

## **Kingsley, Paul**

---

**From:** Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews  
**Sent:** 06 June 2016 16:29  
**To:** Kingsley, Paul  
**Subject:** FW: WSCC Boundary Review Crawley

---

**From:** Peter Smith (Ifield) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 June 2016 20:02  
**To:** reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
**Cc:** 'Peter Smith' <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** WSCC Boundary Review Crawley

Dear Sir / Madam,

I was surprised and disappointed to hear that the Boundary Commission has decided to review the draft arrangements for Crawley in West Sussex, overturning its original decision. I fail to see a good reason for this. The comments on the original arrangements have come from Conservative councillors and supporters only and do not justify a review.

I wish to object strongly to the proposed alternative scheme. Some of the reasons are:

### **Combining Langley Green and most of Ifield**

Langley Green is a ward with a very definite character with a high concentration of residents from an ethnic minority background. Ifield is another large ward and also has a very definite character. An older, more settled area it has a much more rural feel, with its direct access to the countryside, through its much loved and well regarded conservation area, round what was the original ancient village of Ifield, mentioned in the Domesday Book. The whole area has a very different 'feel' to Langley Green. It is not sensible or 'natural' to join these two large areas together, especially as they are divided by one of the main arterial roads to Crawley – Ifield Avenue. Joining these together would be a major upset for residents of both Borough wards and would not make a comfortable fit. Crawley's residents are very attached to and strongly identify with their individual wards. Each of those wards has its own very definite character which has developed over the past years. For County Council electoral purposes some of these wards are combined, but careful thought has to be given as to how and with whom they are joined – joining Langley Green with Ifield would not do this.

### **Part of Pound Hill and Three Bridges**

Where these two have been joined, there is no access between the two, due to the main railway line and the lines have been drawn purely to attempt to balance numbers without any evidence of any rationale or logic! There is no link between these two areas at all and no common background or structure. This is a complete nonsense and should not be endorsed by the Boundary commission.

### **Ward sizes**

There are wide discrepancies between wards. On the east side of the town the number of new developments, and therefore likely future population figures, is known down to single figures, Forge Wood, for example. Yet tolerances of -6% in Pound Hill, and -5% in Maidenbower and Worth, are being put forward as acceptable.

In central Crawley, where so much development is happening, +8% in Gossops Green and Southgate, and +6% in Northgate are deemed acceptable.

On the western side of Crawley, Langley Green and Ifield +4% is suggested, with all the new developments coming on stream on the outskirts of Ifield, where developers are showing considerable interest in expanding, Ifield Golf Course, for example.

### **Lack of support**

There are nine county councillors representing Crawley. Six of them are adamantly against this draft proposal (Peter Lamb, Michael Jones, Brenda Smith, Brian Quinn and Sue Mullins) and only three support it (Duncan Crow, Bob Lanzer and Richard Burrett). The Boundary Commission working party, at West Sussex County Council only had one

Labour representative on it, so naturally its recommendations were endorsed, by the Conservative controlled administration.

With the future boundary reviews due shortly for Borough elections, as well as a review of constituency boundaries, I have a concern that by accepting these draft proposals at this late stage, could leave the boundary Commission open to accusations of political bias and of not following its own policies, in making decisions.

I would welcome a return to the original draft proposals, made in February, this year, as the most sensible and least disruptive and divisive way of moving forward with any publically acceptable, boundary changes for Crawley divisions. Co-terminosity with ward boundaries is good and recognition given to natural and man-made boundaries, such as main roads and railway lines. It is not always possible to make decisions purely on numbers, the feelings and identities of local residents must be taken into consideration.

Kind Regards,  
Peter

Cllr Peter Smith, Ifield and Ifield West