

**Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 251**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 251

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton GCB KBE

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin QC

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank

Professor Michael Chisholm

Mr R R Thornton CB DL

Sir Andrew Wheatley CBE

To the Rt Hon Merlyn Rees, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS
FOR THE ADUR DISTRICT OF WEST SUSSEX

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the district of Adur, in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that district.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 31 December 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to Adur District Council, copies of which were circulated to West Sussex County Council, Parish Council and Parish Meetings in the district, the Member of Parliament for the constituency concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of the local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.
3. Adur District Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the Council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The Council have passed a resolution under section 7(4)(b) of the 1972 Act, requesting a system of elections by thirds.

5. On 12 June 1975, Adur District Council presented their draft scheme of representation. They proposed to divide the area of the district into 13 wards each returning 3 members to form a council of 39.

6. We considered the draft scheme submitted by the District Council, the comments which had been made upon it and an alternative scheme which had been submitted. We noted that the Council's scheme complied with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines set out in our Report No 6. We decided to adopt it as the basis of our draft proposals but in the light of the comments which we had received, we made two modifications. We divided the Council's 3-member Marine ward into a 2-member Marine ward covering the Shoreham Beach area and a single member St Mary's ward covering the remainder. We changed the name of the proposed Sompting ward to Peverel. Subject to these modifications and to minor boundary realignments suggested to us by Ordnance Survey, we adopted the Council's draft scheme as our draft proposals.

7. On 9 July 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the District Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make the draft proposals and the accompanying map, which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked for comments to reach us by 10 September 1976.

8. The District Council objected to the sub-division of their 3-member Marine ward and maintained that in the light of their option for annual elections their system of 3-member wards should not be disturbed. The Council also asked for the southern boundary of the Southlands ward to be realigned to run along the Brighton to Worthing railway.

9. We received other comments, some supporting and others opposing, our proposals for the Marine and St Mary's wards. A local political association re-submitted proposals for an alternative boundary between the St Nicolas and Buckingham wards. The remaining comments raised objections to our proposals for the Southwick and Shoreham areas.

10. In view of these comments, we felt we needed more information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, Mr J Whatley was appointed as Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

11. Notice of the meeting was sent to all who had received our draft proposals or had commented on them, and was published locally.

12. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting in the Council Chamber, Manor House Annexe, Southwick on 9 March 1977 and visited the areas which were the subject of comment. A copy of his report is at Schedule 1.

13. In the light of the discussion at the meeting and his inspection of the area, the Assistant Commissioner confirmed our draft proposals, including the proposed Marine and St Mary's wards; recommended that the name of the proposed Kingston ward should be changed to Southwick Green; and proposed two boundary amendments. The first amendment realigned the southern boundary of the Southlands ward to the railway, as requested by the District Council; the second amendment realigned the St Nicolas/Buckingham boundary to include the Church of St Nicolas in the ward of that name.

14. We reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the comments we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We concluded that the recommendations made by the Assistant Commissioner should be accepted. Subject to these modifications, we confirmed our ^{draft} proposals as our final proposals.

15. Details of these proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report

and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 shows the order of retirement of councillors. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.

PUBLICATION

16. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Adur District Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report (without map) are being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A description of the proposed wards as shown on the map is set out in Schedule 4 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

J T BROCKBANK

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

R R THORNTON

ANDREW WHEATLEY

N DIGNEY (Secretary)

July 1977

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REPORT ON ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

DISTRICT OF ADUR

J. WHATLEY
APRIL 1977

TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

REPORT of a local meeting held at the Council Chamber, Manor House Annexe, Southwick Street, Southwick, Sussex at 10.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 9th March, 1977 to consider the Commission's draft proposals concerning the electoral arrangements for the District of Adur in the County of West Sussex

PRESENT :

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANISATION REPRESENTED
F.M.G. Staden) Roy Shippam) A. Newman)	Manor House, Southwick Street, Southwick	Adur (Secretary and Solicitor) District (Sen. Admin. Officer) Council (Admin. Assistant)
Edmund Potter	High Street, Shoreham-by-Sea	Adur District Councillor and Chairman of West Branch Conservative Association
I.R.W. Elliott	38 Parkside, Shoreham-by-Sea	Shoreham Constituency Conservative Association
Ethel M. Hardin	17 Park Lane, Southwick	
W.H. Blagden	1 Southdown Road, Southwick	Southwick (Sussex) Society
B.A.J. Divers	80 Southwick Street, Southwick	Southwick (Sussex) Society
F.C. Southgate	34 Beach Green, Shoreham-by-Sea	Shoreham Beach Residents' Association
C.F. Williams	133 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea	-ditto-
B.E. Warner (Mrs)	49 The Meadway, Shoreham-by-Sea	-ditto-
N.C. Warner	-ditto-	-ditto-
A. Sore	10 Cheal Close, Shoreham-by-Sea	-ditto-
P.A. James (Mrs)	92 Beach Green, Shoreham-by-Sea	-ditto-
P.W. Barton	9 Beach Road, Shoreham-by-Sea	-ditto-
S.H. Barton	15 Fowey Close, Shoreham-by-Sea	-ditto-
A.M. Thomas	County Hall, Chichester	West Sussex County Council
H.G. Garrett	73 Cross Road, Southwick	Vice-Chairman, Southwick (Sussex) Society

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANISATION REPRESENTED
J.E. Rider	63 Southwick Street, Southwick	Southwick (Sussex) Society
G.M. Young	23 Croft Avenue, Southwick	-ditto-
O.M. Burt (Mrs)	67 Cross Road, Southwick	-ditto-
Nick Hough	Western Lodge, Western Road, Shoreham-by-Sea	Evening Argus
Jeremy Gardner	71 Cromwell Road, Hove	Shoreham Herald

COMMISSION'S PROPOSALS

The Commission's draft proposals were issued on 9th July, 1976 and are as follows:-

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS</u>
BUCKINGHAM	3
CHURCHILL	3
COKEHAM	3
EASTBROOK	3
HILLSIDE	3
KINGSTON	3
MANOR	3
MARINE	2
MASH BARN	3
PEVEREL	3
ST. MARY'S	1
ST. NICOLAS	3
SOUTHLANDS	3
WIDEWATER	3

A description of the boundaries of the wards proposed by the Commission is attached as Appendix A.

OBJECTIONS TO THE COMMISSION'S PROPOSALS

Adur District Council

The District Council opposed the subdivision of the proposed Marine Ward into two separate wards, Marine and St. Mary's on three counts - electoral inequality, establishment of a precedent and detriment to the 3-member ward system (conceived in the context of the Council's option for annual election).

Shoreham-by-Sea Conservative Constituency Association
(West Branch)

The Branch supported the Commission's 2-member Marine Ward and single member St. Mary's Ward but would prefer the St. Nicolas and Buckingham Wards to be separated by a North/South line rather than an East/West one, to take account of historic communities.

The Southwick (Sussex) Society

The Society claimed that Southwick's historic boundary had been ignored and gave (in order of preference) three possibilities for their area's division within this boundary, claiming the subdivision of Marine Ward as a precedent.

Councillor G. B. Wey

Councillor Wey opposed special treatment for Shoreham Beach when other residents of Shoreham and Southwick had been unable to keep their own areas as separate entities.

Support for the proposals had been expressed by the Shoreham Beach Residents' Association.

PROPOSALS ADVANCED AT THE MEETING

Mr. F. M. G. Staden, Ll.B., Secretary and Solicitor to the Adur District Council read a statement of the views of his Council on the matter in hand, which is reproduced as Appendix B. The principal points in Mr. Staden's argument were as follows:-

- (a) No part of the District differed so much from any other as to warrant a departure from a three-member ward system.
- (b) The Council's own draft scheme, which did not envisage separate Marine and St. Mary's Wards had serious regard to the criteria laid down in Schedule 11 of the 1972 Act and in Report No. 6 of the Commission.
- (c) The Council had made an error in their own draft scheme which was regretted, in defining the southern boundary of Southlands Ward. The Commission's proposals had followed this incorrect line.
- (d) The Council objected to the Commission's proposals for St. Mary's and Marine Wards on three grounds :
 - (i) the proposals did not provide as great a degree of equality of representation as the Council's scheme. Under the Council's scheme the extremities of variation in representation from the average were 11.8% above and 10.8% below. Under the draft proposals, St. Mary's, the smallest ward with only one

member, would be at best 16.3% below the average. The Council thought that that divergence was too great.

(ii) To have one part of the district which did not conform to the general electoral system would lead to confusion among the electorate. Also, although Mr. Staden admitted that it was not strictly relevant, the political balance on the Council might be critically affected by the adoption of a proposal creating elections at irregular intervals in a part of the District.

(iii) The Council did not accept that Shoreham Beach was not an integral part of Shoreham. The River Adur could be regarded as an important linking factor between Shoreham and the Beach, rather than a barrier. Activities on the river and on each bank did affect the amenities of those living near it. For more than 60 years one County Council member had represented both sides of the river, without objection from the electorate. Acceptance of the Shoreham Beach area as a separate electoral entity would make it difficult to resist separate representation for other minority areas. In the course of the Boundary Review so far there had been several votes taken

on this issue in the Council Chamber and all have been heavily against separate representation for the Beach. Such representation would hamper attempts to establish the District as a single unit of local government and would perpetuate division and rivalry between electoral groups.

The Council's own scheme achieved greater electoral equality than any of the alternatives propounded. Mr. Staden submitted a table showing the relative electoral equality of the various alternatives, reproduced as Appendix C.

Mr. Staden also stated that the West Sussex County Council had recently adopted a new policy in relation to the A259, which meant that the population projection within the review period would not be affected by any highway improvement proposals. The table submitted had been prepared prior to that decision.

Mr. Southgate of the Shoreham Beach Residents' Association stated that he thought Mr. Staden should have circulated copies of his opening statement.

Mr. Divers of the Southwick (Sussex) Society stated that his Society did not have the assistance of full time experts nor did it have facilities for distributing copies of documents.

Councillor Potter, Chairman of West Branch of the Shoreham-by-Sea Conservative Constituency Association, and a member of the District Council, stated that he had asked the Department of the Environment for copies of maps and documents but they had not been forthcoming.

Mr. Staden stated that the Council had no intention of taking an unfair advantage of other organisations represented, regretted that it had not been possible to circulate copies of his opening statement, and offered to repeat any portions of it for the benefit of anyone present.

I assured the meeting that no one wishing to address me would be prejudiced by lack of professional representation or the absence of copy documents.

Councillor Elliott, a member of the West Sussex County Council and of the District Council, and the leader of the Conservative Group on the latter body, spoke on behalf of the Shoreham Constituency Conservative Association. He stated that, contrary to supposition, there was another political organisation represented at the meeting other than the Conservative Association, in the presence of members of the Shoreham Beach Residents' Association.

This statement was denied by members of the Beach Association.

Mr. Elliott then stated that his Association supported the District Council's proposals. Any variation from those proposals would be difficult to achieve. In the case of the St. Mary's and Marine Wards there would be different election dates if the two separate wards were created. Shoreham Beach was an integral part of the District, and the Council's proposals were the only tenable ones.

A great deal of local concern had been expressed by the inhabitants of Shoreham Beach and Southwick, and by the West Branch of his Association regarding the proposals. He had some sympathy for the views of those organisations. Before reorganisation they were discrete communities.

but his Association now thought that the boundaries should be arranged so as to enhance the overall unity of the District.

There were three major areas of concern.

- (1) The St. Mary's/Marine area
- (2) The Buckingham/St. Nicolas Ward boundaries
- (3) The ward boundaries in the area of the previous Southwick U.D.C.

He could understand the concern expressed on all three issues, but in common with the District Council, he thought they should now look at the District as a whole. His Association could not agree that the Council's proposals should be varied, even though such variation might be to their advantage.

Councillor Potter stated that the lines of demarcation of wards affected the branches of the Conservative Constituency Association. He handed me a copy of the letter from the West Branch to the Commission dated 29th May, 1975, together with a copy of the document enclosed therewith.

He supported the Beach Association's desire for a separate ward for that area. The River was too great a barrier between the two parts of Shoreham, joined as they were only by a footbridge and the A259. It was physically impossible to operate both areas together from the political point of view. He had attempted to stand for election in St. Mary's Ward and he knew the difficulties of conducting a political campaign on both sides of the river.

The ancient town of Shoreham was near St. Nicolas Church. The harbour was where the airfield now is. A great storm in the Middle Ages altered the course of the river and the new harbour and a new town were established in the area of St. Mary's de Haura. The streets and lanes in that part still followed the Norman pattern and the area should be retained as a separate entity. He supported the Boundary Commission's proposals for a single councillor ward. Unification with the beach area would be a calamity.

He represented St. Nicolas Ward. Councillor Elliott represented Buckingham Ward and was not an officer of any branch of the Association. Communities were grouped round the various churches. He did not want to see St. Nicolas and Buckingham Wards divided along the East/West line. It would only constitute a gain for a Branch of the Conservative Association.

He drew attention to the anomalous fact that the Church of St. Nicolas was outside the proposed ward of St. Nicolas.

The North/South division between St. Nicolas and Buckingham Wards was the best, with the churches of St. Nicolas and St. Mary as the focal points. The strength of any area lay in its ecclesiastical, sociological and intellectual activities. The old Grammar School, near St. Mary's Church, was now the Community Centre. The northerly part of the North/South boundary proposed by his Association would be a compass bearing. The Southern boundary of Southlands Ward should be the railway line.

Councillor Mrs. Warner, Chairman of the Shoreham Beach Residents' Association, handed me copies of the letters from the Association to the Commission dated 16th April, 27th May and 9th June, 1975. She stated that Shoreham Beach did not want to be separated from the rest of the District. On the contrary it spent most of its time struggling to be part of it. The Beach was developed by West Sussex County Council and most of the residents' problems had to be referred to the County Council. Mrs. Warner stated that the Association would like to see the proposed ward extended to take in Widewater, but appreciated that this was not at present possible because of the Parish Boundary, and would have to wait until Parish boundaries were reviewed. She stated that a number of members of the Association wished to address me.

Mr. Southgate, a member of the Beach Residents' Association, stated that the boundaries of the proposed Marine Ward are natural and that nature knows best. The residents took a tremendous interest in the affairs of the Association. He saw no need for uniformity throughout the District. Marine Ward is a close-knit community with good community spirit. The residents frequently cleaned the beach and gritted the Shoreham footbridge in frosty weather. That enthusiasm might disappear if Marine Ward were combined with St. Mary's. The wishes of the people were being brushed aside. The objections of the Administration and Councillor Elliott to their proposals were political.

Mrs. Warner. The fares from Shoreham Beach to St. Mary's were 14p each way, greatly in excess of fares for other comparable local routes.

Mr. Williams, a member of the Association but not of the Committee, said that he would give instances of inefficient local administration. First, however, he took exception to statements to the effect that the electorate would be confused by elections held at different intervals from those in other wards. The electorate was intelligent enough to understand the position. The statements revealed a typical bureaucratic outlook. The Beach residents liked their representatives to be independent politically. In the past, the Beach had been used as a political football.

Sea defences had for many years been financed by a separate rate, levied only on Marine Ward. Several times the Association had tried to get sea defences paid for out of the general rate, because Shoreham Harbour benefits generally from the defences. On two occasions the Conservative majority turned down this suggestion. Just before Local Government was reorganised, the Conservative majority passed the necessary resolution and used it as a plank in the election campaign - an example of political football.

At the last election the Beach Residents' Association put up its own candidates. They received about 800 votes, while the Conservatives received 300 and Liberal and Labour less than 100 each. If they were forced to be combined the picture might be different and the power of the independents might be reduced. Therefore it was more democratic to leave the ward as it was.

Mr. Williams gave examples of how decision-makers were in ignorance of the facts. In the development of a fine residential site on the Beach, the County Council dealt

with speculative builders who erected a lot of terraced houses. The earlier development consisted of detached houses and bungalows.

On another part of the Beach, two more terraces ran north and south, the southern ends having no windows and being faced with black bricks. The officials apparently did not know that the sea was across the road.

In October 1975 a paving gang was sent by the County Council to work in the Beach area. They were still there in January 1976, long after the work was finished, together with a hired road roller.

The Residents' Association reported the matter to the County Council, who praised them.

Insufficient car parks were provided to cope with the summer traffic when people came to the beach at weekends, presumably because officials were not on duty at weekends.

There were only two buses an hour, which came down Old Fort Road, turned round and came back the same way. The Association asked that the service should be a round trip, returning along Harbour Way. This was agreed, provision was made for the necessary bus stops, and then someone in authority decided it was not possible because there was no tarmac on Harbour Way. The County Council surfaced part only of Harbour Way, so there was still no bus service along it.

For these reasons it was essential that Marine Ward had its own representatives.

Mr. Elliott asked Mr. Williams whether, having been a Beach resident for 16 years, and given that he had been represented by Beach representatives, he would feel that he might be better represented by members who covered a wider area.

Mr. Williams replied that Beach residents found it difficult to deal with a Council whose members were political. He stated that they had had a car park near the Lady Jane public house for some years. The District Council was going to turn it into a yacht marina. The Council did not appreciate early enough that the car park was very important, and the Beach nearly lost the car park.

Councillor Mrs. James observed that the Beach had a representative who sat for the Beach and St. Mary's on the County Council. The Beach residents never felt that they got the support which they would if they had a representative of their own.

Mr. Sore, Vice-Chairman, Beach Residents' Association, stated that out of an electorate of nearly 2,500, they now had 1,000 members in the Association. Periodically they had called protest meetings on specific issues, and on two occasions the hall had been filled, and overflow meetings had been held. Regarding the car park mentioned by Mr. Williams, the Association had started a Birthday Fund, to provide amenities, i.e. a grassed area and seats on part of it. So far they had had promises of £600.

Councillor Mrs. Warner said that the number of electors in St. Mary's Ward was 984, only 116 less than the Council's average of 1,100. She said that if Beach residents were told that they lived in St. Mary's Ward they would be confused. She was horrified that Mr. Staden had mentioned the importance of maintaining political balance - it savoured of gerrymandering. The Beach had no chemist

no Bank and no doctor. Visitors to the Beach only brought a swimming costume and towel. Nevertheless, the Beach felt that it was an integral part of the Adur District and its interests and the interests of St. Mary's were in conflict over such matters as the traffic flow and the location of industry.

Mr. P. W. Barton, a past Chairman of the Beach Residents' Association said there was no conflict, but rather a difference of emphasis. St. Mary's represented culture and commerce, the Beach was residential and industrial. A union of the two areas might produce three political councillors whereas the Beach alone would return two non-political ones. But in a new combined ward Marine Ward would comprise two thirds of the voters, and might return three non-political councillors. St. Mary's would not suffer if they had members of the right calibre. The two Beach members were doing a splendid job, but a Ward including St. Mary's also might prove too much for them. He believed the Commission's proposals were irrational. The Beach residents were interested in Shoreham as a whole, and many of them were active in Shoreham town life.

Mr. S. H. Barton, stated that there had been some local antagonism, that other parts of the District were getting what they wanted under the Commission's draft proposals and that Adur Council was an improvement on the previous system.

Mr. Divers, representing the Southwick (Sussex) Society referred to the Society's statement dated 20th May 1975 and stated that the boundaries of a ward should reflect

the historical and community aspects. He pointed out that under the Commission's proposals Shoreham were given five wards, but only one of the wards in the Southwick area was entirely within Southwick proper, the others being joined with bits of Shoreham. The wards in the portion of the previous Rural District were also satisfactory. The greater part of Kingston was in Southwick, which had a long history, as doubtless did other parts of the District. If his Society's suggestions for an alternative system of warding did not meet with the Commission's approval, he asked that the Kingston Ward be re-named Southwick or The Green.

Mr. Staden stated that in 1939 the West Sussex County Council made an Order combining Shoreham and Southwick, but the war prevented any progress in the matter.

Mr. Garrett, Vice-Chairman of the Southwick Society, said that the proposals for uniformity made by the District Council were political vandalism. His Society's proposals were intended to preserve the historic entity of Southwick. 1,000 years of history should not be wiped out, and the name of Southwick should be preserved.

Major Blagden, a member of the Southwick Society, said we had heard today of community spirit engendered by the residents in an area. The Beach used to be bathing huts and railway carriages. This spirit could be paralleled in Southwick. They had a thriving Community Centre. This was more important than achieving uniformity.

Mr. Ridler, a member of the Southwick Society, objected to the name of Kingston Ward.

Mrs. Burt, a member of the Southwick Society, said

the re-warding had been carried out by people who sat in offices and drew lines on maps which could split a community. It was necessary to go out and meet people. Areas should be kept together.

A letter was received from Ivy K. Flavell and Gwen M. Bolam protesting against any proposal which would further lessen the size of Southwick electorally or otherwise. The original is enclosed.

INSPECTION

On Wednesday, 16th March, I inspected the Beach area, the built up portions of Shoreham and Southwick, and the open country to the north. I was accompanied at various times on my inspection by Councillor Mrs. Warner, Councillor Mrs. James, Councillor Potter, Major Blagden and Messrs. Divers and Garrett, all of whom drew my attention to important features. I was also accompanied throughout by Mr. Staden, who co-ordinated the arrangements, and Mr. Shippam, his Senior Administrative Officer.

ASSESSMENT OF THE WEIGHT OF ARGUMENTS ADVANCED AT THE MEETING

The three principal issues were as follows:-

(a) Shoreham Beach - proposed Marine Ward

The case for the District Council was carefully prepared and well presented by Mr. Staden, and was ably supported by Councillor Elliott. Their arguments, stemming from the desirability of securing equality of representation and ensuring a degree of uniformity in the pattern of elections so that the electorate would not be confused were based on sound principles. I ~~also~~ took due notice of the statement that the Adur District Council had on several occasions

decided against separate representation for the Beach area, and I was conscious of the fact that a treatment of this problem which appeared to be preferential would be relied on as a precedent by other interested parties. I also sympathised with the evident desire of the Council to mould the integral parts of the District, each with its own disparate history, into a single administrative unit. However, it seemed to me that in stating that no part of the district differed so much from any other as to warrant a departure from a three member ward system they were making a statement which might be subject to correction, and in further stating that the Council did not accept that Shoreham Beach was not an integral part of Shoreham they were attributing to the residents of the Beach a point of view which did not appear to be held by them. Their argument that the River Adur could be regarded as a link, rather than a barrier, between the Beach and the proposed St. Mary's Ward did not appear to be very convincing.

I was impressed by the arguments advanced by the various ladies and gentlemen who spoke in support of the Shoreham Beach Residents' Association and also in support of the Commission's proposals for separate wards for the Marine and St. Mary's areas. I was also impressed by Councillor Potter's statement concerning his own experience in conducting a political campaign. Those arguments, combined with my own observations made during my inspection, convinced me, after much careful thought, that the combined social and physical characteristics of the area warranted a departure from the normal pattern of three member wards.

(b) The boundaries of the St. Nicolas and Buckingham Wards

Councillor Potter's opposition to the Commission's proposals was based on considerations of history, and of the focal points of local activities, such as churches and

community centres. It did not appear to me that the undoubted historical and aesthetic attractions of this area would be invalidated by the Commission's proposals, which were supported by the District Council and by Councillor Elliott.

It was also apparent that Councillor Potter's preference for a division of the area by a boundary line running North and South stemmed in part from a difference of opinion between two Branches of the Conservative Constituency Association and to this extent I am inclined to discount his arguments.

However, I regard his observation that the Church of St. Nicolas is outside the St. Nicolas Ward as valid, and a recommendation designed to correct this appears later in this Report.

(c) Ward boundaries in the area of the previous Southwick UDC

The representatives of the Southwick (Sussex) Society who voiced objections to the Commission's proposals were asking that the Commission's proposals be altered to ensure that no part of the previous Shoreham UDC be united in one ward with any part of the previous Southwick UDC.

They were also asking that the name of Southwick be preserved in the name of one of the proposed wards.

I was satisfied that there is a considerable amount of community spirit in Southwick and that the area commands a great deal of affection in the hearts of its residents. I therefore think that it would be right to change the name of Kingston Ward to Southwick Green Ward.

I do not believe it would be right to alter the ward boundaries from those proposed by the Commission, as to do

so would further disturb the balance of 3 member wards over the whole District. The geographical considerations which influenced me in recommending a departure from this principle in the Marine/St. Mary's area are not present in Southwick.

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N

I recommend that the arrangements for the future election of District Councillors for the District of Adur be as follows:-

<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Number of Councillors</u>
BUCKINGHAM	3
CHURCHILL	3
COKEHAM	3
EASTBROOK	3
HILLSIDE	3
MANOR	3
MARINE	2
MASH BARN	3
PEVEREL	3
ST. MARY'S	1
ST. NICOLAS	3
SOUTHLANDS	3
SOUTHWICK GREEN	3
WIDEWATER	3

I further recommend that the boundaries of the wards aforesaid be as set out in the Commission's draft proposals with the following exceptions.

- (i) That the southern boundary of the Southlands ward should be realigned to the railway line, and
- (ii) The boundary between the St.Nicolas and Buckingham wards should be re-drawn to include the Church of St.Nicolas in the ward of that name.

Dated this 12th day of April 1977

.....
J. WHATLEY

Assistant Commissioner

SCHEDULE 2

THE ADUR DISTRICT OF WEST SUSSEX

NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO OF COUNCILLORS</u>
BUCKINGHAM	3
CHURCHILL	3
COKEHAM	3
EASTBROOK	3
HILLSIDE	3
MANOR	3
MARINE	2
MASH BARN	3
PEVEREL	3
ST MARY'S	1
ST NICOLAS	3
SOUTHLANDS	3
SOUTHWICK GREEN	3
WIDEWATER	3

SCHEDULE 3

ADUR DISTRICT

ORDER OF RETIREMENT OF COUNCILLORS - ELECTION BY THIRDS

NAME OF WARD	NO. OF COUNCILLORS REPRESENTING WARD	1ST YEAR 1980	2ND YEAR 1982	3RD YEAR 1983
BUCKINGHAM	3	1	1	1
CHURCHILL	3	1	1	1 PE
COKEHAM	3	1	1	1 PE
EASTBROOK	3	1	1	1
HILLSIDE	3	1	1	1
MANOR	3	1	1	1 PE
MARINE	2	1	1	
MASH BARN	3	1	1	1 PE
PEVEREL	3	1	1	1 PE
ST MARY'S	1			1
ST NICOLAS	3	1	1	1
SOUTHLANDS	3	1	1	1
SOUTHWICK GREEN	3	1	1	1
WIDEWATER	3	1	1	1 PE
		13	13	13

PE denotes parish election year

DISTRICT OF ADUR - DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

NOTE: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

HILLSIDE WARD

Commencing at a point where Old Shoreham Road meets the eastern boundary of the District, thence westwards along said road and Upper Shoreham Road to the round-a-bout at the eastern end of Shoreham by-pass, thence northwards around the eastern perimeter of said round-a-bout to and northeastwards and northwestwards along the access road to Holmbush Farm and continuing along said road to a point opposite the northeast corner of the market garden being National Grid reference TQ 2267006952 thence northwestwards in a straight line to the northern boundary of the District at National Grid reference TQ 2140908519 being the northwest corner of parcel No 6137 as shown on Ordnance Survey 1:2500 plan TQ 2108, Revision of 1956, thence generally eastwards and southwards following the northern and eastern boundaries of the District to the point of commencement.

EASTBROOK WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Hillside Ward meets the eastern boundary of the District, thence generally southwards and westwards following the eastern and southern boundaries of the District to a point due south of the road known as Lock Approach, thence due northwards crossing the Prince Philip Lock and Prince George Lock to and along said road to Albion Street, thence westwards along said street to and northwards along Grange Road to and continuing northwards along the eastern side of The Green to Southdown Road, thence eastwards along said road to and generally northwards along Southwick Street to the southern boundary of Hillside Ward, thence eastwards following said boundary to the point of commencement.

SOUTHWICK GREEN WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Eastbrook Ward meets the southern boundary of the District, being Low Water, thence generally westward following said southern boundary to a point midway between the Inner Breakwater and West Pier, thence generally northwestwards to and along the Shoreham Harbour West Arm (River Adur) to a point due south of the southwestern corner of No 146 Brighton Road, thence due north to said corner and continuing along the western boundary of said property to its northwest corner, thence northeastwards in a straight line to the southeast corner of the King's Manor School, thence continuing along the eastern boundary of said school to Middle Road, thence eastwards along said road to and northwards along Stoney Lane to the southern boundary of Hillside Ward in Upper Shoreham Road, thence eastwards following said southern boundary to and generally southwards following the western boundary of Eastbrook Ward to the point of commencement.

SOUTHLANDS WARD

Commencing at a point on the western boundary of Southwick Green Ward being the junction of Stoney Lane and Middle Road, thence westwards and southwards following said western boundary to the Brighton to Portsmouth railway, thence westwards along said railway to Eastern Avenue, thence northwards along said avenue to and eastwards and northwards along the rear access road to the properties in Adur Drive adjacent to the southern boundaries of No 26 Eastern Avenue, Nos 1 and 2 Adur Drive, the rear boundaries of Nos 2 to 44 Adur Drive and the eastern boundary of No 10 Middle Road to and crossing said road to and along Park Avenue to Upper Shoreham Road, thence eastwards along said road to the western boundary of Southwick Green Ward, thence southwards following said western boundary to the point of commencement.

MARINE WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Southwick Green Ward meets the southern boundary of the District, thence generally westwards along said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of Lancing CP, thence generally northwards along said parish boundary to the Portsmouth-Brighton Railway, thence eastwards along said railway to the River Adur, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said river to the southwestern boundary of Southwick Green Ward, thence southeastwards along said southwestern boundary to the point of commencement.

ST MARY'S WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Southwick Green Ward meets the northern boundary of Marine Ward, thence westwards and northwards along said northern boundary to the Portsmouth-Brighton Railway, thence eastwards along said railway to the southern boundary of Southlands Ward, thence southeastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Southwick Green Ward thence southwards along said western boundary to the point of commencement.

ST NICOLAS WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Southlands Ward meets the northern boundary of St Mary's Ward, thence westwards along said northern boundary and the northern boundary of Marine Ward to the eastern boundary of Lancing CP, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to Old Shoreham Bridge, thence eastwards along said bridge to the railway that runs from Shoreham-By-Sea to the Cement Works, to the south of Dacre Gardens, thence northwards along said railway to a point opposite the northern boundary of No 3 Steyning Road, thence eastwards to and along said northern boundary to Steyning Road, thence northwards along said road to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of the properties known as Greystones and The Paddock, thence southeastwards to and along said southwestern boundary and southwestwards along the eastern boundary of

St Nicolas' Church (C of E) to St Nicolas Lane, thence eastwards along said lane and southwards along The Street to Upper Shoreham Road, thence north-eastwards and eastwards along said road to the western boundary of Southlands Ward, thence generally southwards following said western boundary to the point of commencement.

BUCKINGHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Southlands Ward meets the northern boundary of St Nicolas Ward, thence generally westwards following the northern boundary of St Nicolas Ward to and generally northwestwards following the eastern boundaries of Lancing CP and Coombes CP to the northern boundary of the District, thence generally eastwards following said northern boundary to and generally southeastwards following the western boundary of Hillside Ward to and westwards following the northern boundary of Southlands Ward to the point of commencement.

CHURCHILL WARD

The Churchill Ward of the parish of Lancing

COKEHAM WARD

The Cokeham North Ward
and Cokeham South Ward of the parish of Sompting.

MANOR WARD

The parish of Coombes
and the Manor Ward of the parish of Lancing

MASH BARN WARD

The Mash Barn Ward of the parish of Lancing

PEVEREL WARD

The Peverel North Ward
and Peverel South Ward of the parish of Sompting

WIDEWATER WARD

The Widewater Ward of the parish of Lancing

