

Fuller, Heather

From: Kingsley, Paul
Sent: 10 November 2015 12:42
To: Fuller, Heather
Subject: FW: West Sussex County Council Boundary Review

Paul Kingsley
Review Adviser
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP
0330 500 1275
www.lgbce.org.uk

It would help us if you would take a few minutes to answer a few questions about your experience of how we dealt with you.

[How are we doing? - Click on this link to give us your views](#)

From: Duncan Crow [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 22:44
To: Bowden, Tim <tim.bowden@lgbce.org.uk>; Kingsley, Paul <paul.kingsley@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: West Sussex County Council Boundary Review

Dear Sirs,

I wish to comment on The West Sussex Labour Group submission for the West Sussex County Council boundary review that proposes an alternative scheme for Crawley. The proposed Labour scheme as published on your website is riddled with inaccuracies and also contains many unsubstantiated assertions around community of interest in Crawley.

When compared with the scheme proposed by West Sussex County Council, the proposed Labour scheme would leave their Pound Hill division in a very unsatisfactory position with an electorate of +10.3% of the County average by 2021 with it rapidly growing each and every year thereafter as the new Forge Wood estate is built. It is also a statement of fact that the proposed Labour scheme has less co-terminosity with Crawley Borough Council wards than the County Council's proposed scheme. It is my opinion that it also has less community of interest. Please do come back to me if you require clarification on any of the points I raise.

Inaccuracies in their Pound Hill and Maidenbower proposals

The Labour proposal for two divisions contained wholly east of the railway line in Pound Hill and Maidenbower is for 810 electors to move from Pound Hill into Maidenbower with the Worth Way footpath as the boundary. This would create a scheme for 2021 with Maidenbower being 8.7% over the average and Pound Hill 9.5% over the average.

However, their proposal contains the following errors:

1. A quick calculation shows that the number of electors to transfer into Maidenbower from Pound Hill adds up to 800 and not 810 as per the calculation submitted.
2. Despite using the Worth Way as a boundary, a lack of local knowledge becomes very apparent as they have transferred the entire electorate of Church Road into Maidenbower from Pound Hill. With Church Road having properties both side of the Worth Way and most of the electorate to the north, the correct apportion for the Labour scheme should be 47 electors transferring into Maidenbower from Pound Hill and not the entire 117 electors of Church Road.
3. The Labour scheme apportions 2% growth by 2021 to the transferring 810 electors when it should be 2% growth on 730 electors (810 -10 -70). Therefore the correct number to transfer for the Labour scheme is 745 electors and not 826.

Using the corrected and now accurate figures, the percentage variances for the Labour scheme for 2021 are Maidenbower at +7.8% and Pound Hill at +10.3%. That is of course +10.3% and rapidly rising due to the current on-going building of the new Forge Wood estate due for completion in 2025/26. With electoral equality being the primary criteria for the review, that is an unsustainable and unfair position to knowingly leave any electoral division in. This alone is sound justification to cease any further consideration of the Labour proposal.

The two County Councillors that currently represent Pound Hill and Maidenbower are strongly opposed to the Labour proposal and join me in supporting West Sussex County Council's proposed scheme for Crawley.

Inaccuracies for their Southgate and Crawley Central proposal

Incredibly, the Labour proposal lists and calculates the 47 electors of Westfield Road twice. It also lists and calculates Albany Road as having 50 electors when in fact it has 145. Given

these inaccuracies for whole roads, I have little confidence that the number of 63 electors listed for part of Ifield Road will be correct.

The Labour proposal transfers '729' electors from West Green into the current Southgate and Crawley Central division. This means that an existing division containing one whole Crawley Borough Council ward and parts of two others wards, would become a division of one whole ward (Southgate) plus parts of another three wards (Northgate, Three Bridges and West Green).

West Green is one of Crawley's oldest and most established neighbourhoods and as well as Labour proposing a messy boundary, the area of West Green that they propose to move to Southgate and Crawley Central, does not look south to the whole of Southgate and certainly not well to the east to Pembroke Park in Three Bridges. Conversely, the far north of Southgate West does look northwards to West Green (Asda and Crawley Hospital are walking distance) and the town centre, as per the County Council proposal.

Less co-terminosity

The proposed Labour scheme sees five Crawley Borough Council wards split (Ifield, West Green, Three Bridges, Northgate and Pound Hill South) as opposed to four wards split (Ifield, Three Bridges, Southgate and Pound Hill South) for the scheme proposed by West Sussex County Council.

Housing growth numbers.

Mr Jones' submission on behalf of the West Sussex Labour Group seeks to cast doubt on the projections for future housing growth in Crawley. It should be noted that the first two meetings of the County Council's Electoral Review Panel of which Mr Jones is Labour's representative, were entirely about the projected housing and population growth across West Sussex and these numbers were discussed at length. As a result of the first meeting, all the projections for housing and population growth were double-checked with the District and Borough Councils that had supplied them. Mr Jones and all members of the panel agreed the accuracy of the double-checked housing and population growth figures at the second panel meeting.

Lack of support for the Labour proposal

It should be noted that the West Sussex Labour Group proposed scheme for Crawley has no support outside of the Labour Party. The cross-party Electoral Review Panel set up by West Sussex County Council that was made up of representatives of all five political groups on the Council, supported the County Council's proposed scheme for Crawley, with only the Labour representative (Michael Jones) not supporting it.

It should also be noted that the support for the proposed Labour scheme from Crawley Borough Council is just like that of West Sussex County Council, in that it is drawn entirely from only the Labour Party. The letter submitted by the Chairman of Crawley Borough Council's Governance Committee, Labour Borough Councillor John Stanley, is worded to create an impression that the Labour scheme enjoys more support than it actually does. A fairer reflection would have been for his letter to mention that the vote was 6/5, split entirely down the Labour and Conservative Party membership of the committee. Please see a link to the minutes of that meeting to confirm the reality of support for the Labour scheme. Only Labour Councillors supported it. http://www.crawley.gov.uk/pub_livx/groups/operational/documents/minutes/pub268307.pdf

Misrepresentation about the proposed Three Bridges and Pound Hill South Division

The Labour submission seeks to undermine the County Council's proposed division of Three Bridges and Pound Hill South with emotive assertions. It is a fact that Three Bridges Station is at the geographical centre of this proposed division in the County Council's proposed scheme and issues emanating from it dominate the agendas of the East Crawley County Local Committee. Please see our most recent agenda where the parking issues in Three Bridges and Pound Hill South dominated our meeting. <http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/clc/ec/ec201015age.pdf>

It will be much more effective to represent residents affected by the issues that Three Bridges Station brings, if there is one County Councillor for one division representing the station and the areas closest to it, as opposed to two County Councillors as we currently have and as the Labour scheme seek to perpetuate. As well as Three Bridges Station itself, the connecting points between the two halves of this proposed division include the main Haslett Avenue and Worth Park Avenue roads. There is also going to be a new direct station access created from Station Hill in Pound Hill South.

Best wishes, [REDACTED].

Duncan Crow.

West Sussex County Councillor for Tilgate and Furnace Green.



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.