

From: Charles Gauntlett [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 April 2018 17:21
To: reviews
Cc: Bill Acraman
Subject: Crawley Boundary Review Consultation Response
Attachments: CrawleyBoundaryReview_Report.docx; Crawley scheme.xlsx; WSCC proposal for Crawley review - shaded areas moved out of existing neighbourhoods wards.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to set out a proposed warding scheme that is being strongly recommended by West Sussex County Council. I attach a report that sets out the proposal and rationale, a supporting map and a supporting spreadsheet that sets out the proposed warding arrangements, which we believe meets the Commission's criteria of strong electoral equality, good community identity and convenient local government.

Please note that Duncan Crow, a member of our electoral review panel, will be submitting further evidence in support of this scheme.

Yours faithfully,
Charles Gauntlett
Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support
West Sussex County Council

[Charles Gauntlett](#) | Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, Democratic Services Unit, [West Sussex County Council](#) | Location: [REDACTED]

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

Governance Committee

March 2018

Part I

Crawley Borough Council Boundary Review

Report by Director of Law and Assurance

Electoral Divisions: All in Crawley

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is consulting on future warding arrangements for Crawley Borough Council, based on 36 members. Draft warding arrangements are invited that provide good levels of projected electoral equality and recognise clear local boundaries and community identity.

The Electoral Review Panel met on 9 March 2018 to consider possible schemes. It recommends that a 13 ward scheme be agreed as a submission to the Commission.

Recommendation

That the proposed scheme be approved for submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is conducting an electoral boundary review of Crawley Borough Council, due to a high level of electoral inequality in certain wards at present.
- 1.2 The County Council is a consultee on boundary reviews and is able to respond to the Commission's consultation on a possible warding arrangement that will deliver better electoral equality, while seeking to recognise the strong neighbourhood arrangements in Crawley. The consultation document is included at appendix 3.
- 1.3 The Commission has indicated that it prefers a Council size of 36 members going forward, one less than at present. It has noted the Council's desire to retain elections in thirds, so is inviting warding schemes with an assumption of 12 wards, each with three members.
- 1.4 Crawley Borough Council is working on a warding scheme, but did not formally consult the County Council on any preferred scheme because of the timing of meetings.

1.5 The County Council's Electoral Review Panel, an advisory panel to the Governance Committee, considered possible schemes at Crawley Library on 9 March. The Panel comprised: Mr Acraman (Chairman), Mr Boram, Mr Crow, Dr Dennis, Mr Jones, Mr Marshall, Mr Mitchell, Mr SJ Oakley and Mr Waight.

2. Proposal

2.1 The County Council wishes to emphasise the strong neighbourhood boundary arrangements in Crawley. Each neighbourhood has its own strong identity, including shopping parades and other local amenities. Strong boundaries exist through roads, parks and railway lines, which gives each neighbourhood a distinct feeling. It also wishes to emphasise the importance of having boundaries that match the County Council divisions as far as possible.

2.2 The Electoral Review Panel considered a number of possible schemes that had been developed and concluded that a 12 ward scheme with three members in each ward would divide many of the existing neighbourhoods and should not therefore be taken forward. It was considered that by having 13 wards, comprising 10 wards of three members and 3 wards of two members, a good electoral equality can be achieved that can largely maintain ward boundaries along the strong neighbourhood boundaries.

2.3 The County Council recommends a scheme based on 13 wards. The recommended scheme is attached as a map at appendix 1 and a spreadsheet demonstrating electoral equality at appendix 2. This scheme sees five existing wards unchanged:

- Furnace Green (2 members)
- Maidenbower (3 members)
- Pound Hill North & Forge Wood (3 members), the change of name is simply intended to acknowledge the new Forge Wood neighbourhood.
- Pound Hill South & Worth (3 members)
- Tilgate (2 members)

2.4 There are changes to the other 8 proposed wards, but most of these are very minor to allow for better projected electoral equality in 2022:

- Bewbush and North Broadfield (3 members) – It is proposed to unite Bewbush with two housing estates in north Broadfield. This will improve electoral equality in Broadfield. The two housing estates have good links to Bewbush through roundabouts and an underpass to provide another good connection.
- Broadfield (3 members) – Most residents of Broadfield would be in this ward, which largely combines the existing north and south wards. It would mean that one northern area is transferred to Bewbush to improve electoral equality.
- Gossops Green (2 members) – This would match the existing ward and neighbourhood with the exception of adding a small number of electors from the far east of Bewbush to the ward to improve electoral equality. This would use Mobray Drive as a good boundary.

- Ifield (3 members) – It is proposed that this ward match the Ifield neighbourhood, so would take in the Orchards estate which, while part of Ifield, is currently in Langley Green Ward.
- Langley Green & Tushmore (3 members) – This sees the entire neighbourhood of Langley Green being retained in one ward, with the Orchards Estate being transferred to Ifield, where it belongs in neighbourhood terms. It also proposes that the Tushmore area adjacent be brought into the ward and recognised as such in the name, to improve electoral equality.
- Northgate & West Green (3 members) – this covers two existing wards and neighbourhoods, which allows the two neighbourhoods to retain their identities. This is very similar to the existing County Council division. In order to maintain electoral equality, it is proposed that the Tushmore area be transferred to Langley Green and the new developments in the town centre be transferred to Three Bridges.
- Southgate (3 members) – The current ward which reflects the current neighbourhood is retained, with the addition of electors from a major new development around the railway station, using Station Way, a major road, as a new northern boundary to the ward.
- Three Bridges (3 members) – The current ward which reflects the current neighbourhood is retained, with the addition of future electors from new developments in the town centre, which neighbour the existing Three Bridges ward. It was felt that the Tinsley Lane area formed a natural part of Three Bridges and its residents strongly felt part of Three Bridges.

2.5 The County Council strongly supports the proposed scheme, but asks the Commission to consider if it is possible to maintain the existing boundaries between Bewbush and Gossops Green in the interests of strong community identity over electoral equality.

2.6 The Electoral Review Panel agreed this scheme by majority. Mr Jones asked it to be recorded that that he did not support this scheme. Mrs Mullins, a member of Governance Committee, has asked that it also be recorded that she did not support the scheme.

3. Resources

3.1 None.

Factors taken into account

4. Consultation

4.1 All County Councillors in the Crawley area were invited to take part in the Electoral Review Panel's consideration. A number of borough councillors asked to attend the Panel's meeting and these requests were agreed by the Panel Chairman.

5. Risk Management Implications

5.1 None as the report is a response to a consultation by an external organisation.

6. Other Options Considered

6.1 The County Council does not have to respond at this initial stage of the consultation, but the risk of not responding at this stage would mean that the chance to promote good levels of co-terminosity with the County Council's divisions is maximised.

7. Equality Duty

7.1 An Equality Impact Report is not required for this decision because it is a response to a consultation by an external organisation.

8. Social Value

8.1 None.

9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

9.1 None.

10. Human Rights Implications

10.1 None.

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

Contact: [REDACTED]

- Appendices:**
- 1. Map of proposed warding scheme.
 - 2. Spreadsheet of electorate figures
 - 3. Consultation Document

Background Papers:
Notes of a meeting of the Electoral Review Panel held on Friday 9 March 2018 at Crawley Library

Agreed Chairman Date..... <hr/>

Action Authorised

.....

Director of Law and Assurance

Date.....

West Sussex County Council Scheme

Bewbush projected for existing ward	6487	
less east Mowbray Dr, Tussock Close	184	
less Burbeach Close and Lulworth Close	101	
add Channel Islands area	486	
add flat roof area	985	
Bewbush and North Broadfield	7673	8.56
Broadfield projection for existing North and south	9209	
less Channel Islands area	486	
less flat roof area	985	
Broadfield	7738	9.48
Furnace Green No change	4532	-3.82
Gossops Green projected for existing ward	3980	
add east Mowbray Dr, Tussock Close	184	
add Burbeach Close and Lulworth Close	101	
Gossops Green	4265	-9.49
Ifield projected for existing ward	6975	
add the Orchards	315	
Ifield	7290	3.14
Langley Green projected for existing ward	5865	
less the orchards	315	
plus Tushmore Lane area	501	
plus Windmill Court and Longmere Road	229	
add London Road south of Tushmore roundabout	131	
less Bothorpe House	22	
Langley Green and Tushmore	6389	-9.61
Maidenbower No change	6684	-5.43
Northgate and West Green projected for existing wards	9202	
less Windmill Court and Longmere Road	229	
less south side Station Way	299	
less Town Hall and county buildings	331	
less Tushmore Lane area	501	
less London Road south of Tushmore roundabout	131	
Northgate and West Green	7711	9.10
Pound Hill North and Forge Wood No Change	7379	4.40
Pound Hill South and Worth No Change	6474	-8.40
Southgate projected for existing ward	6844	
add station way southside from Northgate	299	
Southgate	7143	1.06
Three Bridges projected for existing ward	6460	
plus county buildings and town hall from Northgate	331	
add Bowthorpe House	22	
Three Bridges	6813	-3.61
Tilgate No Change	4710	-0.04
	84801	

THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND
 PERIODIC ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CRAWLEY
 Final Recommendations for Ward Boundaries in Crawley
 July 2002



This map is reproduced from the OS map by The Electoral Commission with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Licence Number: GD601160