644	2,644	78
14	Nelson (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,192	1,064	-27	3,162	1,054	-29
15	Northgate (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,925	1,308	-10	3,833	1,278	-14
16	Ormesby	2	3,454	1,727	19	3,453	1,727	17
17	Regent (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,774	1,258	-14	3,769	1,256	-15
18	Rollesby	1	1,277	1,277	-12	1,267	1,267	-14
19	St Andrews (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,868	1,289	-11	3,795	1,265	-15

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 %
20 Winterton & Somerton	1	1,291	1,291	-11	1,302	1,302	-12
21 Yarmouth North (in Gt Yarmouth)	3	3,505	1,168	-20	3,456	1,152	-22
Totals	48	69,839	-	-	71,110	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,455	-	-	1,481	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Great Yarmouth Borough 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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Nelson ward were relatively over-represented by 27%, while electors in Bradwell North ward were significantly under-represented by 78%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

15 During Stage One the LGCE received eight representations, including borough-wide schemes from Great Yarmouth Borough Council and County Councillor Michael Castle, and representations from Great Yarmouth Constituency Labour Party, three parish councils, one community group and one local resident. 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 Great Yarmouth in Norfolk*.

16 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the Borough Council's proposals, which achieved a substantial improvement in electoral equality, and provided a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards. However, it moved away slightly from the Borough Council's scheme in a number of areas, affecting seven wards, to improve electoral equality, more fully reflect community identities and interests, and better provide effective and convenient local government. It proposed that:

- Great Yarmouth Borough Council should be served by 39 councillors, compared with the current 48, representing 17 wards, four fewer than at present;
- The boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified, while three wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- There should be revised warding arrangements for the parishes of Bradwell, Caister-on-Sea and Hopton-on-Sea, and an increase in the number of councillors serving Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby Parish Council.

Draft recommendation

Great Yarmouth Borough Council should comprise 39 councillors, serving 17 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

17 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 15 of the 17 wards varying by no more than 10% from the borough average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only Lothingland ward varying by more than 10% from the average in 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

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

Great Yarmouth Borough Council

19 The Borough Council supported the draft recommendations. In particular, it stated that it accepted the amendment put forward by the LGCE between its proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards to improve electoral equality in the west of Great Yarmouth town. The Borough Council also provided additional evidence in support of the proposed ward name 'Yarmouth Central'.

Norfolk County Council

20 Norfolk County Council made several general comments in response to the draft recommendations. In particular, it stated that the reflection of community identities and interests was, in its view, of equal importance to the achievement of electoral equality, particularly in rural areas. The County Council also considered that it would have been easier to maximise coterminosity between borough wards and county divisions had reviews of both tiers of local government been conducted at the same time. However, it recognised the difficulties that might have arisen from such a process. The County Council's submission also included representations by Norfolk County Council Labour Group, which supported Great Yarmouth Constituency Labour Party's proposed boundary amendment, as detailed below.

Great Yarmouth Constituency Labour Party

21 Great Yarmouth Constituency Labour Party ('the Labour Party') broadly supported the draft recommendations. However, it proposed that the boundary between the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards in the west of Great Yarmouth town be partly amended to reflect the Borough Council's Stage One proposal. This would entail the use of the A12 link road as the ward boundary in this area. The Labour Party considered that this boundary would better reflect community identities and interests in the area than the draft recommendations, which had included a small area to the south of the link road in Southtown & Cobholm ward. It also supported comments made by the Borough Council at Stage One concerning possible further electoral growth 'in the foreseeable future' in the proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward.

Parish councils

22 We received responses from three parish councils. Bradwell Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations in the parished south of the borough, and continued to support its Stage One proposals in this area. These would affect the existing wards of Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton and Lothingland, entailing the inclusion of Burgh Castle parish in the proposed Bradwell North ward, and the exclusion of Hopton-on-Sea parish from its proposed Bradwell South ward. The Parish Council provided additional evidence to suggest that its proposals would best meet the statutory criteria in this part of the borough. It also put forward proposals regarding its own parishing arrangements.

23 As at Stage One, Somerton Parish Council opposed the proposed East Flegg ward, combining the existing wards of Winterton & Somerton and Hemsby. It supported the inclusion of Somerton parish in a ward with Martham parish, considering that it had more in common with Martham than with Hemsby. Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby Parish Council supported the proposed changes to its own warding arrangements.

Other representations

24 One further representation was received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from a borough and county councillor. Councillor Mike Taylor (Northgate ward and Northgate division) opposed the proposed ward name of 'Yarmouth Central'. He proposed either the retention of the existing ward name of 'Northgate' or the alternative name of 'Northgate Regent'.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

25 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Great Yarmouth 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 20% increase in the electorate of Great Yarmouth borough. At Stage One the Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately two% from 69,839 to 71,110 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expected most of the growth to be in the wards of Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton, Caister South, Claydon, Hemsby, Magdalen West and Martham, while a slight percentage decline in electorate is forecast for nine wards, seven of which lie within the urban area of Great Yarmouth. 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. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, 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.

30 As discussed in paragraphs 81-82 of this report, the LGCE noted the view of the Borough Council that further residential development might take place within five years in its proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward, which would otherwise be forecast to be slightly over-represented by 2006. However, given that this additional electoral growth was unconfirmed and had not been incorporated into the five-year projections provided by the Borough Council, the LGCE instead proposed a boundary amendment between the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards to improve electoral equality.

31 At Stage Three we received representations on this issue from the Borough Council, the Labour Party and Norfolk County Council Labour Group. The Borough Council stated that it had decided not to revise its electorate forecast for this area, commenting that the proposed residential development was at outline approval stage only. The Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group supported their proposals for Southtown & Cobholm ward, reflecting the Borough Council's Stage One scheme, in part with reference to this development, arguing that it would 'in the foreseeable future' resolve the over-representation of the proposed ward. However, they did not explicitly challenge the five-year forecast in this area. We received no further comments on the Borough Council's electorate forecasts at Stage Three and 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 look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

33 Great Yarmouth Borough Council presently has 48 members. In its draft recommendations report the LGCE adopted the Borough Council's proposal for a 39-member council, a reduction of nine councillors, representing a mixed pattern of 17 single-, two- and three-member wards. The Borough Council stated that it had examined a number of council sizes, and had concluded that 'the available demographic data and ... the issues of community and geography, particularly within the constraints of parish boundaries showed that certain solutions were much more effective in terms of [electoral] equality than others.' It also considered that, following the adoption of a leader and cabinet committee system of internal political management in December 1999, a reduction in council size would 'meet the needs of the Council in the future bearing in mind the overall reduction in committee attendance now required and the more precise definition of responsibility arising from Cabinet governance'.

34 The Borough Council therefore put forward a scheme based on a 39-member council as a 'fair and workable solution of electoral representation for the Borough for the foreseeable future', which would rectify the existing imbalance in representation between the parished and unparished areas. It stated that it had undertaken an extensive consultation exercise on its proposals, involving parish councils in the borough, community groups and residents' associations, as well as the general public. The LGCE also received a proposal for a 30-member council, a reduction of 18 councillors, from County Councillor Michael Castle (Southtown & Cobholm division).

35 Having carefully considered the representations received, the LGCE stated that it did not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size, but was prepared to consider a case for change where there was persuasive evidence. In this instance, it noted that there appeared to be a consensus in favour of a significant reduction, but disagreement on whether a council size of 39 or of 30 would be most appropriate. The LGCE further noted that that both proposals referred to the effect on the role of councillors of changes in the internal management structure of the Borough Council, which have been in place for approximately two years. Both the Borough Council and Councillor Castle considered that a consequent reduction in council size would provide more effective and convenient local government. The LGCE also considered that both proposals would secure substantial improvements in electoral equality across the borough and an improved allocation of members between the parished and unparished areas.

36 However, the LGCE considered that unlike the Borough Council's scheme, Councillor Castle's proposal for a council size of 30 did not include any evidence that it had been subject to broad-based consultation or that it was widely supported, despite the support of a local community group. It noted that three of his proposed wards were forecast to have variances of over 10% by 2006, as opposed to two proposed wards under the Borough Council's proposals. The LGCE also considered that by combining existing wards to form three-member wards,

Councillor Castle's scheme overlooked opportunities to improve boundaries in the unparished area. It stated that his proposed transfer of part of Hopton-on-Sea parish to a revised Lothingland ward, and proposed three-member Southern Fleggs ward, comprising the existing coastal ward of Ormesby and the rural wards of Rollesby and Fleggburgh, would not, in its view, reflect community identities and interests in these areas.

37 Moreover, the LGCE also noted that Councillor Castle's proposed council size and uniform pattern of three-member wards was intended to ensure coterminosity between borough wards and county divisions. It stated that it was likely that the boundaries of county divisions would change as a result of the review of Norfolk County Council's electoral arrangements, which is expected to begin towards the end of 2002. The LGCE considered that it was unfeasible to anticipate the outcome of that review in its proposals for Great Yarmouth borough.

38 In comparison, the LGCE noted that the Borough Council's proposed 39-member scheme was supported unanimously by both political groups on the council and had been subject to local consultation. While responses to the Borough Council's consultation tended to focus on issues specific to a single part of the borough, there was evidence of some support for its scheme. However, there was no evidence of widespread support for either the retention of the existing 48-member council or for other council sizes. As discussed in the following section, the LGCE also considered that the Borough Council's proposed warding pattern would provide a better balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests, and providing effective and convenient local government than either the existing arrangements or other proposals. 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 the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 39 members.

39 At Stage Three, the Borough Council, the Labour Party and Norfolk County Council expressed general support for the draft recommendations. We received no further representations on this issue, and are therefore content to confirm the LGCE's draft recommendations for a council size of 39 as final.

Electoral arrangements

40 The LGCE gave careful consideration to the submissions received at Stage One. As a consequence of its decision to adopt the Borough Council's proposed council size of 39 members, it stated that it had been unable to give further consideration to the proposals from Councillor Castle, as these were based on a different council size. The LGCE considered that the Borough Council's proposals would better meet the objectives of the review than the current arrangements or other proposals put forward, while providing an improved allocation of councillors for both the urban and rural parts of the borough. It further noted that the Borough Council undertook an extensive consultation exercise on its proposals, which also received the unanimous support of both political groups on the Council.

41 Accordingly, the LGCE based its recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals. However, to improve electoral equality further and bearing in mind local community identities and interests, it proposed some amendments to its proposed wards in the Great Yarmouth urban area. In addition, in order to follow ground features, the LGCE proposed minor modifications to the Council's proposed boundaries in several parts of the town.

42 At Stage Three the Borough Council stated that it supported the draft recommendations. The Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group also supported the LGCE's proposals, except in one area in the west of Great Yarmouth town, where they proposed a boundary amendment between the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards. Bradwell and Somerton parish councils also put forward alternative proposals in their respective parts of the borough. Noting that the LGCE had already considered the above proposals in its draft

recommendations, but had not adopted them, we gave careful consideration to any new evidence provided by these respondents at Stage Three. Both the Borough Council and Councillor Taylor (Northgate ward and Northgate county division) also provided further evidence regarding the most appropriate name for the proposed Yarmouth Central ward.

43 Norfolk County Council commented generally upon the review process. It stated that the reflection of community identities and interests was, in its view, of equal importance to the achievement of electoral equality, and that the Committee should balance these criteria carefully. The County Council expressed concern that boundary changes could lead to villages being separated from others with which they have 'natural affinities'. However, it did not comment upon any specific rural area of the borough.

44 After due consideration of the representations received, we propose that the LGCE's draft recommendations be substantially endorsed. We consider that these recommendations provide the best balance between achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identities and interests and providing effective and convenient local government. However, we are proposing a boundary amendment between the proposed wards of Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm, which we consider, in the light of further evidence, would better reflect community identities and interests. Seeking consensus on the most appropriate name for the proposed Yarmouth Central ward, we are also proposing a revised name that we consider to be more acceptable to all respondents.

45 For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Fleggburgh, Martham and Rollesby wards;
- (b) Hemsby, Ormesby and Winterton & Somerton wards;
- (c) Caister North and Caister South wards;
- (d) Northgate and Yarmouth North wards;
- (e) Nelson and Regent wards;
- (f) Claydon, Lichfield & Cobholm and St Andrews wards;
- (g) Gorleston, Magdalen East and Magdalen West wards;
- (h) Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton and Lothingland wards.

46 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.

Fleggburgh, Martham and Rollesby wards

47 These three wards are situated in the north of the borough, and each is represented by a single councillor. Fleggburgh ward comprises the parishes of Filby, Fleggburgh, Mautby and Stokesby with Herringby, while Martham ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Rollesby ward comprises the parishes of Ashby with Oby, Repps with Bastwick, Rollesby and Thurne. At present, Martham ward is significantly under-represented, with 68% more electors per councillor than the borough average (78% more than the average by 2006). Fleggburgh ward is also relatively under-represented, with 25% more electors per councillor than the average (23% more than the average by 2006). Rollesby ward is relatively over-represented, with 12% fewer electors per councillor than the average (14% fewer than the average by 2006).

48 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed retaining the existing single-member Fleggburgh ward, while combining the existing Martham and Rollesby wards to form a new two-member West Flegg ward. The LGCE based its draft recommendations on these proposals, noting that they would provide the correct allocation of seven councillors for the north of the borough. Examining the proposal to retain the existing Fleggburgh ward, it noted that the current under-representation of the ward would be resolved by the reduction in council size proposed by the Borough Council, and that its constituent rural parishes were well connected

via the A1064 Acle to Caister-on-Sea road. The LGCE was therefore content to adopt the proposal as part of its draft recommendations.

49 The LGCE also noted that the Borough Council's proposed West Flegg ward would resolve the problem of high electoral variance in the existing Martham and Rollesby wards, particularly the former, which is significantly under-represented. It considered that the constituent parishes of the proposed ward are well linked via the A149 Great Yarmouth road and the B1152 Billockby to Somerton road, and also noted that the Borough Council's own consultation process indicated some support for this proposal. The LGCE therefore decided to adopt the proposed West Flegg ward as part of its draft recommendations.

50 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Fleggburgh ward (comprising the parishes of Filby, Fleggburgh, Mautby and Stokesby with Herringby) would have 1% more electors per councillor than the borough average (equal to the average by 2006). The proposed West Flegg ward (comprising the parishes of Ashby with Oby, Martham, Repps with Bastwick, Rollesby and Thurne) would have 4% more electors per councillor than the average (7% more than the average by 2006).

51 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. As detailed in the following section, Somerton Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations in the north of the borough. It proposed, as at Stage One, that Somerton be included in a ward with Martham parish.

52 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of West Flegg and Fleggburgh as final. While we acknowledge the views of Somerton Parish Council, as discussed below, we do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence to depart from the draft recommendations in this area. Furthermore, we have received no alternative proposals which would reflect the Parish Council's preference for a ward containing both Martham and Somerton parishes, while also providing for good electoral equality across the north of the borough. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations, and are illustrated on Map 2.

Hemsby, Ormesby and Winterton & Somerton wards

53 The wards of Hemsby, Ormesby and Winterton & Somerton are situated on the coast in the north of the borough. Hemsby and Winterton & Somerton wards are each represented by one councillor, while Ormesby is represented by two councillors. Hemsby ward is coterminous with the parish of the same name, while Ormesby ward comprises the parishes of Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby and Ormesby St Michael. Winterton & Somerton ward comprises the parishes of Somerton and Winterton-on-Sea. Hemsby ward is currently significantly under-represented, with 57% more electors per councillor than the borough average. Electoral equality in Hemsby ward is forecast to deteriorate further over the next five years, with the ward forecast to have 67% more electors per councillor than the average by 2006. At present, Ormesby ward is also relatively under-represented, with 19% more electors per councillor than the average (17% more than the average by 2006). Conversely, Winterton & Somerton ward is currently relatively over-represented and has 11% fewer electors per councillor than the average (12% fewer than the average by 2006).

54 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed retaining the existing two-member Ormesby ward, while combining the current Hemsby and Winterton & Somerton wards to form a new two-member East Flegg ward. The LGCE based its draft recommendations on these proposals, noting that they would provide the correct allocation of seven councillors for the north of the borough. It considered that the Borough Council's proposal to retain the existing Ormesby ward in a 39-member council would reduce the current level of under-representation while also

continuing to reflect community identities and interests. The LGCE also noted that the Borough Council's own consultation process indicated some support for this proposal. It was therefore content to put this ward forward for consultation as part of its draft recommendations.

55 Examining the Borough Council's proposed East Flegg ward, the LGCE considered that it would enable a significant improvement in electoral equality, particularly in comparison to the existing Hemsby ward. Further, it noted that Hemsby, Somerton and Winterton-on-Sea are in close proximity to one another, as well as connected via the north-south B1159 to Caister-on-Sea. The LGCE therefore considered that the proposed ward would reflect community identities in the area relatively well. While it acknowledged Somerton Parish Council's proposal to retain the existing Winterton & Somerton ward, it also noted that the current over-representation of this ward would worsen under a 39-member council. The LGCE stated that it had given consideration to the Parish Council's alternative proposal to include Somerton in a ward with Martham parish, but noted that neither a ward comprising both parishes nor the addition of Somerton parish to the Borough Council's proposed West Flegg ward would provide good electoral equality. It was therefore content to put the Borough Council's proposed East Flegg ward forward as part of its draft recommendations.

56 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed East Flegg ward (comprising the parishes of Hemsby, Somerton and Winterton-on-Sea) would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (3% more than the average by 2006). The proposed Ormesby ward (comprising the parishes of Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby and Ormesby St Michael) would have 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average (5% fewer than the average by 2006).

57 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. As at Stage One, Somerton Parish Council opposed the proposed East Flegg ward. It proposed the inclusion of Somerton in a ward with Martham parish. The Parish Council considered that Somerton had more in common with Martham than Hemsby. It also noted that the majority of parish residents lived in West Somerton, which is situated 'much closer' to Martham than to Hemsby.

58 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for the wards of East Flegg and Ormesby as final. We note the preference of Somerton Parish Council for the inclusion of the parish in the same ward as Martham. While we acknowledge its views, we do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence to depart from the draft recommendations in this area. Furthermore, we have received no alternative proposals which would reflect the Parish Council's preference, while also providing for good electoral equality across the north of the borough. Examining the proposed East Flegg ward, we note that it would retain the existing link between the parishes of Somerton and Winterton-on-Sea. We further note that joining the contiguous settlements of Winterton and Hemsby for borough warding purposes would seem to reflect community identities and interests, while the three parishes are well linked by the B1159. We therefore consider that the proposed East Flegg ward would provide the best available balance between the statutory criteria. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations, and are illustrated on Map 2.

Caister North and Caister South wards

59 The two-member wards of Caister North and Caister South cover the town of Caister-on-Sea and the village of West Caister to the north of Great Yarmouth town. Caister North ward comprises the parish of West Caister and the North ward of Caister-on-Sea parish. Caister South ward is coterminous with the South ward of Caister-on-Sea parish. Caister North ward is currently significantly under-represented, with 50% more electors per councillor than the borough average (47% more than the average by 2006). Caister South ward currently has equal to the average number of electors per councillor (7% more than the average by 2006).

60 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed amending the boundary between the wards of Caister North and Caister South within the town of Caister-on-Sea. Under its proposals, an area bounded by St Hilda Road, Seafield Road North, Ormesby Road, Braddock Road and the sea would be transferred from Caister North ward to Caister South ward. The Borough Council also proposed that West Caister parish be transferred from Caister North ward to Caister South ward.

61 The LGCE based its draft recommendations on these proposals, noting that the Borough Council's scheme would significantly reduce electoral variance in Caister North ward, providing the correct allocation of four councillors for Caister-on-Sea and West Caister. It considered that the proposed wards would make continued use of strong road boundaries within the town while also avoiding the division of residential areas (as is currently the case on Braddock Road). The LGCE further noted that West Caister's road links enable it to be placed with either the north or the south of the town for electoral purposes. Considering that the Borough Council's proposed warding pattern provided the best available balance between the statutory criteria, it adopted the proposed wards of Caister North and Caister South as part of its draft recommendations.

62 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Caister North ward (comprising the revised North ward of Caister-on-Sea parish) would have 4% more electors per councillor than the borough average (2% more than the average by 2006). The proposed Caister South ward (comprising West Caister parish and the revised South ward of Caister-on-Sea parish) would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (4% more than the average by 2006).

63 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. We received no further comments, and have decided to confirm the LGCE's proposals as final. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Northgate and Yarmouth North wards

64 The existing wards of Northgate and Yarmouth North are both represented by three councillors and are situated in the north of Great Yarmouth town between the River Bure and the sea. Under the existing arrangements, Northgate ward has 10% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (14% fewer than the average by 2006). Yarmouth North ward is also relatively over-represented, with 20% fewer electors per councillor than the average (22% fewer than the average by 2006).

65 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed retaining the existing Yarmouth North ward, subject to a minor boundary amendment and a reduction in representation to two councillors in view of the proposed reduction in council size. It proposed that the revised southern boundary should follow the existing boundary east from the River Bure until the junction of Salisbury Road and North Denes Road. It would then proceed south along North Denes Road and east along Beaconsfield Road to the sea, resulting in the transfer of a small part of the existing Northgate ward to the revised Yarmouth North ward. The remainder of the existing Northgate ward would be combined with part of the existing Regent ward (including the Runham area of the town west of the River Bure) to form a new three-member Yarmouth Central ward. The southern boundary of Yarmouth Central ward would run from the western borough boundary along the main channel of Breydon Water, proceeding along the River Yare before heading east along Regent Street, King Street and Regent Road to the sea.

66 The LGCE based its draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, considering that they would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria as well as facilitating the correct allocation of members for the town, which is 20 councillors. It considered

that the proposed reduction in council size would enable good electoral equality to be achieved in the revised two-member Yarmouth North ward. However, the LGCE proposed one minor amendment on the seafront, where the proposed boundary divided Marine Crescent between Yarmouth Central and Yarmouth North wards. Having visited the area, it noted that Marine Crescent is primarily residential, whereas North Drive, to its south, contains a number of hotels and is therefore more service oriented. The LGCE considered that including all properties on the road in Yarmouth North ward would better reflect community identities and interests, while also providing a slight improvement in electoral equality. It therefore proposed moving the boundary southwards to the junction of Marine Crescent and North Drive.

67 Examining the proposed Yarmouth Central ward, the LGCE noted that it would resolve the over-representation of the existing Northgate and Regent wards. It considered that the predominantly commercial Regent Road and Regent Street, which form the proposed southern boundary of Yarmouth Central ward, would appear to demarcate communities to the north and south reasonably well. While the River Bure separates the Runham area of the town from the rest of the ward, the LGCE noted that there is easy road access between the two areas, and that they are also already linked in the existing Regent ward.

68 Finally, the LGCE noted the view of the Labour Party that the proposed Yarmouth Central ward should retain the existing ward name of 'Northgate', which it considered to be 'an apt name from both geographic and historical considerations', whereas 'the concept of Central Yarmouth would in the minds of most local people embrace a much larger area.' The LGCE considered that it had received no substantive evidence in favour of either ward name, noting that the proposed ward would encompass the majority of the existing Northgate ward, and the whole of Northgate Street, but also a significant part of the existing Regent ward. The LGCE therefore decided to adopt the Borough Council's proposed ward name of 'Yarmouth Central', but stated that it welcomed further views on this issue from both respondents, as well as local residents and other interested parties, at Stage Three.

69 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Yarmouth Central and Yarmouth North wards would have 3% and 1% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (equal to the average and 2% fewer than the average by 2006).

70 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party, and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. The Borough Council also provided additional evidence in support of its proposed ward name 'Yarmouth Central'. The Borough Council considered that, as the proposed ward 'included a high percentage of properties in the Town Centre area', electors in this area would be confused by the alternative ward name of 'Northgate' proposed at Stage One by the Labour Party.

71 However, Councillor Mike Taylor (Northgate borough ward and Northgate county division) opposed the Borough Council's proposed ward name. He expressed a preference for the existing ward name of 'Northgate', arguing that the site of the historic 'North Gate' in the Town Wall lay in the centre of the proposed ward, at the junction of Northgate Street and Rampart Road. As a compromise, Councillor Taylor also suggested the alternative ward name 'Northgate Regent'.

72 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the proposed Yarmouth Central and Yarmouth North wards as final, subject to an amendment to the name Yarmouth Central. We consider that there remains a lack of consensus as to the most appropriate name for this ward, and that neither respondent has made an overwhelming case for its preferred option. As the centre of Regent Road and Regent Street forms the boundary between the proposed Nelson and Yarmouth Central wards, we also consider that Councillor Taylor's suggested compromise of 'Northgate Regent' would cause confusion. Therefore, we are proposing the revised ward name of 'Central & Northgate'. We consider that this would reflect the preferences of both the Borough Council and Councillor

Taylor, and in our view consequently provide the best reflection of community identities in this part of the town.

73 Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Nelson and Regent wards

74 The wards of Nelson and Regent cover part of Great Yarmouth town to the south of the existing Northgate ward, between the rivers Bure and Yare to the west and the sea to the east. However, Regent ward also includes the Runham area of the town, to the west of the Bure and north of the Yare, and a largely uninhabited rural area north of Breydon Water. Both wards are represented by three councillors, and are relatively over-represented both now and in 2006. Nelson ward currently has 27% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (29% fewer than the average by 2006), while Regent ward has 14% fewer electors per councillor than the average (15% fewer than the average by 2006).

75 As discussed in the previous section, at Stage One the Borough Council proposed combining part of the existing Northgate and Regent wards (including the Runham area of the town to the west of the River Bure) to form a new three-member Yarmouth Central ward. It also proposed that the remainder of Regent ward should be combined with the existing Nelson ward to form a revised three-member Nelson ward. The northern boundary of the proposed Nelson ward would then run from the River Yare east along Regent Street, King Street and Regent Road to the sea.

76 The LGCE based its draft recommendations on these proposals, which it considered to provide the best balance between the statutory criteria as well as facilitating the correct allocation of members for the town, which is 20 councillors. As previously stated, it considered that the use of Regent Road and Regent Street, which are mostly commercial in character, as the northern boundary of the proposed Nelson ward would appear to demarcate communities east of the river reasonably well. Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Nelson ward would have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (5% fewer than the average by 2006).

77 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. We received no further comments, and have decided to confirm the LGCE's proposals for this ward as final. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Claydon, Lichfield & Cobholm and St Andrews wards

78 The wards of Claydon, Lichfield & Cobholm and St Andrews occupy the north and centre of that part of Great Yarmouth town lying west of the River Yare and east of the parish of Bradwell. Each of the wards is represented by three councillors and each is relatively over-represented. Claydon and Lichfield & Cobholm wards currently have 18% and 27% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (16% and 30% fewer than the average by 2006). At present, St Andrews ward has 11% fewer electors per councillor than the average (15% fewer than the average by 2006).

79 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed adding part of Claydon ward to the existing Lichfield & Cobholm ward to form a two-member Southtown & Cobholm ward. The modified southern ward boundary would run from the Bradwell parish boundary east along Morton Peto Road and north along Harfreys Road, before proceeding east over the A12 roundabout to the

Beccles Road/Southtown Road junction. It would then run south briefly on Beccles Road before heading north-east to the River Yare at the junction with Malthouse Lane.

80 The Borough Council also proposed a revised three-member Claydon ward and a revised two-member St Andrews ward. The proposed Claydon ward would gain the following areas: that part of St Andrews ward to the north of Trafalgar Road West and Trafalgar Road East; that part of Magdalen West ward to the north of Trinity Avenue; that part of Magdalen East ward to the north of Magdalen Square, and to the north of and including St Catherine's Way. The northern part of the existing Claydon ward would be transferred to the proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward as described in the above paragraph. The Borough Council's revised St Andrews ward would be subject to the transfer to Claydon ward described above, but would also gain the following areas: that part of the existing Claydon ward to the south of Colomb Road and east of the A12 Inner Relief Road; Pier Gardens, and parts of Beach Road and Pier Road, currently in Gorleston ward.

81 The LGCE largely based its draft recommendations on these proposals, considering that they would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria, and the facilitation of the correct allocation of members for the town, which is 20 councillors. However, it noted that in the Borough Council's scheme the proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward was forecast to have a higher variance by 2006 (13% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average) than it would normally seek to recommend. Having asked officers at the Borough Council for further information, and having visited the area, the LGCE noted that that the proposed ward comprises two residential areas, Cobholm and Southtown, which are relatively similar in character and bounded on all sides by major roads and the two rivers. It was also informed by the Borough Council of the possibility of further residential development within the next five years, which would reduce electoral variance in Southtown & Cobholm ward to acceptable levels.

82 The LGCE stated that it nonetheless sought to put forward recommendations which in its judgement provided the best balance between the statutory criteria. Noting that the additional electorate growth in this ward was unconfirmed and had not been incorporated into the five-year projections provided by the Borough Council, it considered that these objectives would best be met by a small transfer of electors from the proposed Claydon ward to that of Southtown & Cobholm. The LGCE commented that this change would ensure good electoral equality while allowing for further improvement should additional development go ahead. It considered that the revised boundary would not significantly encroach upon estates to the south of the A12 access road, and would still reflect community identities reasonably well. The proposed boundary would run from the boundary with Bradwell parish to the south of Harfrey's Industrial Estate to include all of this commercial area in Southtown & Cobholm ward. It would proceed across the Town Lands open space and follow Common Road north and east, rejoining the Borough Council's proposed boundary on Beccles Road before heading north-east to the River Yare at the junction with Malthouse Lane. This would result in the inclusion of Alpha Road and parts of Beccles Road, Common Road and Suffolk Road in the proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward.

83 The LGCE also put forward a boundary amendment between the Borough Council's proposed Claydon and St Andrews wards. Having visited the area, it considered that Trafalgar Road East and Trafalgar Road West are residential streets with similar properties on each side, and that placing these properties entirely in one ward would better reflect community identities in this area. The LGCE therefore proposed that properties on the south side of Trafalgar Road West and Trafalgar Road East (to the west of Back Chapel Lane) be transferred to the proposed Claydon ward. From Trafalgar Road East, it proposed that the ward boundary run northwards on Back Chapel Lane to the junction of Garnham Road, High Road, and High Street, and then east to the River Yare. This would result in the inclusion of parts of Back Chapel Lane and High Street in St Andrews ward. The LGCE noted that these amendments would provide the same variance in Claydon ward as the Borough Council's proposals, and slightly improve electoral equality in St Andrews ward by 2006. Additionally, it proposed two minor boundary amendments between the proposed wards of Gorleston and St Andrews in

order to facilitate access to properties, as described in the following section, which would not affect electoral equality in the relevant wards.

84 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Claydon and St Andrews wards would have 3% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (equal to the average and 1% fewer by 2006). The proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward would have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the average (10% fewer than the average by 2006).

85 At Stage Three the Borough Council expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. Commenting on the proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward, it stated that it 'accepted your argumentation on electoral equality ... as the proposed development at Cobholm is still at outline approval stage only'. The Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group both expressed broad support for the draft recommendations, but put forward a boundary amendment between the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards. They considered that the boundary should run east along the A12 link road between the A12 roundabout and the Beccles Road/Southtown Road junction, as proposed by the Borough Council at Stage One, rather than along Common Road as proposed in the draft recommendations.

86 Both the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group argued that this 'natural' boundary would better reflect community identities and interests. Conversely, they considered that the LGCE's recommendations would 'provide a legacy of long-term difficulties' for affected electors in the proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward living to the south of the link road. It was argued that, following the construction of this road in 1984/1985, residents of Alpha Road, Beccles Road, Common Road and Suffolk Road no longer identified with the Southtown area to the north. Finally, both the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group supported comments made by Borough Council officers at Stage One regarding further electoral growth in its proposed Southtown & Cobholm ward. They stated that outline planning permission for new dwellings would lead 'in the foreseeable future' to an improvement in electoral equality in this area.

87 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the proposed St Andrews ward as final. We are satisfied that this ward would provide good electoral equality, reflect community identities and interests, and provide effective and convenient local government. We also concur with the LGCE that our proposals in this area cannot take into account the possibility of additional electorate growth in Southtown & Cobholm by 2006, which cannot be confirmed by the Borough Council at this time. We further note that the Borough Council accepted this view at Stage Three.

88 However, we have decided to move away from the draft recommendations and modify the boundary between the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards. Further evidence received would indicate that the LGCE's proposed boundary would not reflect community identities and interests in this area. Rather, the A12 link road, acknowledged as an effective and convenient boundary, is considered to separate communities in this part of the town. We are therefore proposing to move away from the draft recommendations in this area and adopt the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group's proposed boundary, in order to provide a better balance between the statutory criteria, despite the resulting slight over-representation of Southtown & Cobholm ward. We note that this would also lead to a slight increase in electoral variance in the proposed Claydon ward, but are content that this ward would continue to have good electoral equality both now and in 2006.

89 Under our final recommendations, the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards would have 5% more and 10% fewer electors per councillor than the average number of electors per councillor respectively (2% more and 13% fewer than the average by 2006). Our

final recommendation for the proposed St Andrews ward would provide the same level of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Gorleston, Magdalen East and Magdalen West wards

90 The wards of Gorleston, Magdalen East and Magdalen West occupy the south of that part of Great Yarmouth town lying west of the River Yare and east of the parish of Bradwell. Each of the wards is represented by three councillors and is relatively over-represented both now and in 2006. Gorleston ward currently has 11% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (14% fewer than the average by 2006). Magdalen East and Magdalen West wards have 24% and 21% fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively (27% and 17% fewer than the average by 2006).

91 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed a revised two-member Gorleston ward. To the south, this proposed ward would include the Links Road/Warren Road area of Hopton-on-Sea parish, currently in Bradwell South & Hopton ward. It would also include part of Magdalen West ward situated to the south of James Paget Hospital and Woodfarm Lane, in which extensive residential development is anticipated by 2006. As previously stated, the Borough Council also proposed that Pier Gardens and parts of Beach Road and Pier Road would be transferred from the existing Gorleston ward to a revised St Andrews ward. Finally, amendments to the western boundary of Gorleston ward would result in the transfer of the area bounded by the A12, Bridge Road and properties on the west side of Victoria Road and Waunci Crescent to a new Magdalen ward.

92 The new three-member Magdalen ward proposed by the Borough Council would comprise the majority of the existing Magdalen East and Magdalen West wards. In addition to transfers to and from the revised Gorleston ward as described above, part of Magdalen East ward north of Magdalen Square and St Catherine's Way and part of Magdalen West ward north of Trinity Avenue would both be transferred to a revised Claydon ward (see the section on Claydon ward above for details).

93 The LGCE based its draft recommendations on these proposals, which it considered provided the best balance between the statutory criteria as well as facilitating the correct allocation of councillors for the town. It decided to put forward the Borough Council's proposed Magdalen ward for consultation, and noted that a combination of the existing Magdalen East and Magdalen West wards was also put forward in Councillor Castle's 30-member scheme.

94 While the LGCE noted the opposition of Hopton-on-Sea Parish Council to the inclusion of the northern part of the parish in Gorleston ward, it considered that maintaining the current boundary in this area of the borough would not reflect community identities and interests. The affected properties have limited direct access to Hopton-on-Sea town, but are contiguous with the southern part of Gorleston. The LGCE also noted that that the Borough Council's own consultation exercise indicated a measure of support for this proposal, and that Councillor Castle's 30-member scheme also entailed the inclusion of this area in his proposed Gorleston St Andrew ward.

95 The LGCE therefore decided to adopt the Borough Council's proposed Gorleston ward, subject to three minor amendments in order to facilitate access to properties, which would not adversely affect electoral equality. First, it proposed that several properties in Hopton-on-Sea parish on Sidegate Road, with good access to Gorleston via the A12 roundabout, should also be included in the proposed Gorleston ward. Second, on Cliff Hill the LGCE proposed moving the ward boundary from the centre of the road, south of the junction with Lower Cliff Road, in order to include properties on the east side in the proposed Gorleston ward. These properties are separated from the rest of the proposed St Andrews ward by a steep slope to the east and a break in residential properties to the north. Third, it also proposed including a number of

commercial properties at the northern end of Lower Esplanade in St Andrews ward, which it noted were easily accessed via Beach Road and Pier Gardens.

96 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Gorleston ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (4% more than the average by 2006). The proposed Magdalen ward would have 3% more electors per councillor than the borough average (1% more than the average by 2006).

97 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. We received no further comments, and have decided to confirm the LGCE's proposals in this area as final. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our proposals for this area are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton and Lothingland wards

98 The wards of Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton and Lothingland are situated to the west and south of the town of Great Yarmouth. Bradwell North ward is coterminous with the North ward of Bradwell parish, while Bradwell South & Hopton ward comprises the parish of Hopton-on-Sea and the South ward of Bradwell parish. Both wards are represented by two councillors. The three-member Lothingland ward comprises the parishes of Belton with Browston, Burgh Castle and Fritton & St Olaves. Both Bradwell North and Bradwell South & Hopton wards are significantly under-represented, with 78% and 69% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. Electoral equality is expected to deteriorate further over the next five years, and both wards are forecast to have 83% more electors per councillor than the average by 2006. Lothingland ward currently has 2% fewer electors per councillor than the average (5% fewer than the average by 2006).

99 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed to retain the existing warding pattern in this area, subject to changes in representation and several minor boundary amendments. It proposed that Bradwell North and Bradwell South & Hopton wards each gain an additional councillor and become three-member wards, and that Lothingland become a two-member ward in view of the proposed reduction in council size. The Borough Council also proposed that Bradwell Avenue, Lilac Close and parts of Beccles Road and Mill Lane be transferred from Bradwell North ward to Bradwell South & Hopton ward. As previously discussed, its proposed Gorleston ward would also include the northern part of Hopton-on-Sea parish.

100 Although the Borough Council recognised that its proposed Lothingland ward would be relatively under-represented, it opposed the alternative proposal by Bradwell Parish Council to transfer Burgh Castle parish to Bradwell North ward. The Borough Council argued that the existing link between Belton and Burgh Castle parishes should be retained on the grounds of community identity, stating that 'geographically Burgh Castle, spread out as it is, is located closer to the heart of Belton, being reliant on it for schools and local shopping. There is little obvious boundary between the southern part of Burgh Castle and the northern part of Belton. Both villages are home to major holiday sites.'

101 The LGCE based its draft recommendations on the Borough Council's proposals, retaining the existing Lothingland ward without modification, albeit represented by two members. It considered that Bradwell Parish Council's proposals would provide better electoral equality for this part of the borough, and would also enable the remaining parishes in the south (Belton with Browston, Fritton & St Olaves and Hopton-on-Sea) to form a three-member ward with a low electoral variance. However, the LGCE also considered that community identities in the existing Lothingland ward outweighed the electoral imbalance caused by the Borough Council's proposals, and that Bradwell, despite being parished, effectively forms part of the Great Yarmouth urban area. Burgh Castle, conversely, is a comparatively small rural village,

and the LGCE concurred with the view expressed by the Borough Council that it is strongly linked socially, geographically and historically to the town of Belton to its south. It noted that while the Borough Council's own consultation exercise indicated a lack of consensus, with support for Bradwell Parish Council's proposal coming from Bradwell, the proposed retention of Lothingland ward would appear to reflect the preference of its constituent parishes.

102 Consequently, the LGCE also decided to adopt the Borough Council's proposed wards of Bradwell North and Bradwell South & Hopton. It noted that these proposals would provide an improved allocation of councillors for this part of the borough. As Bradwell Parish Council's proposed boundary amendments between Bradwell North and Bradwell South wards assumed the inclusion of Burgh Castle parish in Bradwell North, the LGCE stated that it had been unable to give them further consideration. It considered that a combination of Bradwell and the small town of Hopton-on-Sea would link parishes situated on the urban or semi-urban periphery of Great Yarmouth, which had more in common with each other than with the more rural parishes to the east. While the LGCE noted the preference of Hopton-on-Sea Parish Council for a single-member ward coterminous with the parish, under a 39-member council this would lead to its under-representation. As discussed in the preceding section, the LGCE also proposed to include the northern part of the parish in the Borough Council's proposed Gorleston ward in order to better reflect community identities and interests in this area, subject to a minor amendment.

103 The LGCE also noted a number of boundary anomalies between Bradwell parish and Great Yarmouth. These included the division of properties on Burgh Road, Headington Close and Oriel Avenue between the parish and the unparished area. The LGCE also noted the lack of direct access from Bunnewell Avenue, Ecclestone Close and Leach Close, situated within the parish, to Bradwell town, except via Great Yarmouth. It stated that had no power to recommend changes to parish boundaries, and suggested that these anomalies might be corrected at some future point. Such a parish review lies within the Borough Council's remit under the 1997 Local Government and Rating Act.

104 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations, the proposed Bradwell North ward (comprising the revised Bradwell North ward of Bradwell parish) and Bradwell South & Hopton ward (comprising the revised Bradwell North ward of Bradwell parish and the South ward of Hopton-on-Sea) would have 6% and 11% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (both 4% fewer than the average by 2006). The proposed Lothingland ward (comprising the parishes of Belton with Browston, Burgh Castle and Fritton & St Olaves) would have 19% more electors per councillor than the average (15% more by 2006).

105 At Stage Three the Borough Council, the Labour Party and the County Council Labour Group expressed broad support for the draft recommendations. Bradwell Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations in this area and provided further evidence in support of its Stage One proposals, which it considered would provide better electoral equality than the draft recommendations. These would entail combining the northern part of Bradwell parish and the parish of Burgh Castle to form a three-member Bradwell North ward. The remainder of Bradwell parish would form a two-member Bradwell South ward without Hopton-on-Sea parish.

106 The Parish Council considered the view expressed by the LGCE, that Burgh Castle was more closely linked to the town of Belton, to be 'somewhat flawed'. It argued that ties also existed with Bradwell, as Burgh Castle residents used its schools, shops and services, drove to Great Yarmouth via Bradwell and also worked there. The Parish Council further considered that the two parishes were linked by clubs and other social organisations, and that prior to 1960 many Bradwell families were linked to those in Burgh Castle by marriage. It stated that it had little in common with Hopton-on-Sea, comparing its 'residential and holiday' character with 'residential and industrial' Bradwell. Under Bradwell Parish Council's proposals, Bradwell North and Bradwell South wards would have 3% and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (1% fewer and 3% more than the average by 2006).

107 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendation for the proposed wards of Bradwell North, Bradwell South & Hopton and Lothingland as final. We note that Bradwell Parish Council supported its proposal to combine the northern part of Bradwell parish with that of Burgh Castle by providing evidence of links between the two communities. We acknowledge these ties, but consider nonetheless that the draft recommendations best reflect the statutory criteria in this part of the borough, despite the slight under-representation of the proposed Lothingland ward.

108 In particular, we consider that the Parish Council's proposals would, by dividing the southern part of Burgh Castle from the almost contiguous town of Belton, neither reflect community identities and interests in this area nor promote effective and convenient local government. We further note that the Borough Council's Stage One consultation indicated that the other affected parish councils opposed Bradwell Parish Council's scheme, expressing a preference for the retention of the existing Lothingland ward. We also concur with the LGCE that there is a difference in character between Burgh Castle and Bradwell, which effectively forms part of the Great Yarmouth urban area. We do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence to overcome these reservations and depart from the draft recommendations.

109 We note that Bradwell Parish Council argued that the linkage of the parishes of Bradwell and Hopton-on-Sea for borough warding purposes does not reflect the community identities and interests of either parish. However, we do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence to support this assertion. Further, as stated in the draft recommendations, the number of warding options in the parished south of the borough that would meet the objectives of the review is, in our judgement, very limited. Taking this constraint into account, and having decided that the retention of the existing Lothingland ward would best meet the statutory criteria in this part of the borough, we have therefore decided to put forward the LGCE's proposed Bradwell North and Bradwell South & Hopton wards without amendment as part of our final recommendations. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations, and are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Electoral cycle

110 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

111 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 Great Yarmouth town we propose that the boundary between the proposed Claydon and Southtown & Cobholm wards be amended to follow the A12 link road, having been persuaded by further evidence that this boundary would better reflect community identities and interests in this area and provide more effective and convenient local government;
- we propose changing the name of the proposed Yarmouth Central ward to Central & Northgate ward.

112 We conclude that, in Great Yarmouth:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 48 to 39;
- there should be 17 wards, four fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 18 of the existing wards should be modified.

113 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	48	39	48	39
Number of wards	21	17	21	17
Average number of electors per councillor	1,455	1,791	1,481	1,823
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	18	2	19	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	10	0	10	0

114 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 18 to 2, with no wards varying by more than 20% from the borough average. This level of electoral equality would continue in 2006, with only two wards, Lothingland and Southtown & Cobholm, varying by more than 10% from the average, at 15% and 13% respectively. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final recommendation

Great Yarmouth Borough Council should comprise 39 councillors serving 17 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 council electoral arrangements

115 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 borough wards, it should also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. In the LGCE's draft recommendations report it proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for the parishes of Bradwell, Caister-on-Sea and Hopton-on-Sea to reflect the proposed borough wards. At the request of the Borough Council, it also proposed increasing the number of councillors representing the parish of Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby.

116 The parish of Bradwell is currently served by 15 councillors representing two wards: North ward, represented by 10 councillors, and South ward, represented by five councillors. At Stage One Bradwell Parish Council proposed increasing the number of parish councillors by one, to 16. It proposed that North parish ward be renamed Bradwell North and be served by nine councillors, and South parish ward be renamed Bradwell South and be served by seven councillors. The Parish Council proposed that the boundary between the parish wards be modified to reflect the boundary between its proposed borough wards of Bradwell North and Bradwell South. While the Borough Council put forward its own Bradwell North and Bradwell South borough wards for this area, it supported the Parish Council's proposals for its own arrangements.

117 The LGCE decided to adopt the increase in representation and revised parish ward names proposed by the Parish Council. However, as part of the draft recommendations, it put forward the Borough Council's proposed borough wards of Bradwell North and Bradwell South & Hopton, rather than the Parish Council's scheme. The LGCE therefore proposed to modify the boundaries between the parish wards to reflect these new borough warding arrangements. As the distribution of parish councillors proposed by the Parish Council would no longer be equitable under these circumstances, it also proposed that Bradwell North parish ward continue to be represented by 10 councillors, and that the representation of Bradwell South parish ward be increased from five to six councillors.

118 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Bradwell Parish Council stated that its proposed increase in the number of parish councillors, from 15 to 16, was contingent upon the acceptance of its borough warding proposals. Should these proposals not be adopted, it expressed a preference for the retention of 15 parish councillors. To obtain a more equal allocation of parish councillors, the Parish Council proposed that Bradwell North parish ward be served by nine councillors and Bradwell South parish ward by six councillors.

119 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed borough wards in the area, we have decided to confirm the proposed Bradwell North and Bradwell South parish wards as final. However, we are adopting Bradwell Parish Council's further proposals for a redistribution of parish councillors based on the existing parish council size.

Final recommendation

Bradwell Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bradwell North (returning nine councillors) and Bradwell South (returning six councillors). The parish ward boundary between the two wards should reflect the proposed borough ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

120 The parish of Caister-on-Sea is currently served by 15 councillors representing two wards: North ward, represented by seven councillors, and South ward, represented by eight councillors. In the light of the draft recommendations, the LGCE proposed to modify the boundaries between the parish wards to reflect the new borough warding. Further, it also proposed to modify the level of representation of North ward to reflect more accurately the distribution of the parish electorate. It proposed that both North and South wards be served by eight councillors, increasing the number of parish councillors from 15 to 16.

121 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, no further comments were received from the Borough Council or the Parish Council. Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Caister-on-Sea parish as final.

Final recommendation

Caister-on-Sea Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, one more than at present, representing two wards: North and South, each returning eight councillors. The parish ward boundary between the two wards should reflect the proposed borough ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

122 The parish of Hopton-on-Sea is currently served by 11 councillors and is not warded. In the light of the draft recommendations, the LGCE proposed to create two new parish wards, North ward and South ward, to facilitate the division of the parish between the proposed Bradwell South & Hopton and Gorleston borough wards. The boundary between the proposed North and South wards should reflect the borough ward boundary. The LGCE proposed that the new North ward should return one councillor and the new South ward should return 10 councillors.

123 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, no further comments were received from the Borough Council or the Parish Council. Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Hopton-on-Sea parish as final.

Final recommendation

Hopton-on-Sea Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: North (returning one councillor) and South (returning 10 councillors). The parish ward boundary between the two wards should reflect the proposed borough ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

124 The parish of Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby is currently served by 13 councillors and divided into two parish wards, Ormesby ward, represented by eight councillors, and Scratby ward, represented by five councillors. Having conducted its own consultation exercise with parish councils, the Borough Council proposed at Stage One that Ormesby parish ward should be served by 10 councillors, instead of the current eight, thereby increasing the total number of councillors on the Parish Council from 13 to 15. The LGCE stated that, as its proposed borough warding arrangements would result in no change to this area, it was content to put forward this proposal as part of its draft recommendations.

125 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby Parish Council stated that it supported the proposed increase in the number of parish councillors. Having considered all the evidence received, we confirm the draft recommendation for Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby parish as final.

Final recommendation

Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, instead of the current 13, representing two wards: Ormesby (returning 10 councillors) and Scratby (returning five councillors).

Map 2: Final recommendations for Great Yarmouth

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

126 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in Great Yarmouth 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).

127 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 10 September 2002.

128 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

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

APPENDIX A

Final recommendations for Great Yarmouth: Detailed mapping

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

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

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the proposed warding arrangements for Great Yarmouth.

Map A1: Final recommendations for Great Yarmouth: Key map