

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Caradon 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?	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Caradon: Detailed Mapping	<i>27</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>31</i>

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

WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Commission:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

SUMMARY

We began a review of Caradon'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 Caradon:

- **in 17 of the 30 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and eight wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 19 wards and by more than 20 per cent in 11 wards.**

Our main proposals for Caradon's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 78 - 79) are that:

- **Caradon District Council should have 42 councillors, one more than at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards, instead of 30 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of eight wards, and four wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **In 17 of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in 21 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Liskeard and Saltash.**
- **an increase in the number and redistribution of councillors serving Torpoint Town Council, and revised warding arrangements.**
- **a reduction in the number of councillors serving Pelynt Parish Council.**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for nine 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. It will also decide when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 28 January 2002:

**Review Manager
Caradon 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	Callington	3	<i>unchanged</i> - the parish of Callington	Map 2
2	Calstock	3	the parish of Calstock	Map 2
3	Dobwalls & District	2	the parishes of Dobwalls & Trewidland, Morval, St Keyne and St Pinnock	Map 2
4	Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny	2	the parishes of Duloe, Lanreath, Lansallos and Pelynt	Map 2
5	Fowey Moor	2	the parishes of St Cleer, St Neot and Warleggan	Map 2
6	Landrake & St Dominick	2	the parishes of Botusfleming, Landrake-with-St Erney, Landulph, Pillaton, St Dominick and St Mellion	Map 2
7	Lanteglos & St Veep	1	the parishes of Broadoak, Boconnoc, Lanteglos, St Veep and St Winnow	Map 2
8	Liskeard North	3	the proposed Liskeard North parish ward of Liskeard parish	Map A2
9	Liskeard South	2	the proposed Liskeard South parish ward of Liskeard parish	Map A2
10	Looe & St Martin	3	the parishes of Looe and St Martin-by-Looe	Map 2
11	Lynher	1	<i>unchanged</i> - the parishes of Linkinhorne and South Hill	Map 2
12	Menheniot & St Ive	2	the parishes of Menheniot and St Ive	Map 2
13	Millbrook	1	<i>unchanged</i> - the parish of Millbrook	Map 2
14	Rame Peninsular	1	the parishes of Antony, Maker with Rame and St John	Map 2
15	St Germans	1	the parishes of Quethiock and St Germans	Map 2
16	Saltash Burraton	2	the proposed Saltash Burraton parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
17	Saltash Essa	2	<i>unchanged</i> - Saltash Essa parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
18	Saltash Pill	2	the proposed Saltash Pill parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
19	Saltash St Stephens	2	the proposed Saltash St Stephens parish ward of Saltash parish	Large map
20	Torpoint East	2	the proposed Torpoint East parish ward of Torpoint parish	Large map
21	Torpoint West	2	the proposed Torpoint West parish ward of Torpoint parish	Large map
22	Whitsands	1	the parishes of Deviock and Sheviock	Map 2

Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.

2 The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 in Appendix A.

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Caradon

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 Callington	3	3,714	1,238	-19	4,651	1,550	-5
2 Calstock	3	4,899	1,633	7	5,144	1,715	5
3 Dobwalls & District	2	2,987	1,494	-2	3,054	1,527	-6
4 Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny	2	3,287	1,644	8	3,373	1,687	3
5 Fowey Moor	2	3,552	1,776	16	3,650	1,825	12
6 Landrake & St Dominick	2	3,277	1,639	7	3,411	1,706	4
7 Lanteglos & St Veep	1	1,610	1,610	5	1,694	1,694	4
8 Liskeard North	3	3,544	1,181	-23	4,686	1,562	-4
9 Liskeard South	2	3,098	1,549	1	3,223	1,612	-1
10 Looe & St Martin	3	4,560	1,520	0	4,812	1,604	-2
11 Lynher	1	1,635	1,635	7	1,673	1,673	2
12 Menheniot & St Ive	2	3,096	1,548	1	3,166	1,583	-3
13 Millbrook	1	1,648	1,648	8	1,741	1,741	7
14 Rame Peninsular	1	1,527	1,527	0	1,558	1,558	-5
15 St Germans	1	1,511	1,511	-1	1,551	1,551	-5
16 Saltash Burraton	2	3,151	1,576	3	3,151	1,576	-3
17 Saltash Essa	2	3,192	1,596	5	3,208	1,604	-2
18 Saltash Pill	2	2,500	1,250	-18	3,331	1,666	2
19 Saltash St Stephens	2	3,180	1,590	4	3,233	1,617	-1
20 Torpoint East	2	3,237	1,619	6	3,237	1,619	-1
21 Torpoint West	2	3,198	1,599	5	3,226	1,613	-1
22 Whitsands	1	1,718	1,718	13	1,792	1,792	10
Totals	42	64,121	-	-	68,565	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,527	-	-	1,633	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Caradon 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 Caradon 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 Caradon. Caradon's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in May 1979 (Report no. 375). 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 consider 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 Electoral Commission

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 Caradon District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Cornwall County Council, Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, the local authority associations, Cornwall Association of Parish and Town Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South West Region and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Caradon 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 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 decide 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 for England. 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 Caradon is located in south-east Cornwall, the most easterly of the six Cornish districts. It lies immediately across the River Tamar from the city of Plymouth. The district is entirely parished (41 in total), covers an area of 66,407 hectares and has a population of 76,516. The area has five principle settlements, the rural towns of Callington, Liskeard, Looe, Saltash and Torpoint. It has a strong rural character, with the Fowey, Lynher and Tamar rivers running down from deep wooded valleys through a farmed landscape to the coast. The four main supports for Caradon's economy are agriculture, tourism, defence and related industries, and the economy of Plymouth.

17 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'.

18 The electorate of the district is 64,121 (February 2001). The Council presently has 41 members who are elected from 30 wards, nine of which are relatively urban, with the remainder being mainly rural. Two of the wards are each represented by three councillors, seven are each represented by two councillors and 21 are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

19 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,564 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,672 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 17 of the 30 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, eight wards by more than 20 per cent and seven wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Cleer ward where the councillor represents 70 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Caradon

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 Burraton	2	4,121	2,061	32	4,800	2,400	44
2 Callington	2	3,714	1,857	19	4,651	2,326	39
3 Calstock & Harrowbarrow	1	1,872	1,872	20	1,914	1,914	14
4 Chilsworthy & Delaware	1	1,591	1,591	2	1,713	1,713	2
5 Dobwalls & Trewidland	1	1,553	1,553	-1	1,576	1,576	-6
6 Downderry	1	1,374	1,374	-12	1,438	1,438	-14
7 Essa	2	3,192	1,596	2	3,208	1,604	-4
8 Gunnislake	1	1,436	1,436	-8	1,517	1,517	-9
9 Landrake	1	1,874	1,874	20	1,960	1,960	17
10 Lansallos	1	1,354	1,354	-13	1,377	1,377	-18
11 Lanteglos	1	887	887	-43	927	927	-45
12 Liskeard North	2	3,349	1,675	7	4,491	2,246	34
13 Liskeard South	2	3,293	1,647	5	3,418	1,709	2
14 Looe	3	4,313	1,438	-8	4,549	1,516	-9
15 Lynher	1	1,635	1,635	5	1,673	1,673	0
16 Maker	1	844	844	-46	853	853	-49
17 Menheniot	1	1,477	1,477	-6	1,503	1,503	-10
18 Millbrook	1	1,648	1,648	5	1,741	1,741	4
19 Morval	1	1,452	1,452	-7	1,505	1,505	-10
20 Pill	2	2,592	1,296	-17	2,744	1,372	-18
21 St Cleer	1	2,651	2,651	70	2,701	2,701	62
22 St Dominick	1	1,403	1,403	-10	1,451	1,451	-13
23 St Germans	1	1,350	1,350	-14	1,390	1,390	-17
24 St Ive	1	1,780	1,780	14	1,824	1,824	9
25 St Neot & Warleggan	1	901	901	-42	949	949	-43
26 St Stephens	2	2,118	1,059	-32	2,171	1,086	-35
27 St Veep	1	1,237	1,237	-21	1,297	1,297	-22
28 Sheviock	1	1,274	1,274	-19	1,322	1,322	-21
29 Torpoint	3	6,435	2,145	37	6,463	2,154	29

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 %
30 Trelawny	1	1,401	1,401	-10	1,439	1,439	-14
Totals	41	64,121	–	–	68,565	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,564	–	–	1,672	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Caradon 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 Veep ward were relatively over-represented by -21 per cent, while electors in Torpoint ward were relatively under-represented by 37 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

20 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 Caradon District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

21 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 two submissions during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council, both of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

Caradon District Council

22 The District Council proposed a council of 42 members, one more than at present, serving 22 wards, compared to the existing 30. Its proposals for the district would provide for single- and multi-member district wards, comprising whole parishes. The Council proposed no change to the existing cycle of whole council elections. Under its proposals there would be significant improvement to the current high electoral variances, with only one ward having a variance of more than 10 per cent by 2006.

23 The District Council forwarded 17 responses to its proposals, from parish and town councils.

Parish and Town Councils

24 We received a submission from Saltash Town Council suggesting alternative warding arrangements for Saltash parish, which it argued would provide for better representation of the parish's rural area.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

25 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Caradon 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.

26 As described earlier, our primary aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Caradon 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”.

27 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.

28 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.

29 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

30 Since 1975 there has been just under a 30 per cent increase in the electorate of Caradon district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 6 per cent from 64,121 to 68,565 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in the wards of Callington, Liskeard North and Pill. 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.

31 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and have noted the relatively high projected increase in electorate in Caradon and across the Cornish districts. We have sought rigorous justification for these forecasts and are now satisfied that the District Council’s figures provide the best estimates that can be reasonably made at this time.

Council Size

32 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.

33 Caradon District Council presently has 41 members. The District Council proposed a council of 42 members, which it considered would “allow a better councillor/elector representation without altering the towns outer boundaries to take in neighbouring parishes which [...] have different interests to that of the towns.”

34 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 42 members. In particular, the increase of one in council size provides the correct distribution of councillors between the five more urban settlements and the rural area of Caradon.

Electoral Arrangements

35 We have given careful consideration to the views that we received during Stage One, including the district-wide scheme received from the District Council. We note that there is some support and limited opposition to the District Council’s scheme as a whole. We also note that the District Council’s scheme avoids the need for parish warding and that it secures improved levels of electoral equality across the district. Therefore, we propose adopting the Council’s scheme in its entirety, subject to some minor modifications to boundaries to tie them to ground detail, affecting no electors.

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

- (a) Saltash (four wards);
- (b) Liskeard (two wards);
- (c) Callington and Torpoint wards;
- (d) Looe ward;
- (e) Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware, Landrake, Gunnislake and St Dominick wards;
- (f) Menheniot, St Germans and St Ive wards;
- (g) Maker, Millbrook and Sheviock wards;
- (h) Dobwalls & Trewidland, Dowderry and Morval wards;
- (i) Lansallos, Lanteglos, St Veep and Trelawny wards;
- (j) Lynher, St Cleer and St Neot & Warleggan wards.

37 Details of our draft recommendations, including changes to district ward boundaries as a consequence of amended parish boundaries which have been approved by the Secretary of State and set out in The Caradon (Parishes and Electoral Changes) Order 2000 and The Parish of Torpoint (Wards) Order 2000, 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.

Saltash (four wards)

38 These four two-member wards are located in the east of the district and cover Saltash, the largest town in Caradon. Burraton ward is currently 32 per cent under-represented (44 per cent by 2006). Essa ward is currently 2 per cent under-represented (4 per cent over-represented by 2006). Pill ward is currently 17 per cent over-represented (18 per cent by 2006). St Stephens ward is currently 32 per cent over-represented (35 per cent by 2006).

39 Under the District Council's proposals there would be no change to Essa ward, while Burraton, Pill and St Stephens wards would be subject to some modifications. The District Council proposed a modified Burraton ward, additionally including Homer Park, currently in Pill ward, but excluding the area south of Prospect Lane and west of Fairmead Road, and the area of development to the south-east of Saltash Industrial Estate. The area of development would then form part of an enlarged Pill ward, while the area to the south and west of Prospect Lane and Fairmead Road would be included in a modified St Stephens ward. The District Council also proposed prefixing all the wards with 'Saltash'. Saltash Burraton ward would be 3 per cent under-represented (3 per cent over-represented by 2006). Saltash Essa ward would be 5 per cent under-represented (2 per cent over-represented by 2006). Saltash Pill ward would be 18 per cent over-represented (2 per cent under-represented by 2006). Saltash St Stephens ward would be 4 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006).

40 We have carefully considered the evidence received during Stage One. We have examined alternative warding arrangements to better represent the rural areas, as proposed by Saltash Town Council. Its proposal sought "to maintain St Stephens ward as a predominantly rural ward." However, we consider there is insufficient evidence to justify the poor levels of electoral equality that this would produce, particularly the resulting 17 per cent over-representation for Saltash St Stephens by 2006. We have examined the possibility of a rural single-member ward, but consider that there are insufficient electors in the rural part of the parish to warrant a whole councillor.

41 We are aware that the under District Council's proposals Saltash Pill ward would initially be significantly over-represented. However, substantial housing developments would significantly reduce this imbalance by 2006. We have examined a number of alternative arrangements to reduce the 2001 imbalance, but these would significantly worsen electoral equality in 2006. We are therefore endorsing the District Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations, subject to a minor alteration to tie the Saltash Burraton/Saltash St Stephens boundary to ground detail. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Liskeard (two wards)

42 The two two-member wards of Liskeard North and Liskeard South cover Liskeard town and are currently 7 per cent under-represented (34 per cent by 2006) and 5 per cent under-represented (2 per cent by 2006), respectively.

43 The District Council proposed that Liskeard North ward should be represented by an additional third councillor, while Liskeard South ward would remain a two-member ward. It

also proposed that the Plymouth Road continue to be utilised as the boundary between Liskeard North ward and Liskeard South ward, but that it be extended south-east, to the roundabout and junction with Liskerrett Road and Charter Way. The wards of Liskeard North and Liskeard South would be 23 per cent over-represented (4 per cent by 2006) and 1 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006), respectively. Liskeard Town Council supported the proposed allocation of an additional councillor to Liskeard North ward. We did not receive any other comments concerning these proposals.

44 Under these proposals Liskeard North ward would initially be significantly over-represented, but substantial housing developments, planned for a number of sites, would reduce this imbalance by 2006. We have examined a number of alternative arrangements to reduce the 2001 variances, but these would significantly worsen the electoral equality in 2006. Following careful consideration of the evidence, we propose endorsing the District Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2 and Map A2.

Callington and Torpoint wards

45 These two wards represent relatively urban areas of the district. The two-member Callington ward comprises the parish of the same name and is currently 19 per cent under-represented (39 per cent by 2006). Torpoint ward has three councillors and comprises the parish of the same name. It is currently 37 per cent under-represented (29 per cent by 2006).

46 The District Council proposed that Callington ward should be represented by an additional third member, but did not propose any change to its boundaries. It further proposed that area of Torpoint parish should be represented by an additional fourth councillor and be divided into two two-member district wards, generally using the parish ward boundary which is due to come into effect in 2003, under the Parish of Torpoint (Wards) Order 2000. It proposed a slight amendment to the boundary line in the south of the ward. This would create two two-member wards of Torpoint East and Torpoint West.

47 Under this scheme, Callington ward would be 19 per cent over-represented (5 per cent by 2006), while the wards of Torpoint East and Torpoint West would be 6 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006) and 5 per cent under-represented (1 per cent over-represented by 2006), respectively.

48 Callington Town Council supported the proposed allocation of an additional councillor. Torpoint Town Council supported the addition of an extra councillor and the proposed arrangements for warding, which had already been subject to detailed consultation during the 1998 parish boundary review.

49 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We are of the view that the District Council's proposed Callington, Torpoint East and Torpoint West wards secure 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, subject to two minor amendments. In consultation with Ordnance Survey, we propose a minor modification to include 33 Trevol Road and 93 Carbeile Road in Torpoint East, to provide a better, clearer boundary. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as

under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2. The recommendations for Torpoint are also illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Looe ward

50 Looe is a three-member ward situated on the south coast, comprising the parish of the same name. It is currently 8 per cent over-represented (9 per cent by 2006).

51 The District Council proposed combining Looe parish with St Martin-by-Looe parish (currently combined with Deviock parish in Donderry ward) to create a three-member Looe & St Martin ward, which would have a variance of zero per cent, but would be 2 per cent over-represented by 2006. The District Council's proposals for the remainder of Donderry ward are discussed below.

52 Looe Town Council supported the District Council's proposal to combine it with St Martin-by-Looe; however, St Martin-by-Looe and Deviock parish councils both objected to the proposals. St Martin-by-Looe parish council argued that "the interests of the parish [...] will not be served by linking such a rural area, with the heavily commercialised town of Looe". It added "rural issues that are important to the Council will not be so important when weighted against the issues that will affect the town of Looe." Deviock parish proposed no change to the area, stating that under the District Council's proposals "there is a real danger of St Martin being overwhelmed and largely ignored."

53 We have carefully considered the evidence received during Stage One. We note the objections of St Martin-by-Looe and Deviock parish councils, however, we cannot consider any area in isolation, but must consider the district as a whole. Looe ward currently merits between two and three councillors. Therefore, our options have been to create a three-member ward comprising Looe parish and some surrounding areas, or to create a two-member ward for only part of Looe, necessitating the creation of parish wards. We consider the only suitable boundary that would reflect community identity is the river Looe, but as this would not result in acceptable electoral variances, we have rejected this option. We consider that the District Council's proposals provide for improved levels of electoral equality for this area as a whole, without the need for parish warding. Therefore, we propose adopting the District Council's scheme for the proposed Looe & St Martin ward. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware, Landrake, Gunnislake and St Dominick wards

54 These five single-member wards are situated in the north-east of the district. Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware and Gunnislake wards cover the parish of Calstock. Calstock & Harrowbarrow ward is currently 20 per cent under-represented (14 per cent by 2006), Chilsworthy & Delaware ward is currently 2 per cent under-represented (2 per cent by 2006), while Gunnislake ward is currently 8 per cent over-represented (9 per cent by 2006). Landrake ward comprises the parishes of Botusfleming, Landrake-with-St Erney and Landulph, and is currently 20 per cent under-represented (17 per cent by 2006). St Dominick

ward comprises the parishes of Pillaton, St Dominick and St Mellion and is currently 10 per cent over-represented (13 per cent by 2006).

55 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the three single-member wards of Calstock & Harrowbarrow, Chilsworthy & Delaware and Gunnislake should be combined in a new three-member Calstock ward. It also proposed combining the wards of St Dominick and Landrake to form a two-member Landrake & St Dominick ward. Under these proposals, Calstock ward would be 7 per cent under-represented (5 per cent by 2006) and Landrake & St Dominick ward would be 7 per cent under-represented (4 per cent by 2006).

56 Calstock Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposed Calstock ward "given the scattered communities that members represent." St Dominick Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposed Landrake & St Dominick ward, questioning the District Council's figures for planning applications in St Mellion parish. No other submissions were received concerning these wards.

57 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One and are satisfied with the District Council's electoral projections. Therefore, we propose endorsing the creation of a two-member Landrake & St Dominick ward. We have examined alternative arrangements for Calstock parish and concluded that there would need to be substantial re-warding to achieve greater electoral equality under a pattern of single-member wards. We have not been convinced that the "scattered communities" would be inadequately represented in a multi-member ward, covering as it would a single parish. Therefore, we propose adopting the District Council's scheme to create a three-member Calstock ward. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Menheniot, St Germans and St Ive wards

58 These three single-member wards are situated in the centre of the district. Menheniot ward comprises the parish of Menheniot and the Bethany parish ward of St Germans parish, and is currently 6 per cent over-represented (10 per cent by 2006). St Germans ward comprises the parish of Quethiock, and the Polbathic, St Germans and Tideford parish wards of St Germans parish, and is currently 14 per cent over-represented (17 per cent by 2006). St Ive ward comprises the parish of St Ive and is currently 14 per cent under-represented (9 per cent by 2006).

59 At Stage One the District Council proposed that the parish of St Ive be combined with the parish of Menheniot to create a two-member Menheniot & St Ive ward. In addition, it proposed combining the parishes of Quethiock and St Germans to form a single-member St Germans ward. This would then unite the whole of St Germans parish in a single ward. Under these arrangements, Menheniot & St Ive ward would be 1 per cent under-represented (3 per cent over-represented by 2006), and St Germans ward would be 1 per cent over-represented (5 per cent by 2006). We did not receive any other comments concerning these proposals.

60 After careful consideration of the evidence and in view of the lack of other comments, we propose adopting the District Council's scheme in this area without modification. We consider that the revised wards would balance the need to reflect local communities, while providing improved levels of electoral equality. These recommendations would result in the

same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Maker, Millbrook and Sheviock wards

61 The three single-member wards of Maker, Millbrook and Sheviock are situated in the south-east of the district. Maker ward comprises the parish of Maker-with-Rame and is currently 46 per cent over-represented (49 per cent by 2006). Millbrook ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 5 per cent under-represented (4 per cent by 2006). Sheviock ward comprises the parishes of Antony, St John and Sheviock, and is currently 19 per cent over-represented (21 per cent by 2006).

62 At Stage One the District Council proposed no change to Millbrook ward, but proposed the creation of a new single-member Rame Peninsular ward, comprising the parishes of Antony, Maker-with-Rame and St Johns. It proposed that Sheviock parish be joined with Deviock parish to create a new Whitsands ward, as described below. Under these proposals Millbrook ward would be 8 per cent under-represented (7 per cent by 2006) and Rame Peninsular ward would have a variance of zero per cent, but be 5 per cent over-represented by 2006. No other submissions were received concerning these wards.

63 Following careful consideration of the evidence, the lack of comment on the District Council's proposals, the improved level of electoral equality and the use of whole parishes, we propose endorsing this scheme as part of our draft recommendations. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Dobwalls & Trewidland, Donderry and Morval

64 These three single-member wards stretch southward from Liskeard to the coast. Dobwalls & Trewidland ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 1 per cent over-represented (6 per cent by 2006). Donderry ward comprises the parishes of Deviock and St Martin-by-Looe, and is currently 12 per cent over-represented (14 per cent by 2006). Morval ward comprises the parishes of Duloe, Morval and St Keyne, and is currently 7 per cent over-represented (10 per cent by 2006).

65 The District Council proposed that Dobwalls & Trewidland ward be expanded to additionally include the parishes of Morval, St Keyne and St Pinnock (currently part of St Veep ward), to create a new two-member Dobwalls & District ward. In addition, the District Council proposed the creation of a new single-member Whitsands ward, comprising the parishes of Deviock and Sheviock (currently part of Sheviock ward, discussed above). The District Council proposed that Duloe parish form part of a new Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward (discussed below) and that St Martin-by-Looe parish form part of an enlarged Looe & St Martin ward (discussed above). Under the proposals Dobwalls & District ward would be 2 per cent over-represented (6 per cent by 2006), while Whitsands ward would be 13 per cent under-represented (10 per cent by 2006).

66 The parish councils of Deviock and Dobwalls & Trewidland both objected to the District Council's proposals. As stated above, Deviock Parish Council opposed the proposal to place the parish of St Martin-by-Looe in a ward with Looe parish, stating that "there is a real danger

of St. Martin being overwhelmed and largely ignored.” It also questioned the District Council’s electoral projections, suggesting “the projected figure may already be out of date.” Both St Keyne Parish Council and St Pinnock Parish Council supported the District Council’s proposals.

67 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We have noted the objections of Deviock Parish Council to the District Council’s proposals and its desire to retain the current Dowerry ward. However, in light of the higher levels of electoral inequality and our recommendations for surrounding wards, we have rejected this option. We have considered placing the parish of St Martin-by-Looe in the District Council’s proposed Whitsands ward, in order to retain the parishes of St Martin-by-Looe and Deviock in a single ward, however, this would result in that ward being 25 per cent under-represented, which we do not consider to be justified in terms of the statutory criteria. We have not been convinced that the District Council’s proposals would be detrimental to the community identities and interests of Deviock parish. Therefore, we propose adopting the District Council’s proposed Whitsands ward as part of our draft recommendations.

68 We also consider there is insufficient evidence to reject the District Council’s proposal to create a new Dobwalls & District ward. Therefore, we propose adopting the District Council’s scheme in this area as part of our draft recommendations. The proposed wards of Dobwalls & District and Whitsands would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council’s proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Lansallos, Lanteglos, St Veep and Trelawny wards

69 These four single-member wards are situated in the south-west of the district. Lansallos ward comprises the parish of the same name and is currently 13 per cent over-represented (18 per cent by 2006). Lanteglos ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 43 per cent over-represented (45 per cent by 2006). St Veep ward comprises the parishes of Boconnoc, Broadoak, St Pinnock, St Veep and St Winnow, and is currently 21 per cent over-represented (22 per cent by 2006). Trelawny ward comprises the parishes of Lanreath and Pelynt, and is currently 10 per cent over-represented (14 per cent by 2006).

70 The District Council proposed that Lansallos and Trelawny wards should be combined with Duloe parish (currently part of Morval ward) to create a new two-member Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward. Additionally, it proposed combining Lanteglos ward with the parishes of Boconnoc, Broadoak, St Veep and St Winnow to form a new single-member Lanteglos & St Veep ward. St Pinnock would become part of Dobwalls & District ward and is discussed above. Under these arrangements Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward would be 8 per cent under-represented (3 per cent by 2006). Lanteglos & St Veep ward would be 5 per cent under-represented (4 per cent by 2006).

71 Lansallos Parish Council considered the District Council’s proposals for the new Duloe, Lansallos & Trelawny ward to be “logical”, but was concerned about the impact on councillor workload. We did not receive any other comments concerning these proposals. Following consideration of the evidence we propose adopting the District Council’s scheme in this area without modification. We consider that the revised wards would accurately reflect local communities, whilst providing improved levels of electoral equality. These recommendations

would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Lynher, St Cleer and St Neot & Warleggan wards

72 These three single-member wards cover the north and north-west of the district and include the district's most under-represented ward. Lynher ward comprises the parishes of Linkinhorne and South Hill, and is currently 5 per cent under-represented (zero per cent by 2006). St Cleer ward, comprising the parish of the same name, is currently 70 per cent under-represented (62 per cent by 2006). St Neot & Warleggan ward comprises the parishes of St Neot and Warleggan, and is currently 42 per cent over-represented (43 per cent by 2006).

73 Under the District Council's proposals there would be no change to Lynher ward. However, it proposed combining St Cleer and St Neot & Warleggan wards to create a new two-member Fowey Moor ward. This ward would be 16 per cent under-represented (12 per cent by 2006). Lynher ward would be 7 per cent under-represented (2 per cent by 2006).

74 Linkinhorne Parish Council supported the District Council's proposals for retaining the current Lynher ward. St Neot Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposals to create a new Fowey Moor ward, considering that St Cleer parish would be too dominant. It proposed two alternatives, which in its opinion, better reflected community identities. It proposed that St Pinnock and Broadoak parishes (both currently part of St Veep ward) be combined with St Neot & Warleggan ward, or that St Cleer parish be warded and the northern part of this parish be combined with St Neot & Warleggan ward.

75 We note that the District Council's proposals would result in a high variance in the proposed Fowey Moor ward. We have therefore examined alternatives, including those suggested by St Neot Parish Council. However, we are concerned that the alternatives would not provide significantly better electoral equality overall, worsening it in neighbouring wards. Additionally, these alternatives would require us to move away, quite considerably, from a locally-generated district-wide scheme that has been consulted on, commands support from a number of parishes and provides improving electoral equality. In the light of this, we are adopting the District Council's scheme in this area as part of our draft recommendations, as we consider that this proposed scheme provides the most appropriate balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. These recommendations would result in the same levels of electoral equality as under the District Council's proposals. These recommendations are illustrated and named on Map 2.

Electoral Cycle

76 We received one response regarding the District Council's electoral cycle. The District Council itself "agreed with the objective of increasing turnout [...] but did not consider that annual elections, with their additional cost, would necessarily achieve that aim."

77 At present, the majority view appears to be that the present electoral cycle should be retained and we therefore propose no change.

Conclusions

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

- there should be a an increase in council size from 41 to 42;
- there should be 22 wards;
- the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of eight, and four wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

79 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals, with only minor modifications to tie boundaries to ground detail.

80 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will effect 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	41	42	41	42
Number of wards	30	22	30	22
Average number of electors per councillor	1,564	1,527	1,672	1,633
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	17	5	19	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	8	1	11	0

81 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Caradon District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 17 to five. By 2006 only one ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

Draft Recommendation

Caradon District Council should comprise 42 councillors serving 22 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

82 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 Liskeard, Saltash and Torpoint to reflect the proposed district wards.

83 The parish of Liskeard is currently served by 16 councillors, representing two wards: Liskeard North and Liskeard South. At Stage One, the District Council put forward proposals for the district warding of Liskeard, which were supported by the Town Council.

84 As stated earlier, we have adopted the proposed Liskeard North and Liskeard South wards as part of our proposals. Accordingly, we propose an alternative boundary between the parish wards of Liskeard North and Liskeard South. We are not, however, proposing any other alternative electoral arrangements for Liskeard Town Council.

Draft Recommendation

Liskeard Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Liskeard North and Liskeard South, each returning eight councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

85 The parish of Saltash is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Burraton, Essa, Pill and St Stephens. At Stage One, the District Council put forward proposals for district warding for Saltash. Saltash Town Council objected to these proposals and put forward alternative arrangements.

86 As stated earlier, the Town Council's proposals would not provide good levels of electoral equality and we have therefore adopted the District Council's proposed Saltash Burraton, Saltash Essa, Saltash Pill and Saltash St Stephens wards as part of our proposals. Accordingly, we propose alternative boundaries between the parish wards of Saltash Burraton, Saltash Pill and Saltash St Stephens. We are not, however, proposing any other alternative electoral arrangements for Saltash Town Council.

Draft Recommendation

Saltash Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Saltash Burraton, Saltash Essa, Saltash Pill and Saltash St Stephens, each returning four councillors. The boundary between the four parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

87 The parish of Torpoint is currently served by 15 councillors and is not warded. In agreement with the District Council, Torpoint Town Council proposed that Torpoint parish should be served by 16 councillors, instead of the current 15, representing two parish wards. It proposed that current Torpoint district ward be divided into two district wards, generally reflecting the parish ward boundary, which is due to come into effect in 2003 under the Parish of Torpoint (Wards) Order 2000. This proposal has already been subject to detailed consultation during the 1998 parish boundary review and we are therefore content to recommend it as part of our draft recommendations, subject to two minor amendments. In consultation with Ordnance Survey, we propose a minor modification to include 33 Trevel Road and 93 Carbeile Road in Torpoint East ward, to provide a clearer boundary. We are therefore proposing that Torpoint parish be divided into two parish wards, Torpoint East and Torpoint West, coterminous with the proposed district wards of the same names.

Draft Recommendation

Torpoint Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, instead of the existing 15, representing two wards: Torpoint East and Torpoint West, each returning eight 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 this report.

88 The parish of Pelynt is currently served by 12 councillors and is not warded. In agreement with the District Council, Pelynt Parish Council proposed that Pelynt parish should be served by 10 councillors, instead of the existing 12. Our proposed district warding arrangements would result in no change to this area and we are content to put forward the Parish Council's proposal for consultation.

Draft Recommendation

Pelynt Parish Council should comprise 10 parish councillors, instead of the current 12.

89 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 Caradon

5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

90 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Caradon 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.

91 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Caradon 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

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

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Caradon: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Caradon 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 Maps A2 and the large map at the back of this report.

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Liskeard parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for the parishes of Saltash and Torpoint.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Caradon: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Liskeard 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 for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

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

Table B1: LGCE compliance with Code criteria

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