

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	6
Division patterns	6
Detailed divisions	7
Adur District	8
Arun District	9
Chichester District	11
Crawley Borough	13
Horsham District	16
Mid Sussex District	18
Worthing Borough	21
Conclusions	23
Parish electoral arrangements	23
3 Have your say	27

## Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council	29
B Submissions received	36
C Glossary and abbreviations	37



# 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 draft recommendations therefore propose that West Sussex County Council's 70 councillors should represent 70 single-member divisions across the county. None of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for West Sussex by 2021.

**You have until 8 February 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 27 for how to have your say.**



# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being 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 legislation<sup>1</sup> 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](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
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
17 May 2016	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## 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:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> 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 wards 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.

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of West Sussex	622,815	663,675
Number of councillors	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	8,897	9,481

10 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the county 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 district 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 Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums 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 and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

### Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

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 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft 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 invited submissions on division patterns for West Sussex based on a council size of 70.

19 Based on the evidence received we have based our draft recommendations on a council size of 70. This provides the following allocation across the districts:

- Adur – 5 members
- Arun – 13 members
- Chichester – 10 members
- Crawley – 9 members
- Horsham – 12 members
- Mid Sussex – 12 members
- Worthing – 9 members

## Division patterns

20 During consultation on warding 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 warding arrangements in particular areas of the county.

21 The county-wide scheme provided a division arrangement of 70 single-member divisions for the county. The county-wide proposal included three divisions with variance of more than +/- 10% from the county average. In the areas of Horsham, Mid Sussex, Crawley and Adur the Council proposed division patterns which were very different to the existing pattern. In Worthing, Chichester and Arun the Council proposed a division pattern which was largely similar from the existing pattern of divisions. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of divisions resulted in generally good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the county and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

22 The alternative proposal for Crawley from the West Sussex Labour Group was based on nine single-member divisions. Of these none of the divisions would have had a variance of more than +/- 10% from the county average. These proposals were largely based on the existing divisions but subject to modifications to improve electoral equality.

23 Our draft recommendations are for 70 single-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

24 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 29 – 35) and on the large map accompanying this report.

25 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

## Draft recommendations

26 The tables on pages 8 – 22 detail our draft recommendations for each area of West Sussex. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>4</sup> criteria of:

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

---

<sup>4</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Adur District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Lancing</b>	1	6%	This division includes the wards of Churchill, Marsh Barn and part of Widewater ward.	We received two proposed division patterns covering this part of Adur. We considered that one of the proposed division patterns provided for a reasonable level of electoral equality, however, we have made small modifications to the boundaries in order to improve coterminosity and provide for more identifiable boundaries.
<b>Shoreham North</b>	1	6%	This division includes the wards of Buckingham, Southlands and part of St Nicolas, St Mary's and Southwick wards.	We received two proposed division patterns covering this part of Adur. We considered that one of the proposed division patterns provided for a reasonable level of electoral equality, however, we have made some modifications to the boundaries in order to provide for more identifiable boundaries and improve road links in the division.
<b>Shoreham South</b>	1	0%	This division includes Marine ward and part of St Mary's, St Nicolas and Widewater wards.	We consider that our Shoreham South division provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries. We have modified the proposal made to us for this area in order to provide for clearer boundaries.
<b>Sompting &amp; North Lancing</b>	1	7%	This division includes the wards of Peverel, Manor and Cokeham.	We received two proposed division patterns covering this part of Adur. We considered that one of the proposed division patterns provided for a reasonable level of electoral equality, however we have made small modifications to the boundaries in order to improve coterminosity and provide for more identifiable boundaries.
<b>Southwick</b>	1	-1%	This division includes the wards of Hillside and Eastbrook and part of Southwick Green ward.	We consider that our Southwick division provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries. We have modified the proposal made to us for this area in order to provide for clearer boundaries.

## Arun District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Angmering &amp; Findon</b>	1	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Findon, Clapham, Patching, Angmering and Poling.	Our proposed Angmering & Findon division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria
<b>Arundel &amp; Wick</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Houghton, South Stoke, Burpham, Arundel, Warningcamp, Lyminster & Crossbush and part of Littlehampton.	Our proposed Arundel & Wick division is similar to the current division in this part of the county. The main difference is the southern boundary in the Littlehampton area. In order to provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality between divisions we have proposed the southern boundary run along the south of Malthouse Passage and Swanbourne Road.  We consider this provides for an identifiable boundary and division with a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Bersted</b>	1	5%	This division includes part of Bersted and Bognor Regis parishes.	Our proposed Bersted division is similar to the existing division in this part of Arun District. In order to provide for clearer boundaries we propose the southern boundary of this division follows the boundary of Pevensey and Marine wards.
<b>Bognor Regis East</b>	1	1%	This division comprises part of Bognor Regis and Bersted parishes.	Our proposed Bognor Regis East division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Bognor Regis West &amp; Aldwick</b>	1	4%	This division includes Marine ward, part of Aldwick East ward and part of Aldwick West ward.	Our proposed Bognor Regis West & Aldwick division is similar to the existing division in this part of Arun District. In order to provide for clearer boundaries we propose the north-eastern boundary of this division follows the boundary of Pevensey and Marine wards.

<b>East Preston &amp; Ferring</b>	1	7%	This division includes the parishes of Ferring, Kingston, East Preston and part of Rustington.	Our proposed East Preston & Ferring division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Felpham</b>	1	-3%	This division includes the parish of Felpham and the Flansham area of Yapton parish.	Our proposed Felpham division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Fontwell</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Slindon, Madehurst, Walberton, Barnham, Eastergate and Aldingbourne.	Our proposed Fontwell division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria
<b>Littlehampton East</b>	1	5%	This division includes Beach ward, Brookfield ward and part of Rustington West ward	We consider that our proposed Littlehampton East division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Littlehampton Town</b>	1	-8%	This division includes parts of the district wards of River and Courtwick with Toddington.	Our proposed Littlehampton Town division is similar to the existing division. However, in order to provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality in this division we propose the northern boundary runs along the south of Malthouse Passage and Swanbourne Road.  We consider our Littlehampton Town division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Middleton</b>	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Ford, Climping, Middleton-on-Sea and the Yapton area of Yapton parish.	Our proposed Middleton division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Nyetimber</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises the parish of Pagham and part of Aldwick.	Our proposed Nyetimber division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria

<b>Rustington</b>	1	3%	This division largely comprises Rustington parish	Our proposed Rustington division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria
-------------------	---	----	---	--

### Chichester District

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Bourne</b>	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Marden, Compton, Stoughton, Westbourne, Southbourne, Chidham & Hambrook and West Thorney	Our proposed Bourne division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Chichester East</b>	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Tangmere and Oving, the ward of Chichester East and part of Chichester South ward	<p>We received two proposals for this part of Chichester. One largely supported the existing division and the other proposed more significant modifications. Having considered the evidence received we consider that the existing Chichester East division has clear boundaries. However, we have proposed a modification in order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality between divisions.</p> <p>Under our draft recommendations we have decided to include the area around Pound Farm Road in our Chichester South division. Additionally we propose to include the Bostock Road area in this division. We also received a proposal which suggested a different northern boundary for the division. We have not included this proposal in our draft recommendations as doing so would create an unviable parish ward.</p>
<b>Chichester North</b>	1	9%	This division includes the parishes of West Dean,	We received a submission in relation to this division that supported the existing division boundaries subject to two

			Singleton, East Dean, Upwaltham, Eartham, Boxgrove, Westhampnett, Lavant, and the Chichester North ward.	<p>small modifications to the southern boundary. Having considered the proposal we identified that one of the modifications would have resulted in the creation of an unviable parish ward.</p> <p>We consider that our proposed Chichester North division has clear boundaries and provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.</p>
<b>Chichester South</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Appledram, Donnington, Hunston and North Mundham, the Chichester South ward and part of the Chichester East ward.	Our proposed Chichester South division is similar to the existing division covering this part of Chichester. Under our draft recommendations we propose to include the parish of North Mundham in this division and the area around Pound Farm Road. We consider that this provides for a Chichester South division that provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Chichester West</b>	1	1%	This division comprises the parishes of Bosham, Fishbourne, Funtington, and the Chichester West ward.	<p>We received two submissions specifically relating to this division. One proposed retaining the existing division and the other suggest some small modifications.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence received we consider that the existing Chichester West division provides for a good balance between our statutory criteria and have decided to include it as part of our draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Fernhurst</b>	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.	Our proposed Fernhurst division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.

<b>Midhurst</b>	1	-5%	This division includes the parishes of Linch, Milland, Rogate, Trotton with Chithurst, Harting, Elsted & Treyford, Bepton, Stedham with Iping and Wollbeding with Redford.	Our proposed Midhurst division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Petworth</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Loxwood, Plaistow, Northchapel, Lurgashall, Ebernoe, Kirdford, Wisborough Green, Stopham, Fittleworth, Petworth and Tillington.	Our proposed Petworth division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Selsey</b>	1	-8%	This division solely comprises of the parish of Selsey.	Our proposed Selsey division is similar to the division arrangement covering this part of the area, however it would no longer include the parish of Sidlesham. We consider a division based on the boundaries of Selsey parish reflects community identities and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>The Witterings</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the parishes of West Wittering, East Wittering, Earnley, West Itchenor, Birdham and Sidlesham.	Our proposed The Witterings division is similar to the division arrangement covering this part of the county, however it would now also include Sidlesham parish. We consider this division provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.

### Crawley Borough

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Bewbush &amp; Ifield West</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises the whole of the Bewbush ward	We received two submissions regarding this division. One supported the existing division pattern, while the other

			and the south-western part of the Ifield ward.	<p>proposed a small modification to the existing division in this area.</p> <p>Our draft recommendations propose the existing division is retained. We consider it has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Broadfield</b>	1	0%	This division includes the wards of Broadfield North and Broadfield South.	We received two identical proposals which supported the existing Broadfield division. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria and have included it as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Gossops Green &amp; Ifield East</b>	1	-8%	This division includes the Gossops Green ward and the northern part of the Ifield ward.	Our proposed Gossops Green & Ifield East division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Langley Green &amp; West Green</b>	1	-3%	This division includes the Langley Green ward and the northern part of the West Green ward.	<p>We received two different division patterns for this part of Crawley. One combined Langley Green and West Green in a division, while the other combined Langley Green and part of Ifield in a division.</p> <p>Having considered the proposals our draft recommendations are for a Langley Green &amp; West Green division. We consider this division provides a good balance between the statutory criteria.</p>
<b>Maidenbower</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the Maidenbower ward and part of the Pound Hill South & Worth ward.	We received two different division patterns covering this part of Crawley. Our draft recommendations propose a Maidenbower division which is similar to the existing division that covers this area, but now includes part of Pound Hill South & Worth in order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality between divisions. We consider it has identifiable boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.

<b>Northgate &amp; Three Bridges</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the Northgate ward and part of the Three Bridges ward.	<p>We received two different division patterns in this part of Crawley. One supported a division similar to the existing, while the other proposed that an area of Pound Hill to the east of the railway line be included in the division.</p> <p>During our visit to the area we observed the different proposals. We considered that the railway was a clear and identifiable boundary. We also observed that crossing the railway line appeared to divide the Pound Hill community.</p> <p>We have therefore proposed a Northgate &amp; Three Bridges division which is similar to the existing division. We consider it has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Pound Hill &amp; Worth</b>	1	10%	This division comprises the Pound Hill North ward and part of the Pound Hill South & Worth ward.	<p>As detailed in the Northgate &amp; Three Bridges section above, we received two different proposals in this part of Crawley. One included part of Pound Hill in a division to the west of the railway line, the other used the railway line as a boundary.</p> <p>We considered during our tour of the area that the railway line provided a clear boundary. We therefore propose a Pound Hill &amp; Worth division as part of our draft recommendations. We consider this division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Southgate &amp; Crawley Central</b>	1	0%	This division includes the Southgate ward and parts of the West Green, Northgate and Three Bridges wards.	<p>Our division covering this area is similar to the existing division. In order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality between divisions the boundary to the north follows part of Ifield Road and to the north of properties along The Boulevard. We consider this division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p>

<b>Tilgate &amp; Furnace Green</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises the wards of Tilgate and Furnace Green.	We received two identical proposals which supported the existing Tilgate & Furnace Green division. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria and have included it as part of our draft recommendations.
------------------------------------	---	-----	---	---

### Horsham District

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Billingshurst</b>	1	4%	This division includes the parishes of Billingshurst, Shipley and Itchingfield.	Our proposed Billingshurst division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Bramber Castle</b>	1	-2%	This division includes the parishes of Ashurst, Bramber, Steyning, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote and part of Henfield parish.	Our proposed Bramber Castle division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Broadbridge</b>	1	-2%	This division includes the parishes of Rudgwick, Slinfold, Warnham and Broadbridge Heath.	We received one proposed division covering this part of Horsham. We consider our proposed Broadbridge division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Henfield</b>	1	-9%	This division includes the parishes of West Grinstead, Cowfold, Shermanbury and part of Henfield parish.	Our proposed Henfield division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Holbrook</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises the wards of Holbrook West and Holbrook East.	We consider our proposed Holbrook division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality. We did not receive any alternative division patterns in this part of the county.
<b>Horsham East</b>	1	-7%	This division includes the Roffey North ward and parts of	We observed this division during our tour of the county. We considered our Horsham East division has clear boundaries

			the Roffey South and Forest wards.	and has good internal road links. We also consider it provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Horsham Hurst</b>	1	-9%	This division includes the Trafalgar ward and part of the Horsham Park ward.	We observed this division during our tour of the county. We considered our Horsham Hurst division has clear boundaries and has good internal road links. We also consider it provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Horsham Riverside</b>	1	-1%	This division includes the whole of Deene ward and parts of the Horsham Park and Forest wards.	<p>We observed this division during our tour of the county. We considered our Horsham Riverside division has clear boundaries and has good internal road links.</p> <p>We did consider whether part of this division could be included in the Southwater &amp; Nuthurst division to the south in order to improve the level of electoral equality between divisions. However, we considered this modification would not have reflected community identities.</p>
<b>Pulborough</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Coldwaltham, Pulborough, West Chiltington and Thakeham.	Our proposed Pulborough division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>St Leonard's Forest</b>	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Rusper, Colgate, Lower Beeding, part of Nuthurst and part of Horsham Town.	We received one proposed division in this part of Horsham. In order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality between divisions we proposed to include less of Nuthurst parish in this division. In order to provide for a division with reasonable levels of electoral equality in Horsham Town we have included part of the Roffey area in this division. We consider this area has good road links into the rest of the division.
<b>Southwater &amp; Nuthurst</b>	1	-9%	This division includes the parish of Southwater and part of Nuthurst parish	We received one proposal for this area which was for a Southwater & Nuthurst division with a variance of -11%. In order to improve this level of electoral equality we propose to include more of Nuthurst parish in the division. We consider

				this provides for a better level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.
<b>Storrington</b>	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington & Sullington, Washington, Ashington and Wiston	Our proposed Storrington division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.

### Mid Sussex District

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Burgess Hill East</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the wards of Burgess Hill St Andrews, Burgess Hill Franklands and parts of Burgess Hill Leylands and Burgess Hill Meeds.	<p>We received two proposals for this part of Burgess Hill. Our investigations indicated that one of the proposals would have resulted in poor levels of electoral equality in divisions outside the Burgess Hill area.</p> <p>We consider that our Burgess Hill East division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Burgess Hill Town</b>	1	9%	This division includes parts of the wards of Burgess Hill Victoria, Burgess Hill Dunstall, Burgess Hill Leylands and Burgess Hill Meads.	<p>We received two proposals for this part of Burgess Hill. Our investigations indicated that one of the proposals would have resulted in poor levels of electoral equality in divisions outside the Burgess Hill area.</p> <p>We consider that our Burgess Hill Town division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Cuckfield &amp; Lucastes</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the parish of Cuckfield, part of Ansty & Staplefield and the	Our proposed Cuckfield & Lucastes division is identical to the existing division covering this part of Mid Sussex. We consider the proposed division has clear boundaries and provides for a good level of electoral equality.

			western part of Haywards Heath Town.	
<b>East Grinstead Meridian</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises the north-eastern part of East Grinstead.	Our proposed East Grinstead Meridian division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>East Grinstead South &amp; Ashurst Wood</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises the main part of East Grinstead Town and the parish of Ashurst Wood.	Our proposed East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality
<b>Hassocks &amp; Victoria</b>	1	1%	This division includes part of the Burgess Hill Meeds and Burgess Hill Victoria wards and the parish of Hassocks.	<p>We received two proposals for this part of Mid Sussex. Our investigations indicated that one of the proposals would have resulted in poor levels of electoral equality in divisions outside the Burgess Hill area. We visited this area during our tour of the county and observed the good road links between Hassocks and Burgess Hill via the A273.</p> <p>We consider that our Hassocks &amp; Victoria division has clear boundaries and provides for a good level of electoral equality.</p>
<b>Haywards Heath East</b>	1	-6%	This division includes the eastern part of Haywards Heath Town and part of Lindfield Rural parish.	We received one proposal for this part of Mid Sussex. We have modified the division suggested to us in order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality. We have included part of the Lindfield Rural parish in our division. We consider our proposed division has clear boundaries.
<b>Haywards Heath Town</b>	1	-7%	This division includes the central part of Haywards Heath town and part of Ansty & Staplefield parish.	We received one proposal for this part of Mid Sussex. We have modified the division suggested to us in order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality. We have included the area of Fox Hill in our division. We consider our proposed division has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.

<b>Hurstpierpoint &amp; Bolney</b>	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.	<p>One of the proposals put forward for this part of Mid Sussex included an area of Burgess Hill Town in the division. We investigated whether it would be possible to propose a division that did not include part of Burgess Hill. However, our investigations indicated that doing so would not provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality.</p> <p>We did visit this area and did observe the road links from Burgess Hill into the rural area. We consider that our proposed Hurstpierpoint &amp; Bolney division provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.</p>
<b>Imberdown</b>	1	-5%	This division includes the eastern part of Worth and the north-western part of East Grinstead.	Our proposed Imberdown division is identical to the existing division covering this part of the county. We consider it has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Lindfield &amp; High Weald</b>	1	0%	This division includes the parishes of West Hoathly, Horsted Keynes, Lindfield and part of Lindfield Rural.	We received one proposal for this part of Mid Sussex. We have modified the boundaries of the division proposed in order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality in the Lindfield & High Weald division and the divisions in Haywards Heath. We consider our proposed Lindfield & High Weald division has clear boundaries and provides for a good level of electoral equality.
<b>Worth Forest</b>	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Slaugham, Balcombe, Ardingly, Turners Hill and part of Worth.	We received proposals for this part of Mid Sussex. Our proposed Worth Forest division is similar to the existing division covering the area. We consider it provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.

## Worthing Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Broadwater</b>	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 one proposal for this part of Worthing. Our draft recommendations are for a single-member Broadwater division which has very similar boundaries to the existing division. The southern boundary of the division will no longer follow the railway line in order to provide for a division with a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Cissbury</b>	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 one proposal in this part of the county. The Cissbury division we propose as part of the draft recommendations is identical to the existing division covering the area. We consider this reflects community identities, has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Durrington &amp; Salvington</b>	1	6%	This division includes the whole of Durrington ward and the southern part of Salvington ward (south of the A27).	We received one proposal in this part of the county. The Durrington & Salvington division we propose as part of the draft recommendations is identical to the existing division covering the area. We consider this reflects community identities, has clear boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Goring</b>	1	-8%	This division includes Goring ward and the southern part of Castle ward.	<p>We received one submission for this part of the Worthing. The county-wide proposal suggested the existing boundary between the divisions of Goring and Northbrook be modified in order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality.</p> <p>The proposal made to us was the boundary should follow the rear of properties to the north of The Strand. The boundary also followed part of Newtimber Avenue. We have modified this proposal to provide for a clearer boundary whilst still</p>

				providing for a division with a reasonable level of electoral equality.
<b>Northbrook</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the majority of Castle ward and the whole of Northbrook ward.	We received one proposal for this part of the county. Our proposed Northbrook division has very similar boundaries to the existing Northbrook division. The only difference is the southern boundary along the Strand as described in the Goring section above. We consider our Northbrook division provides a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Tarring</b>	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.	Our proposed Tarring division is identical to the existing division. We consider it provides for a reasonable levels of electoral equality, has clear boundaries and reflects community identities.
<b>Worthing East</b>	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.	Our proposed Worthing East division is similar to the existing division in this part of the county. In order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality between divisions the northern boundary of the division does not follow the railway line in its entirety. This division will now include the area around Angola Road and Meredith Road. We consider this area has good road access into the Worthing East division along Ham Road. We consider this division provides a good balance between our statutory criteria.
<b>Worthing Pier</b>	1	-2%	This division includes the southern part of Heene ward and follows the A259 as its eastern boundary	Our proposed Worthing Pier division is identical to the existing division in this part of the county. We consider the Worthing West division provides for reasonable electoral equality and has clear boundaries.
<b>Worthing West</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises Marine Ward and the northern part of Heene ward to the north of the A259	Our proposed Worthing West division is identical to the existing division in this part of the county. We consider the Worthing West division provides for reasonable electoral equality and has clear boundaries.

# Conclusions

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

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	70	70
Number of electoral divisions	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	8,897	9,481
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	11	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

**Draft 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 draft recommendations for West Sussex on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbc.org.uk>

## Parish electoral arrangements

28 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 wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

29 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 warding arrangements. However, the district councils in West Sussex have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

30 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 Bognor Regis, Burgess Hill, Chichester, Haywards Heath, Lancing, Lindfield Rural, Littlehampton, North Horsham and Nuthurst parishes.

31 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.

**Draft 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 Pevensy (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

32 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.

**Draft 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.

33 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.

**Draft recommendation**  
Chichester City Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Chichester Bostock (returning one member), Chichester East (returning five members), Chichester North (returning five members), Chichester Pound Farm (returning one member), Chichester South (returning five members) and Chichester West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

34 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 Haywards Heath parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Haywards Heath Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Haywards Heath Ashenground (returning three members), Haywards Heath Bentswood (returning three members), Haywards Heath Fox Hill (returning one member), Haywards Heath Franklands (returning two members), Haywards Heath Heath (returning three members) and Haywards Heath Lucastes (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

35 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.

**Draft 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), Pen Hill (returning four members) and Widewater (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

36 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 Lindfield Rural parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Lindfield Rural Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Lindfield Rural Central (returning one member), Lindfield Rural East (returning five members) and Lindfield Rural West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

37 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 two members), Brookfield (returning three members), Clun (returning four members), Courtwick with Toddington (returning two member), Lyminster (returning one member) and River (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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 North Horsham parish.

**Draft 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.

39 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 Nuthurst parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Nuthurst Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: North (returning six members) and South (returning five members) The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 Have your say

40 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole district or just a part of it.

41 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for West Sussex, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

42 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

43 Submissions can also be made by emailing [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk) or by writing to:

**Review Officer (West Sussex)**  
**The Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millbank Tower**  
**Millbank**  
**London SW1P 4QP**

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for West Sussex which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

44 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices in Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at [www.local.gov.uk](http://www.local.gov.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

45 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

46 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

47 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for West Sussex County Council in 2017.

## Equalities

48 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: Draft 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 %
<b>Adur District</b>							
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%
<b>Arun District</b>							
6 Angmering & Findon	1	8,203	8,203	-8%	8,747	8,747	-8%
7 Arundel & Wick	1	7,360	7,360	-17%	9,470	9,470	0%
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) Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
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	8,533	8,533	-4%	8,720	8,720	-8%
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%
<b>Chichester District</b>								
19	Bourne	1	9,427	9,427	6%	9,715	9,715	2%
20	Chichester East	1	8,786	8,786	-1%	10,210	10,210	8%
21	Chichester North	1	8,909	8,909	0%	10,304	10,304	9%
22	Chichester South	1	9,287	9,287	4%	9,854	9,854	4%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
23	Chichester West	1	9,372	9,372	5%	9,575	9,575	1%
24	Fernhurst	1	8,742	8,742	-2%	9,549	9,549	1%
25	Midhurst	1	8,522	8,522	-4%	8,985	8,985	-5%
26	Petworth	1	9,545	9,545	7%	9,783	9,783	3%
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%
<b>Crawley Borough</b>								
29	Bewbush & Ifield West	1	8,608	8,608	-3%	9,077	9,077	-4%
30	Broadfield	1	9,090	9,090	2%	9,469	9,469	0%
31	Gossops Green & Ifield East	1	8,313	8,313	-7%	8,747	8,747	-8%
32	Langley Green & West Green	1	8,486	8,486	-5%	9,155	9,155	-3%
33	Maidenbower	1	10,100	10,100	14%	10,276	10,276	8%
34	Northgate & Three Bridges	1	8,284	8,284	-7%	9,742	9,742	3%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
35	Pound Hill & Worth	1	7,753	7,753	-13%	10,406	10,406	10%
36	Southgate & Crawley Central	1	8,161	8,161	-8%	9,508	9,508	0%
37	Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	8,912	8,912	0%	9,294	9,294	-2%
<b>Horsham District</b>								
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	-2%
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%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
46	Pulborough	1	9,691	9,691	9%	10,273	10,273	8%
47	St Leonard's Forest	1	6,674	6,674	-25%	9,210	9,210	-3%
48	Southwater & Nuthurst	1	8,455	8,455	-5%	8,605	8,605	-9%
49	Storrington	1	9,945	9,945	12%	10,278	10,278	8%
<b>Mid Sussex District</b>								
50	Burgess Hill East	1	8,793	8,793	-1%	10,091	10,091	6%
51	Burgess Hill Town	1	9,823	9,823	10%	10,293	10,293	9%
52	Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	8,401	8,401	-6%	9,855	9,855	4%
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 & Victoria	1	9,079	9,079	2%	9,536	9,536	1%
56	Haywards Heath East	1	8,457	8,457	-5%	8,953	8,953	-6%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
57	Haywards Heath & Town	1	8,551	8,551	-4%	8,851	8,851	-7%
58	Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	9,423	9,423	6%	9,804	9,804	3%
59	Imberdown	1	8,380	8,380	-6%	8,967	8,967	-5%
60	Lindfield & High Weald	1	8,953	8,953	1%	9,513	9,513	0%
61	Worth Forest	1	9,857	9,857	11%	10,221	10,221	8%
<b>Worthing Borough</b>								
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%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council**

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
69 Worthing Pier	1	8,847	8,847	-1%	9,250	9,250	-2%
70 Worthing West	1	8,815	8,815	-1%	9,038	9,038	-5%
<b>Totals</b>	70	622,815	–	–	663,675	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	8,897	–	–	9,481	–

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 Authorities

- West Sussex County Council
- Arun District Council
- Crawley Borough Council

### Councillors

- Councillor D Crow (Tilgate & Furnace Green)

### Political groups

- Burgess Hill Branch Labour Party
- West Sussex County Council Labour Group

### Parish and town councils

- Littlehampton Town Council
- North Horsham Parish Council
- Shipley Parish Council
- Turners Hill Parish Council

### Local organisations

- Coastal West Sussex CCG

### Residents

- Five local residents

# 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 <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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