

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION HELD
ON 12 JUNE 2002 at Trevelyan House**

Present: Sam Younger (Chair)
Glyn Mathias
Sir Neil McIntosh
Karamjit Singh

In attendance: Roger Creedon Rael Zackon
Jacqui Dixon Martine Padwell

Implementation Team: Derek Little
Maggie Crosby
Alice Cuninghame
Ann Devine

Boundary Committee: Pamela Gordon
Archie Gall
Rachel Hopkins

Apologies: Professor Graham Zellick

1. District of Telford and Wrekin UA

- 1.1 GM presented the report, which raised only one area of concern relating to the Lightmoor Parish ward. AC advised the Commissioners that the local authority had received a formal request from Gorge Parish Council for a parish review which the local authority was willing to undertake.
- 1.2 The 1997 legislation enables local authorities to determine the number of parish councillors. It was felt that the Boundary Committee should inform the local authority of this, rather than the Electoral Commission whose role was to decide on the recommendations out before it.
- 1.3 **The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations.**

2. Borough of Blackpool UA

- 2.1 NM presented the report. The scheme was based largely on the submission made by the local authority. No representations had been received.
- 2.2 **The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations.**

3. District of West Berkshire UA

- 3.1 KS presented the report. Five representations has been received, of which three raised areas of concern . Representations in respect of a name change in the Thatcham area and the ward boundaries for Tilehurst Parish were not recommended for acceptance. However a proposed boundary change in respect of Birch Copse Ward was acceptable. AG indicated that the Boundary Committee were agreeable to this, subject to a formal request from this meeting.
- 3.2 **The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations, subject the approval of the Boundary Committee to the proposed modification.**

4. District of West Dorset

- 4.1 SY presented the report and referred to the recommendation in paragraph 14 of the report concerning a proposal from the local authority for two single member wards in Charminster and Cerne Valley. AG explained the background to this suggested modification. He advised that while the Boundary Committee may well have been prepared to adopt the proposal at Stage Three of the review had it been submitted at this time, further evidence in support of the change would have been sought.
- 4.2 PG suggested that the Electoral Commission may not wish to accept requests for modifications based on a lower level of evidence than the Boundary Committee would have used.
- 4.3 SY summarised the discussion by stating that there was not sufficient evidence in the representation to justify the change requested by the local authority and that therefore it should not be referred back to the Boundary Committee.
- 4.4 **The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations of the Boundary Committee. The modification requested by the local authority was not agreed.**

5. Borough of Weymouth and Portland

- 5.1 SY presented the report. The two representations received dealt with matters which were not for the Electoral Commission to determine.
- 5.2 **The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations.**

6. Borough of Christchurch

6.1 SY presented the report. One representation had been received which dealt with matters already considered by the Boundary Committee.

6.2 The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations.

7. District of North Dorset

7.1 SY presented the report. There had been significant changes following the consultation process. Neither of the two representations received provided any new arguments.

7.2 The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations.

8. District of East Dorset

8.1 SY presented the report. One representation had been received in respect of Three Cross and Potterne Ward but the electoral inequality was so great that the need to correct it had to be the overriding concern. The other representation concerned a name change that could be decided by the local authority.

8.2 The Commissioners agreed to accept the recommendations.

9. Borough of Warrington UA

9.1 SY presented the paper which included the original report from the Boundary Committee and the response from the Boundary Committee to the matters raised by the Commissioners at the previous meeting. SY also advised the Commissioners that he had sought the views of GZ who had indicated that he was now content with the recommendations of the Boundary Committee.

9.2 The Commissioner agreed to accept the recommendations of the Boundary Committee.

10. Implementation of revised electoral arrangements

10.1 JD explained that this paper sought confirmation of the views of the Commissioners in respect of the implementation of change orders for those local authorities which elect by thirds. This matter had been discussed previously but there appeared to be no formal minute. Queries were now being received from local authorities which may be affected and the Implementation Team wished to be able to write confirming the arrangements.

- 10.2 The orders would be made within the agreed timetable but the implementation date in the relevant orders would be stated to be 2004.
- 10.3 **The Commissioners agreed the recommendation.**

11. Power to make regulations

- 11.1 This item was for information. JD advised the Commissioners of the action which she had taken in respect of the drafting of orders, in the light of advice received from the Legal Advisor. On balance, the action taken was the best course in the circumstances.
- 11.2 **The Commissioners noted the report.**