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FOREWORD

This is our report containing our Draft Proposals for the City and County of Cardiff.

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

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

This review of the City and County of Cardiff is the nineteenth 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 helping us develop our draft proposals, the Community Councils for their contribution and all those who made representations.

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

Ceri Stradling
Interim 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 City and County of Cardiff. 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. 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 DRAFT 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 City and County of Cardiff.

- The Commission proposes a council of 77 members, an increase from the current size of 75. This results in a proposed county average of 3,158 electors per member.

- The Commission proposes 28 electoral wards, a reduction from 29 existing wards.

- The largest under-representation (in terms of electoral variance) within the proposals is Caerau (24% above the proposed county average). At present the greatest under-representation is in Butetown (133% above the proposed county average).

- The largest over-representation (in terms of electoral variance) within the proposals is Pentyrch and St Fagans (26% below the proposed county average). At present the greatest over-representation is in Cathays (23% below the proposed county average).

- The Commission is proposing 28 multi-member wards in the city and county consisting of nine two-member electoral wards, 17 three-member electoral wards and two four-member electoral wards.

- The Commission has proposed no changes to 16 electoral wards.

- The Commission received representations from: The City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group, three community councils and five county councillors. The Commission considered the representations carefully before it formulated its proposals. A summary of these representations can be found at Appendix 5.

Summary Maps

1. On the following pages are thematic maps illustrating the current and proposed arrangements and their variances from the proposed county average of 3,158 electors per member. Those areas in green are within +/-10% of the county average; yellow and hatched yellow between +/-10% and +/-25% of the county average; orange and hatched orange between +/-25% and +/-50% of the county average; and, those in red and hatched red are over +/-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 City and County of Cardiff has been informed 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 75 members is in-line with the methodology’s overall aim.

2. The Commission reviewed the electoral arrangements for the City and County of Cardiff in light of its methodology and took into account the representations which had been made. For the reasons given below, the Commission believes that in the interest of effective and convenient local government a council of 77 members would be appropriate to represent the City and County of Cardiff.

3. The Commission has provided a set of arrangements that provides for effective and convenient local government. The Commission is restrained by the building blocks that it can use to create new electoral wards. The current building blocks in the City and County of Cardiff have led the Commission to creating the proposals as set out in Chapter 4 of this report.

4. The Commission’s policy is to limit the maximum size of a council to 75 members if the appropriate improvements in electoral parity can be achieved. When considering all the existing options, and the City and County of Cardiff Council’s electorate projections, the Commission could not achieve the appropriate improvements within the maxima set out in its policy. A decision has therefore been taken to breach the policy on this occasion in the interest of electoral parity and propose a council of 77 members.

Number of electors

5. The numbers shown as the electorate for 2019 and the estimates for the electorate in the year 2024 are those submitted by the City and County of Cardiff. The forecast figures supplied by the City and County of Cardiff show a forecasted increase in the electorate of Cardiff from 243,196 to 263,904. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has also provided their estimated number of persons eligible to vote but who are not on the electoral register. This showed an estimated 45,405 more people eligible to vote than the 2019 electorate.

6. The Commission is aware that there are Welsh Government proposals to legislate to extend the franchise to include 16 and 17 year olds and foreign nationals not currently eligible to vote at the 2022 local government elections. The Commission’s Council Size Policy utilises the entire population to determine Council Size and these two groups were included in the Council Size deliberations.

7. While 16 and 17 year olds are not in the existing electoral figures provided by the City and County of Cardiff, they will have been included in the forecasted figures provided by the Council. These figures have been included in the Commission’s deliberations on its recommendations.

8. Foreign nationals are included in the census data provided by the ONS. Consideration of this data has been included as part of the Commission’s deliberations on its recommendations.

Councillor to electorate ratio

9. In respect of the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward, there is a wide variation from the current county average of 3,243 electors per councillor ranging from 23%
below (2,506 electors – Cathays) to 133% above (7,550 electors – Butetown). The determination of the council of 77 members (see paragraph 2) results in an average of 3,158 electors being represented by each councillor.

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

Judgement and Balance

11. In producing a scheme of electoral arrangements, the Commission must have regard to a number of issues contained in the legislation. In the proposed scheme, the Commission has placed emphasis on achieving improvements in electoral parity whilst maintaining community ties wherever possible. The Commission has made every effort to ensure that the revised electoral wards are an appropriate combination of existing communities and community wards.

12. In some areas the Commission has considered the retention or 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. The Commission acknowledges the established practice of multi-member wards within the City and County of Cardiff and this is reflected in the Commission’s proposals.

13. The Commission has looked at each area and is satisfied that it would be difficult to achieve electoral arrangements that keep the existing combination of communities and community wards without having a detrimental effect on one or more of the other issues that the Commission must consider. The Commission recognises 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

14. The Commission is naming electoral wards and not the places within the proposed electoral wards. 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.

15. 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 responsibility to advise on the standard forms of Welsh place-names and specialist knowledge in the field. At each proposal an indication is given of the Welsh Language Commissioner’s recommendation and where they differ, the specific recommendation and why the Commissioner 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.
Community Council Arrangements

16. The Commission wishes to highlight that this review of electoral arrangements is seeking to make improvements to electoral representation within the City and County of Cardiff Council. This process is independent from any changes to arrangements concerning community councils. Where combinations of communities or their wards are used to create electoral wards, the individual communities in question will retain their existing community council arrangement. These councils will remain independent following the outcome of this review, any precepts generated, or assets contained with a community council will remain part of that community council.

17. Change to community arrangements are dealt with under a separate section of the legislation, as part of a community review led by the Council.
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 in Appendix 5;
   - The views of the Commission;
   - The composition of the proposed electoral ward and the proposed name;
   - A map of the proposed electoral ward (see key on page 10).

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 is proposing to retain.

   - Adamsdown
   - Caerau
   - Canton
   - Cyncoed
   - Ely
   - Fairwater
   - Gabalfa
   - Heath
   - Llandaff
   - Llandaff North
   - Penylan
   - Rhiwbina
   - Riverside
   - Rumney
   - Splott
   - Trowbridge
   - Whitchurch and Tongwynlais

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:
   - The electoral ward of Canton to be given the Welsh Language name of Treganna and the English Language name of Canton. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.
   - The electoral ward of Ely to be given the Welsh Language name of Treláí and the English Language name of Ely. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.
   - The electoral ward of Fairwater to be given the Welsh Language name of Y Tyllgoed and the English Language name of Fairwater. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement
with the proposed name.

- The electoral ward of Heath to be given the Welsh Language name of **Y Mynydd Bychan** and the English Language name of **Heath**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.

- The electoral ward of Llandaff to be given the Welsh Language name of **Llandaf** and the English Language name of **Llandaff**. The Welsh Language Commissioner states that Llandaf is the form recommended in the national standard reference work, Rhestr o Enwau Lleoedd / A Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names (University of Wales Press, 1967) and that preference should be given to the Welsh language name when the Welsh and English names differ by one or two letters.

- The electoral ward of Llandaff North to be given the Welsh Language name of **Ystum Taf** and the English Language name of **Llandaff North**. The Welsh Language Commissioner states that Ystum Taf is the form recommended in the national standard reference work, Rhestr o Enwau Lleoedd / A Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names (University of Wales Press, 1967). The Welsh Language Commissioner also proposed the English language form of Llandaf North. The Welsh Language Commissioner states 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. Llandaf is a Welsh name (Llan (Church/Parish) + name of the river Taf) therefore, there is no need to double the letter ‘f’.

- The electoral ward of Penylan to be given the Welsh Language name of **Pen-y-llan** and the English Language name of Penylan. The Welsh Language Commissioner states Pen-y-llan is the form recommended in the national standard reference work, A Gazetteer of Welsh Place-Names.

- The electoral ward of Rhiwbina to be given the Welsh Language name of **Rhiwbeina** and the English Language name of **Rhiwbina**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.

- The electoral ward of Riverside to be given the Welsh Language name of **Glanyrafon** and the English Language name of **Riverside**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.

- The electoral ward of Rumney to be given the Welsh Language name of **Tredelerch** and the English Language name of **Rumney**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.

- The electoral ward of Splott to be given the Welsh Language name of **Y Sblot** and the English Language name of **Splott**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.

- The electoral ward of Whitchurch and Tongwynlais to be given the Welsh Language name of **Yr Eglwys Newydd a Thongwynlais** and the English Language name of **Whitchurch and Tongwynlais**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name.
4. The Commission has consulted the Welsh Language Commissioner with regard to the names of the retained electoral wards, and the Welsh Language Commissioner has recommended the following changes:

- The electoral ward of Adamsdown to retain the single name of *Adamsdown* based on The City and County of Cardiff (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1998. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and advises that their place-names panel does not recommend the form Waunadda as the Adam in Adamsdown is a specific personal name. It is believed that the place is named after 14th Century Adam Kyngot. There isn’t sufficient evidence that the Welsh form has become well-established.

5. The Commission would welcome any comments on the ward 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.
Creigiau/St. Fagans and Pentyrch

7. The existing Pentyrch electoral ward is composed of the Gwaelod-y-garth and Pentyrch wards of the Community of Pentyrch. It has 2,801 electors (2,869 projected) represented by one councillor which is 11% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,795 eligible voters.

8. The existing Creigiau/St. Fagans electoral ward is composed of the Creigiau ward of the Community of Pentyrch and the Community of St. Fagans. It has 4,181 electors (8,366 projected) represented by one councillor which is 32% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 3,960 eligible voters.

9. The Commission received four representations concerning these wards from: The City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group, Pentyrch Community Council and Councillor Graham Thomas (Creigiau/St. Fagans).

10. The City and County of Cardiff Council proposed no change to the existing arrangements. However, the Council did propose to increase the number of councillors in the Creigiau/St. Fagans ward to two members in future. They specified a preference for this change to take place as part of a subsequent Electoral Review in to address the projected increase in the electorate.

11. The City and County of Cardiff Council Conservative Group and Pentyrch Community Council both proposed to divide the existing Creigiau/St. Fagans electoral ward to create two single-member wards for the Creigiau community ward and the Community of St. Fagans respectively. The Community Council cites the significant increase in the projected electorate as a reason to support the proposed change. The Community Council proposed no changes to the existing Pentyrch electoral ward.

12. Councillor Graham Thomas (Creigiau/St. Fagans) proposed to increase the number of councillors in the Creigiau/St. Fagans ward to two members. They cited the numerous developments being undertaken in the area and the projected increase in the electorate as reasons to support his proposal. They also noted the ward is projected to have more electors than some of the existing three-member wards within the authority.

13. The Commission proposes that the Communities of Pentyrch and St. Fagans are combined to form an electoral ward of 6,982 electors (11,235 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation that is 26% below the proposed county average.

14. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Pentyrch a Sain Ffagan; and the English language name of Pentyrch and St Fagans. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

15. The Commission acknowledges that no representations were received in support of this proposal. However, due to the significant increase in the projected electorate because of planned developments in the area, the Commission considers that this proposal provides an appropriate solution when considering the projected 2024 electorate.

16. The Commission recognises that the electoral ward of Pentyrch and St Fagans would continue to have an inappropriate level of electoral variance at 26% below the proposed county average. However, the projected increase in the electorate provided by the City and County of Cardiff Council shows the ward would have an appropriate level of variance in 2024.
Pentyrch and St Fagans

- Pentyrch Ward (1,907)
- Gwaegleodgyrth Ward (894)
- Community of Pentyrch (4,936)
- Creigiau Ward (2,135)
- Community of St. Fagans (2,046)
Radyr

17. The existing Radyr electoral ward is comprised of the Community of Radyr. It has 5,259 electors (5,562 projected) represented by one councillor which is 67% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 5,160 eligible voters.

18. The Commission received five representations concerning these wards from; The City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group, Radyr and Morganstown Community Council, Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen) and Councillor Rod McKerlich (Radyr).

19. The City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group, Radyr and Morganstown Community Council and Councillor Rod McKerlich (Radyr) all proposed to allocate an additional councillor in the Radyr electoral ward in order to address the inappropriate level of electoral variance in this ward.

20. Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen) stated that whilst he does not presently accept the arguments to increase the council size above 75 members, he would support an additional member in the Radyr electoral ward in order to address the existing under-representation.

21. The Commission proposes that the Community of Radyr forms an electoral ward of 5,259 electors (5,562 projected), which if represented by two councillors (an increase of one) would result in a level of representation that is 17% below the proposed county average.

22. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh Language name of Radur and the English Language name of Radyr. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

23. The Commission agrees with the representations received for the area. It is the view of the Commission that this arrangement best addresses the existing levels of electoral variance. The Commission considers that the proposed electoral ward shares a common identity and provides for an effective electoral ward, which would build on the established community, communication and social links within the area.
Lisvane and Llanishen

24. The existing Lisvane electoral ward is comprised of the Community of Lisvane. It has 2,894 electors (6,256 projected) represented by one councillor which is 8% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 2,887 eligible voters.

25. The existing Llanishen electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Llanishen and Thornhill. It has 13,167 electors (12,971 projected) represented by four councillors which is 4% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 13,953 eligible voters.

26. The Commission received four representations concerning these wards from the City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group, Lisvane Community Council and Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen).

27. The City and County of Cardiff Council proposed no change to the existing arrangements for Llanishen, however, the Council did propose to increase the number of councillors in the Lisvane ward from one to two. They specified a preference for this change to take place as part of a subsequent Electoral Review in order to address the projected increase in the electorate.

28. Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to increase the number of councillors representing the Lisvane electoral ward from one to two.

29. Lisvane Community Council requested no changes be made to the existing arrangements for the ward. The Community Council noted the projected increase in the electorate as provided by the City and County of Cardiff Council. However, the Community Council is of the opinion that the existing arrangements should continue on the basis of the current electorate and not the 2024 projection.

30. Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen) proposed to make two small boundary changes to the existing Llanishen electoral ward. Councillor Bale proposed to transfer a small section of the existing Lisvane electoral ward (North of Capel Gwilym Road) into the Thornhill community ward to amend the existing boundary. Councillor Bale also proposed to transfer a small section of Mill Road (North of Lisvane Road) of the existing Llanishen electoral ward into the Lisvane electoral ward. Councillor Bale also proposed that all ward names follow the standardised form set out by the Welsh Language Commissioner.

31. The Commission proposes that the Communities of Lisvane and Thornhill be combined to form an electoral ward with 8,347 electors (11,628 projected) which, if represented by three councillors, would result in a level of representation that is 12% below the proposed county average.

32. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Llys-faen a’r Ddraenen; and the English language name of Lisvane and Thornhill. The Welsh Language Commissioner agrees with the proposed name. The Welsh Language Commissioner’s Place-name Standardisation Panel recommends the Welsh form Y Ddraenen, with the contracted form of the definite article. The Welsh names Draenen Pen-y-graig and Y Ddraenen both have some circulation as the Welsh forms for Thornhill. The name Draenen Pen-y-graig (abbreviated to Y Ddraenen by Welsh speakers) is older than the Thornhill housing development. Both forms seem to be equally used today in Welsh writing and our Panel recommends adopting the form Y Ddraenen for Thornhill as it believes that Draenen Pen-y-graig may have actually originally referred to another smaller settlement at the top of the hill.
33. As a consequence, the Commission proposes that the Community of Llanishen form an electoral ward with 7,714 electors (7,599 projected) which, if represented by two councillors, would result in a level of variance that is 22% above the proposed county average.

34. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of **Llanisien**; and the English language name of **Llanishen**. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the Commission’s proposed name.

35. The Commission notes the representations concerning the Lisvane electoral ward and the inappropriate level of projected variance in 2024. It is the view of the Commission that the combination of the Communities of Lisvane and Thornhill would successfully address the projected variance. The Commission notes that no representations suggested the combination of the Communities of Lisvane and Thornhill, however, in order to address the projected variance in Lisvane alternative arrangements are necessary. The Commission considers that this proposal, whilst not ideal in isolation, provides the best solution for the area in respect of both the current and the future electorate.

36. The Commission considered the representation made by Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen) in respect of the transfer of properties and re-alignment of community boundaries. However, as this area contained such a small number of electors it is not within the scope of the review and the Commission cannot make any proposals including such changes. These proposals would need to be conducted in a community review under Section 31 of the Act, led by the Council.
Cathays

37. The existing Cathays electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Cathays and Castle. It has 10,024 electors (12,168 projected) represented by four councillors which is 21% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 21,309 eligible voters.

38. The Commission received two representations concerning these wards from the City and County of Cardiff Council and the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group.

39. The City and County of Cardiff Council inferred a preference for retaining the existing arrangements in both electoral wards.

40. Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to reduce the number of councillors representing the Cathays electoral ward from four to three.

41. The Commission electoral ward of Cathays form an electoral ward of 10,024 electors (12,168 projected) which, if represented by three councillors (a reduction of one), would result in a level of representation that is 6% above the proposed county average.

42. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the single name of Cathays. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

43. The Commission considered the representation made by the Conservative Group, and notes Cardiff Council’s preference for retaining the existing arrangements where possible. It is the view of the Commission that reducing the number of councillors representing this ward provides improvements to electoral parity and assists the Commission in achieving its Council Size Aim.
Plasnewydd

44. The existing Plasnewydd electoral ward is comprised of the Community of Plasnewydd. It has 11,270 electors (12,317 projected) represented by four councillors which is 11% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 15,461 eligible voters.

45. The Commission received one representation concerning this ward from the City and County of Cardiff Council. They inferred a preference for retaining the existing arrangements in this electoral ward.

46. The Commission proposes that the Community of Roath forms an electoral ward of 11,270 electors (12,317 projected) which, if represented by three councillors (a reduction of one) would result in a level of representation that is 19% above the proposed county average.

47. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the single name of Plasnewydd. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

48. The Commission considered the existing arrangements for this ward, however, when evaluating the authority as a whole it was deemed appropriate to reduce the number of councillors in this ward in order to improve electoral parity for the wider area and to assist the Commission in achieving its Council Size Aim.
Butetown

49. The existing Butetown electoral ward is comprised of the Community of Butetown. It has 7,550 electors (10,046 projected) represented by one councillor which is 139% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 11,449 eligible voters. The Community of Butetown includes the Island of Flat Holm, which contains no electors.

50. The Commission received three representations concerning this ward from: The City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group and Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen).

51. The City and County of Cardiff Council and the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to increase the number of councillors representing the Butetown electoral ward from one to two to address the significant level of under-representation in the ward.

52. Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen) supported the proposal to increase the number of councillors representing the Butetown electoral ward from one to two. However, Councillor Bale stated that he does not presently accept the arguments to increase the overall number of members above 75.

53. The Commission proposes that the Community of Butetown forms an electoral ward of 7,550 electors (10,046 projected) which, if represented by three councillors (an increase of two), would result in a level of representation that is 20% below the proposed county average.

54. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the single name of Butetown. The Welsh Language Commissioner considered the name and proposed the Welsh Language name of Tre-biwt. The Welsh Language Commissioner’s Place-names Standardisation Panel recognises that the coined Welsh form, Tre-biwt, has become well-established and is in common use, especially now that a Welsh medium school has opened there. Note that Ysgol Hamadryad uses both Tre-biwt and Butetown on their website. Cardiff Council have not yet officially adopted the Welsh form. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

55. The Commission agrees with the recommendations to increase the number of councillors for Butetown made within the representations and the need for improvement in electoral parity. It is the view of the Commission that the arrangements proposed in the representations do not provide for appropriate levels of electoral parity. The inclusion of a third councillor for this ward ensures this arrangement best addresses both the existing and projected levels of electoral variance for Butetown.
Grangetown

56. The existing Grangetown electoral ward is comprised of the Community of Grangetown. It has 13,088 electors (15,439 projected) represented by three councillors which is 38% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 16,581 eligible voters.

57. The Commission received two representations concerning this ward from the City and County of Cardiff Council and the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group.

58. The City and County of Cardiff Council proposed to increase the number of councillors representing the Grangetown electoral ward to four members. However, the Council states a preference for this change to be enacted in a subsequent electoral review.

59. The Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to increase the number of councillors representing the Grangetown electoral ward to four members in order to address the existing inappropriate under-representation in the Grangetown electoral ward.

60. The Commission proposes that the Community of Grangetown forms an electoral ward of 13,088 electors (15,439 projected) which, if represented by four councillors (an increase of one), would result in a level of representation that is 4% above the proposed county average.

61. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the single name of Grangetown. The Welsh Language Commissioner notes that 'Trelluest' is a recently coined Welsh name and that there is no historic basis for the name. There isn't sufficient evidence that the Welsh form has become well-established. The Welsh Language Commissioner therefore recommends Grangetown as the only form. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

62. The Commission agrees with the recommendations made by the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group and the improvement in electoral parity. It is the view of the Commission that the proposed arrangement best addresses the existing levels of electoral variance.

63. The Commission considered the representation made by the Council to consider retaining the existing arrangements as part of this current electoral review. However, the Commission proposes to address the existing inappropriate level of under-representation in this ward as part of this current review to ensure significant improvement to electoral parity.

64. The Commission acknowledges that this proposal breaches its policy of not proposing any new four-member wards. However, the Commission received no proposals to split the Grangetown electoral ward and any other alternative arrangement would result in a proposed electoral ward in excess of four members. The Commission considers that the proposed electoral ward shares a common identity and would provide for an effective electoral ward which would build on the established community, communication and social links within the area.
Grangetown

Community of Grangetown
(13,088)
Llanrumney

65. The existing Llanrumney electoral ward is comprised of the Community of Llanrumney. It has 7,694 electors (7,575 projected) represented by three councillors which is 19% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 8,485 eligible voters.

66. The Commission received one representation concerning this ward from Cardiff Council Conservatives Group.

67. Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to reduce the number of councillors representing the Llanrumney electoral ward from three to two members.

68. The Commission proposes that the Community of Llanrumney form an electoral ward of 7,694 electors (7,575 projected) which, if represented by two councillors (a reduction of one) would result in a level of representation that is 22% above the proposed county average.

69. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Llanrhymni; and the English language name of Llanrumney. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

70. The Commission considered the representations received and agreed with the option proposed by the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group. When evaluating the authority as a whole it was deemed appropriate to reduce the number of councillors in this ward in order to improve electoral parity for the wider area and to assist the Commission in achieving its Council Size Aim.
Pentwyn

71. The existing Pentwyn electoral ward is composed of the Communities of Llanedeyrn and Pentwyn. It has 10,741 electors (10,206 projected) represented by four councillors which is 15% below the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 11,872 eligible voters.

72. The Commission received two representations concerning this ward from the City and County of Cardiff Council, the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group and Councillor Bablin Molik (Cyncoed).

73. The City and County of Cardiff Council inferred a preference to retain the existing arrangements.

74. Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to reduce the number of councillors representing the Pentwyn electoral ward from four to three members.

75. Councillor Molik proposed to re-align the boundary between Cyncoed and Pentwyn to ensure the entirety of Hollybush Road be included in the Cyncoed electoral ward to address the existing over-representation in the ward. The road is currently split between Cyncoed and Pentwyn.

76. The Commission proposes that the Communities of Llanedeyrn and Pentwyn form an electoral ward of 10,741 electors (10,206 projected) which, if represented by three councillors (a reduction of one), would result in a level of representation that is 13% above the proposed county average.

77. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the single name of Pentwyn. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

78. The Commission agrees with the recommendations made by the Cardiff Council Conservatives Group and the resulting improvement in electoral parity. It is the view of the Commission that this arrangement best addresses the existing levels of electoral variance. When evaluating the authority as a whole it was deemed appropriate to reduce the number of councillors in this ward in order to improve electoral parity for the wider area and to assist the Commission in achieving its Council Size Aim.

79. The Commission acknowledges the proposal from Councillor Molik to include the entirety of Hollybush Road within the Cyncoed electoral ward. However, the Commission considers that this change is more suited to a Community Review which utilises a different section of the Act, and is led by the Council.
Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons

80. The existing Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons electoral ward is comprised of the Communities of Old St Mellons and Pontprennau. It has 7,537 electors (10,410 projected) represented by two councillors which is 19% above the proposed county average. The electoral ward has an estimated population of 7,498 eligible voters.

81. The Commission received five representations concerning these wards from; The City and County of Cardiff Council, Cardiff Council Conservatives Group, Councillors Joel Williams and Diane Rees (Pontprennau/Old St Mellons) and Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen).

82. The City and County of Cardiff Council proposed to increase the number of councillors representing the Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons electoral ward from two to three members. This proposal addresses the projected electorate growth in the ward as a result of housing developments which are already underway. The Council, however, stated a preference for this change to be enacted in a subsequent electoral review.

83. Cardiff Council Conservatives Group proposed to increase the number of councillors representing the Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons electoral ward from two to three members. The Conservatives Group cites the developments underway within the ward, and the projected electorate growth as reasons in support of the proposal.

84. Councillors Joel Williams and Diane Rees (Pontprennau/Old St Mellons) proposed to increase the number of councillors for the Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons electoral ward from two to three members. They cite the numerous developments ongoing within the ward as reasons to support this proposal. The Councillors also expressly state their opposition to any division of the existing electoral ward.

85. Councillor Phil Bale (Llanishen) supported the proposal to increase the number of councillors representing the Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons electoral ward from two to three members should the Commission propose a council size in excess of 75 members. However, Councillor Bale stated that he does not presently accept the arguments to increase the number of councillors for Cardiff above 75 members.

86. The Commission proposes that the Communities of Old St Mellons and Pontprennau form an electoral ward with 7,537 electors (10,410 projected) which, if represented by three councillors (an increase of one), would result in a level of representation that is 20% below the proposed county average.

87. The Commission has given the proposed electoral ward the Welsh language name of Pontprennau a Phentref Laneirwg and the English language name of Pontprennau and Old St Mellons. The Welsh Language Commissioner is in agreement with the proposed name. The Welsh Language Commissioner states Pentref Llaneirwg is used as a Welsh name for Old St Mellons and this is the Welsh form used by Cardiff Council according to our records. The Commission would welcome any suggestions for alternative names.

88. The Commission agrees with part of the recommendation made by the Council and by the Conservatives Group to increase the number of councillors representing this ward from two to three members. However, it is the view of the Commission that this change be implemented in this review as opposed to a subsequent electoral review.

89. It is the view of the Commission that this arrangement best addresses the projected levels of electoral variance. The Commission considers that the proposed electoral ward has a common
identity and would provide for effective electoral wards, which would build on the established links within the area.
Chapter 5. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS

1. The existing electoral arrangements (as shown in Appendix 2) provide for the following levels of electoral representation within the City and County of Cardiff:
   - Electoral variance ranges from 23% below the current county average (Cathays) to 133% above the current county average (Butetown) of 3,243 electors per councillor.
   - Two electoral wards had levels of representation more than 50% above or below the current county average of 3,243 electors per councillor.
   - Two electoral wards have levels of representation more than 25% above or below the current county average of 3,243 electors per councillor.
   - 14 electoral wards have levels of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the current county average of 3,243 electors per councillor.
   - 11 electoral wards have levels of representation less than 10% above or below the current county average of 3,243 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 City and County of Cardiff:
   - Electoral variance ranges from 26% below the proposed county average (Pentyrch and St Fagans) to 24% above the proposed county average (Caerau) of 3,158 electors per councillor.
   - One of the electoral wards has a level of representation more than 25% above or below the proposed county average of 3,158 electors per councillor.
   - 15 electoral wards have levels of representation between 10% and 25% above or below the proposed county average of 3,158 electors per councillor.
   - 12 electoral wards have levels of representation less than 10% above or below the proposed county average of 3,158 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.

4. 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. As such, the Commission has made every effort to ensure that the revised electoral wards are appropriate combinations of existing communities and community wards.

5. 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 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 therefore welcome any alternative suggestions that comply with the legislation.
6. 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, it would welcome alternative suggestions. The Commission would therefore 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 Welsh or English.

7. This draft scheme represents the Commission’s preliminary views on the electoral arrangements for the City and County of Cardiff. It welcomes any representations in respect of these proposals. The Commission will consider carefully all representations made to it before formulating our final proposals and submitting them to the Welsh Government.
Chapter 6. RESPONSES TO THIS REPORT

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

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

   Or by email to:

   consultations@boundaries.wales

   no later than 13 April 2020.
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**APPENDIX 1 – GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>The Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (area)</td>
<td>The unit of local government that lies below the level of the Principal Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Council</td>
<td>An elected council that provides services to their particular community area. A Community Council may be divided for community electoral purposes into community wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / Town ward</td>
<td>An area within a Community Council created for community electoral purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Directions issued by Welsh Ministers under Section 48 of the Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral wards</td>
<td>The areas into which Principal Councils are divided for the purpose of electing county councillors, previously referred to as electoral divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral review</td>
<td>A review in which the Commission considers the electoral arrangements for a Principal Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral variance</td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward varies from the county average; expressed as a percentage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>The number of persons registered to vote in a local government area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population of Eligible Voters</td>
<td>The estimated number of eligible persons (18+) within a local government area who are eligible to vote. These figures have been sourced from the Office of National Statistics’ 2015 Ward population estimated for Wales, mid-2015 (experimental statistics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested party</td>
<td>Person or body who has an interest in the outcome of an electoral review such as a community or town council, local MP or AM or political party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order made by an implementing body, giving effect to proposals made by the Principal Council or the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-representation</td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward compared to the county average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal area</td>
<td>The area governed by a Principal Council: in Wales a county or county borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal council</strong></td>
<td>The single tier organ of local government, responsible for all or almost all local government functions within its area. A county or county borough council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected electorate</strong></td>
<td>The five-year forecast of the electorate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Split Community</strong></td>
<td>A Community which is divided between two, or more, Electoral Wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Council</strong></td>
<td>A Community Council with the status of a town are known as Town Councils. A Town Council may be divided for community electoral purposes into wards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-representation</strong></td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward compared to the county average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Electoral Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>No. OF COUNCILLORS</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2019</th>
<th>2019 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>ELECTORATE 2024</th>
<th>2024 RATIO</th>
<th>% variance from County average</th>
<th>Population Eligible to Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adamsdown</td>
<td>Community of Adamsdown (5,585), [7,374]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,585</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>7,374</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butetown</td>
<td>Community of Butetown (7,550), [10,046] Includes Flat Holm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>186%</td>
<td>11,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caerau</td>
<td>Community of Caerau (7,813), [7,772]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>Community of Canton (10,913), [12,239]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,913</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12,239</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cathays</td>
<td>Communities of Cathays (9,084), [11,027] and Castle (940), [1,141]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,024</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>12,168</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>21,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Creigiau/St. Fagans</td>
<td>The Creigiau ward of the Community of Pentyrch (2,135), [4,273] and the Community of St Fagans (2,046), [4,094]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cyncoed</td>
<td>Community of Cyncoed (8,343), [7,973]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,343</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>7,973</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>9,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>Community of Ely (9,521), [9,358]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,521</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>9,358</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>10,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>Community of Heath (9,743), [9,106]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,743</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>9,106</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>10,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lisvane</td>
<td>Community of Lisvane (2,894), [6,256]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Llandaff</td>
<td>Community of Llandaff (6,855), [6,968]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,855</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6,968</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>7,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Llanrumney</td>
<td>Community of Llanrumney (7,694), [7,575]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,694</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>8,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pentwyn</td>
<td>Communities of Pentwyn (5,295), [5,031] and Llandeyrn (5,446), [5,175]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,741</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>10,206</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>11,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pontprennau/Old St. Mellons</td>
<td>Communities of Pontprennau (5,207), [7,192] and Old St. Mellons (2,330), [3,218]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,537</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10,410</td>
<td>5,205</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rumney</td>
<td>Community of Rumney (6,514), [6,658]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,514</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>7,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Splott</td>
<td>Communities of Splott (4,975), [4,927] and Tremorfa (4,039), [4,000]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,014</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>10,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
<td>Community of Trowbridge (10,926), [11,289]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,926</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11,289</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Whitchurch and Tongwynlais</td>
<td>The communities of Whitchurch (11,435), [11,255] and Tongwynlais (1,395), [1,369]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,830</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>12,594</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>13,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>243,196</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td></td>
<td>263,904</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td></td>
<td>288,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio is the number of electors per councillor

Electoral figures supplied by Cardiff City Council

Population figures supplied by the Office for National Statistics

### Greater than + or - 50% of County average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Between + or - 25% and + or - 50% of County average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Between + or - 10% and + or - 25% of County average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Between 0% and + or - 10% of County average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adamsdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caerau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cathays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cycoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fairwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gabalfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grangetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lisvane and Thornhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Llandaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Llandaff North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Llanishen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Llanrumney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pentwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pentrych and St Fagans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Penylan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plasnewydd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pontprennau and Old St Mellons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Radyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rhiwbina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rumney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Splott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Whitchurch and Tongywnlais</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |                               |                              | 77           | 243,196        | 3,158      |                                        | 263,904        | 3,427      |                                        |

Ratio is the number of electors per councillor
Electorate figures supplied by Cardiff Council
Population figures supplied by Office for National Statistics (ONS)

Between + or - 10% of the proposed county average: 43% (2019) 50% (2024)
Between + or - 10% and + or - 25% of the proposed county average: 54% (2019) 50% (2024)
Between + or - 25% and + or - 50% of the proposed county average: 4% (2019) 0% (2024)
Greater than + or - 50% of the proposed county average: 0% (2019) 0% (2024)
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 City and County of Cardiff 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 review of electoral arrangements the following changes to local government boundaries in Cardiff have taken place.

   • The City and County of Cardiff (Old St. Mellons, Rumney and Trowbridge Communities) Order 2009.
   • The City and County of Cardiff (Communities) Order 2016.

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 26 March 2019 to the City and County of Cardiff Council, the Town and Community Councils in the area, the Member 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 Council to submit a suggested scheme or schemes for new electoral arrangements. The Commission also requested the City and County of Cardiff 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. The initial consultation period closed on 24 June 2019.

9. This Report is on deposit at the Offices of the City and County of Cardiff Council and the Office of the Commission in Cardiff, as well as on the Commission’s website (http://ldbc.gov.wales).

Policy and Practice

10. The Commission published the Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice document in October 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 the Commission takes towards each of the statutory considerations to be made when addressing a review’s particular circumstances. However, because those circumstances are unlikely to provide for the ideal electoral pattern, in most reviews compromises are made in applying the policies in order to strike the right balance between each of the matters 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.
SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE COMMISSION INITIAL CONSULTATION ON THE REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF CARDIFF
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CYNGOR CAERDYDD
CARDIFF COUNCIL

COUNCIL: 20 JUNE 2019

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF GOVERNANCE AND LEGAL SERVICES

ELECTORAL REVIEW - CARDIFF

Reason for this Report

1. To seek approval for the Council’s preferred option for submission as part of the consultation being undertaken by the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales ("the Commission").

Background

2. Section 21(3) of the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 provides that the Commission in carrying out its duties must seek to ensure effective and convenient local government. This is the paramount and primary function of the Commission and one of the duties provided for by the Act is the conduct of reviews of the electoral arrangements of principal areas.

3. Section 29 of the Act puts a duty upon the Commission to review the electoral arrangements for each principal area including:
   - The total number of councillors to be elected to the council
   - The number and boundaries of the electoral wards
   - The number of councillors to be elected for each electoral ward in the principal area, and
   - The name of any electoral ward

4. On 23 June 2016 the then Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Local Government published a written statement requiring the Commission to restart its review programme with a prioritised timetable. There was an expectation that all 22 electoral reviews be completed in time for new arrangements to be in place for the 2022 local government elections.
Issues

5. The electoral review for Cardiff commenced on 4 April, 2019 and as part of their pre-review procedure the Commission conducted a series of meetings with Officers and Group Leaders culminating in a briefing to all Members on 28 March 2019. The briefing provided Members with an overview of the statutory basis of the exercise and the anticipated timetable.

6. The deadline for the Council to submit a response to the review is 24 June, 2019. It is also worth noting that it is open to individual Members, Community Councils and other stakeholders to put forward their own proposals to the Commission. Similarly, all interested parties will have the opportunity to respond to the Commission’s draft proposals once they are published in due course.

7. The Commission very rarely resolves the establishment of an electoral ward that demonstrates both now and in the future, a perfect electoral ratio. At present, 11 of the 29 electoral wards (38%) are within ±10% of the average electoral ratio of 3,343. 20 of the 29 electoral wards (69%) are within ±20% of the average electoral ratio.

8. The Commission has emphasised that the numbers of Councillors determined by its methodology can be used to develop locally generated schemes. They may, however, consider varying from this methodology if they were provided with cogent reasons and if the variation was able to provide effective electoral arrangements. This reflects the difficulties in achieving an effective balance between the various rules and directions.

9. The Commission’s Policy and Practice 2016 document identifies that based on electorate size and the elected members to constituent ratio, Cardiff should be allocated 89 Councillors. However, due to Ministerial direction the largest council size was capped at 75 Members to ensure that the council did not become unwieldy and difficult to manage.

10. Due to the increase from the current 2019 electorate to the forecasted five year population estimate the Commission will need to give due regard to reviewing the current council maximum size constraint rule in light of Cardiff’s unique requirements as compared to other Welsh principal areas.

11. To inform any potential options, comprehensive data has been compiled and political groups have been consulted.

Considerations for a Review of a Principal Area

12. The legislation requires the Commission exercise a balanced judgement of all relevant consultation responses with a view to making recommendations for effective electoral arrangements which meet its objectives to ensure efficient and convenient local government.

13. The Commission has a degree of discretion in the way that it weights the factors that aid it in making its decision; but is required by Section 30 of the Act to:
- Seek to ensure that the ratio of electors to the number of members of the Council to be elected is, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral ward of the principal area; and
- Have regard, amongst other things, to the desirability of fixing boundaries for electoral wards which are easily identifiable and not breaking local ties when fixing boundaries for wards.

14. In making their judgement, the Commission recognises that in addition to statutory requirements, reviews present a range of issues which need to be taken into account. This may include the following:

a. Effective and convenient local government
- Effective and convenient local government is difficult to define; it may be a consideration when the Commission reaches a decision about council size but must not be overlooked as a consideration in designing electoral arrangements.
- A practical example of effective and convenient local government for the Commission when considering proposed electoral arrangements is to ensure that wards are internally coherent. That is to say, that there are reasonable road links across the ward so that it can be easily traversed, and that all members in the ward can engage in the affairs and activities of all parts of it without heading to travel through an adjoining ward. This situation may arise, for example, when a potential ward boundary amalgamates two communities where a feature such as a mountain or river divides them.
- The commission would also consider the practical choices which people make. Concluding that a ward contributes to effective and convenient local government because two villages are connected by a narrow, tortuous rural lane which is little used when they each have much easier connections to different villages or towns may not be a sound basis for devising an electoral pattern.

b. Electoral equality and Numbers of Councillors
- The number of electors within electoral wards represented by elected members indicates the electoral ratios for those wards. Setting the number of elected members enables the average electoral ratio for the council to be calculated. Although the Commission will seek to achieve ratios close to the council average, it is acknowledged that there will be variances.
• When considering what variances are acceptable, the Commission must comply with the considerations set out in the legislation that state that the Commission must seek to ensure that “the ratio of local government electors to the number of members of the council to be elected is, as nearly as may be, the same in every electoral ward of the principal area.”

• While it could be helpful to have a percentage variance from the council average that will be acceptable in terms of electoral equality, the Commission takes the view that each council is different and that some councils and electoral wards will be able to provide for a better level of electoral equality than others. All efforts will therefore be made to seek to provide the best level of electoral equality for each area under review and will take each case on its merit.

• The Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 places a further requirement on the Commission, which states that account must be taken of “...any discrepancy between the number of local government electors and the number of persons eligible to be local government electors (as indicated by relevant official statistics) ...” The Commission is reliant on the Office for National Statistics (ONS) to provide this information and will utilise the available statistics as best it can and where it is appropriate to do so.

• The Commission’s general intent is to improve electoral equality at the first election to occur after the making of an implementation order following a review and so places greater emphasis on immediate improvements in electoral equality over longer term equality. It is still a requirement, however, to have regard to electoral forecasts and to respond to the implications of changes in the number and distribution of electors.

c. The appropriate number of councillors in an electoral ward

• As a general rule the Commission takes the view that in the first instance; it is desirable that each electoral ward should return a single member. However, given the constraints on creating divisions (i.e. out of communities and their wards), this may sometimes not be possible as the number of electors in individual communities or community wards may be significantly at variance from the county average.

• Furthermore, the Commission believes that it is desirable to not have more than three members in a ward as having four or more members is not appropriate in a first-past the-post electoral system and that this many members would dilute accountability to an excessive amount.

• In addition, from an administrative point of view, an election is increasingly difficult for electoral administrators and returning officers to administer where there are more than three members. Accordingly, the Commission will not recommend any new multi-member wards with more than three members.

• Where four or five member wards are present in the existing arrangements, the Commission would consider alternative arrangements providing for wards with three members or fewer. If the Commission receives substantial evidence that such arrangements are working effectively and is convenient for local government then the Commission may consider recommending maintaining the existing arrangement.

• It is the Commission’s view that multi-member electoral wards are more likely to be effective and convenient in urban areas than in rural areas. In areas of denser population, such as is found in urban areas, it is possible that many of the issues which a councillor may be called upon to deal with might be broadly similar in nature and would allow multiple councillors to deal with similar issues.

• As such the Commission supports the principle that each electoral ward should reflect the requirements of the community or communities it covers and will endeavour to recommend this but recognises that sometimes multi-member wards are the most effective means of balancing the criteria.

d. Communities

• There can be some confusion over what is meant by the word community. It means different things to different people. Some may consider it to be the street in which they live, others a more broad village area, others much larger areas. All of these are entirely accurate, and reflect the lives of people and the differences and similarities of places where we live, work and interact. However, in Wales there is an additional and more technical meaning to the word as the whole of Wales is divided into community areas.

• Many community areas have community or town councils. Where a community area has a community or town council then these areas may be divided into wards for electoral purposes. In Wales the Commission will use community and ward boundaries as the primary building blocks making up electoral wards. The 2013 Act makes provision for the Commission to recommend changes to community and community ward boundaries as a consequence of changes to the electoral ward boundaries.
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15. On Council size, the position in 2019 is 1:3,243 rising to 1:3,519 by 2024 which reflects the expected increase in the overall population within the local authority area over the next five years.

16. In comparison with all other Welsh principal councils, Cardiff has a significantly higher population density, along with a very low population percentage living outside urban settlements of more than 10,000. This has resulted in the authority being classed in a distinct category of its own with a councillor to population ratio band of 1:4,000.

17. No other Welsh authority is classed within this category and, as previously stated, based on this methodology Cardiff should be allocated 69 Members. Due to the current Welsh Government ministerial constraint cap the allocation remains limited to 75 Members.

18. Moreover, in the period since 1996 Councillor workload has increased significantly. Upon reorganisation in 1996 there was a significant reduction in the number of elected members, but at the same time workloads increased to include former authority functions.

19. Since then workloads have increased further as a result of:
- Changes to the devolution settlement which has seen a very significant increase in the duties placed upon local government.
- A growth in regional and collaborative arrangements which has increased complexity in service delivery;
- Growth in social media which has changed the way in which the electorate engage with the democratic process; and
- The impact of austerity has seen a significant shift in policy and patterns of service delivery which have added to Councillor workload especially in terms of having to communicate, engage and consult local people about the impact of budget cuts. Typically, caseloads for Councillors representing the most deprived areas of the City have increased.

Analysis and Conclusion

20. The Boundary Commission provided a ward map showing the existing variance from the Council’s average representation which is attached at Appendix A.

21. Relevant data was collected from the Office of National Statistics and a methodology was agreed with Cardiff Research to project population increase for the five year period until 2024. This methodology was also informed by strategic development sites identified in the Local Development Plan and in consultation with planning officers. A map of the strategic development sites is shown at Appendix B.
22. In presenting its analysis of electoral party, the Commission have highlighted Butetown and Radyr and Morganstown as having a variance of greater than 50% above the council average. Creigiau St. Fagans and Grangetown were also noted for having a variance appreciably above the Council average. These wards have the largest variance from the proposed councillor to electorate ratio in terms of under-representation.

23. There are no perfect solutions on offer across the council area. There are arguments that can be made for and against the proposals. However, in the final analysis, the proposals seek to balance all the factors and criteria as best possible.

24. Following the statistical analysis it is the Council’s position that there is a strong case to explore changes in terms of the level of representation for the areas stated below. However, initial advice from the Commission was to minimise disruption to the authority’s electoral arrangements resulting from the current review process.

25. Taking account of all factors described above, officers have identified the following proposals to provide the optimum balance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| One      | Increase the number of elected members for Butetown from one to two members. | 1. As identified in Appendix C, Butetown is significantly under-represented with 1 councillor representing 7,550 constituents. This equated to a variance of 133% from the Council’s average representation which is considered a priority to address.  
2. There is also a strategic development site within the Butetown ward which will potentially increase the number of constituents to 10,046 which will increase the ratio to 185% above the Council average.  
3. The ward contains an area of deprivation which requires significant engagement from the ward councillor to support their constituents.  
4. The current member of this ward has a level of member enquiries which is four times higher than the council’s average.  
5. This proposal addresses the concerns of the Commission. |
Legal Implications

29. Under Part 3 of the Local Government (Democracy) Wales Act 2013 (the ‘Act’), the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales (the ‘Commission’) has a duty to conduct a review of the electoral arrangements for each principal area at least every ten years, in accordance with its published timetable, and recommend any changes it considers appropriate to the Welsh Ministers.

30. ‘Electoral arrangements’ for these purposes is defined to mean —

(a) the number of members of the council for the principal area,
(b) the number, types and boundaries of the electoral wards into which the principal area is divided for the purpose of the election of members,
(c) the number of members to be elected for any electoral ward in the principal area, and
(d) the name of any electoral ward.

31. When carrying out a review, the Commission’s overall objective is to secure effective and convenient local government. Specifically, the Commission must seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor within a principal council is as close to the same as possible. In considering this ratio, the Commission must take account of 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 any change to the number or distribution of local government electors which is likely to take place in the five years period following its recommendation. It must also seek to ensure that electoral divisions have recognisable boundaries and community ties are respected.

32. The procedure for conducting electoral reviews is set out in Chapter 4 of the Act, and may be summarised as follows:

i. Prior to starting a review, the Commission is required to notify the Council that an electoral review is about to take place, and the procedure and methodology it is going to follow in conducting the review.

ii. The Commission is required to consult with the Council (and other statutory consultees, including the Police and Crime Commissioner and any trade unions who have asked to be consulted) and carry out any appropriate investigations.

iii. After consultation, the Commission may publish its draft proposals.

iv. After publication of its draft proposals, the Commission must allow a 6 to 12 week period for representations to be made on the draft proposals.

v. After the period for representations has ended, the Commission must consider the representations received, and prepare and publish final proposals for submission to the Welsh Ministers.

vi. The Welsh Ministers may then, after 6 weeks from receiving the final proposals, implement the proposals, with or without modifications and any consequential changes considered appropriate, by making an Order, or decide to take no action.

33. As stated in the body of the report, the consultation period, prior to the Commission’s publication of its draft proposals, is currently ongoing and is due to end on 24th June 2019.

34. This means the Council has the opportunity now to put forward its own proposals in relation to changes to the electoral arrangements for Cardiff. The Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice 2016 published by the Commission confirms that:

‘225. 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.’

35. The recommendation of the report is to approve a proposal for changes to the electoral arrangements to Cardiff to be submitted for consideration to the Commission. In considering any proposed changes, the Council must have regard to the factors set out in paragraph 31 above and detailed in the report.

36. The Commission will publish its draft proposals in due course and a further report will be presented to Council for consideration of the Council’s response to the same.

Financial Implications

37. There are no financial implications resulting from the proposal, although any agreed increase in the number of Elected Members would require funding at the rates determined by the Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales, for which the cost implication may require senior roles.

RECOMMENDATION

38. The Council is recommended to authorise the Director of Legal and Governance Services to submit the following proposals to the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales:

a. Increase the number of elected members for Butetown from one to two members.

b. Increase the number of elected members for Radyr and Morganstown from one to two members.
c. That Cardiff Council be considered in the first tranche of the next review programme following the conclusion of the current Boundary Commission review to enable the current projections to be validated before making further changes to the electoral make up of Cardiff.

Davina Fiore
Director of Governance and Legal Services
4 June 2019

Appendix A: Map of Existing Variance from Council Size Aim
Appendix B: Ward Boundaries and Local Development Plan Strategic Sites
Appendix C: Cardiff Council – Existing Council Membership

Background Papers
Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales
Electoral Reviews – Policy and Practice Guidance 2016
2. **Cardiff City Council Conservative Group** wrote on the 24 June 2019 to provide alternative arrangements to the full Council proposals. Cardiff Conservatives Group proposes to divide the existing electoral ward of Creigiau and St. Fagans between the communities of Creigiau and St. Fagans to create two single-member electoral wards. The Group also proposes to increase the number of councillors in the Butetown, Radyr and Morganstown, Grangetown, Pontprennau and Old St. Mellons and Lisvane wards by one, whilst reducing the number of councillors in the Cathays, Llanrumney and Pentwyn wards by one councillor. Aside from the division of Creigiau and St. Fagans, the Conservative Group proposes no alteration to the electoral division boundaries.

3. **Lisvane Community Council** wrote on the 13 June 2019 to request that no changes are made to the existing arrangements for Lisvane. The Community Council noted the projected increase in the electorate as provided by Cardiff Council, however, the Community Council is of the opinion that the existing arrangements should continue on the basis of the current electorate figures and not the 2024 projection.

4. **Pentyrch Community Council** wrote on the 6 June 2019 to request that the electoral ward of Creigiau/ St. Fagans be divided to create two new single-member wards for the respective Communities based on the significant projected increase in the electorate in these areas. The Community Council proposes no changes to the Pentyrch electoral ward.

5. **Radyr and Morganstown Community Council** wrote on the 12 June 2019 to propose an increase in the number of elected members for the ward from one to two in order to reduce the existing under-representation in the ward. The Community Council cites numerous community-wide initiatives that it undertakes and notes the strong community identity in the area. The Council also suggests that should a higher ratio of electors per councillor be required to justify the increase in councillors, then consideration should be given to the addition of a small neighbouring area to the ward. However, the Community Council notes that this would create a divergence between the Ward and Community Council boundaries but state this would be preferable to any alternative that involved dividing the ward or otherwise diluting the identity of the Community.

6. **Councillor Phil Bale** (Llanishen) wrote on the 17 June 2019 to propose that ward names follow the standardised form set out by the Welsh Language Commissioner. (Llanishen as Llanisien, Rhiwbina as Rhiwbeina etc.) Councillor Bale also proposes that a small section of the existing Lisvane ward (North of Capel Gwilym Road) be transferred into the Thornhill ward due to the existing boundaries. Additionally, Councillor Bale proposes that a section of Mill Road (North of Lisvane Road) which is currently in the Llanishen ward, be transferred to Lisvane. Councillor Bale states that whilst he does not presently accept the arguments to increase the number of councillors for Cardiff above 75, the Councillor would support additional members in Butetown, Radyr and Pontprennau, should the Commission propose a Council Size in excess of 75.

7. **Councillor Roderick McKerlich** (Radyr and Morganstown) wrote on the 30 May 2019 to request that the number of councillors representing the ward be increased from one to two in order to address the existing levels of under-representation in the ward.
8. **Councillor Bablin Molik** (Cyncoed) wrote on the 14 May 2019 to propose that the whole of Hollybush Road be included in the Cyncoed ward to address the existing over-representation in the ward, as this road is currently split between Cyncoed and Pentwyn.

9. **Councillors Diane Rees and Joel Williams** (Pontprennau) wrote on the 3 June 2019 to request that the number of councillors representing the Pontprennau ward be increased from two to three. The Councillors cite the numerous developments ongoing within the ward, and the projected increase in electorate as reasons to support the increase in councillors. The Councillors also expressly state their opposition to any division of the existing electoral ward.

10. **Councillor Graham Thomas** (Creigiau and St. Fagans) wrote on the 24 June 2019 to propose that the number of councillors for the Creigiau and St. Fagans ward be increased from one to two. Councillor Thomas cites the numerous developments being undertaken in the area and the projected increase in electorate as reasons to support an increase in councillors for the electoral ward. Councillor Thomas also states that the ward is projected to have more electors than some of the existing three-member wards within the authority.
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.