

## Kingsley, Paul

---

**From:** Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews  
**Sent:** 06 June 2016 16:28  
**To:** Kingsley, Paul  
**Subject:** FW: Review of West Sussex County Council - further consultation for Crawley

---

**From:** Duncan Crow [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 June 2016 22:25  
**To:** reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
**Subject:** Review of West Sussex County Council - further consultation for Crawley

As the 17 Conservative Borough Councillors for Crawley who represent 45% of Crawley Borough Council and who also include Crawley's three Conservative West Sussex County Councillors, we fully support the revised draft recommendations for Crawley from the LGBCE for the review of the West Sussex County Council electoral divisions. The draft recommendations reflect West Sussex County Council's proposal and the detailed work done by its cross-party (Conservative/UKIP/LibDem/Labour/Independent) Electoral Review Panel that had only the panel's Labour member not supporting this proposal for Crawley.

We are pleased to see that West Sussex County Council endorsed the LGBCE's draft recommendation for Crawley at their Full Council meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May and note that only County Councillors from the Labour group raised any opposition to it, who in total represent just 8.5% of the County Council's political make-up. There were no objections at this meeting from any Conservative, UKIP, LibDem or Independent members, who represent the other 91.5% of WSCC.

We welcome that the LGBCE proposal provides a very sustainable solution for Crawley with residents east of the London to Brighton railway no longer facing the prospect of being increasingly under-represented and left in a wholly unfair position due to the continuing growth of Forge Wood from 2015 to 2026.

We are very pleased that Crawley's long-established and much-cherished neighbourhood principle will not be weakened but will be strengthened, with the LGBCE proposal seeing Crawley's County electoral divisions not coterminous with only three of Crawley's Borough wards, as opposed to not being coterminous with five borough wards under the Labour party proposal. This is clearly a huge improvement and assists with public understanding as well as more effective local government.

Added to this improvement in coterminosity, we welcome that the LGBCE proposal also sees two less neighbourhood splits than the Labour proposal, with the Orchards estate in Ifield now in a division (Langley Green & Ifield East) with the rest of Ifield East, and the

historic neighbourhood of Worth all in one division (Maidenbower & Worth) rather than being divided at the Worth Way as previously proposed.

Crawley as a designated new town was designed with a neighbourhood principle very much at its heart. Crawley Borough wards have always very strongly matched Crawley's neighbourhoods and West Sussex County electoral divisions have always maximised coterminosity with Crawley Borough wards. The revised LGBCE draft recommendation gives recognition to this and respects the weight that should be given to Crawley's neighbourhood principle.

The revised LGBCE proposal sees three Crawley divisions divided by a railway line which is exactly the same as the Labour party proposal, but the LGBCE proposal sees considerably more mileage of railway line used as boundaries for electoral divisions in Crawley than the Labour proposal, giving stronger boundaries overall for the electoral divisions within Crawley.

The LGBCE revised draft recommendations for Crawley are superior to the Labour party's proposal on all three of the LGBCE's criteria in qualifying order, of equality of electorate, of coterminosity with Borough wards and of community of interest. It is also an improvement on the existing arrangements with a further uniting of both neighbourhoods and Borough wards within Crawley. We urge the LGBCE to adopt their draft recommendations for Crawley that are supported by West Sussex County Council.

### **LGBCE Proposed Divisions for Crawley:**

**Bewbush & Ifield West:** We support this proposal which enables greater equality of electorate and a more even split for the Ifield ward and neighbourhood. We recognise that Ifield needs to be split and the LGBCE proposal allows for a more even split of the neighbourhood. Ifield is very much one neighbourhood and the exact location of the split of the neighbourhood into two divisions is not of any major significance, although a fairly even split as proposed is preferable.

**Broadfield:** We support this proposal.

**Langley Green & Ifield East:** We support this proposal which sees Langley Green paired with the east of Ifield as opposed to West Green under the current arrangements. This is a much better arrangement as Langley Green has a much greater interface with the east of Ifield than it does with West Green, and the east of Ifield has a much greater interface with Langley Green than it does with Gossops Green. This can easily be seen by looking at a map. In addition, many residents from Langley Green visit the Hindu Temple in the eastern Ifield and residents in eastern Ifield regularly make use of the large neighbourhood shopping parade in Langley Green.

**Maidenbower & Worth:** We support this proposal which sees Maidenbower partnered with Worth rather than the LKA polling district of Pound Hill South as per the current arrangement. Historically Maidenbower and Worth have been together in a WSCC division. We are very pleased that Worth is no longer being split under the revised LGBCE recommendation.

**Northgate & West Green:** We strongly support this proposal which is an improvement on the Labour proposals for both Northgate and for West Green. A map of Crawley clearly shows that Northgate and West Green have a long interface along London Road, the High Street and the southern section of Pegler Way. Compared to the current arrangements and the Labour party proposal, this interface is much more than Northgate has with Three Bridges along Northgate Avenue which is an A-road with a 40mph speed limit that has few pedestrians and no buildings of any type.

The Northgate and West Green division will have the town centre at its heart. Residents of both wards use shops and facilities in the other one. In West Green this includes the Asda and Sainsbury supermarkets, Crawley Hospital and Crawley Leisure Park. In Northgate this includes the town centre.

For community of interest as well as coterminosity, having the northern part of Southgate coming into this division, which does look northwards to the town centre, is a much better proposal than the southern part of West Green going into a division with all of Southgate and part of Northgate and Three Bridges, as per the Labour proposal.

We very much welcome West Green not being split in two as previously proposed and that there will not be an unprecedented electoral division made up of parts of four Crawley Borough wards as previously proposed. West Green is a much smaller neighbourhood than Southgate and splitting this neighbourhood would have had a more negative effect on the community spirit in a smaller neighbourhood than in a much larger one such as Southgate.

**Pound Hill:** We strongly support the LGBCE proposal which addresses and provides a sustainable solution to the rapid population growth in Pound Hill due to the continuing building out of the new Forge Wood neighbourhood. There will now be no risk of any Crawley division breaching +10% above the West Sussex average in 2021 or indeed breaching +30% and triggering another county-wide boundary review in the years following 2021. These were serious risks under the Labour party proposal for Crawley.

**Southgate & Gossops Green:** We support this proposal that gives Gossops Green a better match than the current arrangement of being matched with Ifield East. Gossops Green was historically with Southgate West as a division until 2005 and having Goffs Park at the centre of this division is logical as residents of both neighbourhoods mingle here. There is a strong boundary of the railway line separating most of this proposed division to the north, other than the small part of Southgate West that is going into Northgate & West Green to ensure electoral equality.

**Three Bridges:** We strongly support this proposal which sees all of Three Bridges neighbourhood and ward placed in one division as opposed to two under the Labour party proposal. This is especially welcome for the Pembroke Park part of Three Bridges which has no connection or affinity whatsoever to the southern part of West Green or indeed the whole of Southgate as per the Labour party proposal.

A further improvement is for the LKA polling district of Pound Hill South which looks much more to Three Bridges and the area around Three Bridges Station than it looks south to Maidenbower.

This division will have Three Bridges Station at its centre and as a focal point. This will also provide for more effective local government by having one county councillor (as opposed to two currently) covering the station and the immediate areas affected by issues relating to it. As has been documented by the East Crawley County Local Committee, both Three Bridges and the LKA polling district of Pound Hill South have the same issues relating to Three Bridges Station.

**Tilgate & Furnace Green:** We support this proposal.

Yours sincerely, Cllr Duncan Crow.

On behalf of the Crawley Borough Council Conservative Group of:

Cllr Duncan Crow – Furnace Green, Conservative Group Leader at Crawley Borough Council and County Councillor for Tilgate and Furnace Green.

Cllr Carol Eade – Furnace Green

Cllr Richard Burrett – Pound Hill North and County Councillor for Pound Hill and Worth.

Cllr Tina Belben - Pound Hill North

Cllr Kevan McCarthy – Pound Hill North

Cllr Bob Lanzer – Pound Hill South and Worth, and County Councillor for Maidenbower.

Cllr Dr Howard Bloom – Pound Hill South and Worth

Cllr Beryl Mecrow – Pound Hill South and Worth

Cllr Ken Trussell - Maidenbower

Cllr Duncan Peck – Maidenbower

Cllr Kim Jaggard – Maidenbower

Cllr Bob Burgess – Three Bridges

Cllr Brenda Burgess – Three Bridges

Cllr Jan Tarrant – Southgate

Cllr Francis Guidera – Tilgate

Cllr Lisa Vitler – Gossops Green

Cllr Martin Stone – Ifield

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.