

Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements

Clackmannanshire Council Area

Report to the Secretary of State for Scotland

Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland

Report Number E98027
September 1998

Third Statutory Review of Electoral Arrangements Clackmannanshire Council Area

Introduction

1. The Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 determined that on and after 1 April 1996, Scotland should be divided into local government areas as named and described in Schedule 1 to the Act and that, for each area, there should be a council consisting of a convener and councillors. It further determined that each council should have all the functions exercised immediately before 1 April in relation to their area by any existing regional, islands or district council.

2. On 1 April 1996 all local government areas existing immediately before that date which were regions and districts and all regional and district councils ceased to exist.

3. Schedule 2 of the Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 also established that every local government area (other than areas of the old islands councils) should be divided into such electoral wards as may be specified in a direction made by the Secretary of State after carrying out such consultations as he considered appropriate. Those wards were to apply for the purpose of any election of councillors held before 'the relevant year of election' (defined as meaning the first year of ordinary election of councillors for the area in question occurring after the making of an order constituting the new electoral wards of that local government area in consequence of the review currently being undertaken by the Commission). In accordance with procedures that applied prior to the reorganisation in 1975, the views of councils were invited. Thereafter, the Secretary of State determined that, for the purpose of any election of councillors before the relevant year of election, 12 electoral wards were appropriate for Clackmannanshire local government area. Additionally, the proposed wards should be as described in the report of the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland to the Secretary of State for Scotland on its second statutory review of electoral arrangements for Clackmannan District dated November 1993.

Origin and Commencement of the Review

4. The Commission has a statutory duty under section 14 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 to undertake periodic reviews of local authority electoral arrangements. The Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994 amended section 20 and schedule 5 of the 1973 Act, directing that:

as soon as practicable after 1 April 1996, the Boundary Commission shall-

review the electoral arrangements for all local government areas for the purpose of considering the future electoral arrangements for those areas; and

formulate proposals for those arrangements.

5. This, therefore, is one of the statutory reviews required in terms of section 16(2) and Schedule 5 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, as amended.

6. On 22 March 1996, the Scottish Office Development Department gave local authorities advance notice of the intention of the Commission to carry out a third statutory review of electoral arrangements. On 29 March 1996, we wrote to all councils to announce the commencement of the third statutory review of electoral arrangements and to explain the procedures to be followed. We also gave notice of the commencement of the review to all Community Councils, Electoral Registration Officers, Members of Parliament with a constituency interest and the Scottish headquarters of the political parties. In addition, public notice of the commencement of the review, which included an invitation to interested parties to apply to us for a copy of our consultation letter to councils, was given in newspapers.

Background

7. During the passage through Parliament of the 1994 Act, there was cross-Party understanding that we would review the number of councillors and boundaries of electoral wards for each council in time for changes to be implemented for the 1999 local elections. This was seen to be important because at the time of reorganisation, as mentioned above, the Secretary of State defined the electoral wards for the new councils and to a great extent based these on existing district wards. It was, however, recognised that using the existing district wards led to some councils being significantly over-represented in relation to other areas. Further, it also led to councillors within the same local authority areas representing wards with significantly different numbers of electors. Accordingly, our review was seen as important to ensure equity in representation across and within all local authorities. Further, the new authorities were now responsible for the provision of the full range of all services and, accordingly, consideration had to be given to determining an appropriate number of councillors for service provision to be effectively managed.

8. This review is, therefore, the first conducted by us which sets out to determine the appropriate number of councillors required for councils to operate efficiently and to establish the boundaries of electoral wards. To achieve both objectives our review was conducted in 2 main stages:

identification of a suitable methodology for determining numbers of councillors which, applied across all local authority areas, would be seen to be equitable and consistent; and

the division of each local authority area into the appropriate number of electoral wards in accordance with the statutory rules.

9. A copy of the statutory rules to be employed by us and the Secretary of State in considering proposals for electoral arrangements is provided at Appendix A.

Number of Councillors

10. In formulating proposals for the number of councillors we have been guided by two main principles:

effective management of councils; and

equity amongst electors.

11. We recognised that the number of councillors is crucial because there is, undoubtedly, some number below which it would be impossible for a council to discharge its duty to deliver services to its population and, conversely, there is also some number above which a council becomes unwieldy and cumbersome. We were influenced in this respect by the prior considerations of two other bodies.

12. The Royal Commission on Local Government In Scotland 1966-69, under the Chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Lord Wheatley, provided a basis by which the number of regional councillors and the size of constituency to be represented might be determined by taking into account the fact that population density varies widely in Scotland as a whole and within regions. The then accepted view was that council size should not generally exceed 75 members. In England and Wales the Redcliffe-Maude Commission, which reported to Parliament in 1969, also drew attention to the management problems of large councils and endorsed the recommendation of The Committee on the Management of Local Government that a maximum number of 75 councillors should be set.

13. After careful consideration we concluded that, in the Scottish context and to provide additional flexibility, an upper limit of 80 councillors should be set. We also concluded that a minimum number of councillors should be set, recognising that even the smallest local government areas are now responsible for a wide range of functions. Accordingly, we decided that the minimum number of councillors should be 18. Further, these limits should apply to all councils.

14. Regarding equity as between voters, we considered that ideally each elector's vote should possess the same weight and significance in local government elections throughout the country; furthermore, ideally, there should be similar mutual accessibility between electors and councillors. However, since Scotland is a country of great diversity, both geographically and demographically, a fact reflected in the areas for which councils created by the Act of 1994 are

responsible, and since we are satisfied that, in the interests of good local government, the number of councillors in any council must fall within certain limits, we concluded that these ideals are unattainable in practice. In this situation, recognising that a fair degree of homogeneity exists within certain groups of councils, which exhibit broadly similar geographic and demographic characteristics, we resolved to strive for equity in the senses mentioned within these groups, so far as that is possible within the constraints of the legislation under which we operate.

15. We, therefore, proposed a methodology which initially categorised council areas by density and distribution of population using data available from the 1991 Census of Population. Having classified council areas according to these criteria and adjusted the ratio of electors to each councillor to take account of similar characteristics, we have been able to achieve a broad equity of electorate across and within all council areas.

16. In our letter of 29 March 1996, all councils were informed of the proposed methodology and future pattern of representation for their council area. Councils were requested to make any representations they wished on numbers of councillors by 29 April 1996 so that a meeting could be arranged with the Deputy Chairman and Secretary to discuss the pattern of representation and any matters regarding our review that the Council wished to raise. Following visits to all councils by the Deputy Chairman and Secretary to discuss the proposed methodology and to consider alternatives which could be applied across Scotland, no alternative methodologies were offered but a number of councils suggested that the underlying classification should be amended to include an additional category.

17. At our meeting of 17 June 1996, we re-examined the criteria to be used to categorise mainland councils with similar characteristics in light of the representations made by a number of councils. We concluded that there should be 6 rather than 5 categories. The final categorisation of similar mainland councils was then agreed as follows:

- Category 1 Large Cities Glasgow and Edinburgh.
- Category 2 Cities Aberdeen and Dundee.
- Category 3 Authorities with less than 60% of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons **AND** an overall population density of one person or more per hectare.
- Category 4 Authorities with **EITHER** 60% or more of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons **OR** an overall population density of less than one person per hectare.
- Category 5 Authorities with 60% or more of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons **AND** an overall population density of less than one person per hectare.

- Category 6 Authorities with 60% or more of the population living outwith settlements of 10,000 or more persons **AND** an overall population density of less than 0.2 persons per hectare.

18. In addition to the 6 categories we then determined the ratio of councillors to electorate for mainland councils that would allow for efficient management and appropriate representation, as set out in paragraphs 11 - 14 above, and considered that the following would be appropriate:

• Category 1	1:6,000
• Category 2	1:4,000
• Category 3	1:3,500
• Category 4	1:3,000
• Category 5	1:2,500
• Category 6	1:2,000

19. On 20 June 1996 we wrote to all mainland councils informing them of the revised criteria for determining councillor numbers and inviting them to prepare a draft scheme of electoral arrangements for their Council area. Following upon that, Aberdeen City Council brought a petition for Judicial Review of the decision taken by us at our meeting of 17 June, 1996 in the Court of Session. In it they sought a decree of declarator that that decision in relation to them was unlawful, ultra vires and null and void; they also sought a decree of reduction of the decision in relation to them and certain ancillary remedies. We resisted this petition, which was dismissed by the Court on 20 December 1996 after a hearing.

20. We considered the ratio of councillors to electors for the 3 islands councils at our meeting of 26 August 1996 and concluded that the appropriate ratio would be 1:750. On 28 August 1996 we wrote to these councils informing them of our decision.

Clackmannanshire Council's Proposals

21. The Council submitted a scheme of electoral arrangements for 18 wards on 3 December 1996. The Council stated that, following extensive public consultation, a strong and unanimous view had emerged from the Council and community groups that community identity was paramount and that splitting or joining communities to achieve numerical equity compromised local democracy. The Council's draft scheme, therefore, reflected the views expressed and there were deviations from electoral parity. Whilst the Council appreciated the legislative framework within which the Commission was required to operate, it believed that there was scope to depart from the principle of electoral equity in cases which merited special consideration. The Council concluded that its area should be considered as a special case because, in determining the number of wards, the Commission had, in recognising the small size of Clackmannanshire, considered that the application of a standard numerical formula was not appropriate. It followed, therefore, that implementing equal representation was unsound and unworkable in small geographic areas

because a 5%-10% deviation from electoral parity, which the Council believed was the Commission's yardstick for measuring acceptable parity, made it impossible to retain boundaries with which local communities identified. Further, the Council felt that there were practical difficulties in accurately forecasting population growth and movements which made the aspiration to have electoral parity inherently unachievable. Most importantly, however, there was convincing community support in Clackmannanshire for wards based on community identity. There was very strong evidence that people identified more with the notion of community as opposed to an abstract notion of equality of numbers which, far from enhancing local democracy, was perceived as limiting it because, where communities were split along unnatural lines, individuals were less inclined to participate in the democratic process.

22. The Council intimated also that it was undertaking a period of consultation and that it would forward any representations received to the Commission for its consideration.

23. As a result of the public consultation exercise 6 representations were received.

24. Alva Community Council wrote to thank Council officials for explaining the draft proposals for Alva. The Community Council asked that the boundary, which extended along Queen Street, should be altered to include houses on Beauclert Street, which would have the effect of better balancing the number of voters between the two respective wards. In general, however, the Community Council found both sets of plans acceptable in that Alva was retained as two distinct wards. The Community Council wrote to say also that there should be 6 wards in Hillfoots and that the significant communities of Dollar/Muckhart and Menstrie should each comprise one ward whilst Alva and Tillicoultry should each comprise two wards. Ward boundaries should be drawn in any suitable place between communities but not within a community. It considered that, whilst the statutory rule concerned electoral parity, a ward should not comprise parts of more than one community. A councillor should represent only one community and should not have divided loyalties.

25. Tullibody, Cambus and Glenochil Community Council wrote to say that it unanimously agreed that the second of the Council's draft options best defined its current communities. The Community Council recognised that the proposals did not meet the statutory rules regarding electoral parity. Nevertheless, it firmly believed that the proposals allowed communities to retain current identities. It proposed a minor change between the St Serfs and Delph Wards which would include Abercromby School and residences at Old School Court in the Delph Ward.

26. Tillicoultry Community Council wrote to say that the second of the Council's draft options was the best solution for the 18 wards in Clackmannanshire Council area. The Commission's numbers game was not suitable in the situation pertaining to Clackmannanshire, the Commission had already accepted that Clackmannanshire was a special case by proposing wards of less than 2,500 electors. If Clackmannanshire had been split into approximately 13 wards this would have resulted in diverse communities being lumped together to make up desired numbers which could not be allowed to happen. Option 2 proposed by the Council would maintain historical links and would not generate the present type of nonsense which linked part of Tillicoultry with Dollar where the interests were quite different.

27. Dollar Community Council noted that the second of the Council's draft options failed by a substantial percentage to meet the statutory rule regarding electoral parity but agreed that it should be adopted without any adjustment. The problems created by trying to attain electoral equity, which gave rise to the proposals in the Council's third option, were not acceptable. Although Dollar would have approximately 660 electors above the desired average, the numbers would be less than the existing number and the boundary line in Option 2 made considerable sense having a logical local identity. The Community Council considered that the Commission's desire for equality of numbers was understood but it felt that the special circumstances which had led to the increase in the number of wards called for a relaxation of the normal regulations.

28. Alva and Menstrie Branch Labour Party wrote to support the creation of community based wards but accepted that there must be limits because it would not be right to have one councillor with 500 electors and another with 2,000. The Commission's limits were, however, too narrow and went against the wishes of the people. The Branch had no particular view about how Alva should be divided but challenged the assumption that Muckhart should go in with Dollar. Whilst a certain pairing could not be denied, residents of Muckhart looked more to Kinross as a centre rather than Dollar or any other part of Clackmannanshire. The inclusion of Muckhart with Dollar results in Dollar being divided but, if equal sized wards were to be created, Muckhart should be elsewhere, perhaps as part of a recreated Landward Areas Ward comprising Muckhart, Forestmill, Kennet Village and part of Clackmannan.

29. Ochil Constituency Scottish Liberal Democrats, Clackmannanshire Branch, wrote to say that it was considered that the increase in the number of wards proposed by the Commission appeared to be excessive, particularly in view of the current stringent financial constraints to which the local authority was being subjected and in view of the impending General Election. However, the Branch thought that Clackmannan should remain as one unit and Tillicoultry East and West Wards should be renamed 'Eastertoun' and 'Westertoun' respectively.

30. We carefully examined the Council's draft proposals and representations received during the consultation period which supported the Council's view that electoral wards should, primarily, be community based. We concluded that, in many of the proposed wards, the divergence from electoral parity was unacceptably high. We concluded also that there was no opportunity within the statutory rules which would allow considerations of perceived community ties to over-ride the statutory rule regarding electoral parity. It was, however, clear from the representations we had received that the Council had pursued other options in the process of developing the draft scheme which had been submitted to us. We, therefore, instructed our Secretariat to explore, with Council officials, the possibility of developing alternative proposals which better reflected electoral parity using other options which the Council had prepared during the process of producing a draft scheme. We asked also that possible solutions identified by our Secretariat in the course of its initial analysis of the Council's draft proposals should also be further developed for our consideration.

31. Following discussions with Council officials, our officers noted that deviation from electoral parity remained a significant issue in other options for revised electoral arrangements

which had been prepared by the Council. It was, therefore, considered that the only suitable way forward was to develop alternative proposals arising from the initial analysis of the scheme submitted by the Council. Various alternatives were explored and Council officials provided information relating to changes in housing stock, electorate forecast assumptions and 1996 electorate data. We noted that our officers in preparing alternative proposals, had reduced the range of divergence from electoral parity from between -38% and 36% in the Council's proposals to $\pm 9\%$. We concluded that the alternative proposals prepared by our officers should be published as the Commission's provisional proposals.

Publication of Commission's Provisional Proposals

32. Public notice was given of the publication of our provisional proposals on 8 May 1998. Clackmannanshire Council was asked to make available for inspection at its offices copies of the electoral ward boundary descriptions, electoral statistics and illustrative maps. Additionally, copies of our proposals were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had expressed an interest. We asked that any comments should be made to us by 5 June 1998.

Consideration of Representations

33. One hundred and twenty-three representations were received:

- **The Council** wrote to say that it was disappointed to learn that its proposals for the majority of wards did not figure in the Commission's provisional proposals. The Council had earlier asked that Clackmannanshire should be further considered as a special case and it had hoped that the Commission would recognise, in light of the strength of feeling in the community, that wards should reflect community identity rather than electoral parity. The Council believed that the Commission's proposals based on electoral equity were unsound and unworkable because there were real and practical difficulties associated with accurately estimating future population growth and movements and, in a small geographic area, the $\pm 5/10\%$ deviation allowed by the Commission was so small that it did not give scope for any meaningful boundary movements. Given these facts, the Council considered that there was most concern that the provisional proposals for the wards of Dollar, Muckhart, Devon and Clackmannanshire North and Muirside split communities in a manner which would only reduce representatives. Given the Government's drive to enhance local democracy and increase the turnout at local elections, the Council found it extremely disappointing that the Commission's provisional proposals appeared to be destined to promote apathy and disinterest among voters locally. The Council asked that, given the depth of feeling in the area a local enquiry be held so that its concerns and the concerns of local people, could be put directly.

Also the Council wished to know the position of the third statutory review with the recently established Local Government Commission.

We noted the Council's views with regard to the application of the statutory rules, but were unable to accept its interpretation of how these rules could be applied in the consideration of revised electoral arrangements. There were no special geographical reasons within the Council area which would merit departing from the primary rule regarding electoral parity. We concluded, also, that there were no justifiable reasons for holding a public enquiry. With regard to the Local Government Commission, we noted that the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland is required to operate within the constraints of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, as amended by the Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994. Accordingly, in conducting the third statutory review of electoral arrangements, this Commission cannot be concerned with the possible outcome of work being undertaken by the Local Government Commission.

- **Dollar Community Council** wrote to say that the Commission's proposals had caused astonishment and anger. The Community Council had been led to believe that wards should be within $\pm 5\%$ of parity and should comprise, as far as possible, natural and existing communities. Given these criteria, it was incomprehensible that perhaps the only natural community in the whole of Clackmannanshire was to be split so that the parts could be added to other areas. Dollar actually contained almost the exact target electorate. The Community Council and electors would wish to take all legal steps to have the decision changed. The position could be corrected by substituting that part of Dollar in Devon and Clackmannan North for Muckhart which was located in the Dollar and Muckhart Ward. The number of electors on the 1996 electoral register in a ward composed entirely of Dollar would be 2,291, or 2,268 if those outwith the town were excluded. These figures compared with Wards 8, 9 and 15 in the Commission's proposals.
- **Ochil Conservative and Unionist Association** wrote to express concern with our proposal to divide Dollar into two wards. The Association believed the Commission's consideration was to achieve electoral equity at the expense of splitting an identifiable community and that this would lead to confusion within the electorate as to which Councillor represented which ward. It proposed that a better division would be to split the built up area of Dollar from the surrounding landward area which would achieve the same numerical result with none of the confusion. If Muckhart was included with the Devon and Clackmannan Ward, the effect would be to have 2,291 electors for a Dollar ward and 2,089 for a Devon and Clackmannan North Ward. A local meeting was requested so that the objection to our proposals could be enlarged upon and the logic of the alternative better explained.
- **Ochil Liberal Democrats, Clackmannanshire Branch** wrote to object to the Commission's proposals for Wards 6 - 9 on the grounds that it believed the

statutory rules required that regard be taken of any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of boundaries. In the context of the Commission's proposals, the Branch questioned what constituted local ties and what degree of strength such ties had to have before they became significant. The Branch believed that Dollar was historically and geographically a very clearly defined single community. Until reorganisation, it was a Burgh in its own right and was one of the few communities to have continuously maintained a Community Council. The Commission's proposals forced one half of Dollar to associate with two other communities with which it had no social or community links. The Branch asked how this could be justified in terms of the statutory rules. Bridge Street, down which the new boundary would run, was the social and business artery of the community in the centre of the Conservation Area, which had outstanding status from the Secretary of State for Scotland. The Commission's proposals would place the post office, butcher and largest hotel in Dollar and a second hotel, chemist, Co-operative, a general store and two other small businesses in a separate ward from that of two newsagents/stationers, local garage, a third hotel, hardware shop, book shop and dentist, all of whom interact closely in the community approximately twenty yards away on the other side of the street. There could be no justification for doing this on the grounds of arithmetic equality. Such a closely defined geographic community required, in relation to its size and strong community persona, single representation which encompassed the community as a whole. The Branch considered that, in terms of providing a service to the community, it was irrelevant whether one ward had ten or twenty percent more or fewer voters than another, if the community in question was a coherent unit with a clear identity. The dictum that 'government exists for the benefit of the people and not the people for the benefit of government' should be applied.

We were asked to consider the potential unwieldy consequences of our proposals which, for example, would greatly increase the secretarial workload of the Community Council in that it would have to maintain contact with two councillors. The statutory rules stated that the equality of numbers in each ward should be as nearly as may be the same. Dollar currently had approximately 2,270 electors which was within 10% of the 1996 and 7% of the 2001 parity figures. It was, therefore, incomprehensible to split Dollar for the purpose of this review and it would be better to leave it intact. The problem at the eastern end of the Council area could be resolved by placing Muckhart in Ward 7.

Clackmannan, like Dollar, had historically and geographically been a clearly defined single community for many years. Whilst our proposals in this area were less severe, there was no justification on the grounds of electoral equity, for what was being proposed. It was highly undesirable and should be set aside. The Commission was urged to relocate the proposed boundary to encompass Devon Way, Mary Bridge and Helensfield within natural community boundaries.

The Branch also asked if the Commission took soundings of local community views in respect of its proposals. It wished to know also the basis of the decision to increase the number of elected members. Further, in light of the work of the Commission for Local Government and the Scottish Parliament, the Branch asked if the review was premature and a waste of public money. If the Local Government Commission was to propose some form of proportional representation, then the work of this review would be inept for such a system and further spending of public money could be avoided.

- **Dollar Branch, Scottish National Party** wrote to protest about the Commission's proposals which split Dollar and asked for an official enquiry so that the idea could be exposed as totally unreasonable in terms of the coherent representation of any of the communities the proposed wards would attempt to serve.

We received one hundred and eleven proforma letters which objected to the provisional proposals for Ward 6 and Ward 7. Dollar was historically and geographically a clearly defined single community and, since 1975, was one of the few communities in the Clackmannanshire Council area to have maintained a Community Council. Our proposals paid no regard to local ties and split Dollar down the middle, forcing one half into an association with two other communities with which it had no social or community links. The Commission appeared to be happy to accept proposals for Ward 8, Ward 9 and Ward 15 with worse parity figures than would be achieved if Dollar was left intact. The position of Muckhart was clearly the problem but, if Muckhart were included within Ward 7, none of the already diverse communities would be split and acceptable electoral equity would be achieved. The reverse of the letter contained a map illustrating an alternative boundary which did not split Dollar.

- A letter was received which objected to Dollar being split between two wards. The correspondent noted that Clackmannanshire Council believed that wards should reflect communities. The business sector of the village would be split and half the shops etc. would be the responsibility of an outside councillor. The war memorial would be outwith the remit of the village councillor. The sewerage system would be outwith the village itself. The logic of attaching part of Dollar to a town five miles away defied reason. Dollar as it stood was within a reasonable percentage of electoral parity.
- A letter was received which stated that, if Dollar was split, the correspondent's daughter and family would live in a different ward. It seemed sensible to both families to keep Dollar in a single ward. The size of Dollar was appropriate and Muckhart could be combined with Fishcross.

We noted the views expressed by the Community Council, political organisations and others in respect of our proposals for Ward 6 and Ward 7. In considering revised electoral arrangements, the Commission was concerned with the

application of the statutory rules across the whole Council area. Whilst the suggested alternative boundaries maintained Dollar within a single ward, we noted that the adoption of these boundaries would create a revised Ward 7 which covered a substantially enlarged geographic area amounting to approximately one third of the total Council area. We asked the Council to provide the numbers of electors in the areas covered by the revised wards as set out in the representations received. The electorate figures provided by the Council indicated that the proposed amendments had an adverse effect on electoral parity which we considered unacceptable. We were, therefore, not prepared to amend our provisional proposals.

- **Tillicoultry Community Council** wrote to say that the Commission's proposals for Wards 1 -5 were perfectly acceptable. However, the proposals for Dollar and Muckhart were not in line with the expressed wishes of the communities and it was not acceptable to have a small part of Dollar removed from that community and added to a jumble of other communities which had little in common. The proposed Devon and Clackmannan North Ward found no favour with people who would be cut off from their main community and was unacceptable. The Clackmannan South Ward was not acceptable to the community there. The Community Council recommended that the Council's original proposals, which were based on retaining communities as single entities, should be implemented. It was considered by the Community Council that Clackmannanshire Council had been singled out for treatment as a special case and it would be appreciated if the electorate were given the ward boundaries which they felt would serve democracy.

We noted the Community Council's views with regard to Wards 1 - 5. Our views regarding the formulation of electoral arrangements based on community considerations are set out above, where we discuss the representations made in respect of Ward 6 and Ward 7.

- **Inglewood Residents Association** advised the Council that the community did not wish to be associated with Tullibody. Most of the residents considered that they were part of Alloa.
- A letter was received which stated that there was no valid reason for voters in the Lornshill Park area of Alloa to vote for a Tullibody councillor who did not know about the area. Tullibody had always been regarded as a separate village, was rapidly growing into a town and should, therefore, be retained as a separate ward.

We examined the ward boundary in the areas concerned and concluded that there was no readily acceptable solution which would have sufficient regard to the statutory rule regarding electoral parity and we were, thus, unable to alter the boundaries set out in our provisional proposals.

- **Sauchie and Fishcross Community Group** objected to the association of Fishcross and Coalsnaughton with Dollar because the two areas had nothing in common. Further, associating part of Clackmannan with Gartmorn unnecessarily split the community.

We noted the views expressed but were not prepared to alter the boundaries of the wards proposed in our provisional proposals because of the significantly adverse impact on electoral parity which would result.

- **Ochil Constituency Labour Party**, whilst recognising the difficulties in constructing wards for an 18 seat authority, thought that there should be an element of compromise and submitted alternative proposals which were based on the publicly expressed desire to maintain the integrity of communities as much as possible.

We considered the revised proposals submitted by the Constituency Labour Party and noted that the divergence from electoral parity was not acceptable in many areas and, accordingly, we were not prepared to amend the ward boundaries set out in our provisional proposals.

Final Recommendation

34. Having conducted the third statutory review of electoral arrangements for Clackmannanshire Council area in accordance with the procedures described above, we **recommend** that future electoral arrangements for the said Council should provide for a Council of 18 members.

35. The designation of the electoral wards that we recommend for Clackmannanshire Council, together with information which we have received from the Council as to the 1996 electorate and forecast 2001 electorate of the proposed wards, are set out at Appendix B to this report.

36. The boundaries of the proposed electoral wards are described in Appendix C and the following illustrative maps accompany this report:

Map	Area	Scale
1	Clackmannanshire Council Area	1:25,000
2	Menstrie, Alva, Tullibody, Alloa	1:10,000
3	Tillicoultry, Dollar	1:10,000
4	Alloa, Clackmannan	1:10,000

Appendix B

Clackmannanshire Council Area Proposed Electoral Wards

Number	Name	Electorate	
		1996 (Actual)	2001 (Estimated)
a	b	c	d
1	Menstrie	1,731	1,932
2	Alva North	2,013	1,946
3	Alva South	2,150	2,137
4	Tillicoultry West	1,885	2,040
5	Tillicoultry East	2,115	2,145
6	Dollar and Muckhart	2,198	2,168
7	Devon and Clackmannan North	2,323	2,269
8	Clackmannan	2,211	2,264
9	Gartmorn	2,364	2,318
10	Alloa North	2,012	1,989
11	Alloa East	2,226	2,199
12	Alloa Mar	1,854	2,120
13	Alloa West	1,538	1,989
14	Alloa Claremont	2,127	2,032
15	Fairfield	2,168	2,254
16	Muirside	2,210	2,136
17	St Serf's	1,933	2,118
18	Delph and Cambus	1,955	2,074
	Total	37,013	38,130