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

In September 2013, the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 (the Act) came into force. This was the first piece of legislation affecting the Commission for over 40 years and reformed and revamped the Commission, as well as changing the name of the Commission to the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales.

The Commission published its Council Size Policy for Wales’ 22 Principal Councils, its first review programme and a new Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice document reflecting the changes made in the Act. A glossary of terms used in this report can be found at Appendix 1, with the rules and procedures at Appendix 4.

This review of Conwy County Borough Council is the fourth in the programme of reviews conducted under the new Act and Commission’s policy and practice. The issue of fairness is set out clearly in the legislation and has been a key principle for our Policy and Practice. 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. We also look at the number of electors not registered to vote.

In working up our proposals, we have considered 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.

Finally, may I thank the Members and officers of the Principal Council for their assistance in helping us develop our draft proposals, the Community and Town Councils for their contribution and last, but most importantly, all who made representations.

We look forward to receiving any views you may wish to share.

Owen Watkin OBE DL
Chair
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Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

1. The Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales (the Commission) is conducting a review of the electoral arrangements of the County Borough of Conwy. This review is being conducted in accordance with the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 (the Act), specifically Sections 29, 30 and 34-36.

2. The Commission has a duty to conduct a review of all 22 of Wales’ Principal Councils every ten years. This ten-year programme was due to commence in January 2014. However, due to the uncertainties in local government at the time the Commission suspended its programme. This programme of reviews has come as a result of the former Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Local Government’s Written Statement of 23 June 2016, where the Commission was asked to restart its programme of reviews with an expectation that all 22 electoral reviews be completed in time for the new arrangements to be put in place for the 2022 local government elections. The Written Statement can be found at Appendix 6.

3. The Commission’s overarching aim when conducting a review is set out at Part 3, Chapter 1 of the Act and that is to make proposals that seek to ensure effective and convenient local government. The Commission considers that this is the creation of coherent wards, with common interests and good internal communication links.

4. The rules and procedures the Commission follows can be found in the Commission’s Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice [2016] and outlined in Appendix 4. A Glossary of Terms can be found at Appendix 1, providing a short description of some of the common terminology used within this report.

5. The Commission is now seeking views on the proposed electoral arrangements identified at Chapter 4 in this report. On receipt of these views the Commission will consider the representations and make final proposals to Welsh Government. It will then be for Welsh Government Ministers to make the Order, if they deem it appropriate, with or without modification.

6. The Commission welcomes representations that are based on evidence and facts which are relevant to the proposals under consideration.
Chapter 2. **SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

- The Commission proposes a change to the arrangement of electoral wards that will achieve a marked improvement in the level of electoral parity across the County Borough of Conwy.

- The Commission proposes a council of 54 members, down from 59. This results in a proposed county average of 1,655 electors per member.

- The Commission proposes 30 electoral wards, a reduction from 38 existing wards.

- The largest under-representation (in terms of electoral variance) within the proposals is Llandrillo yn Rhos (21% above the proposed county average). At present the greatest under-representation is in Pensarn (30% above the proposed county average).

- The largest over-representation (in terms of electoral variance) within the proposals is Uwch Conwy (24% below the proposed county average). At present the greatest over-representation is in Gower (48% below the proposed county average).

- The Commission is proposing eight multi-member wards in the county borough, consisting of four two-member electoral wards: Gele, Llanddulas a Llysfaen, Llanrwst with Llanddoged, and Penmaenmawr; and four three-member electoral wards: Gogarth Mostyn, Llandudno Junction, Llandrillo yn Rhos, and Pensarn Pentre Mawr.

- The Commission has proposed no changes to 19 electoral wards.

- The Commission proposes to have no split communities across the county borough.

- The Commission received representations from Conwy County Borough Council, seven Town and Community Councils and one County Borough Councillor. The Commission considered all of these representations carefully before it formulated its proposals. A summary of those representations can be found at Appendix 5.

**Summary Maps**

1. On the following pages are thematic maps illustrating the current and proposed arrangements and their variances from the proposed county average of 1,655 electors per member. Those areas in green are within +/-10% of the county average; yellow and hatched yellow between +/-10% and +/-25% of the county average; orange and hatched orange between +/-25% and +/-50% of the county average, respectively.

2. As can be seen from these maps the proposed arrangements provide for a marked improvement in electoral parity across the county.
Chapter 3. ASSESSMENT

Council size
1. The number of elected members for the County Borough of Conwy has been determined by the Commission’s Council Size Policy and methodology. This policy can be found in our Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice document. At present the size of the council at 59 members is six members above the methodology’s overall aim. The methodology sets out a size of the Council of 53 for this review.

2. The Commission reviewed the electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy in the light of our methodology and took account of the representations which had been made. For the reasons given below we believe that in the interests of effective and convenient local government a Council of 54 members would be appropriate to represent the County Borough of Conwy.

3. The Commission received a representation from Conwy County Borough Council which expressed concerns about the Commission’s Council Size Policy and the category they are placed in.

4. The Council Size Policy that is being applied in this review uses the latest, published, data which determines that Conwy is placed in category three. The policy was set by the Commission at the start of its programme of reviews and it is appropriate that the same policy be applied across all reviews within the programme.

Number of electors
5. The numbers shown as the electorate for 2017 and the estimates for the electorate in the year 2022 are those submitted by Conwy County Borough Council. These forecasted figures have been revised by Conwy County Borough Council from the forecasted figures published at the start of the review. The revised forecast figures supplied by Conwy County Borough Council show a forecasted increase in the electorate of Conwy from 89,359 to 93,641.

6. The Office of National Statistics (ONS) have also provided their estimated number of persons eligible to vote but who are not on the electoral register. This showed an estimated 25,582 more people eligible to vote than the 2017 electorate.

Councillor to electorate ratio
7. In respect of the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward there is a wide variation from the current county average of 1,515 electors per councillor ranging from 43% below (867 electors) to 42% above (2,149 electors). The determination of the council of 54 members (see paragraph 2) results in an average of 1,655 electors being represented by each councillor.

8. The Commission considered the ratio of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected, with a view to proposing changes to ensure that the number of local government electors shall be, as near as may be, the same in every ward in the principal area. The size and character of the council was considered as were a wide range of other factors including local topography, road communications, and local ties.
Judgement and Balance

9. In producing a scheme of electoral arrangements the Commission must have regard to a number of issues contained in the legislation. It is not always possible to resolve all of these, sometimes conflicting, issues. In the proposed scheme the Commission has placed emphasis on achieving improvements in electoral parity whilst maintaining community ties wherever possible. The Commission has made every effort to ensure that the revised electoral wards are an appropriate combination of existing community and community wards.

10. The Commission is of the view that, in the first instance, it is desirable that each electoral ward should return a single-member. In some areas however, because of the number of electors in a community or community ward we have considered the creation of multi-member wards in order to achieve appropriate levels of electoral parity. This issue often arises in urban areas where the number of electors is too high to form a single-member ward. It also may arise in more rural wards where the creation of single-member wards would result in substantial variances in electoral parity.

11. The Commission has looked at each area and is satisfied that it would be difficult to achieve electoral arrangements that keep the existing combination of communities and community wards without having a detrimental effect on one or more of the other issues that the Commission must consider. The Commission recognises however that there may be different combinations of communities and community wards that better reflect community ties and it would welcome any alternative suggestions that comply with the legislation.

Electoral Ward Names

12. In the creation of these draft proposals the Commission has considered the names of all the electoral wards proposed in Welsh and English, where appropriate. For these draft proposals we have selected names of either electoral wards or communities that appear in Orders, where they exist, as these are considered to be the existing legal names. Views are welcomed on the proposed names and any alternative names suggested will be considered.

13. The Commission consulted with the Welsh Language Commissioner on the suitability of the names in their draft form prior to the publication of these draft proposals, with a particular focus on the Welsh language names. This recognises the Welsh Language Commissioner’s legal role and specialist knowledge in respect of Welsh language place names. It must be clear that these proposals are not proposals for changes to any place names. At each proposal an indication is given of the Welsh Language Commissioner’s recommendations and, where they differ, the specific recommendation and why they proposed an alternative to the Commission’s proposed name. It is hoped that this process will encourage debate on the proposed names and will ensure the eventual final proposals of the Commission are accurate and meet local wishes.
Chapter 4. THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

1. The Commission’s proposals are described in detail in this chapter. For each new proposal the report sets out:

- The name(s) of the existing electoral wards which wholly or in part constitute the proposed ward;
- A brief description of the existing electoral wards in terms of the number of electors now and projected and their percentage variance from the proposed county average;
- Key arguments made during the initial consultation (if any). Although not all representations are mentioned in this section, all representations have been considered and a summary can be found at Appendix 5;
- The views of the Commission;
- The composition of the proposed electoral ward and the proposed name;
- A map of the proposed electoral ward.

### Retained Electoral Wards

2. The Commission has considered the electoral arrangements of the existing electoral wards and the ratio of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected. It is proposed that the existing arrangements should be retained within the following electoral wards:

- Betws yn Rhos
- Bryn
- Caerhun
- Colwyn
- Conwy
- Craig y Don
- Deganwy
- Eirias
- Glyn
- Kinmel Bay
- Llansanffraid
- Llansannan
- Mochdre
- Pandy
- Penrhyn
- Rhiw
- Towyn
- Tudno
- Uwch Conwy

3. The Commission would welcome any suggestions on alternative names to those mentioned in this section.

- The Commission is proposing to preserve the geographical arrangements and ward names of the electoral wards listed below; however, the Welsh Language Commissioner has recommended the following:
• Betws yn Rhos be renamed Betws-yn-Rhos as it is the form recommended in the Rhestr o Enwau Lleoedd/A Gazetteer of Welsh Place Names (University of Wales Press, 1967) (A Gazetteer of Welsh Place Names). The hyphen is used in Welsh place-names in order to aid pronunciation by showing that stress does not fall on the penultimate syllable.

• The existing Welsh language name Craig y Don and the existing English language name Craig-y-Don be renamed Craig-y-don only. This is the recognised form in the A Gazetteer of Welsh Place Names. The name of a settlement is usually written as one word in order to distinguish between settlements and topographical features. The same form (with hyphens) should be used for both Welsh and English. It should be noted that it is not necessary to capitalise the 'don' element as it is not a personal noun.

**Proposed Electoral Wards**

4. The Commission considered changes to the remaining 19 existing electoral wards. Details of the current electoral arrangements can be found at Appendix 2. The Commission’s proposed arrangements can be found in Appendix 3.
Capelulo and Pant-yr-Afon/Penmaenan

5. The existing Capelulo electoral ward is composed of the Capelulo ward of the Town of Penmaenmawr. It has 1,165 electors (1,255 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 30% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,274 eligible electors.

6. The existing Pant-yr-Afon/Penmaenan electoral ward is composed of the Pant-yr-Afon and Penmaenan wards of the Town of Penmaenmawr. It has 2,126 electors (2,175 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 28% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,587 eligible electors.

7. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards, from County Borough Councillor K. Stevens (Pant-yr-Afon/Penmaenan). He agreed with the findings of the last non-implemented review of electoral arrangements of Conwy in 2011, specifically the merging of Capelulo and Pant-yr-Afon/Penmaenan. The Commission is also in agreement with this view.

8. The Commission notes the high level of over-representation in the existing Capelulo electoral ward and the high level of under-representation in the existing Pant-yr-Afon/Penmaenan electoral ward, compared to the proposed county average and have therefore considered alternative arrangements for these areas.

9. The Commission proposes to combine the wards of Capelulo, Pant-yr-Afon and Penmaenan of the Town of Penmaenmawr to form an electoral ward of 3,291 electors (3,430 projected electorate) which, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of representation that is 1% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Penmaenmawr. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed name. The Commission welcomes any suggestions for alternative names.

10. The Commission considers that this proposed electoral ward respects the natural boundaries that create the Town of Penmaenmawr. There are two headlands of Penmaenbach Point and Penmaenan Point: Penmaenbach Point separates the Capelulo ward from the Town of Conwy and Penmaenan Point separating Pant-yr-Afon and Penmaenan wards from the Bryn and Pandy wards of the Community of Llanfairfechan. There is an arc of hills that separates Capelulo ward from the Tyn-y-Groes of the Community of Caerhun and Pant yr Afon/Penmaenan wards from the Llechwedd ward of the Community of Henryd. The proposed electoral ward has a range of communication links including the A55 with which should allow for effective multi-member representation. The wards of Capelulo, Pant-yr-Afon and Penmaenan have similar characteristics and needs which would aid in the delivery of effective and convenient local government.
Gogarth and Mostyn

11. The existing Gogarth electoral ward is composed of the Gogarth ward of the Town of Llandudno. It has 2,910 electors (2,995 projected electorate) represented by two councillors which is 12% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 3,526 eligible electors.

12. The existing Mostyn electoral ward is composed of the Mostyn ward of the Town of Llandudno. It has 2,769 electors (2,821 projected electorate) represented by two councillors which is 16% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 3,396 eligible electors.

13. The Commission received one representation regarding these wards from Llandudno Town Council. They responded that they were content with the status quo as far as their Local Authority’s representation was concerned. They expressed concerns regarding the change in category of Conwy and the impact that the reduction of County Councillors would have on the engagement with constituents.

14. The Commission notes the over-representation in the existing Gogarth and Mostyn electoral wards, compared to the proposed county average. Due to the need to reduce the number of members to achieve the aim set out in the Council Size Policy, combining of Gogarth and Mostyn electoral wards were considered.

15. The Commission proposes to combine the wards of Gogarth and Mostyn of the Town of Llandudno to form an electoral ward of 5,679 electors (5,816 projected electorate) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation 14% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Gogarth Mostyn. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed name. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

16. In order to improve the level of electoral variance across Conwy and meet the Commission’s Council Size Policy, a reduction in County Councillors is required. The existing Gogarth and Mostyn wards are over-represented each represented by two members. Gogarth and Mostyn is an urban and compact area, with a good range of communication and social links. Whilst the Commission’s preferred position is for single-member electoral wards, it considers that multi-member wards do provide for effective means of representation in urban areas. This proposed electoral ward results in a reduction of one member, from four to three members.
Marl and Pensarn

17. The existing Marl electoral ward is composed of the Marl ward of the Town of Conwy. It has 3,559 electors (3,675 projected electorate) represented by two councillors which is 8% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 4,491 eligible electors.

18. The existing Pensarn electoral ward is composed of the Pensarn ward of the Town of Conwy. It has 2,149 electors (2,364 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 30% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,772 eligible electors.

19. The Commission received no representations in regard to these areas.

20. The Commission notes the high level of under-representation in the existing Pensarn electoral ward, compared to the proposed county average, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

21. The Commission proposes to combine the wards of Marl and Pensarn of the Town of Conwy to form an electoral ward of 5,708 electors (6,039 projected electorate) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation 15% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Cyffordd Llandudno; and the English language name of Llandudno Junction. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed names. The Commission welcomes any suggestions for alternative names.

22. The existing Pensarn ward is the most under-represented electoral ward in Conwy. Llandudno Junction is an urban and compact area, with a good range of communication and social links. Whilst the Commission’s preferred position is for single-member electoral wards, it considers that multi-member wards do provide for effective means of representation in urban areas. The Commission’s view is that the improvement in electoral parity will provide for effective and convenient local government in this area.
Llandrillo yn Rhos

23. The existing Llandrillo yn Rhos electoral ward is composed of the Dinarth and Rhos wards of the Community of Rhos-on-Sea. It has 5,996 electors (6,227 projected electorate) represented by four councillors which is 9% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 7,599 eligible electors.

24. The Commission received no representations in regard to these areas.

25. The Commission considers (Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice [2016] and outlined in Appendix 4) that it is desirable to not have more than three members to a ward, except when the Commission receives evidence to support its retention. Also, due to the need to reduce the number of members to achieve the aim set out in the Council Size Policy, the Commission considered alternative arrangements for the area.

26. The Commission proposes that the existing electoral ward of Llandrillo yn Rhos is reduced by one councillor. This forms an electoral ward of 5,996 electors (6,227 projected electorate) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation 21% above the proposed county average. The Commission proposes the name of Llandrillo-yn-Rhos for this electoral ward. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed name as it is the recommended form in the A Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names, with the inclusion of a hyphen to aid the correct pronunciation of the Welsh place-name. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

27. The Commission’s preferred position is for single-member electoral wards, however it considers that multi-member representation does provide for effective means of representation in urban areas. The Commission notes that this proposed electoral ward results in a reduction of one member and a shift from over-representation to under-representation. Llandrillo-yn-Rhos is an urban and compact area, with a good range of communication and social links.
Llanddulas and Llysfaen

28. The existing Llanddulas electoral ward is composed of the Community of Llanddulas and Rhyd-y-foel. It has 1,327 electors (1,447 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 20% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,628 eligible electors.

29. The existing Llysfaen electoral ward is composed of the Community of Llysfaen. It has 1,905 electors (2,221 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 15% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,571 eligible electors.

30. The Commission received no representations in regard to these areas.

31. The Commission notes the high level of future under-representation in the existing Llysfaen electoral ward, compared to the proposed county average, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

32. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Llanddulas and Rhyd-y-foel and Llysfaen to form an electoral ward of 3,232 electors (3,668 projected electorate). This electoral ward, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of representation 2% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Llanddulas a Llysfaen. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed name. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

33. Llanddulas a Llysfaen has good range of communication and social links. Whilst the Commission’s preferred position is for single-member electoral wards, it considers that multi-member wards do provide for effective means of representation in this area. The alternative arrangements the Commission proposes significantly improves the electoral parity in these areas.
Abergele Pensarn and Pentre Mawr

34. The existing Abergele Pensarn electoral ward is composed of the Pensarn ward of the Town of Abergele. It has 1,938 electors (2,090 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 17% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,577 eligible electors.

35. The existing Pentre Mawr electoral ward is composed of the Pentre Mawr ward of the Town of Abergele. It has 2,750 electors (3,027 projected electorate) represented by two councillors which is 17% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 3,503 eligible electors.

36. The Commission received one representation, from Abergele Town Council, in regard to this area. The Town Council proposes to increase representation in Pensarn by one councillor to two councillors and for the existing arrangements for Pentre Mawr and Gele to remain the same. They stated that consideration should be given to the amount of new housing being built in the Abergele area based on the figures from Conwy County Borough Council. These forecasted figures have been revised by Conwy County Borough Council.

37. The Commission notes the high level of under representation in the existing Abergele Pensarn electoral ward, compared to the proposed county average, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

38. The Commission proposes to combine the wards of Pensarn and Pentre Mawr of the Town of Abergele to form an electoral ward of 4,688 electors (5,117 projected electorate) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation 6% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Pensarn Pentre Mawr. The Welsh Language Commissioner proposed the name of Pensarn Pentremawr as it is the recommended form in the A Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names, with the inclusion of a hyphen to aid the correct pronunciation of the Welsh place-name. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

39. Pensarn and Pentre Mawr is a compact and urban area that has a good range of communication and social links. Whilst the Commission’s preferred position is for single-member electoral wards, it considers that multi-member wards do provide for effective means of representation in urban areas. The Commission’s view is that the improvement in electoral parity will provide for effective and convenient local government in this area.

40. The Commission agrees with the Town Council that the under-representation in Pensarn ward needs to be addressed. However, the Commission is of the view that the over-representation in the adjacent ward of Pentre Mawr and revised projected statistics provided by Conwy County Borough Council do not justify the increase in councillors the Town Council is proposing. The Commission considers that its proposal, as described above (in paragraph 38) substantially improves the electoral parity for the area.
Gele

41. The existing Gele electoral ward is composed of the Gele and St. George wards of the Town of Abergele. It has 3,776 electors (4,260 projected electorate) represented by three councillors which is 24% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 4,704 eligible electors.

42. The Commission received one representation, from Abergele Town Council, in regard to this area. The Town Council propose to increase representation in the Pensarn electoral ward by one councillor – to two councillors – and for the existing arrangements for the Pentre Mawr and Gele electoral wards to remain the same. The Town Council stated that consideration should be given to the amount of new housing being built in the Abergele area based on the figures from Conwy County Borough Council. The original forecasted figures have been revised by Conwy County Borough Council.

43. The Commission notes the high level of over representation in the existing Gele electoral ward, compared to the proposed county average, and have therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

44. The Commission proposes that the existing electoral ward of Gele is reduced by one councillor. This forms an electoral ward of 3,776 electors (4,260 projected electorate) which, if represented by two councillors would result in a level of representation 14% above the proposed county average. The Commission proposes to keep the existing name of Gele. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed name. The Commission welcomes any suggestions for alternative names.

45. Gele has a good range of communication and social links. Whilst the Commission’s preferred position is for single-member electoral wards, it considers that multi-member wards do provide for effective means of representation in this area. The Commission’s view is that the improvement in electoral parity which will provide for effective and convenient local government in this area.

46. The Commission considered the Town Council’s reasoning for retaining the existing Gele electoral ward. However, it is of the view that the over-representation in this area, and the revised projected statistics provided by Conwy County Borough Council do not justify keeping the existing arrangements as proposed by the Town Council. The Commission considers that the new proposal it is putting forward substantially improves the electoral parity in the area.
Cwrst, Eglwysbach, and Gower

47. The existing Cwrst electoral ward is composed of the Cwrst ward of the Town of Llanrwst. It has 1,559 electors (1,633 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 6% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,067 eligible electors.

48. The existing Eglwysbach electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Eglwysbach and Llanddoged and Maenan. It has 1,212 electors (1,242 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 27% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,500 eligible electors.

49. The existing Gower electoral ward is composed of the Gower ward of the Town of Llanrwst. It has 867 electors (882 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 48% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,183 eligible electors.

50. The Commission received no representations for these areas.

51. The Commission noted the high level of over representation in the existing Gower electoral ward, compared to the proposed county average, and have therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

52. The Commission proposes to combine the wards of Cwrst and Gower of the Town of Llanrwst with the Community of Llanddoged and Maenan to form an electoral ward of 2,921 electors (3,015 projected electorate). This proposed ward if represented by two councillors would result in a level of representation 12% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Llanrwst gyda Llanddoged; and the English language name of Llanrwst with Llanddoged. The Welsh Language Commissioner proposed the Commission considers adopting the Welsh language name Llanrwst gyda Llanddoged for both languages as the only difference between them is the conjunction. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

53. The existing Gower ward is the most over-represented electoral ward in Conwy. In creating the multi-member ward of Llanrwst with Llanddoged the Commission acknowledges the proposal combines urban and rural communities. However, the Commission believes this proposal is appropriate due to effective communication links and shared geographies across the two areas, resulting in an electoral ward with appropriate levels of electoral variance.
Llangernwy and Uwchaled

54. The existing Llangernyw electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Llangernyw and Pentrefoelas. It has 1,124 electors (1,147 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 32% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,412 eligible electors.

55. The existing Uwchaled electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Cerrigydrudion, Llanfihangel Glyn Myfyr and Llangwm. It has 1,138 electors (1,160 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 31% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,404 eligible electors.

56. The Commission received no representations from this area.

57. The Commission noted the high level of over representation in the existing Uwchaled and Llangernyw electoral wards, compared to the proposed county average, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for these areas.

58. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Cerrigydrudion, Llanfihangel Glyn Myfyr, Llangwm and Pentrefoelas to form an electoral ward of 1,411 electors (1,444 projected electorate). This proposed ward if represented by one councillor would result in a level of representation 15% below the proposed county average. The Welsh Language Commissioner proposed the name Uwch Aled as recommended in the national standard reference work, Welsh Administrative and Territorial Units (University of Wales Press, 1969). There is no need to write this name as one word as it refers to a geographical area, rather than a specific settlement. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Uwch Aled. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

59. In amending the ward of Uwchaled the Commission acknowledges the increase in size of the ward. However, the Commission believes this proposal is appropriate due to the effective communication links and geographies across the area, resulting in significant improvement in electoral parity.
Eglwysbach and Llangernyw

60. The existing Eglwysbach electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Eglwysbach and Llanddoged and Maenan. It has 1,212 electors (1,242 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 27% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,500 eligible electors.

61. The existing Llangernyw electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Llangernyw and Pentrefoelas. It has 1,124 electors (1,147 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 32% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,412 eligible electors.

62. The Commission received one representation, from Llangernyw Community Council, in regard to the Llangernyw area. The Council stated that the county’s arrangements should stay as they are and they contended that larger wards would be ineffective and inconvenient due to the large area to travel. The Council felt that there was a greater pressure of work for rural councillors due to the size and number of the communities in their wards. They highlighted the importance of rural areas being represented at the County Council and a decrease in this would negatively impact on the Welsh language.

63. The Commission considered the representation from Llangernyw Community Council and noted the high level of over representation in the existing Eglwysbach and Llangernyw electoral wards, compared to the proposed county average. As a consequence of the proposed electoral ward of Llanrwst with Llanddoged (see page 23), the Community of Eglwysbach needs to be placed with further communities to provide appropriate levels of representation. As a consequence of the proposed electoral ward of Uwch Aled (see page 25), the Llangernwy ward of the Community of Llangernwy needs to be placed with further communities to provide appropriate levels of representation. The Commission have therefore considered alternative arrangements for these areas.

64. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Eglwysbach and Llangernyw to form an electoral ward of 1,568 electors (1,605 projected electorate). This proposed ward if represented by one councillor would result in a level of representation 5% below the proposed county average.

65. The Welsh Language Commissioner proposed the name of *Eglwys-bach a Llangernyw* as recommended in the *A Gazetteer of Welsh Place Names*, with the inclusion of a hyphen to aid the correct pronunciation of the Welsh place-name. The Commission has therefore, given the proposed electoral ward the name of *Eglwys-bach a Llangernyw*. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

66. The alternative arrangements the Commission proposes significantly improves the electoral parity in these areas.
Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw

67. The existing Betws-y-Coed electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Betws-y-Coed, Capel Curig and Dolwyddelan. It has 939 electors (939 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 43% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,194 eligible electors.

68. The existing Trefriw electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Dolgarrog and Trefriw. It has 1,021 electors (1,064 projected electorate) represented by one councillor which is 39% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,277 eligible electors.

69. The Commission received no representations for these areas.

70. The Commission noted the high level of over representation in the existing Betws-y-Coed and Trefriw electoral wards, compared to the proposed county average, and have therefore considered alternative arrangements for these areas.

71. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Betws-y-Coed, Capel Curig, Dolwyddelan, Dolgarrog, and Trefriw to form an electoral ward of 1,960 electors (2,003 projected electorate). This proposed ward if represented by one councillor would result in a level of representation 18% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Betws y Coed a Threfriw; and the English language name of Betws y Coed and Trefriw.

72. The Welsh Language Commissioner proposed the Welsh language name of Betws-y-coed a Threfriw; English language name of Betws-y-coed and Trefriw as recommended in the A Gazetteer of Welsh Place Names, noting that it is not necessary to capitalise the ‘coed’ element in Betws-y-coed as it is not a personal noun. The Welsh Language Commissioner also proposed the Commission considers adopting the Welsh language name Betws-y-coed a Threfriw for both languages as the only difference between them is the conjunction. The Commission welcomes views on this suggestion and any alternative names.

73. The alternative arrangements the Commission proposes significantly improves the electoral parity in these areas. The Commission noted that while this creates a large rural ward it was supported by the strong communication links between the areas of Dolgarrog and Trefriw and by retaining the existing arrangements for Caerhun to the north. The Commission would welcome representations on the alternative proposal, to combine the Community of Dolgarrog with the existing electoral ward of Caerhun and to combine the Community of Trefriw with the existing electoral ward of Betws-y-Coed.
Chapter 5. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS

1. The existing electoral arrangements (as shown at Appendix 2) provide for the following levels of electoral representation within the County Borough of Conwy:
   - Electoral variance ranges from 43% below the current county average (Gower) to 42% above the current county average (Pensarn) of 1,515 electors per councillor.
   - 9 electoral wards (24%) have levels of representation more than 25% above or below the current county average of 1,515 electors per councillor.
   - 12 electoral wards (32%) have levels of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the current county average of 1,515 electors per councillor.
   - 17 electoral wards (45%) have levels of representation less than 10% above or below the current county average of 1,515 electors per councillor.

2. In comparison with the existing electoral arrangements shown above, the proposed electoral arrangements (as shown in Appendix 3) illustrate the following improvements to the electoral representation across the County:
   - Electoral variance ranges from 24% below the proposed county average (Uwch Conwy) to 21% above the proposed county average (Llandrillo yn Rhos) of 1,655 electors per councillor.
   - 17 electoral wards (57%) have levels of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the proposed county average of 1,655 electors per councillor.
   - 13 electoral wards (43%) have levels of representation less than 10% above or below the proposed county average of 1,655 electors per councillor.

3. As described in Appendix 4, in producing a scheme of electoral arrangements the Commission must have regard to a number of issues contained in the legislation. It is not always possible to resolve all of these, sometimes conflicting issues. In the Commission’s proposed scheme it has placed emphasis on achieving improvements in electoral parity whilst maintaining community ties wherever possible. The Commission recognises that the creation of electoral wards, which depart from the pattern which now exists, may impact upon existing ties between communities and straddle multiple community councils. The Commission has made every effort to ensure that the revised electoral wards are appropriate combinations of existing community and community wards.

4. The Commission has looked at each area and are satisfied that it would be difficult to achieve electoral arrangements that keep the existing combination of communities and community wards, without having a detrimental effect on one or more of the other issues that it must consider. The Commission recognises however that there may be different combinations of communities and community wards that better reflect community ties and it would welcome any alternative suggestions that comply with the legislation.

5. In this document the proposed electoral wards have been given working names which are intended to represent an area rather than particular settlements, villages, or towns. The Commission recognises that there may be names that are more appropriate and it would welcome alternative suggestions. The Commission would request that these suggested names should not merely consist of listed communities and villages but, instead, should
reflect the character of the areas involved as well as being effective in either English or Welsh.

6. This draft scheme represents our preliminary views on the electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy. We shall welcome any representations in respect of these proposals. We will consider carefully all representations made to us in respect of them before formulating our final proposals and submitting them to the Welsh Government.

Chapter 6. RESPONSES TO THIS REPORT

1. All observations on these draft proposals should be sent to:

   The Chief Executive
   Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales
   Hastings House
   Fitzalan Court
   Cardiff
   CF24 0BL

   Or by email to:

   ldbc.wales@gov.wales

   not later than 25 June 2018.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Commission</strong></th>
<th>The Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community (area)</strong></td>
<td>The unit of local government that lies below the level of the Principal Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Council</strong></td>
<td>An elected council that provides services to their particular community area. A Community Council may be divided for community electoral purposes into community wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community / Town ward</strong></td>
<td>An area within a Community Council created for community electoral purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td>Directions issued by Welsh Ministers under Section 48 of the Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral wards</strong></td>
<td>The areas into which Principal Councils are divided for the purpose of electing county councillors, previously referred to as electoral divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral review</strong></td>
<td>A review in which the Commission considers the electoral arrangements for a Principal Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral variance</strong></td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward varies from the county average; expressed as a percentage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate</strong></td>
<td>The number of persons registered to vote in a local government area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Population of Eligible Voters</strong></td>
<td>The estimated number of eligible persons (18+) within a local government area who are eligible to vote. These figures have been sourced from the Office of National Statistics’ 2015 Ward population estimated for Wales, mid-2015 (experimental statistics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interested party</strong></td>
<td>Person or body who has an interest in the outcome of an electoral review such as a community or town council, local MP or AM or political party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order</strong></td>
<td>Order made by an implementing body, giving effect to proposals made by the Principal Council or the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over-representation</strong></td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward compared to the county average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal area</strong></td>
<td>The area governed by a Principal Council: in Wales a county or county borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal council</td>
<td>The single tier organ of local government, responsible for all or almost all local government functions within its area. A county or county borough council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected electorate</td>
<td>The five-year forecast of the electorate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Community</td>
<td>A Community which is divided between two, or more, Electoral Wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Council</td>
<td>A Community Council with the status of a town are known as Town Councils. A Town Council may be divided for community electoral purposes into wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-representation</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward compared to the county average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abergele Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betws yn Rhos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caernarfon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Craig-y-Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kinmel Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Llandudno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pant-yr-Afon/Penmaenan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pentre Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rhiw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONWY COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
### EXISTING COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>No. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2017</th>
<th>2017 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2022</th>
<th>2022 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>Population Eligible to Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Trefriw</td>
<td>The Communities of Dolgarrog 342 (374) and Trefriw 679 (690)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tudno</td>
<td>The Tudno Ward of the Town Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Uwch Conwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Bro Garmon 562 (562), Bro Machno 537 (537) and Ysbyty Ifan 161 (161)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Uwchaled</td>
<td>The Communities of Cerrigydrudion 563 (573), Llanfihangel Glyn Myfyr 162 (167) and Llangwm 413 (420)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 59 89,359 1,515 93,641 1,587 116,218

- Greater than + or - 50% of County average: 0 0%
- Between + or - 25% and + or - 50% of County average: 9 24%
- Between + or - 10% and + or - 25% of County average: 12 32%
- Between 0% and + or - 10% of County average: 17 45%

Electoral figures supplied by Conwy Borough County Council
Population figures supplied by the Office for National Statistics

---

**Note:**
- Ratio is the number of electors per councillor.
- Electorale figures supplied by Conwy Borough County Council.
- Population figures supplied by the Office for National Statistics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>No. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2017</th>
<th>2017 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2022</th>
<th>2022 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 816 (1,096) and Llanfair Talhaiarn 812 (822)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,630 -1%</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betws y Coed with Trefriw</td>
<td>The Communities of Betws y Coed 409 (409), Capel Curig 166 (166), Dolgwyddelan 364 (364) and Trefriw 679 (690)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,960 18%</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bryn</td>
<td>The Bryn 794 (850) and Lafan Wards 553 (610) of the Town of Llanfairfechan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,347 -19%</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Caerhun</td>
<td>The Communities of Caerhun 1,025 (1,027) and Henrhyn 586 (590)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>1,611 -3%</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Colwyn</td>
<td>The Colwyn Ward of the Community of Colwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,721</td>
<td>1,610 -3%</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>The Aberconwy 1,346 (1,354) and the Castell Wards 1,873 (1,959) of the Town of Conwy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>1,844 11%</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Craig y Don</td>
<td>The Craig y Don Ward of the Town of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>1,382 -17%</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deganwy</td>
<td>The Deganwy Ward of the Town of Conwy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>1,621 -2%</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eglwys-bach a Llangernyw</td>
<td>The Communities of Eglwys-bach 717 (742) and Llangernyw 851 (863)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,568 -5%</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eirias</td>
<td>The Eirias Ward of the Community of Colwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>1,358 -18%</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gele</td>
<td>The Gele 3,545 (4,029) and the St George Wards 231 (231) of the Town of Abergavenny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>1,888 14%</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>23%</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>2,985</td>
<td>1,493 -10%</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gogarth Mostyn</td>
<td>The Gogarth 2,910 (2,995) and the Mostyn Wards 2,769 (2,821) of the Town of Llandudno</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>1,893 14%</td>
<td>5,816</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kinmel Bay</td>
<td>The Kinmel Bay Ward of the Town of Kinmel Bay and Towyn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>1,522 -6%</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Llandulas a Llysfaen</td>
<td>The Communities of Llandulas and Llysfaen 1,616 (1,647) and Llysfaen 1,905 (2,221)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>1,616 -2%</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Llandrillo-yn-Rhos</td>
<td>The Community of Rhos-on-Sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,996</td>
<td>1,999 21%</td>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Llandudno Junction</td>
<td>The Marl 3,559 (3,675) and the Pensarn Wards 2,149 (2,364) of the Town of Conwy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td>1,903 15%</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Llanrwst with Llanddoged</td>
<td>The Town of Llanrwst 2,426 (2,515) and the Community of Llanddoged &amp; Maenan 495 (500)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>1,461 -12%</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Llansanffraid</td>
<td>The Community of Llansanffraid Glan Conwy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,816 10%</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Llansannan</td>
<td>The Communities of Llansannan 1,041 (1,105) and Llannefydd 448 (450)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,489 -10%</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mochdre</td>
<td>The Community of Mochdre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,449 -11%</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pandy</td>
<td>The Pandy Ward of the Town of Llanfairfechan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,449 -12%</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pennaenmawr</td>
<td>The Town of Pennaenmawr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>1,664 -1%</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Penrhyd</td>
<td>The Penrhyd Ward of the Town of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>1,928 17%</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pensarn Pentre Mawr</td>
<td>The Pensarn (Abergavenny) 1,938 (2,090) and the Pentre Mawr Wards 2,750 (3,027) of the Town of Abergavenny</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>1,563 -6%</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rhiw</td>
<td>The Rhiw Ward of the Community of Colwyn Bay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>1,646 -1%</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Towyn</td>
<td>The Towyn Ward of the Town of Kinmel Bay &amp; Towyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>1,844 11%</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tudno</td>
<td>The Tudno Ward of the Town of Llandudno</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>1,825 10%</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Uwch Conwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Bro Garmon 562 (562), Bro Machno 537 (537) and Yafyty Ifan 161 (161)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260 -24%</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>No. OF COUNCILLORS</td>
<td>ELECTORATE 2017</td>
<td>2017 RATIO</td>
<td>% variance from County average</td>
<td>ELECTORATE 2022</td>
<td>2022 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>30</td>
<td>Uwch Aled</td>
<td>The Communities of Cerrigydrudion 563 (573), Llanfihangel Glyn Myfyr 162 (167), Llangwm 413 (420) and Pentrefoelas 273 (284)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 54 89,359 1,655 93,641 1,734

Ratio is the number of electors per councillor
Electoral figures supplied by Conwy Borough County Council
RULES AND PROCEDURES

Scope and Object of the Review

1. Section 29 (1) of the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 (the Act) lays upon the Commission the duty, at least once in every review period of ten 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 Government for a change in those electoral arrangements. In conducting a review the Commission must seek to ensure effective and convenient local government (Section 21 (3) of the Act).

2. The former Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Local Government of the Welsh Government has asked the Commission to submit a report in respect of the review of electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy before the 2022 local government elections.

Electoral Arrangements

3. The changes that the Commission may recommend in relation to an electoral review are:

   a. such changes to the arrangements for the principal area under review as appear to it appropriate; and

   b. in consequence of such changes:

      i. Such community boundary changes as it considers appropriate in relation to any community in the principal area;

      ii. Such community council changes and changes to the electoral arrangements for such a community as it considers appropriate; and

      iii. Such preserved county changes as it considers appropriate.

4. The “electoral arrangements” of a principal area are defined in section 29 (9) of the Act as:

   a. the number of members for the council for the principal area;

   b. the number, type and boundaries of the electoral wards;

   c. the number of members to be elected for any electoral ward in the principal area; and

   d. the name of any electoral ward.
Considerations for a review of principal area electoral arrangements

5. Section 30 of the Act requires the Commission, in considering whether to make recommendations for changes to the electoral arrangements for a principal area, to:

   a. seek to ensure that the ratio of local government electors to the number of members of the council to be elected is, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral ward of the principal area;

   b. have regard to:

      i. the desirability of fixing boundaries for electoral wards which are and will remain easily identifiable;

      ii. the desirability of not breaking local ties when fixing boundaries for electoral wards.

6. In considering the ratio of local government electors to the number of members account is to be taken of:

   a. any discrepancy between the number of local government electors and the number of persons that are eligible to be local government electors (as indicated by relevant official statistics); and

   b. any change to the number or distribution of local government electors in the principal area which is likely to take place in the period of five years immediately following the making of any recommendation.

Local government changes

7. Since the last local government Order in 1998 there has been nine changes to local government boundaries in Conwy:

   - The Conwy (Llandudno and Conwy) Order 2009

8. There have also been 23 changes to the composition to a number of Community and Town Councils across the County Borough, enacted in 2015 by Orders from the County Borough Council.

Procedure

9. Chapter 4 of the Act lays down procedural guidelines which are to be followed in carrying out a review. In compliance with this part of the Act, we wrote on 25 May 2017 to Conwy County Borough Council, all the Community and Town Councils in the area, the Members of Parliament for the local constituencies, the Assembly Members for the area, and other interested parties to inform them of the
Commission’s intention to conduct the review and to request their preliminary views. The Commission invited the County Borough Council to submit a suggested scheme or schemes for new electoral arrangements. The Commission also asked Conwy County Borough Council to display a number of public notices in their area. The Commission also made available copies of our *Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice* document. In addition the Commission made a presentation to both County Borough and Community councillors explaining the review process.

10. The boundaries of the proposed electoral wards 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 as well as on the Commission’s website (http://ldbc.gov.wales).

**Policy and Practice**

11. The Commission published its *Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice* document in November 2016. This document details its approach to resolving the challenge of balancing electoral parity and community ties; it sets out the issues to be considered and gives some understanding of the broad approach which the Commission takes towards each of the statutory considerations to be made when addressing a review’s particular circumstances. However, because those circumstances are unlikely to provide for the ideal electoral pattern, in most reviews compromises are made in applying the policies in order to strike the right balance between each of the matters we must consider.

12. The document also provides the overall programme timetable, and how this was identified, and the Commission’s Council Size Policy. The document can be viewed on the Commission’s website or are available on request.

**Crown Copyright**

13. The maps included in this report and published on the Commissions website were produced by the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales under licence from Ordnance Survey. These maps are subject to © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction will infringe Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Any newspaper editor wishing to use the maps as part of an article about the draft proposals should first contact the copyright office at Ordnance Survey.
SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE COMMISSIONS INITIAL CONSULTATION ON THE REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE COUNTY BOROUGH OF CONWY

1. Conwy County Borough Council emailed on 29 August 2017 outlining the Council’s concerns with the Commission’s approach to the review. Below is the email sent to the Commission expressing the Council’s view.

Thank you for your e-mail of 24 July. I have since met with the relevant Cabinet Member and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Democratic Services Committee and I think it would be fair to say that we were disappointed with the limited time extension granted.

We considered the suggestion that we concentrate on the more ‘difficult areas’ within our area but felt that the maps provided by the Commission showing the ‘Existing Variance in Electoral Representation from the Council Size Aim’ were misleading; now that Conwy has been moved from category 4 to category 3 (due to the urbanisation factor) the variance is likely to have been exacerbated across the County Borough area as the Council is no longer aiming for a 1:2000 Councillor to population ratio, but a 1:2500 ratio. Because of this it has been decided that the Council has insufficient time to put forward a proposed evidence based scheme for Conwy County Borough Council and will await your draft proposals.

As a consequence, during this initial consultation period, I would like to make you aware of the comments made by the Democratic Services Committee at its meeting on 10 July 2017 which at this stage focus on the Council Size Methodology adopted by the Commission and the unique impact the urbanisation factor has had on Conwy. We have received an explanation as to why this has occurred and, to a certain extent, this has been impacted by the need to comply with other Welsh Government policies, such as the LDP and the requirement to meet the set housing requirements which has forced the Authority to accommodate almost all of our population growth in the existing urban locations only. On the one hand there appears to be a push to protect the rural communities from over-development but ultimately this will mean a reduction in their democratic voice. It will inevitably become more and more difficult to encourage a more diverse range of candidates to stand for election in rural communities that cover a vast area and are far too big for effective representation.

It seems strange that the proposals put us out of kilter with our neighbouring authorities in North West Wales who are all placed in category 4 and we would ask for this to be further considered. We accept that we were consulted on the proposed Council Size Policy and Conwy tried to fully engage in that consultation in June 2012 (despite the timing – again immediately after the 2012 local elections) but our response was based on the LDBCW’s consultation document which placed Conwy in the ‘rural’ category. At that time Conwy made it clear that it could only comment on the proposals for the ‘rural’ category as they affected our Council and I would like to take this opportunity to remind you of Conwy’s response to your question “Do you think that the councillor:elector ratio for each category of authorities is appropriate? If not, what ratio is better and why?”

We would only comment on the ‘rural’ category. The ratio of 1:1,750 is the same ratio applied during the review of electoral arrangements for the County Borough of Conwy carried out at the end of 2010, beginning of 2011, in line with the Minister’s Direction which applied to the whole of Wales. When carrying out that review the LGBCW could not come up with acceptable ways of achieving a ratio of 1:1,750, even after considering all the relevant factors such as communities, community wards, local topography, population density, etc.

The final proposal for Conwy was a reduction in the overall number of councillors from 59 to 57, both those seats would have been lost in the rural community. It is unlikely that another review of Conwy would result in a different proposal for the rural area which would mean that any reduction in the number of councillors would have to come from the coastal areas which would be difficult based on the current community wards and our preference would be not to change any long standing community boundaries.

We understand and accept the concept of banding but the ratio 1:1,750 for ‘rural’ authorities is too high. The current average councillor:elector ratio for the ‘rural’ authorities is 1:1,487 (only Carmarthenshire could achieve a ratio of 1:1,750).

If the suggested ratio is applied it could result in an overall loss of 80 councillors from those authorities in the ‘rural’ banding which is a disproportionate amount compared to the other bandings (‘urban’ authorities lose 6, ‘valley’ authorities lose 47, ‘other’ authorities lose 2) and collectively it could have a skewed effect on political distribution.
We suggest a ratio of 1:1,600 for the ‘rural’ authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Rural’ Unitary Authority</th>
<th>Electorate 2011</th>
<th>Existing number of councillors</th>
<th>Existing average ratio</th>
<th>Number of councillors proposed under banding (12,750)</th>
<th>Number of councillors with average ratio 1:16,00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>138,122</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1:1687</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>56,476</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1:1345</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>91,246</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1:1547</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>74,798</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1:1591</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>86,144</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1:1149</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Anglesey</td>
<td>49,484</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1:1237</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>70,663</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1:1643</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>93,120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1:1552</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>102,855</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1:1409</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>762,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>513</strong></td>
<td><strong>1:1,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td><strong>462</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minister’s Direction allows for a minimum of 30 councillors and a maximum of 75.

The County Borough of Conwy is split between rural and urban. Based on more up to date electoral registration figures the rural area is currently represented by 11 councillors with an average councillor:elector ratio of 1:1309. If the rural area was configured in a way previously proposed by the LDBCW it would reduce the number of councillors to 9 with a ratio of 1:1600. The urban area would then be represented by 48 councillors with an average councillor:elector ratio 1:1625. Thus, resulting in a greater equality of votes within the County Borough of Conwy.

Then again in June 2013 Conwy responded to a further consultation on Council Size Policy and questioned the use of 50% as the demarcation point within the urbanisation factor. It appears that Conwy’s comments were taken on board and the dividing point has been amended to 40%. However, the figures used in the 2013 consultation still placed Conwy within the rural category even with a 40% demarcation point and Members feel that they have been misled.

Conwy would continue to argue that the Welsh Government’s local authority classification divides local authority areas in Wales into four categories: Rural, Semi-Rural, Urban and Valleys. The rural category comprises the local authority areas of Carmarthenshire, Ceredigion, Conwy, Denbighshire, Gwynedd, Isle of Anglesey, Monmouthshire, Pembrokeshire and Powys.

Conwy County Borough Council is classed as a rural authority by Welsh Government, WLGA, and other organisations. Conwy CBC receives Rural Development Partnership funding and has rurality factors recognised in the calculation of Indicator Based Assessments as part of the calculations of the Local Government Finance Settlement. The model being used by the LDBCW is not consistent with the data used by other public sector organisations and we would ask that it be revised so there is consistency.

To now undertake an electoral review with Conwy placed in a different category is both misleading and unfair. The Council Size Consultation Document seemed to suggest that the LDBCW would not use the banding in a prescriptive manner and Conwy would urge the LDBCW to use any discretion it has.

Councillors also questioned why the review carried out in 2011 recommended a reduction in Council Size from 59 to 57 Members; if that level of representation was acceptable at that time why does their now appear to be a determination to reduce the level of representation to such a level that it will not provide for “effective and convenient local government”?

As I mention above, we will of course comment on any draft proposals once received as the Committee made reference to a number of existing anomalies that should be addressed. One example given at the Democratic Services Committee relates to the Dolwyd area which is currently split between the Mochdre and Llansanffraid Electoral Divisions.

In addition, you will recall that as part of our last review of Town and Community Councils there were a number boundary changes proposed which we (as a Council) were unable to implement because the also impacted on the electoral division boundaries (not just the community ward boundaries). I trust these proposals will now be taken into consideration.

Siân Williams
Pennaeth y Gwasanaethau Democrataidd / Head of Democratic Services
2. Abergele Town Council emailed on 18 August 2017 to state that Abergele Pensarn should increase to 2 councillors due to the new housing development and that Gele and Pentre Mawr should remain unchanged.

3. Betws yn Rhos and Llanelian yn Rhos Community Council emailed on 17 August 2017 setting out their concerns with regard to changes to the community council. Specifically: dilution of democracy at grass root; no savings as they are volunteers; centralising of precept; and relationship between county councillor and public. This review will not change communities or their councillors.

4. Llandudno Town Council wrote on 2 August 2017 to state that they were content with the status quo as far as the Local Authority was concerned. They expressed concerns over the proposed reduction in councillor numbers; the potential larger electoral wards they would have to cover, making engagement with constituents more difficult; and the change in the council’s category.

5. Llanfairfechan Town Council emailed on 14 August 2017 to state that they strongly support that the two county councillors remain in place for the electoral wards of Bryn and Pandy due to the estimated population increase. They noted the difference in the population statistics and the electoral register from December 2016. They also noted the Welsh Government’s proposed change to lowering the voting age and the impact it may have.

6. Llanfairtalhaiarn Community Council emailed on 17 August 2017 setting out their concerns with regard to changes to the community council. Specifically: dilution of democracy at grass root; no savings as they are volunteers; centralising of precept; and relationship between county councillor and public. This review will not change communities or their councillors.

7. Llannefydd Community Council emailed on 17 August 2017 setting out their concerns with regard to changes to the community council. Specifically: dilution of democracy at grass root; no savings as they are volunteers; centralising of precept; and relationship between county councillor and public. This review will not change communities or their councillors.

8. Llangernyw Community Council emailed on 18 August 2017 to state beliefs that:
   • The county’s arrangements should remain as they are because larger wards would be ineffective and inconvenient due to the larger area to travel.
   • There is greater pressure of work for rural councillors due to size and the number of communities in their wards.
They stated that the topography of the area creates the boundaries for the communities and highlighted the importance of rural areas represented at the County Council and a decrease in this would cause the Welsh language to suffer.

9. Councillor K Stevens (Pantyrafon/Penmaenan) emailed on 20 June 2017 to state that he agreed with the findings of the last review of electoral arrangements of Conwy in 2011. Specifically that the suggested change of merging of Capelulo and Pantyrafon/Penmeanan
into a single ward with 2 county councillors and renaming it after the largest town Penmaenmawr fitted well with the topography and history of the area.
The Local Authority Elections (Wales) Order 2014 provided for local elections in Wales to be delayed for a year, from May 2016 to May 2017. This allowed the elections to be separated from the Assembly elections.

At the present time, the Local Government Act 1972 provides that ordinary elections to local government in Wales take place on the first Thursday of May every four years. Therefore, the next local government elections would normally take place in May 2021. Since the implementation of the provisions of the Wales Act 2014, elections to the National Assembly take place on a five-yearly cycle. The policy of the Welsh Government is that elections at local level should also be placed on a five year cycle. It is intended that councillors elected next May will therefore hold office until May 2022.

The Wales Bill, currently before Parliament, includes provisions which would enable the Assembly to legislate to determine the term of office for local government. As the Bill is currently in draft form and should these provisions, for any reason, not come into force, the Welsh Government could use the same powers under the Local Government Act 2000 as we did in 2014 to delay the elections by a year. This statement therefore provides clarity to local government as to the length of office of those to be elected next year.
In the light of this, I have considered the decision made last year in relation to the electoral arrangements of some principal councils. It was determined that reviews conducted by the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales in relation to nine principal areas would not be implemented, given the intention that councils elected in 2017 would only serve a short term prior to mergers.

However, even though the elections in May next year will now result in a full term, due to their proximity, the arrangements which would be required and the disruption for potential candidates, I do not intend to implement any changes to current electoral arrangements in advance of the 2017 elections resultant from those reviews. The councils concerned are Carmarthenshire, Ceredigion, Conwy, Denbighshire, Gwynedd, Monmouthshire, Pembrokeshire, Powys and Torfaen.

The decision that councils will be elected for a full term also means that the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission (the Commission) will return to its normal ten-year cycle of reviews of electoral arrangements. I expect the Commission to publish a new, prioritised programme as soon as possible which takes into account the age of the current arrangements in some areas and the amount of change since the last review was undertaken. I will ask the Commission, in planning their work, to start by revisiting the nine outstanding reviews, with a view to presenting fresh reports on these at the very start of their programme.

It is my intention that reviews of electoral arrangements in principal councils will be conducted against a set of common criteria to be agreed through the Commission. I also expect electoral reviews to have been completed for all 22 authorities within the next local government term.

These arrangements provide clarity for those considering standing for election in 2017 and also set out a long term planning horizon for local authorities and their public service partners. However, I want to be clear that discussions on the reform agenda are on-going with local authorities and other stakeholders. I will be proposing a way forward on local government reform in the Autumn.