

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES**



Comisiwn Ffiniau  
Llywodraeth Leol  
i Gymru



Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for Wales

**REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES IN  
THE COUNTY OF PEMBROKESHIRE**

**REPORT AND PROPOSALS**



**LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR WALES**

**REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES IN THE COUNTY OF  
PEMBROKESHIRE**

**REPORT AND PROPOSALS**

1. INTRODUCTION
2. PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S PROPOSALS
3. THE COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION
4. PROCEDURE
5. PROPOSALS
6. CONSEQUENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS
7. RESPONSES TO THIS REPORT

*The Local Government Boundary Commission For Wales  
Caradog House  
1-6 St Andrews Place  
CARDIFF  
CF10 3BE*

*Tel Number: (029) 20395031  
Fax Number: (029) 20395250  
E-mail: [lgbc.wales@wales.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:lgbc.wales@wales.gsi.gov.uk)  
[www.lgbc-wales.gov.uk](http://www.lgbc-wales.gov.uk)*





## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Pembrokeshire County Council have conducted a review of the community boundaries and community electoral arrangements under Sections 55(2) and 57 (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994 (the Act). In accordance with Section 55(2) of the Act Pembrokeshire County Council have submitted a report to the Commission of their considerations for changes to a number of community boundaries in their area. A summary of Pembrokeshire County Council's proposed changes is at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 We have considered Pembrokeshire County Council's report in accordance with Section 55(3) of the Act and submit the following report on the Council's recommendations.

## **2. PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S PROPOSALS**

- 2.1 Pembrokeshire County Council's proposals were submitted to the Commission on 6 August 2009. The Commission received representations about the proposals from Ambleston Community Council, Cilgerran Community Council, Clunderwen Community Council, Crymych Community Council, Herbrandston Community Council, Kilgetty Begelly Community Council, Llanstadwell Community Council, Manordeifi Community Council, Marloes & St. Brides Community Council, Nevern Community Council, Slebech Community Council, St Mary Out Liberty Community Council, Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council, Stephen Crabb MP, Paul Davies AM, Councillor D Howlett, Councillor D Bryan, Councillor C Cavill, Councillor I Gollop, Councillor R Hancock, Jordanston Community Association and 84 local residents including a petition of 150 signatures. A summary of these representations is at Appendix 2. During the course of the Commission's consideration of Pembrokeshire County Council's proposals the Commission met with representatives of Ambleston Community Council, Dale Community Council, Herbrandston Community Council, Marloes & St. Brides Community Council, Spittal Community Council and Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council.
- 2.2 As a result of their review the Council have recommended changes to the boundaries between the following communities: Sceddau and Trecwn; Castlemartin and Stackpole; Ambleston and Spittal; Clunderwen and Llandissilio West; Dale and Marloes & St. Brides; Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels; Llawhaden and Slebech; Haverfordwest and Rudbaxton; Haverfordwest and Uzmaston & Boulston; Rudbaxton and Uzmaston & Boulston; Llanstadwell and Rosemarket; Manordeifi and Cilgerran; Crymych and Eglwysrwrw; Cilgerran and Eglwysrwrw; Nevern and Eglwysrwrw; Puncheston and Eglwysrwrw; Llangwm and Freystrop; Freystrop and Hook; Rosemarket and Freystrop; Rosemarket and Burton; Hundleton and Angle; Mathry and Llanrhian; Camrose and Haverfordwest; Camrose and Nolton & Roch; Tiers Cross and Johnston; Amroth and Kilgetty Begelly; East Williamston and Kilgetty Begelly; St. Mary Out Liberty and Saundersfoot; St. Mary Out Liberty and Tenby.

### **3. THE COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1 We first considered whether the County Council had conducted their review in accordance with the procedure set out in the Act. We then considered whether the proposals recommended were apt for securing effective and convenient local government.

### **4. PROCEDURE**

- 4.1 Section 60 of the Act requires the Council to take such steps as they think fit to secure that persons who may be interested in the review are informed of the proposal to conduct the review and subsequently of the draft proposals which are to be placed on deposit at the Council's offices. The final proposals report is also required to be placed on deposit at the Council's offices. Details of Pembrokeshire County Council's proposals were placed on deposit at the Council's offices and at council libraries.
- 4.2 We are satisfied that Pembrokeshire County Council have conducted the review in accordance with the procedure set out in Section 60 of the Act.

### **5. PROPOSALS**

#### **Scleddau and Trecwn**

- 5.1 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Scleddau and Trecwn to form a new Community called Scleddau. Pembrokeshire County Council had received no representations in respect of the proposal. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the two existing Communities are similar. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose that the Community of Scleddau be amalgamated with the Community of Trecwn to form the new Community of Scleddau as illustrated on the map at Appendix 3.

#### **Castlemartin and Stackpole**

- 5.2 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Castlemartin and Stackpole to form a new Community called Stackpole and Castlemartin. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations supporting their proposal from Stackpole Community Council and Castlemartin Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the two existing Communities are similar. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose that the Community of Stackpole be amalgamated with the Community of Castlemartin to form the new Community of Stackpole and Castlemartin as illustrated on the map at Appendix 4.

#### **Ambleston and Spittal**

- 5.3 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Ambleston and Spittal to form a new Community called Ambleston and Spittal. Pembrokeshire County Council requested that the Commission give

consideration to the acknowledged linguistic and cultural differences which exist between the Communities of Ambleston and Spittal when considering their proposal. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations objecting to their proposal from Ambleston Community Council, Spittal Community Council, Stephen Crabb MP, Paul Davies AM, two County Councillors and two other interested bodies. The Commission received representations from Ambleston Community Council, Spittal Community Council, Stephen Crabb MP, Paul Davies AM and Cllr D Howlett. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area, noted the points raised in the representations received and met with representatives of both Community Councils together with the County Councillor representing the Communities and we consider that whilst the general nature of both Communities is similar there are marked differences in cultural identity. We also consider that each Community is distinct and that each community council functions well with a good understanding of local issues relevant to their respective communities. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal for the amalgamation of the Community of Ambleston with the Community of Spittal.

### **Clunderwen and Llandissilio West**

5.4 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Clunderwen and Llandissilio West to form a new Community called Clunderwen and Llandissilio. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations objecting to their proposal from Clunderwen Community Council and Llandissilio West Community Council. The Commission received a representation from Clunderwen Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area and note the points made by the Community Councils in their representations to both Pembrokeshire County Council and the Commission. Whilst we note that the Communities of Clunderwen and Llandissilio are similar with a good road link between them we consider that each Community has its own long standing identity and are well served by their respective Community Councils. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal for the amalgamation of the Community of Clunderwen with the Community of Llandissilio West.

### **Dale and Marloes & St. Brides**

5.5 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Dale and Marloes & St. Brides to form a new Community called Coastlands. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations objecting to their proposal from Dale Community Council, Marloes & St. Brides Community Council and 27 other interested parties. The Commission received representations from Marloes & St. Brides Community Council, Stephen Crabb MP and two local residents. We have inspected the relevant maps, noted the points raised in the representations received, made a site visit to the area and met with representatives of both Community Councils and consider that whilst the general nature of both Communities is similar in that they are both small coastal areas, there are marked differences in terms of social identity and local activities. We also consider that each Community is distinct and that each community council functions well with a good understanding of the local issues relevant to their respective communities. Whilst we acknowledge Pembrokeshire County Council's concern that each Community only has a very small electorate we consider that the fact that both Communities are well represented by responsive and

effective community councils compensates for this considerably. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal for the amalgamation of the Community of Dale with the Community of Marloes & St. Brides.

### **Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels**

5.6 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels to form a new Community called Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels. Pembrokeshire County Council requested that the Commission give consideration to the acknowledged issues which exist relating to the compatibility of the Communities involved. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations objecting to their proposal from Herbrandston Community Council, St. Ishmaels Community Council and two other interested parties. The Commission received representations from Herbrandston Community Council, Paul Davies AM and a local resident. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area, noted the points raised in the representations and met with representatives of Herbrandston Community Council and consider that each community is distinct and has no involvement with each others issues and concerns. We note that there is no permanent direct link between the two communities as they are divided by a sea creek which can only be passed at low tide. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal for the amalgamation of the Community of Herbrandston with the Community of St. Ishmaels.

### **Llawhaden and Slebech**

5.7 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Llawhaden and Slebech to form a new Community called Canaston. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representation supporting their proposal from Llawhaden Community Council and a representation objecting to their proposal from Slebech Community Council. The Commission received a representation from Slebech Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps, noted the points made in the representations and made a site visit to the area and consider that the two Communities appear to be of a similar nature. However, we are aware that a large part of the Community of Slebech lies within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park area, and this will mean that the Community Council will have concerns specific to that situation which are not shared by Llawhaden Community. We are concerned that Slebech has a very small electorate of 127 which is the second smallest electorate for a Community in the County of Pembrokeshire (the lowest being Castlemartin which is to be merged with the Community of Stackpole.) However, having considered the different concerns and local issues faced by each of the Community Councils we are not satisfied that amalgamating Slebech with Llawhaden will provide the most suitable solution to address the issue of the very small electorate in the Community of Slebech.

5.8 We note that the neighbouring Community of Uzmaston & Boulston also has a substantial part of its area within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, has good communication links with Slebech and also has a comparatively small electorate. It has been recommended by Pembrokeshire County Council that the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston be amalgamated with the Community of Rudbaxton as outlined in paragraph 5.11 below. However, we are not satisfied that amalgamating the

Communities of Uzmaston & Boulston and Rudbaxton will be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the reasons given in that paragraph. We note Pembrokeshire County Council's point that the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston is in the parliamentary constituency of Preseli Pembrokeshire CC whilst Slebech is in the parliamentary constituency of Carmarthen West and South Pembrokeshire CC. We note that combining the Communities of Slebech and Uzmaston & Boulston would not automatically change the boundary between the parliamentary constituencies of Preseli Pembrokeshire CC and Carmarthen West and South Pembrokeshire CC although it would result in an anomaly whereby the parliamentary constituency boundaries were no longer co-terminous with the local government boundaries. Such an anomaly would need to be dealt with by means of a review conducted by the parliamentary Boundary Commission for Wales who would be informed by this Commission of any changes to local government boundaries necessitating such a review. We therefore propose the amalgamation of the Community of Slebech with the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston to form a new Community of Uzmaston, Boulston & Slebech as illustrated on the map at Appendix 5.

### **Haverfordwest and Rudbaxton**

5.9 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area of the North Prendergast Ward in the vicinity of Cardigan Road from the Community of Rudbaxton to the Community of Haverfordwest. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representation supporting their proposal from Rudbaxton Community Council. The Commission received a representation from a local resident. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Haverfordwest and the Community of Rudbaxton as illustrated on the map at Appendix 6.

### **Haverfordwest and Uzmaston & Boulston**

5.10 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of properties on Addison Close, Dunsany Park, Uzmaston Road, Style Park and Clover Park from the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston to the Community of Haverfordwest. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representation supporting their proposal from Haverfordwest Town Council and a representation objecting to their proposal from Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council. The Commission received representations objecting to the proposal from Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council, Councillor R Hancock, Councillor D Bryan and 19 local residents. We noted the objection that residents of the area considered that they had more affinity with rural Uzmaston & Boulston than with Haverfordwest. However, it appears to us that the area of Uzmaston & Boulston in the vicinity of Uzmaston Road is a continuation of the residential area of the eastern part of the Priory Ward of Haverfordwest. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Haverfordwest and the Community of Rudbaxton as illustrated on the map at Appendix 7.

## **Rudbaxton and Uzmaston & Boulston**

5.11 Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation is for the amalgamation of the existing Communities of Rudbaxton and Uzmaston & Boulston to form a new Community called Crundale. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations objecting to their proposal from both Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council and Rudbaxton Community Council. The Commission received representations objecting to this proposal from Councillor R Hancock, Councillor D Bryan and four local residents. We have inspected the relevant maps, noted the points raised in the representations, made a site visit to the area and met with representatives of Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council and we consider that there are significant differences between the two Communities. There appear to be few shared interests between the Communities as Rudbaxton is a more densely populated community than Uzmaston & Boulston whilst Uzmaston & Boulston has an area of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park within their community boundary. More importantly, there are no direct road links between the two community areas which would contribute to a sense of division and detachment in an amalgamated community council. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is in the interests of effective and convenient local government and therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal for amalgamating the Community of Rudbaxton with the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston. We note Pembrokeshire County Council's concern that after the transfer of part of Uzmaston & Boulston into the Community of Haverfordwest, Uzmaston & Boulston will be left with a comparatively low electorate of 147. We consider that, as stated in paragraph 5.8 above, a more suitable solution to that problem will be to combine the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston with the Community of Slebech for the reasons given in that paragraph. We therefore propose combining the Community of Uzmaston & Boulston with the Community of Slebech to form a new Community of Uzmaston, Boulston & Slebech as illustrated on the map at Appendix 5.

## **Llanstadwell and Rosemarket**

5.12 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of the area of Jordanston / St. Mary's Park from the Community of Llanstadwell to the Community of Rosemarket. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representations supporting their proposal from Rosemarket Community Council and representations objecting to their proposal from Llanstadwell Community Council and four other interested parties. The Commission received representations objecting to the proposed change from Llanstadwell Community Council, Jordanston Community Association and 58 local residents. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area and considered the representations we have received. We note that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features although the area of Jordanston / St. Mary's Park is separated from the Community of Rosemarket by a tidal tributary. Whilst we acknowledge that Jordanston is close to the village of Rosemarket and that there are road links across the tidal tributary we note that the proposed realignment of the boundary excludes two properties adjacent to the Jordanston / St. Mary's Park area from the transfer. We also note the representation we received stating that the proposed boundary will leave Norton Farm divided between Llanstadwell and Rosemarket. We note the representations we received objecting to the proposed transfer and on balance we are not convinced that there is a significant affinity between the area of Jordanston / St. Mary's Park and the Community of Rosemarket. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's

proposal to transfer the area of Jordanston / St. Mary's Park from the Community of Llanstadwell into the Community of Rosemarket.

### **Manordeifi and Cilgerran**

5.13 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of the area of Pontrhydyceirt from the Community of Manordeifi to the Community of Cilgerran. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representation supporting their proposal from Cilgerran Community Council and a representation objecting to their proposal from Manordeifi Community Council. The Commission also received a representation supporting the proposal from Cilgerran Community Council and a representation objecting to the proposal from Manordeifi Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area and considered the representations we have received. We note that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We have considered the arguments put forward both for and against the transfer of Pontrhydyceirt to the Community of Cilgerran and whilst we acknowledge that the closer proximity of a polling station for residents of the area in Cilgerran would be more convenient for residents on balance we are not satisfied that there is a significant affinity between the area of Pontrhydyceirt and the Community of Cilgerran. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal to transfer the area of Pontrhydyceirt from the Community of Manordeifi into the Community of Cilgerran.

### **Crymych and Eglwysrwr**

5.14 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of the area of Eglwyswen from the Community of Crymych to the Community of Eglwysrwr. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representation supporting their proposal from Eglwysrwr Community Council and a representation objecting to their proposal from Crymych Community Council. The Commission received a representation objecting to the proposal from Crymych Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area and considered the representations we have received. We note that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We have considered the arguments put forward both for and against the transfer of Eglwyswen to the Community of Eglwysrwr and whilst we acknowledge that the closer proximity of a polling station for residents of the area in Cilgerran would be more convenient for residents on balance we are not satisfied that there is a significant affinity between the area of Eglwyswen and the Community of Eglwysrwr. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal to transfer the area of Eglwyswen from the Community of Crymych into the Community of Eglwysrwr.

### **Cilgerran and Eglwysrwr**

5.15 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area at Rhos fach from the Community of Cilgerran to the Community of Eglwysrwr. Pembrokeshire County Council did not receive any objection to their proposal from either Eglwysrwr or Cilgerran Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the proposed boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to

the boundary between the Community of Cilgerran and the Community of Eglwysrwr as shown on the map at Appendix 8.

- 5.16 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area near Meigan Wells from the Community of Cilgerran to the Community of Eglwysrwr. Pembrokeshire County Council did not receive any objection to their proposal from either Eglwysrwr or Cilgerran Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We note, however, that the recommended boundary does not include properties at Llanfeigan which are adjacent to similar properties within the area recommended for transfer to Eglwysrwr. Whilst we note that no objection to the recommendation was put forward by either community council we consider that the area recommended for transfer is of a similar nature to adjacent areas in the Communities of Cilgerran, Eglwysrwr and Crymych and no convincing argument has been put forward as to why the area should be included within Eglwysrwr. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's proposal to transfer the area near Meigan Wells from the Community of Cilgerran to the Community of Eglwysrwr.

### **Nevern and Eglwysrwr**

- 5.17 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of part of the Nevern Ward from the Community of Nevern into the Community of Eglwysrwr. Pembrokeshire County Council received a representation supporting their recommendation from Eglwysrwr Community Council and a representation objecting to their recommendation from Nevern Community Council. The Commission received representations objecting to the recommendation from Nevern Community Council and six other interested parties. We have inspected the relevant maps, made a site visit to the area and considered the representations we received. We noted that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. Whilst we note the points made by Eglwysrwr Community Council that the area is close to Eglwysrwr and will mean residents will be able to vote at a closer polling station we do not consider that a convincing argument has been put forward as to how the transfer of such a large area from the Community of Nevern would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government. It appears to us that the area recommended for transfer is similar to adjacent areas in both Nevern and Eglwysrwr and has no significant affinity with Eglwysrwr. We are not satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore do not accept Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendation to transfer part of the Nevern Ward from the Community of Nevern into the Community of Eglwysrwr.

### **Puncheston and Eglwysrwr**

- 5.18 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of a small area from the Community of Eglwysrwr to the Community of Puncheston. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations supporting their recommendation from Eglwysrwr Community Council and Puncheston Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We also noted from our map of the area that an adjacent boundary between the Communities of Cwm Gwaun and Eglwysrwr did not follow a clearly

defined line and could be realigned to form a straight point between two identifiable geographical features on the ground. This would involve a very minor realignment of a small section of the boundary between the Communities of Cwm Gwaun and Eglwysrwr and we therefore propose that this realignment is adopted in addition to the realignment of the boundary between the Communities of Puncheston and Eglwysrwr. We therefore propose the changes to the boundaries between the Communities of Puncheston and Eglwysrwr and the Communities of Cwm Gwaun and Eglwysrwr as illustrated on the map at Appendix 9.

### **Llangwm and Freystrop**

- 5.19 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of the area of Little Nash Farm from the Community of Llangwm to the Community of Freystrop. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representations objecting to their recommendation from Llangwm Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We note that the only access to Little Nash Farm is through the Community of Freystrop and that whilst Llangwm Community Council had objected to the transfer they had not put forward a compelling argument against it. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Llangwm and the Community of Freystrop as illustrated on the map at Appendix 10.
- 5.20 During the course of their considerations of Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendations the Commission identified an area at Trooper's Inn Farm where the boundary between the Communities of Freystrop and Llangwm was not satisfactory and a more clearly defined line for the boundary was close by. This proposed realignment of the boundary involves the transfer of a small area from the Community of Llangwm into the Community of Freystrop. We are satisfied that this change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Llangwm and the Community of Freystrop as illustrated on the map at Appendix 11.

### **Freystrop and Hook**

- 5.21 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of part of the settlement of Hook currently in the Community of Freystrop from the Community of Freystrop to the Community of Hook. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representation from Freystrop Community Council objecting to the inclusion of Little Milford in the recommended transfer. Pembrokeshire County Council subsequently agreed that Little Milford should not be included in the recommendation and no further objection was received. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. It appears to us that the area of Freystrop indicated by the Council in their recommendation is clearly a continuation of the settlement of Hook and as such should be included with the rest of the settlement within the Community of Hook. We are satisfied that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Hook and the Community of Freystrop as illustrated on the map at Appendix 12.
- 5.22 During the course of their considerations of Pembrokeshire County Council's recommendations the Commission identified a property Stumpy Corner in the

Community of Hook which could only be accessed through the Community of Freystrop. We wrote to Pembrokeshire County Council concerning our proposal to transfer the property at Stumpy Corner from Hook into Freystrop and received a reply including comments from Councillor Michael John that the proposed transfer appeared sensible. However, we also received a representation on behalf of the owner of Stumpy Corner who objected to the realignment of the boundary on the grounds that his property was historically linked to the Community of Hook and the Little Milford area. Although we consider that the existing boundary at Stumpy Corner presents a minor anomaly in terms of access we note that only one property is affected and, having been able to establish that the owner would prefer to remain in the Community of Hook, we are satisfied that the existing boundary should be retained.

### **Rosemarket and Freystrop**

5.23 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of a small area at Trooper's Inn Farm from the Community of Rosemarket to the Community of Freystrop. Pembrokeshire County Council had received a representations supporting their recommendation from Freystrop Community Council and a representation from Rosemarket Community Council suggesting that the recommendation could be in the interests of the residents in the area. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the dwellings clearly have an affinity to similar dwellings in the Freystrop part of Trooper's Inn Farm. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Rosemarket and the Community of Freystrop as illustrated on the map at Appendix 11.

### **Rosemarket and Burton**

5.24 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area at Sardis from the Community of Rosemarket to the Community of Burton. Pembrokeshire County Council had received representations supporting their recommendation from Burton Community Council and Rosemarket Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the area clearly has an affinity to the rest of the settlement of Sardis within the Community of Burton. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Rosemarket and the Community of Burton as illustrated on the map at Appendix 13.

### **Hundleton and Angle**

5.25 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of the Roscrowther Ward of the Community of Hundleton into the Community of Angle. Pembrokeshire County Council had received no representation in respect of their recommendation. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Hundleton and the Community of Angle as illustrated on the map at Appendix 14.

## **Mathry and Llanrhian**

5.26 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area at Square and Compass from the Community of Mathry to the Community of Llanrhian. Pembrokeshire County Council received a representation supporting their recommendation from Llanrhian Community Council and a representation objecting to their recommendation from Mathry Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the whole of the settlement of Square and Compass should be included in the same community area and that, on balance, the preferred Community would be Llanrhian. During the course of the review the Commission noted that a small part of Pembrokeshire County Council's proposed realignment of the boundary followed a field boundary that no longer existed. A small amendment to take account of this had therefore been suggested to the Council's proposal. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Mathry and the Community of Llanrhian as illustrated on the map at Appendix 15.

## **Camrose and Haverfordwest**

5.27 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer part of Haven Road and Douglas James Close from the Community of Camrose into the Community of Haverfordwest. Pembrokeshire County Council had received no representation in respect of their recommendation. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the built up areas of Haven Road and Douglas James Close clearly have an affinity to similar adjacent areas in Haverfordwest. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Camrose and the Community of Haverfordwest as illustrated on the map at Appendix 16.

## **Camrose and Nolton & Roch**

5.28 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer the area of Courtfield Drive at Simpson Cross from the Community of Nolton & Roch into the Community of Camrose. Pembrokeshire County Council received a representation supporting their recommendation from Nolton & Roch Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the built up areas of Courtfield Drive clearly have an affinity to the similar adjacent area in Camrose. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Camrose and the Community of Nolton & Roch as illustrated on the map at Appendix 17.

## **Tiers Cross and Johnston**

5.29 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area of Milford Road from the Community of Tiers Cross into the Community of Johnston. Pembrokeshire County Council received representations supporting their recommendation from Tiers Cross Community Council and Johnston Community Council. We have inspected the relevant

maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the two dwellings at Milford Road in Tiers Cross clearly have an affinity to the adjacent residential area in Johnston. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Tiers Cross and the Community of Johnston as illustrated on the map at Appendix 18.

### **Amroth and Kilgetty Begelly**

5.30 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer an area of Stepside from the Community of Kilgetty Begelly into the Community of Amroth. Pembrokeshire County Council received a representation supporting their recommendation from Amroth Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the area at Stepside in Kilgetty Begelly clearly has an affinity to a similar adjacent area in Amroth. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Kilgetty Begelly and the Community of Amroth as illustrated on the map at Appendix 19.

### **East Williamston and Kilgetty Begelly**

5.31 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer an area of Kingsmoor Close from the Community of Kilgetty Begelly into the Community of East Williamston. Pembrokeshire County Council received a representation supporting their recommendation from East Williamston Community Council and a representation objecting to their recommendation from Kilgetty Begelly Community Council. The Commission received a representation objecting to the recommendation from Kilgetty Begelly Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps, noted the representations received and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We note that Kilgetty Begelly Community Council consider that the railway line and Kingsmoor / Station Road form a natural boundary between their Community and the Community of East Williamston and that the residents of Kingsmoor Close expressed a preference to remain within Kilgetty Begelly. However, it appears to us that the existing boundary is anomalous as the properties at Kingsmoor Close are adjacent to similar properties in East Williamston and detached from any similar area in Kilgetty Begelly with only pedestrian access to that Community. On balance we are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Kilgetty Begelly and the Community of East Williamston as illustrated on the map at Appendix 20.

5.32 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer an area of Templebar Road from the Community of Kilgetty Begelly into the Community of East Williamston. Pembrokeshire County Council had received no representation in respect of their recommendation. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We consider that the properties at Templebar Road currently in the Community of Kilgetty Begelly clearly has an affinity to similar adjacent properties on Templebar Road in East Williamston. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We

therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Kilgetty Begelly and the Community of East Williamston as illustrated on the map at Appendix 21.

### **St. Mary Out Liberty and Saundersfoot**

5.33 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer the area of Rushy Lake, Swallowtree and Broadfield from the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty into the Community of Saundersfoot. Pembrokeshire County Council received a representation supporting their recommendation from Saundersfoot Community Council and representations together with a petition of 208 signatures objecting to their recommendation from St. Mary Out Liberty Community Council and Cllr. Carol Cavill. The Commission received representations objecting to the recommendation from St. Mary Out Liberty Community Council and 9 other interested parties. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features with the exception of the eastern end which we found divided a caravan park and a small amendment to take account of this has therefore been suggested to the Council's proposal. We note from the objections made that the majority of residents are content with the existing arrangements. However, we consider that the properties and area surrounding Nyth Gwennol and Cwm Gwennol are clearly a continuation of the built up area of the southern edge of Saundersfoot and note that this area is defined as part of the settlement of Saundersfoot on Pembrokeshire County Council's Joint Unitary Development Plan. We noted and considered the suggestion raised in the representations that the properties at Broadfield Hill should remain within the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty even if Nyth Gwennol and Cwm Gwennol were to be transferred into Saundersfoot. However, it was difficult to find a satisfactory line for an amended boundary without separating adjacent properties. On balance we are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Saundersfoot and the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty as illustrated on the map at Appendix 22.

5.34 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of an area to the south of the A478 and Devonshire Drive from the Community of Saundersfoot into the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty. Pembrokeshire County Council received no objections to their recommendation. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Saundersfoot and the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty as illustrated on the map at Appendix 23.

### **St. Mary Out Liberty and Tenby**

5.35 Pembrokeshire County Council recommend the transfer of the area of Waterwynch from the Community of Tenby into the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty. Pembrokeshire County Council received representations supporting their recommendation from Tenby Town Council and St. Mary Out Liberty Community Council. We have inspected the relevant maps and made a site visit to the area and consider that the recommended boundary follows identifiable geographical features. We are of the view that the recommended change is of benefit in terms of effective and convenient local government. We therefore propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Tenby and the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty as illustrated on the map at Appendix 24.

## 6. CONSEQUENTIAL ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 In considering the various changes to the community boundaries it was also necessary for us to take account of the consequential effects on the electoral arrangements for community councils and the principal authority, which would result from these changes. This section of our report details our proposals for consequential changes to the electoral arrangements. The electoral statistics used in this report were provided by Pembrokeshire County Council.

### Community Council Electoral Arrangements

6.1 The community electoral arrangement in this part of the report are those brought into effect by the County of Pembrokeshire (Community Electoral Arrangements) Order 2008. The electorate figures used are those supplied by Pembrokeshire County Council as at December 2009.

6.2 The Community of Scleddau is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Scleddau North and Scleddau South. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Scleddau	Scleddau North	248	3	83
	Scleddau South	267	4	67
		<b>515</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>74</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

The Community of Trecwn is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 265 represented by 6 councillors giving an elector to councillor ratio of 1:44.

6.3 Under the proposed merger of the Communities of Scleddau and Trecwn Pembrokeshire County Council has recommended that each ward be represented by 3 councillors. We consider this to be an appropriate level of representation for the new Community of Scleddau. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Scleddau	Scleddau North	248	3	83
	Scleddau South	267	3	89
	Trecwn	265	3	88
		<b>780</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>87</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

6.4 The Community of Stackpole is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Boshaston and Stackpole. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Stackpole	Boshaston	175	3	58
	Stackpole	209	3	70
		<b>384</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>64</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

The Community of Castlemartin is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 117 represented by 6 councillors giving an elector to councillor ratio of 1:20.

- 6.5 Under the proposed merger of the Communities of Stackpole and Castlemartin Pembrokeshire County Council has recommended that the new Community be divided into the two wards of Stackpole and Castlemartin represented by 5 and 2 councillors respectively. We consider this to be an appropriate level of representation for the new Community of Stackpole and Castlemartin. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Stackpole and Castlemartin	Stackpole	384	5	77
	Castlemartin	117	2	59
		<b>501</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>72</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.6 The Community of Slebech is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 127 represented by 6 councillors giving an elector to councillor ratio of 1:21. The Community of Uzmaston and Boulston is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 496 represented by 7 councillors giving an elector to councillor ratio of 1:71. The recommendation to transfer the area of Uzmaston Road from the Community of Uzmaston and Boulston into the Community of Haverfordwest will result in a decrease of 346 electors leaving Uzmaston and Boulston with 150 electors.

- 6.7 Under the proposed merger of the Communities of Slebech and Uzmaston and Boulston we consider that an appropriate level of representation will be 4 councillors per community ward. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Uzmaston, Boulston and Slebech	Uzmaston and Boulston	150	4	38
	Slebech	127	4	32
		<b>277</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>35</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.8 The Community of Rudbaxton is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Rudbaxton and North Prendergast. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Rudbaxton	Rudbaxton	718	9	80
	North Prendergast	179	2	90
		<b>897</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>82</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.9 Under our proposals the North Prendergast Ward will decrease by 130 to 49 electors. We note that this substantial decrease in the electorate for the North Prendergast Ward will create a significant imbalance in the number of electors in the two wards of Rudbaxton and we therefore consider that it would be in the interests of effective and convenient local government for the warding arrangement in the Community of Rudbaxton to be removed. This will leave the Community of Rudbaxton with 767 electors and we consider that an appropriate level of representation would be 10 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:77.

- 6.10 The Community of Haverfordwest is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Castle, Garth, Portfield, Prendergast and Priory. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Haverfordwest	Castle	1,640	3	547
	Garth	1,695	3	565
	Portfield	1,737	4	434
	Prendergast	1,345	3	448
	Priory	1,910	4	478
		<b>8,327</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>490</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.11 Under our proposals the Prendergast Ward will increase by 130 to 1,475 electors, the Priory Ward will increase by 346 to 2,256 and the Portfield Ward will increase by 46 to 1,783 electors. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Haverfordwest. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Haverfordwest	Castle	1,640	3	547
	Garth	1,695	3	565
	Portfield	1,783	4	446
	Prendergast	1,475	3	492
	Priory	2,256	4	564
		<b>8,849</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>521</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.12 The Community of Eglwysrwrw is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 603 represented by 8 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:75. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Eglwysrwrw will increase by 4 from 603 to 607 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:76. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

- 6.13 The Community of Cilgerran is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 1,150 represented by 12 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:96. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Cilgerran will decrease by 6 from 1,150 to 1,144 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:95. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require an reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

- 6.14 The Community of Puncheston is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Puncheston and Henry's Moat. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Puncheston	Puncheston	296	4	74
	Henry's Moat	109	2	55
		<b>405</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>68</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.15 Under our proposals the Henry’s Moat Ward will increase by 2 to 111. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Puncteston. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Puncteston	Puncteston	296	4	74
	Henry’s Moat	111	2	65
		<b>407</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>68</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.16 The Community of Freystrop is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 468 represented by 6 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:78. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Freystrop will decrease by 42 electors from 468 to 426 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:71. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require a reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.17 The Community of Llangwm is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 681 represented by 8 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:85. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Llangwm will decrease by 3 electors from 681 to 678 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:85. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require a reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.18 The Community of Hook is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 592 represented by 7 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:85. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Hook will increase by 48 electors from 592 to 640 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:91. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.19 The Community of Rosemarket is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 454 represented by 6 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:76. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Rosemarket will decrease by 36 electors from 454 to 418 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:70. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require a reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.20 The Community of Angle is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 269 represented by 6 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:45. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Angle will increase by 56 electors from 269 to 325 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:54. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of

councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

- 6.21 The Community of Hundleton is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 675 represented by 8 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:84. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Hundleton will decrease by 56 electors from 675 to 619 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:77. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require an reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.22 The Community of Llanrhian is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 748 represented by 9 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:83. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Llanrhian will increase by 25 electors from 748 to 773 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:86. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.23 The Community of Mathry is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 473 represented by 6 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:79. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Mathry will decrease by 25 electors from 473 to 448 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:75. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require an reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.24 The Community of Camrose is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 1,453 represented by 12 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:121. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Camrose will decrease by 31 electors from 1,453 to 1,422 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:119. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require an reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.
- 6.25 The Community of Nolton and Roch is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Nolton and Roch. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Nolton and Roch	Nolton	113	2	57
	Roch	515	6	86
		<b>628</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>79</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.26 Under our proposals the Roch Ward will decrease by 15 to 500. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Nolton and Roch. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Nolton and Roch	Nolton	113	2	57
	Roch	500	6	83
		<b>613</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>77</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

6.27 The Community of Johnston is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 1,468 represented by 12 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:122. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Johnston will increase by 7 electors from 1,468 to 1,475 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:123. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

6.28 The Community of Tiers Cross is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Thornton and Tiers Cross. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Tiers Cross	Thornton	136	2	68
	Tiers Cross	267	4	67
		<b>403</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>67</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

6.29 Under our proposals the Thornton Ward will decrease by 7 to 129. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Tiers Cross. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Tiers Cross	Thornton	129	2	65
	Tiers Cross	267	4	67
		<b>396</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>66</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

6.30 The Community of Kilgetty Begelly is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Kilgetty and Begelly. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Kilgetty Begelly	Kilgetty	8	1,084	136
	Begelly	4	663	166
		<b>12</b>	<b>1,747</b>	<b>146</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

6.31 Under our proposals the Kilgetty Ward will decrease by 36 to 1,048 and the Begelly Ward will decrease by 8 to 655. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Kilgetty Begelly. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Kilgetty Begelly	Kilgetty	8	1,048	131
	Begelly	4	655	164
		<b>12</b>	<b>1,703</b>	<b>142</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.32 The Community of East Williamston is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of East Williamston and Pentlepoir. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
East Williamston	East Williamston	422	3	141
	Pentlepoir	1,039	9	115
		<b>1,461</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>122</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.33 Under our proposals the Pentlepoir Ward will increase by 41 to 1,080. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of East Williamston. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
East Williamston	East Williamston	422	3	141
	Pentlepoir	1,080	9	120
		<b>1,502</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>125</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.34 The Community of Amroth is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Amroth and Crunwera. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Amroth	Amroth	784	9	87
	Crunwera	245	3	82
		<b>1,029</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>86</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.35 Under our proposals the Amroth Ward will increase by 3 to 787. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Amroth. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Amroth	Amroth	787	9	87
	Crunwera	245	3	82
		<b>1,032</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>86</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

- 6.36 The Community of Saundersfoot is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 2,123 represented by 12 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:177. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of Saundersfoot will

increase by 175 electors to 2,298 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:192. We do not consider that this increase in electors is significant enough to require an increase in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

6.37 The Community of St. Mary Out Liberty is not divided into community wards and currently has an electorate of 522 represented by 7 councillors giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:75. Under our proposals the electorate of the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty will decrease by 170 electors to 352 giving a councillor to elector ratio of 1:50. We do not consider that this decrease in electors is significant enough to require a reduction in the number of councillors representing the Community and therefore the existing community electoral arrangements will continue unchanged.

6.38 The Community of Tenby is currently divided, for Community electoral purposes, into the community wards of Tenby North and Tenby South. The following table shows the number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Tenby	Tenby North	6	1,685	281
	Tenby South	7	1,799	257
		<b>13</b>	<b>3,484</b>	<b>268</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

6.39 Under our proposals the Tenby North Ward will decrease by 5 to 1,680. We consider that the existing number of councillors for each of the Wards in the Community provides an appropriate level of representation and therefore we do not propose any change to the existing electoral arrangements for the Community of Tenby. The following table shows the proposed number of electors and councillors for each ward.

<b>Community</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>E/C*</b>
Tenby	Tenby North	6	1,680	280
	Tenby South	7	1,799	257
		<b>13</b>	<b>3,479</b>	<b>268</b>

\*E/C – electors per councillor

## **County Council Electoral Arrangements**

6.40 The Rudbaxton electoral division consists of the Communities of Rudbaxton and Uzmaston & Boulston and currently has 1,393 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Communities of Rudbaxton and Uzmaston & Boulston would result in fall in the number of electors in the Rudbaxton electoral division to 917.

6.41 The Haverfordwest: Prendergast electoral division, which is coterminous with the Prendergast Ward of the Community of Haverfordwest, currently has 1,345 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Haverfordwest would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Haverfordwest: Prendergast electoral division to 1,475.

6.42 The Haverfordwest: Priory electoral division, which is coterminous with the Priory Ward of the Community of Haverfordwest, currently has 1,910 electors represented by 1

councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Haverfordwest would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Haverfordwest: Priory electoral division to 2,256.

- 6.43 The Haverfordwest: Portfield electoral division, which is coterminous with the Portfield Ward of the Community of Haverfordwest, currently has 1,737 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Haverfordwest would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Haverfordwest: Portfield electoral division to 1,783.
- 6.44 The Crymych electoral division consists of the Communities of Crymych and Eglwysrwrw and currently has 1,890 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Eglwysrwrw would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Crymych electoral division to 1,894.
- 6.45 The Cilgerran electoral division consists of the Communities of Cilgerran and Manordeifi and currently has 1,565 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Eglwysrwrw would result in a fall in the number of electors in the Cilgerran electoral division to 1,559.
- 6.46 The Dinas Cross electoral division consists of the Communities of Cwm Gwaun, Dinas Cross and Puncheston and currently has 1,682 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Puncheston would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Dinas Cross electoral division to 1,684.
- 6.47 The Llangwm electoral division consists of the Communities of Freystrop, Llangwm and Hook and currently has 1,741 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Freystrop would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Llangwm electoral division to 1,744.
- 6.48 The Burton electoral division consists of the Communities of Burton and Rosemarket and currently has 1,459 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Rosemarket would result in a fall in the number of electors in the Burton electoral division to 1,456.
- 6.49 The Camrose electoral division consists of the Communities of Camrose and Nolton & Roch and currently has 1,968 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of Camrose would result in a fall in the number of electors in the Burton electoral division to 1,922.
- 6.50 The Kilgetty / Begelly electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Kilgetty Begelly, currently has 1,084 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Kilgetty Begelly would result in a fall in the number of electors in the Kilgetty / Begelly electoral division to 1,040.
- 6.51 The Amroth electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Amroth, currently has 1,029 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Amroth would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Amroth electoral division to 1,032.

- 6.52 The East Williamston electoral division consists of the Communities of East Williamston and Jeffreyston and currently has 1,899 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of East Williamston would result in a rise in the number of electors in the East Williamston electoral division to 1,940.
- 6.53 The Penally electoral division consists of the Communities of Penally, St. Mary Out Liberty and the Gumfreston Ward of the Community of St. Florence and currently has 1,304 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendment to the boundary of the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty would result in a fall in the number of electors in the Penally electoral division to 1,134.
- 6.54 The Saundersfoot electoral division, which is coterminous with the Community of Saundersfoot, currently has 2,123 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Saundersfoot would result in a rise in the number of electors in the Amroth electoral division to 2,298.
- 6.55 The Tenby: North electoral division, which is coterminous with the Tenby North Ward of the Community of Tenby, currently has 1,685 electors represented by 1 councillor. The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Community of Tenby would result in fall in the number of electors in the Tenby North electoral division to 1,680.
- 6.56 We are of the view that for all of the above electoral divisions the changes to the number of electors as a consequence of the proposed boundary changes are not so significant as, at this time, to require either an increase or a decrease in the number of councillors representing each electoral division. We are currently conducting a review of the electoral arrangements for all principal councils in Wales and will look in detail at the electoral arrangements for the County of Pembrokeshire Council in due course and will take into account any changes that arise from these proposed changes to community boundaries.
- 6.57 We have proposed changes to the boundaries of the Communities of Slebech and Uzmaston and Boulston which crosses the parliamentary constituency boundaries of Preseli Pembrokeshire CC and Carmarthen West and South Pembrokeshire CC. This proposal will be reported to the parliamentary Boundary Commission for Wales in due course.

## **7. RESPONSES TO THIS REPORT**

- 7.1 Having completed our consideration of the review of the community boundaries in the County of Pembrokeshire and submitted our recommendations to the Welsh Assembly Government, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Act.
- 7.2 It now falls to the Welsh Assembly Government, if it thinks fit, to give effect to these proposals either as submitted by the Commission or with modifications, and if the Welsh Assembly Government decides to give effect to these proposals with modifications, it may direct the Commission to conduct a further review.
- 7.3 Any further representations concerning the matters in the report should be addressed to the Welsh Assembly Government. They should be made as soon as possible, and in any event not later than six weeks from the date that the Commission's

recommendations are submitted to the Welsh Assembly Government. Representations should be addressed to:

Democracy Team  
Local Government Policy Division  
Welsh Assembly Government  
Cathays Park  
Cardiff  
CF10 3NQ

**MR P J WOOD (Chairman)**

**REV. HYWEL MEREDYDD DAVIES BD (Deputy Chairman)**

**Mr D J BADER (Member)**

**E H LEWIS BSc. DPM FRSA FCIPD (Secretary)**

**April 2010**

**PEMBROKESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL COMMUNITY REVIEW REPORT  
SUMMARY OF FINAL PROPOSALS**

**Scleddau and Trecwn**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Scleddau and the Community of Trecwn are combined to form a new community with 3 wards, namely Scleddau North, Scleddau South and Trecwn. Each ward will be represented by 3 community councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Scleddau**.

**Castlemartin and Stackpole**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Castlemartin and the Community of Stackpole are combined to form a new community with 2 Wards, namely Stackpole with 5 community councillors and Castlemartin with 2 community councillors. Recommended name of new community is **Stackpole and Castlemartin**.

**Ableston and Spittal**

**Note:** This proposal is being put forward by Pembrokeshire Community Council with the proviso that the Commission '*be requested to consider in depth, and with due weight, the issues of concern which have been expressed by the Communities involved relating to the acknowledged linguistic and cultural differences which exist between those Communities*'.

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Ableston and the Community of Spittal are combined to form a new community with 2 wards, namely Ableston with 3 community councillors and Spittal with 5 community councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Ableston and Spittal**.

**Clunderwen and Llandissilio West**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Clunderwen and the Community of Llandissilio West are combined to form a new community with 2 wards, Clunderwen with 6 community councillors and Llandissilio with 6 community councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Clunderwen and Llandissilio**.

**Dale and Marloes and St. Brides**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Dale and the Community of Marloes and St. Brides are combined to form a new community with 2 wards, Dale with 2 councillors and Marloes with 4 councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Coastlands**. Pembrokeshire County Council considered that further discussion may be necessary in agreeing the name for the proposed new community.

**Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels**

**Note:** This proposal is being put forward by Pembrokeshire County Council with the proviso that the Commission '*be requested to consider in depth, and with due weight, the acknowledged issues which exist relating to the compatibility of the Communities involved*'.

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Herbrandston and the Community of St. Ishmaels are combined to form a new community with 2 wards, Herbrandston with 4 councillors and St. Ishmaels with 5 councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels**.

**Llawhaden and Slebech**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Llawhaden and the Community of Slebech are combined to form a new community with 2 wards, Llawhaden with 6 councillors and Slebech with 2 councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Canaston**. Pembrokeshire County Council considered that further discussion may be necessary in agreeing the name for the proposed new community.

### **Rudbaxton and Haverfordwest**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Rudbaxton and the Community of Haverfordwest to transfer an area of the North Prendergast Ward at Cardigan Road from Rudbaxton into Haverfordwest.

### **Uzmaston & Boulston and Haverfordwest**

Proposed change to the boundary between the Community of Uzmaston and Boulston and the Community of Haverfordwest to transfer an area at Uzmaston Road from Uzmaston & Boulston into Haverfordwest.

### **Rudbaxton and Uzmaston & Boulston**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose that the Community of Rudbaxton and the Community of Uzmaston and Boulston are combined to form a new community with 2 wards, namely Rudbaxton with 9 councillors and Uzmaston with 2 councillors. Proposed name of new community is **Crundale**. Pembrokeshire County Council considered that further discussion may be necessary in agreeing the name for the proposed new community.

### **Llanstadwell and Rosemarket**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Llanstadwell and the Community of Rosemarket to transfer the area of Jordanston / St. Mary's Park from Llanstadwell into Rosemarket.

### **Manordeifi and Cilgerran**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Manordeifi and the Community of Cilgerran to transfer the area of Ponrhydyceirt from Manordeifi into Cilgerran.

### **Kilgetty & Begelly and East Williamston 1 – Kingsmoor Close**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Kilgetty & Begelly and the Community of East Williamston to transfer the area of Kingsmoor Close from Kilgetty & Begelly into East Williamston.

### **Kilgetty & Begelly and East Williamston 2 – Templebar Road**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Kilgetty & Begelly and the Community of East Williamston to transfer the north side of Templebar Road from Kilgetty & Begelly into East Williamston.

### **Llangwm and Freystrop 1 – Little Nash Farm**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Llangwm and the Community of Freystrop to transfer the area of Little Nash Farm from Llangwm into Freystrop.

### **Nevern and Eglwysrwr**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Nevern and the Community of Eglwysrwr to transfer part of the Nevern Ward from Nevern into Eglwysrwr.

### **St. Mary Out Liberty and Saundersfoot 1 - Rushy Lake/Swallowtree/Broadfield**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty and the Community of Saundersfoot to transfer the area of Rushy Lake/Swallowtree/Broadfield from St. Mary Out Liberty into Saundersfoot.

### **St. Mary Out Liberty and Saundersfoot 2 – Devonshire Drive**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty and the Community of Saundersfoot to transfer the area extending along the A478 from Twycross roundabout to the junction with Devonshire Drive meeting the boundary of St. Florence Community from Saundersfoot into St. Mary Out Liberty.

### **Camrose and Haverfordwest**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Camrose and the Community of Haverfordwest to transfer a small part of Haven Road and Douglas James Close from Camrose into Haverfordwest.

### **Cilgerran and Eglwysrwr 1 – Meigan Wells**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Cilgerran and the Community of Eglwysrwr to transfer a small area of Bridell Ward near Meigan Wells from Cilgerran into Eglwysrwr.

### **Cilgerran and Eglwysrwr 2 – Rhos fach**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Cilgerran and the Community of Eglwysrwr to transfer a small area of Bridell Ward at Rhos fach, south of Llantood Farm from Cilgerran into Eglwysrwr.

### **Puncheston and Eglwysrwr**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Puncheston and the Community of Eglwysrwr to transfer a small area of the Community of Eglwysrwr into the Community of Puncheston.

### **Freystrop and Hook**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Freystrop and the Community of Hook to transfer the part of Hook settlement currently in Freystrop into the Community of Hook.

### **Hundleton and Angle**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Hundleton and the Community of Angle to transfer the Rhoscrowther Ward of the Community of Hundleton into the Community of Angle.

### **Kilgetty & Begelly and Amroth**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Kilgetty & Begelly and the Community of Amroth to transfer a small area at Stepside from Kilgetty & Begelly into Amroth.

### **Mathry and Llanrhian**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Mathry and the Community of Llanrhian to transfer part of the settlement of Square and Compass from Mathry into Llanrhian.

### **Nolton & Roch and Camrose**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Nolton & Roch and the Community of Camrose to transfer Courtfield Drive, Simpson Cross from Nolton & Roch into Camrose.

### **Rosemarket and Burton**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Rosemarket and the Community of Burton to transfer a small area at Sardis from Rosemarket into Burton.

### **Rosemarket and Freystrop**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Rosemarket and the Community of Freystrop to transfer a small area at Troopers Inn from Rosemarket into Freystrop.

### **St. Mary Out Liberty and Tenby**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of St. Mary Out Liberty and the Community of Tenby to transfer the area of Waterwynch from Tenby into St. Mary Out Liberty.

### **Tiers Cross and Johnston**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Tiers Cross and the Community of Johnston to transfer an area at Milford Road from Tiers Cross into Johnston.

### **Crymych and Eglwysrwr**

Pembrokeshire County Council propose a change to the boundary between the Community of Crymych and the Community of Eglwysrwr to transfer part of the Eglwyswen and Nant Gwyn Wards from Crymych into Eglwysrwr.

## Summary of Representations received in response to Pembrokeshire Community Review

**Ableston Community Council** wrote to oppose the proposed merger of Ableston and Spittal for the following reasons:

- There are clear linguistic and cultural differences between the two communities. The 'Landsker' line divides the two communities, with Ableston being predominantly Welsh and Spittal being predominantly English. To lose any part of the Welshness within the new larger community would be devastating;
- Representation for Ableston would be reduced by 50%, from six to three councillors;
- There would be increased expense due to additional travel required for community councillors;
- The Aberystwyth University Research Study, 'Role, Function and Future Potential of Community and Town Councils in Wales', studied both Ableston and Spittal Community Councils as part of the study. It concluded that Ableston was small but efficient and active and made no recommendation to merge the two Community Councils.

**Cilgerran Community Council** wrote to approve of the proposed change of moving the Ponrhydyceirt area of Manordeifi to Cilgerran for the following reasons:

- The children from the area currently attend Cilgerran school;
- The residents would have free access to the wildlife Centre and Castle;
- The residents would receive free copies of the local Corwg magazine;
- The residents' postal addresses are Cilgerran, which would make it easier for emergency and postal/delivery services;
- Ponrhydyceirt has historically been associated with Cilgerran and Llwynceilyn in all development plans;
- The residents will be able to attend a closer polling station.

**Clunderwen Community Council** wrote to oppose the proposed merger with Llandissilio Community Council. They provided a copy of their representations to the County Council, a summary of which follows:

It is the view of the Community Council that the proposal would not lead to effective and convenient local government but would be detrimental to all electors within their community. They believe the Community Council offers an effective and convenient role within local government and provides good value for money and an excellent service. An amalgamated Community Council, in their view, would be 'unwieldy and unmanageable' serving a very large rural area which would be difficult to serve in an efficient or convenient manner. They also provided a list of objections, which were as follows:

- The electorate is due to increase by 54 electors and further increases from uncompleted developments/land will increase the electorate further by 2012;
- There are no shared amenities between the communities. Clunderwen has a hall and playing fields in frequent use by its electorate. Llandissilio premises are owned by the County Council;
- The current precept is £12.86 for Clunderwen and £7.10 for Llandissilio, which would result in funding of 65% to 35% funding in a joint community;
- Clunderwen Community Council is very involved in providing support and funding for local organisations in the community. These organisations would be unable to function without their level of support;

- The proposed change in councillors would result in disproportionate representation between the two communities;
- A Clerk would be made redundant.

**Crymych Community Council** wrote to express their opposition to the recommended change of part of their community to Eglwysrw Community Council. They were concerned that as there is no mention of transfer of councillors in the proposal that the residents in the area concerned would lose their representation. They consider that the 95 households is a very substantial number and that it would be impractical geographically to include them in Eglwysrw. They state that the Community Council is a trustee of the Beni Edwards Fund – a charitable fund which distributes money annually to the young people of the Eglwyswen Parish – and the change would have a detrimental affect on the administration of the fund as it requires local knowledge of the councillors in the community. They were also concerned about the lack of consultation on the issue.

**Herbrandston Community Council** opposed the proposed merger of the Communities of Herbrandston and St. Ishmaels. They pointed out that a larger merged community council would mean an increased workload requiring the payment of wages for the council clerk and travelling expenses for the members resulting in a significant increase in costs compared with the existing arrangements. The existing Community Councils had different levels of precepts and different expenditure commitments and if the two were merged there would be a conflict in expenditure policies to the detriment of either one or the other community. They considered that a merger would not result in an improvement in the way residents were served by their community council when decisions may be imposed on them by a majority from a neighbouring village. In a small village it is important that the village is seen to run its own business affairs. The two villages have no affinity with each other and are separated by a sea creek which can only be crossed twice a day when the tide is out, the alternative road route being seven miles and partly outside both communities.

The Council enclosed correspondence they had received from local residents objecting to the proposed merger together with a petition of 205 signatures.

**Kilgetty Begelly Community Council** wrote to oppose the proposed transfer of Kingsmoor Close to East Williamston Community Council. The Council considered that the existing boundary, formed by the road and railway line, provided a good natural boundary. They were also concerned that the residents affected had not been consulted. They have asked the residents and they have been informed that they wish to remain within the Kilgetty Begelly boundary.

**Llanstadwell Community Council** wrote to oppose the proposed transfer of Jordanston/St Mary's Park to Rosemarket. They state the following reasons for their opposition:

- That the residents strongly oppose the change;
- The communities, although geographically close, are isolated from each other by a tidal tributary of Milford Haven, running through a steep sided valley, with a corridor of outstanding natural beauty. This natural boundary has separated the communities since 1536;
- The loss of the area would have a significant impact on the Llanstadwell community as they are active and supportive in community affairs, particularly the Jordanston Residents (Community) Association;
- The proposed boundary will split several farms;

- Rosemarket Communities assertion that Rosemarket provide facilities for St Mary's Park (Jordanston) is misleading;
- Rosemarket is a village. St. Mary's Park is rural, typical of the wider Llanstadwell Community;
- Travel to Rosemarket is difficult and has not been developed to any extent;
- They enclosed a survey of local residents preference – 6 supported the change (11%), 43 opposed (78%) and 6 had no preference (11%).

**Manordeifi Community Council** wrote to strongly oppose and object to the proposed transfer of the Ponrhydyceirt area of Manordeifi to Cilgerran. The reasons have been sent in a number of submissions to the County Council and are primarily based upon the canvassed view of the 'vast majority' of the residents' opposition to the transfer. Pembrokeshire County Council provided us with a summary of the representations they received. These are summarised as follows:

- Councillor Alan Wilson has represented Ponrhydyceirt for 26 years and at no time had the community of Ponrhydyceirt felt part of Llwynceilyn or Cilgerran;
- The hamlet received its own name plate 12 years ago and are very proud of this. It is felt a transfer to Cilgerran would undermine their individuals identity which is very important to them;
- Residents feel the Manordeifi Community Council represents them well and dealt with their issue fairly;
- Proportionately, the community felt that remaining with Manordeifi provided a better sized community for them. They felt that they would become lost in the larger community of Cilgerran and their needs would not be listened to in the same manner that they had experienced under the auspices of Manordeifi;
- There was no affinity with Cilgerran through school attendance. At present there are four children in Ponrhydyceirt. Cilgerran School is an area school and, due to local school closures, has children from all over the area. Children in the Manordeifi community attend schools in Pembrokeshire, Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion and as such there was no close affinity with Cilgerran school;
- Distance from a polling station was not a valid argument as people in rural areas are expected to travel to a polling station;
- Ponrhydyceirt comprises of 15 households with 30 electors. Each household was surveyed when the proposal was first suggested. 73% (11) of the households responded and 53% (8) indicated they wished to remain in Manordeifi;
- Emergency service provision is a non-argument as the emergency services do not use community boundaries to locate households;
- The proposal would impose a minor penalty on the residents of Ponrhydyceirt as they would experience an increase in Council Tax of £5-6 per annum;
- The changes to the precept would have a greater impact on the residents of Manordeifi, as they would have to pay higher charges to meet the deficit;
- Residents of Ponrhydyceirt already receive free copies of Corwg magazine;
- Ponrhydyceirt community considered that Cilgerran felt urban in nature compared to their rural community.

**Marloes & St. Brides Community Council** wrote firstly to thank the Commission for the opportunity to meet with them. The Community Council are 'totally opposed' to the proposed amalgamation with Dale Community Council. They offered the following observations:

- Due to the demands of the post of Clerk for the proposed Community Council, and the fact that the Dale Community Council Clerk does not claim any payment, there

will be an increase in costs. In addition, Community Councillors in the new Community Council may claim expenses for their travel;

- An imbalance of councillors in the proposed Community Council would place a heavy burden on Dale Councillors;
- The two communities have very distinct identities which must be respected;
- It is presently difficult for the present councillors to make effective representation on internal and external bodies. Reducing the area and increasing the coverage for councillors in the area will increase this difficulty;
- The Community Council considers that it currently offers an efficient service to the Marloes and St. Brides community; have demonstrated sound political and financial management; can undertake large local projects at minimal cost to the community; can influence policy at County level; and, dispute the contention that a new council will be more efficient and convenient than what is already presently offered.

**Nevern Community Council** wrote to oppose the transfer of part of their historic community to Eglwysrwr. They were concerned about the lack of consultation on the issue.

**Slebech Community Council** wrote to totally oppose the proposed amalgamation with Llawhaden for the following reasons:

- Slebech will lose its identity as a very old community which includes the Knight of St Johns Slebech which was the formation of the St Johns Ambulance service. To lose the historic parish name is unacceptable, and the name of Canaston is not a recognised area and the wooded area it relates to is actually outside both communities.
- There is a 'radical difference in the way the communities operate'. Slebech has formed the Rhos and District Association which is a self-sufficient charity which provides social and community functions which is administered by the Community Council. Llawhaden use their precept to carry out social functions which are at odds with the requirements of our community'.
- Llawhaden is predominantly rural, whereas the majority of Slebech is within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park and has a different planning and development authority. Population of Slebech is small due to restricted development control but the area has large businesses in the industrial park and has a large tourist development. It would be difficult for councillors outside the area to administer as it requires expertise of planning of a different authority which is very time-consuming, particularly if Slebech were to have two councillors..
- Slebech precept is £3.61 per person as opposed to £8.80 in Llawhaden. Slebech Community Council is cheap and effective.
- They suggested if amalgamation were required then it should be done with either Uzmaston or Wiston as there are social ties with these areas, as well as similar planning constraints. The fact they are in different parliamentary constituencies should not be a constraint as they believe 'politics is flexible enough to support the need of residents rather than follow some arbitrary political line'.

**St Mary Out Liberty Community Council** wrote to strongly oppose the proposed boundary change to Saundersfoot Town Council. The Council feel 'the magnitude of the proposed changes will seriously endanger the existence' of their community.

However, they are not opposed to change and did suggest that certain areas of the change would be acceptable. They did accept that Swallow Tree, Nyth Gwennol and

Cwm Gwennol may be better served as being part of Saundersfoot. They feel that the area from Rushy Lake, Broadfield Hill and Broadfield should remain in St Mary Out Liberty as the people wish to stay and they use the local facilities, inc. Post Office, mini market, public houses, garage and village hall.

They believe the proposed change would have a devastating effect upon the community and make it most difficult to exist in the 'vibrant manner' it has done for the electorate. They state the 'vast majority' of people living in the area concerned are happy with the present situation. They provided supplementary evidence in the form of:

- i. Their submission to the County Council;
- ii. Letters from Mr & Mrs Williams, Joan Ayling (see below) and Cllr Carol Cavil (see below) to the County Council;
- iii. A petition in opposition to the changes by 154 residents of St Mary Out Liberty;
- iv. A survey of residents with all 48 respondents wishing to remain in St Mary Out Liberty.

**Uzmaston and Boulston Community Council** strongly opposed the proposed transfer of Uzmaston Road to Haverfordwest Town Council. They affirm that their core residents are being moved and they wished to remain as they are. They are presently undertaking a regeneration project which would knit the community even closer and the proposed change puts this in jeopardy. They enclosed letters from several residents of Uzmaston and Boulston and a petition of strong objection signed by 210 people.

**Stephen Crabb MP** wrote to express his concern at the proposed amalgamation of Ambleston and Spittal. The Clerks of the two Community Councils provided him with their arguments about why the Community Councils should remain as they are and he agreed with their views and the concerns raised. Mr Crabb is aware the two communities are 'very diverse' with 'differing demands, needs and cultures' which he believes are best represented by those who are elected to serve those communities. He is also concerned that because Spittal is a growing community there will be an increase in demand in the Community Councils activity to represent the concerns of that community.

He also wrote to express his concern at the amalgamation of Dale and Marloes & St Brides. A number of constituents have provided him with their arguments about why the Community Councils should remain as they are and he agrees with their views and the concerns raised. Mr Crabb is aware the two communities are 'very diverse' with 'differing demands, needs and cultures' which he believes are best represented by those who are elected to serve those communities.

In a further representation Mr Crabb expressed his concern at the proposed mergers of communities that have differing demands, needs and cultures and which were best represented by those elected to serve their immediate communities.

**Paul Davies AM** wrote to oppose the proposed amalgamation of Ambleston and Spittal. Mr Davies has been contacted by both Community Councils whom have expressed strong opposition to the amalgamation. It is his opinion that the proposed reduction in Community Councillors together with the unwanted proposal will not aid effective and convenient local government; he believes the opposite to be true. He considers that the proposal will alienate both communities, and urges us to keep the two Community Councils separate.

He also wrote to oppose the proposal to amalgamate Herbrandston and St Ishmaels. He notes that the County Council have requested that the Commission "consider in depth,

and with due weight, the acknowledged issues which exist relating to the compatibility of the Communities involved” and endorses this comment.

Mr Davies feels the communities have little in common and are totally separate entities. He considers that Herbrandston by its geographical position has very close links to Milford Haven, whilst St Ishmaels is far more rural and very different. He is also concerned about the effect of the recommended reduction in community councillors on local democracy.

**Cllr David Howlett** said that as the County Councillor for the electoral division covering both Ambleston and Spittal he was well placed to comment on the proposed amalgamation and was strongly opposed to it. The existing arrangements worked well because councillors for each community were well known to residents and have a vast amount of local knowledge of their respective areas. If the Communities were merged then councillors may have to make decisions on areas for which they had no knowledge. The residents of Ambleston and Spittal did not travel through each others Communities and therefore had little contact with each other. He pointed out that no one was in favour of the proposed amalgamation. He enclosed copies of several letters from residents of Ambleston and Spittal to Pembrokeshire County Council objecting to the proposed merger.

**Councillor David Bryan** wrote to oppose the proposal to transfer part of the Uzmaston and Boulston Community to Haverfordwest, as a councillor for an adjoining ward and a resident affected. Cllr Bryan does not consider that there would be any saving to be made and is concerned that there would be a ‘vast increase’ in precept without any extra services. He also questioned the merger with the Community of Rudbaxton as there is no obvious link between the two communities and there would only be a minor role for Uzmaston councillors in the proposed merged community council.

**Councillor Carol Cavill** wrote to express her concerns about the proposed changes to the boundary of St Mary Out Liberty and Saundersfoot. Cllr Cavill conceded that Cwm Gwennol, Nyth Gwennol and Swallowtree appeared to belong to Saundersfoot but considered that Broadfield Hill and Rushy Lake should remain in St Mary Out Liberty as the residents use the Post Office, shop garage, cash point, newsagents, attend functions at the village hall. Some residents were concerned they may not be able to partake in community events which they currently participate in.

She also points out that St Mary Out Liberty Community Council, in conjunction with the County Council, has created a footpath to this area which may not have been supported if the area was part of Saundersfoot. She also notes that due to the increase in visitors during the holiday season, community facilities are used more frequently and a smaller community may not have the resources to cope with their needs.

**Councillor Ian Gollop** wrote to oppose the proposed change of part of Nevern to Eglwysrwrw Community Council. He was concerned about the lack of consultation with the residents over this issue.

**Councillor Richard Hancock** wrote to oppose to the proposed amalgamation of Rudbaxton Community Council and Uzmaston & Boulston Community Council. He considered that the process was flawed and there had been a lack of consultation on the proposals. He argues that residents of Uzmaston and Boulston consider themselves to be a rural community and they do not receive, or expect to receive, services in an urban area. He notes that the precept for the Uzmaston and Boulston Community Council is

one of the smallest in the county, thus it is difficult to justify the changes on the basis of cost.

He enclosed 9 pieces of correspondence he had received concerning the proposed changes.

**Jordanston Community Association** wrote to strongly oppose to the proposed transfer of Jordanston (in Llanstadwell) to Rosemarket. They enclosed 58 proformas returned by residents. They gave the following reasons to remain in the Llanstadwell Community Council:

- The majority of residents of Jordanston do not wish to be transferred to Rosemarket;
- Jordanston comprising scattered rural settlements is totally disparate to the minor urban conurbation of Rosemarket;
- Jordanston is an historic part of the long established rural community of Llanstadwell wherein strong links have been developed;
- The proportion of electors to transfer represents 10% of the Llanstadwell Community;
- National geographic features already exist as the boundary of the Llanstadwell Community;
- The proposed boundary splits a farm into two communities – Norton Farm (on the far south east of the boundary), owned by Richard Hayman, claims his farm is split by the boundary;
- There are only two roads to Rosemarket, both of which are narrow and dangerous. Pedestrians do not use them and motor vehicles only use them when necessary;
- There are no general commerce outlets in Rosemarket to draw residents;
- The children do not attend school in Rosemarket
- Residents do not regularly spend their leisure time in Rosemarket;
- Religious worship is not centred upon the church in Rosemarket.

**A resident of Marloes** wrote to oppose the restructuring with the Dale Community. He stated that the three communities are quite dissimilar in geographical nature, preoccupation and expectation and 'deserve the effective representation which they have hitherto received'. He considered the change would be a step in the wrong direction and raised concerns about the reduction of councillors. He is also concerned that no reasons have been given for the proposal.

**A resident of Herbrandston** wrote to strongly oppose the proposed amalgamation with St Ishmaels. The two communities are separated by a tidal estuary and there has been heated rivalry between the two on the sports field for forty years. He stated that the people of Herbrandston have no interest in the affairs of St Ishmaels. Any council meeting time spent on those matters would be time wasted for Herbrandston members, and visa versa. Indeed, any involvement by one party in the affairs of the other would probably be seen as totally unwarranted interference.

**A resident of St Mary Out Liberty** wrote to oppose the proposed boundary to Saundersfoot change for historical reasons and due to the loss of precept and its detrimental impact on the community. She believes the community is 'happy and healthy' with its own 'special facilities' for both residents and visitors in its present format.

**A resident of Swallow Tree** wrote to oppose the proposed change of St Mary Out Liberty to Saundersfoot as he believed it would increase the Council Tax with no advantage to the residents [of Saundersfoot].

**A resident of St Mary Out Liberty** wrote to oppose the proposed changes to Saundersfoot. He stated that the St. Mary Out Liberty's Community Council is an 'exceptionally vibrant body of people'. He noted that a house to house survey was undertaken of the proposed area to be transferred and, with the exception of Cwm Gwennol Street, the response was 'overwhelmingly' to remain in St Mary Out Liberty. He stated that people living in the affected area feared that they would be marginalised and noted the success the Community Council had achieved in improving road safety and provision of a footpath in this area which may not have been done if they were on the outskirts of another Community Council. He also stated that the priorities of Tenby and Saundersfoot were of tourism and leisure and that St Mary Out Liberty's were residential and agricultural. He believes that the transfer of Devonshire Drive to St Mary Out Liberty would be a 'drain on the lifeblood and enthusiasm' in the current area. He is concerned that no reason has been given for the change but the status quo is 'well balances and importantly, works well'.

**A resident of St Mary Out Liberty** wrote to oppose any changes to St Mary Out Liberty. They thought that this issue had been resolved three years ago and were opposed to anything that would disrupt the harmony of the residents within the boundary of St Mary Out Liberty.

**A resident of New Hedges** wrote to oppose the changes of St Mary Out Liberty. They considered themselves part of a close knit community and does not want to be added to the outskirts of the two larger communities. She believes they should maintain their independence as their rural residential are has different needs to Tenby and Saundersfoot. She is also concerned that if the proposed changes are made then in a future review the new smaller community will be scrapped all together. She enclosed a petition against the change by 150 residents.

**A resident of St Mary Out Liberty** wrote to oppose the proposed boundary change for historical reasons and due to the loss of precept and its detrimental impact on the community. She believes the community is 'happy and healthy' in its present format.

**A resident of New Hedges** wrote to oppose the proposed boundary change for historical reasons. She believes the community is 'happy and healthy' with its own 'special facilities' for both residents and visitors in its present format.

**A resident of Broadfield** wrote to oppose the change. They have been most impressed by the 'enthusiastic dedication of the hard working councillors to all the community issues'. They are convinced that if the proposal is made the residents 'would see a dramatic deterioration in all aspects of village life' and the Council Tax would also increase.

**A resident of Haverfordwest** wrote to raise their concerns about the proposal to move an area of Rudbaxton (Cardigan Road) to Haverfordwest Town Council. They complain about the lack of consultation on the issue and raise concerns about increases in Council Tax.

**A resident of Dunsany Park** wrote to oppose to the proposed changes of her community to Haverfordwest Town Council. Angela considers herself to be part of a rural community based around the Uzmaston church. She supports and participates in community activities and they are 'raising funds to make the church hall more user friendly to ensure it is at the heart of the community'. She feels there is a true sense of togetherness in the area and the boundary changes 'would take the heart out of our

community'. She also raises concerns that many in the area are on low incomes and the four to five fold increase in precept would be difficult. In addition, Angela believes the merger with Rudbaxton as incomprehensible as the communities are only linked via a road through Haverfordwest.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote to strongly object to the proposal to move his road to Haverfordwest Town Council. He considered the area was well served by the 'efficient, small, active, low key community council' and suggested the Town Council is 'largely ineffective', thus he would incur additional cost with no benefit.

**A resident of Cartlett** wrote to oppose the proposed change to Haverfordwest Town Council. Helen feels part of the countryside, not the town. She also complains about the lack of consultation on the issue.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote to 'violently' oppose the change because of an historic association of the Dunsany Estate with Uzmaston. He also complains about the lack of consultation on the issue and increase in rates and tax.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote and emailed to object to the proposed amendment. He complained about the lack of consultation with the Community Council and himself by the local councillor (at the time of the initial proposal). They considered their property to be rural because: the dwelling is surrounded by fields on all sides; the nearest neighbour is 100m away; the property is outside the 30mph zone; there are no street lights or pavements; it is on the rural post service and refuse collection route; connected to overhead electricity lines and subject to short outages; there are no salting of the roads during poor weather conditions; farm animals are moved on the road; and, the road is busy when the farmer is transporting silage or harvesting.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote to oppose the proposals. She complained about the lack of consultation on the process and asked the reasoning behind the decision. She was also concerned about the impact on tourism on the 'country market town' of Haverfordwest developing into a 'large urban area'. She also had concerns about a possible increase in council tax and questions what extra services she will receive.

**A resident of Dunsany Park** wrote to oppose the proposals. They feel that they are part of a small, caring community with good community spirit. They cannot recall any community events in Haverfordwest and would like to remain as part of a small community rather than part of the town where people keep themselves to themselves.

**A resident of Boulston** wrote to oppose the boundary changes as they have a very strong and friendly community, linked to the church.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote to strongly oppose the proposed changes. He stated that by adding the three park estates to the Uzmaston and Boulston Community new life was generated in the community; to remove these would deprive Uzmaston of its heart and support. In addition, to link Uzmaston with Crundale (Rudbaxton) would be 'at variance with the aspirations of the people' and notes that it would be necessary to drive through Haverfordwest to get to Crundale. He does not believe Crundale has a 'focal point' and there is existing friction there which would be exacerbated by joining Uzmaston with them. He suggests joining Uzmaston with Slebech as an alternative, as it will reinforce the community.

**A resident of Clover Park** wrote to strongly oppose the proposed change. They raise concerns about the increase in precept and what it contributes to in Haverfordwest.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote to express their concern with the proposed changes. They are active members of the parish church and feel part of the community. As a community they meet regularly and are working hard to upgrade the church hall to further increase local community events. They believe that moving the areas concerned to Haverfordwest would 'seriously damage the community ethos'. They are also concerned about the loss of representation on the County Council as the changes would 'remove our autonomous nature and reduce our community voice'.

**A resident of Cartlett** wrote to strongly oppose the change. They believe that they are part of a community with a strong spirit and are concerned that in a larger community their needs will not be represented as strongly. They note that they are outside of the 'town limits' and their services are those of rural areas and a change to the town would result in an increase in rates. They also complain about the lack of consultation on the issue. In further correspondence, they state that it does not make sense to amalgamate Rudbaxton with Uzmaston and Boulston as it is a large community at the other end of Haverfordwest, across the other side of the valley.

**A resident of Uzmaston Road** wrote to convey her concerns over the proposals. She complained that local residents have not been consulted. She feels there is a 'striving local community based around Uzmaston' and provides an example of here the community gathered together to oppose a Tetra mast which Haverfordwest residents took no part in. She also questioned why, if they are part of Haverfordwest, there is no town bus service. In correspondence with her county councillor she also raises concerns about increases in community charges and questions the relationship between Boulston and Crundale.

**A resident of Creamston Road**, resident in the present Uzmaston and Boulston Community, wrote to comment on the 'rural' services she presently receives and questioned if these services would improve and if her council tax would increase.

**A Style Park resident** wrote to strongly oppose to the proposed changes. They have connections with the church in Uzmaston and join in with community activities. They also raise concerns about the lack of consultation. They also claim they will not take part in any further local elections if they are transferred to Haverfordwest.

**A resident of Felindre Farchog** wrote to oppose the proposed change of an area of Nevern to Eglwysrwrw Community Council. She was also concerned at the lack of consultation on this issue. We received a further 41 identical responses.

**A resident of Brynberian** wrote to oppose the proposed change of an area of Nevern to Eglwysrwrw Community Council. They are also concerned at the lack of consultation on this issue. We received a further 15 identical responses.

**A resident of Moylegrove** wrote to strongly oppose the proposed change of an area of Nevern to Eglwysrwrw Community Council. They are also concerned about the lack of consultation.