

Final recommendations



Future electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council

November 2008

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Boundary Committee:

Tel: 020 7271 0500

Email: publications@boundarycommittee.org.uk

© The Boundary Committee 2008

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Electoral Commission with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 03114G

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
Draft recommendations	7
General analysis	8
Electoral division arrangements	9
Adur	9
Arun	10
Chichester	13
Crawley	14
Horsham	18
Mid Sussex	22
Worthing	23
Conclusions	25
Parish electoral arrangements	26
3 What happens next?	29
4 Mapping	31
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	33
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	37
C Table C1: Final recommendations for West Sussex	39
D Table D1: Existing arrangements for West Sussex	47
E Additional legislation we have considered	55

Summary

The Boundary Committee for England is the body responsible for conducting electoral reviews of local authorities. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority.

Following a request from West Sussex County Council, the Electoral Commission has directed that this review be undertaken with the presumption of single-member electoral divisions being recommended.

Current electoral arrangements

Under the existing arrangements, 19 divisions currently have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average with one division varying by more than 20%.

This review has been conducted in four stages:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
One	26 February 2008	Submission of proposals to us
Two	22 April 2008	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	1 July 2008	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	26 August 2008	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Submissions received

We received 100 representations overall during Stage Three, including a response to our draft recommendations from the County Council. The representations were generally of a localised nature, many from parish and town councils, district or borough councils, or individual county councillors. Of the 100 representations, 60 opposed the proposal to transfer Ashington (Horsham district) to Billingshurst division. Some submissions opposed the County Council's proposal to move to single-member divisions, particularly in Crawley. In considering our final recommendations we sought further views and information in the areas of Littlehampton and Billingshurst.

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

The County Council projected an increase in the electorate of 4.3% from 606,979 to 633,182 over the five-year period between 2007 and 2012. We did not receive any specific comments in relation to those electorate figures and have used them as the basis for developing our recommendations.

Council size

During Stage One we received a proposal for a council size of 71 from the County Council, and a proposal for a council size of 76 from a local resident. Having considered the information received we adopted a council size of 71 members in our draft recommendations. At Stage Three we received no proposals for a different council size.

General analysis

On 1 July 2008 we published our draft recommendations for a uniform pattern of 71 single-member divisions based on the County Council's proposals, with some modifications to improve the level of electoral equality and to strengthen boundaries.

We carefully considered the submissions received during Stage Three, particularly where a new division pattern had been proposed, and have sought further views in some areas. We have modified our draft recommendations in the areas of Littlehampton; Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green; Billingshurst, Ashington and Itchingfield. We have made minor modifications in central Crawley and altered the names of three electoral divisions. With the exception of parish electoral arrangements, we are confirming the remainder of our draft recommendations as final.

In terms of electoral equality, 17 of the 71 divisions in our final recommendations would vary by more than 10% from the county-wide average, and this is forecast to improve to only 11 divisions varying by more than 10% from the average by 2012.

What happens next?

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be sent to the Electoral Commission. The Commission cannot make an Order implementing them before 26 December 2008. However, to reflect the Christmas period, this will be extended to 9 January 2009. Any representations received by that date will be made publicly available once the Order has been made. Any further correspondence should be sent to the following address:

**Legal and Implementation Team
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Fax: 020 7271 0505

Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk

The full report is available to download at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk

1 Introduction

1 The Electoral Commission directed the Boundary Committee to conduct a review of the electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council. The review commenced on 26 February 2008 when we invited the submission of proposals to us on the electoral arrangements for the County Council. The submissions we received from the County Council and others informed our *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council*, which was published on 1 July 2008. We then undertook a further eight-week period of consultation which ended on 26 August 2008. We sought further views and information in the areas of Littlehampton and Billingshurst. We have now reconsidered the draft recommendations in the light of this consultation and information and decided whether to modify them.

What is an electoral review?

2 The main aim of an electoral review is to improve levels of electoral fairness in a single local authority. To do this, we seek to ensure that each councillor who is elected to the County Council represents approximately the same number of electors – thus achieving electoral fairness. When we make our recommendations, we also seek to reflect communities in the area, and provide for convenient and effective local government.

3 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for convenient and effective local government – are set out in legislation and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations.

4 Our powers, as well as the guidance under which we conduct electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review of West Sussex County Council?

5 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIH Act) allows a local authority that holds whole-council elections every four years to request the Electoral Commission to direct the Boundary Committee to undertake an electoral review with the presumption of recommending single-member wards or divisions.

6 West Sussex County Council submitted a request to the Electoral Commission to direct this ‘single-member review’ and on 17 January 2008 the Electoral Commission agreed to this request and directed the Committee to undertake a review. The legislation makes clear that, when conducting such a review, the Boundary Committee must continue to have regard to the statutory criteria that govern all electoral reviews, as outlined in paragraph 12.

7 This in effect means that the Committee is not required to recommend single-member wards or divisions – reflecting the statutory criteria must be the primary

objective of the review. The Committee must, however, seek to recommend single-member wards or divisions where the criteria can also be reflected in that pattern.

8 The population of any local authority area is constantly changing, with inward or outward migration, as well as people moving between different areas within the same authority. This is particularly the case where areas are subject to major growth or regeneration initiatives. As a result of these changes in population, the levels of electoral fairness change, with some councillors representing considerably more – or fewer – electors than their colleagues. This review has also sought to reduce these imbalances across the local authority.

How will our recommendations affect you?

9 Our recommendations may affect the county electoral division in which you vote (and, as a result, which councillor represents you), the boundaries of electoral divisions and, in some instances, parish or town council wards. Your electoral division name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards.

10 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council and submitted our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation.¹ It is now up to the Electoral Commission to decide whether or not to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order cannot be made before 26 December 2008 (six weeks after the publication of this report), and the Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made to them by that date. However, to reflect the Christmas period, this period will be extended to 9 January 2009. Any representations received by that date will be made publicly available once the Order has been made. Contact details for the Commission can be found on page 33.

What is the Boundary Committee for England?

11 The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. We are responsible for conducting reviews as directed by the Electoral Commission or the Secretary of State.

Members of the Committee are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Jane Earl
Robin Gray
Professor Ron Johnson
Joan Jones CBE
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Professor Colin Mellors

Director:

Archie Gall

¹ Under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI No. 2001/3962).

2 Analysis and final recommendations

12 As described earlier, the prime aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for West Sussex is to achieve electoral fairness. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended), which defines the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities
- secure the matters in respect of equality of representation referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972

13 Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being 'as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough'. In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing clearly identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

14 Absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is to keep variances to a minimum.

15 If electoral imbalances are to be minimised, electoral fairness should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should also make this their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identities and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate should also be taken into account, and we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over this period.

16 Our recommendations do not affect county, district or parish external boundaries, local taxes, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries. We are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

17 At the start of the review, West Sussex County Council, district and borough councils in the county, parish and town councils and other interested parties were invited to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for the County Council.

18 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Committee visited the area and met with officers and members from the County Council. We also held two briefing sessions with parish and town councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 34 representations during Stage One and 100 representations during Stage Three, all of which may be inspected both at

our offices and those of the County Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

Electorate figures

19 We are required to take into account any changes to the number and distribution of electors that are likely to take place within the next five years following the start of the review.² The County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2012, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 4.3% from 606,979 to 633,182 over the five-year period from 2007 to 2012. The figures were based on estimates provided to the County Council by the seven district and borough councils in West Sussex.

20 We did not receive any representations in relation to the electorate figures that the County Council provided during Stage One.

21 We recognise that forecasting electorate figures is difficult and, having considered the County Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We believe the County Council has considered all known planning applications likely to be implemented in the county within the timeframe, and are satisfied that the electorate figures it has provided reflect the growth anticipated at the start of this review.

Council size

22 West Sussex County Council presently has 70 members. At Stage One the County Council proposed a revised council size of 71 members. With greater predicted growth in the town of Horsham than in many other parts of the county, the County Council proposed that an additional member be allocated to Horsham district. In our draft recommendations we noted that Horsham was entitled to this additional member under a 71-member scheme.

23 At Stage One the County Council took account of the likely distribution of electors within the county over the five-year period from December 2007. Although the County Council provided little information about the councillor roles and the numbers in relation to security and other functions or other councillor responsibilities, it argued that the number of roles was roughly appropriate for a council size of 70 or 71, and that this size currently works well.

24 We received one other representation in relation to council size from a local resident. He proposed allocating each district council except Adur one extra councillor, thereby bringing the overall council size to 76. However, he did not provide sufficient evidence to justify this increase, and we were not persuaded to adopt his preferred council size of 76.

25 Having considered the information received from the County Council, we had proposed an increase in the existing council size from 70 to 71. We were satisfied that the County Council had provided sufficient information to demonstrate that this new council size would provide effective and convenient local government in the context of the County Council's internal political management structure and the

² Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972.

representational role of councillors. We received no representations on council size at Stage Three and have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendation for a council size of 71 members as final.

Electoral fairness

26 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. The Electoral Commission expects the Boundary Committee's recommendations to provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for convenient and effective local government.

27 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor in the county. The council size and total county electorate determine this average. It is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (606,979 in December 2007 and 633,182 by December 2012) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 71 under our final proposals. Therefore the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 8,549 in 2007 and is forecast to be 8,918 by 2012.

28 Under our final recommendations, initially 17 divisions will have variances of greater than 10% from the average for the county. This is forecast to improve to 11 divisions by 2012 when forecast housing development should have been completed. We are satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our final recommendations for West Sussex whilst taking into account all other factors.

Draft recommendations

29 The County Council's proposed division pattern for Stage One was based on the existing arrangements throughout the county. However, where multi-member divisions existed or where divisions were forecast to have an electoral variance of over 10% by 2012, the County Council generally made minor adjustments. Having been satisfied by the County Council that a council size of 71 was appropriate, we used its proposals as the starting point for our draft recommendations.

30 We adopted as our draft recommendations the County Council's proposals in Adur, Arun and Chichester without modification. In Horsham our draft recommendations differed only slightly from the County Council's proposals. In Mid Sussex and Worthing we recommended minor boundary changes in order to improve electoral equality. Where we have modified the County Council's proposals to improve electoral equality we have sought to provide for stronger boundaries and to tie them to more easily identifiable geographical features. In Crawley we recommended a division pattern for the areas of Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green which was substantially different from that proposed by the County Council.

31 Under our draft recommendations nine divisions would have variances of more than 10% from the county average. In Adur district Kingston Buci electoral division (ED), Shoreham ED and Southwick ED would contain 12% fewer, 16% fewer and 13% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. In Arun district, Angmering & Findon ED, Arundel & Wick ED, Bersted ED, Bognor Regis East ED and East Preston & Ferring ED would contain 11% fewer, 12% fewer, 12% more, 13% more and 12% more electors than the county average in 2012. In Mid Sussex district

Hassocks & Victoria ED would contain 15% more electors than the county average in 2012.

General analysis

32 In our final recommendations we have built upon our draft recommendations, making modifications based upon evidence received during consultation. Our proposals are for a uniform pattern of single-member divisions across the county. We believe our proposals meet our aims of achieving good levels of electoral equality while generally reflecting community identities and interests. We have sought to use existing parishes as the 'building blocks' of the proposed county divisions.

33 During Stage Three we received 100 submissions. With the exception of the submission from the County Council, all submissions received concentrated on proposals for their own local area or their district. Almost two thirds of representations concerned the parish of Ashington, in Horsham district.

34 The County Council broadly supported our draft recommendations, but also proposed a number of alterations. The County Council opposed the transfer of approximately 300 electors from Broadwater ED to Offington ED, and suggested minor modifications in the centre of Crawley and in East Grinstead in order to tie the boundary more firmly to geographical detail. We have adopted the County Council's proposed modification in Crawley.

35 The County Council opposed our proposed divisions in the areas of Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green. Following a visit to these areas, we have revised our proposals and our final recommendations reflect the original proposal made by the County Council at Stage One. Our draft recommendations show that the areas of Bewbush and Ifield West should be united in a division called Bewbush & Ifield West ED and the areas of Gossops Green and Ifield be united in a division called Gossops Green & Ifield East ED.

36 At the end of Stage Three we considered it was necessary to seek further information and views in relation to two areas: Littlehampton (Arun) and Billingshurst (Horsham). On 26 September 2008 we published a request for further information and wrote to all those who had submitted evidence regarding those areas. In light of the responses received, in Littlehampton we have moved away from our draft recommendations and adopted the proposal from Littlehampton Town Council. In Billingshurst we have moved away from our draft recommendations and propose a Billingshurst division containing the parishes of Billingshurst, Shipley and Itchingfield, with Ashington parish in a division with Storrington.

37 A number of changes were suggested to division names, particularly in Worthing. On each occasion we have considered whether the proposed name better reflects the area than the current name or the name given in our draft recommendations. In our final recommendations we have altered the names of three divisions and two parish wards. In addition, two of the names published in the draft recommendations were incorrect: Southwater Nuthurst ED should have been Southwater & Nuthurst ED, and East Preston and Ferring ED should be East Preston & Ferring ED.

38 We are undertaking this review with a presumption in favour of single-member divisions. Consequently, where we consider that single-member divisions will provide good levels of electoral equality, reflect community identities and provide effective and convenient local government we are unlikely to be persuaded to adopt any two-member divisions.

Electoral division arrangements

39 For county division purposes, the following district council areas are considered in turn:

- Adur (page 9)
- Arun (page 10)
- Chichester (page 13)
- Crawley (page 14)
- Horsham (page 18)
- Mid Sussex (page 22)
- Worthing (page 23)

40 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and C1 (on pages 25 and 39, respectively), and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Adur

41 Adur, in the south east of West Sussex, contains the coastal settlements of Shoreham and Lancing. It lies between the town of Worthing and the city of Brighton & Hove. The district of Adur is split in two by the river Adur, with the electoral divisions of Saltings ED, Lancing ED and Sompting ED on the west side and the electoral divisions of Kingston Buci ED, Shoreham ED and Southwick ED on the east side.

42 Appendix D outlines the existing electoral variances for 2007 and the variances which the divisions are forecast to have by 2012 if the existing arrangements were to remain in place.

43 During Stage One we received representations from the County Council and from a local resident, both of which can be seen on our website. Both submissions argued strongly for six councillors to represent Adur, although the area is entitled to 5.47 county councillors in 2012. The River Adur bisects the district, with roughly equal numbers of electors on either side. There are few crossings, particularly to the north of the district, and the County Council argued that to reduce to five members would necessitate the strong river boundary being breached when formulating divisions, which would in turn result in a poor reflection of community identities.

44 We agreed with the County Council that the River Adur is a very strong boundary with few crossings, and should not be breached when forming electoral divisions. We proposed that, in order to maintain this boundary and to provide a fair level of electoral equality and to reflect community identities, Adur should retain six councillors. This does, however, mean that there will be relatively high electoral variances in this area.

45 The County Council did not propose any change to the divisions of Kingston Buci ED, Shoreham ED and Southwick ED to the east of the river. These divisions will have 12% more, 16% fewer and 13% fewer electors than the county average by 2012 respectively. The local resident supported retaining the current Southwick ED, saying that ‘the Southwick division covers virtually all the area popularly known as “Southwick” locally’.

46 To the west of the river, the County Council proposed no change to the existing Saltings ED, which would have 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2012. In order to improve the level of electoral equality in both the remaining divisions, the County Council proposed to transfer part of Lancing ED to Sompting ED. It proposed transferring the parish of Coombes and part of the parish of Lancing which lies to the north of the A27. This would result in the A27 forming the boundary between the two divisions.

47 The local resident proposed that the Churchill area be transferred to Sompting ED. However, much of this area is separated from Sompting by an industrial estate. We did not consider it appropriate to combine these two areas as we felt that it would not provide a strong boundary or reflect community identities.

48 The County Council’s proposals throughout the district would not provide particularly good electoral fairness, with 12% fewer, 7% fewer, 3% fewer, 16% fewer, 2% fewer and 13% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2012. Nevertheless, they provided easily recognisable boundaries and, on the basis of the information received, reflected community identities.

49 We were broadly satisfied with the proposals from the County Council, and adopted them as our draft recommendations. We did not consider that we could adopt the suggestions from the local resident due to the considerably higher levels electoral inequality which would have resulted.

50 At Stage Three we received two submissions in relation to our draft recommendations in Adur. The County Council proposed that the name of the Sompting division be changed to ‘Sompting & North Lancing ED’ to reflect the fact that the division contains a ‘substantial area of Lancing north of the A27’. The Deputy Leader of Adur District Council supported our draft recommendations. We received no other submissions regarding Adur.

51 We recognise that the name of ‘Sompting & North Lancing ED’ is appropriate given the area covered by the division and therefore have decided to adopt it as part of our final recommendations. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final, with the modification to the name of one electoral division as described above.

52 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for county divisions in Adur district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 3c accompanying this report.

Arun

53 Arun lies in the south of the county, along the coast. The 2007 electorate is 115,112, predicted to increase by 3.4% to 119,026 in 2012. Appendix D outlines the existing electoral variances for 2007 and the variances which the divisions are

forecast to have by 2012 if the existing arrangements were to remain in place. Under a 71-member scheme Arun is entitled to 13 councillors, which is the current allocation.

54 For our draft recommendations we adopted the proposal from the County Council without modification. The County Council proposed that the existing arrangements be retained in seven of the 13 divisions, with changes in the other six divisions to improve electoral equality.

55 The County Council proposed that two changes take place in the Bognor Regis area: one to improve the electoral imbalances in Bersted ED and the other to improve electoral equality in Nyetimber ED. As a result, Bersted ED, Bognor Regis East ED, Bognor Regis West & Aldwick ED and Nyetimber ED would contain 12% more electors, 13% more electors, 9% more electors and 3% more electors than the county average in 2012.

56 We made a slight modification to the proposal for the area transferred between Bersted ED and Bognor Regis East ED. This was to provide a stronger boundary and to link Old Farm Cottages with their nearest neighbours in Bognor Regis East ED rather than with more distant settlements in Bersted ED.

57 The third transfer proposed by the County Council and adopted in our draft recommendations would improve the electoral equality of Littlehampton East ED to 2% more electors and Littlehampton Town ED to 2% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

58 During Stage One we received two submissions in addition to county-wide schemes from the County Council and a local resident. Arun District Council made no comment. A submission from Councillor O'Neill (Littlehampton Town ED) supported the proposals made by the local resident, but provided no evidence.

59 At Stage One a local resident objected to the proposal to move part of Bersted ED into Bognor Regis East ED, stating that it was 'drawing an artificial line down one residential road which is very much together as part of one community'. In our draft recommendations we acknowledged the local resident's concern, but received no suggestion for any other area which might better be transferred to in order to address the electoral inequality.

60 The local resident submitted a proposal for a different division pattern in Arun. However, this did not provide for a good level of electoral equality, with five electoral divisions with a variance exceeding 10% in 2012, including one at 25%. Furthermore, it would necessitate dividing the parish of Angmering, which we were reluctant to do without further evidence. We did not receive any support for the local resident's division pattern at Stage Three.

61 At Stage Three we received seven submissions regarding our draft recommendation to transfer an area from Bersted ED to Bognor Regis East ED. Arun District Council supported our draft recommendations, but did not support the consequential changes to parish warding arrangements. Bersted Parish Council opposed our draft recommendations and submitted a different proposal. Bognor Regis Town Council supported our draft recommendations and strongly opposed the division pattern submitted by Bersted Parish Council.

62 County Councillor Simon McDougall (Bersted ED) supported Bersted Parish Council, and County Councillor Francis Oppler (Bognor Regis East ED) submitted comments on both proposals.

63 Bersted Parish Council made the additional request that, in the event that we confirmed our draft recommendations as final, we change the names of the parish wards. They suggested that we change the name of Bersted West parish ward to Bersted North parish ward and change the name of Bersted East parish ward to Bersted Brooks parish ward.

64 We considered that since the division pattern proposed by Bersted Parish Council was strongly opposed by Bognor Regis Town Council it did not necessarily represent perceived community identities and interests across the two areas. We considered that Councillor Oppler's submission had some merit, but noted that the electoral equality was worse than our draft recommendations. Although Bersted Parish Council had sought to provide community evidence to support its proposal, Councillor Oppler and Bognor Regis Town Council had submitted conflicting evidence.

65 We note the wish of Bersted Parish Council that the parish should not be warded. However, we are required, so far as is reasonably practicable, to have regard to the provisions of Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972. This provides that parish council areas should be warded if they cross principal authority electoral boundaries. We see no reason to depart from this provision in regard to Bersted.

66 We received no submissions regarding our draft recommendations in Aldwick.

67 At Stage Three we received four submissions regarding the Littlehampton area. Arun District Council supported our draft recommendations, although with reservations over the consequential changes to parish warding arrangements. Littlehampton Town Council opposed our draft recommendations in its area, arguing that the proposal 'splits a long standing historic community'. They also pointed out the poor electoral equality of nearby Arundel & Wick ED, which under our draft recommendations would contain 12% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

68 Littlehampton Town Council submitted an alternative proposal which transfers 384 electors to Littlehampton Town ED and 241 to Arundel & Wick ED. As a result, the electoral equality in 2012 in Littlehampton East ED, Littlehampton Town ED and Arundel & Wick ED would be 4% more electors, 7% fewer electors and 9% fewer electors than the county average respectively. Arun District Councillor Nicholas Wiltshire (Beach), who is also a parish councillor, supported the proposal from Littlehampton Town Council.

69 We recognise that Littlehampton Parish Council provided community evidence in opposition to our draft recommendations and that its division pattern improves upon electoral equality across all three electoral divisions. However, we were concerned that the submission from Littlehampton Parish Council had not been seen by the County Council, local councillors or the neighbouring parish of Arundel, who would be affected by the proposal. This was in contrast to Bognor Regis, where both

parish councillors and county councillors from both divisions were aware of the proposals which had been made. We therefore sought further clarification on the electoral arrangements in Littlehampton.

70 We wrote to all those who had submitted representations during Stage Three, all county councillors who represent the divisions in question, all district councillors who represent wards covering part of the area, and the parish council. In doing so we offered two options. Option One was our draft recommendations, and transferred part of Littlehampton East ED to Littlehampton Town ED, creating a new parish ward as a consequence. Option Two was the proposal from Littlehampton Town Council, which transferred small sections of Littlehampton East ED to Littlehampton Town ED and Arundel & Wick ED.

71 We received ten direct replies to our letter and five submissions from individuals who had not previously written to us. Of those responses, two supported Option One, 11 supported Option Two and two did not wish to give support to either option.

72 Option One, our draft recommendations, was supported by the Arun and South Downs Conservative Association and the Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Conservative Association. The former suggested that our draft recommendations minimised upheaval, while the latter commented that it was a more straightforward proposal.

73 Option Two, as proposed by Littlehampton Town Council, was supported by Arun District Council, two local community groups, three county councillors and three district councillors. The County Council also supported this option, as it 'avoids the impact on Town Council warding, and still achieves good electoral equality'.

74 Two district councillors expressed their opposition to any change to the electoral division boundaries or Littlehampton boundaries at this time.

75 We noted that the majority of those who expressed a preference supported Option Two, that it was proposed by the local parish council, and that it provides for better electoral equality. We consider that Option Two is in keeping with the feelings of the local community and provides a good balance between the need for electoral equality and reflecting community identities and interests.

76 Therefore we confirm our draft recommendations as final in the areas of Bognor Regis, Bersted and Aldwick. Our final recommendations adopt the proposal from Littlehampton Town Council.

77 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for county divisions in Arun district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 5a and Map 5b accompanying this report.

Chichester

78 Chichester lies in the west of the county. Under a 71-member scheme Chichester is entitled to 10 councillors. Appendix C provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for county divisions in Chichester district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

79 During Stage One we received three submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and a local resident. We received a submission from Chichester District Council which stated that 'it is felt that there was no valid reason for any changes in the number of electoral divisions or county councillors within the Chichester District'. Marden Parish Council requested that no change be made to electoral divisions. Sidlesham Parish Council argued that it should form an electoral division with Selsey, which is to the south of Sidlesham, rather than with the urban part of Chichester.

80 The County Council proposed that the existing divisions be retained unchanged, noting that they will all have an electoral variance of 10% or less by 2012. The County Council did not provide any other evidence to support retaining the existing divisions. The local resident submitted a proposal, but the scheme did not provide for good electoral equality: one division would have 21% more electors than the average in 2012.

81 At Stage One we considered the potential for transferring a number of electors from Chichester East ED into Chichester North ED to improve electoral equality, but concluded that the existing boundary was strong and easily identifiable. We also explored options to achieve a better level of electoral equality than the County Council's proposed Petworth ED, which would contain 10% more electors than the average in 2012. However, any transfer of whole parishes would have a knock-on effect on neighbouring electoral divisions.

82 We considered the request by Sidlesham Parish Council to form a division with Selsey. However, we noted that the current South Chichester ED would provide a good level of electoral equality, and that we had not received sufficient justification to move to an alternative pattern.

83 Our draft recommendations were therefore based on the County Council's submission, and proposed no change to electoral divisions in Chichester.

84 At Stage Three we received four submissions. The County Council, Chichester District Council, Chichester Liberal Democrats and Fishbourne Parish Council supported our draft recommendations. No other comments were received.

85 We therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final. We consider the divisions we have proposed in Chichester will provide for single-member divisions with good levels of electoral equality and, in general, will provide strong boundaries. We remain of the view that the alternative proposals received at Stage One were not supported by sufficient evidence to justify the higher electoral variances that would have resulted.

86 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for county divisions in Chichester district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

Crawley

87 Crawley lies in the north of the county, with strong road and rail links to Surrey and London. The 2007 electorate is 74,111, predicted to increase by 5.1% to 77,893 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Crawley is entitled to nine councillors.

88 During Stage One we received nine submissions in addition to county-wide schemes proposed by the County Council and the local resident. County Councillors Joyce (Northgate & Three Bridges ED), McGough (Broadfield ED), Mortimer (Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED), Mullins (Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED), Smith (Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED) and Sully (Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED) signed a joint letter objecting to the review, on the basis that the last review of the electoral divisions was carried out in 2004, and to proposals for single-member divisions. Five of these councillors also submitted separate representations in support of the existing two-member divisions in their respective areas.

89 The six councillors raised concerns that single-member divisions would move away from the 'neighbourhood principle' on which Crawley district wards have long been based. They felt that the current two-member divisions reflect the communities they represent because they are coterminous with the district ward boundaries. Many of the submissions from the county councillors in Crawley expanded on this suggestion, arguing that Crawley, as a relatively new town, had been built in distinct neighbourhood areas. The councillors argued that the district wards had been carefully drawn to support these community neighbourhoods, and that therefore splitting district wards would invariably divide communities.

90 We also received support for the existing two-member divisions from a Crawley resident and Crawley Borough Council Labour Group. Crawley Borough Council did not express any particular view beyond noting the preferences of the Labour borough councillors for the existing two-member divisions and the preferences of the Liberal Democrat and Conservative district councillors for single-member divisions.

91 The local resident's submission for this area included a proposal that the Northgate & Three Bridges ED be combined with the existing Tilgate & Furnace Green ED to create a two-member division. He did not provide any evidence in support of this proposal. We did not receive proposals for any other division patterns from other respondents during Stage One.

92 The County Council proposed that the two-member division of Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower ED be split to become two single-member divisions, and that the two-member divisions of Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED and Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED and the single-member division of Northgate & Three Bridges ED be split into five single-member divisions.

93 The County Council proposed that an area of land be removed from the existing single-member Northgate & Three Bridges ED and be combined with Southgate district ward to form a Southgate & Crawley Central ED to improve electoral equality. It also proposed dividing the two-member division of Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower ED. This would create a Worth & Pound Hill North ED with 5% fewer electors than the county average by 2012 and a Maidenbower & Pound Hill South ED would contain 2% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

94 The County Council further proposed that the district wards of Langley Green and West Green, which are currently part of Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED, become a single-member division called Langley Green & West Green ED. This division would have 5% more electors than the district average by 2012.

95 The County Council proposed an electoral division, called Gossops Green & Ifield East ED, combining the district ward of Gossops Green with part of the district ward of Ifield. The County Council also proposed a Bewbush & Ifield ED combining the district ward of Bewbush with the western part of the district ward of Ifield. Councillor Mortimer objected to this proposal.

96 The local resident opposed the two new divisions proposed by the County Council, arguing that Worth does not look to Maidenbower. The local resident did not propose any alternative single-member divisions. We received no submissions for single-member divisions or evidence for retaining a two-member division in relation to this area.

97 We noted that a number of submissions opposed the proposed single-member divisions. However, none of the respondents provided persuasive evidence in relation to how a particular two-member division in Crawley either provides a better reflection of specific community identities or results in more effective and convenient local government than single-member divisions would in the same area. While we accepted that a number of councillors sought to base their views on two-member divisions on the concept of neighbourhoods, we did not consider that the evidence received demonstrated that the single-member divisions proposed would adversely affect community identities.

98 Our draft recommendations proposed changes to all three of the current two-member divisions and one of the current single-member divisions. We adopted proposals from the County Council to divide the two-member division of Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower, resulting in electoral imbalances in Worth and Pound Hill North ED of 5% fewer electors than the county average and in Maidenbower and Pound Hill South ED of 2% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

99 We also adopted proposals from the County Council for Langley Green & West Green ED, Southgate & Crawley Central ED, Northgate & Three Bridges ED with variances of 5% more, 7% fewer and 3% fewer electors than the county average respectively in 2012. We made a slight modification to the County Council's Northgate & Three Bridges division and its Southgate & Crawley Central division. in order to better tie the boundary between these divisions to local features.

100 We proposed a new division pattern in the areas of Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green. This differed from the proposal submitted by the County Council, which suggested that Bewbush should be combined with Ifield West and that the remainder of Ifield be combined with Gossops Green.

101 We proposed that the entire Ifield area should be combined with the area of Gossops Green immediately to the south of Ifield railway station. This division of Ifield & Gossops Green North ED would have 10% fewer electors than the county average by 2012. We also proposed that the southern part of the area of Gossops Green be included with Bewbush. This Bewbush & Gossops Green South ED would have 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

102 At Stage Three we received 18 submissions relating to Crawley, one of which was a petition of approximately 300 signatures. Of the other 17 submissions, one was a county-wide response from the County Council and 13 focused on the desire

for two-member divisions. Six residents mentioned their wish for the status quo to be maintained in Ifield. Only two residents made any reference to the proposal to link Ifield West with Bewbush, commenting that there was no public transport to Bewbush.

103 Councillor Janet Sully (Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED, previously county councillor for Bewbush ED) mentioned that the residents of Ifield had previously been accustomed to dealing with her as their councillor, and that another change so soon after the last would be confusing for the electorate.

104 Councillors Christopher Mullins (Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED) and John Mortimer (Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED) were both opposed to Ifield West being placed with Bewbush, but appeared to be more strongly opposed to the splitting of Gossops Green.

105 The Labour Group on Crawley Borough Council strongly opposed the introduction of single-member divisions, arguing that 'to break these neighbourhoods apart with an arbitrary division along a residential street in the middle of a neighbourhood is completely incomprehensible'.

106 The Conservative Group on Crawley Borough Council supported our draft recommendations in the Northgate, Southgate and Three Bridges area and in the Maidenbower and Pound Hill area. They opposed our draft recommendations in Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green, supporting the County Council's original proposal. Crawley Borough Councillor Beryl Mercow (Gossops Green ward) also supported the County Council's proposal and opposed the spitting of Gossops Green.

107 County Councillor Duncan Crow (Tilgate & Furnace Green ED) strongly opposed the draft recommendations in Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green, supporting instead the County Council's original proposal. He argued that 'Ifield west is widely regarded as a whole community in its own right due to its geography and very different layout to the rest of Ifield' and that many residents walk or cycle to the parade of shops in Bewbush. Councillor Crow also argued against Gossops Green being split between two divisions.

108 We received a petition of approximately 300 signatures calling for the boundaries in Crawley to remain unchanged. However, newly built apartments in the centre of Crawley, some of which appear to already be occupied, mean that the electorate will certainly increase in the next few years, leading to very poor electoral equality. Given the purpose of this review – to provide, if possible, for a uniform pattern of single-member divisions throughout the county – and the recent development in Crawley, we do not consider that we can fulfil the request of the petition to retain the current pattern of divisions.

109 At Stage Three the County Council opposed our draft recommendations in Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green, on the grounds that 'preserving the cohesion of an established local community (Gossops Green) within a single division ought to have a significantly higher priority than creating "direct (vehicular) access" between Bewbush and Ifield West'. The County Council also requested a minor boundary change to tidy the boundary between Northgate & Three Bridges ED and Southgate

& Crawley Central ED. The boundary would run to the south of the Town Hall instead of around the north side. It does not affect any electors.

110 On 22 August 2008 we visited Crawley. Following this visit, we reconsidered the division pattern in Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green. We consider that Gossops Green is a well-established community with few physical features along which to divide the area. We had previously considered that Ifield Station would provide a focal point for residents in the north of Gossops Green and in Ifield. However, it was clear from our site visit that the station is not necessarily a focal point for the community, as it is obscured by a bridge over the railway and access is via a narrow residential road. Rather than look north towards the station, the residents of Gossops Green appear to look towards the parade of shops in the centre of the area which provided a community focus for the area.

111 Although there is no vehicle access between Bewbush and Ifield West, there is a footbridge over the railway line. Ifield West is geographically a similar distance from both Bewbush and the main part of Ifield. A local resident walking to the post office or to shops would walk a slightly shorter distance to Bewbush than to Ifield, although both are under a mile.

112 On balance, we accept that our draft recommendations for Bewbush, Ifield and Gossops Green would not have sufficient regard for community identities. Based on the evidence received, Ifield West, while having better road links to Ifield than to Bewbush, would appear to have a clear identity of its own and we acknowledge that the proposals put forward by the County Council would avoid the need to divide established communities between divisions. The submissions we received expressed far greater opposition to Gossops Green being divided than to Ifield West being placed with Bewbush. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's original proposal in this area as part of our final recommendations.

113 We also recommend that a minor change is made to the boundary between Northgate & Three Bridges ED and Southgate & Crawley Central ED as put forward by the County Council. We confirm our draft recommendations for Maidenbower and Pound Hill as final.

114 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for county divisions in Crawley district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 2b accompanying this report.

Horsham

115 Horsham lies in the middle of the county. The 2007 electorate is 100,198, predicted to increase by 5.7% to 105,890 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Horsham is entitled to 12 councillors. The increase in councillors from 11 to 12 means that, unlike in the rest of the county, it is not possible for the existing divisions to be retained. Consequently, unlike in the other districts the County Council has proposed a different pattern of divisions than the existing arrangements.

116 During Stage One we received seven submissions, including that from the County Council. Two Liberal Democrat county councillors in Horsham broadly supported the proposals from the County Council, while Broadbridge Heath and Slinfold parish councils and Councillor Michael Hodgson (Warnham & Rusper ED)

objected to the proposal to combine Broadbridge Heath parish with part of the town of Horsham.

117 The County Council proposed a number of changes within the town of Horsham, as well as three changes to the rural area of the district. Its proposed divisions are based on providing good levels of electoral equality and strong boundaries. All of these divisions would vary from the county average by 10% or less by 2012.

118 The County Council proposed creating a new single-member division, called Horsham Tanbridge, to include Broadbridge Heath parish and the Denne area in the south west of Horsham. The two communities are divided by the A24. The County Council's proposal was supported by Councillor Millson and Councillor Dennis, who currently represent divisions in the urban area of Horsham. Broadbridge Heath Parish Council opposed the County Council's proposal, arguing that the parish has a stronger identity with the parishes outside of Horsham town than with Horsham itself. This view was supported by Slinfold Parish Council and Councillor Hodgson (Warnham & Rusper ED).

119 The County Council further proposed that Ashington parish should cease to be part of Storrington ED and become part of Billingshurst ED. A local resident considered that Ashington parish should be included in a division with Storrington parish rather than moved to Billingshurst ED, stating that there 'is not enough common interest between the communities to justify [the proposed Billingshurst division]'. However, we did not receive any representation from Ashington at Stage One to justify moving away from the County Council's proposals.

120 For our draft recommendations, we adopted, with a minor modification, the proposals of the County Council for a new division pattern in Horsham town. We also adopted the County Council's proposal to transfer Ashington parish from Storrington ED to Billingshurst ED.

121 During Stage Three we received three submissions regarding Horsham town and the surrounding area. Councillor Michael Hodgson (Warnham & Rusper ED) opposed the Horsham Tanbridge & Broadbridge Heath ED, and proposed a different division pattern for Horsham and the surrounding villages. However, his scheme contained electoral divisions with variances of 23% fewer electors than the county average in 2012 and so offers very poor electoral equality. It was also opposed by Colgate Parish Council, which would be joined with part of Horsham under the scheme.

122 Broadbridge Heath Parish Council supported Councillor Hodgson's submission, arguing that it is a separate community with no links to Horsham. However, it is necessary that an area outside of Horsham be linked with part of the town in order to provide an acceptable level of electoral equality throughout the town. We have considered a number of different options for this area and do not feel that any other than our draft recommendations provides good electoral equality without severe knock-on effects in the rest of the district. We consider there is insufficient justification not to include Broadbridge Heath parish in a Horsham town division.

123 Councillor Hodgson also expressed concern over the numbers of new houses to be built. He mentioned developments to the 'west of Crawley' and argued that these potential new houses should not be included in the future projections as the

'proposals still have to be tested in a public enquiry scheduled to start in early 2009' and may not be built. We are aware that there are a number of proposals for increased housing in the Horsham area, but our projections (as provided by the County Council) do not take into account developments which do not yet have planning permission. If the developments mentioned by Councillor Hodgson have not yet reached the permission stage then they will not have been included in the projected electorate.

124 In our draft recommendations we proposed that a small area north of Horsham railway station should be transferred from Roffey ED to Horsham Hurst ED. Councillors Millson (Horsham Riverside) and Dennis (Horsham Carfax) had proposed this transfer, requesting that the district ward boundary also be altered. However, we are unable to change the district ward boundary without a review of all district wards in Horsham district. We consider that our draft recommendations would result in a situation which would be potentially confusing and inconvenient for the 29 electors in this area. We note that we have tried, where possible, to maintain coterminosity between the electoral division and district ward boundaries. Therefore in our final recommendations we propose that this small area be part of Roffey ED.

125 During Stage Three we received 59 submissions regarding the transfer of Ashington parish from Storrington ED to Billingshurst ED, all of which were opposed to the draft recommendations. We consider that these submissions provided a substantial body of evidence that Ashington has few community or geographical links with Billingshurst. In our draft recommendations we acknowledged that Ashington has closer road links to Storrington and that the removal of Ashington would split the district ward of Chanctonbury between three different county divisions, which does not appear to be in the interests of convenient and effective local government.

126 The arguments provided by the 59 respondents included the geographical distance from Billingshurst and the lack of good roads; doctors and dentists being based in Storrington and Steyning; lack of public transport to Billingshurst (but not to Storrington); inclusion in a different County Local Committee from Billingshurst; different youth groups due to a different school system; school children from Ashington going first to Rydon (Storrington) and then Steyning schools; community projects between Ashington, Washington, Thakeham and Wiston.

127 The County Council did not provide any further evidence in relation to this area. Furthermore, the County Council's submission during Stage Three suggested that if the Committee concludes that 'the community identity arguments for retaining Ashington parish in the Storrington ED should prevail, it might also wish to consider the merits of Itchingfield parish becoming part of the Billingshurst ED'.

128 We received a submission from Billingshurst Parish Council stating that it would prefer to be joined with Itchingfield parish (which in our draft recommendations was included in the proposed Warnham & Ruser division) rather than with Ashington parish.

129 A division pattern which retained Ashington in Storrington ED but did not transfer Itchingfield to Billingshurst ED would provide poor electoral equality of 14% more electors than the county average in Storrington ED and 17% fewer electors than the county average in Billingshurst ED by 2012. A division pattern which retained Ashington in Storrington ED and transferred Itchingfield to Billingshurst ED

would provide electoral equality of 14% more electors in Storrington ED and 3% fewer electors in Billingshurst ED by 2012. However, Warnham & Rusper ED would worsen, containing 11% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

130 Following the comments received during Stage Three, we considered that it was necessary to seek further information and views on the division pattern in the area of Billingshurst. We wrote to all those who had submitted representations during Stage Three, all county councillors who represent the divisions in question, all district councillors who represent wards covering part of the area, and the parish councils of Billingshurst, Shipley, Itchingfield and Ashington.

131 In writing we offered two options. Option One was our draft recommendations, and provided for a Billingshurst ED comprised of Billingshurst parish, Shipley parish and Ashington parish. Option Two was mentioned during Stage Three by the County Council, and provided for a Billingshurst ED comprising of Billingshurst parish, Shipley parish and Itchingfield parish.

132 We received 63 direct replies to the letter and 24 submissions from individuals who had not previously written to us. Of those responses, four supported Option One, 81 supported Option Two and two did not wish to give support to either option.

133 Billingshurst Parish Council proposed that Billingshurst and Shipley parishes make up an electoral division without either Ashington or Itchingfield parishes. The parish council has not given their support for either option. Shipley Parish Council supported Option Two, as 'they feel that there is a greater natural affinity between the parishes of Shipley and Itchingfield'. The parish council suggested that the residents of Coolham, Dragons Green and Shipley use the shop and post office at Barns Green, in Itchingfield, and that both parishes look towards Horsham.

134 Itchingfield Parish Council opposed Option Two, arguing that 'Itchingfield parish has far more in common with Slinfold and Warnham, particularly in so far as social intercourse is concerned, and precious little with Shipley'. Itchingfield parish clerk also raised the concern that Itchingfield would 'lose its identity by being included within a division of much larger villages like Billingshurst and Shipley'.

135 Ashington Parish Council supported Option Two. They argued that Ashington should not be separated from Storrington, Washington, Thakeham and Wiston in order to be placed in a division with Billingshurst. They repeated the substantial community evidence provided during Stage Three.

136 We note that the overwhelming majority of respondents supported Option Two. We also note that a sizeable minority of submissions came from residents who had not been in contact with us during the previous consultation stages, but who downloaded the feedback form from our website.

137 We also note that prior to 2005 Billingshurst ED contained the parishes of Billingshurst, Shipley and Itchingfield. Residents of Ashington have argued that they have strong community links with Storrington and Steyning and that there is no major road and no public transportation to connect them to Billingshurst.

138 We recognise that Itchingfield is a separate community which is distinct from Billingshurst, and that they have connections with their neighbouring villages in

Slinfold and Warnham parishes. However, we note that the road connections between Barns Green (Itchingfield parish) and Billingshurst are stronger than between Ashington and Billingshurst, and that the 924, 75 and 76 buses travel from Barns Green into Billingshurst.

139 We therefore recommend that Itchingfield be included in Billingshurst ED and Ashington be retained in Storrington ED. We consider, on balance, that this option provides a better reflection of community identities and interests in this area of the county than our draft recommendations. We confirm as final our draft recommendations for the remainder of Horsham, with a minor modification to the north of Horsham railway station.

140 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Horsham district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1 and Map 2a accompanying this report.

Mid Sussex

141 Mid Sussex lies in the east of the county, with links to Brighton and Lewes. The 2007 electorate is 102,055, predicted to increase by 6.8% to 108,987 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Mid Sussex is entitled to 12 councillors.

142 During Stage One we received nine submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and the local resident. These included submissions from the town councils of East Grinstead and Burgess Hill, Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats, Mid Sussex Conservatives, Mid Sussex District Council, Ashurst Wood Parish Council, Turners Hill Parish Council and a parish councillor in West Hoathley.

143 The County Council proposed that the two-member divisions of East Grinstead and Burgess Hill be split into single-member divisions. East Grinstead South ED and East Grinstead Meridian ED would contain 1% more electors and 6% more electors than the county average in 2012, respectively. Burgess Hill East ED would contain 9% more electors and Burgess Hill West ED would contain 4% more electors than the county average in 2012. They proposed no other changes to divisions in Mid Sussex district.

144 The local resident suggested a scheme for Mid Sussex which contained two multi-member wards, one of which, covering East Grinstead and Ashurst Wood, would contain 23% more electors than the county average by 2012. We did not feel that sufficient evidence was provided for this proposal, especially taking into account the requests from Burgess Hill and East Grinstead town councils for single-member divisions.

145 Having considered the proposals for Mid Sussex received during Stage One we decided to adopt the proposals from the County Council for the whole of the district, subject to two minor modifications in East Grinstead, as part of our draft recommendations.

146 At Stage Three the County Council proposed that we modify the boundary of Imberdown ED and East Grinstead Meridian ED. They suggested tying the boundary to London Road along a small triangle, affecting around 50 electors. Although we

recognise that London Road is a strong boundary, the triangle is bordered on one side by an existing railway line and on the other by a disused railway line (now a line of large trees) and access to the area is via London Road, rather than across the current or disused railway lines. We consider that this area looks to the south, across London Road, and therefore should not be transferred.

147 We received four submissions in addition to that from the County Council. East Grinstead Town Council supported our draft recommendations, and accepted the consequences for parish warding arrangements. Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats also supported our draft recommendations for single-member divisions, although they did not support the consequential changes to the parish wards in Burgess Hill and East Grinstead. We did not receive any proposals for a different pattern of parish wards in either parish.

148 Burgess Hill Parish Council repeated the submission it made at Stage One and argued for three county divisions. We considered that this would provide poor electoral equality, with all three divisions containing between 13% and 15% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. This division pattern would also have a considerable knock-on effect across the whole of Mid Sussex, with electoral divisions close to Burgess Hill containing 20% more electors and 18% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

149 We also received a submission from Turners Hill Parish Council requesting that they be included in Imberdown ED rather than in Worth Forest ED. They provided good evidence in the form of community links to the area of Crawley Down. The move would also improve electoral equality. However, Turners Hill parish comprises the entire width of Worth Forest ED. To remove Turners Hill would cause Worth Forest ED to become two disconnected areas separated by several miles of woodland which would be in another electoral division. We considered carefully whether it was possible to propose a different division pattern, but any solution which joins the whole of Turners Hill with the Crawley Down section of Worth parish would necessarily either result in Worth Forest ED becoming two separate areas or produce significant knock-on effects in East Grinstead and the rest of the district.

150 It would be possible to transfer the eastern part of Turners Hill parish to Imberdown ED, leaving the western part of the parish in Worth ED. However, in further correspondence Turners Hill Parish Council told us that they did not wish to be warded. As we do not consider that it is possible to transfer the whole of Turners Hill parish without adversely affecting electoral arrangements in the rest of Mid Sussex, we recommend that Turners Hill parish remain in Worth ED.

151 We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendations for Mid Sussex.

152 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Mid Sussex district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 3a accompanying this report.

Worthing

153 Worthing lies in the south of the county, along the coast. The 2007 electorate is 79,244, predicted to increase by 2.2% to 81,009 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Worthing is entitled to nine councillors.

154 During Stage One we received two submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and local resident. The West Worthing Liberal Democrats supported the proposals from the County Council. A representation from the Conservative county councillors in the two-member division of Salvington argued that their division worked well and should be retained, but did not contain any other evidence.

155 The County Council did not propose any change to the single-member divisions in Worthing, nor did it provide any evidence justifying their retention. The County Council proposed dividing each of the three two-member divisions into two single-member divisions.

156 The local resident proposed a nine-member scheme which included three two-member divisions. Two of these divisions would have electoral variances greater than 10% in 2012, with one, West Durrington ED, containing 23% more electors than the county average. We did not consider that the local resident's proposal provided good electoral equality, or that he had provided sufficient evidence for a West Durrington division with such a high variance.

157 For our draft recommendations we adopted the proposals from the County Council for Tarring ED, Goring ED, Northbrook ED and Durrington ED, which would provide electoral variances of 9% more, 9% fewer, 8% more and 8% more electors than the county average in 2012. We adopted the County Council's proposed Broadwater ED and Offington ED with a modification. We noted that the County Council's proposed Broadwater ED would contain 11% more electors than the county average, while Offington ED would contain 8% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. In our draft recommendations we proposed that approximately 300 electors be transferred from Broadwater ED into Offington ED in order to create variances of respectively 8% more and 4% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

158 At Stage Three we received a submission from Worthing Liberal Democrats supporting our draft recommendations, and a county-wide submission from the County Council. No other representations were received.

159 The County Council opposed our draft recommendations for Offington ED and Broadwater ED, arguing that it weakens a boundary which is coterminous with the district ward boundary. However, our draft recommendations in this area were supported by the Worthing Liberal Democrats. To adopt the County Council's proposal would worsen the electoral imbalance, and in the absence of any evidence other than coterminosity we are not minded to accept it.

160 The Worthing Liberal Democrats, while supporting the division pattern in our draft recommendations, suggested changing the names of a number of the divisions. They suggested that Broadwater ED become Broadwater Village ED, Durrington ED become Lower Salvington ED, Goring ED become Goring-by-Sea ED, Northbrook ED become Castle Goring ED, Offington ED become Cissbury ED, Tarring ED become West Tarring ED, and Worthing East ED become Wilde ED.

161 We considered that it would be appropriate to change the name of Durrington ED to Durrington & Salvington ED in order to better reflect the area, and to change

the name of Offington ED to Cissbury ED after the local landmark. Without further support for these division names we recommend that the remainder of the names remain as expressed in our draft recommendations.

162 We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Worthing as final, with the exception of changes to two division names, as explained above.

163 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Worthing district. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 4 accompanying this report.

Conclusions

164 Table 1 shows how our final recommendations will affect electoral fairness, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on the December 2007 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for December 2012.

Table 1: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	Current arrangements		Final recommendations	
	2007	2012	2007	2012
Number of councillors	70	70	71	71
Number of divisions	62	62	71	71
Average number of electors per councillor	8,671	9,045	8,549	8,918
Number of divisions with a variance of more than 10% from the average	19	16	17	10
Number of divisions with a variance of more than 20% from the average	1	2	2	0

165 As shown in Table 1, our final recommendations for West Sussex County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 19 to 17. By 2012 only 10 divisions are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%. We propose to increase council size from 70 to 71 members, and we are also proposing an entire pattern of single-member divisions across the county.

Final recommendation

West Sussex County Council should comprise 71 councillors serving 71 divisions, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and C1, and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

166 As part of an electoral review we can make recommendations for new electoral arrangements for parish and town councils. Where there is no impact on the county council's electoral arrangements, the Committee will generally be content to put forward for consideration proposals from parish or town councils for changes to parish or town council electoral arrangements in our electoral reviews. However, we will usually wish to see some rationale for the proposal from the parish or town council concerned. Proposals should be supported by evidence, illustrating why changes to parish or town electoral arrangements are required. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review of a county council.

167 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different electoral divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division. Accordingly, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Lancing, Bersted, Littlehampton, Aldwick, Burgess Hill, North Horsham and East Grinstead.

168 Under the existing arrangements, the parishes of Rustington, Slaugham and Worth are divided between two different divisions. We do not recommend any changes to any of the divisions containing wards of these parishes, and therefore recommend no changes to the parish wards of the parishes of Rustington, Slaugham and Worth.

169 The parish of Lancing is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Churchill parish ward, Manor parish ward, Mash Barn parish ward and Widewater parish ward.

Final recommendation

Lancing Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Churchill parish ward (returning four councillors), Manor North parish ward (returning two councillors), Manor South parish ward (returning two councillors), Mash Barn parish ward (returning four councillors) and Widewater parish ward (returning four councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3c.

170 The parish of Bersted is currently served by 14 councillors representing the un-warded parish.

Final recommendation

Bersted Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bersted North parish ward (returning 11 councillors) and Bersted Brooks parish ward (returning three councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5b.

171 The parish of Littlehampton is currently served by 15 councillors representing five wards: Beach parish ward, Brookfield parish ward, Ham parish ward, River parish ward and Wick with Toddington parish ward.

Final recommendation

Littlehampton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Beach parish ward (returning three councillors), Brookfield parish ward (returning three councillors), Ham parish ward (returning three councillors), River parish ward (returning three councillors) and Wick with Toddington parish ward (returning three councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5a.

172 The parish of Aldwick is currently served by 14 councillors representing three wards: Aldwick East parish ward, Aldwick West parish ward and Rose Green parish ward.

Final recommendation

Aldwick Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Aldwick East parish ward (returning six councillors), Aldwick West parish ward (returning four councillors), St Richards parish ward (returning two councillors) and Rose Green parish ward (returning two councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5b.

173 The parish of Burgess Hill is currently served by 18 councillors representing six wards: Burgess Hill Dunstall parish ward, Burgess Hill Franklands parish ward, Burgess Hill Meeds parish ward, Burgess Hill Leylands parish ward, Burgess Hill St Andrew's parish ward and Burgess Hill Victoria parish ward.

Final recommendation

Burgess Hill Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Burgess Hill Dunstall parish ward (returning three councillors), Burgess Hill Franklands parish ward (returning three councillors), Burgess Hill Meeds North parish ward (returning one councillor), Burgess Hill Meeds South parish ward (returning two councillors), Burgess Hill Leylands parish ward (returning three councillors), Burgess Hill St Andrew's parish ward (returning three councillors) and Burgess Hill Victoria parish ward (returning three councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3b.

174 The parish of North Horsham is currently served by 19 councillors representing four wards: Roffey North parish ward, Roffey South parish ward, Holbrook East parish ward, and Holbrook West parish ward.

Final recommendation

North Horsham Parish Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Roffey North parish ward (returning six councillors), Roffey South West parish ward (returning one councillor), Roffey South East parish ward (returning three councillors), Holbrook East parish ward (returning five councillors) and Holbrook West parish ward (returning four councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2a.

175 The parish of East Grinstead is currently served by 18 councillors representing six wards: East Grinstead Ashplats parish ward, East Grinstead Baldwins parish ward, East Grinstead Herontye parish ward, East Grinstead Imberhorne parish ward, East Grinstead Town parish ward and East Grinstead Worsteds parish ward.

176 During Stage One East Grinstead Town Council proposed that East Grinstead Worsteds parish ward be divided along the A22, with the area to the west of the A22 becoming part of East Grinstead Herontye parish ward and the area to the east of the A22 forming a new parish ward with part of the existing East Grinstead Ashplats parish ward.

177 Having recommended the new divisions of East Grinstead Meridian ED and East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood ED, we are unable to propose a parish ward combining East Grinstead Worsteds parish ward with parts of East Grinstead Ashplats parish ward. This is due to the division boundary running between the two areas.

Final recommendation

East Grinstead Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: East Grinstead Ashplats parish ward (returning four councillors), East Grinstead Baldwins parish ward (returning three councillors), Herontye parish ward (returning three councillors), East Grinstead Imberhorne parish ward (returning four councillors), East Grinstead Town North parish ward (returning one councillor), East Grinstead Town South parish ward (returning two councillors) and East Grinstead Worsteds parish ward (returning one councillor). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3a.

3 What happens next?

178 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council and submitted our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation.³

179 It is now up to the Electoral Commission to decide whether or not to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 26 December 2008 (six weeks after the publication of this report). However, to reflect the Christmas period, this period will be extended to 9 January 2009. The Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made to them by then.

180 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

**Legal and Implementation Team
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Fax: 020 7271 0505

Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk

The full report is available to download at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

³ Under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI No. 2001/3962).

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for West Sussex

115 The following maps illustrate our proposed electoral division boundaries for West Sussex County Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for West Sussex County Council, including constituent parish and town council areas.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Horsham.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Crawley.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3a** illustrates the proposed divisions in East Grinstead.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Burgess Hill.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3c** illustrates the proposed divisions in Adur.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4** illustrates the proposed divisions in Worthing.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Littlehampton.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Bognor Regis.

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its mission is to foster public confidence and participation by promoting integrity, involvement and effectiveness in the democratic process
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's

Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 12 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'

Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Committee for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision-making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories: a directly elected mayor and cabinet, or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average

Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council
------	--

Appendix B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation* (http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/servicefirst/2000/consult/code/_consultation.pdf) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Boundary Committee for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: The Boundary Committee for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	Given the expectation that our recommendations will be implemented in 2009 we were unable to ensure that each consultation period lasted Twelve weeks. However the combined period of consultation for this review was 16 weeks.

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

We comply with this requirement.

Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

We comply with this requirement.

Appendix C

Table C1: Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Adur							
1 Kingston Buci	1	7,466	7,466	-13	7,832	7,832	-12
2 Lancing	1	8,156	8,156	-5	8,306	8,306	-7
3 Saltings	1	8,091	8,091	-5	8,608	8,608	-3
4 Shoreham	1	7,394	7,394	-14	7,486	7,486	-16
5 Sompting & North Lancing	1	8,663	8,663	1	8,720	8,720	-2
6 Southwick	1	7,709	7,709	-10	7,797	7,797	-13
Arun							
7 Angmering & Findon	1	7,908	7,908	-7	7,949	7,949	-11
8 Arundel & Wick	1	7,578	7,578	-11	8,111	8,111	-9

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
9 Bersted	1	9,265	9,265	8	9,952	9,952	12
10 Bognor Regis East	1	9,359	9,359	9	10,099	10,099	13
11 Bognor Regis West & Aldwick	1	9,454	9,454	11	9,686	9,686	9
12 East Preston & Ferring	1	9,849	9,849	15	9,993	9,993	12
13 Felpham	1	7,929	7,929	-7	8,943	8,943	0
14 Fontwell	1	9,051	9,051	6	9,119	9,119	2
15 Littlehampton East	1	9,203	9,203	8	9,312	9,312	4
16 Littlehampton Town	1	8,134	8,134	-5	8,264	8,264	-7
17 Middleton	1	8,612	8,612	1	8,738	8,738	-2
18 Nyetimber	1	9,197	9,197	8	9,229	9,229	3
19 Rustington	1	9,573	9,573	12	9,631	9,631	8

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Chichester							
20 Bourne	1	9,279	9,279	9	9,333	9,333	5
21 Chichester East	1	9,419	9,419	10	9,829	9,829	10
22 Chichester North	1	8,138	8,138	-5	9,016	9,016	1
23 Chichester South	1	8,925	8,925	4	9,245	9,245	4
24 Chichester West	1	9,245	9,245	8	9,327	9,327	5
25 Fernhurst	1	8,488	8,488	-1	9,050	9,050	1
26 Midhurst	1	8,792	8,792	3	8,921	8,921	0
27 Petworth	1	9,505	9,505	11	9,824	9,824	10
28 Selsey	1	8,854	8,854	4	8,884	8,884	0
29 The Witterings	1	8,135	8,135	-5	8,199	8,199	-8

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Crawley							
30 Bewbush & Ifield West	1	8,397	8,397	-2	8,420	8,420	-6
31 Broadfield	1	8,644	8,644	1	8,571	8,571	-4
32 Gossops Green & Ifield East	1	8,119	8,119	-5	8,292	8,292	-7
33 Langley Green & West Green	1	8,973	8,973	5	9,321	9,321	5
34 Maidenbower & Pound Hill South	1	8,602	8,602	1	8,757	8,757	-2
35 Northgate & Three Bridges	1	7,847	7,847	-8	8,626	8,626	-3
36 Worth & Pound Hill North	1	8,443	8,443	-1	8,516	8,516	-5
37 Southgate & Crawley Central	1	6,256	6,256	-27	8,323	8,323	-7
38 Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	8,830	8,830	3	9,067	9,067	2

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Horsham							
39 Billingshurst	1	8,178	8,178	-4	8,665	8,665	-3
40 Bramber Castle	1	9,182	9,182	7	9,438	9,438	6
41 Henfield	1	8,372	8,372	-2	8,694	8,694	-3
42 Holbrook	1	8,530	8,530	0	8,548	8,548	-4
43 Horsham Hurst	1	7,970	7,970	-7	8,170	8,170	-8
44 Horsham Riverside	1	7,918	7,918	-7	8,484	8,484	-5
45 Horsham Tanbridge & Broadbridge Heath	1	6,714	6,714	-21	8,142	8,142	-9
46 Pulborough	1	9,133	9,133	7	9,773	9,773	10
47 Roffey	1	7,688	7,688	-10	8,039	8,039	-10

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
48 Southwater & Nuthurst	1	9,552	9,552	12	9,846	9,846	10
49 Storrington	1	9,647	9,647	13	10,150	10,150	14
50 Warnham & Rusper	1	7,314	7,314	-14	7,941	7,941	-11
Mid Sussex							
51 Burgess Hill East	1	9,184	9,184	7	9,698	9,698	9
52 Burgess Hill West	1	9,051	9,051	6	9,278	9,278	4
53 Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	7,676	7,676	-10	9,329	9,329	5
54 East Grinstead Meridian	1	8,464	8,464	-1	9,212	9,212	3
55 East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood	1	8,343	8,343	-2	8,993	8,993	1
56 Hassocks & Victoria	1	9,692	9,692	13	10,220	10,220	15
57 Haywards Heath East	1	7,431	7,431	-13	8,431	8,431	-5

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
58 Haywards Heath Town	1	7,993	7,993	-8	8,317	8,317	-7
59 Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	7,758	7,758	-9	8,146	8,146	-9
60 Imberdown	1	7,869	7,869	-8	8,130	8,130	-9
61 Lindfield & High Weald	1	9,415	9,415	10	9,599	9,599	8
62 Worth Forest	1	9,179	9,179	7	9,634	9,634	8
Worthing							
63 Broadwater	1	9,564	9,564	12	9,603	9,603	8
64 Durrington & Salvington	1	9,634	9,634	13	9,615	9,615	8
65 Goring	1	8,160	8,160	-5	8,137	8,137	-9
66 Northbrook	1	8,431	8,431	-1	9,635	9,635	8
67 Cissbury	1	8,571	8,571	0	8,523	8,523	-4

Table C1 (continued): Final recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
68 Tarring	1	9,802	9,802	15	9,689	9,689	9
69 Worthing East	1	8,060	8,060	-6	8,317	8,317	-7
70 Worthing Pier	1	8,312	8,312	-3	8,737	8,737	-2
71 Worthing West	1	8,710	8,710	2	8,753	8,753	-2
Totals	71	606,979	-	-	633,182	-	-
Averages	-	-	8,549	-	-	8,918	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by West Sussex County Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral division varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix D

Table D1: Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Adur							
1 Kingston Buci	1	7,466	7,466	-14	7,832	7,832	-13
2 Lancing	1	10,005	10,005	15	10,188	10,188	13
3 Saltings	1	8,091	8,091	-7	8,608	8,608	-5
4 Shoreham	1	7,394	7,394	-15	7,486	7,486	-17
5 Sompting	1	6,814	6,814	-21	6,838	6,838	-24
6 Southwick	1	7,709	7,709	-11	7,797	7,797	-14
Arun							
7 Angmering & Findon	1	7,908	7,908	-9	7,949	7,949	-12
8 Arundel & Wick	1	7,337	7,337	-15	7,870	7,870	-13

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
9 Bersted	1	10,351	10,351	19	11,144	11,144	23
10 Bognor Regis East	1	8,273	8,273	-5	8,907	8,907	-2
11 Bognor Regis West & Aldwick	1	8,230	8,230	-5	8,453	8,453	-7
12 East Preston & Ferring	1	9,849	9,849	14	9,993	9,993	10
13 Felpham	1	7,929	7,929	-9	8,943	8,943	-1
14 Fontwell	1	9,051	9,051	4	9,119	9,119	1
15 Littlehampton East	1	9,828	9,828	13	9,937	9,937	10
16 Littlehampton Town	1	7,750	7,750	-11	7,880	7,880	-13
17 Middleton	1	8,612	8,612	-1	8,738	8,738	-3
18 Nyetimber	1	10,421	10,421	20	10,462	10,462	16
19 Rustington	1	9,573	9,573	10	9,631	9,631	6

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Chichester							
20 Bourne	1	9,279	9,279	7	9,333	9,333	3
21 Chichester East	1	9,419	9,419	9	9,829	9,829	9
22 Chichester North	1	8,138	8,138	-6	9,016	9,016	0
23 Chichester South	1	8,925	8,925	3	9,245	9,245	2
24 Chichester West	1	9,245	9,245	7	9,327	9,327	3
25 Fernhurst	1	8,488	8,488	-2	9,050	9,050	0
26 Midhurst	1	8,792	8,792	1	8,921	8,921	-1
27 Petworth	1	9,505	9,505	10	9,824	9,824	9
28 Selsey	1	8,854	8,854	2	8,884	8,884	-2
29 The Witterings	1	8,135	8,135	-6	8,199	8,199	-9

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name		Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Crawley								
30	Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate	2	16,146	8,073	-7	16,114	8,057	-11
31	Broadfield	1	8,644	8,644	0	8,571	8,571	-5
32	Ifield, Langley Green & West Green	2	15,526	7,763	-10	16,197	8,099	-10
33	Northgate & Three Bridges	1	7,920	7,920	-9	10,671	10,671	18
34	Pound, Hill Worth & Maidenbower	2	17,045	8,523	-2	17,273	8,637	-5
35	Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	8,830	8,830	2	9,067	9,067	0
Horsham								
36	Billinghurst	1	9,130	9,130	5	9,701	9,701	7
37	Bramber Castle	1	9,182	9,182	6	9,438	9,438	4
38	Henfield	1	8,372	8,372	-3	8,694	8,694	-4

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
39 Holbrook	1	8,530	8,530	-2	8,548	8,548	-5
40 Horsham Carfax	1	9,229	9,229	6	9,979	9,979	10
41 Horsham Riverside	1	8,921	8,921	3	9,489	9,489	5
42 Pulborough	1	9,133	9,133	5	9,773	9,773	8
43 Roffey	1	9,807	9,807	13	10,301	10,301	14
44 Southwater & Nuthurst	1	9,552	9,552	10	9,846	9,846	9
45 Storrington	1	9,647	9,647	11	10,150	10,150	12
46 Warnham & Rusper	1	8,695	8,695	0	9,971	9,971	10
Mid Sussex							
47 Burgess Hill	2	18,235	9,118	5	18,976	9,488	5
48 Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	7,676	7,676	-11	9,329	9,329	3

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
49 East Grinstead	2	17,241	8,621	-1	18,663	9,332	3
50 Hassocks & Victoria	1	9,692	9,692	12	10,220	10,220	13
51 Haywards Heath East	1	7,431	7,431	-14	8,431	8,431	-7
52 Haywards Heath Town	1	7,993	7,993	-8	8,317	8,317	-8
53 Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	7,758	7,758	-11	8,146	8,146	-10
54 Imberdown	1	7,435	7,435	-14	7,672	7,672	-15
55 Lindfield and High Weald	1	9,415	9,415	9	9,599	9,599	6
56 Worth Forest	1	9,179	9,179	6	9,634	9,634	7
Worthing							
57 Gaisford	2	19,674	9,837	13	19,600	9,800	8
58 Goring & Northbrook	2	16,591	8,296	-4	17,772	8,886	-2

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
59 Salvington	2	17,897	8,949	3	17,830	8,915	-1
60 Worthing East	1	8,060	8,060	-7	8,317	8,317	-8
61 Worthing Pier	1	8,312	8,312	-4	8,737	8,737	-3
62 Worthing West	1	8,710	8,710	0	8,753	8,753	-3
Totals	70	606,979	-	-	633,182	-	-
Averages	-	-	8,671	-	-	9,045	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by West Sussex County Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral division varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix E

Additional legislation we have considered

Equal opportunities

In preparing this report we have had regard to the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination
- promote equality of opportunity
- promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Broads

We have also had regard to:

- Section 11A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as inserted by section 62 of the Environment Act 1995). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in a National Park, any relevant authority shall have regard to the Park's purposes. If there is a conflict between those purposes, a relevant authority shall attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park.
- Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of the AONB.
- Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act (as inserted by section 97 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in the Broads, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purposes of the Broads.

The Boundary Committee

Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW

Tel 020 7271 0500
Fax 020 7271 0505
info@boundarycommittee.org.uk
www.boundarycommittee.org.uk

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by the UK Parliament. The Committee's main role is to conduct electoral reviews of local authorities in England with the aim of ensuring the number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same. Other duties include reviewing local authority boundaries and advising the Government on local authority bids for unitary status.