

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No. 425

LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
BOUNDARY COMMISSION  
FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 425

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr R R Thornton CBE, DL

MEMBERS

Lady J M Ackner

Mr J T Brockbank DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

TO THE RT. HON. MICHAEL R D HESELTINE MP  
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY AND  
THE DISTRICTS OF HORSHAM AND MID-SUSSEX

1. In a letter dated 18 December 1978 Crawley Borough Council requested us to review the boundary between the Borough of Crawley and the District of Mid-Sussex with a view to transferring land either already developed as housing estates or going to be developed as such belonging to Crawley Borough into the borough. In a further letter dated 20 February 1979 Crawley Borough Council and Horsham District Council requested us, in a joint submission, to review the boundary between the Borough of Crawley and the District of Horsham with a view to transferring land which was going to be developed by, and belonging to Crawley Borough, into the Borough.
2. We considered Crawley Borough Council's and Horsham District Council's requests as required by Section 48(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, having regard to Department of Environment Circular 33/78 and to our own Report No. 287.
3. We decided that we should undertake a review and on 24 January 1980 we issued a consultation letter which invited the Crawley Borough Council to submit a detailed scheme. The letter was addressed to Crawley Borough Council, Horsham and Mid-Sussex District Councils, West Sussex County Council, Clerks of the parish councils in Horsham and Mid-Sussex districts, Solicitors for the Whitehall Residents' Association, a number of private individuals, and the Pound Hill Branch Labour Party. The Borough Council were asked to put copies of a notice announcing the start of the review and the invitation to submit a detailed scheme on display at places where public notices were customarily displayed and notices were inserted in the local press. A period of eight weeks after the publication of the Borough Council's scheme was allowed for comments.
4. The Borough Council published their scheme on 23 May 1980 in the local press and by public notices. The scheme proposed that the boundary between Crawley and Horsham should be realigned so that two areas in the parishes of Rusper and Lower Beeding adjacent to the Langley Green and Gossops Green areas of Crawley would be transferred into that borough. Both these areas were at that stage undeveloped. It was also proposed that the entire boundary between Crawley and Mid-Sussex, with the exception of a short section at Peasepottage Forest, should be realigned so that it followed the M23 motorway. The areas to be transferred would include both developed and undeveloped land, Land would be transferred from Worth and Slaugham parishes in Mid-Sussex to Crawley and a small area (part of Tilgate Forest) would be transferred from Crawley to Mid-Sussex. The affected areas are adjacent to the Broadfield, Tilgate, Furnace Green and Pound Hill areas of Crawley.

## RESPONSE TO SCHEME

5. Representations were received from the County Council, the two district councils, Worth Parish Council (this included a petition), Crawley Labour Party, Horsham and Crawley Constituency Labour Party, the Whitehall Residents Association and six private individuals.
6. Horsham District Council were in agreement with the scheme. The County Council agreed with the proposed boundary changes that affected Horsham district. The Whitehall Residents Association objected to the scheme because it would mean that houses on either side of the same road would be in different districts. They forwarded an alternative suggestion which would keep all the houses together in Rusper parish. They felt the scheme would divide the community and result in duplication of services.
7. Crawley Labour Party agreed with the scheme but considered that certain land which was previously included within Crawley parish and then annexed on local government re-organisation in 1956 to the parishes of Rusper and Lower Beeding should be returned to the Borough. Horsham and Crawley Constituency Labour Party fully supported the Borough Council's scheme.
8. West Sussex County Council and Mid-Sussex District Council accepted that part of the scheme that transferred the Broadfield and Wakehams Green areas into Crawley but objected to the Worth Village, Crabbet Park, Burleyswood and Maidenbower areas being incorporated into the Borough. Mid-Sussex District Council considered that the second generation housing needs of Crawley borough could be met by using the land that was to be transferred in the Broadfield area and the land proposed to be transferred from Horsham. If this was not so they suggested that further information should be provided on housing needs and employment. The District Council questioned the inclusion of the Maidenbower area in the scheme. They pointed out that this thinly populated area was not allocated for residential development but was to be retained for agriculture and forestry. The District Council acknowledged that residents in the immediate vicinity of Crawley looked to the town for services but questioned the extent to which that should affect the district boundary.
9. Worth Parish Council felt that the scheme would not serve the interests of the area or the local residents and that Worth church should remain in the parish. They considered it essential that the rural gap between Crawley and East Grinstead should be preserved. The Parish Council had no objection to the Wakehams Green development being included in Crawley but they maintained that Worth Village and Crabbet Park should be allowed to remain as part of the parish. They put forward a suggestion for

a boundary line south of the A264 which would have involved transferring some land from Crawley to Mid-Sussex apart from the small area already agreed upon. They forwarded a petition signed by residents in the Worth and Crabbet Park areas opposing the extension of the Crawley Borough boundary to the M23 motorway.

10. One private individual objected to the scheme in so far as it related to Worth Church. He felt that the scheme would lead to subsequent development and abort previous decisions to ensure that the heritage of the Church and its environs remained unspoiled by the construction of the M23 motorway. Two private individuals supported the proposed incorporation of Crabbet Park into Crawley because they considered that the area had more affinity with Crawley than with Mid-Sussex. Three pensioners on the Wakehams Green estate supported the scheme because they felt that Crawley would provide better services.

11. We considered the Borough Council's scheme and all the representations that had been made to us on it.

12. We noted that although Crawley Borough Council had provided details of the electoral consequential adjustments which would arise in the Borough as a result of the proposed changes, more information was needed on this subject from the two district councils concerned. We decided therefore that we could do no more than reach provisional conclusions on the scheme. We concluded that Crawley Borough Council had some justification for the case they had made but we were unable to proceed until the district councils had provided information on the electoral consequentials and we had more information about the county structure plan in relation to the Maidenbower area. We also concluded that for the purposes of our draft proposals it might be appropriate to include everything from the Borough Council's scheme except what had been proposed in respect of Maidenbower, which we had been told was reserved for agriculture and forestry.

13. The further information referred to above was obtained from the District Councils. Horsham District Council indicated that the proposed change in Rusper Ward would result in a reduction of the electorate from 2,784 to 1,288. The number of electors per ward in the district as a whole was approximately 1,700, so there was clearly a case for reducing the number of members from two to one. Although this was acceptable in principle to the District Council they objected to this change at the present time because of the history leading to the allocation of two councillors and the fact that their parish review, which had been submitted to us, could have substantial effects on the electoral arrangements for the whole district. We concluded that the latter objection could be met by dealing with the parish review in parallel with the boundary

review. Mid-Sussex District Council had accepted that the boundary alterations would engender the need for a reduction by one councillor each in the Slaughtam ward (from two to one) and in the Copthorne and Worth ward (from three to two).

14. Our draft proposals were published on 13 May 1981. Copies were sent to all those who had received our initial consultation letter or who had made representations to us, to the headquarters of the main political parties, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned and to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Comments on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom details had been sent and by public notices from other members of the public and interested bodies.

#### RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT PROPOSALS

15. In response to the publication of our draft proposals we received comments from the Borough Council, the two District Councils, the County Council, Rusper and Worth Parish Councils, Crawley Labour Party, Horsham and Crawley Constituency Labour Party, several Branch Labour parties situated in Crawley, fifteen private individuals and the Whitehall Residents' Association.

#### CRAWLEY/HORSHAM

16. Crawley Borough Council were pleased to note that our draft proposals were based on their scheme. West Sussex County Council supported our draft proposals.

17. Horsham District Council had no objection to make on the boundary changes but were concerned at our proposal to reduce the number of district councillors representing Rusper ward from two to one. They considered it was imperative that no change was made to the level of representation until a decision had been reached on their parish review. They did not feel it was desirable for the representation of Rusper ward to be changed several times in the space of a few years.

18. The Whitehall Residents Association opposed our draft proposals and took the view that because of the strong local opposition not only from them but from other bodies a local meeting should be held. Rusper Parish Council requested us to give sympathetic consideration to the submission of the Residents' Association.

19. Two private individuals objected to our proposals and commented that they seemed to have been formulated with the intention of enclosing all the new housing developments within the Borough. They felt this did not apply to them and suggested two alternative boundary lines which would have the effect of leaving Whitehall Drive in Horsham district.

20. Crawley Labour Party reiterated their proposal concerning the area of land formerly part of Crawley parish. They commented that over the years there had been a community of interest sufficient to justify their proposal. These views were supported by the Furnace Green, Gossops Green and Bewbush, and Three Bridges Branch Labour Parties and the Horsham and Crawley Constituency Labour Party.

#### CRAWLEY/MID-SUSSEX

21. Crawley Borough Council were pleased to note that our draft proposals were based on their scheme. They did not understand, however, why the Maidenbower area was not included. They considered that a community of interest had been expressed by the residents of this area. They also considered the M23 motorway would be a logical, clearly defined boundary and the shape of the Borough on the eastern side would be improved by the addition of this area.

22. The Borough Council maintained that the County Structure Plan had identified the Maidenbower area for the long-term house-building land needs of Crawley; any such development would be dependent upon their services with a community of interest towards Crawley. They considered that for ease of administration and to avoid any possible conflict it must be sensible for the land to be under the control of the authority which was responsible for its development and the provision of services. They pointed out that the principal means of communication and transport for the area is from and through Crawley. The Borough could provide all the local government services for this area by a simple extension of their existing services.

23. West Sussex County Council supported our draft proposals generally but objected to our proposal to include part of Worth Village, Crabbet Park and Burleyswood in Crawley. They also supported our proposal to leave the Maidenbower area in Mid-Sussex and indicated that they would wish to make representations if there were any question of modifying our draft proposals in this respect.

24. Mid-Sussex District Council objected to our draft proposals and adhered to their previous view that the Maidenbower, Worth Village, Crabbet Park and Burleyswood areas should remain in their district. Worth Parish Council were satisfied with the proposal to leave Worth Church and the Maidenbower area in their parish. They were however disappointed with our proposals for the Crabbet Park and Burleyswood estates in view of the strength of local feeling.

25. Crawley Labour Party considered that our proposals were a compromise which was acceptable to nobody. They also considered that the M23 should be established as the total eastern boundary because it was readily recognised by the general public,

formed a physical barrier which was likely to endure, effectively cut off Worth from the rest of Mid-Sussex and was to be preferred to the former railway line which was rapidly disappearing due to development. The Furnace Green, Pound Hill, Gossops Green and Bewbush, and Three Bridges branch Labour Parties supported the views of the Crawley Labour Party, as did the Horsham and Crawley Constituency Labour Party.

26. A private individual strongly objected to our proposals for Maidenbower and Worth Village. A local resident of Worth wrote that he was wholly in favour of our proposals. He said the village enjoyed the amenities of Crawley just as much as neighbouring areas which were part of the town. Four local residents supported our proposals for Crabbet Park, while two supported our proposals for the Wakehams Green area. There were objections to our proposals from five private individuals who felt that the only sensible proposal would be to put the eastern boundary of Crawley at the M23 motorway.

27. We have reviewed our draft proposals in the light of the written representations which we received and have noted that our proposals are largely accepted. Although there were some requests for a local meeting to be held we consider we have sufficient information to reach decisions on the evidence before us. We were unable to accede to Horsham District Council's request to delay the decision on the district representation of Rusper Ward. Their parish review was not yet finalised and we consider that our decision on this matter could not be deferred to await the outcome. We have decided not to accede to the Crawley Labour Party's request to transfer areas of land that were formerly part of Crawley and that were now parts of the parishes of Rusper and Lower Beeding back into the borough. There was no support for this proposal from the councils involved. We consider that the boundary in the vicinity of Whitehall Drive should be realigned so that it follows the curtilage of the back gardens. The residents of the area appear to have more community of interest with the parish of Rusper and the boundary suggested in our draft proposals would have split the community.

28. With regard to the Maidenbower area, having regard to the Borough Council's views we came to the preliminary conclusion that the area should also be transferred to the borough of Crawley and that the M23 motorway would provide a better boundary than the one that followed the disused railway included in our draft proposals. West Sussex County Council had indicated that they wished to make further representations if there were any question of modifying our draft proposals with respect to this area. They were therefore invited to do so. Copies of our letter were also sent to the district councils involved.

29. In their reply the County Council sent us an extract from the county structure plan and contended that there was no suggestion in it that the Maidenbower area had been identified for Crawley's long-term house building needs. They suggested that any proposal to make the M23 the Borough boundary implied that the land thus enclosed would eventually be used for building. They considered that the north-south railway and the line of the dismantled railway were sound natural barriers. Crawley Borough Council also replied to our letter to the County Council stating that development and expected development was only one criterion that should be applied to this case. Consideration should also be given to community of interest, shape of the area, geographical influences, means of communication and accessibility of services. Mid-Sussex District Council and Worth Parish Council also replied to our letter and reiterated their opposition to the transfer of the Maidenbower area to the borough of Crawley.

30. We noted that in the extracts from the structure plan which we had been sent the Maidenbower area was in fact suggested as suitable for meeting any long term needs of the town although the plan indicated that at present there is no requirement for development there. After careful consideration we decided on balance that the M23 would make a better boundary.

31. We are satisfied that in the interests of effective and convenient local government the boundaries between the districts of Crawley, Horsham and Mid-Sussex should be realigned as indicated in our draft proposals, subject to modifications referred to in paragraphs 27 and 30 above. We confirm these as our final proposals.

32. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 1, 2, 3 and 4 to this report. Schedules 1 and 2 specify the proposed changes in local authority areas and Schedules 3 and 4 specify the consequential adjustments to the existing electoral arrangements. The proposed boundaries are shown on the attached map.

#### PUBLICATION

33. Separate letters are being sent with copies of the report and of the map to Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council and Mid-Sussex District Council asking them to place copies of this report on deposit at their main offices, and to put notices to this effect on public notice boards and in the local press. The text of the notices will refer to your power to make an Order implementing the proposals, if you think fit, after the expiry of six weeks from the date they are submitted to you; it will suggest that any comments on the proposals should therefore be addressed to you, in writing, preferably within six weeks of the date of the letter.

Copies of this report which includes a small scale map are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments.

L.S.

Signed: R R THORNTON (Deputy Chairman)

J M ACKNER

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

L B GRIMSHAW  
Secretary

1982

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

PRINCIPAL AREAS REVIEW

BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY/HORSHAM DISTRICT/MID SUSSEX DISTRICT

SCHEDULE 1

OS description of the proposed district boundary of the Borough of Crawley.

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.

Commencing at the point where the western boundary of Crawley Borough meets the northern boundary of the County of West Sussex, thence generally north-eastwards and southeastwards along said northern boundary to the M23 Motorway, thence southwards and southwestwards along said Motorway to a point due east of the southernmost point of the property known as East Lodge, thence due west to said point and northwestwards along the southwestern boundary of said property and continuing northwestwards along the northern boundaries of Parcels No's 8924 and 7334, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A\*) TQ 2533, date of publication 1959, to the northern most point of the last mentioned parcel, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the northeastern corner of Parcel No 5033, thence westwards along the northern boundary of said parcel to the eastern boundary of Parcel No 2935, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and northwestwards along the northern boundary of said parcel to the existing western boundary of Mid Sussex District, thence northwards along said western boundary to the northern boundary of Parcel No 2800, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) TQ 2534, date of publication 1967, thence westwards along said northern boundary to the northernmost point of said parcel, thence due west from said point to the western boundary of North Drive, thence northwards along said western boundary to the northern boundary of the Golf Course, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary, to the western boundary of Parcel No 9500, as shown on

OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) TQ 2434, date of publication 1967, thence northwards along said western boundary and northwards along the western boundaries of Parcel No's 9126, 8937, 9044 and 9250 to the westernmost point of the last mentioned parcel, thence due west from said point to the western boundary of Parcel No 7353, thence generally northwards along said western boundary to the southern boundary of the A 264 road, thence southwestwards along said southern boundary to a point opposite the western boundary of Beaubush Cottage, thence northwards to and along said western boundary and the western boundary of Parcel No 9474, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) TQ 2334, date of publication 1976, to the western boundary of Parcel No 0004, thence northwards along said western boundary, continuing on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) TQ 2335, date of publication 1974, to and northwards along the western boundaries of Parcels No's 9353 and 0072 to the path leading northwestwards from the westernmost point of the last mentioned parcel to the Horsham - Crawley Railway, thence northwestwards along said path to the southeastern boundary of said railway, thence northeastwards along said railway to the northeastern boundary of Lower Beeding CP, thence northwestwards along said CP boundary to the southeastern boundary of Parcel No 5400, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary and northwestwards along the northeastern boundary of said parcel, and continuing on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) TQ 2336, date of publication 1974, to the eastern boundary of Parcel No 5611, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and westwards along the northern boundary of said parcel to the Drain leading northeastwards from the last mentioned parcel to the southern boundary of Parcel No 3737, thence northeastwards along said Drain to said southern boundary, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to and northeastwards along the eastern boundary of said parcel to the stream known as Hyde Hill Brook, thence generally eastwards along said stream to the western boundary of Parcel No 3352, as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (A) TQ 2436 date of publication 1968, thence northwards along said western boundary and eastwards along the northern boundary of said parcel to the easternmost point of the property known as Lyans, thence due

east from said point to the unnamed road leading southeastwards to Ifield Mill (Disused), thence southeastwards along said unnamed road to the stream known as Hyde Hill Brook, thence northwards along said stream to the existing western boundary of Crawley Borough, thence generally northeastwards along said existing Borough boundary to the stream known as The Brook, thence generally northeastwards along said stream to the existing western boundary of Crawley Borough, west of Amberley Farm, thence westwards along said existing Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

## SCHEDULE 2

OS description of the areas to be transferred, consequent upon the proposed realignment of the boundaries between the Borough of Crawley and the Districts of Horsham and Mid Sussex.

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.

A: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the proposed western Borough boundary meets the existing western Borough boundary, west of Amberley Farm, thence eastwards, southwards and generally southwestwards along said existing Borough boundary to the proposed western boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards along said proposed western boundary to the point of commencement.

B: that area bounded by a line, commencing at the point where the existing western Borough boundary meets the Horsham - Crawley Railway, thence southwestwards along said railway to the proposed western Borough boundary, thence northwestwards and generally northeastwards along said proposed western boundary to the existing western boundary of the Borough, thence generally southwards along said existing western boundary to the point of commencement.

C: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the south eastern boundary of Area B meets the existing western Borough boundary, thence southwards along said existing western boundary to the existing southern boundary of Ruser CP, thence generally northwestwards along said southern boundary to the southeastern boundary of Area B, thence northeastwards along said southeastern boundary to the point of commencement.

D: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the southwestern boundary of Area C meets the existing western Borough boundary, thence eastwards and southwards along said existing western boundary to

the A 264 road, thence westwards along said road to the proposed western Borough boundary, thence westwards and northwards along said proposed western boundary to the southwestern boundary of Area C, thence generally southeastwards along said southwestern boundary to the point of commencement.

E: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the southern boundary of Area D meets the existing western boundary of the Borough, thence generally southeastwards along said existing western boundary to the existing eastern boundary of Horsham District, thence southwards along said existing eastern boundary to the proposed western Borough boundary, thence generally westwards and northwards along said proposed western boundary to the southern boundary of Area D, thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

F: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing southern Borough boundary meets Brighton Road, thence southwards along said road to Pease Pottage roundabout (LA name), thence southeastwards along the northeastern carriageway of the said roundabout to the proposed southern Borough boundary, thence generally westwards along said proposed southern boundary to the existing eastern boundary of Horsham District, thence northwards along said existing eastern boundary to the existing southern Borough boundary, thence eastwards along said existing southern boundary to the point of commencement.

G: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of Area F meets the existing southern Borough boundary, thence generally southeastwards along the said existing southern boundary to the proposed southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards along said proposed southern boundary to the eastern boundary of Area F, thence generally northwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

H: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing southern Borough boundary meets the proposed southern Borough boundary on the western boundary of Parcel No 8082 as shown on OS 1:2500 Microfilm (B) TQ 2733, date of publication 1977, thence northeastwards along said proposed southern boundary to the existing southern Borough boundary, thence southwards and westwards along said southern boundary to the point of commencement.

J: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing southern Borough boundary meets the proposed eastern Borough boundary being the existing western boundary of Worth CP, thence southwards and southwestwards along said proposed eastern Borough boundary and the proposed southern Borough boundary to the existing southern Borough boundary, thence northwards and northeastwards along said existing southern boundary to the point of commencement.

K: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the proposed eastern Borough boundary meets the existing eastern Borough boundary, east of a property known as Downswold, thence southwards and westwards along said existing eastern boundary to the proposed eastern Borough boundary, thence northwards along said proposed eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

L: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the A 264 road meets the proposed eastern Borough boundary, thence southwards along said proposed eastern boundary to the existing eastern boundary, thence westwards and northwards along said existing eastern boundary to the A 264 road, thence northeastwards along said road to the point of commencement.

M: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing eastern boundary of the Borough meets the existing northern boundary of Mid Sussex District, being on the northern boundary of the county of West Sussex, thence southeastwards along said northern County boundary to the

proposed eastern Borough boundary, thence southwards along said proposed eastern boundary to the northern boundary of Area L, thence southwestwards along said northern boundary to the existing eastern Borough boundary, thence generally northwards along said existing eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

N: that area bounded by a line commencing at the point where the existing eastern boundary of the Borough meets the proposed southeastern boundary, thence southwestwards along said proposed southeastern boundary to the eastern boundary of Area J, thence northwards along said eastern boundary and continuing northwards and generally eastwards along the existing eastern Borough boundary to the point of commencement.

#### Areas of Change

1. Areas described in paragraphs A, B and C to be transferred from Rusper CP, Horsham District to Crawley Borough.
2. Areas described in paragraphs D and E to be transferred from Lower Beeding CP, Horsham District to Crawley Borough.
3. Areas described in paragraphs, F, G and J to be transferred from Slaugham CP, Mid Sussex District to Crawley Borough.
4. Areas described in paragraphs L, M and N to be transferred from Worth CP, Mid Sussex District to Crawley Borough.
5. Area described in paragraph H to be transferred from Crawley Borough to Slaugham CP, Mid Sussex District.
6. Area described in paragraph K to be transferred from Crawley Borough to Worth CP, Mid Sussex District.

SCHEDULE 3

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS (DISTRICT WARDS) CONSEQUENT UPON THE PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN THE BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY AND THE DISTRICTS OF HORSHAM AND MID SUSSEX \*

It is proposed:

1. that the Langley Green Ward of the Borough of Crawley, as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Rusper which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph A of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors for the said Ward shall be unchanged;
2. that the Ifield Ward of the Borough of Crawley, as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Rusper which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph B of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors for the said Ward shall be increased from 2 to 3;
3. that a new Ward, to be known as Bewbush, shall be constituted, comprising that area bounded by a line commencing at a point where the proposed western boundary of the Borough of Crawley meets the Horsham to Crawley railway, thence northeastwards along the said railway to the connecting channel of Ifield Pond, thence southeastwards along the said connecting channel to the footbridge that crosses the said channel, thence northeastwards along the said footbridge to the eastern boundary of Ifield Pond, thence generally southwards along the said eastern boundary to Broadfield Brook, thence generally eastwards along the said brook to Creasy's Brook (LA name), thence generally southwards along the said brook to Bewbush Drive, thence eastwards along the said drive to the A 264 road, thence

southwestwards along the said road to the proposed western boundary of the Borough of Crawley, thence westwards and northwards along the said western boundary to the point of commencement, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be 2;

4. that the Gossops Green Ward of the Borough of Crawley, as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Rusper which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph C of Schedule 2 and which is not included in the proposed new Bewbush Ward, and by the separation of those parts of Gossops Green Ward which are included in the proposed new Bewbush Ward, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be unchanged;

5. that the Broadfield Ward of the Borough of Crawley, as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered by the addition of those parts of the parishes of Lower Beeding and Slaugham which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley as described in paragraphs E and F of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors for the said Ward shall be increased from 2 to 3;

6. that the Tilgate Ward of the Borough of Crawley, as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Slaugham which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph G of Schedule 2, and by the separation of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of the District of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph H of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors for the said Ward shall be unchanged;

7. that the Furnace Green Ward of the Borough of Crawley as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered

by the addition of those parts of the parishes of Slaugham and Worth which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs J and N of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors for the said Ward shall be unchanged;

8. that a new Ward, to be known as Pound Hill North, shall be constituted, comprising that area bounded by a line commencing at a point where the Crawley to Horsham railway meets the existing northern boundary of the Borough of Crawley, thence eastwards along the said existing northern boundary and generally southwards along the existing eastern boundary of the Borough of Crawley to and eastwards along the existing northern boundary of the district of Mid Sussex to the proposed eastern boundary of the Borough of Crawley, thence southwards along the said proposed eastern boundary to the A 264 road, thence southwestwards along the said road to the western boundary of the existing Pound Hill Ward, thence northwards along the said Ward boundary to the point of commencement, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be 3;

9. that a new Ward, to be known as Pound Hill South, shall be constituted, comprising that part of the Pound Hill Ward, as defined in the Borough of Crawley (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, not included in the proposed new Pound Hill North Ward, and altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Worth which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley as described in paragraph L of Schedule 2 and by the separation of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Mid Sussex as described in paragraph K of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be 2;

10. that the Rusper Ward of the district of Horsham, as defined in the District of Horsham (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1978, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parishes of Rusper and Lower Beeding which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as

described in paragraphs A, B, C, D and E of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be reduced from 2 to 1;

11. that the Copthorne and Worth Ward of the district of Mid Sussex, as defined in the District of Mid Sussex (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parish of Worth which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs L, M and N of Schedule 2, and by the addition of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph K of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be reduced from 3 to 2;

12. that the Slaugham Ward of the district of Mid Sussex, as defined in the District of Mid Sussex (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parish of Slaugham which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs F, G and J of Schedule 2, and by the addition of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph H of Schedule 2, and that the number of councillors representing the said Ward shall be reduced from 2 to 1;

SCHEDULE 4

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS (COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISIONS)  
CONSEQUENT UPON THE PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN THE  
BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY AND THE DISTRICTS OF HORSHAM AND MID SUSSEX

It is proposed:

1. that the Crawley No 1 Electoral Division, as defined in the County of West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, as amended by the Charlwood and Horley (Electoral Divisions and Wards) Order 1974, shall be altered by the addition of those parts of the parish of Worth which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs L and M of Schedule 2, and by the separation of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph K of Schedule 2;
2. that the Crawley No 2 Electoral Division, as defined in the County of West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973 shall be altered by the addition of those parts of the parishes of Rusper, Lower Beeding and Slaugham which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs C, D, E and F of Schedule 2;
3. that the Crawley No 3 Electoral Division, as defined in the County of West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973 shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Rusper which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph B of Schedule 2;
4. that the Crawley No 4 Electoral Division, as defined in the County of West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, as amended by the Charlwood and Horley (Electoral Divisions and Wards) Order 1974, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Rusper which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph 4 of Schedule 2;

5. that the Crawley No 6 Electoral Division, as defined in the County of West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, shall be altered by the addition of those parts of the parishes of Slaugham and Worth which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs J and N of Schedule 2;
6. that the Crawley No 8 Electoral Division, as defined in the County of West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the parish of Slaugham which is within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraph G of Schedule 2, and by the separation of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph H of schedule 2;
7. that the Horsham Rural No 2 Electoral Division, as defined in the West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parish of Rusper which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs A, B and C of Schedule 2;
8. that the Horsham Rural No 3 Electoral Division, as defined in the West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parish of Lower Beeding which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs D and E of Schedule 2;
9. that the Cuckfield Rural No 1 Electoral Division, as defined in the West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parish of Worth which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs L, M and N of Schedule 2, and by the addition of that part of the Borough of Crawley, which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph K of Schedule 2;

10. that the Cuckfield Rural No 5 Electoral Division, as defined in the West Sussex (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973, shall be altered by the separation of those parts of the parish of Slaugham which are within the realigned boundary of the Borough of Crawley, as described in paragraphs F, G and J of Schedule 2, and by the addition of that part of the Borough of Crawley which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Mid Sussex, as described in paragraph H of Schedule 2.

# PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION  
FOR ENGLAND  
FINAL PROPOSAL



