

Appendix 1

Monmouthshire County Council

Electoral Review – Proposed scheme for submission to Local Democracy and Boundary Commission

Draft – July 2020

Contents

Considerations and context of proposals	3
Rural	4
Caerwent.....	4
Croesonen	4
Crucorney.....	4
Devauden	5
Gobion Fawr.....	5
Goetre Fawr	6
Llanelly Hill	6
Llangybi Fawr	7
Llantilio Crossenny	7
Mardy	8
Raglan.....	8
Rogiet	8
Shirenewton.....	9
St Arvans	9
Wards Likely to change	10
Rural	10
Llanfoist & Govilon.....	10
Mitchel Troy & Trellech United	10
Llanbadoc & Usk.....	12
Portskewett.....	13
TOWNS.....	15
Abergavenny	15
Monmouth.....	15
Chepstow	16
Magor with Undy	17
Caldicot	18

Considerations and context of proposals

The Local Democracy and Boundary Commission will be responsible for preparing for consultation the draft and final proposals in relation to the new County Council boundaries ahead of the 2022 local council elections. Monmouthshire County Council will be a consultee in their process and invite the Council to put forward a scheme for the new County Council arrangements as part of their review.

The community wards will be used as the basis for forming the County wards. The community wards are not the current ward boundaries but the ones proposed as part of the review of community/town council boundary and electoral arrangements that will be adopted in 2022 and are [available here](#). An entire community ward must be contained within a County Council seat but a community council area could be split between county seats where its warded.

As part of the review in to the Community/Town Council boundary and electoral arrangements, Council agreed to form a working group with a member from each political party tasked with drafting the proposals and recommendations. This group has carried forward and undertaken a review of the County Council arrangements in proposing this scheme to Full Council for approval.

What happens if Council agree the report?

If Council agree the proposals contained in this report, it will be submitted to the Commission as the Councils formal scheme for recommendation for the Commission to consider as part of its review.

What happens if Council do not agree the report?

If Council does not agree to the proposals contained in this report then no formal scheme will be put forward by the Council for the Commission to consider as part of its review. Individual members and political groups will be still be able to put forward their own recommendations to the Commission regardless of whether a scheme is adopted or not.

What needs to be considered as part of the proposals?

The Commission have published it criteria that needs to be considered as part of the review and presented this information at a Members Seminar in January 2020. It is summarised as follows:

- Ideal Council size of 46 councillors.
- Ideal Councillor:elector ratio of 1:1599
- Have regard to the five year forecast of electorate changes in the area
- Have clearly identifiable boundaries that do not break local ties
- Any wards with a variance higher than + or – 25% of the desired ratio will be unlikely to be considered by the Commission and preference would be given to options that would reduce the variance further.

It should be noted that the upper limit of 46 Councillors is not fixed and may be adjusted either way depending on how the proposals fit best. Due to the forecast increase in electorate as well, the application of the ratio to different levels of electorate will impact differently on how the proposals are to be perceived. This scheme proposes 47 members due to the impact of the forecast electorate compared to the current electorate and provides for single member wards where possible.

What about the LDP and the proposals for development with that?

As part of the review the Commission are required to have regard to the electorate forecasts for the next five years. It is unlikely that proposals contained within the new LDP will have an effect on the five year electorate forecast and will therefore be included as part of the next review the Commission will undertake as part of its rolling 10 year review programme.

Rural Caerwent

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
St. Brides Netherwent	Caerwent	308	1798	1	112%		308	1798	112%
Caerwent	Caerwent	660					660		
Dinham	Caerwent	438					438		
Llanvair Discoed	Caerwent	214					214		
Crick	Caerwent	178					178		

It is proposed that the above community wards will create the Caerwent County ward. The proposed Caerwent ward looks similar to the current arrangements pending changes to the community wards as part of the Community boundary review. The forecast electorate for the area would see a variance to the County average of +12% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission.

Croesonen

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Croesonen	Llantilio Pertholey	1551	1551	1	97%		1551	1551	97%

It is proposed that the above community ward will create the Croesonen County ward. The proposed Croesonen ward looks similar to the current arrangements pending changes to the community wards as part of the Community boundary review. The forecast electorate for the area would see a variance to the County average of -3% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission.

Crucorney

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Bwlch, Trewyn and Oldcastle	Crucorney	52	1652	1	103%		52	1712	107%
Forest and Ffwdog	Crucorney	130					130		
Llanvihangel Crucorney	Crucorney	364					364		
Cwmyoy	Crucorney	116					116		
Pandy	Crucorney	365				30	395		
Grosmont	Grosmont	516				30	546		
Llangattock Lingoed	Grosmont	109					109		

It is proposed that the above community wards will create the Crucorney County ward. The proposed Crucorney ward looks similar to the current arrangements pending changes to the community wards as part of the Community boundary review. The forecast electorate for the area would see a variance to the County average of +7% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission. Much of this ward is surrounded by the external County Council boundary and already covers a large geographical area and the group believe that extending this area further or

merging with another ward as a multi-member seat would make the ward unmanageable to fairly represent the residents due to its size.

Devauden

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Kilgwrrwg	Devauden	106	1312	1	82%		106	1342	84%
Llanvihangel Tor-Y- Mynydd	Devauden	117					117		
Devauden	Devauden	477				30	507		
Itton	Devauden	248					248		
Llangwm	Llantrisant Fawr	233					233		
Llansoy	Llantrisant Fawr	131					131		

It is proposed that the above community wards will create the Devauden County ward. The proposed Devauden ward looks similar to the current arrangements pending changes to the community wards as part of the Community boundary review. The forecast electorate for the area would see a variance to the County average of -16% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission. Consideration was given by the working group as to the effect of Llangwm and Llansoy on the County arrangements given that under the community review they are to be merged with the wards of Llantrisant Community Council that fall within the Llangybi ward.

The preference of the group would be that whole community council areas are contained within a single County seat however moving Llangwm and Llansoy to the Llangybi ward would leave the Devauden forecast at -39% of the county average. Including all of the Llantrisant community within Devauden would leave Llangybi with an average of -27%. Both scenarios sit outside the criteria to be considered as part of the review and only increase the variance rather than improve it.

Consideration was also given to including part of the Shirenewton county seat within Devauden if Llangwm and Llansoy wards moved to the Llangybi seat. Llangybi ward would then be +17% of the county average with the Earlswood and Newchurch ward of Shirenewton replacing the electors that had moved to Llangybi from Devauden and leaving that with an average of -20%. Though this would have reduced the Shirenewton average to -6% from +14% as proposed below.

Given that no option produce a better scenario or more equitable share of the vote spread between the County seats, the group propose to leave the arrangements as they currently are with the Llantrisant community being split between Llangybi and Devauden county seats.

Gobion Fawr

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Llanvapley	Gobion Fawr	95	1674	1	105%		95	1694	106%
Llanfair Cilgydyn	Gobion Fawr	186				10	196		
Llangattock- nigh-Usk	Gobion Fawr	374					374		
Llanddewi Rhydderch	Gobion Fawr	341				10	351		
Bryngwyn	Llanarth	185					185		

Clytha	Llanarth	194					194		
Llanarth	Llanarth	164					164		
Kemeys Commander and Llanccayo	Llanarth	135					135		

The existing Llanover County ward encompasses the Llanarth and Llanover communities and was subject to significant change as part of the community review. The Llanover ward was moved to the community of Goetre Fawr and therefore requires a new name for the County and Community Council. Additionally, the Kemeys Commander and Llanccayo ward was moved into Llanarth Community due to the disbanding of the Gwehelog Community and the Llanvapley ward moved to Gobion Fawr from Llanarth though remaining within the Llanover County seat.

Combining the new communities of Gobion Fawr and Llanarth to replicate the current arrangements produces the above arrangements that are +6% to the county average which is within the criteria set by the Commission for the review and ensure whole communities are contained within a single County seat.

The name Gobion Fawr was put forward by the current Llanover Community Council as part of the community review given that the Llanover ward had been removed from the Llanover Community. It is proposed to continue this name through to the County seat but the group are open to suggestions for alternatives.

Goetre Fawr

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Llanover	Goetre Fawr	232	1857	1	116%		232	1857	116%
Goetre Wharf	Goetre Fawr	357					357		
Goytre	Goetre Fawr	1122					1122		
Nant-Y-Derry	Goetre Fawr	146					146		

The Goetre Fawr community now includes the Llanover ward as a result of the Community review and the Little Mill ward moved to the community of Llanbadoc which currently sits within the Goetre Fawr county seat. The new Goetre Fawr community as outlined above creates a County ward that is +16% of the county average and is within the criteria set by the Commission for the review and ensures a whole community area falls within the County seat. Retaining the Little Mill ward in the Goetre Fawr seat would not only split community area between county seats but would also increase the county average for Goetre Fawr to +43% which would be outside the criteria set by the Commission.

Llanelly Hill

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Darrenfelen	Llanelly	496	3315	2	104%		496	3315	104%
Clydach	Llanelly	456					456		
Gilwern	Llanelly	2363					2363		

It is proposed that the above community wards will create the Llanelly Hill County ward. The proposed Llanelly Hill ward looks similar to the current arrangements pending changes to the community wards as part of the Community boundary review. The forecast electorate for the area would see a variance to the County average of +4% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission and would be a two member ward.

Llangybi Fawr

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Coed-Y-Paen	Llangybi	128	1502	1	94%		128	1522	95%
Llandegfedd	Llangybi	161					161		
Llangybi	Llangybi	486				20	506		
Llangattock Nigh Caerleon	Llangybi	95					95		
Llanhennock	Llangybi	136					136		
Tredunnock	Llangybi	149					149		
Gwernesney	Llantrisant Fawr	119					119		
Llantrisant	Llantrisant Fawr	228					228		

It is proposed that the above community wards will create the Llangybi County ward. The proposed Llangybi ward looks similar to the current arrangements pending changes to the community wards as part of the Community boundary review. The forecast electorate for the area would see a variance to the County average of -5% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission.

Options were considered for Llangybi given that the Llantrisant Fawr community is split between the Llangybi and Devauden wards and are explained under the Devauden heading above but it is considered that the above formation provides the best option and ensures equity in terms of the average variance across the area.

Llantilio Crossenny

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Cross Ash	Skenfrith	284	1683	1	105%	30	314	1713	107%
Llanvetherine	Skenfrith	143					143		
Skenfrith	Skenfrith	139					139		
Llangattock Vibon Avel	Whitecastle	79					79		
Llanvihangel-Ystern-Llewern	Whitecastle	87					87		
Newcastle	Whitecastle	166					166		
Rockfield and St Maughans	Whitecastle	374					374		
Whitecastle	Whitecastle	258					258		
Penrhos	Whitecastle	153					153		

Whilst there were significant changes to the community arrangements that sit within the existing Llantilio Crossenny ward, most of the changes are contained within the existing Llantilio Crossenny county ward with the exception of

Llanvetherine moving into the communities contained within Llantilio Crossenny from Grosmont within the Crucorney county ward. In proposing the new community areas that currently sit within the Llantilio Crossenny county area as outlined above, whole community areas are contained within a county council seat and give a county average of +7% which is within the criteria set by the Commission.

Mardy

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Pantygelli	Llantilio Pertholey	143	1258	1	79%		143	1694	106%
Mardy	Llantilio Pertholey	799				436	1235		
Sgyrrid	Llantilio Pertholey	316					316		

The community review resulted in minimal external boundary changes to the Mardy ward with some internal ward changes that doesn't affect the County arrangements for the ward. There is significant development taking place within the Mardy ward that will increase the electorate by 436 electors in the five year forecast. Whilst the proposed arrangements would result in an average of -21%, the effect of the future electorate would result in an average of +6% which decreases the overall variance and is in-line with the criteria set by the Commission.

Raglan

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Llandenny	Raglan	239	1745	1	109%		239	1835	115%
Kingcoed	Raglan	149					149		
Raglan	Raglan	1075				90	1165		
Gwehelog	Raglan	282					282		

As a result of the community boundary review, Pen-y-Clawdd and Llangovan ward which currently sits in the Raglan county ward moved to the Mitchel Troy Community and due to the disbanding of the Gwehelog Community, the Gwehelog ward will now form part of the community of Raglan. In adjusting the county boundary for the Raglan ward to match the new Raglan community, the above arrangements are proposed for the new Raglan county ward. The proposal has a county average of +15% which falls within the criteria set by the Commission for the review.

Rogiet

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Rogiet	Rogiet	1400	1400	1	88%	22	1422	1400	88%

The community review had little effect to the current arrangements for the Rogiet county seat. Consideration was given by the group to the surrounding communities and whether merging those would give greater parity and reduce the variance however this would lead to splitting communities and not having easily identifiable boundaries. It is therefore proposed to retain the current Rogiet ward using the Rogiet community boundary which would have a variance of -12% to the county average.

Shirenewton

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Pwllmeyric	Mathern	353	1782	1	111%	34	387	1816	114%
Mounton	Mathern	41					41		
Mathern	Mathern	420					420		
Shirenewton and Mynyddbach	Shirenewton	659					659		
Earlswood and Newchurch	Shirenewton	309					309		

The community boundary review resulted in minor external changes to the ward boundary of Shirenewton and internally resulted in the merging of Earlswood and Newchurch wards and Shirenewton and Mynyddbach wards. Apart from these small changes there is no other impact on the county ward to the existing arrangements.

Other options were considered for these wards as part of the review for Devauden, Shirenewton and Llangybi but no alternatives provided clear boundaries and resulted in better electoral parity than the current arrangements.

It is therefore proposed that the Shirenewton ward contains the above community wards and would result in an average of +14% to the County average based on future electorates which is line with the criteria set by the Commission.

St Arvans

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
St Arvans	St Arvans	602	1540	1	96%		602	1562	98%
Llandogo	Wye Valley	382					382		
Tintern	Wye Valley	556				22	578		

St Arvans county seat was greatly affected by the community boundary review. Trellech Grange moved from the Tintern Community into Trellech Community. Chapel Hill and Penallt wards were merged with St Arvans and Tintern wards. The Llandogo ward previously of the Trellech community was moved in to a new Wye Valley community alongside the Tintern ward.

Whilst significant changes occurred, using the current County ward footprint of St Arvans which included the St Arvans and Tintern communities and overlaying the new Wye Valley community alongside the St Arvans community would result in the above arrangements and have a county average of -2% which is within the criteria set out by the Commission for the review.

Wards Likely to change

Rural

Llanfoist & Govilon

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Llanfoist	Llanfoist Fawr	1396	1860	1	116%	230	1626	2176	136%
Llanellen	Llanfoist Fawr	464				86	550		
Govilon	Llanfoist Fawr	1123	1123	1	70%		1123	1123	70%

As part of the community boundary review, the Llanwenarth Citra ward which currently sits within the Llanfoist County ward was moved to the Abergavenny community area and is being proposed to form part of the County ward alongside Cantref. The remaining Llanfoist and Llanellen wards which make up the remainder of the existing Llanfoist County seat would have a future electorate county average of +36% which sits outside upper limit of + or – 25% of the average. Similarly, the Llanwenarth Ultra county seat consisting of the Govilon ward has a county average of -30%, again this is outside the limits of the review of the Commission.

In combining all wards together into a 2 member seat, the ward would then see a county average of +3%. All wards form part of the Llanfoist community area so the County ward would then encompass the whole community area that sits underneath it. This proposal would result in a position that falls within the criteria required by the Commission for this review. The resulting electorate and arrangements are set out below.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Llanfoist	Llanfoist Fawr	1396	2983	2	93%	230	1626	3299	103%
Llanellen	Llanfoist Fawr	464				86	550		
Govilon	Llanfoist Fawr	1123					1123		

Mitchel Troy & Trellech United

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Cwmcarvan	Mitchel Troy	170	1151	1	72%		170	1181	74%
Dingestow	Mitchel Troy	202				30	232		
Wonastow	Mitchel Troy	60					60		
Pen-y-Clawdd	Mitchel Troy	110					110		
Mitchell Troy	Mitchel Troy	355					355		
Tregare	Mitchel Troy	254					254		

The current Mitchel Troy ward had little change as a result of the community boundary review but now includes the Pen-y-Clawdd ward previously of the Raglan community. Including this ward with current arrangements for the

Mitchel Troy county ward would result in a county average of -26% as seen in the table above. This is currently outside the criteria set by the Commission for the review.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Catbrook	Trellech United	308	1940	1	121%		308	1986	124%
The Narth	Trellech United	361					361		
Penallt	Trellech United	444				20	464		
Whitebrook	Trellech United	83					83		
Trellech Town	Trellech United	436					436		
Llanishen	Trellech United	226				26	252		
Trellech Grange	Trellech United	82					82		

The Trellech United ward had some small internal changes to the wards as a result of the community boundary review but more significantly had Trellech Grange move within its community area from Tintern, and Llandogo moved out of Trellech into the new Wye Valley community. A new county seat that encompasses the new Trellech community is detailed above and would result in a county average of +24%, just within the criteria set by the Commission, but would likely be an area that would be considered in greater detail given the inequality between Mitchel Troy and Trellech as neighbouring seats.

Name	County Electorate	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Mitchel Troy	1151	3091	2	97%	30	1181	3167	99%
Trellech United	1940				46	1986		

One option to reduce the parity between the two areas was to merge them into a multimember ward giving a county variance of -1% for the ward. Whilst this reduces the parity significantly between the two wards, it was considered that geographically this ward was too large to propose and had limited connections between wards on outer edges of the areas. Additionally the proposal crosses community areas unlike the proposal for a multimember ward in Llanfoist. It was therefore considered that this proposal was not a viable option.

Another option to reduce the parity between the two areas would be that the Penallt ward of Trellech United moves to within the county boundary of Mitchel Troy. The resultant change would see a county average for Mitchel Troy of +3% and Trellech United having -5% compared to the current variance of -26% and +24%.

The working group considered this option as part of the community boundary review proposals and felt that the ward could be positioned in either Mitchel Troy or Trellech United community given the access between the areas along the Lydart to Mitchel Troy road (C49-12), but ultimately left the Penallt ward in the Trellech community due to the existing ties the area has with the community.

If a change is required to the two County wards as a result of the variance, then the council would propose that Penallt ward of the Trellech community has a consequential change to the community arrangements and move to within the community of Mitchel Troy. This ensures that whole communities are contained within a single County seat where possible and ensures clear and identifiable boundaries and areas of responsibilities.

The resultant statistics of Penallt moving from Trellech to Mitchel Troy are highlighted below.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Cwmcarvan	Mitchel Troy	170	1595	1	100%		170	1645	103%
Dingestow	Mitchel Troy	202				30	232		
Wonastow	Mitchel Troy	60					60		
Pen-y-Clawdd	Mitchel Troy	110					110		
Mitchell Troy	Mitchel Troy	355					355		
Tregare	Mitchel Troy	254					254		
Penallt	Trellech United	444				20	464		

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Catbrook	Trellech United	308	1496	1	94%		308	1522	95%
The Narth	Trellech United	361					361		
Whitebrook	Trellech United	83					83		
Trellech Town	Trellech United	436					436		
Llanishen	Trellech United	226				26	252		
Trellech Grange	Trellech United	82					82		

Llanbadoc & Usk

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Glascoed	Llanbadoc	221	1131	1	71%		221	1161	73%
Llanbadoc	Llanbadoc	219					219		
Monkswood	Llanbadoc	251					251		
Little Mill	Llanbadoc	440				30	470		

The existing Llanbadoc County seat is split between the communities of Llanbadoc and Gwehelog. As previously mentioned, the Gwehelog community has been disbanded with the Gwehelog ward forming part of a proposed Raglan county seat and the Kemeys Commander and Llancayo ward within Gobion Fawr. The current Llanbadoc ward was divided by the County ward of Usk and the river Usk which split the communities of Llanbadoc and Gwehelog. An additional change under the community review resulted in the Little Mill ward being transferred from Goetre Fawr in to the Llanbadoc community. A new county seat that matches the proposed Llanbadoc community would result in a county average of -27% which outside the criteria the Commission set for the review.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Usk	Usk	1947	1947	1	122%	40	1987	1987	124%

There were minimal changes to the Usk ward as a result of the community review however the future electorate forecast for the ward will see the county average rise to +24%. Whilst this is within the criteria set by the Commission, given that it neighbours a ward that would be significantly lower than the average it's likely that these areas would be considered in greater detail.

Given that Usk with highest number of electors is not warded and has to be taken as a whole entity, to ensure the county seats consist of whole communities, it is proposed that the Llanbadoc and Usk communities combine in to a 2 member ward. This would result in a county average of -2% which is within the criteria set by the Commission as part of the review.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Glascoed	Llanbadoc	221	3078	2	96%		221	3148	98%
Llanbadoc	Llanbadoc	219					219		
Monkswood	Llanbadoc	251					251		
Little Mill	Llanbadoc	440				30	470		
Usk	Usk	1947				40	1987		

Portskewett

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Sudbrook	Portskewett	401	1900	1	119%	442	843	2924	183%
Portskewett Village	Portskewett	1317				582	1899		
Leechpool	Portskewett	182					182		

There was little changes to the Portskewett area as a result of the community review and none that would have an effect on the level of electors within the area. There are however significant developments proposed within the Portskewett community that will significantly increase the forecast electorate for the area. The current electorate level would see a county average of +19% and a future forecast of +83%. Using the current electorate level the proposals are within the criteria set by the Commission and the future electorate average significantly above the level set by the Commission.

Various options were considered by the working group in introducing wards from neighbouring communities including Caldicot, Mathern and Shirenewton however each of the proposals simply pushed the issue of electoral parity to another area and also led to communities being split with confusion of boundaries and areas of responsibility.

For that reason, the group consider the Portskewett County boundary should remain as it is and mirror the Portskewett community however it is clear that this option will need additional representation in the near future due to the scale of the developments within the community and the increase in electorate within the area those developments will have. Implementing a 2 member ward in Portskewett will have a county average of -41% at the point of election however a future electorate average on a 2 member ward would result in a county average of -9%. The working group note from electoral reviews for other local authorities that in some cases areas with significant future development

have not been given the level of representation to cater for the forecast (See Newport City Council Electoral Review – Llanwern ward). Therefore the working group are unclear as to what level of representation to recommend but are clear in that the boundaries of the Portskewett ward should mirror that of the Portskewett community.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Sudbrook	Portskewett	401	1900	2	59%	442	843	2924	91%
Portskewett Village	Portskewett	1317				582	1899		
Leechpool	Portskewett	182					182		

TOWNS

Abergavenny

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Cantref	Abergavenny	1526	1688	1	106%		1526	1688	106%
Llanwenarth Citra	Abergavenny	162					162		
Pen Y Fal	Abergavenny	1538	1538	1	96%	102	1640	1640	103%
Grofield	Abergavenny	1823	1823	1	114%	94	1917	1917	120%
Landsown	Abergavenny	1740	1740	1	109%	50	1790	1790	112%
Park	Abergavenny	1546	1546	1	97%	36	1582	1582	99%

The community review made significant changes to the community ward boundaries of Abergavenny and also resulted in the Llanwenarth Citra ward moving into the Abergavenny community from Llanfoist. Merging the Llanwenarth Citra ward with Cantref and having the County seats coterminous with the other four community wards would result in five single members with a variance ranging from -1% to +20% which falls within the criteria set by the Commission for the review.

The working group considered other options for the area which resulted in a smaller variance between the wards such as merging Grofield ward with Pen-Y-Fal or Park. Whilst this lead to increased parity, the group consider that as the proposals for single members fall within the + or – 25% variance threshold and that the parity is only increased based on the future electorate, to ensure clear and identifiable boundaries and areas of responsibility that single member ward would be the best option for the Abergavenny area.

Monmouth

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Wyesham	Monmouth	1725	1725	1	108%	92	1817	1817	114%
Osbaston	Monmouth	1714	1714	1	107%		1714	1714	107%
Drybridge	Monmouth	1772	3522	2	110%	140	1912	3662	115%
Town	Monmouth	1750					1750		
Overmonnow	Monmouth	1470	1470	1	92%	392	1862	1862	116%

The community review made significant changes to the wards of Monmouth and also sees a significant increase in the electorate within the community. The table above mirrors the existing warding arrangements applied to the new ward boundaries with the Town and Drybridge wards combined into a multi-member ward whereas they are currently combined as a single member ward. Whilst the above arrangements are within the criteria set by the Commission for the review, the new boundaries result in a large increase in the electorate for the Town ward and justifies that ward being split from Drybridge and having a single member County ward for both Drybridge and Town.

Whilst the proposals for all community wards to be single member county wards results in a slightly higher variance (+7% to +20% compared to +7% to +16%) the clear boundaries and areas of responsibility that single member wards provide would be the preferred option and ensures the proposals still fall within the criteria set by the Commission for the review. Additionally, when using the current electorates, the variance is closer to the County average but the

proposals still ensure that the wards fall within the criteria based on the future electorates as well. The proposed electorates and representation for single member wards is detailed below.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Wyesham	Monmouth	1725	1725	1	108%	92	1817	1817	114%
Osbaston	Monmouth	1714	1714	1	107%		1714	1714	107%
Drybridge	Monmouth	1772	1772	1	111%	140	1912	1912	120%
Town	Monmouth	1750	1750	1	109%		1750	1750	109%
Overmonnow	Monmouth	1470	1470	1	92%	392	1862	1862	116%

Chepstow

As a result of the community boundary review, the consequential changes to the County wards proposed by the Commission at that time resulted in two multi-member wards covering the entire Chepstow area. The working group would prefer where possible to adopt single member wards rather than large multi members seats, however in proposing single member wards, due to the Mabey Bridge development in the Chepstow Castle ward the variance would result in a county average of +58% which is outside the criteria set by the Commission for the review.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Thornwell	Chepstow	1388	1388	1	87%		1388	1388	87%
Larkfield	Chepstow	1066	1659	1	104%		1066	1659	104%
Maple Avenue	Chepstow	593					593		
Bulwark	Chepstow	1873	1873	1	117%		1873	1873	117%
St Kingsmark	Chepstow	1535	1535	1	96%		1535	1535	96%
Chepstow Castle	Chepstow	1369	1369	1	86%	1158	2527	2527	158%
Mount Pleasant	Chepstow	1572	1572	1	98%		1572	1572	98%

Various other options for the area were considered, such as merging Mount Pleasant ward with Chepstow Castle, but some of these resulted in the variance still being outside the scope of the review with county averages of +27 and +28%.

The working group arrived at two options that have been presented to the Chepstow County Councillors to put forward their preferred option. The two options are detailed in the tables below. The first see two multi-member wards and one single member ward with an average county variance that is closer to the desired ratio. The second proposes an additional single member ward but an increase in the variance to the County average, though it still falls within the criteria set by the Commission.

Name	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Thornwell	1388	3854	2	121%		1388	3854	121%
Bulwark	1873					1873		
Maple Avenue	593					593		
Larkfield	1066	4007	3	84%		1066	5165	108%

Chepstow Castle	1369				1158	2527		
Mount Pleasant	1572					1572		
St Kingsmark	1535	1535	1	96%		1535	1535	96%

Name	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Thornwell	1388	3854	2	121%		1388	3854	121%
Bulwark	1873					1873		
Maple Avenue	593					593		
Larkfield	1066	2435	2	76%		1066	3593	112%
Chepstow Castle	1369				1158	2527		
Mount Pleasant	1572	1572	1	98%		1572	1572	98%
St Kingsmark	1535	1535	1	96%		1535	1535	96%

Upon being put to the local councillors, there was no consensus amongst the members as to a preferred option. Individual members have been encouraged to submit their own scheme to the Commission for their consideration that fall within the criteria.

For the purpose of a Council wide scheme, the working group put forward the second option above that returns the most single member wards as a general consensus amongst the elected members is single member wards should be retained where possible.

Magor with Undy

As a result of the community boundary review, Magor with Undy was significantly changed from having four wards with large differences in electorates to 3 wards of similar sizes. As a result of the change, the Commission proposed a ward of Undy and Magor West represented by two members, and a Magor East ward with a single member. The preference of the working group was to retain three single member County wards however due to the electorate forecast in Magor East the county variance would be +39% which is outside the scope of the review set by the Commission as detailed below.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
Magor East	Magor with Undy	1777	1777	1	111%	450	2227	2227	139%
Magor West	Magor with Undy	1643	1643	1	103%		1643	1643	103%
Undy	Magor with Undy	1333	1333	1	83%	532	1865	1865	117%

The working group therefore propose that if three single member wards cannot be implemented due to the future forecast of electorate for the area, then Magor East and West should be combined as a multi-member ward with Undy as a single member ward. This retains the historic links between Magor and Undy as separate areas whilst ensuring that the county variance, whilst still high, falls within the criteria for the review of + or – 25%.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
------	-----------	----------	-------------------	-------------	------------	-----------------	-------------------	--------------------------	------------

Magor East	Magor with Undy	1777	3110	2	97%	450	2227	3870	121%
Magor West	Magor with Undy	1643					1643		
Undy	Magor with Undy	1333	1333	1	83%	532	1865	1865	117%

Caldicot

As with other towns, as a result of the community boundary review Caldicot had its boundaries changed significantly and new community wards created within the area. Consequential changes to the County boundaries were proposed by the Commission as a result of the community boundary review which resulted in the arrangements below. In considering the arrangements, the working group agreed that the consequential arrangements to the County wards would be the best proposals going forward in having five single members that are coterminous with the community ward boundaries except for the case of the Severn ward that combines The Village and Severn community wards in to a single member County ward.

Name	Community	Electors	County Electorate	Councillors	% Variance	5 year forecast	5 Year Electorate	County Future Electorate	% Variance
West End	Caldicot	1382	1382	1	86%		1382	1382	86%
Severn	Caldicot	736	1752	1	110%		736	1752	110%
The Village	Caldicot	1016					1016		
Caldicot Castle	Caldicot	1349	1349	1	84%	260	1609	1609	101%
Dewstow	Caldicot	1459	1459	1	91%		1459	1459	91%
Caldicot Cross	Caldicot	1567	1567	1	98%	32	1599	1599	100%