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FOREWORD

This is our report containing our Draft Proposals for Pembrokeshire County 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 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 Pembrokeshire County Council is the fifth of 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 five 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 of Pembrokeshire. 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 rules and procedures the Commission follows can be found in the Commission’s Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice [2016] and outlined in Appendix 4.

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 significant improvement in the level of electoral parity across the County of Pembrokeshire.

- The Commission proposes to retain a council of 60 members. This results in a proposed county average of 1,574 electors per member.

- The Commission proposes 58 electoral wards, a reduction from 60 existing wards.

- The largest under-representation (in terms of electoral variance) is proposed to be in Milford: East (24% above the proposed county average). At present the greatest under-representation is in Pembroke Dock: Pennar (58% above the proposed county average).

- The largest over-representation (in terms of electoral variance) is proposed to be in St Florence and St Mary Out Liberty (24% below the proposed county average). At present the greatest over-representation is in Newport (43% below the proposed county average).

- The Commission is proposing two multi-member wards in the County; consisting of two-member electoral wards for Fishguard and Pembroke: Monkton and St Mary South.

- The Commission has proposed no changes to 28 electoral wards.

- The Commission proposes to have three electoral wards within the county which combine a part of a warded community, along with its neighbouring community. These community splits are present within the Communities of Narberth, Neyland and Saundersfoot.

- The Commission received representations from Pembrokeshire County Council, six Community Councils and two county councillors. Pembrokeshire County Council also submitted individual comments made by 12 county councillors, within their representation. 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. 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; and, those in red and hatched red in excess of +/-50% of the county average.

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

Council size

1. The number of elected members for the County of Pembrokeshire 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 60 members is two members below the methodology’s overall aim. The methodology sets out a size of the council of 62 for this review.

2. The Commission reviewed the electoral arrangements for the County of Pembrokeshire 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 60 members would be appropriate to represent the County of Pembrokeshire.

Number of electors

3. The numbers shown as the electorate for 2017 and the estimates for the electorate in the year 2022 are those submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council. The forecast figures supplied by Pembrokeshire County Council show a forecasted increase in the electorate of Pembrokeshire from 94,431 to 94,692. The Office for 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 4,584 more people eligible to vote than the 2017 electorate.

Councillor to electorate ratio

4. In respect of the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward there is a wide variation from the current county average of 1,574 electors per councillor ranging from 43% below (897 electors) in Newport, to 58% above (2,479 electors) in Pembroke Dock: Pennar. The determination of the council of 60 members supports an average of 1,574 electors being represented by each councillor.

5. 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 Commission considered the size and character of the council and a wide range of other factors including topography, road communications, and local ties.

Judgement and Balance

6. 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. The Commission’s proposed scheme has placed an 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, in the Commission’s view, are an appropriate combination of existing communities and community wards.
7. The Commission is of the view that, in the first instance, it is desirable that each electoral ward of a principal authority area should return a single-member. However, in some areas, because of the number of electors in a community or community ward, the Commission has 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.

8. 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. However, the Commission recognise, 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**

9. 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.

10. 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 recommendation 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; and,
- 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. Names displayed in **bold** within the list below denote the electoral wards where the existing geography and electoral ward names have been prescribed within Orders, and which the Commission are proposing to retain.

- Burton
- Goodwick
- Haverfordwest: Castle
- Haverfordwest: Garth
- **Haverfordwest: Portfield**
- **Haverfordwest: Prendergast**
- Haverfordwest: Priory
- **Hundleton**
- Kilgetty/Begelly
- Lampeter Velfrey
- Lamphey
- Letterston
- **Llangwm**
- **Martletwy**
- Merlin’s Bridge
- Milford: Central
- Milford: West
- Narberth
- Narberth Rural
- Neyland: East
- Neyland: West
- Pembroke: St. Mary North
- Pembroke Dock: Market
- Solva
- St. David’s
- St. Dogmaels
- Tenby: North
- Tenby: South
3. Whilst the Commission is recommending to preserve the geographical arrangements within the electoral wards listed above, it is proposing to introduce new electoral ward names for the following (names displayed in **bold** throughout the remainder of this report denote the Commission’s proposed electoral ward name preferences):

- The Electoral Ward of Burton to be given the single name of **Burton**, based on The County of Pembrokeshire (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1998 (the 1998 Order) for the English language name, and the County of Pembrokeshire (Community Electoral Arrangements) Order 2008 (the 2008 Order) for confirmation of Welsh language names of communities and community wards. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral Ward of Goodwick to retain the English language name of **Goodwick**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Wdig**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Haverfordwest: Castle to retain the English language name of **Haverfordwest: Castle**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Hwlffordd: Castell**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Haverfordwest: Garth to retain the English language name of **Haverfordwest: Garth**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Hwlffordd: Garth**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral Ward of Haverfordwest: Priory to retain the English language name of **Haverfordwest: Priory**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Hwlffordd: Priordy**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Kilgetty/Begelly to be renamed **Cilgeti a Begeli** in the Welsh language and, **Kilgetty and Begelly** in the English language, based on the 2008 Order and the 1998 Order, respectively. With reference to the existing electoral ward name of Kilgetty/Begelly, the Commission has decided to apply consistency with respect to ward names across the county by avoiding the use of this type of punctuation within names of wards which combine two, or more, community areas. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Lampeter Velfrey to retain the English language name of **Lampeter Velfrey**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Llanbedr Efelffre**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Lamphey to retain the English language name of **Lamphey**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Llandyfái**, based on the 2008 Order.
Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral ward of Letterston to retain the English language name of **Letterston**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Treletert**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral Ward of Merlin’s Bridge to retain the English language name of **Merlin’s Bridge**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Pont Fadlen**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral Ward of Milford: Central to retain the English language name of **Milford: Central**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Aberdaugleddau: Canol**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Milford: West to retain the English language name of **Milford: West**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Aberdaugleddau: Gorllewin**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Narberth to be renamed **Arberth: Trefol** in the Welsh language and, **Narberth: Urban** in the English language, based on the 2008 Order and the 1998 Order, respectively. The Commission decided to include the term ‘urban’, separated with a colon, within the proposed electoral ward name in order to easily differentiate this area from Narberth: Rural (see the proposal below). The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral Ward of Narberth Rural to be renamed **Arberth: Gwledig** in the Welsh language and, **Narberth: Rural** in the English language, based on the 2008 Order and the 1998 Order, respectively. The Commission decided to utilise a colon within the name, in keeping with the proposed naming format within the county, and to help differentiate this area from Narberth: Urban (see the proposal above). The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

- The Electoral Ward of Neyland: East to retain the English language name of **Neyland: East**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Neyland: Dwyrain**, based on the 2008 Order, and in keeping with the naming format used within the 1998 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

- The Electoral Ward of Neyland: West to retain the English language name of **Neyland: West**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Neyland: Gorllewin**, based on the 2008 Order, and in keeping with the naming format used within the 1998 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).
• The Electoral Ward of Pembroke: St. Mary North to be renamed **Penfro: Gogledd St Mary** in the Welsh Language and, **Pembroke: St Mary North** in the English language, based on the 2008 Order and the 1998 Order, respectively. The Commission’s proposal also applies the current convention to omit a full stop at the end of a contraction which includes the final letter of the word (i.e. ‘St’ for *Saint*). The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

• The Electoral Ward of Pembroke Dock: Market to retain the English language name of **Pembroke Dock: Market**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Doc Penfro: Farchnad**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

• The Electoral Ward of Solva to retain the English language name of **Solve**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Solfach**, based on the 2008 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

• The Electoral Ward of St. David’s to be renamed **Tyddewi** in the Welsh language and, **St David’s** in the English language, based on the 2008 Order and the 1998 Order, respectively. The Commission’s proposal also applies the current convention to omit a full stop at the end of a contraction which includes the final letter of the word (i.e. ‘St’ for *Saint*). The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

• The Electoral Ward of St. Dogmaels to be renamed **Llandudoch** in the Welsh language and, **St Dogmaels** in the English language, based on the 2008 Order and the 1998 Order, respectively. The Commission’s proposal also applies the current convention to omit a full stop at the end of a contraction which includes the final letter of the word (i.e. ‘St’ for *Saint*). The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed no change to the Commission’s proposed name.

• The Electoral Ward of Tenby: North to retain the English language name of **Tenby: North**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Dinbych-y-Pysgod: Gogledd**, based on the 2008 Order, and in keeping with the naming format used within the 1998 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

• The Electoral Ward of Tenby: South to retain the English language name of **Tenby: South**, based on the 1998 Order, and to be given the Welsh language name of **Dinbych-y-Pysgod: De**, based on the 2008 Order, and in keeping with the naming format used within the 1998 Order. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed a change to the Commission’s proposed name (see paragraph 4 for further details).

4. The Commission has consulted the Welsh Language Commissioner with regards to the names of the retained electoral wards, and the Welsh Language Commissioner has recommended the following changes:

• **Goodwick** to be given the name **Gwdig** in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that Wdig is the standard Welsh form recommended by the reference book, *A Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names* (University of Wales Press, 1967) (Gazetteer of
Welsh Place-Names). However, the Commissioner’s Place-names Standardisation Panel favours the non-mutated form, *Gwdig*.

- **Haverfordwest: Castle** to be given the name *Hwlffordd: Y Castell* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner believes that the Welsh definite article (*Y*) should be included in the Welsh name as this is the normal pattern for Welsh when referring to specific features.

- **Haverfordwest: Priory** to be given the name *Hwlffordd: Y Priordy* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner believes that the Welsh definite article (*Y*) should be included in the Welsh name as this is the normal pattern for Welsh when referring to specific features.

- **Kilgetty and Begelly** to be renamed *Cilgeti and Begeli* in the English language. The Welsh Language Commissioner highlights that Cilgeti and Begeli are the standard Welsh forms recommended by the Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names. The Commissioner emphasises that there is only one ‘t’ in this name in accordance with the rules of Welsh orthography. Also, the double ‘ll’ which occurs in the form Begelly is misleading as the combination ‘ll’ could be taken as the Welsh ‘ll’ (Llanelli etc.). The Commissioner’s Place-names Standardisation Panel's Guidelines state that if the difference between the Welsh form and the 'English' form consists of only one or two letters, the use of a single form is recommended, with preference being given to the Welsh form.

- **Lampeter Velfrey** to be given the name *Llanbedr Felffre* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that Llanbedr Felffre is the standard Welsh form recommended by the Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names.

- **Milford: Central** to be given the name *Gorllewin Aberdaugleddau* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name.

- **Milford: West** to be given the name *Dwyrain Neyland* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name.

- **Neyland: East** to be given the name *Gorllewin Neyland* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name.

- **Pembroke Dock: Market** to be given the name *Doc Penfro: Y Farchnad* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner believes that the Welsh definite article (*Y*) should be included in the Welsh name as this is the normal pattern for Welsh when referring to specific features.

- **St David’s** to be given the name *St Davids* in the English language. The Welsh Language Commissioner has highlighted their guidelines, which state that the current convention is to omit the possessive apostrophe, and therefore recommend the form *St Davids* in the English language. However, the Commissioner did advise that either form (with, or without, the apostrophe) would be acceptable in their view.
• **Tenby: North** to be given the name *Gogledd Dinbych-y-pysgod* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name.

• **Tenby: South** to be given the name *De Dinbych-y-pysgod* in the Welsh language. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name.

5. The Commission would welcome any comments on the names mentioned in this section.

**Proposed Electoral Wards**

6. The Commission considered changes to the remaining electoral wards. Details of the current electoral arrangements can be found at Appendix 2. The Commission’s proposed arrangements can be found at Appendix 3.
7. The existing Fishguard North East electoral ward is composed of the Fishguard North East ward of the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick. It has 1,496 electors (1,467 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 5% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,507 eligible voters.

8. The existing Fishguard North West electoral ward is composed of the Fishguard North West ward of the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick. It has 1,201 electors (1,159 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 24% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,242 eligible voters.

9. The Commission received no representations concerning these wards.

10. The Commission notes the level of representation within the existing electoral ward of Fishguard North West, compared to the other wards within the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick, and has considered alternative arrangements for the area.

11. The Commission proposes to combine the Fishguard North East and Fishguard North West wards of the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick to form an electoral ward with 2,697 electors (2,626 projected electors) which, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of representation that is 14% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Abergwaun, and the English language name of Fishguard. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

12. The Commission believe that the two Fishguard wards of the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick share a common identity and are distinct from the Goodwick ward to the north. In order to improve the level of electoral parity within the area, the Commission has proposed the creation of a two-member electoral ward in this relatively urban region of Pembrokeshire, which will be able to utilise existing community, communication and social ties to form an effective electoral ward.
Llanrhian and Scleddau

13. The existing Llanrhian electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Llanrhian and Mathry. It has 1,232 electors (1,249 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 22% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,233 eligible voters.

14. The existing Scleddau electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Pencaer and Scleddau. It has 1,150 electors (1,102 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 27% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,215 eligible voters.

15. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council. They suggested that the Communities of Llanrhian, Mathry and Pencaer combine to form a single-member electoral ward.

16. The Commission notes the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of Scleddau and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area.

17. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Llanrhian, Mathry and Pencaer to form an electoral ward with 1,588 electors (1,590 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 1% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Llanrhian. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

18. The Commission agrees with the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area, and the improvement in electoral parity. The Commission believes the combination of three rural communities along the A487 will form an effective electoral ward.
Dinas Cross and Scleddau

19. The existing Dinas Cross electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Dinas Cross and Puncheston. It has 1,309 electors (1,281 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 17% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,405 eligible voters.

20. The existing Scleddau electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Pencaer and Scleddau. It has 1,150 electors (1,102 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 27% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,215 eligible voters.

21. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council. They suggested that the Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Puncheston and Scleddau combine to form a single-member electoral ward.

22. The Commission notes the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of Scleddau and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area.

23. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Puncheston and Scleddau to form an electoral ward with 1,431 electors (1,399 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 9% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Scleddau a Chas-mael, and the English language name of Scleddau and Puncheston. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

24. The Commission agrees with the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area, and the improvement in electoral parity. The Commission believes the combination of these three rural communities will form an effective electoral ward.
Dinas Cross and Newport

25. The existing Dinas Cross electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Dinas Cross and Puncheston. It has 1,309 electors (1,281 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 17% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,405 eligible voters.

26. The existing Newport electoral ward is composed of the Community of Newport. It has 897 electors (879 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 43% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 995 eligible voters.

27. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council. They suggested that the Communities of Dinas Cross and Newport combine to form a single-member electoral ward.

28. The Commission notes the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of Newport and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area.

29. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Dinas Cross and Newport to form an electoral ward with 1,569 electors (1,522 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is five electors below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Trefdraeth gyda Dinas, and the English language name of Newport with Dinas. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

30. The Commission agrees with the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area, and the improvement in electoral parity. The Commission believes the combination of these communities along the A487 will form an effective electoral ward.
Cilgerran and Crymych

31. The existing Cilgerran electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Cilgerran and Manordeifi. It has 1,575 electors (1,562 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is one elector above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,658 eligible voters.

32. The existing Crymych electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Crymych and Eglwyswrw. It has 2,136 electors (2,144 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 36% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,088 eligible voters.

33. The Commission received three representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, Manordeifi Community Council and County Councillor John Davies (Cilgerran).

34. Pembrokeshire County Council suggested that the Maenclochog ward of the Community of Maenclochog combine with the Communities of Eglwyswrw and Mynachlogddu to form a single-member electoral ward, and, a single-member ward is formed from the Community of Crymych.

35. Manordeifi Community Council wrote of their desire to retain the existing electoral ward arrangements for Cilgerran.

36. Councillor John Davies (Cilgerran) objected to the proposal put forward by Pembrokeshire County Council, suggesting that the combination of the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu is insufficiently cognisant of existing communities with no roads directly linking Eglwyswrw with the communities to its south.

37. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Crymych and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for this area.

38. In consideration of the representations received and the proposal made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards combining the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make the proposals as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal to split the Community of Maenclochog, and in the absence of communication links between the Communities of Eglwyswrw and Maenclochog.

39. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Cilgerran and Eglwyswrw to form an electoral ward with 1,787 electors (1,767 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 14% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Cilgerran ac Eglwyswrw, and the English language name of Cilgerran and Eglwyswrw. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

40. The Commission acknowledges the representation made by Manordeifi Community Council to retain the existing electoral ward arrangements for Cilgerran. However, the Commission’s proposal addresses the variation in electoral representation within the area and creates wards from whole community areas in this proposal and the wider area. The Commission are content that the proposal for Cilgerran and Eglwyswrw is an appropriate combination of...
community areas which are both rural in nature, and well connected along the A487 and B4332 roads.

41. The Commission recognises that this proposal generates an increase in the level of electoral variance compared to the existing arrangements within the Cilgerran electoral ward. However, the Commission believes the proposal is suitably justified, in order to create wards encompassing whole community areas and to improve electoral parity in the wider area.
Cilgerran and Clydau

42. The existing Cilgerran electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Cilgerran and Manordeifi. It has 1,575 electors (1,562 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is one elector above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,658 eligible voters.

43. The existing Clydau electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Boncath and Clydau. It has 1,201 electors (1,187 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 24% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,220 eligible voters.

44. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from Manordeifi Community Council.

45. Manordeifi Community Council wrote of their desire to retain the existing electoral ward arrangements for Cilgerran.

46. The Commission notes the levels of electoral representation in the existing electoral wards of Clydau and neighbouring areas within the county, and have therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

47. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Boncath, Clydau and Manordeifi to form an electoral ward with 1,621 electors (1,590 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 3% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Boncath a Chlydau, and the English language name of Boncath and Clydau. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

48. The Commission acknowledges the representation made by Manordeifi Community Council to retain the existing electoral ward arrangements for Cilgerran. However, the Commission’s proposal addresses the variation in electoral representation within the area and creates wards from whole community areas in this proposal and in the wider region. The Commission are content that the proposals for the area are formed from appropriate combinations of communities, which are largely rural in nature, and well connected by a number of roads.

49. The Commission recognises that this proposal generates a minor increase in the level of electoral variance, compared to the existing arrangements within the Cilgerran electoral ward. However, the Commission believes the proposal is suitably justified, in order to create wards encompassing whole community areas and to improve electoral parity in the wider area.
Crymych and Maenclochog

50. The existing Crymych electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Crymych and Eglwyswrw. It has 2,136 electors (2,144 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 36% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,088 eligible voters.

51. The existing Maenclochog electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West, Maenclochog, Mynachlogddu and New Moat. It has 2,459 electors (2,463 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 56% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,505 eligible voters.

52. The Commission received three representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, County Councillor John Davies (Cilgerran) and County Councillor Huw George (Maenclochog).

53. Pembrokeshire County Council suggested that the Maenclochog ward of the Community of Maenclochog combine with the Communities of Eglwyswrw and Mynachlogddu to form a single-member electoral ward, and, a single-member ward is formed from the Community of Crymych. The Council also recommend a further single-member ward be created by combining the Llanycefn ward of the Community of Maenclochog with the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West and New Moat.

54. Councillor John Davies (Cilgerran) objected to the proposal put forward by Pembrokeshire County Council, suggesting that the combination of the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu is insufficiently cognisant of existing communities with no roads linking Eglwyswrw with the communities to its south.

55. Councillor Huw George (Maenclochog) opposed the recommendation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council stating that their proposal adversely impacts communities by dividing Llanycefn from the Maenclochog and Rosebush areas within the same community, and impacts on culture and Welsh language in the area by dividing a community.

56. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral wards of Crymych and Maenclochog, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

57. In consideration of the representations received and the proposal made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards combining the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make the proposals as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal to split the Community of Maenclochog, and in the absence of communication links between the Communities of Eglwyswrw and Maenclochog.

58. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Crymych and Mynachlogddu to form an electoral ward with 1,892 electors (1,911 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 20% above the proposed county average.

59. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Crymych a Mynachlog-ddu, and the English language name of Crymych and Mynachlogddu. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the English language name of Crymych
The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that Mynachlog-ddu is the standard Welsh form recommended by the Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names. The Welsh Language Commissioner’s Place-Names Standardisation Panel’s (The Panel’s) Guidelines state that hyphens should be used to aid in the pronunciation of the Welsh place names, and that a single language form should be used when the difference is very minor, with a preference given to the Welsh language; in this instance, being Mynachlog-ddu for both forms. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

60. The Commission considers the combination of these two communities is supported by good communication links between the settlements of Crymych and Mynachlogddu, and provides for an improvement in electoral parity when compared to the existing arrangements in Crymych and Maenclochog.
61. The existing Maenclochog electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West, Maenclochog, Mynachlogddu and New Moat. It has 2,459 electors (2,463 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 56% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,505 eligible voters.

62. The Commission received three representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, County Councillor John Davies (Cilgerran) and County Councillor Huw George (Maenclochog).

63. Pembrokeshire County Council suggested that the Maenclochog ward of the Community of Maenclochog combine with the Communities of Eglwyswrw and Mynachlogddu to form a single-member electoral ward. A further single-member ward was also to be created by combining the Llanycefn ward of the Community of Maenclochog with the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West and New Moat.

64. Councillor John Davies (Cilgerran) objected to the proposal put forward by Pembrokeshire County Council, suggesting that the combination of the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu is insufficiently cognisant of existing communities with no roads linking Eglwyswrw with the communities to its south.

65. Councillor Huw George (Maenclochog) opposed the recommendation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council stating that their proposal adversely impacts communities by dividing Llanycefn from Maenclochog and Rosebush areas within the same community, and impacts on culture and Welsh language in the area by dividing a community.

66. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Maenclochog and has considered alternative arrangements for the area.

67. In consideration of the representations received and the proposal made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards combining the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal to split the Community of Maenclochog, and in the absence of communication links between the Communities of Eglwyswrw and Maenclochog.

68. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West and Maenclochog to form an electoral ward with 1,718 electors (1,749 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 9% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Maenclochog. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

69. The Commission considers the combination of these three communities, which already form part of the existing electoral ward of Maenclochog, promote the desirability to maintain community ties, and will be able to utilise existing community, communication and social ties to form an effective electoral ward.
70. The existing Maenclochog electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West, Maenclochog, Mynachlogddu and New Moat. It has 2,459 electors (2,463 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 56% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,505 eligible voters.

71. The existing Wiston electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Ambleston, Spittal and Wiston. It has 1,592 electors (1,606 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 1% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,612 eligible voters.

72. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and County Councillor Huw George (Maenclochog).

73. Pembrokeshire County Council suggested that the Llanycefn ward of the Community of Maenclochog be combined with the Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West and New Moat to form a single-member electoral ward.

74. Councillor Huw George (Maenclochog) opposed the recommendation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council stating that their proposal adversely impacts communities by dividing Llanycefn from Maenclochog and Rosebush areas within the same community, and impacts on culture and Welsh language in the area by dividing a community.

75. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Maenclochog, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

76. In consideration of the representations received and the proposal made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards combining the Community of Eglwyswrw with Maenclochog and Mynachlogddu. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal, particularly the splitting of the Community of Maenclochog across two electoral wards.

77. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Ambleston, New Moat and Wiston to form an electoral ward with 1,537 electors (1,516 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 2% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of **Cas-wis**, and the English language name of **Wiston**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

78. The Commission considers the combination of these three communities is supported by good communication links and contributes to the improvement in electoral parity in the wider area. The Commission believes the combination of these three rural communities, will form an effective electoral ward.

79. The Commission recognises that this proposal generates a minor increase in the level of electoral variance, compared to the existing arrangements within the Wiston electoral ward. However, the Commission believes the proposal is suitably justified, in order to create wards encompassing whole community areas and to improve electoral parity in the wider area.
Radbaxton and Wiston

80. The existing Rudbaxton electoral ward is composed of the Community of Rudbaxton. It has 898 electors (876 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 43% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 676 eligible voters.

81. The existing Wiston electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Ambleston, Spittal and Wiston. It has 1,592 electors (1,606 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 1% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,612 eligible voters.

82. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and County Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose).

83. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to combine the northern region (with 741 electors) of the Community of Camrose with the Community of Rudbaxton to form a single member electoral ward. Further detail concerning Pembrokeshire County Council’s recommended boundary changes can be found on page 7 of Appendix 5.

84. Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose) opposed the recommendation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council stating that as there are no links between the Communities of Camrose and Rudbaxton, the combination of these areas is not supported.

85. The Commission notes the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of Rudbaxton and has considered alternative arrangements for the area.

86. In consideration of the representations received and the proposals made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections of splitting the Community of Camrose and placing the northern area with the Community of Rudbaxton. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the proposed splitting of the Community of Camrose.

87. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Rudbaxton and Spittal to form an electoral ward with 1,306 electors (1,305 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 17% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of Rudbaxton. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

88. The Commission considers that this proposal improves the levels of electoral parity, utilising whole communities to create wards here and in the wider area. The Commission are content that the proposals for the area are formed from appropriate combinations of communities, which are well connected along the B4329 road.

89. The Commission recognises that this proposal generates an increase in the level of electoral variance, compared to the existing arrangements within the Wiston electoral ward. However, the Commission believes the proposal is suitably justified, in order to create wards encompassing whole community areas and to improve electoral parity in the wider area.
90. The existing Camrose electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Camrose, and Nolton and Roch. It has 2,160 electors (2,222 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 37% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,153 eligible voters.

91. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and County Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose).

92. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to combine the northern region (with 741 electors) of the Community of Camrose with the Community of Rudbaxton to form a single-member electoral ward. A further single-member ward was to be created by combining the southern region (with 754 electors) of the Community of Camrose with the Community of Tiers Cross. Further detail concerning Pembrokeshire County Council’s recommended boundary changes can be found on page 7 of Appendix 5.

93. Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose) opposed the recommendation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council stating that, in comparison to the existing electoral ward arrangements for Camrose, there are no links between the Communities of Camrose and Rudbaxton, and there are fewer links between the Communities of Camrose and Tiers Cross. The Councillor was therefore unable to support the Council’s recommendation. With reference to the existing arrangement, which combines the Communities of Camrose, and Nolton and Roch, Councillor Adams explains this is supported by strong links with the Camrose school catchment area.

94. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Camrose and has considered alternative arrangements for the area.

95. In consideration of the representations received and the proposals made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections of splitting the Community of Camrose and placing the northern area with the Community of Rudbaxton, and the southern area with the Community of Tiers Cross. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the proposed splitting of the Community of Camrose.

96. The Commission proposes the Community of Camrose forms an electoral ward with 1,495 electors (1,508 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 5% below the proposed county average.

97. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Camros, and the English language name of Camrose. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the name of Camros. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that Camros is the standard Welsh form recommended by the Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names. The Panel’s Guidelines state that a single language form should be used when the difference is very minor, with a preference given to the Welsh language; in this instance, being Camros for both forms. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

98. The Commission considers that this proposal improves the levels of electoral parity, and the desirability to place the Community of Camrose wholly within an electoral ward. The Commission believes that, as the proposal for the area constitutes one existing Community
area, this arrangement will successfully utilise the existing community, communication and social ties to form an effective electoral ward.
Camrose and The Havens

99. The existing Camrose electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Camrose and Nolton and Roch. It has 2,160 electors (2,222 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 37% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,153 eligible voters.

100. The existing The Havens electoral ward is composed of the Communities of The Havens and Walwyns Castle. It has 1,195 electors (1,178 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 24% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,203 eligible voters.

101. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and County Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose).

102. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed combining the Communities of Nolton and Roch, and The Havens to form a single-member electoral ward.

103. Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose) opposed the recommendation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council stating that, in comparison to the existing electoral ward arrangements for Camrose, there are no links between the Communities of Camrose and Rudbaxton, and there are fewer links between the Communities of Camrose and Tiers Cross. The Councillor is therefore unable to support the Council’s recommendation. With reference to the existing arrangement, which combines the Communities of Camrose and Nolton and Roch, Councillor Adams explains this is supported by strong links with Camrose school catchment area.

104. The Commission notes the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of Camrose and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area.

105. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Nolton and Roch, and The Havens to form an electoral ward with 1,564 electors (1,612 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 1% below the proposed county average.

106. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the name of The Havens. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the Welsh language name of Yr Aberoedd. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

107. The Commission acknowledges the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area, and the inappropriate levels of electoral variance in the existing Camrose electoral ward. Although Councillor Jamie Adams (Camrose) highlighted links which exist between the Communities of Camrose, and Nolton and Roch, the Commission considers that this proposal is justified because of the resulting improvements towards electoral parity. The Commission believes the combination of two communities, which form the primary beach areas of St Brides Bay, will form an effective electoral ward.
108. The existing Johnston electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Johnston and Tiers Cross. It has 1,998 electors (2,200 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 27% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,102 eligible voters.

109. The existing St Ishmael’s electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Dale, Herbrandston, Marloes and St Brides, and St Ishmael’s. It has 1,117 electors (1,140 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 29% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,859 eligible voters.

110. The existing The Havens electoral ward is composed of the Communities of The Havens and Walwyns Castle. It has 1,195 electors (1,178 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 24% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,203 eligible voters.

111. The Commission received three representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, Johnston Community Council and County Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston).

112. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to combine the existing electoral ward of St Ishmael’s with the Community of Walwyns Castle, to form a single-member electoral ward. In addition, Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to combine the southern region of the Community of Camrose (see boundary change on page 7 of Appendix 5) with the Community of Tiers Cross. Furthermore, they proposed to create a single-member electoral ward from the Community of Johnston.

113. Johnston Community Council submitted their preference towards forming a single-member electoral ward from the Community of Johnston. They also suggest that the continuation of the existing arrangement would be supported.

114. Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston) provided his general observation that Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposed arrangement, to combine five community councils into a single-member electoral ward, is too large.

115. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Johnston, and the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of St Ishmael’s, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

116. In consideration of the representations received and the proposals made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards combining the southern area of the Community of Camrose with the Community of Tiers Cross. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal and the splitting of the Community of Camrose.

117. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Dale, Herbrandston, Marloes and St Brides, St Ishmael’s, Tiers Cross and Walwyns Castle to form an electoral ward with 1,857 electors (1,898 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 18% above the proposed county average.

118. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Llanisan yn Rhos, and the English language name of St Ishmael’s. The Welsh Language
Commissioner has suggested the Welsh language name of *Llanisan-yn-Rhos* and English language name of *St Ishmaels*. The Welsh Language Commissioner has noted the hyphenated form of the name in the Welsh language and recommends this based upon historical evidence. The Commissioner also highlighted their guidelines, which state that the current convention is to omit the possessive apostrophe, and therefore recommend the form *St Ishmaels* in the English language. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

119. The Commission acknowledges the representation made by Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston) concerning the proposal for a large number of community councils being represented by a single councillor. However, the Commission’s proposal addresses the inappropriate levels of electoral variance within the area.

120. The Commission note that the proposal for St Ishmael’s creates a large electoral ward, covering a substantial land area. However, in comparison to some rural electoral wards within the county, the proposal for St Ishmael’s covers a smaller land area than the existing electoral wards of Crymych, Dinas Cross, Hundleton, Maenclochog and Martletwy.

121. The Commission are content that the proposals for the area are formed from appropriate combinations of communities, which share common interests and rural character, and well connected by a number of roads. The Commission believes the proposal is suitably justified, in order to create wards encompassing whole communities and to improve the level of electoral parity in this ward and the wider area.
Johnston

122. The existing Johnston electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Johnston and Tiers Cross. It has 1,998 electors (2,200 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 27% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,102 eligible voters.

123. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and Johnston Community Council.

124. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to create a single-member electoral ward from the Community of Johnston.

125. Johnston Community Council submitted their preference towards forming a single-member electoral ward from the Community of Johnston. They also suggest that the continuation of the existing arrangement would be supported.

126. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Johnston and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area.

127. The Commission proposes the Community of Johnston forms an electoral ward with 1,554 electors (1,722 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, 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 Johnston. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

128. The Commission considers that this proposal improves the levels of electoral parity, and the desirability to place the Community of Johnston wholly within an electoral ward. The Commission believes that, as the proposal for the area constitutes one existing Community area, this arrangement will successfully utilise the existing community, communication and social ties to form an effective electoral ward.
Milford: Hakin and Milford: Hubberston

129. The existing Milford: Hakin electoral ward is composed of the Hakin ward of the Town of Milford Haven. It has 1,771 electors (1,699 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 13% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,826 eligible voters.

130. The existing Milford: Hubberston electoral ward is composed of the Hubberston ward of the Town of Milford Haven. It has 1,979 electors (1,929 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 26% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,127 eligible voters.

131. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and County Councillor Michael Evans (Tenby: South).

132. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed two boundary changes between the Milford: Hakin and Milford: Hubberston electoral wards. The County Council proposed to transfer a small area (with 36 electors), to the north of Waterloo Road, from the Hakin ward, into the Hubberston ward, and to transfer the area of Glebelands (with 205 electors), from the Hubberston ward, into the Hakin ward.

133. Councillor Michael Evans (Tenby: South) believes the number of electors in Milford Haven deserved two extra councillors.

134. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Milford: Hubberston and has considered Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposal.

135. The Commission considered an amendment to Pembrokeshire County Council’s boundary change proposal to transfer 205 electors from the Hubberston ward, into the Hakin ward, of the Town of Milford Haven. This involved adjusting Pembrokeshire County Council’s original boundary change proposal to ensure only houses with the Glebelands address were involved in the transfer. Pembrokeshire County Council agreed with the Commission’s assessment and confirmed this would alter their original proposal by three electors. This can be seen on the maps on pages 51 and 52.

136. The Commission proposes to apply the boundaries as described in paragraph 135, to form a new Milford: Hubberston electoral ward with 1,813 electors (1,787 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 15% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Aberdaugleddau: Hubberston, and the English language name of Milford: Hubberston. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

137. The Commission proposes, as a consequence, to apply the new boundaries as described at paragraph 135, to form a new Milford: Hakin electoral ward with 1,937 electors (1,832 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 23% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Aberdaugleddau: Hakin, and the English language name of Milford: Hakin. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.
138. Pembrokeshire County Council have made no suggestions as to the consequential warding arrangements for Milford Haven Town Council; these have been considered by the Commission in Chapter 6.

139. The Commission acknowledges the representation made by Councillor Michael Evans (Tenby: South) suggesting Milford Haven should be given two additional councillors. However, to accommodate this additional council membership for Milford Haven, it would either require two additional councillors be added to the whole authority, or the reduction of two members outside of Milford Haven and the reorganisation of the rest of Pembrokeshire’s electoral wards to accommodate the suggested increase within the town. The Commission are content that the proposals are supported by the desirability to retain single-member wards within the town, with appropriate levels of electoral variance, and which utilise the boundary changes recommended by Pembrokeshire County Council.
Milford: East and Milford: North

140. The existing Milford: East electoral ward is composed of the East ward of the Town of Milford Haven. It has 1,582 electors (1,538 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 1% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,684 eligible voters.

141. The existing Milford: North electoral ward is composed of the North ward of the Town of Milford Haven. It has 2,027 electors (2,162 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 29% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,171 eligible voters.

142. The Commission received three representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, County Councillor Michael Evans (Tenby: South) and County Councillor Guy Woodham (Milford: East).

143. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed a boundary change between the Milford: East and Milford: North electoral wards. The County Council proposed to transfer the area centred on Vaynor Road (with 365 electors), from the North ward, into the East ward of the Town of Milford Haven.

144. Councillor Michael Evans (Tenby: South) believes the number of electors in Milford Haven deserved two extra councillors.

145. Councillor Guy Woodham (Milford: East) confirmed he was not in opposition to Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposals as they impact on his ward.

146. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Milford: North and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for this area.

147. The Commission proposes to apply the boundaries suggested by Pembrokeshire County Council to form a new Milford: East electoral ward with 1,947 electors (1,849 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 24% above the proposed county average.

148. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Aberdaugleddau: Dwyrain, and the English language name of Milford: East. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the Welsh language name of Dwyrain Aberdaugleddau. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

149. The Commission proposes, as a consequence, to apply the new boundaries suggested by Pembrokeshire County Council to form a new Milford: North electoral ward with 1,662 electors (1,860 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 6% above the proposed county average.

150. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Aberdaugleddau: Gogledd, and the English language name of Milford: North. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the Welsh language name of Gogledd Aberdaugleddau. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.
151. The Council have made no suggestions as to the consequential warding arrangements for Milford Haven Town Council; these have been considered by the Commission in Chapter 6.

152. The Commission acknowledges the representation made by Councillor Michael Evans (Tenby: South) suggesting Milford Haven should be given two additional councillors. However, to accommodate this additional council membership for Milford Haven, it would either require two additional councillors be added to the whole authority, or the reduction of two members outside of Milford Haven and the reorganisation of the rest of Pembrokeshire’s electoral wards to accommodate the suggested increase within the town. The Commission are content that the proposals are supported by the desirability to retain single-member wards within the town, with appropriate levels of electoral variance, and which utilise the boundary changes recommended by Pembrokeshire County Council.
The existing Pembroke Dock: Pennar electoral ward is composed of the Pennar ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock. It has 2,479 electors (2,464 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 58% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,556 eligible voters.

The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council and County Councillor Tony Wilcox (Pembroke Dock: Pennar).

Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to create two new electoral wards from the existing Pennar ward. They proposed an Eastern ward (with 1,314 electors), and a western ward (with 1,165 electors), from the existing Pennar ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock.

Councillor Tony Wilcox (Pembroke Dock: Pennar) felt Pembrokeshire County Council’s original boundary change proposal simply splits a large and compact area, in half.

The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Pembroke Dock: Pennar and has considered Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposal.

The Commission considered an amendment to Pembrokeshire County Council’s boundary change detailed above. This involved adjusting Pembrokeshire County Council’s original boundary change proposal to the former, private shipyard of Jacob’s Pill. This amendment ensured electors residing to the east of Bentlass Terrace were not separated from the proposed western electoral ward. Pembrokeshire County Council agreed with the Commission’s assessment and confirmed this would increase their original proposal for the western electoral ward by 98 electors, and reduce the proposal for the eastern electoral ward by 98 electors. This can be seen on the maps on pages 59 and 60.

The Commission proposes to apply the boundaries as detailed at paragraph 158 to form a new Pennar West electoral ward with 1,263 electors (1,291 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 20% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Doc Penfro: Gorllewin Pennar, and the English language name of Pembroke Dock: Pennar West. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

The Commission proposes, as a consequence, to apply the new boundaries as detailed at paragraph 158 to form a new Pennar East electoral ward with 1,216 electors (1,128 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 23% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Doc Penfro: Dwyrain Pennar, and the English language name of Pembroke Dock: Pennar East. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

The Council have made no suggestions as to the consequential warding arrangements for Pembroke Dock Town Council; these have been considered by the Commission in Chapter 6.

The Commission acknowledges the representation made by Councillor Tony Wilcox (Pembroke Dock: Pennar) regarding Pembrokeshire County Council’s original warding proposals for Pennar. However, the Commission are content that their boundary assessment removes any anomalies which existed within Pembrokeshire County Council’s
original recommendation, and sought to apply ward boundaries which are easily identifiable, and provides improved electoral parity.
163. The existing Pembroke Dock: Central electoral ward is composed of the Central ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock. It has 1,075 electors (1,041 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 32% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,394 eligible voters.

164. The existing Pembroke Dock: Llanion electoral ward is composed of the Llanion ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock. It has 1,955 electors (2,062 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 24% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,109 eligible voters.

165. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from Pembrokeshire County Council.

166. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed a boundary change between the Central and Llanion electoral wards. The County Council proposed to transfer the area of Llanion (with 458 electors), from the Llanion ward, into the Central ward, and change the Llanion ward name to Bush.

167. The Commission notes the level of over-representation in the existing electoral ward of Pembroke Dock: Central and has considered Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposal.

168. The Commission considered an amendment to Pembrokeshire County Council’s boundary change detailed above. This involved adjusting Pembrokeshire County Council’s original boundary change proposal to include all residential properties along Pembroke Ferry (Road) to the east of Cleddau Bridge, within the transfer to the Central ward. Pembrokeshire County Council agreed with the Commission’s assessment and confirmed this would increase their original proposal by 26 electors, and therefore, result in a transfer of 484 electors from the Llanion ward, into the Central ward. This can be seen on the maps on pages 63 and 64.

169. The Commission proposes to apply the boundaries as detailed at paragraph 168 to form a new Central electoral ward with 1,559 electors (1,731 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 1% below the proposed county average.

170. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Doc Penfro: Canol, and the English language name of Pembroke Dock: Central. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the Welsh language name of Canol Doc Penfro. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that, when using compass points within Welsh place names, the compass reference would precede the place name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

171. The Commission proposes, as a consequence, to apply the new boundaries as detailed at paragraph 168 to form a new electoral ward with 1,471 electors (1,417 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 7% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Doc Penfro: Bush, and the English language name of Pembroke Dock: Bush. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.
172. The Council have made no suggestions as to the consequential warding arrangements for Pembroke Dock Town Council; these have been considered by the Commission in Chapter 6.

173. The Commission are content that their boundary assessment removes any anomalies which existed within Pembrokeshire County Council’s original recommendation, and applies ward boundaries which are easily identifiable, and provide improved electoral parity.
THE EXISTING PEMBROKE: MONKTON ELECTORAL WARD IS COMPOSED OF THE MONKTON WARD OF THE TOWN OF PEMBROKE. IT HAS 1,038 ELECTORS (1,198 PROJECTED ELECTORS) REPRESENTED BY ONE COUNCILLOR WHICH IS 34% BELOW THE PROPOSED COUNTY AVERAGE. THE ELECTORAL WARD HAS AN ESTIMATED POPULATION OF 1,183 ELIGIBLE VOTERS.

THE EXISTING PEMBROKE: ST MARY SOUTH ELECTORAL WARD IS COMPOSED OF THE ST MARY SOUTH WARD OF THE TOWN OF PEMBROKE. IT HAS 1,060 ELECTORS (1,035 PROJECTED ELECTORS) REPRESENTED BY ONE COUNCILLOR WHICH IS 33% BELOW THE PROPOSED COUNTY AVERAGE. THE ELECTORAL WARD HAS AN ESTIMATED POPULATION OF 1,155 ELIGIBLE VOTERS.

THE EXISTING PEMBROKE: ST MICHAEL ELECTORAL WARD IS COMPOSED OF THE ST MICHAEL WARD OF THE TOWN OF PEMBROKE. IT HAS 2,071 ELECTORS (1,987 PROJECTED ELECTORS) REPRESENTED BY ONE COUNCILLOR WHICH IS 32% ABOVE THE PROPOSED COUNTY AVERAGE. THE ELECTORAL WARD HAS AN ESTIMATED POPULATION OF 2,038 ELIGIBLE VOTERS.

THE COMMISSION RECEIVED ONE REPRESENTATION CONCERNING THESE WARDS FROM PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL.


THE COMMISSION PROPOSES TO APPLY THE BOUNDARIES AS SUGGESTED BY PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL FOR THE ST MARY SOUTH WARD, AND PROPOSES TO COMBINE IT WITH THE MONKTON WARD TO FORM AN ELECTORAL WARD WITH 2,629 ELECTORS (2,777 PROJECTED ELECTORS) WHICH, IF REPRESENTED BY TWO COUNCILLORS, WOULD RESULT IN A LEVEL OF REPRESENTATION THAT IS 16% BELOW THE PROPOSED COUNTY AVERAGE.

THE COMMISSION HAS GIVEN THE PROPOSED ELECTORAL WARD THE WELSH LANGUAGE NAME OF **Penfro: Cil-maen a De St Mary**, and the English language name of **Pembroke: Monkton and St Mary South**. The Welsh Language Commissioner has suggested the Welsh language name of **Penfro: Monkton a De St Mary**. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

THE COMMISSION PROPOSES, AS A CONSEQUENCE, TO APPLY THE NEW BOUNDARIES SUGGESTED BY PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO FORM A NEW ST MICHAEL ELECTORAL WARD WITH 1,540 ELECTORS (1,443 PROJECTED ELECTORS) WHICH, IF REPRESENTED BY ONE COUNCILLOR, WOULD RESULT IN A LEVEL OF REPRESENTATION THAT IS 2% BELOW THE PROPOSED COUNTY AVERAGE. THE COMMISSION HAS GIVEN THE PROPOSED ELECTORAL WARD THE WELSH LANGUAGE NAME OF **Penfro: St Michael**, and the English language name of **Pembroke: St Michael**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

THE COUNCIL HAVE MADE NO SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE CONSEQUENTIAL WARDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR PEMBROKE TOWN COUNCIL; THESE HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION IN CHAPTER 6.
184. The Commission acknowledges the recommendation made by Pembrokeshire County Council, to apply a consequential change to the Pembroke: St Mary South and Pembroke: St Michael wards of the Town of Pembroke, and support the boundary change element of this proposal. However, the County Council’s proposal would retain the electoral ward of Pembroke: Monkton with an inappropriate level of over-representation.

185. The Commission believe their proposal addresses the inappropriate levels of electoral variance in Pembroke, whilst utilising Pembrokeshire County Council’s boundary changes and retaining as many single-member wards as possible.
Pembroke: Monkton ward (1,038)

Pembroke: St Mary South ward (1,060)

Town of Pembroke

Area to be transferred from St Michael to St Mary South (531 electors)
186. The existing Manorbier electoral ward is composed of the Community of Manorbier and a westerly area of the Community of St Florence. It has 1,679 electors (1,712 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 7% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,657 eligible voters.

187. The existing Penally electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Penally and St. Mary Out Liberty, and an easterly area of the Community of St Florence. It has 1,308 electors (1,338 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 17% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,422 eligible voters.

188. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from County Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North).

189. Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North) highlighted a previous concern regarding proposals which would see the separation of the Communities of Penally and St. Mary Out Liberty, from their existing electoral arrangement.

190. In consideration of the representations received and the split Community of St Florence across the existing electoral wards, the Commission has considered alternative arrangements for the area.

191. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Manorbier and Penally to form an electoral ward with 1,790 electors (1,814 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 14% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Manorbŷr a Phenalun, and the English language name of Manorbier and Penally. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

192. The Commission recognises that this proposal generates an increase in the levels of electoral variance, compared to the existing arrangements in the area. However, the Commission believes the proposal is justified in order to create wards encompassing whole community areas, and supported by comparable geographical characteristics and strong communication links along the A4139.

193. The Commission acknowledged the representation from Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North) which supported the retention of existing arrangements in the area. The Commission noted the viability of retaining the existing arrangement of electoral wards in this region, which does provide two, single-member wards with appropriate levels of electoral representation. Therefore, as an alternative to the proposal described in paragraph 191 the Commission welcomes views on the option to retain the existing electoral arrangements of Manorbier and Penally. In order to do this, the Community of St Florence would, as a consequence of the proposal, need to be warded along the existing electoral ward boundary. This would require the re-introduction of the Gumfreston and St Florence wards of the Community of St Florence.
Manorbier and Penally

194. The existing Manorbier electoral ward is composed of the Community of Manorbier and a westerly area of the community of St Florence. It has 1,679 electors (1,712 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 7% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,657 eligible voters.

195. The existing Penally electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Penally and St. Mary Out Liberty, and an easterly area of the Community of St Florence. It has 1,308 electors (1,338 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 17% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,422 eligible voters.

196. The Commission received one representation concerning these wards from County Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North).

197. Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North) highlighted a previous concern regarding proposals which would see the separation of the Communities of Penally and St. Mary Out Liberty, from their existing electoral arrangement.

198. In consideration of the representations received and the split Community of St Florence across the existing electoral wards, the Commission has considered alternative arrangements for the area.

199. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of St Florence and St. Mary Out Liberty to form an electoral ward with 1,197 electors (1,236 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 24% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of **St Florence a Llanfair Dinbych-y-pysgod**, and the English language name of **St Florence and St Mary Out Liberty**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

200. The Commission recognises that this proposal generates an increase in the levels of electoral variance, compared to the existing arrangements in the area. However, the Commission believes the proposal is suitably justified, in order to create wards encompassing whole community areas, and by combing communities which form part of the same existing electoral arrangement.

201. The Commission acknowledged the representation from Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North) which supported the retention of existing arrangements in the area. The Commission noted the viability of retaining the existing arrangement of electoral wards in this region, which does provide two, single-member wards with appropriate levels of electoral representation. Therefore, as an alternative to the proposal described in paragraph 199, the Commission welcomes views on the option to retain the existing electoral arrangements of Manorbier and Penally. In order to do this, the Community of St Florence would, as a consequence of the proposal, need to be warded along the existing electoral ward boundary. This would require the re-introduction of the Gumfreston and St Florence wards of the Community of St Florence.
The existing Amroth electoral ward is composed of the Community of Amroth. It has 991 electors (951 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 37% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,045 eligible voters.

The existing Saundersfoot electoral ward is composed of the Community of Saundersfoot. It has 2,015 electors (1,941 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 28% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,210 eligible voters.

The Commission received four representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, East Williamston Community Council, County Councillor Phil Baker (Saundersfoot) and County Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston).

Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to create two new wards by splitting the existing electoral ward of Saundersfoot. They proposed combining the northern part (with 681 electors) of Saundersfoot with the Community of Amroth. The southern part (with 1,334 electors) of Saundersfoot would then be combined with the Wooden region (with 422 electors) of the Community of East Williamston, also described in paragraph 218.

East Williamston Community Council submitted their opposition to Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposal to introduce new warding arrangements within the Community of East Williamston. The community council stated the areas of Pentlepoir and Wooden are well linked to each other and naturally distinct, in multiple ways, from the neighbouring electoral wards of Saundersfoot and Kilgetty/Begelly.

Councillor Phil Baker (Saundersfoot) stated his belief that Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposal to introduce new warding arrangements to combine Wooden, of East Williamston, with Saundersfoot South, is unnatural.

Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston) is opposed to the recommendation made by Pembrokeshire County Council which propose to introduce new warding arrangements. Councillor Williams highlighted the lack of affinity between the two areas and that the boundary between the two communities, along the railway line, should remain. Councillor Williams also stated his belief that the areas of Pentlepoir and Wooden do share a common social, geographical and cultural identity.

The Commission notes the level of over-representation within the existing electoral ward of Amroth, and the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of Saundersfoot, and has considered the recommendations made by Pembrokeshire County Council for Amroth.

The Commission proposes to apply the boundaries as described at paragraph 205 to combine the northern part of the Community of Saundersfoot with the Community of Amroth to form an electoral ward with 1,672 electors (1,563 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 6% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Gogledd Saundersfoot gydag Amroth, and the English language name of Saundersfoot North with Amroth. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with
the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

211. In consideration of the representations received and the proposal made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards implementing new arrangements to combine the Wooden area of East Williamston with the southern part of the Community of Saundersfoot. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal.

212. The Commission proposes, as a consequence of the proposal described at paragraph 210, to form a Saundersfoot South electoral ward with 1,334 electors (1,329 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 15% below the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of De Saundersfoot, and the English language name of Saundersfoot South. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

213. The Council have made no suggestions as to the consequential warding arrangements for Saundersfoot Community Council; these have been considered by the Commission in Chapter 6.

214. The Commission acknowledges the representations which place emphasis on maintaining community links and views that suggest no community council area should be represented by more than one county councillor. However, the proposal addresses the inappropriate levels of electoral variance, and supports the desirability to produce coherent arrangements, within the wider area. The Commission are content that the proposals for the region are formed from appropriate combinations of community areas, which share common interests and character.
Carew and East Williamston

215. The existing Carew electoral ward is composed of the Community of Carew. It has 1,187 electors (1,173 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 25% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,171 eligible voters.

216. The existing East Williamston electoral ward is composed of the Community of Jeffreyston and the East Williamston and Pentlepoir wards of the Community of East Williamston. It has 2,002 electors (1,975 projected electors) represented by one councillor which is 27% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 1,943 eligible voters.

217. The Commission received three representations concerning these wards from: Pembrokeshire County Council, East Williamston Community Council and County Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston).

218. Pembrokeshire County Council proposed to create two new electoral wards. The first was to combine the Community of Jeffreyston with the East Williamston ward of the Community of East Williamston, and the Pentlepoir region (with 725 electors) of the community. The Wooden region (with 422 electors) of the Community of East Williamston would then be combined with the southern part of the Community of Saundersfoot as described in paragraph 205. Details of the specific boundary change proposal can be found on page 10 of Appendix 5.

219. East Williamston Community Council submitted their opposition to Pembrokeshire County Council’s proposal to introduce new arrangements within the Community of East Williamston. The Community Council recommend the Community of East Williamston remain under a single electoral ward, and the existing community wards remain unchanged.

220. Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston) is opposed to the recommendation made by Pembrokeshire County Council which proposes to introduce new arrangements. Councillor Williams stated his belief that the areas of Pentlepoir and Wooden share a common social, geographical and cultural identity, and proposes that the Community of East Williamston could form a single-member electoral ward.

221. The Commission notes the level of under-representation in the existing electoral ward of East Williamston, and has therefore considered alternative arrangements for the area.

222. In consideration of the representations received and the proposal made by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Commission notes the objections towards implementing new arrangements which would split the Community of East Williamston. The Commission considered that it was not appropriate to make this proposal as suggested, due to the representations in opposition to the County Council’s proposal and in support of the creation of coherent electoral wards, based upon combinations of whole communities.

223. The Commission proposes to combine the Communities of Carew and Jeffreyston to form an electoral ward with 1,630 electors (1,629 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, would result in a level of representation that is 4% above the proposed county average. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Caeriw a Jeffreyston, and the English language name of Carew and Jeffreyston.
Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed names. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

224. The Commission considers that the proposals for this area are formed from appropriate combinations of rural communities which are well connected along a number of roads.

225. The Commission proposes, as a consequence, the Community of East Williamston forms an electoral ward with 1,559 electors (1,519 projected electors) which, if represented by one councillor, 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 **East Williamston**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

226. The Commission believe this proposal addresses levels of electoral representation, and the desirability to maintain community links within the Community of East Williamston. The Commission believe that, as the proposal for the area constitutes one existing Community area, this arrangement will successfully utilise the existing community, communication and social ties to form an effective electoral ward.
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 of Pembrokeshire:
   - Electoral variance ranges from 43% below the current county average (Newport) to 58% above the current county average (Pembroke Dock: Pennar) of 1,574 electors per councillor.
   - 18 electoral wards (30%) have a level of representation in excess of 25% above or below the current county average of 1,574 electors per councillor.
   - 21 electoral wards (35%) have a level of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the current county average of 1,574 electors per councillor.
   - 21 electoral wards (35%) have a level of representation less than 10% above or below the current county average of 1,574 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 (St Florence and St Mary Out Liberty) to 24% above the proposed county average (Milford: East) of 1,574 electors per councillor.
   - None of the electoral wards have a level of representation in excess of 25% above or below the proposed county average of 1,574 electors per councillor.
   - 26 electoral wards (45%) have a level of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the proposed county average of 1,574 electors per councillor.
   - 32 electoral wards (55%) have a level of representation less than 10% above or below the proposed county average of 1,574 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 the Commission’s preliminary views on the electoral arrangements for the County of Pembrokeshire. It shall welcome any representations in respect of these proposals. The Commission will consider carefully all representations made to it with respect of them before formulating our final proposals and submitting them to the Welsh Government.
Chapter 6. CONSEQUENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. In considering the changes to electoral wards where the Commission has proposed boundary changes, it has also been necessary to consider the consequence of these changes to the boundaries and electoral arrangements of the community and town councils. This section of the report details our proposals for such consequential changes. The electoral statistics used in this section were provided by Pembrokeshire County Council.

Community and Community Ward Boundaries

2. There are 12 changes to electoral wards which, as a consequence, the Commission must consider the underlying community and community ward arrangements. The proposed changes to community and community ward boundaries are as follows:

MILFORD HAVEN TOWN COUNCIL

3. The proposed electoral ward of Milford: East is proposed to have the same consequential change to the East ward of the Town of Milford Haven, as illustrated on the map at page 55.

4. The proposed electoral ward of Milford: Hakin is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Hakin ward of the Town of Milford Haven, as illustrated on the map at page 52.

5. The proposed electoral ward of Milford: Hubberston is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Hubberston ward of the Town of Milford Haven, as illustrated on the map at page 51.

6. The proposed electoral ward of Milford: North is proposed to have the same consequential change to the North ward of the Town of Milford Haven, as illustrated on the map at page 56.

PEMBROKE TOWN COUNCIL

7. The proposed electoral ward of Pembroke: Monkton and St Mary South is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Pembroke: St Mary South and Pembroke: St Michael wards of Pembroke Town Council, as illustrated on the map at page 67.

8. The proposed electoral ward of Pembroke: St Michael is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Pembroke: St Michael ward of Pembroke Town Council, as illustrated on the map at page 68.

PEMBROKE DOCK TOWN COUNCIL

9. The proposed electoral ward of Pembroke Dock: Bush is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Pembroke Dock: Llanion ward of Pembroke Dock Town Council, as illustrated on the map at page 64.

10. The proposed electoral ward of Pembroke Dock: Central is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Pembroke Dock: Central ward of Pembroke Dock Town Council, as illustrated on the map at page 63.

11. The proposed electoral ward of Pembroke Dock: Pennar East is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Pembroke Dock: Pennar ward of Pembroke Dock Town Council, as illustrated on the map at page 60.
12. The proposed electoral ward of Pembroke Dock: Pennar West is proposed to have the same consequential change to the Pembroke Dock: Pennar ward of Pembroke Dock Town Council, as illustrated on the map at page 59.


SAUNDERSFOOT COMMUNITY COUNCIL

14. The proposed electoral ward of Saundersfoot North with Amroth is proposed to have the same consequential change to the warding arrangements within Saundersfoot Community Council, as illustrated on the map at page 75.

15. The proposed electoral ward of Saundersfoot South is proposed to have the same consequential change to the warding arrangements within Saundersfoot Community Council, as illustrated on the map at page 76.

Town and Community Council Electoral Arrangements

16. The Commission are required to consider the consequential changes to the community electoral arrangements that would occur following the proposals detailed above. The existing electoral arrangements and the proposed changes to those arrangements are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Town Councillors</th>
<th>Electors per Councillor</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Town Councillors</th>
<th>Electors per Councillor</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakin</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubberston</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. The Commission is satisfied that the existing electoral arrangements are appropriate and are in the interests of effective and convenient local government.
18. The Commission is satisfied that these proposed changes are appropriate and are in the interests of effective and convenient local government.

**Pembroke Dock Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electors</td>
<td>Town Councillors</td>
<td>Electors per Councillor</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Electors</td>
<td>Town Councillors</td>
<td>Electors per Councillor</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanion</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennar</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennar East</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennar West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6840</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td>6840</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The Commission is satisfied that these proposed changes are appropriate and are in the interests of effective and convenient local government.
# Saundersfoot Community Council Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Community Councillors</th>
<th>Electors per Councillor</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>Community Councillors</th>
<th>Electors per Councillor</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saundersfoot</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundersfoot North</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saundersfoot South</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 20. The Commission is satisfied that these proposed changes are appropriate and are in the interests of effective and convenient local government.
Chapter 7. 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 24 September 2018.
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APPENDIX 1 – GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**Commission**
The Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales.

**Community (area)**
The unit of local government that lies below the level of the Principal Council.

**Community Council**
An elected council that provides services to their particular community area. A Community Council may be divided for community electoral purposes into community wards.

**Community / Town ward**
An area within a Community Council created for community electoral purposes.

**Directions**
Directions issued by Welsh Ministers under Section 48 of the Act.

**Electoral wards**
The areas into which Principal Councils are divided for the purpose of electing county councillors, previously referred to as electoral divisions.

**Electoral review**
A review in which the Commission considers the electoral arrangements for a Principal Council.

**Electoral variance**
How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward varies from the county average; expressed as a percentage.

**Electorate**
The number of persons registered to vote in a local government area.

**Estimated Population of Eligible Voters**
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 for National Statistics’ 2015 Ward population estimates for Wales, mid-2015 (experimental statistics).

**Interested party**
Person or body who has an interest in the outcome of an electoral review, such as a community council, local MP or AM or political party.

**Order**
Order made by an implementing body, giving effect to proposals made by the Principal Council or the Commission.

**Over-representation**
Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward compared to the county average.

**Principal area**
The area governed by a Principal Council: In Wales, a county or county borough.
Principal Council: 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.

Projected electorate: The five-year forecast of the electorate.

Split Community: A Community which is divided between two, or more, Electoral wards.


Town Council: 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.

Under-representation: Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward compared to the county average.
<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>1</td>
<td>Amroth</td>
<td>The Community of Amroth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>The Communities of Burton and Rosemarket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Camrose</td>
<td>The Communities of Camrose and Nolton and Roch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carew</td>
<td>The Community of Carew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>1,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cligerran</td>
<td>The Communities of Cligerran and Manordeifi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clydau</td>
<td>The Communities of Boncath and Clydau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crymych</td>
<td>The Communities of Crymych and Eglwyswrw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dinas Cross</td>
<td>The Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Dinas Cross and Puncheston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>East Williamston</td>
<td>The Communities of East Williamston and Jeffreyston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fishguard: North East</td>
<td>The Fishguard North East ward of the Community of Fishguard and Goodwick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fishguard: North West</td>
<td>The Fishguard North West ward of the Community of Fishguard and Goodwick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Goodwick</td>
<td>The Goodwick ward of the Community of Fishguard and Goodwick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Castle</td>
<td>The Castle ward of the Community of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Garth</td>
<td>The Garth ward of the Community of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Portfield</td>
<td>The Portfield ward of the Community of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Prendergast</td>
<td>The Prendergast ward of the Community of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Priory</td>
<td>The Priory ward of the Community of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hundleton</td>
<td>The Communities of Angle, Hundleton and Stackpole &amp; Castelemartin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>The Communities of Johnston and Tiers Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kilgetty/ Begelley</td>
<td>The Community of Kilgetty/ Begelly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lampeter Velfrey</td>
<td>The Communities of Lampeter Velfrey and Llanddewi Velfrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>1,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lamphey</td>
<td>The Communities of Cosheston and Lamphey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Letterston</td>
<td>The Communities of Hayscastle, Letterston and Wolfscastle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Llangwm</td>
<td>The Communities of Freystrop, Hook and Llangwm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Llanrhian</td>
<td>The Communities of Llanrhian and Mathry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>No. OF COUNCILLORS</td>
<td>ELECTORATE 2017</td>
<td>ELECTORATE 2022</td>
<td>% variance from County average</td>
<td>% variance from County average</td>
<td>Population Eligible to Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Maenclochog</td>
<td>The Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West, Maenclochog, Mynachlog-Ddu and New Moat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manorbier</td>
<td>The Communities of Manorbier and St Florence (609 electors)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Martletwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Llawhaden, Martletwy and Uzmaston, Boulston and Slebech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Merlin's Bridge</td>
<td>The Community of Merlin's Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Milford Haven: Central</td>
<td>The Central ward of the Community of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Milford Haven: East</td>
<td>The East ward of the Community of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Milford Haven: Hakin</td>
<td>The Hakin ward of the Community of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Milford Haven: Hubberston</td>
<td>The Hubberston ward of the Community of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Milford Haven: North</td>
<td>The North ward of the Community of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Milford Haven: West</td>
<td>The West ward of the Community of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Narberth</td>
<td>The Narberth Urban ward of the Community of Narberth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Narberth Rural</td>
<td>The Community of Templeton, and the Narberth Rural ward of the Community of Narberth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>The Community of Newport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Neyland East</td>
<td>The East ward of the Community of Neyland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Neyland West</td>
<td>The Community of Llanstadwell and the West ward of the Community of Neyland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Central</td>
<td>The Central ward of the Community of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Llanion</td>
<td>The Llanion ward of the Community of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Market</td>
<td>The Market ward of the Community of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Pennar</td>
<td>The Pennar ward of the Community of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pembroke: Monkton</td>
<td>The Monkton ward of the Community of Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Pembroke: St Mary North</td>
<td>The St Mary North ward of the Community of Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pembroke: St Mary South</td>
<td>The St Mary South ward of the Community of Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pembroke: St Michael</td>
<td>The St Michael ward of the Community of Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Penally</td>
<td>The Communities of Penally, St. Mary Out Liberty and St Florence (98 electors)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rudbaxton</td>
<td>The Community of Rudbaxton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>676</td>
<td></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>
<td>Population Eligible to Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Saundersfoot</td>
<td>The Community of Saundersfoot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Scleddau</td>
<td>The Communities of Pencaer and Scleddau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Solva</td>
<td>The Communities of Brawdy and Solva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>St David's</td>
<td>The Community of St Davids City Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>St Ishmael's</td>
<td>The Communities of Dale, Herbrandston, Marloes and St Brides and St Ishmael's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>St. Dogmaels</td>
<td>The Communities of Nevern and St Dogmaels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Tenby: North</td>
<td>The Tenby North ward of the Community of Tenby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Tenby: South</td>
<td>The Tenby South ward of the Community of Tenby together with Caldey and St Margaret's Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>The Havens</td>
<td>The Communities of The Havens and Walwyn's Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Wiston</td>
<td>The Communities of Ambleston, Spittal and Wiston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94,431</td>
<td>94,574</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,692</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio is the number of electors per councillor.
Electoral figures supplied by Pembrokeshire County Council.
Population figures supplied by the Office for National Statistics.

2017 | 2022
---|---
Greater than + or - 50% of County average | 2 | 3% | 2 | 3%
Between + or - 25% and + or - 50% of County average | 16 | 27% | 19 | 32%
Between + or - 10% and + or - 25% of County average | 21 | 35% | 17 | 26%
Between 0% and + or - 10% of County average | 21 | 35% | 22 | 37%
# PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
## PROPOSED COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

**APPENDIX 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>No. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2017</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2022</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2017</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2022</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boncath and Clydau</td>
<td>The Communities of Boncath, Manordeifi and Clydau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>The Communities of Burton and Rosemarket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Camrose</td>
<td>The Community of Camrose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carew and Jeffreyston</td>
<td>The Communities of Carew and Jeffreyston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cilgerran and Eglwyswrw</td>
<td>The Communities of Cilgerran and Eglwyswrw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Crymych and Mynachlogddu</td>
<td>The Communities of Crymych and Mynachlogddu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>East Williamston</td>
<td>The Community of East Williamston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fishguard</td>
<td>The Fishguard North East and Fishguard North West ward of the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Goodwick</td>
<td>The Goodwick ward of the Town of Fishguard and Goodwick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>-0%</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>-0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Castle</td>
<td>The Castle ward of the Town of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Garth</td>
<td>The Garth ward of the Town of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Portfield</td>
<td>The Portfield ward of the Town of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Prendergast</td>
<td>The Prendergast ward of the Town of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Haverfordwest: Priory</td>
<td>The Priory ward of the Town of Haverfordwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hundleton</td>
<td>The Communities of Angle, Hundleton and Stackpole &amp; Castlemartin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>The Community of Johnston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kilgetty and Begelly</td>
<td>The Community of Kilgetty/Begelly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lampeter Velfrey</td>
<td>The Communities of Lampeter Velfrey and Llanddewi Velfrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lamphey</td>
<td>The Communities of Cosheston and Lamphey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Letterston</td>
<td>The Communities of Hayscastle, Letterston and Wolftscastle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Llangwm</td>
<td>The Communities of Freystrop, Hook and Llangwm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Llanrhian</td>
<td>The Communities of Llanrhian, Mathry and Pencaer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Maenclochog</td>
<td>The Communities of Clunderwen, Llandissilio West and Maenclochog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Manorbier and Penally</td>
<td>The Communities of Manorbier and Penally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Martletwy</td>
<td>The Communities of Llawhaden, Martletwy and Uzmaaston, Boulston and Slebech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Merlin's Bridge</td>
<td>The Community of Merlin's Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Milford: Central</td>
<td>The Central ward of the Town of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>-3%</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>28</td>
<td>Milford: East</td>
<td>The proposed 'East' ward of the Town of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Milford: Hakin</td>
<td>The proposed 'Hakin' ward of the Town of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Milford: Hubberston</td>
<td>The proposed 'Hubberston' ward of the Town of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Milford: North</td>
<td>The proposed 'North' ward of the Town of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Milford: West</td>
<td>The West ward of the Town of Milford Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Narberth: Urban</td>
<td>The Narberth Urban ward of the Town of Narberth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Narberth: Rural</td>
<td>The Community of Templeton, and the Narberth Rural ward of the Town of Narberth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Newport with Dinas</td>
<td>The Communities of Dinas Cross and Newport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Neyland: East</td>
<td>The Neyland East ward of the Town of Neyland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Neyland: West</td>
<td>The Community of Llanstadwell and the Neyland West ward of the Town of Neyland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Bush</td>
<td>The proposed 'Bush' ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Central</td>
<td>The proposed 'Central' ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Market</td>
<td>The Market ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Pennar East</td>
<td>The proposed 'Pennar East' ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pembroke Dock: Pennar West</td>
<td>The proposed 'Pennar West' ward of the Town of Pembroke Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pembroke: Monkton and St Mary South</td>
<td>The Monkton ward and the proposed 'St Mary South' ward of the Town of Pembroke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pembroke: St Mary North</td>
<td>The St Mary North ward of the Town of Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pembroke: St Michael</td>
<td>The proposed 'St Michael' ward of the Town of Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Rudbaxton</td>
<td>The Communities of Rudbaxton and Spittal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Saundersfoot North with Amroth</td>
<td>The Community of Amroth and the proposed 'North' ward of the Community of Saundersfoot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Saundersfoot South</td>
<td>The proposed 'South' ward of the Community of Saundersfoot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Scleddau and Puncheston</td>
<td>The Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Puncheston and Scleddau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Solva</td>
<td>The Communities of Brawdy and Solva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>St David's</td>
<td>The Community of St Davids City Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>St Dogmaels</td>
<td>The Communities of Nevern and St Dogmaels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>St Florence and St Mary Out Liberty</td>
<td>The Communities of St Florence and St. Mary Out Liberty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>St Ishmael's</td>
<td>The Communities of Dale, Herbrandston, Marloes and St Brides, St Ishmael's, Tiers Cross and Walwyns Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>20%</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>55</td>
<td>Tenby: North</td>
<td>The Tenby North ward of the Town of Tenby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1.723</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Tenby: South</td>
<td>The Tenby South ward of the Town of Tenby together with Caldey and St Margaret's Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1.774</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>The Havens</td>
<td>The Communities of The Havens and Nolton and Roch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Wiston</td>
<td>The Communities of Ambleston, New Moat and Wiston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

| 60 | 94,431 | 1,574 | 94,692 | 1,578 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2022</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between + or - 10% and + or - 25% of County average</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 0% and + or - 10% of County average</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio is the number of electors per councillor
Electoral figures supplied by Pembrokeshire County Council
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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 asked the Commission to submit a report in respect of the review of electoral arrangements for the County of Pembrokeshire 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 2013 Act as:

   i) the number of members for the council for the principal area;

   ii) the number, type and boundaries of the electoral wards;

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

   iv) 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 near 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 a number of changes to local government boundaries in Pembrokeshire.

   • The County of Pembrokeshire (Community Electoral Arrangements) Order 2008.
   • The Pembrokeshire (Communities) Order 2011.
   • The Pembrokeshire (St. Mary Out Liberty and Tenby Communities) Order 2012.

Procedure

8. 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, the Commission wrote on 21 July 2017 to Pembrokeshire County Council, all the Community 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 our intention to conduct the review and to request their preliminary views. The Commission invited the County Council to submit a suggested scheme or schemes for new electoral arrangements and also requested Pembrokeshire
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County Council display a number of public notices in their area. The Commission also made available copies of the *Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice* document. In addition, the Commission made a presentation to both County and Community councillors explaining the review process.

9. 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 Pembrokeshire County Council and the Office of the Commission in Cardiff, as well as on the Commission’s website ([http://ldbc.gov.wales](http://ldbc.gov.wales)).

**Policy and Practice**

10. The Commission published the *Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice* document in November 2016. This document details the Commission’s 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 is taken 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 the Commission must consider.

11. 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**

12. The maps included in this report, and published on the Commission’s 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 OF PEMBROKESHIRE

1. Pembrokeshire County Council wrote on the 23 October 2017 outlining their
recommendations for electoral arrangements for areas which possess the highest
levels of electoral variance within the county. Pembrokeshire County Council submitted
a copy of the Chief Executive’s report to Council, dated 19 October 2017, along with
comments made by a number of Members during the Council meeting, which are
shown below.

Dear Ross

Consultation Response to the Local Democracy and Boundary Consultation for
Wales on Electoral Review

Please find attached a report to Council, which was considered at the meeting on 19th
October, 2017. The Report was approved with an amended recommendation and
with an assurance that the comments made by Members during the meeting would
be included in the response.

The amended recommendation as approved is recorded below:-

‘It is recommended that Council approves this initial response to the consultation and
receives a further consultation report in Spring 2018.

and -

That this Council believes the Commission’s aim from the outset of this review,
should have been with a view to decreasing the number of Pembrokeshire County
Councillors.’

Councillors raised views with the proposal during the meeting as summarised below:-

Cllr Jamie Adams (Carmarthen)
• Views that fewer councillors (as low as 45) would be better.
• Support for single member wards
• Carmarthen is a large ward and electors need parity with other wards (accepts
the need for change).

We welcome correspondence in Welsh and English, and will respond within a maximum of 15 working days. We
will respond in the language in which the correspondence is received (unless you ask us to do otherwise).

Pembrokeshire County Council on the number above. / Os amgopi mewn print mawr, format hawdd ei
eddardlen, Braille, sain neu mewn iaith arall, cyflymuwch â Chyngor Sir Penfro ar y nif iechor.
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Cllr Huw George (Maenclochog)
- The proposal adversely impacts communities by dividing Llanycefn from Maenclochog and Rosebush.
- Culture and language is divided (Welsh language/bilingual communities impacted).

Cllr Tony Wilcox (Pembroke Dock: Penmar)
- The proposal simply splits a large, compact area in half.
- There should not be an increase in the number of Councillors – now is not the time.
- The number of members could be reduced to 30.

Cllr Guy Woodham (Milford: East)
- No problem with proposals as they impact on my ward.
- Problem with 5 year review programme – too frequent.
- Equality of electors per ward shouldn’t override other criteria.

Cllr Jacob Williams (East Williamson) also provided comments on behalf of Cllr Michael Evans (Tenby: South) as marked *
- Unable to support the proposals as tabled.
- East Williamson is a ward, Pentlepoir and East Williamson.
- Proposal splits Pentlepoir ward in half.
- Wooden and Pentlepoir are one community.
- Mathematical convenience is not the best way to proceed.
- General observation that St Ishmaels (as proposed) would cover 5 Community Council areas – too large.
- Supports the view that 30 County Councillors is sufficient.
- The number of elections in Milford Haven deserve two extra Councillors, not one (speaking on behalf of Cllr Michael Evans#).

Cllr Phil Baker (Saundersfoot)
- Appreciates the difficulty of the task.
- Unnatural to join Saundersfoot to Wooden.

Cllr Bob Kilmister (Dinas Cross)
- As Cabinet member with responsibility for finance, cannot support an increase in the number of councillors.
- Suggests 54 (19% reduction).

Cllr David Lloyd (St Davids)
- Supportive of the concept that Members’ views as given during the Council meeting should form part of the PCC response.

Cllr Michelle Bateman (Letterston)
- Does not support any increase in the number of Councillors.
- Greater emphasis required to maintain community links.

Cllr John Davies (Gigerran)
- There should be fewer Councillors, not more.
- The proposal (impacting Egwyswyf) is insufficiently cognisant of existing communities with no road links between communities proposed to be joined.

The debate at Council on 19th October 2017 can be viewed by accessing the Council’s archive of webcast meetings.

In addition, subsequent to the Council meeting, I have also received emails from Councillors Mark Carter and Jacob Williams, summarised below -

Cllr Mark Carter (Solva)
- The number of councillors should be reduced to 56.
- No Community Council area should be covered by more than one County Councillor.
- Some Community Councils should be merged.

Cllr Jacob Williams (East Williamson)
- Significant concern that PCC’s submission arbitrarily carves up the East Williamson Electoral Division’s most populous community ward (Pentlepoir) merely for mathematical convenience. This unnatural divide, to make up the numbers of a neighbouring electoral division, is unacceptable and would break Pentlepoir’s significant links.

Yours sincerely,

Chief Executive

Ends
1. Report to Council dated 19th October 2017
2. Affected area proposal maps
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COUNCIL

Report of: Chief Executive
Date: 19 October 2017

PROPOSED CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES ON ELECTORAL REVIEW

Purpose
On 28th July 2017, Members had the opportunity to attend a seminar at which representatives of the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission presented its guidance and policy for electoral reviews.

This report sets out a proposed response to the Commission’s current consultation on the review of the electoral arrangements in Pembrokeshire.

This is a response to an initial consultation period. There will be a second 12 week consultation period during Spring 2018, and a further Members’ Seminar and report to Council accordingly.

Background
The provisions of the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 in respect of local government reviews requires the Commission to ensure effective and convenient local government.

The Commission is required to exercise a balanced judgement taking account of all relevant considerations, with a view to making recommendations for electoral arrangements that are to achieve effective and convenient local government. The Commission has a degree of discretion in the way that it attaches weight to the factors that aid it in making its decisions.

Ideally, it would be possible to devise a scheme in which all councillors in the authority had an equal electoral ratio, brought together people in clearly identifiable communities, demonstrated clearly how local government would be both effective and convenient and had the appropriate number of councillors.

The geographic, social, economic and administrative make-up of the area is not so straightforward as to facilitate the drawing up of such ideal schemes. The Commission must consider all of the factors together and has devised the Electoral Review: Policy and Practice document, in order to give weighting to all of the relevant factors and guidance to principal councils. This document was made available to Members at the presentation on 20th July 2017.

When applying the policies to Pembrokeshire the Commission has recommended a council size of 62 Members with an average electorate of 1,520 electors per elected Member. In order to reach a satisfactory arrangement a band of up to +/- 25% (1,140 - 1,910) has been applied to the preferred number of electors. When calculating the number of electors per electoral division the Commission require the use of a projected electorate for the year 2022.

General Approach
The Council accepts the Commission’s Council Size Policy and its methodology for determining the size of Councils as well as its requirements to ensure effective and convenient local government, electoral equality, local ties and easily identifiable boundaries.

As required the focus has been to concentrate the review on the electoral divisions which are the most disproportionate in terms of number of electors to councillor.

In adopting this approach there will need to be an acceptance that whilst addressing the target areas consequential changes to neighbouring electoral divisions will be subject to subsequent review.

Consideration of Proposals

Crymych and Maenclochog Areas (Appendix 1)
Affected Area - The combined extent of the current Crymych and Maenclochog Electoral Divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Crymych (2143) and Maenclochog (2462) electoral divisions exceed the maximum electorate (1910).

Description of changes - Three new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the two existing.

'Crymych' to be the area of Crymych Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1410.

'Maenclochog' to be the area of Eglwyswen & Myrachogliud Community Councils and Maenclochog Community Ward with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1375.

'Clunderwen' to be the area of New Most, Llandeilo West & Clunderwen Community Councils and Llanychaf Community Ward with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1515.

Camrose, Rudbaxton, The Havens, Johnston and St Ishmaels Areas (Appendix 2)
Affected area - the combined extent of the current Camrose, Johnston, Rudbaxton, St Ishmaels and The Havens electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Camrose (2224) and Johnston (2195) electoral divisions exceed the maximum allowed electorate (1910).

The estimated 2022 electorates in Rudbaxton (876) and St Ishmaels (1137)
electoral divisions are less than the minimum allowed electorate (1146) in 2022.

Description of changes - Five new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the five existing.

*Carmarthenshire* to be the area of Rhodfa'r Llyn and the northern half of Carmarthen Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1535.

*Uplands* to be the area of Llanelli Community Council and the southern half of Carmarthen Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1118.

*The Havens* to be the area of Llanelli & Roch and The Havens Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1607.

*Johnston* to be the area of Johnston Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1710.

*St Ishmael's* to be the area of Manorbier & St Brides, Dale, St Ishmaels, Herbrandston and Willows Castle Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1369.

Llanrhian, Scolddau, Dinas and Newport (Appendix 3)

Affected Area - the combined extent of the current Dinas Cross, Llanrhian, Newport and Scolddau electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Newport (979) and Scleddau (1103) electoral division are less than the minimum allowed electorate (1146).

Description of changes - Three new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the four existing.

*Llanrhian* to be the area of Llanrhian electoral division, and the Llanwnda and St Nicholas Community Councils (Pencader Community Council) with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1516.

*Scleddau & Puncheston* to be the area of Scleddau, Cwm Guaran and Puncheston Community Councils with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1409.

*Newport & Dinas* to be the area of Newport electoral division and Dinas Cross Community Council with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1510.

Haverfordwest (Appendix 4)

Area affected – the combined extent of the current Haverfordwest: Garth, Haverfordwest: Porfield and Haverfordwest: Princetown electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Haverfordwest: Garth (1926) and Haverfordwest: Princetown (2014) electoral divisions exceed the maximum allowed electorate (1910).

Description of changes - Four new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the three existing.

*Haverfordwest: Garth* to be Haverfordwest: Garth electoral division minus the area to the west of St Davids Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1372.

*Haverfordwest: Porfield* to be the western part of Haverfordwest: Porfield electoral division plus the area to the west of St Davids Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1516.

*Haverfordwest: Princetown* to be the eastern part of Haverfordwest: Porfield electoral division plus the area to the north or Scarrowscand Lane with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1689.

*Haverfordwest: Princetown* to be Haverfordwest: Princetown electoral division minus the area to the north of Scarrowscand Lane with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1508.

Milford Haven (Appendix 5)

Area affected – the combined extent of the current Milford: East, Milford: Hakin, Milford: Hubberston and Milford: North electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Milford: Hubberston (1948) and Milford: North (2209) electoral divisions exceeds the maximum allowed electorate (1910).

Description of changes - Four new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the four existing.

*Milford: East* to be Milford: East electoral division plus the area centred on Vynor Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1842.

*Milford: North* to be Milford: North minus the area centred on Vynor Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1853.

*Milford: Hakin* to be Milford: Hakin electoral division plus the area of Glanbeinlands and minus the area to the north of Waterlo Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1929.

*Milford: Hubberston* to be Milford: Hubberston electoral division minus the area of Glanbeinlands with the addition of the area to the north of Waterlo Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1777.

Pembrokeshire (Appendix 6)

Area affected – the combined extent of the current Pembrokeshire: St Mary South and Pembrokeshire: St Michael electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorate in Pembrokeshire: St Michael (1929) electoral division exceeds the maximum allowed electorate (1910) in 2022. The estimated 2022 electorate in Pembrokeshire: St Mary South (1073) electoral division is less than the minimum allowed electorate (1146).

Description of changes - Two new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the two existing.

*Pembrokeshire: St Mary South* to be Pembrokeshire: St Mary South electoral division plus the area south and south east of Golden Grove school with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1569.

*Pembrokeshire: St Michael* to be Pembrokeshire: St Michael electoral division minus the
Area south and south east of Golden Grove school with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1433.

**Pembroke Dock (Appendix 7)**
Area affected – The combined extent of the current Pembroke Dock: Central; Pembroke Dock: Llanion; and Pembroke Dock: Pennar electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Pembroke Dock; Llanion (2141) and Pembroke Dock; Pennar (2354) electoral divisions exceed the maximum allowed electorate (1910).

Description of changes - Four new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the three existing:
- Pembroke Dock: Central to be Pembroke Dock: Central electoral division plus the Llanion part of Pembroke Dock: Llanion electoral division with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1766.
- Pembroke Dock: East to be Pembroke Dock: Llanion electoral division minus the Llanion part of Pembroke Dock: Llanion electoral division with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1609.
- Pembroke Dock: Pennar East to be the eastern part of Pembroke Dock: Pennar electoral division with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1284.
- Pembroke Dock: Llanion West to be the western part of Pembroke Dock: Pennar electoral division with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1500.

**Saundersfoot Area (Appendix 8)**
Area affected – the combined extent of the current Amroth, East Williamston and Saundersfoot electoral divisions.

Reason for change - The estimated 2022 electorates in Saundersfoot (1941) and East Williamston (1975) electoral divisions exceed the maximum allowed electorate (1910) in 2022. The estimated 2022 electorate in Amroth (951) electoral division is less than the minimum allowed electorate (1146) in 2022.

Description of changes - Three new electoral divisions are proposed to replace the three existing:
- East Williamston to be the area of East Williamston electoral division minus the southern part of the Pembroiopir Community Ward (Wooden area) with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1579.
- Saundersfoot South & Wooden to be the southern part of Saundersfoot electoral division plus the southern part of the Pembroiopir Community Ward (Wooden area) with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1768.
- Saundersfoot North & Amroth to be the northern part of Saundersfoot electoral division and Amroth electoral division with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 1674.

**Conclusions and Feedback from the Members’ Seminar held on 19 October 2017**

The Commission wishes to encourage principal councils to use the knowledge of their respective areas to suggest a scheme for electoral arrangements to the Commission when a review is being undertaken. Having conducted a review of our communities, and being aware of the appropriate number of members to be elected for the principal council area, it is anticipated that Councils should be in a position to respond to the review by the Commission by suggesting electoral wards that meet the requirements of communities having identifiable boundaries and which do not break local ties.

At a Seminar for Members held on 19th October 2017, Councillors noted that there will be a subsequent consultation in Spring 2018 and reserved the right to comment further. Initial observations were recorded in response to the proposals contained herein and will form part of the response to the consultation:

- Significant concern that some proposals could be more cognisant of impacts on established communities, particularly with the proposals for Camrose, Havenes, Johnstone and St Ishmaels areas where local ties would be broken.
- The overall Council size aim of 62 Members for Pembrokeshire should be reduced as a cost efficiency measure.
- The overall Council size aim of 62 Members for Pembrokeshire was appropriate to enhance effective representation.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on equalising the numbers of electors per electoral division irrespective of the subsequent impacts on other criteria such as community cohesion.
- Some of the names of proposed electoral divisions should be reconsidered.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that Council approves this initial response to the consultation and receives a further consultation report in Spring 2018.

**Attachments**

Appendix 1 – Proposal map, Cymyach and Maenclochog areas
Appendix 2 – Proposal map, Camrose, Rudbaxton, The Havenes, Johnstone and St Ishmaels Areas
Appendix 3 – Proposal map, Llanllian, Secludau, Dinas and Newport areas
Appendix 4 – Proposal map, Haverfordwest area
Appendix 5 – Proposal map, Milford Haven area
Appendix 6 – Proposal map, Pembroke area
Appendix 7 – Proposal map, Pembroke Dock area
Appendix 8 – Proposal map, Saundersfoot area
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Electoral Division Changes in Milford Haven

- **Proposed New EDs for 2022**
- **Current EDs Subject to Change**
  - Milford: East
  - Milford: Haven
  - Milford: Haverfordwest
  - Milford: North


Description of changes: Four new EDs proposed to equalise the four existing EDs.
- Milford: East to be Milford: East & Bonymaen, the area centred on Uynor Hill with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 38,612.
- Milford: Haven to be Milford: Haven, the area centred on Uynor Hill with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 38,612.
- Milford: Haverfordwest to be Milford: Haverfordwest & Gestein, the area of Gestein plus the area to the north of Haverfordwest with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 38,789.
- Milford: North to be Milford: North & St Catherine, the area of Gestein plus the area to the north of Milford: Haven with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 38,789.

Electoral Division Changes in Haverfordwest

- **Proposed New EDs for 2022**
- **Current EDs Subject to Change**
  - Haverfordwest: Garden
  - Haverfordwest: Portfield
  - Haverfordwest: Pigmore

Area affected: Combined extent of the current Haverfordwest: Garden, Haverfordwest: Portfield, and Haverfordwest: Pigmore EDs.


Description of changes: Two new EDs proposed to equalise the three existing EDs.
- Haverfordwest: Garden to be Haverfordwest: Garden & St David’s, the area to the west of St David’s Road with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 19,617.
- Haverfordwest: Portfield to be Haverfordwest: Portfield & St David’s, the area to the north of St David’s Lane with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 19,617.
- Haverfordwest: Pigmore to be Haverfordwest: Pigmore & St David’s, the area to the north of St David’s Lane with an estimated electorate in 2022 of 19,617.
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Electoral Division Changes in Pembroke Dock

- Proposed new EDs for 2022
- Current EDs Subject to Change

PENMBROKE DOCK: SOUTH
PENMBROKE DOCK: CENTRAL
PENMBROKE DOCK: LLANBRO
PENMBROKE DOCK: PENRITH

Reason for change: The re-timetabled 2022 elections in Pembroke Dock: Lickey (2141) and Penbroke Dock: Penrice (2135) EDs have the minimum required electorate of 1500.

Description of changes: Five new EDs proposed to replace the three existing EDs.
- Pembroke Dock: Central to be Pembroke Dock: Central ED plus the Lickey part of Penrice
- Pembroke Dock: Lickey ED with an extended electorate in 2022 of 1704.
- Pembroke Dock: Penrice ED with the Penrice part of Pembroke Dock
- Pembroke Dock: Penrice ED with an extended electorate in 2022 of 2524.

Electoral Division Changes in Pembroke

- Proposed new EDs for 2022
- Current EDs Subject to Change

PENMBROKE DOCK: SOUTH
PENMBROKE DOCK: CENTRAL
PENMBROKE DOCK: LLANBRO
PENMBROKE DOCK: PENRITH

Reason for change: The re-timetabled 2022 elections in Pembroke Dock: Lickey (2141) and Penbroke Dock: Penrice (2135) EDs have the minimum required electorate of 1500.

Description of changes: Six new EDs proposed to replace the three existing EDs.
- Pembroke Dock: Central to be Pembroke Dock: Central ED plus the Lickey part of Penrice
- Pembroke Dock: South ED with an extended electorate in 2022 of 1704.
- Pembroke Dock: Penrice ED with the Penrice part of Pembroke Dock
- Pembroke Dock: South ED with an extended electorate in 2022 of 2524.
2. **East Williamston Community Council** emailed on the 20 October 2017 to submit their opposition to a proposal which would see the splitting of the areas of Pentlepoir and Wooden for local authority representation purposes, highlighting their belief that no sound reason exists to justify splitting the two, nor a natural way of achieving it.

The Community Council state the areas of Pentlepoir and Wooden are well-linked to each other and naturally distinct, in multiple ways, from the neighbouring electoral wards of Saundersfoot and Kilgetty/Begelly.

The Community Council believe the Pentlepoir ward of the Community of East Williamston should be counted as a single unit, and ask the Commission to give consideration towards the Community of East Williamston remaining under a single electoral ward.

3. **Hundleton Community Council** emailed on the 22 August 2017 and provided comments regarding the electoral arrangements within their Community, stating their unanimous view that the current arrangements were working well for everyone and there was no need for changes to be made.
4. **Johnston Community Council** wrote on the 12 September 2017 and submitted their preference towards retaining the Community of Johnston within a single-member electoral ward. Members of the Community Council are most concerned that Johnston should not be split up in any way.

The Community Council recognise the high levels of under-representation within the existing electoral ward and, feel an electoral ward could be formed of the Community of Johnston. However, the Community Council do also propose a continuation of the current arrangements, which combines the Communities of Johnston and Tiers Cross.

5. **Manordeifi Community Council** emailed on the 13 September 2017 and submitted several comments supporting the combination of the Communities of Manordeifi and Cilgerran within an electoral ward, and therefore proposing to retain the existing arrangements for the electoral ward of Cilgerran.

6. **Nevern Community Council** wrote on the 6 September 2017 to state that, after careful consideration, they believe the present arrangement to be satisfactory.

7. **Templeton Community Council** emailed on the 1 October 2017 to highlight the differences between the electoral wards of Narberth Rural and Narberth, and to support a proposal which provides separate representation for these areas.

The Community Council highlight the levels of rurality that exist within the Community of Templeton and it's focal point within the sparsely populated community, and explain that the concerns and issues of the predominantly rural population in the electoral ward of Narberth Rural are different from that of the people living in Narberth itself.

Templeton Community Council support the idea of single-member wards for accountability.

8. **Councillor Jacob Williams (East Williamston)** emailed on the 20 October 2017 to object to the proposal submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council, which would see the southern half of the Pentlepoir ward (Wooden) of the East Williamston Community combine with the southern half of Saundersfoot Community.

The Councillor highlighted the lack of affinity between Pentlepoir towards Saundersfoot, and highlights the lack of development between the two areas. However, his belief is that the areas of Pentlepoir and Wooden, which are together in a single community ward, do share social, geographical and cultural identities.

In the event that the electoral ward of East Williamston does need to change, then the Councillor believes the areas of Pentlepoir, Wooden and Moreton, or at the very least, Pentlepoir and Wooden, must remain together. He suggests the Pentlepoir ward should not be, as has never been, divided in an arbitrary fashion, as proposed by Pembrokeshire County Council, and suggests – only if changes are absolutely necessary – the existing ‘building blocks’ of the electoral ward of East Williamston
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(namely the Community of Jeffreyston and the wards of East Williamston and Pentlepoir) are used as-is.

The Councillor proposes the Community of East Williamston could form a single-member electoral ward, which currently has 1,559 electors. He also highlights that the boundary between the existing electoral wards of East Williamston and Saundersfoot follows the railway line, and considers that this should remain as the boundary between the two areas.

With reference to the representation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council, the Councillor states their submission does not address the effect, if any, its proposals would have on Community Councils, or the consequential effects they would have upon Community and Community ward arrangements.

The Councillor believes the representation submitted by Pembrokeshire County Council has too strong a focus upon achieving electoral parity, whereas more emphasis needs to be placed upon promoting effective representation and maintaining existing community structures along natural lines.

The Councillor is of the opinion that Pembrokeshire currently has too many county councillors and suggests, at the most, there should be 45 members.

The Councillor, as a member of East Williamston Community Council, also supports the representation made by East Williamston Community Council, at paragraph 2, above.

9. **Councillor Michael Williams (Tenby: North)** emailed on the 3 August 2017 to highlight a previous concern regarding proposals which would see the separation of the Communities of Penally and St Mary Out Liberty, from their existing electoral arrangement.
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.