

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No.183

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 183.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess of Albermarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Merlyn Rees, MP  
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY IN THE COUNTY OF WEST SUSSEX

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the borough of Crawley in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that borough.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 31 December 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Crawley Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the West Sussex County Council, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from interested bodies.
3. The Crawley Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. When doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were also asked to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. The Council have passed a resolution under section 7(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 requesting the Secretary of State to provide for a system of elections by thirds.
5. On 17 March 1975 the Crawley Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. They proposed to divide the area of the district into 10 wards, each returning either 2 or 3 members to give a council of 25.
6. We considered the draft scheme submitted by the Council together with a comment we had received about it from an Association representing the area of the district transferred from the county of Surrey under section 2 of the Charlwood and Horley Act 1974. The Association urged that the whole area should be allowed to form part of one district ward, preferably the Pound Hill ward, and objected to the Council's proposal to continue with the existing arrangements whereby it was divided between three wards. We decided to modify the Council's draft scheme in this respect for the purpose of our draft proposals. We noted that the proposed Gossops Green ward would be under-represented by 1980 with only 3 members, and decided to divide it into two wards, to be known as Gossops Green and Broadfield each returning 2 councillors, thus increasing the size of council to 26 members.
7. We then formulated our draft proposals accordingly.
8. On 31 March 1976 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had made comments. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying map which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main office. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 2 June 1976.

9. The Borough Council accepted our draft proposals except those relating to the Pound Hill, Langley Green and Northgate wards. West Sussex County Council supported the Borough Council in their objections to those wards. The Gatwick Community Association were in favour of our proposals for the three wards. Two other comments were received relating to the same area, one from a political party and one from an individual living there. Both suggested modifications to the draft proposals.

10. In view of these comments we considered that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act, and at our request, Mr L J Slocombe was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

11. The Assistant Commissioner held the meeting at Crawley on 19 October 1976. A copy of his report is attached as Schedule 1 to this report.

12. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that our draft proposals should be confirmed subject to the modification that the proposed Pound Hill, Northgate and Langley Green wards should be replaced by the existing Pound Hill, Northgate and Langley Green wards.

13. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report of the local meeting. We concluded that we should accept the modification which the Assistant Commissioner had recommended, and formulated our final proposals accordingly.

14. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 2 and 3 to this report and on the attached map. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. Schedule 3 shows the order of retirement of councillors. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the attached map.

PUBLICATION

15. In accordance with section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 a copy of this report and a copy of the map are being sent to Crawley Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council offices at Crawley. Copies of this report<sup>(without map)</sup> are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter or have subsequently made comments. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards as defined on the map is set out in Schedule 4 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

NEIL DIGNEY (Secretary)

11 November 1976

The Secretary  
 Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
 Room 123  
 20 Albert Embankment  
 London SE1 7TJ

Sir

Review of Electoral Arrangements  
Borough of Crawley, West Sussex

In accordance with my appointment by the Secretary of State as an Assistant Commissioner and pursuant to the instructions contained in your letter of the 23rd September 1976, I have the honour to submit the following report.

1. Date of Meeting

A local Meeting was held at the Town Hall, Crawley on Tuesday 19th October 1976 commencing at 10-30 a.m. and concluding at 13-15 hours, after which I made an inspection of certain boundaries. Details of the inspection are contained in paragraph 13 of this report.

2. Attendance

The signed attendance list accompanies this report. All those who spoke or participated in the proceedings are shown below.

Mr K J Newell Chief Executive on behalf of the Crawley Borough Council.

Mr G S Lowth (Chairman) on behalf of the Gatwick Community Association, supported by Mr R Jeal, a Committee member of the Association (did not speak) and Mrs M Hobson (Secretary) who spoke as an individual.

Councillor A C W Crane for Crawley Labour Party and Labour Councillors.

Councillor M A Vallance for Conservative Councillors and Pound Hill Ward Councillor.

Mr K J Bridgeman Vice-Chairman of Horsham and Crawley (Divisional) Conservative Association.

Each speaker had the opportunity of commenting on what had been said by others, in addition to making their own views known. Not everyone availed themselves of the right of reply but some did.

3. The Commission's draft proposals

The Borough Council's draft scheme was for a Council of 25 members elected from 10 wards. The Commission adopted this scheme as a basis for their own proposals but with some modifications as follows :-

(a) The Commission considered that, taking into account future development, the Council's proposed Gossops Green ward would be under-represented with 3 councillors in 1980 and decided to divide it into two 2 - member wards, known as Gossops Green and Broadfield. This modification increased the size of the Council to 26.

(b) The Commission also decided to accept a proposal by the Gatwick Community Association to put the whole of the area which was transferred from Surrey on re-organization into the Pound Hill Ward instead of perpetuating the present situation which splits it into three parts each of which is combined with a previously existing ward to form the present Langley Green, Northgate and Pound Hill wards.

This area when in the County of Surrey formed parts of the parishes of Charlwood and Horley.

#### 4. Comments on the draft proposals.

The Commission's draft proposals were advertised locally and comments invited. A small number of comments were received by the Commission. I mention these comments here in summary form but deal with all the cases advanced at the meeting in detail in the main body of my report.

Crawley Borough Council oppose the draft proposals for the area formerly within the County of Surrey and press for their own proposals, which preserve the existing arrangements, to be adopted. They accept the Commission's proposal to divide the Gossops Green ward into two wards.

West Sussex County Council support the Borough Council's proposals for the reasons stated by them and do not see that the Commission's proposals really create a better alternative.

Gatwick Community Association fully support the Commission's draft proposals in relation to the three wards with which they are concerned.

Sir George Sinclair M.P. agrees with the Commission's draft proposals and supports the views expressed by the Gatwick Community Association.

Pound Hill Branch Labour Party would prefer the northern boundary of Pound Hill ward to be the old Surrey/Sussex boundary, ie not to include any of the former Surrey area even the part which is at present in the ward. (Note: A further letter from this Branch was handed to me at the hearing and this indicated support for the Borough Council's original proposals).

Mrs M Hobson - a resident in the former Surrey area puts forward a suggestion for a "Crawley Rural" ward formed from the transferred area combined with the more rural parts of some of the former Crawley wards.

Conservative Group - a letter from the Conservative Group on the Borough Council had expressed support for the draft proposals. (Note: This letter was not before me at the meeting but had just been received by the Commission).

#### 5. An alternative proposal.

Before recording the views expressed at the meeting on matters which had been the subject of written comments, I here dispose of an alternative proposal which the Commission had asked me to offer to the meeting.

This was to place the whole of the area transferred from Surrey into the Langley

Green ward instead of into the Pound Hill ward. Such a proposal was, numerically, slightly superior to the draft proposals. I put this suggestion to the meeting with the following result: no person or organization spoke in favour of it, the Borough Council strongly opposed it, as did Councillor Crane, and it was not acceptable to the Gatwick Community Association. In the light of this reaction I reject the proposed alternative and do not consider it necessary for me to refer to it again.

#### 6. Cases advanced at meeting.

The following paragraphs 7 to 12 deal with the cases advanced at the meeting in support of, or against, the Commission's draft proposals. The report is not in any way a verbatim note of every word that was said but is, I hope, a fair summary of the principal points made by the various speakers, both initially and in reply. My assessment of the weight of arguments advanced at the meeting is contained in paragraph 14 below.

#### 7. Crawley Borough Council.

Mr K J Newell, Chief Executive, presented the views of the Borough Council which were strongly against the Commission's draft proposals in relation to the transferred area. He started with a review of the history of that area consequent upon the operation of the Charlwood and Horley Act 1974. In making electoral arrangements for such area the Home Office, after consultation, had published proposals dividing the transferred area between the three wards of Pound Hill, Northgate and Langley Green, with no provision for a parish system. Mr Lowth had objected to these proposals; the Council stood by them and asked the Secretary of State to reject the objection, which he subsequently did and made the Charlwood and Horley (Electoral Divisions and Wards) Order 1974 and Amendment Order 1974. In taking action to exercise their option for a system of election by thirds a warding scheme had been prepared and this subsequently became the Council's draft scheme for the Commission's review of the district. Apart from complying with the rules in the Local Government Act 1972 and the Commission's guide-lines, the Borough Council had tried hard to fix easily identifiable ward boundaries and to avoid breaking local ties. One matter on which they placed prime importance was the practice (since the creation of the former Urban District) of identifying wards with the geographical neighbourhoods established as part of the new town development. This had worked well and was an accepted system for the electorate.

Mr Newell here referred to the desirability of changes in administrative boundaries and parliamentary constituency boundaries but I indicated that such matters were not within my jurisdiction and could not be considered by me. He then went on to deal with the formal objections which had been received from the Gatwick Community Association both in writing and in the case submitted by Mr Lowth.

Mr Newell said he did not accept that the transferred area could be described as "rural" as it contained the second largest airport in the country. Certainly it was sparsely populated but so were other parts of the Borough. He conceded that the N.N.I. lines shown on a map produced by Mr Lowth were substantially correct but the N.N.I. 35 line indicated that other parts of the Borough as well as the transferred area were affected and were the concern of the whole Borough Council and not any small group. So far as the objection about access was concerned he indicated other parts of the Borough which were as far away from the Town Centre and its amenities. Whatever the distances involved his councillors considered themselves responsible as a whole for all the problems of all parts of the Borough. Noise from Gatwick Airport and associated problems were a matter for the Council as a whole and the Council would, and did, deal with such matters as necessary. He did not agree that there were any planning problems relating to industrialization which were peculiar to the transferred area and these were dealt with by the Council in its efforts to obtain an integrated planning policy for the whole Borough. The Council would oppose any ideas about creating a separate parish for the Gatwick area and believed this had been made clear in the action which had been taken to split up the former Charlwood and Horley parishes between different authorities. His Council were firmly against the Commission's proposals to attach the whole of the transferred area to Pound Hill ward which would be unwieldy in size and shape, destroy the declared policy of seeking to integrate the new area into Crawley community, and wipe out some useful physical boundaries which were ideal for ward boundaries, ie the Railway and the A.23 road. He doubted whether there was any real community of interest, regarded the Secretary of State's earlier decision as positive support for the Council's intentions, did not favour the idea of a referendum which had been suggested, concerned that the Commission had shown a greater regard to the views of a very small section of the Community - 340 electorate - than to the views of an elected Council representing nearly 52000 electors. He said that physical and financial constraints had so far prevented the distribution of the "District News" to the transferred area but it was hoped this would be solved in due course. Whilst accepting the proposed division of Gossops Green ward, Mr Newell said that for all the reasons given at this meeting, and in correspondence, the Commission's draft proposals for the transferred area were totally unacceptable to the Council and he urged a reversion to their own proposals for the three wards of Pound Hill, Northgate and Langley Green.

#### 8. Gatwick Community Association.

Mr G S Lowth, Chairman, presented the case for this Association. He first explained what he considered were the requirements for a ward to be viable. Essentially these were that the interests of the residents should be effectively

represented by those they elect, there should be common interests in the ward and minority interests must also be served. He agreed that a ward is simply an area whose residents have been grouped together for electoral purposes and that it was helped if there are common interests. The re-drawing of the Surrey/West Sussex county boundary has little effect on social life - people still shop where they used to do and continue with their social organizations which are not directed to Crawley.

Mr Lowth pointed out what his Association considered the special interests of his area :- dominance of the area by the Airport (noise, sound-proofing grants, atmospheric pollution and safety risks) ambiguous planning status of area and consequent worry and uncertainties, the contrast of a rural area with the predominantly urban Crawley, remoteness from Town Centre and special problems of rates and cess pool charges. He then went on to suggest certain changes in administrative boundaries and pointed out that the transferred area was in the Dorking Parliamentary Constituency whilst Crawley was in Horsham Constituency. I reminded him that these were not matters for the present meeting.

Mr Lowth said openly and fairly that the Association would be pressing for Parish status for the Gatwick area when a review of parishes was made by the Commission and handed in a plan showing their ideas. Here again I informed Mr Lowth that this was not a matter for me. His reply was that if the parish application was successful the area would have to be re-warded so why not leave it now in one ward only as proposed by the Commission. He was anxious that the Gatwick area should not degenerate; this could only be prevented if the morale of the residents could be fostered and the best way was to keep them as one entity. Pound Hill had some similarity but not Northgate or Langley Green.

Mr Lowth then criticised in some detail the Council's arguments:- the split-up between three wards could upset their size and balance, queried the Council's assertion that the enlarged Pound Hill ward would be more difficult to administer, doubted how the objections of integration would be effected, said there was a close network of roads in area and access was not a serious problem, said problems could be better dealt with if area remained as one, did not accept that the earlier decision of the Secretary of State should be an argument for the status quo, and noted with significance the earlier letter from the Pound Hill Branch Labour Party.

Mr Lowth handed in a statement showing the membership of his Association in the transferred area. This indicated a membership of over 60% of the households concerned. I had the opportunity of reading a number of news-letters concerning the activities of the Association which Mr Lowth handed in together with three plans showing existing boundaries, N.N.I. lines and parish proposals.

In conclusion Mr Lowth emphasized that the Association was non-political, that the area was neglected by councillors, (instancing the non-canvassing at election time and non-delivery of Borough News), that he had received courteous attention to any requests to councillors and officials but felt that communication in its widest sense would be enhanced by putting the transferred area in Pound Hill ward and consequently supported the Commission's draft proposals.

9. Mrs M Hobson.

Mrs Hobson supported the views expressed by the Gatwick Community Association but spoke as an individual local resident. She could follow the Council's reasoning in dividing the transferred area into three parts but considered it the wrong decision. Her view was that there was more sense of community in the Gatwick area than in any of the other wards and it would assist to maintain and enhance that community spirit if the whole of the transferred area were in one ward. It was difficult enough now to vote and she did not think the main body of Crawley councillors really knew anything about the problems of the area where she lived. She did not agree that putting the area into one ward would cause any difficulties to the Council. The access to the area would not be changed just because of a change in ward boundaries. She was in support of the Commission's draft proposals.

10. Councillor A C W Crane.

Mr Crane spoke on behalf of the Labour Part in Crawley. He explained that he had been associated with the local government of the area since 1953 and was presently a councillor for Crawley, the local government liason officer of the Labour Party and Secretary to the Labour group of councillors on the Borough Council. Any proposals for change in boundaries, wards and representation were discussed by delegates of various labour groups and organizations comprising some 12000 people. The Borough Council's scheme and the Commission's draft proposals had been so discussed and he said the Labour Party fully supported the Borough Council's scheme and objected to the Commission's draft proposals. The Party were in agreement with the neighbourhood principle which had worked well and had no doubt the present system should be maintained for the added areas. The Commission had over-ridden some good and sensible boundaries. He, and all councillors had a constant concern for all their constituents irrespective of party. He referred to an earlier local association - the County Oak Association - , considered residents associations could play a useful part in community life but was firmly against a separation into parishes in a borough or urban area. So far as the Pound Hill Branch of the Labour Party was concerned all they had aimed to do was to reduce the size of the ward, if possible. Now, as was clear from their latest letter, the Branch fully supported the Borough Council's scheme and opposed the Commission's draft proposals.

11. Councillor M A Vallance.

Mr Vallance said he was speaking on behalf of the Conservative Group of Councillors on the Borough Council and as a member for the Pound Hill ward. He stressed what he described as the absurdity of the Council's proposal to continue the division of the transferred area between three wards. He had been much impressed with what had been said on behalf of the Gatwick Community Association and considered that support should be given to the local people as otherwise there would be apathy. He suggested a referendum would be useful and if not, supported the Commission's draft proposals.

12. Mr K J Bridgeman.

Mr Bridgeman spoke as Vice-Chairman of the Horsham and Crawley Divisional Conservative Association and as Chairman of the Crawley Branches. He knew that a letter was being sent to the Commission but was not aware of its detailed contents. So far as he was concerned the Commission's draft proposals were really a nonsense when looked at purely from the provision of readily identifiable boundaries. But considering, as he did, the need for concern for individual feelings, he was rather inclined to go along with the Commission's draft proposals.

13. Inspections.

In company with Mr Newell and Mr Lowth I made a short tour of inspection on the afternoon of the 19th October to see various boundary points in the Pound Hill, Northgate and Langley Green wards. Starting near Three Bridges Station I proceeded to and along Balcombe Road noting the Motorway Link Roads, then down Radford Road to the bridge at Tinsley Green to examine the main Railway Line and the accesses over it. From there for a circuit of the Airport via the A.23, Horley Road, Charlwood Road and back to the Town Centre via the London Road A.23. I was thus enabled to see all that was necessary in respect of the boundaries in dispute.

14. Assessment of weight of arguments.

Having heard the various arguments and expressions of view, carefully considered all that had been said and written, and finished my inspections, I reached the conclusion that there was only one matter requiring resolution - should I recommend the Council's scheme for the three wards of Langley Green, Northgate and Pound Hill or support the Commission's draft proposals? Before assessing the position I first clear up one or two minor doubts which arose at the meeting concerning the views of the Pound Hill Branch Labour Party and the Conservative Group. The former, in a letter dated 17th October 1976 addressed to Mr Newell, came out clearly in favour of the Council. The latter, in a letter dated 14th October 1976 addressed to the Commission, came out clearly in favour of the Commission's draft proposals, although Mr Bridgeman's

views were rather less firm.

No questions arose about the number of councillors or their distribution, nor on growth rates or numbers of electors per ward. The issue was a direct conflict of philosophies and principles. The Gatwick Community Association was formed to represent the people transferred from Surrey who live on the fringe of Gatwick Airport and who say they have problems in common. Their aim is to prevent their "rural" area from being drawn into the urban communities of Crawley. The Borough Council's clear aim is to integrate the new areas with the rest of the Borough.

I accept without question that the Gatwick Community Association is fully representative of the people who live in the transferred area and figures of membership put in by Mr Lowth confirm this. But I do not accept that the problems outlined by Mr Lowth are confined to the transferred area. Certainly the effect of the Airport laps substantially into many of the northern parts of the Borough below the former county line. I next considered what would be the best way of dealing with these problems. The Association say they would be better off from the point of view of representation and solidity if they were all in one ward. The Council say exactly the opposite. If they were split, as they now are, there would be eight councillors available apart from the generality of all Borough councillors being concerned with the needs and problems of the Borough. I next turn to an examination of the practicalities of the situation. The first point is that the Borough Council is the only corporate legal entity that can take formal action under the various powers available to local authorities. No individual councillor or group of people has these powers. Secondly so far as talk about majorities and minorities is concerned I have to accept as a fact of life that decisions are rarely consensus decisions but those of a majority party or group. The number of people involved in the transferred area is very small. Those in the Pound Hill ward will remain there whatever happens and probably less than 200 electors are affected in the other two wards. There is no real hard evidence that the present arrangements have been unfair or harsh bearing in mind that the Borough Council have only had the transferred areas for a couple of years, and are clearly doing their best in the circumstances. Thirdly it became quite clear to me, and Mr Lowth said so, that the Gatwick Community Association will continue in existence whatever the division of wards, and ward boundaries will not, of themselves, change the physical layout of the area and its roads. Consequently I do not think their activities would be hindered by having the area in three wards, and have not been so injured. Fourthly I place a good deal of weight on the earlier decision of the Secretary of State (on much the same arguments as now) to divide the transferred area over three wards. To explain my thinking on this point I need to go back in history

for about 20 years. When the New Town Development Corporation started work the Master Plan showed a neighbourhood system and this principle was used by the former Crawley Urban District Council to form the electoral wards. There is no evidence to suggest that this system has not worked well, and is now firmly accepted. The Commission's draft proposals would negate this basis. It must be remembered that a very large part of the present Borough was, not very long ago, a rural area. The problems of growth into an urban area have been carried through successfully and I have no reason to think that the transferred area cannot eventually be integrated into the Borough. I consider that this has more chance of success if the Borough Council's scheme is adopted.

Fifthly I do not attach much weight to the point made by the Gatwick Community Association about parish status. Briefly stated the argument was that if the whole of the transferred area was in one ward it would mean no further division if parish status was granted. The flaw in this is that to make a viable parish it would mean biting into other wards and districts so the whole matter would be again in the melting pot. However the whole subject is so speculative that I see no value in pursuing it further.

Sixthly on a minor point of "readily identifiable boundaries". The old county boundary is in a number of places no longer readily visible on the ground. Particularly is this so in the area north of County Oak Lane and Fleming Way where the boundary runs from the London Road A.23, (a) eastwards to the main railway line near Tinsley Lane North and (b) westwards towards Amberley Farm. Mr Lowth had suggested a slight movement of the boundary southwards if his scheme was adopted. In the Council's scheme both these vague boundaries are swallowed up by the Langley Green ward ( (b) above) and in Northgate ward ( (a) above), by a clear boundary - London Road A.23 and Brighton Road A.23. This is the solution I prefer. Finally would I say that in general I would give more weight to the evidence of an authority that has the executive power and the actual duty and responsibility for all the problems in its area than to those with a lesser responsibility and lesser or narrower interest. Sometimes it is a difficult choice to make but in this case I am firmly of the opinion, in the light of what I have said above, that the Council's scheme should be preferred to that of the Commission's and shall recommend accordingly.

#### 15. Acknowledgments.

I record my grateful thanks to all the parties at the hearing for their assistance in supplying information, plans and opinions, to the officers of the Council who made all the necessary arrangements for the hearing and inspections, and for the cogent and pleasant way in which the evidence was given.

#### 16. Recommendation.

I recommend that the Commission's draft proposals for a Council of 26 members

electd from 11 wards be approved subject to the modification that the Borough Council's proposals for Pound Hill, Northgate and Langley Green wards be adopted in place of the Commission's draft proposals for these wards.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L J SLOCOMBE', written over a horizontal line.

L J SLOCOMBE

Assistant Commissioner

25th October 1976

## BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

<u>NAME OF WARD</u>	<u>NO OF COUNCILLORS</u>
BROADFIELD	2
FURNACE GREEN	2
GOSSOPS GREEN	2
IFIELD	2
LANGLEY GREEN	3
NORTHGATE	2
POUND HILL	3
SOUTHGATE	3
THREE BRIDGES	2
TILGATE	3
WEST GREEN	2

BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY

ELECTIONS BY THIRDS

ORDER OF RETIREMENT

	NO. OF COUNCILLORS REPRESENTING WARD	1ST YEAR	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR
Broadfield	2	1	1	-
Furnace Green \	2	-	1	1
Gossops Green	2	1	-	1
Ifield \	2	1	1	-
Langley Green \	3	1	1	1
Northgate	2	-	1	1
Pound Hill \	3	1	1	1
Southgate	3	1	1	1
Three Bridges \	2	1	-	1
Tilgate	3	1	1	1
West Green	2	1	1	-
		9	9	8

## BOROUGH OF CRAWLEY

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

NOTE: Where the boundary is described as following a road, railway, river, canal or similar feature it should be deemed to follow the centre line of the feature unless otherwise stated.

## LANGLEY GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where Ifield Avenue meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northeastwards and following said boundary, and the northern boundary of the Borough to the London-Brighton railway, thence southwards along said railway to a point being the National Grid reference TQ 2873140470, thence due westwards to Brighton Road, thence southwards and following said road and London Road to the Tushmore Roundabout, thence westwards and southwestwards round the northern and western carriageways of said roundabout to Crawley Avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to Ifield Avenue, thence northwestwards along said avenue to the point of commencement.

## NORTHGATE WARD

Commencing at a point where the Horsham-Three Bridges railway meets High Street, thence northwards along said street and London Road to the Tushmore Roundabout, thence northwestwards round the western carriageway of said roundabout to the eastern boundary of Langley Green Ward, thence northwards and following said boundary to the London-Brighton railway, thence southwards along said railway to a point being the National Grid reference TQ 2875639492, thence due westwards to Tinsley Lane North, thence southwestwards along said lane and Gatwick Road to the northern carriageway of the roundabout at the junction with Northgate Avenue, thence southwestwards and southeastwards round the western carriageway of said roundabout to said avenue, thence southwestwards along said avenue to College Road, thence southwards along said road and Southgate Avenue to the Worsham-Three Bridges railway, thence westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

**POUND HILL WARD**

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the London-Brighton railway, thence northwards along said railway and the eastern boundaries of Northgate Ward and Langley Green Ward to the northern boundary of the Borough, thence eastwards and southwards following the northern and eastern boundaries of the Borough to the point of commencement.

**THREE BRIDGES WARD**

Commencing at the point where the Horsham-Three Bridges railway meets the eastern boundary of Northgate Ward, thence northwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Pound Hill Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the Horsham-Three Bridges railway, thence southwestwards and westwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

**IFIELD WARD**

Commencing at the point where the Horsham-Three Bridges railway meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the southwestern boundary of Langley Green Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary to Crawley Avenue, thence southwestwards and southwards along said avenue to the Horsham-Three Bridges railway, thence westwards and southwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

**WEST GREEN WARD**

Commencing at a point where the Horsham-Three Bridges railway meets the eastern boundary of Ifield Ward, thence northwards and following said boundary and the southeastern boundary of Langley Green Ward to the western boundary of Northgate Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the Horsham-Three Bridges

railway, thence northwestwards along said railway to the point of commencement.

#### GOSSOPS GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where Horsham Road meets the western boundary of the Borough, thence northwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of Ifield Ward, thence northeastwards and eastwards along said boundary to Crawley Avenue, thence southeastwards along said avenue to Horsham Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the point of commencement.

#### BROADFIELD WARD

Commencing at a point where the road known as Pease Pottage Hill meets the southern boundary of the Borough, thence generally westwards and northwards along the southern and western boundaries of the Borough to the southeastern boundary of Gossops Green Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Crawley Avenue, thence southeastwards and southwards along said avenue, Brighton Road and Pease Pottage Hill to the point of commencement.

#### SOUTHGATE WARD

Commencing at a point where Southgate Avenue meets the eastern boundary of Broadfield Ward, thence northwestwards following said boundary and the eastern boundary of Gossops Green Ward to the southern boundary of West Green Ward, thence southeastwards along said boundary and the southern boundary of Northgate Ward to Southgate Avenue, thence southwards and southwestwards along said avenue to the point of commencement.

## TILGATE WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Broadfield Ward, thence generally northwards along said ward boundary to the southeastern boundary of Southgate Ward, thence northeastwards along said boundary to Hawth Avenue, thence eastwards along said avenue to a point being in prolongation northwestwards of the rear boundary of No 2 Furnace Drive, thence southeastwards along said prolongation and said boundary and the rear boundaries of Nos 4-14 Furnace Drive and in prolongation thereof to Bligh Close, thence northeastwards along said close and the path, to the southeast of No 14 Furnace Drive, to a point opposite the southwestern boundary of No 16 Furnace Drive, thence southeastwards to and along said boundary and northeastwards along the southeastern boundary of said property to said drive, thence southeastwards and eastwards along said drive to a point opposite the western boundary of The Robert May Primary Schools, thence southwards to and along said boundary and northeastwards along the southern boundary of said schools and in prolongation thereof to the western boundary of No 11 Epping Walk, thence southwards along said boundary, crossing said walk, the western boundary of No 10 in said walk and in prolongation thereof to the western boundary of No 9 Savernake Walk, continuing southwards along said boundary and crossing said walk and continuing southwards along the western boundary of No 8 in said walk to a point being the National Grid reference TQ 2795735468, thence due westwards to the eastern boundary of The Bishop Bell Infant and Junior School, thence southwards along said boundary to Weald Drive, thence eastwards along said drive to a point being in prolongation northeastwards of the western boundary of Nos 275-283 Weald Drive thence southwards to and along said boundary and continuing southeastwards along the northeastern boundary of Tilgate Playing Field, and in prolongation thereof to the northwestern boundary of Long Wood, thence southwestwards and southwards along the northwestern and western boundaries of said wood to Tilgate Drive, thence westwards along said drive to the stream flowing from Tilgate Lake, thence

southwards along said stream to the path to the north of said lake, thence eastwards along said path to the eastern boundary of Tilgate Park, thence southwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of the Borough to the southern boundary of the Borough, thence westwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### FURNACE GREEN WARD

Commencing at the point where the eastern boundary of the Borough meets the eastern boundary of Tilgate Ward, thence northwards and following said ward boundary and the eastern boundary of Southgate Ward to the southern boundary of Three Bridges Ward, thence eastwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Pound Hill Ward, thence southwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of the Borough, thence southwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

DMT