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FOREWORD

This is our report containing our Final Proposals for Conwy County Borough Council.

In January 2009, the Local Government Minister, Dr Brian Gibbons asked this Commission to review the electoral arrangements in each principal local authority in Wales. Dr Gibbons said:

“Conducting regular reviews of the electoral arrangements in each Council in Wales is part of the Commission’s remit. The aim is to try and restore a fairly even spread of councillors across the local population. It is not about local government reorganisation.

Since the last reviews were conducted new communities have been created in some areas and there have been shifts in population in others. This means that in some areas there is now an imbalance in the number of electors that councillors represent.

The Commission will review the total number of councillors making up each council; the number of councillors representing each electoral division and the name and boundary of each division.

As far as possible, I want to restore fairness so that councillors generally represent the same number of people.” [13 January 2009].

This issue of fairness is set out clearly in the legislation and has been a key principle for our work. The situation which currently exists, where a councillor from one part of the County Borough represents a small number of voters whereas another Councillor may represent many, many more is simply not fair on electors. In practical terms, it means that some areas have an unfair advantage over others in decisions made in the council chamber.

Putting this right is far from simple given the constraints against which the Commission must operate. We cannot just move lines on the map; we have to adhere to existing “building blocks”, which are the Community Areas and Community Wards which cover the whole of Wales. Sometimes, these do not reflect the current patterns of community life in Wales but, even where this is the case, we have not been able to accept suggestions which cut across these boundaries. This is frustrating for both respondents and the Commission.

We are also required to look to the future and have asked the council to give us predictions of the number of electors in 5 years time. At the best of times this would be challenging but, in the current economic climate, it is particularly difficult.

The publication of our first few draft proposals reports drew some concern that we were moving away from the principle of having one councillor for an electoral division to suggesting far greater use of multi member divisions. The Rules within which we operate envisage that each electoral division shall be represented by one councillor; this could be called the “default position”. However, we can move away from this for a variety of reasons, including where we have found this is the best way of ensuring that electors are more equally represented.
In working up our proposals, we have tried to cater for local ties and those who wish to retain current boundaries. We have looked carefully at every representation made to us. However, we have had to balance these issues and representations against all the other factors we have to consider and the constraints set out above. In particular, the requirement for electoral parity, democratic fairness for all electors, is the dominant factor in law and this is what we have tried to apply. We believe that greater fairness, along with other proposals in our report, will lead to local government which is effective and convenient.

The Minister for Social Justice and Local Government of the Welsh Assembly Government has issued a statement to the effect that he will not be making any changes to the present electoral arrangements for any local authorities in Wales until after the 2012 local government elections. Some have interpreted this to mean that we have stopped all the ongoing work in respect of electoral reviews. I can confirm that this is not the case and that we are continuing with the programme of electoral reviews as required by the legislation. We continue to welcome active participation in the reviews by those persons or organisations that have an interest.

Finally, may I thank the Members and officers of the Principal authority for their assistance in our work, the community and town councils for their contribution and last but most importantly, the ordinary citizens who have taken the time and trouble to make comments and suggestions.

Paul Wood
Chairman
Mr Carl Sargeant
Minister for Social Justice and Local Government
Welsh Assembly Government

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE COUNTY BOROUGH OF CONWY

REPORT AND PROPOSALS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In accordance with the directions issued by the Minister on 13 January 2009, we, the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales (the Commission), have completed the review of electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy and present our Final Proposals for the future electoral arrangements. A glossary of terms used in this report can be found at Appendix 1. In 2010 the County Borough of Conwy had an electorate of 91,258. At present it is divided into 38 divisions returning 59 councillors. The average number of electors to each councillor for the County Borough is currently 1,547. The existing electoral arrangements have a level of representation that ranges from 42% below to 41% above the current county average. The present electoral arrangements are set out in detail in Appendix 2.

2. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

2.1 We propose a reduction in the council size from 59 to 57 elected members and a change to the arrangement of electoral divisions that will achieve a significant improvement in the level of electoral parity across the County Borough of Conwy. The average number of electors to each councillor for the County is proposed to be 1,601. The proposed electoral arrangements have a level of representation that ranges from 20% below to 27% above the proposed county average. The proposed electoral arrangements are set out in detail in Appendix 3.

3. SCOPE AND OBJECT OF THE REVIEW

3.1 Section 57 of the Local Government Act 1972 (the 1972 Act) lays upon the Commission the duty, at intervals of not less than ten and not more than fifteen years, to review the electoral arrangements for every principal area in Wales for the purpose of considering whether or not to make proposals to the Welsh Assembly Government for a change in those electoral arrangements.

3.2 The Minister for Social Justice and Local Government of the Welsh Assembly Government has directed the Commission to submit a report in respect of the review of electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy by 30 June 2011.

Electoral Arrangements

3.3 The “electoral arrangements” of a principal area are defined in section 78 of the Act as:
i) the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;

ii) the number and boundaries of electoral divisions;

iii) the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral division; and

iv) the name of any electoral division.

**Rules to Be Observed Considering Electoral Arrangements**

3.4 We are required by section 78 to comply, so far as is reasonably practicable, with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the Act. These require the Commission to provide for there to be a single member for each electoral division. However, the Welsh Assembly Government may direct the Commission to consider the desirability of providing for multi-member electoral divisions for the whole or part of a principal area.

3.5 The rules also require that:

Having regard to any change in the number or distribution of local government electors of the principal area likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following consideration of the electoral arrangements:

i) subject to paragraph (ii), the number of local government electors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral division in the principal area;

ii) where there are one or more multi-member divisions, the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral division in the principal area (including any that are not multi-member divisions);

iii) every ward of a community having a community council (whether separate or common) shall lie wholly within a single electoral division; and

iv) every community which is not divided into community wards shall lie wholly within a single electoral division.

In considering the electoral arrangements we must have regard to (a) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and (b) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary.

**Minister’s Directions**

3.6 The Minister has directed that we shall consider the desirability of multi-member electoral divisions in each county and county borough council in Wales.

3.7 The Minister has also given the following directions to us for our guidance in conducting the review:

(a) it is considered that a minimum number of 30 councillors is required for the proper management of the affairs of a county or county borough council;
(b) it is considered that, in order to minimise the risk of a county council or a county borough council becoming unwieldy and difficult to manage, a maximum number of 75 councillors is ordinarily required for the proper management of the affairs of a county or a county borough council;

(c) it is considered that the aim should be to achieve electoral divisions with a councillor to electorate ratio no lower than 1:1,750;

(d) it is considered that decisions to alter the existing pattern of multi and single member electoral divisions should only be taken where such proposals for alteration are broadly supported by the electorate in so far as their views can be obtained in fulfilment of the consultation requirement contained in Section 60 of the Act; and

(e) It is considered that the Commission shall, when conducting reviews under Part 4 of the Act, comply with paragraph 1A of Schedule 11 to the Act that is, the Rules.

The full text of the Directions is at Appendix 4. The Directions were further confirmed in a letter from the Minister on 12 May 2009. A copy of this letter follows the Directions at Appendix 4.

Local Government Changes

3.8 Since the last review of electoral arrangements there has been one change to local government boundaries in Conwy:


This made changes to the boundary between the Communities of Conwy and Llandudno and made consequential changes to the boundaries of the Craig-y-Don, Deganwy, Marl, Penrhyn, Pensarn and Tudno electoral divisions.

Procedure

3.9 Section 60 of the Act lays down procedural guidelines which are to be followed in carrying out a review. In compliance with Section 60 of the Act we wrote on 28 September 2009 to Conwy County Borough Council, all the community councils in the area, the Members of Parliament for the local constituencies and other interested parties to inform them of our intention to conduct the review, to request their preliminary views and to provide a copy of the Welsh Assembly Government’s directions to the Commission. We invited the County Borough Council to submit a suggested scheme or schemes for new electoral arrangements. We also publicised our intention to conduct the review in local newspapers circulating in the County Borough and asked Conwy County Borough Council to display a number of public notices in their area. We also made available copies of our electoral reviews guidance booklet. In addition we made a presentation to both County Borough and Community councillors explaining the review process.
4. DRAFT PROPOSALS

4.1 Prior to the formulation of our draft proposals we received representations from Conwy County Borough Council; 7 community councils; Gareth Jones AM (Aberconwy); 4 councillors; and 1 resident. These representations were taken into consideration and summarised in our Draft Proposals report published on 1 April 2010. The following is a summary of our Draft Proposals.

Betws-y-Coed, Trefriw

4.2 The Betws-y-Coed electoral division consists of the Communities of Betws-y-Coed (452 electors, 443 projected), Capel Curig (184 electors, 184 projected) and Dolwyddelan (366 electors, 369 projected) with a total of 1,002 electors represented by one councillor which is 35% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 43% below 1,750 electors per councillor. These are sparsely populated upland communities with the largest centre of population being Betws-y-Coed in the Conwy Valley at the eastern edge of the electoral division.

4.3 In their initial representation Betws-y-Coed Community Council were of the view that in the consideration of the representation of rural communities factors such as distances and remoteness etc. should be taken into account. We were of the view however that even making allowances for rural sparsity, the current high level of representation is not appropriate when compared to the county average. Consideration was therefore given to combining all or part of this electoral division with other areas in order to form electoral divisions with levels of representation closer to the county average. We therefore gave consideration to combining all or part of the Betws-y-Coed electoral division with the adjoining Trefriw electoral division.

4.4 The Trefriw electoral division consists of the Communities of Dolgarrog (337 electors, 325 projected) and Trefriw (680 electors, 672 projected) with a total of 1,017 electors represented by one councillor which is 34% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 42% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We noted that there is limited but adequate access between these two electoral divisions the main route being the B5106 that runs along the western side of the Conwy Valley.

4.5 We noted that the Community of Dolwyddelan in the Betws-y-Coed electoral division is adjacent to the Community of Bro Machno which is in the Uwch Conwy electoral division and it appeared to us that the topography and nature of the settlements within the two communities are similar in nature. This suggested to us that it would be convenient for the Community of Dolwyddelan to be in the same electoral division as the Community of Bro Machno and we proposed this at 4.17 below. This then left a combined Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw electoral division consisting of the Communities of Capel Curig, Betws-y-Coed, Dolgarrog and Trefriw. Combining these areas would create an electoral division with 1,653 electors (1,624 projected) which, if represented by one councillor, would be 3% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 6% below 1,750 electors per councillor. This option appeared to us to provide a more appropriate level of representation than the existing arrangements. We therefore put this scheme forward as a proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a
working name of Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw. We considered that this proposal would result in a substantial improvement in electoral parity, and though there would be a reduction of one councillor, it would produce a more appropriate combination of communities than alternative schemes.

Llanrwst electoral divisions (Crwst and Gower)

4.6 The Gower electoral division consists of the Gower ward of the Community of Llanrwst with 899 electors (885 projected) represented by one councillor which is 42% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 49% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that it is not in accordance with the principle of electoral parity for such a large variation in the level of representation to exist between that of the Gower electoral division and the county average. We noted that the adjoining Crwst electoral division, which consists of the Crwst ward of the Community of Llanrwst with 1,589 electors (1,585 projected), represented by one councillor, is 3% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 9% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that such a large variation in the levels of representation between electoral divisions that are formed from the two wards of the same community is not appropriate. We were of the view that it would be desirable to make changes to the electoral arrangements in this area in order to achieve improvements in electoral parity.

4.7 In their initial representation Llanrwst Town Council suggested that Llanrwst Town be considered as a single electoral division to be represented by two councillors. This suggested electoral division would have 2,488 electors (2,470 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, will result in a level of representation of 1,224 electors per councillor which is 20% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and 29% below 1,750 electors per councillor.

4.8 In our Draft Proposals report we noted that although this suggested arrangement has the advantage of improving the overall level of electoral parity for the town of Llanrwst the level of representation for the suggested electoral division would still be significantly higher than the county average. We therefore considered combining the Community of Llanrwst with an adjoining community in order to achieve further improvements in electoral parity.

4.9 We noted that the adjoining Eglwysbach electoral division, with 1,224 electors (1,225 projected) represented by one councillor, has a similar level of representation to that of the suggested Llanrwst electoral division. Part of the Eglwysbach electoral division is the Community of Llanddoged and Maenan which has 475 electors (486 projected). This community adjoins Llanrwst to the north and the two are joined by the A470 trunk road and other minor roads.

4.10 In our Draft Proposals report we considered combining the Community of Llanrwst with the Community of Llanddoged and Maenan to form an electoral division with a total of 2,963 electors (2,956 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of representation of 1,482 electors per councillor which is 7% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 15% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that this arrangement significantly improved the level of electoral parity for the area. We put this scheme forward as a
draft proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of **Llanrwst**.

**Llangernyw**

4.11 The Llangernyw electoral division consists of the Communities of Llangernyw (888 electors, 905 projected) and Pentrefoelas (298 electors, 292 projected) with a total of 1,186 electors (1,197 projected) represented by one councillor which is 23% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 32% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that it is not appropriate for such a large variation in the level of representation to exist between that of the Llangernyw electoral division and the county average. We therefore considered making changes to the electoral arrangements in this area.

4.12 In our Draft Proposals report we noted that, despite being in the same electoral division, the Community of Pentrefoelas appeared to us to have few, if any, community ties with the Community of Llangernyw as there are no direct road links across their common boundary. We considered that is likely that Pentrefoelas has closer ties with the adjoining Community of Cerrigydrudion along the A5 trunk road. We also considered that the Community of Llangernyw has closer ties with the adjoining Community of Eglwysbach and that it would be appropriate for both of these two communities to be in the same electoral division. We therefore proposed dissolving the Llangernyw electoral division, including the Community of Pentrefoelas within the proposed Uwchaled electoral division (4.19 below) and including the Community of Llangernyw within the proposed Eglwysbach and Llangernyw electoral division (4.14 below). Eglwysbach and Llangernyw electoral division under this proposal would be 2% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors represented by each councillor. This proposal would result in a reduction of one councillor representing the area but it would improve the electoral parity and, we considered, would result in a more appropriate combination of communities.

**Eglwysbach**

4.13 The Eglwysbach electoral division consists of the Communities of Eglwysbach (749 electors, 739 projected) and Llanddoged and Maenan (475 electors, 486 projected) with a total of 1,224 electors (1,225 projected) which is 21% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 30% below 1,750 electors per councillor.

4.14 As detailed at 4.10 above, in our Draft Proposals report we proposed including the Community of Llanddoged and Maenan within a proposed Llanrwst electoral division and, as detailed at 4.12 above, we proposed the dissolution of the existing Llangernyw electoral division. This left the adjoining Communities of Eglwysbach and Llangernyw to form a new electoral division with a total of 1,637 electors (1,644 projected) which, if represented by one councillor, would be 2% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 6% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that this arrangement improves the level of electoral parity for the area and we put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of **Eglwysbach and Llangernyw**.
Uwch Conwy

4.15 The Uwch Conwy electoral division consists of the Communities of Bro Machno (577 electors, 554 projected), Bro Garmon (558 electors, 554 projected) and Ysbyty Ifan (161 electors, 166 projected) with a total of 1,296 electors (1,274 projected) represented by one councillor which is 16% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 26% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that it is not appropriate for such a large variation in the level of representation to exist between that of the Uwch Conwy electoral division and the county average. We therefore considered making changes to the electoral arrangements in this area.

4.16 As detailed at 4.5 above, in our Draft Proposals report we considered that it would be appropriate for the Community of Dolwyddelan (366 electors, 369 projected) to be in the same electoral division as the Community of Bro Machno (577 electors, 554 projected). We noted that the Community of Ysbyty Ifan covers the area of the valley formed by the Afon Conwy lying to the south of A5 trunk road. The main access route to Ysbyty Ifan is through the Community of Pentrefoelas and it appeared to us have closer community ties with Pentrefoelas than the adjoining Community of Bro Machno. We considered therefore that it would be appropriate to include the Community of Ysbyty Ifan in the same electoral division as the Community of Pentrefoelas.

4.17 The inclusion of the Community of Dolwyddelan and the exclusion of the Community of Ysbyty Ifan from the existing Uwch Conwy electoral division would result in an electoral division consisting of the Communities of Bro Garmon, Bro Machno and Dolwyddelan. This electoral division resulted in a total of 1,501 electors (1,477 projected) which, if represented by one councillor, would be 6% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 14% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that this arrangement improves the level of electoral parity for the area and, we considered, will result in a more appropriate combination of communities. We put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We suggested that Uwch Conwy be retained as the name for this electoral division.

Uwchaled

4.18 The Uwchaled electoral division consists of the Communities of Cerrigydrudion (594 electors, 606 projected), Llanfihangel Glyn Myfyr (162 electors, 169 projected) and Llangwm (424 electors, 427 projected) with a total of 1,180 electors (1,202 projected) represented by one councillor which is 24% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 33% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that it is not appropriate for such a large variation in the level of representation to exist between that of the Uwchaled electoral division and the county average. We therefore considered making changes to the electoral arrangements in this area.

4.19 As detailed at 4.12 above in our Draft Proposals report we considered the inclusion of the Community of Pentrefoelas (298 electors, 292 projected) in the Uwchaled electoral division and as detailed at 4.17 above we also considered the inclusion of the Community of Ysbyty Ifan (161 electors, 166 projected) in the Uwchaled electoral division. These two additions would result in an electoral division with a
total of 1,639 electors (1,660 projected) which, if represented by one councillor, would be 2% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 6% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that this arrangement improves the level of electoral parity for the area and, we considered, would result in a more appropriate combination of communities. We put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We suggested that **Uwchaled** be retained as the name for this electoral division.

**Llanddulas and Llysfaen**

4.20 The Llanddulas electoral division consists of the Community of Llanddulas and Rhyd-y-Foel with 1,286 electors (1,396 projected) represented by one councillor which is 17% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 27% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The adjoining Llysfaen electoral division consists of the Community of Llysfaen with 1,916 electors (2,279 projected) represented by one councillor which is 24% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 9% above 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that it is not appropriate for a large variation to exist in the levels of representation between electoral divisions that are adjacent to each other and appeared, to us, to be closely linked and of similar character. We therefore gave consideration to a change to the electoral arrangements in the area.

4.21 We proposed combining the electoral divisions of Llanddulas and Llysfaen to form an electoral division with a total of 3,202 electors (3,675 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of representation of 1,601 electors per councillor which is the proposed county average and is 9% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that this arrangement improves the level of electoral parity for the area and we put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of **Llanddulas and Llysfaen**.

**Penmaenmawr electoral divisions (Capelulo and Pant-yr-afon / Penmaenan)**

4.22 The Capelulo electoral division consists of the Capelulo ward of the Community of Penmaenmawr with 1,211 electors (1,209 projected) represented by one councillor which is 22% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 31% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The Pant-yr-afon / Penmaenan electoral division consists of the Pant-yr-afon 1,556 electors (1,626 projected) and Penmaenan 623 electors (649 projected) wards of the Community of Penmaenmawr with a total of 2,179 electors (2,275 projected) represented by one councillor which is 41% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 25% above 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that such a large variation in the levels of representation between electoral divisions that are formed from wards of the same community is not appropriate. We were of the view that it would be desirable to make changes to the electoral arrangements in this area in order to achieve improvements in electoral parity.

4.23 We considered the initial representation from Councillor Stevens (Pant yr Afon / Penmaenan electoral division) who noted that the Pant yr Afon and Penmaenan Community wards were joined together some 18 years ago to form an electoral division. He considered that, after some initial resentment amongst local people, this arrangement is now working well. We considered that an extension to this
arrangement whereby the whole of the Community of Penmaenmawr forms an electoral division would equally work well in providing effective representation for the community.

4.24 In our Draft Proposals report we considered an electoral division consisting of the Community of Penmaenmawr would have 3,390 electors (3,484 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of representation of 1,695 electors per councillor which is 6% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 3% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We noted that this proposal creates a 2-member electoral division from two single-member electoral divisions but we considered that this arrangement improves the level of electoral parity for the area. We put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of Penmaenmawr.

Marl and Pensarn

4.25 The Marl electoral division consists of the Marl ward of the Community of Conwy with 2,998 electors (3,640 projected) represented by two councillors with a level of representation of 1,499 electors per councillor which is 3% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 14% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The adjoining Pensarn electoral division consists of the Pensarn ward of the Community of Conwy with 2,100 electors (2,175 projected) represented by one councillor which is 36% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 20% above 1,750 electors per councillor. The other two Conwy electoral divisions are Conwy (with 1,680 electors per councillor) and Deganwy (1,684 electors per councillor). We considered that it is not appropriate for a large variation to exist in the levels of representation between electoral divisions that are formed from wards of the same community and gave consideration to a change to the electoral arrangements in the area.

4.26 In our Draft Proposals report we considered combining the existing electoral divisions of Marl and Pensarn to form an electoral division with a total of 5,098 electors (5,815 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation of 1,699 electors per councillor which is 6% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 3% below 1,750 electors per councillor. This arrangement would result in all three Conwy electoral divisions having similar levels of representation based on the existing number of electors. We noted that the County Borough Council had forecast a rise of 642 electors for the Marl ward and a rise of 75 electors for the Pensarn ward. If this rise in the number of electors were to come about then this would result in the combined electoral division having 5,815 electors with a level of representation of 1,938 electors per councillor. We compared this with the forecast levels of 1,686 electors per councillor for Deganwy and 1,697 for Conwy. We noted that this variance was not as large as the current variance. We considered that the combination of the Marl and Pensarn electoral divisions would therefore provide an improvement in the level of electoral parity in the area. We put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of Conwy East.
Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr

4.27 The Abergele Pensarn electoral division consists of the Pensarn ward of the Community of Abergele with 2,044 electors (2,068 projected) represented by one councillor which is 32% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 17% above 1,750 electors per councillor. The adjoining Pentre Mawr electoral division consists of the Pentre Mawr ward of the Community of Abergele with 2,830 electors (2,812 projected) represented by two councillors with a level of representation of 1,415 electors per councillor which is 9% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 19% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The remaining Abergele electoral division is Gele which consists of the Gele 3,666 electors (3,689 projected) and St George 219 electors (214 projected) wards of the Community of Abergele with a total of 3,885 electors (3,903 projected) represented by 3 councillors with a level of representation of 1,295 electors per councillor which is 16% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 26% below 1,750 electors per councillor. We considered that it is not appropriate for a large variation to exist in the levels of representation between electoral divisions that are formed from wards of the same community and gave consideration to a change to the electoral arrangements in the area.

4.28 In our Draft Proposals report we noted that due to the relative positions of the community wards and the number of electors in them, the options were limited for making changes that go some way in improving the level of electoral parity in the area. One option we considered would be to combine the existing Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral divisions to form an electoral division with a total of 4,874 electors (4,880 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation of 1,625 electors per councillor which is 1% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 7% below 1,750 electors per councillor. Although this would provide a level of representation that is closer to the proposed county average we noted that it would still vary from that of the Gele electoral division, although to a lesser degree than the current arrangements. We considered that the combination of the Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral divisions would therefore provide an improvement in the level of electoral parity in the area. We put this scheme forward as a draft proposal. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of Pensarn and Pentre Mawr.

Llandrillo yn Rhos

4.29 The Llandrillo yn Rhos electoral division consists of the Community of Rhos on Sea with 6,345 electors (6,353 projected) represented by 4 councillors with a level of representation of 1,586 electors per councillor which is 3% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 9% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The Community of Rhos on Sea is divided for community electoral purposes into the community wards of Dinarth 2,304 electors (2,270 projected) and Rhos 4,041 electors (4,083 projected).

4.30 In their initial representation the Bay of Colwyn Town Council (Rhos on Sea is part of the group council) recommended the formation of two electoral divisions based on the Dinarth and Rhos community wards. A Dinas electoral division would have 2,304 electors (2,270 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, result in a
level of representation of 1,152 electors per councillor which is 28% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 34% below 1,750 electors per councillor. If represented by one councillor the level of representation would be 44% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. A Rhos electoral division would have 4,041 electors (4,083 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, result in a level of representation of 2,021 electors per councillor which is 26% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. If represented by three councillors the level of representation of 1,347 electors per councillor would be 16% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 23% below 1,750 electors per councillor.

4.31 As can be seen from these figures the suggestion to form separate electoral divisions from the Dinarth and Rhos community wards would only serve to increase the variance from the county average of the area’s level of representation. We therefore proposed no changes to the existing Llandrillo yn Rhos electoral division.

4.32 In our Draft Proposals report we recommended a reduction in the council size from 59 to 57 elected members and a change to the arrangement of electoral divisions that will achieve a significant improvement in the level of electoral parity across Conwy County Borough Council. We considered that these arrangements provide for effective and convenient local government and met in principle the directions provided by the Welsh Assembly Government.

4.33 Copies of the Draft Proposals were sent to all of the interested parties referred to in paragraph 3.9 seeking their views. A copy was also sent to anyone who had submitted preliminary comments. By public notice we also invited any other organisation or person with an interest in the review to submit their views. Copies of the Draft Proposals were made available for inspection at the offices of Conwy County Borough Council and the Commission and on the Commission’s web site.

5. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

5.1 In response to our Draft Proposals report we received representations from Abergele Town Council, Bro Garmon Community Council, Bro Machno Community Council, Capel Curig Community Council, Dolgarrog Community Council, Dolwyddelan Community Council, Eglwysbach Community Council, Llanddoged Community Council, Llandudno Town Council, Llangernyw Community Council, Pentrefoelas Community Council, Ysbyty Ifan Community Council, Councillor Gail Hall (Capelulo electoral division), Councillor Dave Holland (Abergele Pensarn electoral division), Councillor Meirion Hughes (Pensarn electoral division), Councillor Elizabeth M.B Roberts (Betws–y-Coed electoral division), Councillor Sam Rowlands (Pentre Mawr electoral division), Councillor Deion Smith (Llysfaen electoral division), Councillor L.A. Tobin (Conwy electoral division), Councillor Brenda Taylor (Llanddulas electoral division), Councillor Emlyn Thomas (Treftiw electoral division), and a resident of Dolwyddelan. A summary of these representations can be found at Appendix 5.
6. ASSESSMENT

Council Size

6.1 At present the size of the council at 59 members is within the numerical limits indicated in the Minister’s direction. The current member to electorate ratio for the council is 1:1,547 which is 12% below 1,750 electors per councillor (see Councillor to electorate ratio above). There are currently 16 multi-member divisions out of 38 electoral divisions.

6.2 We reviewed the electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy in the light of the Welsh Assembly Government’s directions for our guidance and took account of the representations which had been made to us. In our deliberations we considered the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected, with a view to ensuring that the number of local government electors shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral division in the principal area. We looked at the present multi-member divisions to consider if we should recommend the creation of single member divisions. We considered the size and character of the principal council area and a wide range of other factors including population density, the local topography, road communications and local ties.

6.3 For the reasons given below we believe that in the interests of effective and convenient local government a council size of 57 would be appropriate to represent the County Borough of Conwy. The proposed council size results in an average of 1,601 electors being represented by each councillor.

Councillor to electorate ratio

6.4 The Minister’s directions include the following at 3.7 (a): “It is considered that the aim should be to achieve electoral divisions with a councillor to electorate ratio no lower than 1:1,750.” The Minister has indicated to us that this means that the number of electors per councillor should not normally fall below 1,750, and this is how we have interpreted and applied the Direction. We bear in mind that the directions are provided as guidance and should not be applied without regard to the special circumstances of the particular area: there may well be factors relating for example to topography or population of the area where it will be considered that an electoral division of fewer than 1,750 electors to be represented by each councillor is appropriate. This was explained in the letter from the Minister (Appendix 4) which stated: “This means that the ratio remains as the aim to be worked towards and not as a goal to be achieved in each case. In doing so attention should be paid to local communities having their own identifiable representation even where the indicative figure of 1,750 electors / councillor is not always achievable”. In the absence of special circumstances we aim to propose electoral arrangements in which the level of representation does not fall below 1,750 electors per councillor. We are not constrained in the same way by this direction from proposing electoral arrangement in which the number of electors to be represented by each councillor is, in appropriate cases, higher than 1,750. Throughout this review we have kept the ratio of 1:1,750 very much in mind, but have not referred to it expressly in every case.
Number of Electors

6.5 The numbers shown in Appendix 2 as the electorate for 2010 and the estimates for the electorate in the year 2014 are those provided by County Borough Conwy Council.

Electoral Divisions

6.6 We have considered the boundaries of the existing electoral divisions of Betws yn Rhos, Bryn, Colwyn, Conwy, Craig-y-Don, Deganwy, Eirias, Gele, Glyn, Gogarth, Kinmel Bay, Llanddulas, Llandrillo yn Rhos, Llansanffraid, Llansannan, Llansannan, Mochdre, Mostyn, Pandy, Penrhyn, Rhiw, Towyn, Tudno, Uwch Conwy and the ratio of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected and we propose that the existing arrangements should continue. We considered changes to the remaining electoral divisions. Details of the current electoral arrangements for the area can be found at Appendix 2.

6.7 In the following section the proposals for each of the new electoral divisions are laid out in the same way. The first part of the initial paragraph for each new electoral division to be considered gives a historical context by listing all the existing electoral divisions or their component parts used to construct each proposed electoral division. These components - the communities and community wards - are described as a complete community together with its current and projected electorates if it was used as such. If only part of a community is used - i.e. a community ward - then the name of that community ward, its electorate figures, and the name of its community will be shown as such. Finally, in each new electoral division, the component parts of that proposal are listed in the same way - either as whole communities with current and projected electorates, or as a named community ward, its electorate figures and the name of its community - as before. This method of describing the make-up of electoral divisions is also used in the tables at Appendix 2 and 3.

Betws-y-Coed, Caerhun and Trefriw

6.8 The existing Betws-y-Coed electoral division consists of the communities of Betws-y-Coed with 452 electors (443 projected), Capel Curig 184 electors (184 projected) and Dolwyddelan 366 electors (369 projected) represented by one Councillor with a level of representation of 1,002 per councillor, which is 35% below the existing county average of 1,547. Caerhun electoral division consists of the communities of Caerhun 1,108 electors (1,072 projected) and Henryd with 581 electors (565 projected) represented by one councillor, which is 3% below the existing county average of 1,547. Trefriw electoral division consists of the Communities of Dolgarrog with 337 electors (325 projected) and Trefriw 680 electors (672 projected) represented by one Councillor with a level of representation of 1,017 per councillor, which is 34% below the existing county average of 1,547. We are of the view that the current level of representation is unacceptably high when compared to the county average and we are also concerned about the high degree of variance in electoral representation between adjoining electoral divisions. In our Draft Proposals report we proposed forming an electoral division consisting of the Communities of Betws-y-Coed, Dolgarrog, Capel Curig and Trefriw. This left the community of Dolwyddelan which we proposed to be included in the Uwch Conwy electoral division.
6.9 We received objections to this proposal from Capel Curig Community Council, Dolgarrog Community Council, Dolwyddelan Community Council, Councillor Elizabeth Roberts (Betws-y-Coed), Councillor Emlyn Thomas (Trefriw), and from a local businessman and resident. The objectors’ main concerns were that the proposed electoral division would be too large and this could increase the councillors’ workload and lead to them becoming remote from the electorate. The view was also expressed that the language, history and culture of the area should be considered.

6.10 We also considered Dolgarrog Community Council’s objection to the proposal in which they expressed the view that the bringing together of Trefriw and Dolgarrog under the last review had never really worked. They noted that previously Dolgarrog had been linked to Tal-y-bont and that Dolgarrog School is in Tal-y-bont. Dolgarrog Community Council suggested therefore that their community should be linked to Tal-y-bont which is a ward of the Community of Caerhun. If the Community of Dolgarrog is included in the existing Caerhun electoral division this would create an electoral division with a total of 2,026 electors (1,962 projected) which, if represented by 1 councillor, would be 27% above the proposed county average of 1,601. We noted that this proposed electoral division would have a significantly lower level of representation than both the county average (27% variance) and that achieved by our draft proposals for the area. We have however considered the evidence of the strength of community ties between Dolgarrog and the Tal-y-bont ward of the Community of Caerhun and consider it would be desirable in the interest of effective and convenient local government for these areas to be in the same electoral division. We therefore propose a Caerhun electoral division consisting of the Communities of Caerhun, Dolgarrog and Henryd with a total of 2,026 electors represented by 1 councillor.

6.11 We noted Dolwyddelan Community Council’s objection to our draft proposal to include their Community within the Uwch Conwy electoral division. They consider that, historically, Dolwyddelan has no connection with Bro Machno and Bro Garmon whereas they do have links to Betws-y-Coed and Capel Curig. We therefore gave consideration to include Dolwyddelan in the same electoral division as Betws-y-Coed and Capel Curig.

6.12 By combining the Betws-y-Coed electoral division with the Community of Trefriw an electoral division is formed with a total of 1,682 electors (1,668 projected) which, if represented by 1 councillor, would result in a level of representation which is 5% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. We consider that this arrangement provides a level of electoral parity that is within the range we consider to be appropriate for the area and also takes account of the evidence of community ties expressed in the representation. This proposal will improve the electoral parity in the area. We therefore confirm this as our proposal for Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw electoral division. We have considered proposals for the remainder of the Uwch Conwy electoral division at 6.20 below.

**Llanrwst (Crwst & Gower) and Eglwysbach**

6.13 The existing Crwst electoral division consists of the Crwst ward of the Community of Llanrwst with 1,589 electors (1,585 projected) represented by one councillor which is 3% above the existing county average of 1,547. The existing Gower electoral division consists of the Gower ward of the Community of Llanrwst with 899 electors
(885 projected) represented by one councillor which is 42% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. The existing Eglwysbach electoral division consists of the Communities of Eglwysbach 749 electors (739 projected) and Llanddoged and Maenan 475 electors (486 projected) with 1,224 electors (1,225 projected) represented by one councillor which is 21% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. We are of the view that the current level of representation is unacceptably high in the Gower and Eglwysbach electoral divisions when compared to the county average and we are also concerned about the high degree of variance in electoral representation between adjoining electoral divisions. In our Draft Proposals report we proposed forming an electoral division consisting of the Community of Llanrwst and the Community of Llanddoged and Maenan (from the existing Eglwysbach electoral division). We proposed the name of Llanrwst for the electoral division.

6.14 We noted one objection to this proposal from Llanddoged and Maenan Community Council who were not happy with the suggested name. No alternative or suggestion was given to the proposed name of Llanrwst.

6.15 By combining the Community of Llanrwst with the Community of Llanddoged and Maenan (from the Eglwysbach electoral division) an electoral division is formed with a total of 2,963 electors (2,956 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, will result in a level of representation of 1,482 electors per councillor which is 7% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. We consider that this would provide an appropriate level of representation for the area. We are therefore of the view that this proposal would be of benefit, in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore make this proposal. In giving consideration to the representation made by Llanddoged and Maenan Community Council we gave consideration to alternative names to the proposed electoral division. However, we considered that a name that combines the two community names would be too long and unwieldy. In the absence of any suggestions for alternative names we have therefore named the electoral division **Llanrwst** as this is the name of the largest constituent community.

Uwchaled, Uwch Conwy and Llangernyw

6.16 The existing Uwchaled electoral division consists of the Communities of Cerrigydrudion (594 electors, 606 projected), Llanfihangel Glyn Myfyr (162 electors, 169 projected) and Llangwm (424 electors, 427 projected) with a total of 1,180 electors (1,202 projected) represented by one councillor which is 24% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. The existing Uwch Conwy electoral division consists of the communities of Bro Machno with 577 electors (554 projected), Bro Garmon with 558 elector (554 projected) and Ysbyty Ifan with 161 electors (166 projected) with a total of 1,296 electors (1,274 projected) represented by one councillor which is 16% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. The Commission is of the view that the current level of representation is unacceptably high when compared to the county average. In our Draft Proposals report we included the Community of Pentrefoelas (298 electors, 292 projected) from the Llangernyw electoral division and Community of Ysbyty Ifan (161 electors, 166 projected) from the Uwch Conwy electoral division in the Uwchaled electoral division. These two additions resulted in an electoral division with a total of 1,639 electors (1,660 projected) represented by one councillor which
is 2% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor and 6% below 1,750 electors per councillor.

6.17 We considered the representation from Pentrefoelas Community Council who wrote to support the Draft Proposal for the Community to be included into the Uwchaled electoral division. We also considered the objection from Ysbyty Ifan Community Council whose concern was there is no natural link between the two areas, whereas there is a strong link between Ysbyty Ifan and its existing division of Uwch Conwy. We have therefore given consideration to retaining the Community of Ysbyty Ifan in the Uwch Conwy electoral division.

6.18 By combining the Uwchaled electoral division and Community of Pentrefoelas the proposed Uwchaled electoral division would have a total of 1,478 electors (1,494 projected) which, if represented by one councillor, is 8% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor.

6.19 In our Draft Proposals report we proposed forming a Uwch Conwy electoral division to consist of the Communities of Bro Machno, Bro Garmon and Dolwyddelan. At 6.12 above we now propose including the Community of Dolwyddelan in the Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw electoral division. This then leaves the existing Uwch Conwy electoral division consisting of the Communities of Bro Machno, Bro Garmon and Ysbyty Ifan with a total of 1,296 electors (1,274 projected) represented by one councillor which is 19% below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor.

6.20 We note that although these proposals do not provide the level of improvement in electoral parity achieved by those for the area in the Draft Proposals report, they do take account of the ties between communities in the area as evidenced by the representations. We are of the view that the proposal for a revised Uwchaled electoral division and the proposal to retain the existing Uwch Conwy division are desirable, in terms of effective and convenient local government.

**Eglwysbach and Llangernyw**

6.21 The existing Llangernyw electoral division consists of the Community of Llangernyw (888 electors 905 projected) and the Community of Pentrefoelas (298 electors 292 projected) with a total of 1,186 electors (1,197 projected) represented by one councillor, which is 23% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. We are of the view that the current level of representation is not appropriate when compared to the county average. In our Draft Proposals report we noted that, despite being in the same electoral division, the Community of Pentrefoelas appeared to us to have few, if any, community ties with the Community of Llangernyw as there are no direct road links across their common boundary. We considered that it is likely that Pentrefoelas has closer ties with the adjoining Community of Cerrigydrudion along the A5 trunk road (see 6.18 above). We also considered that the Community of Llangernyw has closer ties with the adjoining Community of Eglwysbach and that it would be appropriate for both of these two communities to be in the same electoral division. We therefore proposed dissolving the Llangernyw electoral division, including the Community of Pentrefoelas within the Uwchaled electoral division (see 6.18 above) and including the Community of Llangernyw within the Eglwysbach and Llangernyw electoral division. Eglwysbach and Llangernyw electoral division under this proposal would
have a total of 1,637 electors (1,644 proposed) which is 2% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor.

6.22 We received objections from Eglwysbach Community Council on the grounds that there would be fewer rural voices in the cabinet and the parliamentary boundaries of Aberconwy and Clwyd West would be affected. We also received objections from Llangernyw Community Council to the proposal as they are concerned about the effect on the Welsh language should they be amalgamated with Eglwysbach. They also noted that Llangernyw and Eglwysbach are in two different valleys and the connecting road between the two areas is narrow and dangerous.

6.23 We noted the concerns regarding the Welsh Language, however information, derived from the 2001 Census, shows that the existing Llangernyw electoral division (which consists of the Communities of Llangernyw and Pentrefoelas) has the second highest percentage of Welsh speakers in Conwy with 69% whereas the existing Eglwysbach electoral division has the ninth highest with 54%. Out of the 38 existing electoral divisions in Conwy there are 10 above 50% and 28 out of the 38 below 50% (down to 11% in Kinmel Bay and Towyn). Both Llangernyw and Eglwysbach therefore have a relatively high number of Welsh speakers compared to the county average and we are not satisfied that combining the two areas within the same electoral division would have a significant detrimental effect on the Welsh language. We note that it is said that, as is indeed the case, the two areas lie in different valleys, but the two valleys are adjoining and the settlements within them are of a very similar character. We are also satisfied that there are sufficient transport links between Llangernyw and Eglwysbach communities in that there are minor roads crossing the boundary between the two communities. It is also noted that under the existing arrangement there are no direct road links between Llangernyw and Pentrefoelas.

6.24 We have also noted the concern expressed here, and elsewhere, with regards to the crossing of parliamentary constituency boundaries. The (Parliamentary) Boundary Commission for Wales in their reviews use the electoral divisions as the building blocks of parliamentary constituencies. Any changes to the local government electoral divisions, such as those that may arise from this review, will be taken account of by the (Parliamentary) Boundary Commission for Wales during their next review. The legislation requires that proposals for changes to electoral arrangements are desirable in the interest of effective and convenient local government. There is no requirement to consider the implications for such changes on the parliamentary constituencies as changes to parliamentary constituencies are covered by different legislation and follow on from any local government changes.

6.25 Eglwysbach 749 electors (739 projected) and Llangernyw 888 electors (905 projected) electoral division under this proposal would have a total of 1,637 electors (1,644 proposed) which is 2% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. For the reasons considered above we remain of the view that our Draft Proposal for an Eglwysbach and Llangernyw electoral division is desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government. We therefore confirm this proposal.
Llanddulas and Llysfaen

6.26 The existing Llanddulas electoral division consists of the Community of Llanddulas and Rhyd-y-Foel with 1,286 electors (1,396 projected) represented by one councillor which is 17% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 27% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The adjoining Llysfaen electoral division consists of the Community of Llysfaen with 1,916 electors (2,279 projected) represented by one councillor which is 24% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. In our Draft Proposals report we proposed combining the electoral divisions of Llanddulas and Llysfaen to form an electoral division with a total of 3,202 electors (3,675 projected) represented by two councillors with a level of representation of 1,601 electors per councillor which is equal to the proposed county average. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of Llanddulas and Llysfaen.

6.27 We noted the objections from Councillor Smith (Llysfaen) who considered that the current electoral division had more than enough electorate to warrant its independence and that it will grow in future. He also objected to the proposed name of the electoral division and suggested that the name for the electoral division should be Llysfaen, Llanddulas and Rhyd-y-Foel as Llysfaen is the larger village. We also noted Councillor Taylor’s (Llanddulas) view that the merger of Llanddulas and Llysfaen has been ill thought out as the only common factor between them is a landfill site. She felt it is unreasonable to expect councillors to give due diligence to both areas as each have very different needs that reflect their different demographic structures.

6.28 We noted the concerns regarding the lack of community ties between the two areas that were evidenced by the representations and we noted that our proposals include other electoral divisions that have similar variances from the county average as the existing Llanddulas and Llysfaen electoral divisions. We are now of the view that the improvement in electoral parity provided in our draft proposal for this area is not so significant as to outweigh the retention of single-member electoral divisions formed from individual community areas. We are of the view therefore that it would be desirable, in terms of effective and convenient local government, to retain the existing Llanddulas and Llysfaen electoral divisions.

Penmaenmawr (Capelulo and Pant-yr-afon / Penmaenan)

6.29 The existing Capelulo electoral division consists of the Capelulo ward of the Community of Penmaenmawr with 1,211 electors (1,209 projected) represented by one councillor which is 22% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and is 31% below 1,750 electors per councillor. The Pant-yr-afon / Penmaenan electoral division consists of the Pant-yr-afon (1,556 electors, 1,626 projected) and Penmaenan (623 electors, 649 projected) wards of the Community of Penmaenmawr with a total of 2,179 electors (2,275 projected) represented by one councillor which is 41% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. We are of the view that the current level of representation is not appropriate when compared to the county average. In our Draft Proposals report we proposed combining all of the wards of the Community of Penmaenmawr to form an electoral division with 3,390 electors (3,484 projected) represented by 2 councillors with a level of representation of 1,695 electors per councillor which is 6% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor.
6.30 We noted the representation from Councillor Hall (Capelulo) who expressed the view that Capelulo and Dwygyfylchi were separate from Penmaenan and Pant-yr-afon and should not be joined together in an electoral division. We considered that, although they are distinct settlement areas with the Community of Penmaenmawr they are part of the same community and are linked. At present the wide variance in the level of representation, 22% below and 41% above, is not acceptable and easily cured by the amalgamation of the two electoral divisions, with two councillors. Councillor Hall also raised a concern about the Welsh language as she considered that the majority of the Dwygyfylchi residents speak Welsh whilst it is the minority language in Penmaenan and Pant-yr-afon. We considered information derived from the 2001 Census which show that in the existing Capelulo electoral division 37% of the population are Welsh speakers and in the existing Pant-yr-afon/Penmaenan electoral division 38% of the population are Welsh speakers. We do not consider therefore that combining these two areas that are within the same community would have a detrimental affect on the Welsh language.

6.31 We remain of the view that our proposal combines areas that have community ties and in comparison with the existing arrangements provides an improvement in electoral parity. We therefore confirm our proposal for a Penmaenmawr electoral division.

Marl and Pensarn

6.32 The existing Marl electoral division consists of the Marl ward of the Community of Conwy with 2,998 electors (3,640 projected) represented by two councillors with a level of representation of 1,499 electors per councillor which is 3% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. The adjoining Pensarn electoral division consists of the Pensarn ward of the Community of Conwy with 2,100 electors (2,175 projected) represented by one councillor which is 36% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. We are of the view that the current level of representation is not appropriate when compared to the county average. Our Draft Proposals report proposed combining the Marl and Pensarn electoral divisions to form an electoral division with a total of 5,098 electors (5,815 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, will result in a level of representation of 1,699 electors per councillor which is 6% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. We gave the proposed electoral division a working name of Conwy East.

6.33 We received no specific objections to the proposed arrangement though we noted representation from Councillor Hughes which suggested the alternative name of Maelgwn for this electoral division to take account of history, community sensitivities, identity and sense of place. We considered this alternative name and are of the view the name is appropriate for the area. We remain of the view that an electoral division consisting of the Marl and Pensarn wards of the Community of Conwy is desirable in terms of the interest of effective and convenient local government and we have accepted the name Maelgwn for the proposed electoral division.
Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr

6.34 The existing Abergele Pensarn electoral division consists of the Pensarn ward of the Community of Abergele with 2,044 electors (2,068 projected) represented by one councillor which is 32% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. The adjoining Pentre Mawr electoral division consists of the Pentre Mawr ward of the Community of Abergele with 2,830 electors (2,812 projected) represented by two councillors with a level of representation of 1,415 electors per councillor which is 9% below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. We are of the view that the current level of representation is not appropriate when compared to the county average. Our Draft Proposals report proposed combining the existing Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral divisions to form an electoral division with a total of 4,874 electors (4,880 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation of 1,625 electors per councillor which is 1% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor.

6.35 We noted the objections from Abergele Town Council, Councillor Rowlands (Pentre Mawr) and Councillor Holland (Pensarn). The objectors’ main concerns were that Abergele Pensarn electoral division is a distinctive and identifiable community and is physically separated from Pentre Mawr by the A55 dual carriageway. Concerns were also expressed that the councillor workload would increase and they also believed that the residents would prefer to retain the current electoral arrangements and have their own identifiable and accountable local councillor rather than being a small part of a larger multi-member division.

6.36 We considered that the A55 is a significant barrier between the two areas but there is one road across the A55 that links them. Although Pensarn and Pentre Mawr are divided by the A55 into two distinct settlement areas they are part of the same community (Abergele) and as such will have community ties. We note the objection put forward in relation this proposed amalgamation that it would lead to an increase in councillor workload. The present position is that Abergele Pensarn has 2,044 electors represented by one councillor (32% above county average) and Pentre Mawr has 2,830 electors represented by two councillors, which is 9% below. We draw attention to the sharp variance in representation between these areas, which are adjoining and similar in character. Although there may be circumstances relating to particular areas where it may be correct that amalgamation leads to an increase in councillor workload, we do not accept that that necessarily occurs following amalgamation. We are satisfied that there is no reason in principle why that should occur. However, it is undoubtedly the case that where there is a variance between two areas of 32% above and 9% below, there must as a matter of principle be an imbalance in workload between the councillors, and amalgamation will offer a remedy to that imbalance. Nor does the Commission accept that the relationship between councillors in a multi member division and their electorate is necessarily weaker or less effective than in a single member division: the opposite may be the case, and much will depend upon the individual circumstances of the area.

6.37 Combining the existing Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral divisions would form an electoral division with a total of 4,874 electors (4,880 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, has a level of representation of 1,625 electors per councillor which is 1% above the proposed county average of 1,601
electors per councillor. Whilst there would be no change to the number of councillors representing the area by combining these electoral divisions a substantial improvement in the level of electoral parity is achieved. We are therefore of the view that it would be desirable in terms of effective and convenient local government, to amalgamate Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral divisions. We therefore confirm our proposal for a Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral division.

Summary of Proposed Arrangements

6.38 The proposed electoral arrangements (as shown at Appendix 3) provide a level of representation that ranges from 20% below to 27% above the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor (based on the existing electoral figures). 1 (3%) of the proposed electoral divisions has a level of representation more than 25% above or below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. 13 (41%) are between 10% and 25% above or below the proposed county average and the remaining 18 (56%) are all less than 10% above or below the proposed county average of 1,601 electors per councillor. This compares with the existing electoral arrangements (as shown at Appendix 2) where the level of representation ranges from 42% below to 41% above the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor. 8 (21%) electoral divisions have levels of representation more than 25% above or below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor, 13 (34%) electoral divisions have levels of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the existing county average of 1,547 electors per councillor and the remaining 17 (45%) electoral divisions have levels of representation less than 10% above or below the current county average of 1,547 electors per councillor.

6.39 In producing a scheme of electoral arrangements it is necessary to have regard to a number of issues contained in the legislation and in the Minister’s Directions. It is often not possible to resolve all of these sometimes conflicting issues because of the requirement of using the existing communities and community wards as building blocks of electoral divisions and the varying level of representation that currently exists within these areas. In our proposed scheme we have placed emphasis on achieving improvements in electoral parity, moving towards 1,750 electors per councillor and retaining, where possible, single member electoral divisions. We recognise that the creation of electoral divisions which depart from the pattern which now exists would inevitably bring some disruption to existing ties between communities and may straddle community council areas in a way which is unfamiliar. We have made every effort to ensure that the revised electoral divisions do reflect logical combinations of existing communities and community wards. We have looked at each of these areas and are satisfied that it would be difficult to achieve electoral arrangements that keep the existing combination of communities and community wards within single electoral divisions without having a detrimental effect on one or more of the other issues that are required to be considered.

7. PROPOSALS

7.1 We propose a council of 57 members and 32 electoral divisions, with 18 multi-member divisions out of 32 electoral divisions, as set out in Appendix 3. For purposes of comparison the present electoral arrangements for the County Borough are given at Appendix 2. The boundaries of the proposed electoral divisions are shown by continuous yellow lines on the map placed on deposit with
this Report at the Offices of Conwy County Borough Council and the Office of the Commission in Cardiff.
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9. **RESPONSES TO THIS REPORT**

9.1 Having completed our review of the County Borough of Conwy and submitted our recommendations to the Welsh Assembly Government on the future electoral arrangements for the principal authority, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the directions issued by the Welsh Assembly Government.

9.2 It now falls to the Welsh Assembly Government, if it thinks fit, to give effect to these proposals either as submitted by the Commission, or with modifications, and if the Welsh Assembly Government decides to give effect to these proposals with modifications, it may direct the Commission to conduct a further review.

9.3 Any further representations concerning the matters in the report should be addressed to the Welsh Assembly Government. They should be made as soon as possible and in any event not later than six weeks from the date that the Commission’s recommendations are submitted to the Welsh Assembly Government. Representations should be addressed to:
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   Local Government Policy Division  
   Welsh Assembly Government  
   Cathays Park  
   Cardiff  
   CF10 3NQ
MR P J WOOD (Chairman)

REV. HYWEL MEREDYDD DAVIES BD (Deputy Chairman)

Mr D J BADER (Member)

E H LEWIS BSc. DPM FRSA Chartered FCIPD (Secretary)

March 2011
## GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THIS REPORT

<p>| <strong>Building Blocks</strong> | Because communities and, where they exist, community wards, are required to lie in one electoral division, they are used as building blocks for electoral divisions |
| <strong>Commission</strong> | The Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales |
| <strong>Council size</strong> | The number of councillors elected to the council |
| <strong>Directions</strong> | Directions issued to the Commission by the Government under Section 59 of the 1972 Act |
| <strong>Electoral arrangements</strong> | How many Councillors there should be on the council of local government area, the parts into which the area should be divided for the purpose of electing councillors, the number of councillors for each electoral division, and the name of any electoral area |
| <strong>Electoral divisions</strong> | The divisions into which principal areas are divided for the purpose of electing councillors, sometimes referred to colloquially as wards |
| <strong>Electoral review</strong> | A review in which the Commission considers electoral arrangements for a local government area |
| <strong>Electorate</strong> | The number of persons entitled to vote in a local government area |
| <strong>Electoral parity</strong> | The principle that votes within a principal area should carry equal weight, measured by a comparison between an electoral division and the county average of the number of electors represented by a single councillor. |
| <strong>Government</strong> | The Welsh Assembly Government |
| <strong>Interested person</strong> | Person or body who has an interest in the outcome of an electoral review such as the principal council concerned, local MPs, AMs and political parties, community and town councils |
| <strong>Multi member division</strong> | Electoral division within a principal area represented by more than one councillor |
| <strong>Order</strong> | Order made by the Government, giving effect to the proposals of the Commission, either as submitted or with modifications |
| <strong>Principal area</strong> | The area governed by a principal council: in Wales, a County or County Borough |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Principal council</strong></th>
<th>In Wales, one of the unitary authorities: a County or County Borough council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected electorate</strong></td>
<td>The five-year forecast of the number of electors provided by the Council for the area under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>Body or individual person who responds to the Commission’s consultation by making representations or suggesting alternative proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules</strong></td>
<td>Rules to be observed by the Commission in considering electoral arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single member division</strong></td>
<td>Electoral division of a principal authority represented by one councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 1972 Act</strong></td>
<td>The Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the 1994 Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 1994 Act</strong></td>
<td>The Local Government (Wales) Act 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unitary authority</strong></td>
<td>A principal council - the single tier organ of local government, responsible for all or almost all local government functions within its area, which in Wales replaced the two tier system of county councils and district councils: a County Council, or a County Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wards</strong></td>
<td>The electoral areas of Community Councils (not all Community Council areas are warded). The term is also used to describe the principal council electoral divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abergele Pensarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betws-y-Coed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Betws yn Rhos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caernarfon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Capelulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Colwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Craig-y-Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cwist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Degannwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eglwysbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eirias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Glyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gogarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kinmel Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Llanddulas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Llandrillo yn Rhos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Llangernyw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Llansanffraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Llansannan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Llysfaen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Marl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mochdre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mostyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pant-yr-afon/ Penmaenan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Penrhyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pensarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pentre Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rhiw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Trefriw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tudno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Uwch Conwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Uwchaled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

| 59 | 91,258 | 1,547 | 94,240 | 1,597 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than + or - 50% of County average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between + or - 25% and + or - 50% of County average</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between + or - 10% and + or - 25% of County average</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 0% and + or - 10% of County average</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio is the number of electors per councillor
Electoral figures supplied by Conwy County Borough Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>No. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
<th>2010 ELECTORATE</th>
<th>2010 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>2014 ELECTORATE</th>
<th>2014 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Betws yn Rhos</td>
<td>The Communities of Betws yn Rhos 824 (849) and Llanfair Talhaearn 825 (822)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw</td>
<td>The Communities of Betws-y-Coed 452 (443), Capel CURG 184 (184), Dolwyddelan 365 (369) and Trefriw 680 (672)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>The Bryn 780 (886) and Llanfair Talhaiarn 825 (822)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Caernhun</td>
<td>The Communities of Caernhun 1,108 (1,072), Dolgarrog 377 (325) and Henryd 581 (565)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Colwyn</td>
<td>The Colwyn ward of the Community of Old Colwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,618</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Conwy 1,108 (1,072), Dolgarrog 377 (325) and Henryd 581 (565)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Craig-y-Don</td>
<td>The Craig-y-Don ward of the Community of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deganwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Deganwy 3,082</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eglwyshabach and Llangernyw</td>
<td>The Communities of Eglwyshabach 3,666 (3,689) and Llangernyw 888 (905)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eirias</td>
<td>The Eirias ward of the Community of Colwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gele</td>
<td>The Glyn wards of the Community of Colwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,666 (3,689) and St George 219 (214) wards of the Community of Abergale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glyn</td>
<td>The Glyn ward of the Community of Colwyn Bay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gogarth</td>
<td>The Gogarth ward of the Community of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kinmel Bay</td>
<td>The Kinmel Bay ward of the Community of Kinmel Bay and Towyn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>5,421</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Llanddulas</td>
<td>The Communities of Llanddulas and Rhuddlan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Llandrillo yn Rhos</td>
<td>The Communities of Llandrillo yn Rhos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>6,353</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Llanrwst</td>
<td>The Communities of Llanrwst 2,486 (2,470) and Llanddoged and Maenan 475 (468)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Llanarfan</td>
<td>The Communities of Llanarfan and Rhuddlan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>No. OF COUNCILLORS</td>
<td>2010 ELECTORATE</td>
<td>2010 RATIO</td>
<td>% variance from County average</td>
<td>2014 ELECTORATE</td>
<td>2014 RATIO</td>
<td>% variance from County average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Llansannan</td>
<td>The Communities of Llansannan 1,077 (1,074) and Llannefydd 451 (436)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Llysfaen</td>
<td>The Community of Llysfaen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maelgwn</td>
<td>The Marl 2,598 (3,640) and Pensarn 2,100 (2,173) wards of the Community of Conwy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mochdre</td>
<td>The Community of Mochdre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mostyn</td>
<td>The Mostyn ward of the Community of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pandy</td>
<td>The Pandy ward of the Community of Llandudno</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Penmaenmawr</td>
<td>The Community of Penmaenmawr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Penrhyndeudwy</td>
<td>The Penrhyndeudwy ward of the Community of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3,814</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pensarn and Pentre Mawr</td>
<td>The Pensarn 2,044 (2,068) and Pentre Mawr 2,830 (2,812) wards of the Community of Abergele</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,874</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rhiw</td>
<td>The Rhiw ward of the Community of Colwyn Bay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Towyn</td>
<td>The Towyn ward of the Community of Kinmel Bay and Towyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tudno</td>
<td>The Tudno ward of the Community of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,713</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Uwch Conwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Bro Machno 577 (554), Bro Garmon 558 (564) and Ysbyty Ifan 161 (166)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Uwchaled</td>
<td>The Communities of Cerrigydrudion 594 (606), Llanfair Glyn Myfyr 162 (169), Llangwm 424 (427), Pentrefoelas 298 (292)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,258</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,601</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>94,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,653</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Borough of Conwy**

**Proposed Council Membership**

**Appendix 3**

**Ratio is the number of electors per councillor**

The number of electors for 2010 and 2014 (in brackets) are included in the description of those electoral divisions which comprise more than one community / community ward

Electoral figures supplied by Conwy County Borough Council
SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

2009 NO. 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Directions to the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales 2009

Made 2009
Coming into force 2009

The Welsh Ministers, in exercise of the powers conferred on the Secretary of State by section 59 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972(1) and now vested in them (2) make the following Directions:

Title, commencement and application

1.—(1) The title of these Directions is the Directions to the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales 2009.

(2) These Directions come into force on the day after the day on which they are made.

(3) These Directions are given to the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales and apply in relation to Wales.

Interpretation

2. In these Directions—

“the Act” means the Local Government Act 1972; and

“the Commission” means the Local Government Boundary Commission for Wales.

Multi Member Divisions

3.—(1) Pursuant to paragraph 1A(3) of Schedule 11 to the Act (3) the Welsh Ministers direct that the Commission shall consider the desirability of multi member electoral divisions in each county council and county borough council (4) in the principal areas in Wales mentioned in section 20, Schedule 4 of the Act.

(1) 1972 c.70.
(2) By virtue of the National Assembly for Wales (Transfer of Functions) Order 1999 (S.I. 1999/672) and paragraph 30(1) and 2 (a) of Schedule 11 to the Government of Wales Act 2006.
(3) as inserted by section 7(3) of the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994.
(4) as referred to in the Local Government Act 1972, section 20, Schedule 4, substituted by the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994, section 1 (2), Schedule 1, paragraph 2.
Review of electoral arrangements

4.—(1) Pursuant to section 59 (1) of the Act the Welsh Ministers give the following directions to the Commission for their guidance in conducting the review of electoral arrangements which they are required to carry out under section 55 of the Act—

(a) It is considered that a minimum number of 30 councillors is required for the proper management of the affairs of a county or a county borough council;

(b) It is considered that, in order to minimise the risk of a county council or a county borough council becoming unwieldy and difficult to manage, a maximum number of 75 councillors is ordinarily required for the proper management of the affairs of a county or a county borough council;

(c) It is considered that the aim should be to achieve electoral divisions with a councillor to electorate ratio no lower than 1:1750;

(d) It is considered that a decision to alter the existing pattern of multi and single member divisions in the areas referred to in paragraph 3 of these Directions should only be taken where such proposals for alteration are broadly supported by the electorate so far as their views can be obtained in fulfilment of the consultation requirement contained in section 60 of the Act;

(e) It is considered that the Commission shall, when conducting reviews under Part 4 of the Act, comply with paragraph 1A of Schedule 11 to the Act and these Directions.

Reports of the review of electoral arrangements

5.—(1) Pursuant to section 58(1) of the Act the Welsh Ministers direct that reports prepared by the Commission in respect of the review of electoral arrangements in relation to county and county borough councils in Wales shall be submitted to the Welsh Ministers by no later than 30 June 2011.

Signed by the Minister for Social Justice and Local Government

Date 13/1/2009
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Brian Gibbons AC/AM
Y Gweinidog dros Gyflaenwder Cymdeithasol a Llywodraeth Leol
Minister for Social Justice and Local Government

Eich cyf/Your ref
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Paul Wood
Chair
Local Government Boundary
Commission for Wales
Caradog House
1-6 St Andrews Place
Cardiff
CF10 3BE

12th May 2009

Directions on Reviews of Electoral Arrangements

I am aware that you have now commenced preliminary work on the cycle of reviews of electoral arrangements in each of the principal councils. Representations I have received from local government suggest to me that you may have interpreted my directions as being more prescriptive than those issued by the Secretary of State for Wales in 1995 prior to the last review cycle. I want to make clear that this is not the case.

The directions are issued for your guidance and are not to be viewed as instructions. In a number of respects – notably, in relation to the areas appropriate for multi-member divisions and the timetable – the last directions were more prescriptive but in relation to the central issue of the councillor to elector ratio the wording is identical. This means that the ratio remains as the aim to be worked towards and not as a goal to be achieved in each case. In doing so attention should be paid to local communities having their own identifiable representation even where the indicative figure of 1750 electors/councillor is not always achievable.

I do, of course, recognise that since 1995 we have seen the introduction of executive or alternative arrangements in principal councils, which may have implications for the number of councillors required to make a council fully functional. The 1995 directions were also introduced at a time of reorganisation, in a different political atmosphere from now.
Finally, I should also point out the stipulation in Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972, that regard should be had to the need to fix boundaries which are easily identifiable and which recognise local community ties.

I wish you well in the review process.

Yours sincerely

Brian Gibbons AM
SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO DRAFT PROPOSALS

Abergele Town Council noted that the aim should be to achieve electoral divisions with a councillor to electorate ratio no lower than 1:1,750, but felt very strongly that a common sense approach should be taken to avoid this being purely a numbers game, with little or no consideration being given to individual distinctiveness of communities or the geographical size of some electoral divisions. The Minister’s comments that “attention should be paid to local communities having their own identifiable representation, even where the indicative figure of 1,750 electors/councillor is not always achievable” are considered to be very important.

The Council shares the concerns of Conwy County Borough Council that in some divisions there is a high turnover of transient residents, which isn’t reflected in the electoral statistics, and that special consideration should be given to areas with a large influx of tourists, as their needs are often met by local members. The workload of a member is not determined solely by the number of electors in their division, but can be impacted upon by a wide variety of other factors, such as schools, public buildings/services, businesses, tourist attractions and public amenity spaces.

The Council also agrees with Conwy County Borough Council that multi-member electoral divisions can cause an imbalance in the workload between members within the division and that the size of multi-member divisions should be kept to a minimum to avoid local democracy being further removed from the electorate. The Council are of the view that there is a danger that the amalgamation of some electoral divisions, as proposed, will result in local members being further distanced from the communities they represent, thereby diluting their local knowledge, accountability and effectiveness.

Specific Proposals for Abergele Pensarn / Pentre Mawr

Although Pentre Mawr electoral division currently has a level of representation of only 1,393 electors per councillor (8% below the county average), the division has four schools, a business park, industrial estate, a number of retail outlets, several public houses, a doctors’ surgery and large public amenity space.

Pensarn electoral division (Pensarn Ward of the Community of Conwy) which includes the settlement areas of Pensarn and Belgrano, is a distinctive and identifiable community, with its own unique needs and aspirations, and is physically separated from Pentre Mawr by the busy A55 dual carriageway. Although the representation here is much higher, at 1,958 electors to one councillor, public amenities and businesses are much fewer and the workload of the councillor is therefore not considered to be excessive, in comparison to Pentre Mawr.

Although it could be argued, based on these figures, that the electorate does not currently enjoy equal representation at County Council level, Abergele Town Council strongly believes that the residents would prefer to retain their own easily identifiable and accountable local councillor than to become a small part of a much larger multi-member division. Therefore, the council objects to the proposed amalgamation of the Pensarn and Pentre Mawr electoral division and request that the current electoral division be retained.
Bro Garmon Community County wrote to express their unhappiness at losing one of the councillors representing the area. They considered that to have one councillor representing an area which stretches from Dolwyddelan and Penmachno to Llangernyw would be unfair to constituents and to the councillor responsible for representing the area.

Bro Machno Community Council noted the proposed change to the rural areas of Upper Conwy and Uwchaled and that there would be one less Councillor. They consider that this would be completely unacceptable. They consider that it is crucial for rural areas within Conwy Council to retain a strong representation, as the majority of Councillors are located on the coast. This means the recommendation weakens the voice of the countryside on the Council.

Capel Curig Community Council wrote to propose that the status quo be retained for their electoral division. They gave the following reasons:

- Capel Curig is a sparsely populated, upland rural area which varies widely in the needs and characteristics from one village/hamlet to the next.
- The logistics of covering such a large area for one councillor could be daunting and the population may be ill served - even if a candidate could be found.
- Capel Curig has a rich legacy of language, history and culture, which they respectfully request that due cognizance be given to consideration of ‘a sense of place’.

Dolgarrog Community Council wrote to object to the proposal for Dolgarrog. They consider that the last change to electoral arrangements brought together the villages of Dolgarrog and Trefriw and they expressed the view that this has never really worked. They stated that the distance between the two villages is 4 miles and this has proven to be quite an obstacle in terms of representation and service provision. Previously Dolgarrog was linked to Tal-y-bont and there is approximately one half mile between the village centres. In addition, Dolgarrog School is in Tal-y-bont. The proposed change would involve Dolgarrog in an even larger electoral division which the council considers would inevitably lead to a further reduction in services and contact with their County Councillor due to the distances involved (approximately 11 miles).

Dolwyddelan Community Council wrote to say that the Council were extremely disappointed with the Commission’s decision for Upper Conwy as it would mean 2 members being lost from Conwy Borough, both from rural areas. They believe that this is proof that the Commission did not consider the underpinning culture of the rural area. The members believe that the Commission have completely ignored the nature of the rural area and have instead concentrated on the numbers and somehow created a ‘jigsaw’ in order to reach the numbers that have been forced upon the Commission.

They consider that historically, Dolwyddelan has no connection with the areas of Bro Machno and Bro Garmon and that the area around Betws–y-Coed and Capel Curig is the recognised link. Pupils from these areas that attend Ysgol Dyffryn Conwy share a bus to school. Betws-y-Coed has been the centre for plays and concerts in the area and hundreds of young people and adults have found work here and continue to do so.

The Council are of the view that the proposed arrangements for this area would put more pressure on the Councillor by increasing the distances and that this would disperse the service the Councillor can offer their electors. They consider that looking at figures that
are on an electoral role is unfair as Betws-y-Coed and Capel Curig are all-year-round tourist areas.

The Council suggest if the boundary had to be moved at all, adding Bro Machno to Dolwyddelan, Betws-y-Coed and Capel Curig, would be far more sensible. The Council feel the Commission should revisit their plans.

**Eglwysbach Community Council** wrote to raise concerns regarding the following issues:

- There will be fewer rural voices in the Cabinet, which causes a disadvantage to rural areas compared to towns.
- The parliamentary and Assembly constituency boundaries will be affected – Eglwysbach is currently in the Aberconwy constituency and Llangernyw is in Clwyd West.

**Llanddoged Maenan Community Council** stated that they were not happy with the name of Llanrwst for the proposed electoral division.

**Llandudno Town Council** noted that there were no proposed changes to the Llandudno electoral divisions and the Council were in agreement with the Commission’s conclusions that the existing arrangements should continue in the following Llandudno electoral divisions: Craig y Don, Gogarth, Mostyn, Penrhyn and Tudno.

**Llangernyw Community Council** wrote to oppose the dissolving of the Llangernyw electoral division and the resultant amalgamation of Penterfoelas with Cerrigydrudion and Llangernyw with Eglwysbach. They made the following comments:

- The Council are not happy with fewer county councillors as the landscape is so extensive.
- Llangernyw is a naturally Welsh speaking area and the Council operates through the medium of Welsh – they are worried about the effect on the Welsh language if Eglwysbach and Llangernyw are amalgamated.
- Llangernyw and Eglwysbach are in two different valleys - Eglwysbach looks towards Colwyn Bay whilst Llangernyw is in the Hiraethog area. There is no main road connecting the two areas – Llangernyw is on the A548 and Eglwysbach is near the A470. The connecting road between the two areas is narrow and dangerous.
- The number of electors does not represent what is going on in the area – that is to say the amount of work that the councillor has and how much the area produces for the county.
- It is much easier for a town councillor to visit his electors without having to travel far.
- They feel that the money needed to make this change could be better spent elsewhere.
- The loss of this councillor would mean less of a voice for the countryside and the Council believes that the electorate there is as important as any urban electorate.

**Pentrefoelas Community Council** wrote to state their support for the proposal to include Pentrefoelas Community in the Uwchaled electoral division.
Ysbyty Ifan Community Council stated that they were unanimous that the boundaries should not be moved as their area has been part of Upper Conwy since time immemorial. They consider that including Ysbyty Community with Uwchaled does not make any sense as people in the area go down the valley rather than up towards Uwchaled in order to socialise, work, shop, etc. They consider that there is no natural link between the two areas. They expressed disappointed to see the countryside losing a councillor, as they consider that rural areas need more support not less. They were concerned that the influence of the rural areas will be further diminished in comparison to that of coastal and town areas.

Councillor Gail Hall (Capelulo) wrote to object to the proposed Penmaenmawr electoral division as people of Capelulo and Dwygyfylchi do not like being called Penmaenmawr residents as Capelulo and Dwygyfylchi are two distinct villages. By keeping the status quo, the two very distinct villages are able to keep their own identities where they actually recognise and know their County Councillor. Welsh is spoken by most residents of Dwygyfylchi, while it is the minority language in Penmaenmawr and Pant Yr Afon. Councillor Hall expressed concerns that English would become the dominant language should there be a joining of Capelulo and Dwygyfylchi with Penmaenmawr and Pant Yr Afon.

Councillor Dave Holland (Abergele Pensarn) asked the Commission to reconsider the proposals for Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr. He stated that he wholeheartedly agreed with the comments made by Councillor Rowlands in his representation. Councillor Holland considers that the Commission’s proposals appear to be based purely on the parity of numbers. Whilst he understands this and appreciates the Commission’s legal position, he considers that the proposal does not help the reality of the situation. He considers that the two electoral divisions are very different. He considers that the current arrangement works well and the size of the Abergele Pensarn electoral division allows him to deliver leaflets and newsletters to each house at least twice a year. He considers that the size of the proposed electoral division would make this virtually impossible. He noted that although Abergele Pensarn is the third most deprived electoral division in Conwy and in the top 10% in Wales it does not give him the major problems that this may indicate. This allows him time to work on the future development of the area as a whole rather than the number of individual complaints that Councillor Rowlands has to deal with. He considers that the issue of communication with local people is important and that the proposals will damage this process and will be detrimental to the relationship he has built up with the residents. He hopes that his comments, along with those of Councillor Rowlands, will be sufficient for the Commission to see that although it may seem to bring in a system giving more electoral equality to residents, the merger is not in anyone’s interests.

Councillor Meirion Hughes (Pensarn) submitted the following comments on the draft proposals report:

- Councillor Hughes expressed the view that the working name of Conwy East for the proposed electoral division of Marl and Pensarn is highly inappropriate. Councillor Hughes suggests the name Maelgwn for the proposed electoral division as this would take into account historical and community sensitivities, identity and sense of place.

- There is general emphasis on the ratio of electors to members within the draft proposals which appears to emerge from an over-rigid interpretation of Ministerial
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Guidance and a goal of achieving uniformity. This has a particularly stark impact within the proposals for rural, sparsely populated electoral divisions. Councillor Rowlands (Pentre Mawr electoral division) believes this Commission presents within its draft proposals for Conwy, and likely elsewhere in Wales, a radical departure from the Customs and Practices of previous Commissions which have taken factors such as sparsity into account and balanced these and other factors against ratios when making proposals. Such balancing is an appropriate "check and balance" to prevent marginalisation of populations and the environment they occupy within a democratic system, and in order to prevent the unwarranted concentration of political power into few geographic areas within a democratic nation. The radical departure from Customs and Practices of previous Commissions within the draft proposals, if applied, would, Councillor Hughes believes, be contrary to Common Law and would possibly be in contravention of Human Rights.

- Councillor Hughes considers that the Commission has failed to take proper account of previous Commission findings in which geographic and topographic concerns accepted by past Commissions need to be tested for change to those geographic and topographic conditions in any subsequent departure by subsequent Commissions, such changes to be evidenced in any proposals. This aspect indicates a failure to apply transparent process and again a radical departure from Customs and Practices which Councillor Hughes believes to be contrary to Common Law.

Councillor Elizabeth M. B. Roberts (Betws-y-Coed) wrote to say in the Welsh Assembly Government’s (WAG) Rural Strategy documentation is the emphasis on capacity-building – encouraging communities to look within, and forge strong community and sustainable partnerships for an integrated approach to defined need. It is within this spirit and the spirit of rural self-reliance and efficiency that her work has been concentrated. Councillor Roberts points to the vision, from the WAG document ‘A shared Community’ 2008 which concludes from evidence that public services need to work together to provide accessible and well co-ordinated services to people in their local neighbourhood and further emphasises that citizens need to be able to engage seamlessly with service providers at all levels of public service’. To this end Councillor Roberts states that she has worked tirelessly within her community to achieve full community appraisals and action plans to support identified need. This process has ensured that the communities are ready to access funding initiatives such as the Welsh European Funding Office (WEFO) Rural Development funds.

The rural area is approximately 25 miles in circumference and entails working within villages who have their own culture and practices, which means that projects which have been successful in one area cannot be catapulted to another village as research demonstrates that it can take up to 25 years to make a real change in a community. Therefore emphasis should be for the Commission to take a more balanced approach giving due consideration to the quality of Councillor practice rather than focus in isolation on the quantitative aspect of electorate number. Councillor Roberts wished to emphasise the difference between that rural and urban communities. Whereas urban councillors are able to walk an electoral division of approximately 2,000 electors in a matter of hours, walking the rural Betws-y-Coed electoral division would be out of the question.

Although the figures in the report add up the suggestion of the Betws-y-Coed ward, Capel Curig joining up with Trefriw and Dolgarrog wards may compound the effectiveness of
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‘seamless engagement’ (A Shared Community 2008) for the elected members and possible detrimental effectiveness due to the further travel and mileage. In addition, a rural member would have to attend four Community Council meetings compared one Town Council meeting.

Penmachno up until 10 years ago was in the Betws-y-Coed electoral division which included the village of Dolwyddelan and Capel Curig, which gave a quantitative figure of 1:1,200. Culturally and in line with rural practices a return to this configuration would enable the elected member to be "accessible to all and coordinate services" (A Shared Community 2008) in a much more qualitative and effective manner and with not so much emphasis and focus on the quantitative element as proposed in the Draft report.

Councillor Sam Rowlands (Pentre Mawr) wrote to say that he agreed with most of the proposals but asked the Commission to reconsider the proposal in respect of the Pentre Mawr electoral division. Councillor Rowlands understands the proposal to amalgamate the Pentre Mawr and Abergele Pensarn electoral divisions in terms of the number of electors per councillor. He wished to alert the Commission however to other issues which should also be considered:
- There are 4 schools in the electoral division. There is also a growing business park, busy doctor’s surgery and at least 6 residential/nursing homes. All of this has and this has a huge impact on the councillor’s workload and it is therefore unfair to make proposals based purely on the electorate to councillor ratio.
- Pensarn electoral division although it has a higher than average ratio of electorate to councillor has none of the public services mentioned above so therefore the local member would be able to cope with the higher than average ratio more easily.

Councillor Rowlands considers that the current electoral arrangements for Pentre Mawr and Abergele Pensarn work well and that the proposal would be to the detriment of the residents and the work that the members carry out for them.

Councillor Deion Smith (Llysfaen) wrote to submit following observations and comments:
- Llysfaen as an electoral division has more than enough electorate to warrant its independence now and in the future.
- Llysfaen will grow in future and a lot of history is connected to Llysfaen village, which used to be part of the old Caernarfonshire.
- the name Llysfaen should be retained as it is the bigger village and Llanddulas and Rhyd-y-foel should follow.

Councillor Mrs Brenda Taylor (Llanddulas) wrote to express the view that the merger of Llanddulas and Llysfaen has been ill thought out, with the only common factor between the two being the Landfill site. Councillor Taylor states that due consideration has not been given to the fact that Llanddulas is part rural and Rhyd Y Foel, which is part of Llanddulas ward, is partly rural and a distance of two miles inland. She expressed the view that full consideration has not been given to the dramatic increase in population during the holiday season, with seven caravan sites on the coastal area alone.

Councillor Taylor feels it is unreasonable to expect councillors to give due diligence to both areas as each have very different needs, given the demographic structure of both.
Councillor Emlyn Thomas (Trefriw) wrote in response to the Draft report. His comments were in respect of seven main issues:

- Allowance for Rural Sparsity;
- Communities Affected;
- Distance and Dispersal;
- Community Councils;
- Snowdonia National Park Authority;
- Emergencies; and
- Proposed Formula.

**Allowance for Rural Sparsity**

Although the Commission’s Draft Proposals report suggests that allowances have been made for rural sparsity there seems to be no indication of what those allowances are. Councillor Thomas is of the view that the proposal to amalgamate Betws-y-Coed, Capel Curig, Trefriw and Dolgarrog seems to rely exclusively on simple numbers of residents to deduce the final proportion of constituents to councillor.

**Communities Affected**

Although Councillor Thomas’ response only deals with the proposed Betws-y-Coed electoral division he considers that the same arguments apply to the proposed amalgamation of Dolwyddelan with Penmachno and that of Llangernyw and Eglwysbach. He considers that the four communities of Betws-y-Coed, Trefriw, Dolgarrog and Capel Curig are separate and different:

Betws-y-Coed is largely a tourist attraction and consists of shops, hotels guest houses, holiday lets and similar businesses. Many coaches stop at Betws-y-Coed and the village also provide enough parking to be considered a “hub” village for the Snowdonia National Park.

Trefriw is largely within Snowdonia National Park, attracts visitors by coach to the woollen mill and to enjoy the network of footpaths maintained by the community council offering access to forest, lakes and the northern part of the National Park. There are also hotels and guest houses available. The community of Llanrhychwyn has also become part of Trefriw. Most of the working population commute to Llandudno and the coast for work.

Dolgarrog was an industrial village and most of the housing was built by the aluminium company. The works closed 2 years ago, followed closely by the village shop and post office. The village has now become a dormitory village for a population who find employment on the coast, or who have retired. A recent development of new houses has added to the demographic change of the village.

Capel Curig lies about 7 miles from Betws-y-Coed and is essentially a holiday village with outdoor equipment shops, hotels, holiday cottages, camp sites and the Plas y Brenin National Mountaineering Centre. The village should be regarded as a foremost national and international centre for adventure training and adventure sports.
Distance and Dispersal

Travelling from the north, Trefriw is 2 miles from Dolgarrog, and a further 4 miles from Betws-y-Coed, which in turn is 7 miles from Capel Curig. Therefore, by road, to travel from Capel Curig to Dolgarrog involves a journey of 13 miles. Issues such as closure of rural post offices and the schools modernisation programme are important to people living in rural areas and demand attention from the local county councillor. Effective early intervention in such issues depends on contact with local people who have come to expect their representative to be available, almost at all times. The proposed merger of 4 communities into one electoral division can only have the effect of making representation less effective.

Community Councils

Each of the above communities has a separate identity with different problems and different objectives. It is very doubtful whether one county councillor could satisfy the requirement of 4 disparate councils. And it would certainly dilute the attention that each council demands and indeed deserves. Attendance at community council meetings often generates a list of tasks that the county councillor is expected to perform. This would reduce the level of service that could be provided, especially when one compares the level of representation and service available to residents of multi-member elector divisions in the coastal towns.

Snowdonia National Park Authority (SNPA)

A very large part of the proposed electoral division lies in the SNPA, and several matters involve negotiations, or dealing with that authority. Representing the views of constituents to the SNPA on matters such as planning, control and use of the locality’s facilities often cause concern and require a different level of communication and representation than would be encountered in areas of higher population density. This further dilution of the county councillor’s time would also add to the reduction in the representation that could be offered by the county councillor representing the rural area. This further reduction in the level of representation may be found to be unacceptable.

Emergencies

It should be noted that the proposed Betws-y-Coed electoral division is very vulnerable to natural emergencies, especially flooding. The local councillor needs to be able to initiate emergency action and responses. It is Councillor Thomas’ experience that this presence is greatly appreciated by residents affected or threatened by flooding. It would be unsatisfactory if the councillor is some distance from the potential emergency and is unable to be present to initiate these responses and this will result in a decrease in the standards of service.

Proposed Formula

For the above reasons the simplistic formula using crude numbers used by the Commission could result in unacceptable changes to the level of representation presently enjoyed by rural communities in Wales. In order to alleviate these changes it is suggested that a new formula, a Rural Additions Multiplier Factor (RAMF) should be developed that takes account of the wide dispersal and divergence between rural communities. This formula should reflect the difficulties that the simplistic calculation of electoral divisions can
create and should be utilised to decide on electoral boundaries for county council electoral divisions.

This multiplier could be calculated by using an agreed formula. Thus, the proposed Betws-y-Coed electoral division would have a basic population increased by perhaps a factor of 20% for calculating purposes to take account of its dispersed and diverse population. The RAMF for each rural electoral division could be agreed between the Commission and the county council.

Conclusion

Councillor Thomas considers that the use of simple numbers of people to decide on the boundaries of county council electoral divisions diminishes the level of representation available to constituents in dispersed rural electoral divisions and results in a removal of rights to those constituents. In emergencies such as those experienced in the recent past, remote and vulnerable communities would lose the emergency services of the councillor presently available. The amalgamation of 4 electoral divisions into one would represent a serious loss of amenity to the residents and represent a potentially unacceptable loss of representation at unitary authority level. Note should also be taken of the location of part or whole of each of the 4 electoral divisions in the SNPA and the increased burden of responsibility that the need to work with two authorities represents.

Councillor L. A. Tobin (Conwy) wrote to say that his first reaction was that Conwy had not fared badly in comparison with other Counties until he considered the implications to their rural areas. He stated the report was all about electoral division ratio comparisons, which did not seem a reasonable method of approach. He felt that although it may be an acceptable method for urban electoral divisions, it is more difficult to use in rural areas due to the topography.

Councillor Tobin stated that rural areas face the following issues:

- Farmers have suffered in the past due to Foot and Mouth and the continuing problem of Bovine TB.
- There is depleted emergency cover by the emergency services and out of hours GP provisions.
- Distances from health provisions.
- Reduction in service that promote rehabilitation following ill health, education and leisure facilities that promote well being.

In his experience because of the greater number of members from urban electoral divisions, rural members often in the minority, make it difficult for them to be able to serve the needs of their Communities.

A resident and businessman of Dolwyddelan wrote to say that he understands and agrees that each local councillor should ideally represent a similar number of residents. In the case of his local Councillor however, she represents three rural communities and covers a huge geographical area in comparison to the more urban electoral divisions such as the North Wales coastal towns for example. He considers that the extent of geographical area should be a key criterion in determining how effective a councillor can be and believes it to be wholly inappropriate for her current ward boundaries to be altered or extended to include Trefriw and Dolgarrog.
He considers that his local councillor is a very proactive councillor and has spear-headed and delivered a number of initiatives over the past 5 years without which he is convinced Dolwyddelan would be a dying community with no facilities whatsoever.

He considers that the villages of Betws-y-Coed, Capel Curig, Dolwyddelan and Penmachno are close both geographically and in terms of road networks, but more importantly consider themselves as a combined community at the head of the Conwy Valley. In his opinion this grouping would be far more beneficial to local residents by allowing local councillors in rural areas meet their target electorate figures, but more importantly to work with their own communities where they naturally will be most effective.

He also noted that Trefriw and Dolgarrog are geographically adjacent to Llanrwst and in his view should be included within the Crwst/ Gower ward.