

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
North Cornwall in Cornwall

November 2001

© Crown Copyright 2001

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

page

WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?	v
SUMMARY	vii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	5
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	11
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	13
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	27
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for North Cornwall: Detailed Mapping	29
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	33

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

WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Commission:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

SUMMARY

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

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

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

- **in 16 of the 27 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and seven wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 16 wards and by more than 20 per cent in six wards.**

Our main proposals for North Cornwall's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 69-70) are that:

- **North Cornwall District Council should have 36 councillors, two fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 23 wards, instead of 27 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net decrease of four, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In all of the proposed wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue with the number of electors per councillor in none of our proposed wards expected to vary by more than nine per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the re-distribution of councillors for the parishes of Bodmin and Bude-Stratton;**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 27 November 2001. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission which, subject to Parliamentary approval, with effect from 1 April 2002 will be responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 28 January 2001:

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

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

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Allan	1	the parishes of Egloshayle, St Breock, St Mabyn and St Tudy	Map 2
2	Altarnun	1	the parishes of Altarnun, North Hill and St Clether	Map 2
3	Blisland & St Breward	1	the parishes of Blisland, Cardinham, Helland and St Breward	Map 2
4	Bodmin St Mary's	3	part of Bodmin parish (the proposed St Mary's parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
5	Bodmin St Petroc	3	part of Bodmin parish (the proposed St Petroc parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
6	Bude	2	part of Bude-Stratton parish (the proposed Bude parish ward)	Map 2 and large map
7	Camelford	1	the parish of Camelford	Map 2
8	Camelot	2	the parishes of Michaelstow, St Teath and Tintagel	Map 2
9	Grenville	1	the parishes of Morwenstow and Kilkhampton	Map 2
10	Lanivet	1	the parishes of Lanhydrock, Lanivet and Withiel	Map 2
11	Launceston	3	the parish of Launceston	Map 2
12	Marhamchurch	1	the parishes of Launcells, Marhamchurch and Poundstock	Map 2
13	North Petherwin	1	the parishes of North Petherwin, St Stephens by Launceston Rural, St Thomas the Apostle Rural and Werrington	Map 2
14	Padstow & District	3	the parishes of Padstow, St Ervan, St Eval, St Issey and St Merryn	Map 2
15	St Endellion & St Kew	1	the parishes of St Endellion and St Kew	Map 2
16	St Minver	1	<i>Unchanged</i> the parishes of St Minver Highlands and St Minver Lowlands	Map 2
17	South Petherwin	1	the parishes of Lawhitton, Lewannick, South Petherwin and Trewen	Map 2
18	Stokeclimlsland	1	<i>Unchanged</i> the parishes of Lezant and Stokeclimlsland	Map 2
19	Stratton	2	part of the parish of Bude-Stratton (the proposed Stratton parish ward)	Map 2 and large map
20	Tremaine	1	the parishes of Advent, Davidstow, Egloskerry, Laneast, Otterham, Tremaine, Treneglos, Tresmeer and Warbstow	Map 2
21	Valency	1	the parishes of Forrabury & Minster, Lesnewth, St Gennys, St Juliot and Trevalga	Map 2

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
22	Wadebridge	3	the parish of Wadebridge	Map 2
23	Week St Mary & Whitstone	1	the parishes of Boyton, Jacobstow, North Tamerton, Week St Mary and Whitstone	Map 2

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and Maps A1-A2 in Appendix A.

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for North Cornwall

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 Allan	1	1,846	1,846	6	1,919	1,919	5
2 Altarnum	1	1,655	1,655	-5	1,726	1,726	-6
3 Blisland & St Breward	1	1,900	1,900	9	1,978	1,978	8
4 Bodmin St Mary's	3	4,728	1,576	-10	5,169	1,723	-6
5 Bodmin St Petroc	3	4,921	1,640	-6	5,283	1,761	-4
6 Bude	2	3,496	1,748	0	3,708	1,854	1
7 Camelford	1	1,819	1,819	4	1,903	1,903	4
8 Camelot	2	3,431	1,716	-2	3,580	1,790	-2
9 Grenville	1	1,584	1,584	-9	1,669	1,669	-9
10 Lanivet	1	1,890	1,890	8	1,937	1,937	6
11 Launceston	3	5,371	1,790	2	5,621	1,874	2
12 Marhamchurch	1	1,788	1,788	2	1,852	1,852	1
13 North Petherwin	1	1,873	1,873	7	1,893	1,893	3
14 Padstow & District	3	5,126	1,709	-2	5,316	1,772	-3
15 St Endellion & St Kew	1	1,789	1,789	2	1,818	1,818	-1
16 St Minver	1	1,931	1,931	10	1,978	1,978	8
17 South Petherwin	1	1,800	1,800	3	1,856	1,856	2
18 Stokeclimsland	1	1,896	1,896	8	1,921	1,921	5
19 Stratton	2	3,759	1,880	8	3,815	1,908	4
20 Tremaine	1	1,809	1,809	4	1,875	1,875	3
21 Valency	1	1,824	1,824	4	1,852	1,852	1
22 Wadebridge	3	4,893	1,631	-7	5,295	1,765	-4
23 Week St Mary & Whitstone	1	1,791	1,791	2	1,888	1,888	3
Totals	36	62,920	-	-	65,852	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,748	-	-	1,829	-

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

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

1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of North Cornwall. North Cornwall's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in December 1978 (Report no. 271). The electoral arrangements of Cornwall County Council were last reviewed in November 1983 (Report no. 456). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements in 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should

automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

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

Table 3: Stages of the Review

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

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

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

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

13 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 27 November 2001 and will end on 28 January 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

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

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

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The district of North Cornwall is situated in the north-east of the county. The area is predominantly rural in character and therefore the agricultural industry is of great importance. Virtually all of the coastline and Bodmin Moor are designated as areas of outstanding natural beauty and the district boasts a number of buildings of historic importance. The County Town of Bodmin serves as the centre of road communications in the district being connected to the A30 and A38 and being served by a mainline railway station, Bodmin Parkway. Covering some 119,521 hectares, and with a population of 81,000, North Cornwall has a population density of just under 1.5 people per hectare.

17 The district contains 65 parishes, and is completely parished. Bodmin town comprises 15 per cent of the district's total electorate.

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

19 The electorate of the district is 62,920 (February 2001). The Council presently has 38 members who are elected from 27 wards. Four of the wards are each represented by three councillors, three are each represented by two councillors and 20 are single-member wards. The whole council is elected every four years.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,656 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,733 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 16 of the 27 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, seven wards by more than 20 per cent and three wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Endellion ward where the councillor represents 44 per cent fewer electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in North Cornwall

Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Allan	1	1,321	1,321	-20	1,403	1,403	-19
2 Altarnun	1	2,247	2,247	36	2,322	2,322	34
3 Bodmin St Mary's	3	4,728	1,576	-5	4,888	1,629	-6
4 Bodmin St Petroc	3	4,921	1,640	-1	5,564	1,855	7
5 Bude & Poughill	3	5,945	1,982	20	6,135	2,045	18
6 Camelford	1	1,942	1,942	17	2,025	2,025	17
7 Grenville	1	2,032	2,032	23	2,121	2,121	22
8 Lanivet	1	1,760	1,760	6	1,805	1,805	4
9 Launceston North	2	3,162	1,581	-5	3,194	1,597	-8
10 Launceston South	2	2,209	1,105	-33	2,427	1,214	-30
11 Lesnewth	1	1,783	1,783	8	1,828	1,828	5
12 North Petherwin	1	1,561	1,561	-6	1,590	1,590	-8
13 Ottery	1	1,248	1,248	-25	1,314	1,314	-24
14 Padstow & St Merryn	2	3,646	1,823	10	3,739	1,870	8
15 Penfound	1	1,821	1,821	10	1,838	1,838	6
16 Rumford	1	1,480	1,480	-11	1,577	1,577	-9
17 South Petherwin	1	1,606	1,606	-3	1,650	1,650	-5
18 St Breward	1	1,415	1,415	-15	1,444	1,444	-17
19 St Endellion	1	929	929	-44	941	941	-46
20 St Minver	1	1,931	1,931	17	1,978	1,978	14
21 St Teath	1	1,825	1,825	10	1,923	1,923	11
22 Stokeclimsland	1	1,896	1,896	15	1,921	1,921	11

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 %
23 Stratton	1	1,310	1,310	-21	1,388	1,388	-20
24 Tintagel	1	1,443	1,443	-13	1,491	1,491	-14
25 Trigg	1	1,277	1,277	-23	1,337	1,337	-23
26 Wadebridge	3	5,779	1,926	16	6,183	2,061	19
27 Week St Mary	1	1,703	1,703	3	1,826	1,826	5
Totals	38	62,920	–	–	65,852	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,656	–	–	1,733	–

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in St Endellion ward were relatively over-represented by 44 per cent, while electors in Altarnun ward were relatively under-represented by 36 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

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

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

North Cornwall District Council

23 The District Council proposed a council of 36 members, two fewer than at present, serving 23 wards, compared to the existing 27. It proposed a mix of single and multi-member wards throughout the district.

24 Under the District Council's proposals, electoral equality would improve with all but one ward varying by no more than 10 per cent by 2006. Its proposed Bodmin St Mary's ward would vary by 11 per cent by 2006; however, it also submitted an alternative proposal for the ward which would secure an electoral variance of less than 10 per cent.

Parish and Town Councils

25 We received responses from 14 parish and town councils. Bude-Stratton Town Council supported the District Council's proposals for their area. St Mabyn Parish Council supported the District Council's proposed Allan ward. Michaelstow and St Tudy Parish Councils objected to the District Council's proposals in their areas and proposed alternative warding arrangements. St Ervan and St Issey Parish Councils objected to the District Council's proposed Padstow & District ward, St Ervan proposing that the current Rumford ward be maintained. Boyton and North Petherwin Parish Councils proposed that the current arrangements in their areas be maintained. The parish councils of Altarnun and St Eval commented on their parishing arrangements. Launceston Town Council commented on development in its area. The parish councils of Forrabury & Minster, St Breward and St Kew proposed ward name changes. We received one further submission from a local resident, stating that the urban areas of the district were currently under-represented.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

Electorate Forecasts

31 The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 5 per cent from 62,920 to 65,852 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Bodmin. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates.

32 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having looked at the District Council’s figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council Size

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

34 North Cornwall District Council presently has 38 members. The District Council proposed a council of 36 members. It stated that it felt that 36 members was “sufficient to service the interests of this community”. No other representations were received on council size.

35 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 36 members.

Electoral Arrangements

36 We have given careful consideration to the views which we received during Stage One, including the district-wide scheme received from the District Council. We note that there is limited opposition to the District Council’s scheme as a whole and that the majority of the opposition concerns its proposed ward names. We also note that the District Council’s scheme avoids the need for parish warding and that it secures a good level of electoral equality across the district. Therefore, we propose adopting the Council’s scheme, subject to a number of ward name changes. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Allan, Padstow & St Merryn, Rumford, St Endellion, St Minver and Wadebridge wards;
- (b) Bodmin St Mary’s, Bodmin St Petroc, Lanivet, St Breward and Trigg wards;
- (c) Camelford, Lesnewth, Ottery, Penfound, St Teath and Tintagel wards;
- (d) Bude & Poughill, Grenville, Stratton and Week St Mary wards;
- (e) Altarnun, Launceston North, Launceston South, North Petherwin, South Petherwin and Stokeclimsland wards.

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

Allan, Padstow & St Merryn, Rumford, St Endellion, St Minver and Wadebridge wards

38 These six wards are situated in the south-west of the district. Allan ward, comprising the parishes of St Kew and St Mabyn, is represented by a single councillor and currently has 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (19 per cent fewer in 2006). Padstow & St Merryn ward, comprising the parishes of Padstow and St Merryn, is represented by two councillors and has 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (8 per cent more in 2006). Rumford ward, comprising the parishes of St Ervan, St Eval and St Issey, is represented by a single councillor and has 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (9 per cent fewer in 2006). St Endellion ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is represented by a single councillor and has 44 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (46 per

cent fewer in 2006). St Minver ward, comprising the parishes of St Minver Highlands and St Minver Lowlands, is represented by a single councillor and has 17 per cent more electors than the district average currently (14 per cent more in 2006). Wadebridge ward, comprising the parishes of Egloshayle, St Breock and Wadebridge, is represented by three councillors and has 16 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (19 per cent more in 2005).

39 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the wards of Padstow & St Merryn and Rumford be combined in a three-member Padstow & District ward. It proposed that the current single-member St Minver ward be maintained on its current boundaries. It proposed that the parishes of St Endellion and St Kew be combined in a single-member St Endellion ward, arguing that this combination was necessary as the current St Endellion ward would have 46 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. It proposed that the town of Wadebridge be represented in a three-member ward and that the parishes of Egloshayle and St Breock be combined with the parishes of St Mabyn and St Tudy to form a revised single-member Allan ward. Under the District Council's proposals its proposed Allan, Padstow & District, St Endellion, St Minver and Wadebridge wards would have 6 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 10 per cent more and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent more, 3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer, 8 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer in 2006).

40 The parish councils of St Ervan and St Issey both objected to the District Council's proposed Padstow & District ward. St Issey Parish Council argued that the "harbour town of Padstow has little in common with the rural parishes". St Mabyn Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals while St Tudy Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposed Allan ward, arguing that the parish has an affinity with the parishes of Michaelstow and St Mabyn, and that the parishes of Egloshayle and St Breock have "historically, geographically and socially nothing in common with St Tudy". It proposed that a ward should be based around the Bodmin Moor area and should include the parishes of Michaelstow, St Breward, St Mabyn and St Tudy. St Kew Parish Council objected to the proposed St Endellion ward name and proposed it be named St Endellion & St Kew or vice versa.

41 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note the objections of the parish councils of St Ervan and St Issey to the District Council's proposed Padstow & District ward and note that under a 36-member council the current Padstow & St Merryn ward would secure a good level of electoral equality by 2006, but that the current Rumford ward would have 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006. Having visited the area we are of the view that the composite areas of the ward share good links and that we could not justify such a large electoral imbalance in the area. We are of the view that the District Council's proposed Padstow & District ward secures a good level of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, and therefore we are content to endorse it as part of our draft recommendations. We have also considered the proposals of St Tudy Parish Council that it be combined in a ward with the parishes of Michaelstow, St Breward and St Mabyn. However, we cannot view any area in isolation and note that while its proposed ward would secure a good level of electoral equality it would seriously impact on the electoral equality in the surrounding wards. Therefore we are content to endorse the District Council's proposed Allan ward. We note the opposition of St Kew Parish Council to the proposed St Endellion ward name and note that the parishes of St Endellion and St Kew are of a similar size. We therefore propose that the District Council's proposed St Endellion ward be renamed St Endellion & St Kew ward in order to better reflect the composite parts of the ward. We note that the District Council's proposed Wadebridge ward unites the entire town in a single ward and are therefore content to endorse it as part of our draft recommendations.

42 Under our draft proposals, our proposed Allan ward (comprising the parishes of Egloshayle, St Breock, St Mabyn and St Tudy), Padstow & District ward (comprising the parishes of Padstow, St Ervan, St Eval, St Issey and St Merryn), St Endellion & St Kew ward (comprising the parishes of the same name), St Minver ward (comprising the parishes of St Minver Highlands and St Minver Lowlands) and Wadebridge ward (comprising the parish of the same name) would have 6 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 10 per cent more and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent more, 3 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer, 8 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer in 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Bodmin St Mary's, Bodmin St Petroc, Lanivet, St Breward and Trigg wards

43 These five wards are situated in the south-east of the district. Bodmin St Mary's ward, comprising St Mary's parish ward of Bodmin parish, is represented by three councillors and currently has 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent fewer in 2006). Bodmin St Petroc ward, comprising St Petroc parish ward of Bodmin parish, is represented by three councillors and has 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (7 per cent more in 2006). Lanivet ward, comprising the parishes of Lanivet and Withiel, is represented by a single councillor and has 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (4 per cent more in 2006). St Breward ward, comprising the parishes of Michaelstow, St Breward and St Tudy, is represented by a single councillor and has 15 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (17 per cent fewer in 2006). Trigg ward, comprising the parishes of Blisland, Cardinham, Helland and Lanhydrock, is represented by a single councillor and has 23 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (23 per cent fewer in 2006).

44 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the current Bodmin St Mary's and Bodmin St Petroc wards be maintained on their current boundaries. However, under a 36-member council its proposed Bodmin St Mary's ward would have 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor by 2006, therefore, it also proposed an alternative warding arrangement in the town. It proposed that the current boundary along Copshorn Road in the north of the town be maintained but that it run south-east along Bodiniel Road and Berrycombe Road as far as the A389, where it proposed it then run west along Dennison Road, before running south between the Finn VC Estate as far as Lower Bore Road where it would rejoin the existing boundary. It proposed that the properties numbered 1-38 on the Finn VC Estate be included within the proposed Bodmin St Mary's ward and that the properties numbered 39-56, Ranleigh Mews and the Ringway Flats be included within the proposed Bodmin St Petroc ward. It noted that this would reduce the electoral imbalance within Bodmin St Mary's ward to 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2006.

45 It also proposed that the parish of Lanhydrock be combined with the current Lanivet ward to form a new single-member Lanivet ward and that the parishes of Blisland, Cardinham, Helland and St Breward be combined to form a single-member Blisland ward. It stated that although its proposed Blisland ward would have 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006 it felt it was justified due to the rural nature of the ward and on the grounds of community identity.

46 Under the District Council's proposals, its proposed Bodmin St Mary's, Bodmin St Petroc, Blisland and Lanivet wards would have 10 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer, 9 per cent more and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (11 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 8 per cent more and 6 per cent more in 2006). Under the District Council's proposed amendments, its proposed

Bodmin St Mary's and Bodmin St Petroc wards would have 10 per cent fewer and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (6 per cent fewer and 4 per cent fewer in 2006).

47 St Breward Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposed Blisland ward name, arguing that the parish of St Breward has the largest electorate in the ward and that the current ward covering the area is called Trigg ward.

48 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We have noted the District Council's proposal that Bodmin St Mary's and Bodmin Petroc wards are maintained on their current boundaries, however, we also note that the proposed Bodmin St Mary's ward would have 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average in 2006. We are of the view that an electoral variance of 11 per cent in an urban area would have to be particularly well argued, however, we do not believe the argumentation to be sufficiently compelling to endorse these proposals in Bodmin town, certainly in the light of the alternative proposal. We note that the District Council's alternative proposals for the town would provide for a superior level of electoral equality while having regard for the statutory criteria. Therefore, we propose adopting the District Council's alternative configuration for its proposed Bodmin St Mary's and Bodmin Petroc wards. We also note that its proposed Lanivet and Blisland wards would combine parishes of a similar nature while securing an acceptable level of electoral equality. However, we note the opposition of St Breward Parish Council to the proposed Blisland ward name. We also note that St Breward is the largest parish in the proposed ward but that Blisland parish is the second largest and that it also forms the centre of the ward. Therefore we propose renaming the District Council's proposed Blisland ward as Blisland & St Breward ward.

49 Under a 36-member council our proposed Bodmin St Mary's ward, Bodmin St Petroc ward, Blisland & St Breward ward (comprising the parishes of Blisland, Cardinham, Helland and St Breward) and Lanivet ward (comprising the parishes of Lanhydrock, Lanivet and Withiel) would have 10 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer, 9 per cent more and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (6 per cent fewer, 4 per cent fewer, 8 per cent more and 6 per cent more in 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

Camelford, Lesnewth, Ottery, Penfound, St Teath and Tintagel wards

50 These six wards are situated along the eastern coast and centre of the district. Camelford ward, comprising the parishes of Advent and Camelford, is represented by a single councillor and currently has 17 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (17 per cent more in 2006). Lesnewth ward, comprising the parishes of Davidstow, Forrabury & Minster, Lesnewth, Otterham, St Clether, St Juliot and Trevalga, is represented by a single councillor and has 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent more in 2006). Ottery ward, comprising the parishes of Egloskerry, Laneast, Tremaine, Treneglos, Tresmeer, Trewen and Warbstow, is represented by a single councillor and has 25 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (24 per cent fewer in 2006). Penfound ward, comprising the parishes of Jacobstow, Poundstock and St Gennys, is represented by a single councillor and has 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (6 per cent more in 2006). St Teath ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is represented by a single councillor and has 10 per cent more electors than the district average currently (11 per cent more in 2006). Tintagel ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is represented by a single councillor and has 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (14 per cent fewer in 2006).

51 At Stage One the District Council proposed combining the parishes of Michaelstow, St Teath and Tintagel in a two-member Camelot ward. It proposed that the town of Camelford form a single member Camelford ward and that the parishes of Forrabury & Minster, Lesnewth, St Gennys, St Juliot and Trevalga be combined to form a single-member St Juliot ward. It proposed that the parishes of Advent, Davidstow, Egloskerry, Laneast, Otterham, Tremaine, Treneglos, Tresmeer and Warbstow be combined to form a single-member Tremaine ward.

52 Under the District Council's proposals, its proposed Camelford, Camelot, St Juliot and Tremaine wards would have 4 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer, 4 per cent more and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (4 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 3 per cent more in 2006).

53 Forrabury & Minster Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposed St Juliot ward name, arguing that it was one of the smaller parishes in the proposed ward. It proposed that it be renamed Valency ward after the river that runs through three of the parishes or that it be renamed Boscastle & District. Michaelstow Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposed Camelot ward, arguing that the parishes of St Teath and Tintagel are "heavily involved with the Tourist Trade", while the parish of Michaelstow was heavily agricultural. It stated that it would be better served as part of the proposed Blisland ward.

54 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note Michaelstow Parish Council's objection to the District Council's proposed Camelot ward but also note that were it to be combined with the District Council's proposed Blisland ward it would have a detrimental effect on electoral equality. Indeed, the proposed Blisland ward would have 17 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average in 2006. Although not ideal, we consider that Michaelstow parish shares adequate links with the parishes of St Teath and Tintagel and note that the alternative proposal would significantly impact on the electoral equality in the proposed Blisland ward. Therefore we are content to endorse the District Council's proposed Camelot ward as part of our draft recommendations. We are also content to endorse the District Council's proposed St Juliot ward. However, we have been persuaded to rename the ward Valency ward, as proposed by Forrabury & Minster Parish Council, but would be interested to hear from interested parties at Stage Three as to alternative names for the ward. We also note that the District Council's proposed Camelford and Tremaine wards secure good levels of electoral equality and propose endorsing both as part of our draft recommendations.

55 Under a 36-member council our proposed Camelford ward (comprising the parish of Camelford), Camelot ward (comprising the parishes of Michaelstow, St Teath and Tintagel), Tremaine ward (comprising the parishes of Advent, Davidstow, Egloskerry, Laneast, Otterham, Tremaine, Treneglos, Tresmeer and Warbstow) and Valency ward (comprising the parishes of Forrabury & Minster, Lesnewth, St Gennys, St Juliot and Trevalga) would have 4 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer, 4 per cent more and 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (4 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more and 1 per cent more in 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Bude & Poughill, Grenville, Stratton and Week St Mary wards

56 These four wards make up the northern region of the district. Bude & Poughill ward, comprising the parish wards of Bude and Poughill of Bude-Stratton Parish, is represented by three councillors and currently has 20 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (18 per cent more in 2006). Grenville ward, comprising the parishes of Morwenstow, Kilkhampton and Launcells, is represented by a single councillor and has 23 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (22 per cent more in 2006). Stratton ward, comprising the Stratton parish ward of Bude-Stratton Parish, is represented by a single councillor and has 21 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (20 per cent fewer in 2006). Week St Mary ward, comprising the parishes of Marhamchurch, Week St Mary, Whitstone, and North Tamerton, is represented by a single councillor and has 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent more in 2006).

57 At Stage One the District Council proposed that Bude-Stratton town be divided between a two-member Bude ward and a two-member Stratton ward. It proposed that Bude ward comprise Bude polling district (1-G) of the parish while its proposed Stratton ward comprise the Poughill and Stratton parish wards of the parish and the Flexbury polling district (2-G) of the parish. It argued that this would retain the community identities of the town. It proposed combining the parishes of Morwenstow and Kilkhampton to form a single-member Grenville ward and proposed combining the parishes of Launcells, Marhamchurch and Poundstock to form a single-member Marhamchurch ward. It also proposed combining the parishes of Week St Mary, Whitstone and North Tamerton with the parishes of Boyton and Jacobstow to form a single-member Whitstone ward.

58 Under the District Council's proposals, its proposed Bude, Stratton, Grenville, Marhamchurch and Whitstone wards would have equal to, 8 per cent more, 9 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (1 per cent more, 4 per cent more, 9 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more and 3 per cent more in 2006).

59 Bude-Stratton Town Council supported the District Council's proposed Bude and Stratton wards. Week St Mary Parish Council, in a representation submitted to the Commission by the District Council, supported the proposed warding arrangements, but objected to the District Council's proposed Whitstone ward name. Boyton Parish Council proposed that the current North Petherwin ward be maintained.

60 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note Boyton Parish Council's opposition to the District Council's proposed Whitstone ward, but note that maintaining the present warding arrangements for North Petherwin ward, under a 36-member council, would result in there being 11 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (13 per cent fewer in 2006) and would have a detrimental impact on the electoral equality of the District Council's proposed Whitstone ward, which would have 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (15 per cent in 2006). Given the high levels of electoral inequality that would result we are of the view that we cannot endorse Boyton Parish Council's proposals. We note Week St Mary Parish Council's objection to the proposed Whitstone ward name and have been persuaded that the name Week St Mary & Whitstone ward would better represent the ward, as it reflects the two largest parishes. However, we would be interested to hear from interested parties at Stage Three suggesting alternative names for the ward. Therefore we are content to endorse the District Council's proposed Whitstone ward as part of our draft recommendations subject to it being renamed Week St Mary & Whitstone

ward. We are also content to endorse the District Council's proposed wards of Bude and Stratton with minor amendments to the boundary between them to tie it to ground detail. We also note that the District Council's proposed Marhamchurch and Grenville wards secure good levels of electoral equality, while having regard to our statutory criteria and propose endorsing both as part of our draft recommendations.

61 Under a 36-member council our proposed Bude ward, Stratton ward, Week St Mary & Whitstone ward (comprising the parishes of Boyton, Jacobstow, North Tamerton, Week St Mary and Whitstone), and Grenville ward (comprising the parishes of Morwenstow and Kilkhampton) would have equal to, 8 per cent more, 2 per cent more and 9 per cent fewer electors per councillors than the district average currently (1 per cent more, 4 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 9 per cent fewer in 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Altarnun, Launceston North, Launceston South, North Petherwin, South Petherwin and Stokeclimsland wards

62 These six wards are situated on the south east border of the district. Altarnun ward, comprising the parishes of Altarnun, North Hill and Lewannick, is represented by a single councillor and currently has 36 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (34 per cent more in 2006). Launceston North ward, comprising the North parish ward of Launceston parish, is represented by two councillors and has 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than district average currently (8 per cent fewer in 2006). Launceston South ward, comprising the South parish ward of Launceston parish, is represented by two councillors and has 33 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (30 per cent fewer in 2006). North Petherwin ward, comprising the parishes of North Petherwin, Boyton, Werrington and St Stephens By Launceston Rural, is represented by a single councillor and has 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (8 per cent fewer by 2006). South Petherwin ward, comprising the parishes of South Petherwin, St Thomas the Apostle Rural and Lawhitton Rural, is represented by a single councillor and has 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average currently (5 per cent fewer by 2006). Stokeclimsland ward, comprising the parishes of Lezant and Stokeclimsland, is represented by a single councillor and has 15 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average currently (11 per cent more by 2006).

63 At Stage One the District Council proposed a single member Altarnun ward, combining the parishes of Altarnun, North Hill and St Clether. It proposed that the town of Launceston form a three member Launceston ward. It proposed a single member North Petherwin ward, combining the parishes of St Thomas the Apostle Rural, North Petherwin, St Stephens by Launceston Rural and Werrington. It proposed a single member South Petherwin ward, combining the parishes of Lewannick, Trewen, Lawhitton Rural and South Petherwin. It proposed maintaining the present warding arrangements for Stokeclimsland ward.

64 Under the District Council's proposals, its proposed Altarnun, Launceston, North Petherwin, South Petherwin and Stokeclimsland would have 5 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 7 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 8 per cent more than the district average currently (6 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 1 per cent more and 5 per cent more in 2006).

65 Launceston Town Council stated that it would "object to any proposal which would lead to a reduction in the number of (district) ward members", arguing that planned development in the present Launceston South ward would entitle Launceston to four district councillors.

66 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note Launceston Town Council's proposal to retain four district councillors in the town. However, the District Council stated that "although planning permission exists for a considerable number of new houses to be built in Launceston it is very unlikely that the majority of these will be completed and occupied by 2006." As stated in our *Guidance* we have to have regard to the five-year forecasts of electorate based on firm evidence and realistic expectations. Having considered the District Council's statement, we are content that they represent the best estimate that can be reasonably made at this time. Therefore we are content to endorse the proposed three-member Launceston ward as part of our draft recommendations. We are also content to endorse the proposed North Petherwin, South Petherwin and Stokeclimsland wards as they secure good levels of electoral equality, while having regard to our statutory criteria.

67 Under a 36-member council our proposed Altarnun ward (comprising the parishes of Altarnun, North Hill and St Clether), Launceston ward (comprising the parish of Launceston), North Petherwin ward (comprising the parishes of North Petherwin, Werrington, St Stephens by Launceston Rural and St Thomas the Apostle Rural), South Petherwin ward (comprising the parishes of South Petherwin, Lewannick, Trewen and Lawhitton Rural) and Stokeclimsland ward (comprising the parishes of Stokeclimsland and Lezant) would have 5 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 7 per cent more, 3 per cent more and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent fewer, 2 per cent more, 3 per cent more, 1 per cent more and 5 per cent more in 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

68 The District Council proposed that the present system of whole-council elections every four years be maintained. We received no other representations regarding the electoral cycle and therefore propose no change.

Conclusions

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

- there should be a reduction in council size from 38 to 36;
- there should be 23 wards;
- the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of four, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

70 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals subject to the following amendments:

- the proposed Blisland ward be renamed Blisland & St Breward ward;

- the proposed St Juliot ward be renamed Valency ward;
- the proposed Whitstone ward be renamed Week St Mary & Whitstone.

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

Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	38	36	38	36
Number of wards	27	23	27	23
Average number of electors per councillor	1,656	1,748	1,733	1,829
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	16	0	16	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	7	0	6	0

72 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for North Cornwall District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 16 to none. By 2005 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

Draft Recommendation

North Cornwall District Council should comprise 36 councillors serving 23 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

73 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Bodmin and Bude-Stratton to reflect the proposed district wards. We are proposing that Launceston town be represented in a single Launceston ward rather than two different wards as at

present. However, this will not impact on the current parish wards in the town and therefore we propose no change.

74 At Stage One St Eval Parish Council proposed that their parish be divided between two parish wards. It argued that properties originally occupied by RAF airmen and their families have gradually been sold into private ownership and that the area of the parish occupied by these properties would eventually become a complete private housing estate. It proposed that this estate become a parish ward whilst the “various hamlets in the parish” become another. We have carefully considered the submission of St Eval Parish Council and would have no objection in principle to its proposals. However, we would request more detailed proposals from both St Eval Parish Council and the District Council at Stage Three. We would ask that maps are provided as to the precise boundary between these two parish wards and would also request that more accurate figures be provided for both current and projected electorates.

75 The parish of Bodmin is currently served by 16 councillors representing two wards: St Mary’s and St Petroc, both returning eight councillors

76 In the light of our draft recommendations for district warding in Bodmin town, we propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to correspond with those of the district wards within the town.

Draft Recommendation

Bodmin Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: St Mary’s (returning eight councillors) and St Petroc (returning eight councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

77 Bude-Stratton Town Council is currently served by 18 councillors representing three wards: Bude returning nine councillors, Poughill returning three councillors and Stratton returning six councillors.

78 We propose that in the light of our proposed district warding arrangements, Bude-Stratton parish should comprise two parish wards: Bude returning nine councillors and Stratton returning nine councillors. We propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to correspond with those of the district wards within the town.

Draft Recommendation

Bude-Stratton Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bude and Stratton, each returning nine councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

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

Draft Recommendation

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

Map 2: Draft Recommendations for North Cornwall

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

80 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for North Cornwall contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 28 January 2002. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

81 Express your views by writing directly to us:

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for North Cornwall: Detailed Mapping

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

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

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Bodmin parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Bude-Stratton.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for North Cornwall: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Bodmin Parish

Appendix B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

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

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

Table B1: LGCE compliance with Code criteria

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