

## Paul Kingsley

---

**From:** William Morrison  
**Sent:** 18 April 2008 09:16  
**To:** Paul Kingsley  
**Subject:** FW: Cornwall Electoral Review Response

---

**From:** Chris Wells [REDACTED]  
**Posted At:** 16 April 2008 22:35  
**Posted To:** Reviews@  
**Conversation:** Cornwall Electoral Review Response  
**Subject:** Cornwall Electoral Review Response

Dear Mr Williams,

Thank you for providing district council members an opportunity to respond to the draft scheme circulated today. I support the 130 (plus or minus 5) member option for the new unitary authority and also feel strongly that all new divisions should be single member wards. I further support the proposed new divisions for Truro. Obviously it would be preferable to maintain all five divisions within the city boundary, but I recognise that, at present, there are not enough electors to achieve this. I suggest the following names for the five Truro divisions:

51 - Truro Kenwyn  
52 - Truro Boscawen  
53 - Truro Tregolls  
54 - Truro Moresk  
55 - Truro Highertown & Gloweth

The reason for not using the existing name of Trehaverne for either of division numbers 51 and 55 is that the proposed new wards radically alter the current boundaries and it would cause confusion to continue with that name.

I know that the composition of parish and town council wards is not in the remit of this review, but I would comment that Truro City Council's wards could be re-organised to fit neatly into the new divisions with numbers 51, 52, 53 and 54 each returning five City Councillors and number 55 (renamed Highertown) returning four City Councillors, thereby retaining the current total of 24 members of the council.

I trust this assists your deliberations.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Wells (Cllr)  
Carrick District & Truro City Councils  
Trehaverne & Gloweth Ward