

Final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council

Electoral review

August 2016

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1252

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England 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 100049926 2016

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	7
Final recommendations	9
Adur District	10
Arun District	11
Chichester City	13
Crawley Borough	16
Horsham District	20
Mid Sussex District	22
Worthing Borough	25
Conclusions	27
Parish electoral arrangements	27
3 What happens next?	31

Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council	32
B Submissions received	39
C Glossary and abbreviations	42

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why West Sussex?

We are conducting an electoral review of West Sussex County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in West Sussex. Overall, 32% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county.

Our proposals for West Sussex

West Sussex County Council currently has 71 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a reduction in council size by one to 70 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

As West Sussex County Council elects by wholes, the Commission will aim to produce a pattern of mixed divisions. Our final recommendations therefore propose that West Sussex County Council's 70 councillors should represent 70 single-member divisions across the county. Two of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for West Sussex by 2021.

We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for West Sussex.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review has been conducted following our decision to review West Sussex County Council's ('the Council's) electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held two periods of consultation: firstly on division patterns for the Council and secondly on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
23 June 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for division arrangements to LGBCE
1 September 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 December 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
9 February 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
10 May 2016	Publication of further draft recommendations for Crawley and consultation
7 June 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
16 August 2016	Publication of final recommendations

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Dr Peter Knight CBE DL

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors² in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the division we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2015	2021
Electorate of West Sussex	622,815	663,971
Number of Councillors	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	8,897	9,485

10 Under our final recommendations, two of our proposed divisions will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the borough by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for West Sussex.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between borough wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of West Sussex County Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices (by appointment). All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Electors refer to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 6.5% to 2021. The growth will largely be driven by developments across the county, however, the districts of Horsham, Crawley and Mid Sussex are forecast to have the largest growth in electorate.

15 In response to the draft recommendations, the Council argued that housing for an additional 296 electors would be built by 2021 in the Chichester area of Chichester district. We sought clarification from the Council and are satisfied that these additional electors should be included in the figures. We are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

16 Prior to consultation, West Sussex County Council submitted a proposal to us to decrease the existing council size of 71 members to 69 members. During the preliminary period we only received a proposal on council size from the County Council.

17 We carefully considered the representation from the Council. The Council considered that it could manage a small reduction in council size in terms of ensuring that it could continue to effectively provide the strategic direction, undertake effective scrutiny and effectively undertake the representational role. Having considered the Council's submission, we considered it had provided persuasive evidence to support a small reduction in council size. We are content that the Council has sufficiently demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under this council size and ensure effective representation of local residents.

18 We then investigated the allocation of 69 councillors across the seven districts in the county. Our investigations indicated that a council size of 70 would provide for a better allocation of members and therefore result in better levels of electoral equality across the county. We therefore consulted on electoral arrangements for West Sussex based on a council size of 70, which we now confirm as final.

Division patterns

19 During consultation on division patterns, we received 16 submissions, including one county-wide proposal from the County Council. We also received an alternative division pattern for Crawley from the West Sussex Labour Group. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county.

20 Having carefully considered the proposals received we were of the view that the Council had proposed patterns of divisions that generally secured good levels of electoral equality and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries in Adur, Arun, Chichester, Horsham, Mid Sussex and Worthing and therefore used these as the

basis of our draft recommendations. In Crawley we based our draft recommendations on alternative proposals, subject to a number of amendments to improve electoral equality.

Draft recommendations

21 We received 44 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These are detailed in Appendix B. The majority of submissions received were in relation to our proposals for Crawley and Mid Sussex, particularly the Burgess Hill area.

Adur district

22 We did not receive any specific comments on our draft recommendations for Adur and are therefore confirming them as final.

Arun district

23 We received four comments relating to Arun district. A number of comments related to the creation of small parish wards within the parishes of Littlehampton and Bognor Regis. In response to the comments received we propose an amendment to retain an area of Littlehampton to the south of the A259 in Littlehampton Town division, rather than transferring it to Arundel & Wick as under the draft recommendations, which would worsen electoral equality in the Arundel & Wick division to 12% fewer electors than the county average by 2021. We also propose renaming Arundel & Wick division as Arundel & Courtwick division.

Chichester city

24 We received three comments on Chichester, including argument that the Chichester town area would see an additional 296 electors by 2021. As a result of these additional electors, a number of modifications were proposed in the Chichester town area to ensure good levels of electoral equality. In addition, a local group requested an amendment to ensure the divisions covered the area it represents. We are therefore adopting the draft recommendations for Chichester subject to a number of small amendments to ensure good electoral equality and reflect communities. In light of evidence received we are also renaming Fernhurst division as Rother Valley division.

Crawley borough

25 We received 15 submissions in relation to Crawley. There was significant opposition to the draft recommendations, with only limited support. The County Council objected, submitting a modified version of its original proposals. This received support from a number of respondents. Respondents argued that the draft recommendations split a number of communities and stated that our argument of railway lines splitting communities was 'inconsistently applied' as while we had used a railway line as a boundary in one area we had breached it in another, which respondents argued had poor links across it. They argued that it was possible to create a division crossing the London to Brighton railway line if centred on the Three Bridges railway station, arguing that residents on either side shared concerns connected to the railway.

26 We received support for the draft recommendations from a small group of councillors, but no other comments in support. On balance, we considered that there was compelling evidence for the alternative proposals, although we considered they

needed a few amendments to strengthen boundaries and improve electoral equality.

27 Although a version of this alternate pattern had been submitted previously, it had not been subject to public consultation. We therefore decided to consult locally on whether this new pattern of divisions should be adopted as part of our final recommendations.

28 We received 17 submissions in response to the further draft recommendations. Of these, eight supported the further draft recommendations, while nine objected to them. On balance, we do not consider there to be significant new evidence, with both those objecting to, and those supporting, the further draft recommendations offering broadly similar evidence to that submitted before. We do not consider there to be sufficient new or compelling evidence to persuade us to move away from the further draft recommendations.

29 We are therefore amending our draft recommendations in Crawley. We consider that the alternative proposal provides for reasonable electoral equality, and reflects community identities and interests in Crawley.

Horsham district

30 We received eight submissions that commented on the draft recommendations for Horsham, including objections to the split of Nuthurst parish, the inclusion of Warnham parish in a division with Broadbridge Heath and a minor amendment to Billingshurst division. On balance, there is not persuasive evidence to make the changes in Warnham or Billingshurst. However, we are persuaded that while retaining the whole of Nuthurst parish in Southwater & Nuthurst division would worsen electoral equality in St Leonard's Forest division to 12% fewer electors than the county average it would better reflect communities.

Mid Sussex district

31 We received 16 comments in response to our draft recommendations for Mid Sussex, with particular objections to the proposals for Burgess Hill and the Haywards Heath area. We received a number of alternative proposals for Burgess Hill, some of which were identical to or modifications to proposals submitted during consultation on division arrangements. We have considered the alternate proposals, but do not consider that any provide a set of clear boundaries, while reflecting communities and securing good electoral equality in Burgess Hill and the surrounding area. However, in response to evidence received we do propose renaming Burgess Hill Town and Hassocks & Victoria divisions Burgess Hill North and Hassocks & Burgess Hill South divisions.

32 We also received objections in Haywards Heath, particularly around the proposal to include part of Lindfield Rural parish in our Haywards Heath East division, with the area's links to Lindfield parish being highlighted. On balance, we are persuaded by the evidence and are reverting to the existing division, as proposed by a number of respondents during our consultation on division patterns. We do, however, propose a minor amendment between the boundary of Haywards Heath Town and Cuckfield & Lucastes divisions to provide a clearer boundary.

33 We are confirming the remainder of our draft recommendations for this area as final.

Worthing borough

34 We did not receive any specific comments on our draft recommendations for Worthing and are therefore confirming them as final.

Final recommendations

35 The tables on pages 10–26 detail our final recommendations for each area of West Sussex. Where we have moved away from our draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

Adur District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Lancing	1	6%	This division includes the wards of Churchill, Marsh Barn and part of Widewater ward.	In response to the draft recommendations for Adur, we received limited comments which provided general support for our proposals. We did not receive any other comments and are therefore confirming the draft recommendations for these divisions as final.
Shoreham North	1	6%	This division includes the wards of Buckingham, Southlands and part of St Nicolas, St Mary's and Southwick Green wards.	
Shoreham South	1	0%	This division includes Marine ward and part of St Mary's, St Nicolas and Widewater wards.	
Sompting & North Lancing	1	7%	This division includes the wards of Peverel, Manor and Cokeham.	
Southwick	1	-1%	This division includes the wards of Hillside and Eastbrook and part of Southwick Green ward.	

Arun District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Angmering & Findon	1	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Angmering, Findon, Clapham, Patching and Poling Angmering.	We received one response that argued that Poling parish should be in Arundel & Wick division, rather than Angmering & Findon. However, there was no persuasive evidence to support this and no other respondents argued in support of this. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Arundel & Courtwick	1	-12%	This division comprises the parishes of Houghton, South Stoke, Burpham, Arundel, Warningcamp, Lyminster & Crossbush and part of Littlehampton.	We received comments expressing concern about our proposal to include an area to the south of the A259 in our Arundel & Wick division, with the suggestion this is better included in the town. Retaining this area in the Littlehampton Town division would worsen electoral equality in Arundel & Wick to -12% from 0% under the draft recommendations but improve it in Littlehampton Town division from -8% to 3%. On balance, we consider there to be persuasive evidence to adopt this amendment. Finally, we also received comments that suggested that this division would be better reflected by being named Arundel & Courtwick, so we are adopting this name as part of our final recommendations.
Bersted	1	5%	This division includes part of Bersted and Bognor Regis parishes.	We received comments objecting to the creation of small parish wards in Bognor parish and the suggestion that alternative arrangements should be sought. However, in order to secure good electoral equality this has been necessary and we are unable to move away from this. We did not receive any other specific comments on our proposals for these divisions and are therefore confirming them as final.
Bognor Regis East	1	1%	This division comprises part of Bognor Regis and Bersted parishes.	
Bognor Regis West & Aldwick	1	4%	This division includes Marine ward, part of Aldwick East ward and part of Aldwick West ward.	

East Preston & Ferring	1	7%	This division includes the parishes of Ferring, Kingston, East Preston and part of Rustington.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Felpham	1	-3%	This division includes the parish of Felpham and the Flansham area of Yapton parish.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Fontwell	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Slindon, Madehurst, Walberton, Barnham, Eastergate and Aldingbourne.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Littlehampton East	1	5%	This division includes Beach ward, Brookfield ward and part of Rustington West ward.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Littlehampton Town	1	3%	This division includes the district ward of River and part of Courtwick with Toddington.	As stated above in the Arundel & Courtwick section, we are transferring the area to the south of the A259 from the Arundel & Wick division to the Littlehampton division as we consider the evidence received supports this. This improves electoral equality in Littlehampton Town division to 3% by 2021.
Middleton	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Ford, Climping, Middleton-on-Sea and the Yapton area of Yapton parish.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Nyetimber	1	-3%	This division comprises the parish of Pagham and part of Aldwick.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Rustington	1	3%	This division largely comprises Rustington parish.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Chichester City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Bourne	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Marden, Compton, Stoughton, Westbourne, Southbourne, Chidham & Hambrook and West Thorney.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Chichester East	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Tangmere and Oving, the ward of Chichester East and part of Chichester North ward.	<p>As stated in the Chichester North section (below), in response to the draft recommendations the Council informed us that Chichester North would have an additional 296 electors in the Graylingwell site by 2021. As detailed in paragraph 15 we have included this development in the electorate figures.</p> <p>In order to ensure good electoral equality in Chichester North a respondent proposed amendments transferring an area to the south of Kingsmead Avenue to Chichester East. In addition, it was also proposed that a small area of Chichester East to the west of Palmers Field Avenue is transferred to Chichester North to reflect its access into the proposed development, and proposed that the whole of Oving Road should be in Chichester East, rather than Chichester South. Finally, in order to ensure good electoral equality following the transfer of electors from Chichester North, it was proposed that a small area of Chichester East around St Pancras is transferred to Chichester South division.</p> <p>On balance, we consider that these amendments provide for clear boundaries and ensure good electoral equality.</p>

Chichester North	1	9%	This division includes the parishes of West Dean, Singleton, East Dean, Upwaltham, Eartham, Boxgrove, Westhampnett, Lavant, and the Chichester North ward.	<p>In response to the draft recommendations the Council argued that Chichester North would receive an additional 296 electors in the Graylingwell site by 2021. This would push the division to have a variance of greater than 10%. It was therefore proposed that a small area to the south of Kingsmead Avenue is transferred to Chichester East division. In addition, it was proposed that a small section of Chichester East to the west of Palmers Field Avenue is transferred to Chichester North to reflect its access into the proposed development.</p> <p>On balance, we consider that these amendments provide for clear boundaries and ensure good electoral equality.</p>
Chichester South	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Appledram, Donnington, Hunston and North Mundham, most of the Chichester South ward and part of the Chichester East ward.	<p>As stated in the Chichester East section (above), a respondent suggested the transfer of the St Pancras area of Chichester East division to Chichester South division to ensure good electoral equality in Chichester East.</p> <p>In addition, a local group argued that the boundary between Chichester South and Chichester West divisions divides the area it covers and the boundary should run behind the houses on Westgate, rather than down the centre of the road.</p> <p>We have considered the evidence received and on balance consider that both proposals provide for clear boundaries and good electoral equality. We are therefore including them as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Chichester West	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Bosham, Fishbourne, Funtington,	As stated in the Chichester South section, (above), a local group argued that the boundary between Chichester South and Chichester West divisions divides the areas it covers and should run behind the houses on Westgate, rather than

			Chichester West ward and part of Chichester South ward.	down the centre of the road. We have considered the evidence received and on balance consider that this amendment provides for a clearer boundary while reflecting communities and securing good electoral equality. We are therefore including it as part of our final recommendations.
Midhurst	1	-5%	This division includes the parishes of Linch, Milland, Midhurst, Rogate, Trotton with Chithurst, Harting, Elsted & Treyford, Bepton, Stedham with Iping and Woolbeding with Redford.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Petworth	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Loxwood, Plaistow, Northchapel, Lurgashall, Ebernoe, Kirdford, Wisborough Green, Stopham, Fittleworth, Petworth and Tillington.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Rother Valley	1	1%	This division includes the parishes of Linchmere, Fernhurst, Lodsworth, Easebourne, West Lavington, Cocking, Heyshott, Graffham, East Lavington, Duncton, Barlavington, Sutton, Bignor and Bury.	We received one comment in response to our draft recommendations for Fernhurst, which suggested that the proposed name reflected a single parish within the division and that Rother Valley was a more locally recognised name for the area. We are therefore renaming this division as Rother Valley.
Selsey	1	-8%	This division solely comprises the parish of Selsey.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

The Witterings	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of West Wittering, East Wittering, Earnley, West Itchenor, Birdham and Sidlesham.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
-----------------------	---	-----	--	---

Crawley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Bewbush & Ifield West	1	2%	This division comprises Bewbush ward and part of Ifield ward.	<p>In response to the draft recommendations we received limited comments about this division, although those supporting an alternative proposal for Crawley as a whole argued that the modified ward had better electoral equality. We adopted this modified ward as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In response to the consultation on further draft recommendations, a number of respondents expressed concern that this division splits part of Ifield. While we acknowledge this, retaining the whole area in the Langley Green & Ifield East division would create poor electoral equality. We are therefore confirming the further draft recommendation for this division as final.</p>
Broadfield	1	0%	This division includes the wards of Broadfield North and Broadfield South.	This division is identical to the existing division and was unaltered as part of the draft and further draft recommendations. We only received limited comments and are therefore confirming it as final.
Langley Green & Ifield East	1	4%	This division comprises Langley Green ward and part of Ifield ward.	In response to the draft recommendations a number of respondents argued that an alternative proposal linking Ifield and Langley Green better reflects communities than linking Ifield to Gossops Green, while also securing better electoral

				<p>equality. We therefore adopted this as part of the further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In response to the further draft recommendations, a number of respondents supported our proposals. However, there were also objections, arguing that the proposals split Ifield and that Ifield and Langley Green do not share community links.</p> <p>As stated above, we acknowledge that the further draft recommendations separate part of Ifield, but we consider that the links between the remaining area and Langley Green are good and do not breach the railway line, unlike the draft recommendations. We are therefore confirming the further draft recommendations as final.</p>
Maidenbower & Worth	1	-5%	This division comprises Maidenbower ward and part of Pound Hill South & Worth ward.	<p>In response to the draft recommendations, a number of respondents argued that our Maidenbower ward had relatively poor electoral equality and also split Worth. In addition, they argued that the area around the station would be better served with an area on the other side of the railway since they share concerns over issues such as parking. Other respondents rejected the argument that the railway line should be breached, arguing the railway is a strong boundary between communities. We concluded that it would be acceptable to transfer this area, breaching the railway line, and adopted it as part of our further draft recommendations.</p> <p>In response to our further consultation, respondents essentially reiterated their earlier arguments. We do not consider there was any new or compelling evidence and are</p>

				therefore confirming the further draft recommendations as final.
Northgate & West Green	1	6%	This division comprises Northgate and West Green wards and part of Southgate ward.	In response to the draft recommendations, a number of respondents argued that the proposal separated parts of Northgate and Three Bridges wards, and also the Pembroke Park Estate. We therefore adopted an amendment that avoided this as part of our further draft recommendations. We only received limited comments in response to our further draft recommendations and are therefore confirming them as final.
Pound Hill	1	-6%	This division comprises Pound Hill North ward and part of Pound Hill South ward.	In response to the draft recommendations a number of respondents objected to the poor electoral equality in our proposed division, arguing the area is likely to grow beyond the forecast period of the review. They also objected to the proposed split of Worth, transferring part of it to Pound Hill & Worth. We therefore proposed a number of amendments. We received support for our further draft recommendations, and also some objections, but no compelling new evidence. We are therefore confirming the further draft recommendations as final.
Southgate & Gossops Green	1	8%	This division comprises Gossops Green ward and part of Southgate ward.	In response to the draft recommendations a number of respondents objected to the proposals, arguing that they split Northgate, Three Bridges and the Pembroke Park Estate, transferring them to a division with Southgate. An alternative was put forward that didn't split these areas, but rather joined Southgate with Gossops Green. We adopted this as part of the further draft recommendations. We received support for the further draft recommendations, but also objections arguing that Gossops Green and Southgate are two distinct communities separated by the

				A23. We acknowledge these are two distinct communities, but in creating a division pattern it is sometimes necessary to place two communities in a single division and we consider this to be preferable to dividing communities. We are therefore confirming our further draft recommendations as final.
Three Bridges	1	-3%	This division comprises Three Bridges ward and part of Pound Hill South & Worth ward.	<p>During our consultation on the draft recommendations a number of respondents argued that we had been inconsistent in using the railway line as boundary in this area, while breaching railway lines elsewhere. Some respondents argued that there are links across the railway at Three Bridges station and that the station itself means residents on both sides share concerns over issues such as parking. In addition, it was argued that by 2021 with the amount of growth projected to the east of the railway line, electoral equality would be relatively poor. Taken with likely growth beyond this period, respondents argued that the railway would need to be breached soon after. A number of respondents rejected these arguments, reiterating their view that the railway line is a barrier. We concluded that it would be acceptable to breach the railway line at this point.</p> <p>In response to our further consultation respondents essentially reiterated their earlier arguments. We do not consider there was any new or compelling evidence and are therefore confirming the further draft recommendations as final.</p>
Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	-2%	This division comprises the wards of Tilgate and Furnace Green.	This division is identical to the existing division and was unaltered as part of the draft and further draft recommendations. We only received limited comments and are therefore confirming it as final.

Horsham District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Billingshurst	1	4%	This division includes the parishes of Billingshurst, Shipley and Itchingfield.	We received one comment that argued that a small area of Billingshurst parish should be transferred to Pulborough division as it has no direct road access into Billingshurst division. However, we did not include this proposal in our draft recommendations as this would require the creation of an unviable parish ward with 25 electors. There is no additional evidence at this stage so we are confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Bramber Castle	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Ashurst, Bramber, Steyning, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote and part of Henfield parish.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Broadbridge	1	-2%	This division includes the parishes of Rudgwick, Slinfold, Warnham and Broadbridge Heath.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division. We also received objections to the inclusion of Warnham parish in the division, arguing that it would be dominated by the more urban Broadbridge Heath parish. However, we are unable to find any alternative arrangements that would provide good electoral equality. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Henfield	1	-9%	This division includes the parishes of West Grinstead, Cowfold, Shermanbury and part of Henfield parish.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Holbrook	1	-9%	This division comprises the wards of Holbrook West and Holbrook East.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Horsham East	1	-7%	This division includes the Roffey North ward and parts of the Roffey South and Forest wards.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Horsham Hurst	1	-9%	This division includes the Trafalgar ward and part of the Horsham Park ward.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Horsham Riverside	1	-1%	This division includes the whole of Denne ward and parts of the Horsham Park and Forest wards.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Pulborough	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Coldwaltham, Pulborough, West Chiltington and Thakeham.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
St Leonard's Forest	1	-12%	This division includes the parishes of Rusper, Colgate, Lower Beeding, part of Nuthurst and part of Horsham Town.	We received objections to our proposal to divide Nuthurst parish between two divisions. Including the whole of Nuthurst parish in the Southwater & Nuthurst division would worsen electoral equality in St Leonard's Forest to -12%. On balance, we consider there to be persuasive evidence to justify this worsening of electoral equality and are adopting this amendment as part of our final recommendations.
Southwater & Nuthurst	1	0%	This division includes the parish of Southwater and Nuthurst parish.	As stated in the St Leonard's Forest section above, we received evidence to suggest that Nuthurst parish should not be divided between two divisions. On balance, we are persuaded to include the whole parish in the Southwater & Nuthurst division. This would improve electoral equality in this division from -9% in 2021 under our draft recommendations to 0%.
Storrington	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington &	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

			Sullington, Washington, Ashington and Wiston.	
--	--	--	---	--

Mid Sussex District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Burgess Hill East	1	6%	This division comprises the wards of Burgess Hill St Andrews, Burgess Hill Franklands and parts of Burgess Hill Meeds.	We received significant objections to our draft recommendations for Burgess Hill (including the Hassocks & Victoria division) and a number of alternative proposals. One of these proposals broadly reflected a scheme we did not propose as part of our draft recommendations. We did not consider there to be any new evidence to persuade us to adopt an alternative proposal.
Burgess Hill North	1	9%	This division includes Burgess Hill Leylands ward and parts of the wards of Burgess Hill Victoria, Burgess Hill Dunstall, and Burgess Hill Meeds.	<p>A number of respondents expressed support for another proposal. While we consider that this proposal has some merit, we had concerns that a number of the boundaries appear to create divisions that have tenuous internal links and would also result in a division with a variance of 11%. On balance, we do not consider there to be persuasive evidence to support this pattern of divisions.</p> <p>We also received objections to the proposed names. As a result, we propose renaming Burgess Hill Town division as Burgess Hill North. Subject to this name change, we are confirming our draft recommendations as final.</p>
Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	2%	This division comprises the parish of Cuckfield, part of Ansty & Staplefield and the western part of Haywards Heath Town.	We received evidence to suggest that the small area of Antsy & Staplefield parish to the south of Rocky Lane would be better served in a Haywards Heath division. On balance, we concur with this and propose transferring this area to the Haywards Heath Town division.

East Grinstead Meridian	1	-7%	This division comprises the north-eastern part of East Grinstead.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood	1	-2%	This division comprises the main part of East Grinstead Town and the parish of Ashurst Wood.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Hassocks & Burgess Hill South	1	1%	This division includes part of the Burgess Hill Meeds and Burgess Hill Victoria wards and the parish of Hassocks.	See the Burgess Hill East and Burgess Hill North sections. In addition, a respondent objected to the name Hassocks & Victoria, arguing the division should be Hassocks & Burgess Hill South. We are adopting this name change as part of our final recommendations.
Haywards Heath East	1	-10%	This division includes the eastern part of Haywards Heath Town.	As stated in the Lindfield & High Weald section (below), we received a significant objection to our proposal to include part of Lindfield Rural Parish in the Haywards Heath East division, with the links between this area of Lindfield Rural and Lindfield parish being highlighted. On balance, we consider this evidence to be persuasive. However, removing this area from Haywards Heath East worsens electoral equality here to -14%, we therefore propose retaining the Fox Hill area in the division. As a consequence of transferring the Fox Hill area to Haywards Heath East, the variance in Haywards Heath Town division would worsen. However, a number of respondents argued for the inclusion of a small area of Ansty & Staplefield parish in the Haywards Heath Town division. This area links directly into the division and is effectively urban overspill of Hayward Heath and marginally improves electoral equality in this division.
Haywards Heath Town	1	-9%	This division includes the central part of Haywards Heath town and part of Ansty & Staplefield parish.	

				These revised proposals actually reflect the existing divisions (with the exception of the small area of Ansty & Staplefield), which a number of respondents argued should be retained during the consultation on division patterns.
Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Pyecombe, Newtimber, Poynings, Fulking, Albourne, Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common, Twineham and Bolney and part of Burgess Hill Town.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Imberdown	1	-5%	This division includes the eastern part of Worth and the north-western part of East Grinstead.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Lindfield & High Weald	1	9%	This division includes the parishes of West Hoathly, Horsted Keynes, Lindfield and Lindfield Rural.	We received significant objections to our proposal to transfer part of Lindfield Rural parish into our Haywards Heath East division, citing strong links between this area and Lindfield Parish. On balance, we are persuaded that these links should be retained and are therefore retaining this area in the Lindfield & High Weald division. As a consequence, we also propose reverting to the existing divisions in Haywards Heath, subject to a minor amendment with the boundary of Ansty & Staplefield parish.
Worth Forest	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Slaugham, Balcombe, Ardingly, Turners Hill and part of Worth.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Worthing Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Broadwater	1	-1%	This division comprises the majority of Broadwater ward and follows South Farm Road so that the eastern part of Gaisford ward is included in the division.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Cissbury	1	-6%	This division comprises the northern part of Salvington ward (north of the A27), Offington ward and part of Broadwater ward around Grove Road.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Durrington & Salvington	1	6%	This division includes the whole of Durrington ward and the southern part of Salvington ward (south of the A27).	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Goring	1	-8%	This division includes Goring ward and the southern part of Castle ward.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Northbrook	1	9%	This division comprises the majority of Castle ward and the whole of Northbrook ward.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Tarring	1	4%	This division comprises the whole of Tarring ward and the western part of Gaisford ward, using South Farm Road as the western boundary.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Worthing East	1	-7%	This division includes all of Selden ward, has an eastern boundary which follows the A259 and includes the area around Angola Road and Meredith Road to the immediate north of the railway line.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Worthing Pier	1	-2%	This division includes the southern part of Heene ward and follows the A259 as its eastern boundary.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.
Worthing West	1	-5%	This division comprises Marine ward and the northern part of Heene ward to the north of the A259.	We received some limited comments supporting the draft proposals for this division and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Conclusions

35 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	70	70
Number of electoral divisions	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	8,897	9,485
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	11	2
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	3	0

Final recommendation

West Sussex County Council should comprise 70 councillors representing 70 single-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for West Sussex. You can also view our final recommendations for West Sussex on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

36 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

37 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, West Sussex County Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral

arrangements.

38 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ansty & Staplefield, Bognor Regis, Burgess Hill, Chichester, Lancing, Littlehampton and North Horsham parishes.

39 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ansty & Staplefield parish.

Final recommendation
Ansty & Staplefield Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Ansty (returning four members), Brook Street & Borde Hill (returning one member), Rocky Lane (returning one member) and Staplefield (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

40 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bognor Regis parish.

41 In response to our draft recommendations we received objections to the creation of small parish wards. It was argued that if these couldn't be removed then the whole parish should have single-member parish wards. While we acknowledge the concerns over the creation of small parish wards, in some instances this is necessary to ensure a strong division pattern and this remains the case in Bognor Regis. In addition, we do not propose the creation of a pattern of single-member parish wards. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Final recommendation
Bognor Regis Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Hatherleigh (returning one member), Hotham (returning four members), Marine (returning four members), Orchard (returning three members) and Pevensey (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

42 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Burgess Hill parish..

Final recommendation
Burgess Hill Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing 10 wards: Burgess Hill Dunstall (returning one member), Burgess Hill Franklands (returning three members), Burgess Hill Gatehouse (returning one member), Burgess Hill Hammonds (returning one member), Burgess Hill Leylands (returning three members), Burgess Hill Meeds (returning two members), Burgess Hill Norman (returning one member), Burgess Hill St Andrews (returning three members), Burgess Hill St Johns (returning one member) and Burgess Hill Victoria

(returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

43 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Chichester parish. In response to the draft recommendations we are proposing a number of changes that require the creation of additional parish wards in Chichester City.

44 **The parish wards set out below for Chichester City Council may be superseded by those put forward in the ongoing Chichester District Council electoral review. The draft proposals for Chichester City Council under the Chichester District Council review can be seen here:**

<http://www.lqbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/west-sussex/chichester>

Final recommendation

Chichester City Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing 10 wards: Chichester Bostock (returning one member), Chichester East (returning four members), Chichester Kingsmead (returning one member), Chichester North (returning four members), Chichester Palmers Field (returning one member), Chichester Pound Farm (returning one member), Chichester South (returning three members), Chichester St Pancras (returning one member), Chichester West (returning three members) and Chichester Westgate (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

45 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Lancing parish.

Final recommendation

Lancing Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Churchill (returning four members), Manor (returning two members), Mash Barn (returning four members), Penhill (returning four members) and Widewater (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

46 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Littlehampton parish.

Draft recommendation

Littlehampton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Beach (returning three members), Brookfield (returning three members), Courtwick with Toddington (returning three members), River (returning three members), Wick (returning 1 member) and Wickbourne (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

47 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for North Horsham parish.

Final recommendation

North Horsham Parish Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Comptons (returning one member), Holbrook East (returning five members), Holbrook West (returning four members), Roffey North (returning six members) and Roffey South (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

48 We have now completed our review of West Sussex County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

Equalities

49 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Adur District							
1 Lancing	1	9,839	9,839	11%	10,054	10,054	6%
2 Shoreham North	1	9,778	9,778	10%	10,085	10,085	6%
3 Shoreham South	1	9,117	9,117	2%	9,466	9,466	0%
4 Sompting & North Lancing	1	9,983	9,983	12%	10,176	10,176	7%
5 Southwick	1	9,177	9,177	3%	9,375	9,375	-1%
Arun District							
6 Angmering & Findon	1	8,203	8,203	-8%	8,747	8,747	-8%
7 Arundel & Courtwick	1	6,309	6,309	-29%	8,375	8,375	-12%
8 Bersted	1	9,246	9,246	4%	9,967	9,967	5%
9 Bognor Regis East	1	9,442	9,442	6%	9,552	9,552	1%
10 Bognor Regis West & Aldwick	1	9,635	9,635	8%	9,831	9,831	4%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
11	East Preston & Ferring	1	9,947	9,947	12%	10,191	10,191	7%
12	Felpham	1	8,482	8,482	-5%	9,205	9,205	-3%
13	Fontwell	1	8,958	8,958	1%	9,724	9,724	3%
14	Littlehampton East	1	9,910	9,910	11%	9,990	9,990	5%
15	Littlehampton Town	1	9,584	9,584	8%	9,815	9,815	3%
16	Middleton	1	8,398	8,398	-6%	8,888	8,888	-6%
17	Nyetimber	1	9,154	9,154	3%	9,187	9,187	-3%
18	Rustington	1	9,688	9,688	9%	9,729	9,729	3%
Chichester District								
19	Bourne	1	9,427	9,427	6%	9,715	9,715	2%
20	Chichester East	1	8,647	8,647	-3%	10,287	10,287	8%
21	Chichester North	1	8,909	8,909	0%	10,384	10,384	9%
22	Chichester South	1	9,201	9,201	3%	9,768	9,768	3%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
23 Chichester West	1	9,597	9,597	8%	9,800	9,800	3%
24 Midhurst	1	8,522	8,522	-4%	8,985	8,985	-5%
25 Petworth	1	9,545	9,545	7%	9,783	9,783	3%
26 Rother Valley	1	8,742	8,742	-2%	9,549	9,549	1%
27 Selsey	1	8,567	8,567	-4%	8,757	8,757	-8%
28 The Witterings	1	8,975	8,975	1%	9,394	9,394	-1%
Crawley Borough							
29 Bewbush & Ifield West	1	9,223	9,223	4%	9,692	9,692	2%
30 Broadfield	1	9,090	9,090	2%	9,469	9,469	0%
31 Langley Green & Ifield East	1	9,473	9,473	6%	9,848	9,848	4%
32 Maidenbower & Worth	1	8,812	8,812	-1%	8,966	8,966	-5%
33 Northgate & West Green	1	7,968	7,968	-10%	10,076	10,076	6%
34 Pound Hill	1	6,286	6,286	-29%	8,913	8,913	-6%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
35	Southgate & Gossops Green	1	9,727	9,727	9%	10,218	10,218	8%
36	Three Bridges	1	8,216	8,216	-8%	9,198	9,198	-3%
37	Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	8,912	8,912	0%	9,294	9,294	-2%
Horsham District								
38	Billingshurst	1	8,586	8,586	-4%	9,859	9,859	4%
39	Bramber Castle	1	9,123	9,123	3%	9,247	9,247	-3%
40	Broadbridge	1	7,822	7,822	-12%	9,283	9,283	-2%
41	Henfield	1	8,373	8,373	-6%	8,656	8,656	-9%
42	Holbrook	1	8,578	8,578	-4%	8,629	8,629	-9%
43	Horsham East	1	8,666	8,666	-3%	8,836	8,836	-7%
44	Horsham Hurst	1	8,532	8,532	-4%	8,607	8,607	-9%
45	Horsham Riverside	1	7,936	7,936	-11%	9,382	9,382	-1%
46	Pulborough	1	9,691	9,691	9%	10,273	10,273	8%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
47	St Leonard's Forest	1	5,798	5,798	-35%	8,316	8,316	-12%
48	Southwater & Nuthurst	1	9,331	9,331	5%	9,499	9,499	0%
49	Storrington	1	9,945	9,945	12%	10,278	10,278	8%
Mid Sussex District								
50	Burgess Hill East	1	8,793	8,793	-1%	10,091	10,091	6%
51	Burgess Hill North	1	9,823	9,823	10%	10,293	10,293	9%
52	Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	8,281	8, 281	-7%	9,714	9, 714	2%
53	East Grinstead Meridian	1	8,407	8,407	-6%	8,852	8,852	-7%
54	East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood	1	8,869	8,869	0%	9,293	9,293	-2%
55	Hassocks & Burgess Hill South	1	9,079	9,079	2%	9,536	9,536	1%
56	Haywards Heath East	1	8,083	8, 083	-9%	8,510	8,510	-10%
57	Haywards Heath Town	1	8,289	8,289	-7%	8,610	8,610	-9%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
58	Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	9,423	9,423	6%	9,804	9,804	3%
59	Imberdown	1	8,375	8,375	-6%	8,967	8,967	-5%
60	Lindfield & High Weald	1	9,709	9,709	9%	10,038	10,338	9%
61	Worth Forest	1	9,857	9,857	11%	10,221	10,221	8%
Worthing Borough								
62	Broadwater	1	9,255	9,255	4%	9,367	9,367	-1%
63	Cissbury	1	8,774	8,774	-1%	8,886	8,886	-6%
64	Durrington & Salvington	1	9,754	9,754	10%	10,042	10,042	6%
65	Goring	1	8,566	8,566	-4%	8,762	8,762	-8%
66	Northbrook	1	8,327	8,327	-6%	10,371	10,371	9%
67	Tarring	1	9,734	9,734	9%	9,892	9,892	4%
68	Worthing East	1	8,685	8,685	-2%	8,816	8,816	-7%
69	Worthing Pier	1	8,847	8,847	-1%	9,250	9,250	-2%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for West Sussex County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
70 Worthing West	1	8,815	8,815	-1%	9,038	9,038	-5%
Totals	70	622,815	-	-	663,971	-	-
Averages	-	-	8,897	-	-	9,485	-

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 B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/west-sussex/west-sussex-county-council>

Local authority

- West Sussex County Council
- Crawley Borough Council
- Mid Sussex Borough Council

MPs

- Henry Smith MP

Political parties

- Burgess Hill Labour Party
- Burgess Hill Liberal Democrats
- Crawley Borough Council Conservative Group
- Crawley Conservative Association
- Mid Sussex Conservative Association

County councillors

- Councillor Dennis (Horsham Hurst)
- Councillors Jones (Burgess Hill East) & Miles-Barret (Burgess Hill Town)
- Councillor Lanzer (Maidenbower division)
- Councillors Mullins (Gossops Green & Ifield East), Oxlade (Bewbush & Ifield West), Quinn (Broadfield), Smith (Langley Green & West Green), Lamb (Northgate & Three Bridges) & Jones (Southgate & Crawley Central)

District councillors

- Councillor Bradnum (Horsham District Council, Nuthurst ward)
- Councillors Bob Burgess (Crawley Borough Council, Three Bridges ward) & Brenda Burgess (Crawley Borough Council, Three Bridges ward)
- Councillors McCarthy (Crawley Borough Council, Pound Hill North ward), Brockwell (Crawley Borough Council, Pound Hill North ward) & Burrett (Crawley Borough Council, Pound Hill North ward)
- Councillors Mecrow (Crawley Borough Council, Pound Hill South & Worth), Bloom (Crawley Borough Council, Pound Hill South & Worth) & Lanzer (Crawley Borough Council, Pound Hill South & Worth)

Parish and town councils

- Ansty & Staplefield Parish Council
- Bognor Regis Town Council
- Burgess Hill Town Council
- Haywards Heath Town Council
- Horsham Denne Neighbourhood Council
- Lindfield Parish Council
- Lindfield Rural Parish Council
- Littlehampton Town Council
- Nuthurst Parish Council
- Warnham Parish Council

Local groups

- Burgess Hill Town Partnership
- Westgate Residents' Association
- Horsham Trafalgar Neighbourhood Group

Residents

- 13 members of the public

Further consultation: submissions received

Local authority

- West Sussex County Council
- Crawley Borough Council

MPs

- Henry Smith MP

Political parties

- Crawley Borough Council Conservative Group

County councillors

- Councillor Burrett (Pound Hill & Worth)
- Councillor Lanzer (Maidenbower division)
- Councillor Mullins (Gossops Green & Ifield East)

District councillors

- Councillors Bob Burgess (Crawley Borough Council, Three Bridges ward) & Brenda Burgess (Crawley Borough Council, Three Bridges ward)
- Councillor Smith (Crawley Borough Council, Ifield ward)

- Councillor Lamb (Crawley Borough Council, Northgate ward)
- Councillor Lunnon (Crawley Borough Council, Broadfield South ward)

Residents

- Five members of the public

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on 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 fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	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
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 candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
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