

Burgess Hill Labour Party is strongly opposed to moving a part of the town to Hurstpierpoint and Bolney Division. We feel that this gives a loss of representation for Burgess Hill residents, as the problems faced by Burgess Hill residents are very different to those encountered by rural divisions such as Hurstpierpoint and Bolney and in no way satisfies the criteria of reflecting common interest and identity in a division that is dominated by rural wards.

We feel that the proposed boundaries are irrational – such as including the proposed Burgess Hill St Johns area with Burgess Hill East. There is no natural commonality between the St Johns area and the rest of Burgess Hill East.

The proposed Hassocks and Victoria Division has an irrational name. The Victoria area of Burgess Hill is generally considered to be in the Victoria Road and Victoria Industrial Estate area, but this area is proposed to be part of Burgess Hill Town Division. Hassocks and Burgess Hill Meeds would be a more rational name.

Further, the effect of the new Divisions on Burgess Hill Parish Council are totally irrational. The former Burgess Hill Meeds North Ward was considered too small and only in 2015 was merged with Burgess Hill Meeds South Ward to form a 3 member ward. Indeed, previous patterns of having 1, 2 or 3 member wards has over the years been removed to give 6 x 3 members wards for the total of 18 Councillors, which most consider a much better arrangement.

The proposed Burgess Hill St Johns and Burgess Hill Normans wards are far too small to be viable, with these wards having roughly 1050 and 600 electors respectively, whilst the proposed Burgess Hill Gatehouse would seem to have 1793 electors – all of these returning one councillor.

Whilst we understand the work that the Commission has done to ensure parity of electors for the County Divisions up to 2021, no account seems to have been taken on the effect on Burgess Hill St Andrews Ward, which already has 3752 electors with another 1000 homes already planned for this ward, which may provide around 2000 extra electors for this ward. It does not seem appropriate to change the division and ward structure so radically at this stage when the housing provision in Burgess Hill is likely to change very quickly in the short term making any ward and division structure subject to further radical change.

Burgess Hill Labour Party proposal was to form the following wards:

1. Linking Burgess Hill St Andrews, Burgess Hill Leylands and the eastern part of Burgess Hill Dunstall to form a Burgess Hill North Division;
2. linking Burgess Hill Franklands and Hassocks to form a Hassocks and Burgess Hill Franklands Division) and
3. linking Burgess Hill Meeds, Burgess Hill Victoria and the 'Gatehouse' part of Burgess Hill Dunstall Division to form a Burgess Hill South Division).

We strongly believe that this proposal gives a more logical layout of Divisions and future-proofs further known housing proposals that would make effective, efficient government through to a further review in 2025. The Commission's proposal indicates that the pattern of divisions should deliver: Community Identity Effective

and convenient local Government Reflect community interests and identities Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries Natural features which make strong boundaries Proposed names of divisions appropriate Good links across the divisions.

Burgess Hill Labour Party believes that the Commission's proposals for the Burgess Hill parish area fail on most of these criteria, particularly for the Burgess Hill parish wards (those referred to as AD-AM on its map) which would be difficult to make function effectively.