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Response to Draft Recommendation to Pevensey & Westham Ward

Summary

The Commission’s draft recommendation for creating three wards from the current Pevensey & Westham ward (P & W ward) by including the electorate from settlements to the north and east but shedding electorate from Stone Cross to Polegate Central, is not sound because:

- The area electorate figures used in the 2021 electorate forecast for each area are seriously flawed.
- The inclusion of Hooe and Flowers Green within the new wards fails the test of community identity and interest.
- Splitting Stone Cross into two wards (and two electoral divisions) with a large part of the settlement in the Polegate Central ward also fails the community identity and interest test.

The 2021 electorate errors are addressed below by incorporating known development in each of the areas forming the ward. Based on these corrected figures, alternative proposals for the P & W ward are considered in this paper including:

- The preferred option of retaining the existing ward boundary and three ward councillors.
- A non-preferred option of adding Hooe to the preferred option and maintaining three councillors.
- A non-preferred option of creating three wards comprising:
  - Pevensey North and Pevensey Bay East & West
  - Westham, Hankham and North Stone Cross
  - South Stone Cross

All three options have effects on neighbouring wards and these effects are discussed below.

The necessary revisions to the 2021 electorate, with major growth at Stone Cross and minimal elsewhere, may have an impact on the draft recommendation for changes to Westham Parish.

Introduction

The writer lives in Westham, part of the Pevensey and Westham ward (P&W ward) and this paper considers a more equitable arrangement for the ward than that contained in the draft recommendation.

It is considered that dividing the P & W ward into three based upon the three settlements has merits, but thereafter there are major issues with the detail which render this draft recommendation unsuitable. Of the three parameters the Commission has to balance in arriving at a recommendation, it is considered that far too much emphasis has been placed on the electoral equality parameter at the expense of the community identity and interest parameter.

Outlined below are some of the issues with the draft recommendation. It is noted that the numbers of electors in 2021 within each area of the ward used to inform the new proposals is not correct. Corrections are made to these numbers based upon known development and
alternative boundaries are proposed that better comply with the requirement to reflect community identity and interest.

**Issues with the current draft recommendation**

**Number of Electors**

It is considered that major errors have been made in assessing the 2021 electorate in each of the settlements currently comprising the P & W ward. Thus, the statement in paragraph 15 of the Draft Recommendation is not correct and the proposal for the new ward boundaries in the current P & W ward is not sound.

In Table 1 below, data from two Commission spreadsheets is combined, that for Electoral Data and Wealden Electors. The resulting percentage increase in electors between 2015 and 2021 is then calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Ward</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>Pevensey Bay East</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>Pevensey Bay West</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>Pevensey North</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>Westham</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>Stone Cross</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that the Commission has apportioned the same percentage increase in electors across each of the five areas within the P & W ward. Whereas this method may be appropriate for some wards, for this ward it is not. The Council has identified Stone Cross, as a growth area in its 2013 Core Strategy Local Plan (CSLP) and allocated 650 new houses to the village. Since 2013, planning permission has been granted for 750 new houses in Stone Cross. None of the remaining areas in the ward were allocated any growth. Therefore, practically all electorate growth will occur in only one area, with no growth in the remaining four areas. Thus, allocating an equal percentage increase in electors across all areas is wrong. As a result, determining ward boundaries on the basis of incorrect electorate figures will ensure that the test of equalising the electorate is impossible to meet.

**Pevensey Bay**

The proposal correctly identifies Pevensey Bay as a discrete settlement and its suitability to be a new ward. However, the exclusion of the caravan park in the south is illogical as it has very close links with Pevensey Bay village, which is within walking distance, and practically none to either Pevensey or Westham.

**Pevensey & Westham**

Although two historic but separate settlements, combining into a single ward is one possible solution to equalising the electorate. However, the inclusion of Hooe lacks logic being a distinct village separated from the main population by the Pevensey Levels. There is minimal synergy between the Pevensey and Westham and Hooe, there is no public transport connection and cycling is only for the brave or foolhardy given the safety of the connecting roads. Hooe, however, has close links to Ninfield.

The exclusion from the ward of Hankham and Glynleigh fails to reflect the historic connections between these two settlements and Westham. Stone Cross, until 1990 was a relatively small settlement of around 250 houses, but has since grown dramatically to around 1,500 houses with a further 650 houses allocated in the Council’s 2013 local plan. Planning
permission has been granted for 750 new houses in Stone Cross and work is already underway on sites for around half this total. Stone Cross is already contiguous with Eastbourne and is no longer a rural settlement, it is basically now an urban extension of Eastbourne. Thus, a recommendation for the majority of Westham parish’s rural area to be transferred into the new Stone Cross ward is bizarre, this area, including Hankham and Glyneleigh should remain with Westham.

The inclusion of Chapel Row and Flowers Green as part of the P & W ward is at complete variance with the requirement to reflect community interests and identities. These two hamlets are situated between the village of Herstmonceux and its parish church. Planning permission was granted in 2015 for developing the single field that currently separates Chapel Row from Herstmonceux, which when built out will make Chapel Row contiguous with Herstmonceux village. Flowers Green is a hamlet that has always relied upon Herstmonceux for its facilities. Neither hamlet has any geographic, cultural or social links with either Pevensey or Westham and should be in the same ward as Herstmonceux i.e. the southern boundary of the Herstmonceux ward should follow the Herstmonceux parish boundary.

Stone Cross

The draft recommendation states that Polegate Central comprises the Dittons area of Polegate along Dittons Road and towards the railway station. It is considered disingenuous that the recommendation does not mention that the western half of Stone Cross is also to be part of the Polegate Central ward. Stone Cross has an affinity with Westham, Langney and Eastbourne, but practically none to Polegate. Nobody from Stone Cross shops in Polegate; they either use the Langney shopping centre or the facilities in Eastbourne. Polegate is in a different electoral division to Stone Cross. It is presumed that this very artificial division is to meet the electorate equalisation criteria, but it then totally fails the community interests and identity test. Being now an urban part of the district, Stone Cross has little connectivity with the rural areas and settlements to the north and these should not form part of the ward, but remain with Westham, with the boundary between the two being the A27.

In addition the only doctors surgery (there are part time satellites of this surgery in Westham and Pevensey Bay) in the large P & W ward is in Stone Cross, almost exactly on the draft recommendation dividing line between Stone Cross and Polegate Central. This provides an additional constraint against splitting Stone Cross between two wards.

**Corrections to 2021 Electorate**

In this section a more rational number of electors is developed within each of the areas forming the current P & W ward, based upon planned and consented development in accordance with the Council’s 2013 CSLP.

**Pevensey Bay**

The current CSLP has not identified Pevensey Bay for any growth. The area immediately outside the current urban settlement is in flood zone 3. Thus, it is concluded that housing and therefore electoral growth in Pevensey Bay will be very small with any increase arising from minor windfall developments. An increase in electorate of a nominal 20 is considered reasonable to 2021.

**Pevensey North**

The CSLP has not identified Pevensey for any growth. Most of the village is within a conservation area and this is surrounded by land in flood zone 3 and the protected Pevensey Levels. Thus, only very small development is possible and it is very unlikely that there will be more than six additional electors by 2021.
Westham
The CSLP has not identified Westham for any growth. Thus, the only population growth in Westham will come from windfall applications and it is assessed that the electorate will increase by no more than 20 by 2021.

Stone Cross
The Core Strategy Local Plan identified Stone Cross for significant growth and allocated 650 dwellings to this settlement. Currently, there are 750 extant permissions with construction under way on two sites for 376 dwellings and a further site for 120 dwellings is due to commence construction during this summer. It is therefore assessed that 700 of the permissioned 750 dwellings will be occupied by 2021, with a consequential increase in electors of 1,278 (based upon the current average in the ward of 1.825 electors/dwelling).

**Revised 2021 Electorate**

Thus, taking into consideration the Core Strategy Local Plan factors as indicated above, the likely number of electors in each area within the P & W ward is detailed in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Draft Recommendation</th>
<th>Corrected Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey Bay East</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey Bay West</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey North</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westham</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Cross</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>3,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>8,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This corrected assessment, totalling an increase of 1,324 electors, compares favourably with the total increase of 1,373 electors in the draft recommendation. However, the increase in the individual areas is considered a more accurate representation and these figures should be taken forward and used to inform the new ward boundaries.

**Proposed Revision to Draft Recommendation**

Preferred Proposal 1.

The ideal solution to fully comply with the community identity and interest test would be for each of the three parishes/settlements (Pevensey including Pevensey Bay, Westham (including Hankham) and Stone Cross), would each to be a separate ward. Thus, the 200 electors from Hankham currently in the Stone Cross Ward would move to Westham and the 100 electors from Flowers Green would revert to Herstmonceux. The ward would be
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contained within the existing parish boundaries. The electorates for each of these areas are shown in table 3.

Table 3 Existing Settlement Electorate 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey/Pevensey Bay</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westham &amp; Hankham</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Cross</td>
<td>4,263</td>
<td>+47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variances are probably considered too large to meet the elector equality criterion. However, it is noted that the 2021 population of the existing P & W ward of 8,935 is very close to three times the new average Wealden electorate (actually, +3%). Thus, the preferred proposal is that the P & W ward remains within the parish boundaries of Pevensey and Westham and retains three councillors.

This solution fully meets both the electoral equality test and the community identity and interests test for this ward.

However, it is noted that this solution would have an effect on two neighbouring wards:

Polegate Central

This ward would lose the 1,049 electors from Stone Cross west. However, it is noted that with this loss, the total electorate for all four of the proposed Polegate and Willingdon wards would be -6% variance from the Council’s average number of electors. Thus a minor redistribution of the electors in Polegate and Willingdon between the wards could bring about an electorate within each ward that is consistent with the equality criteria. This solution avoids the conflict with the community identity and interests criteria otherwise incurred in Polegate Central with the inclusion of part of Stone Cross.

Herstmonceux, Ninfield and Wartling

This ward would gain the 408 electors from Hooe and approximately 100 electors from Flowers Green that the Commission has currently included in the P & W ward. The Herstmonceux ward is already 7% larger than the Council average and this increase of 508 electors, would make the ward 25% oversize. Elsewhere in the report, the Commission has declared a figure of 25% variance to be unacceptable.

There doesn’t appear to be any opportunity to move some of the excess electors to either of the neighbouring wards of Horam and Punnets Town or Hellingly.

The Commission has three statutory criteria to consider, but in its draft recommendation appears to have ignored the criterion concerning community interests and identity by moving Hooe, Chapel Row and Flowers Green into the P & W ward. By separating these settlements from their traditional locations, this criterion is totally unsatisfied. It is considered that the third criterion is also adversely affected. Potentially, a ward candidate living in either Hooe, Chapel Row or Flowers Green would stand very little chance of election when the bulk of the electorate live elsewhere. Similarly, the interests of these remote electors may not be adequately served by a councillor based and/or living in Pevensey or Westham.

Therefore, the Commission has proposed a solution that satisfies the electorate equality criterion but fails to satisfy the other two criteria. On this basis, it is considered that the unfortunate but necessary 25% imbalance caused by moving the three settlements of Hooe, Chapel Row and Flowers Green back into their traditional ward is justified by the benefit arising from meeting both the community identity and providing convenient and effective local government criteria.
Non Preferred Proposal 2

This proposal is basically the same as Proposal 1 but with the addition of Hooe to the P & W ward. This would increase the electorate by 407, making the total ward electorate 9,384 and with three councillors, the average number of electors per councillor would be +8% above the Council average.

This change would have a beneficial effect on the size of the adjacent Herstmonceux, Ninfield and Wartling ward by reducing its electorate to +10% larger than the Council average. This beneficial reduction, however, does have the drawback of placing the Hooe electorate in a ward where they have a lesser affinity than they do with the villages of Herstmonceux and Ninfield. The removal of the Hooe parish has the effect of reducing the oversize of the Herstmonceux, Ninfield and Wartling ward to +10% of the Council average.

However, as outlined above, this change does not meet the other two criteria.

Non Preferred Proposal 3

It is noted that the Commission’s guidance accepts the principle of multi councillor wards although that apart from two wards, the remainder in the draft recommendation for the Council are single councillor wards. Should the preferred option above of maintaining the existing ward boundary and three councillor representation be considered unsuitable, a further, but non-preferred option is proposed.

This proposal entails forming three wards from the current P & W ward by combining the three areas of Pevensey North, Pevensey Bay East and West into one ward, with Stone Cross north of Rattle/Dittons Road joining Westham and Hankham into a second ward with the remaining southern part of Stone Cross forming the third ward.

Table 4: Non Preferred Option 3 Ward Electorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey/Pevensey Bay</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westham, Hankham &amp; North Stone Cross</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Cross South</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The option has the advantage of maintaining a reasonable equality in the P & W ward electorates. In addition, it maintains the community identity in Pevensey/Pevensey Bay with the ward boundary being the same as the parish boundary. It is accepted that splitting Stone Cross between two wards does not fully comply with the community interest and identity factor, but both wards are contained within the existing Westham parish boundary and same electoral division. However, it does not resolve the resulting inequalities described above in Preferred Proposal 1 for the neighbouring wards of Polegate Central and Herstmonceux, Ninfield and Wartling, and the adjustments described earlier will apply. On this basis, it is considered that this option has less merit than the Preferred Proposal 1.

N J Daines
13 June 2016
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Dangerfield
E-mail: [红acted]
Postcode: [红acted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I fundamentally believe that boundary affecting my property at [红acted] should not be changed. Isfield is a rural parish and is grouped with other rural parishes. It makes no sense at all to group Isfield with an urban area such as West Uckfield, the requirements of an urban area are vastly different from those of a rural one. Isfield’s needs and opinions will always be outweighed by the West Uckfield urban area with its larger population and completely undermines its status as a rural parish. Thank you

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Charlotte Das
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I feel very strongly that to lump a rural community like Isfield in with Uckfield would not serve our community in a fair or objective way. As a rural community are needs and thoughts and priorities are very different to those of the town and being that our population is so much smaller our views and votes would be totally outnumbered and I feel our voice would not be heard. I think it is a totally ludicrous plan and we should be left in the rural boundary that we are already in.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Deller
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Re proposed Mayfield & Five Ashes. The northern exclusion of the Great Trodgars, Mayfield Grange and Lake Street communities distorts the practical coverage being proposed for M&FA. The communities named generally have much greater affinity and association in terms of shopping, orientation and Parish matters with M&FA than that being proposed ie Frant & Wadhurst. The population compensation should not be the highest priority in this matter, but could be partly achieved if necessary by reducing the area coverage in the southern and eastern quadrants of the proposed area for the new-look M&FA

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
And another.

Thanks,

Laura

From: Debbie Ensell
Sent: 26 May 2016 22:48
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Proposed Ward Boundary Changes

To Boundary Commission

I felt I must email to strongly object to the proposal to merge our Ward with Pevensey & Westham. The Ninfield, Hooe and Wartling Ward operates very well and should not be changed, there is a significant geographical distance between Hooe and Pevensey & Westham and there is currently no connection that I am aware of so cannot understand this proposal at all.

To merge with Pevensey & Westham would be detrimental to the community of Hooe and I therefore hope that this proposal will not go any further.

Regards

Deborah Dodge
Hey, submission for Wealden.

Thanks,

Laura

To Boundary Commission

Dear Sir / Madam

I write in relation to the proposed boundary changes to the Hooe, Ninfield and Wartling ward to move Hooe Parish into the Pevensey and Westham ward to express my objection.

There is a long established link between Hooe and Ninfield both geographically and within the community, with many local events spanning across the two villages.

Such events as the Carnival, Bonfire night, Michaelmas fair even the Sports clubs and teams are made up of a collection of players from Hooe and Ninfield.

There is no such link with Pevensey and Westham, we are divided by a significant distance and a major road and it will not be possible to recreate the closeness that Hooe and Ninfield currently share as many families spread across the two villages and thus the links are naturally stronger.

Building and maintaining strong local communities figures prominently on many agendas in terms of improving social issues, care, and a maintaining of traditional standards and community spirit - the proposed boundary changes will destroy a well established local community that maintains very important values and links that will be lost.

Please don’t fix something that is not broken

Regards

Jeremy Dodge
Dear Sir/Madam

I have great concerns regarding the proposed Ward changes that involve Hooe and oppose them totally.

May I first explain my background.

I have lived in the village of Hooe for over thirty eight years, in what is considered as the centre, very close to the Red Lion and the Hooe Village Hall.

I was the curate of the churches of the joint benefice of Hooe and Ninfield (St. Oswald’s and St. Mary’s) and am presently the curate of the Joint benefice of Wartling and Herstmonceux (St Mary Magdalene and All Saints) and am also a Hooe Parish Councillor and so in a truly unique position to comment regarding my knowledge of these areas and of those that live in them.

Hooe, Ninfield and Wartling have a vast amount in common.

As I stated, I live in Hooe in what is now the centre of the village, but this centre is very close to the boundary of Ninfield and the nearest shop we have is actually a few hundred yards away in Ninfield, being only a few minutes leisurely walk and less than a minute cycle ride to reach. This shop being our local farm shop, Hope Cottage Farm Shop.

The next shop, also used by many in Hooe as it includes a post-office, is 1.4 miles away in Ninfield. Our younger children’s nearest school is in Ninfield, our nearest doctors are in Ninfield and many of those who live in Hooe have family members that live in Ninfield and, as already pointed out, both Churches share the same minister and one of our Parish Councillors is also a Ninfield Parish Councillor, both Parish Councils having so much in common interest need to work closely together.

The present close relationship between all three villages, Hooe, Ninfield and Wartling is not just a recent development but a historic fact, as all have History Societies which proves just what a close relationship there always has been.

Farming is still a major industry in our area and many of our farmer’s land actually crosses over the Hooe and Ninfield boundary.
Wartling is also a farming community, with families in Hooe that have links there. I know from my experience as a minister in both areas, and a Hooe Parish Councillor, that farmers in Hooe with joining land also work together with farmers in Wartling in maintaining their common boundaries, which includes the drainage systems, ditches and the streams from both Hooe and wartling that feed Wallers Haven, which is the boundary between the two parishes. Farms in both areas are also involved in the ever more important area of environmental stewardship.

None of the above applies to Herstmonceux or Pevensey and our sizeable geographical distance between them both, in addition to the tourism industry that is so much a part of Pevensey and not any part of Hooe, means that I am totally unable to comprehend why Hooe should be joined to either in the proposed boundary changes.

Yours sincerely,

Rev Peter Doodes
I wish to object to the proposed boundary changes between Forest Row Ward and Hartfield on the grounds that it is illogical.

Mrs Kelly DUHIG
Dear Sir or Madam,

Comments on the Wealden Draft Recommendation

1. The draft recommendation for Wealden Splits Flowers Green and Hooe off from their natural communities with Herstmonceux on the Northern side of the Pevensey Levels.

2. Separating Stone Cross west from Stone Cross and joining it to Polegate central should not happen. This would ignore the natural community links and the barrier of the large Dittions roundabout between Polegate and Stone Cross.

3. Hankham and Glynleigh naturally attach to Westham. Indeed Hankham level is shared by the two settlements.

Stone Cross is rapidly becoming entirely urban with another 750 new houses to be built within the net 2 years. Therefore it is appropriate for the rural settlement of Westham to stay with Hankham.

Yours faithfully, Mrs Fiona Durling
Dear Sirs,

I read with utter amazement for the proposed new boundary for Pevensey and Westham that would include Hooe Parish.

Firstly the overview as depicted by the map supplied has a pinch point at the A259 and forms a "v" with Hooe in the right portion looking north.

A more natural boundary would be the A259 and Pevensey and Westham should join with Pevensey Bay. It has coastline, urban feel and Levels.

Hooe is a traditional rural farming community, it has a Church, Pub, farm shop, nature reserve, village hall (where various activities are held), recreation ground with Pavillion.

Residents of Hooe look at Ninfield as very close neighbours with cross movements between the villages. We share a PostOffice, School, Doctors Surgery, and various clubs and groups.

The residents of Hooe, Ninfield and Wartling have no commonality with the folks of Pevensey as there is no cross-movement between these communities (except cars speeding through Hooe during the "rush hours")

The real worry is that Hooe will not get a true representation at Council meetings as there would most likely be more pressing issues in the urban environment. It would also want to cater for tourism to a greater degree and Hooe could end up "that community at one end of the Ward".

So it is my opinion that we should NOT join Pevensey and Westham and remain as Ninfield, Hooe and Wartling Ward.

Yours Sincerely,

Gary Durman.
Wealden again..? Let me know if it needs to go elsewhere.

Thanks,

Laura

-----Original Message-----
From: Sally Durman
Sent: 28 May 2016 21:00
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Hooe parish, East Sussex

Sir, I write concerning the proposed boundary changes of the parish if Hooe in East Sussex.
At present the Wealden Ward is named Ninfield and Hooe with Wartling. These parishes are very similar profile, all being rural and having a strong farming background, therefor they experience similar issues and challenges. Hooe and Ninfield lie just about a mile apart and have an affinity with each other. Residents of Hooe use the Ninfield village shop and post office, the Doctor's surgery is shared by both communities, children from Hooe attend Ninfield pre-school and Ninfield Primary School and the churches of both villages share the same incumbent. Residents from both villages attend the same clubs and societies.
It is being proposed that Hooe should be separated from its present partnership and be joined to Pevensey and Westham. These communities have no connection at all with Hooe. They are seaside communities and share no characteristics. Geographically they are separated by the A259 and the Pevensey levels and have completely different issues and challenges.
I object strongly to the proposed changes and feel that they are totally unsuitable.
Yours sincerely
Sally Durman.

Sent from my iPad
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

16th June 2016

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:
  • I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
  • They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
  • Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
  • The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of
voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.

• The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

Tristan Elbrick
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Irene Eltringham-Willson
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I feel very strongly that Herstmonceux Castle should remain as part of Herstmonceux, with the same councillors etc as the rest of Herstmonceux. This makes more sense historically, and functionally today as BISC fosters links with the local community of Herstmonceux. To place Herstmonceux Castle within Pevensey would be a very unfortunate situation, as there are no real links there at all.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Ms Starkie,

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

By creating a new ward of West Uckfield and Isfield the Commission has effectively split a village in two. Piltdown is a rural community of some 200 people spread over a relatively wide geographical area which is part of the Fletching Parish. As a result of these factors there have been significant efforts made to ensure that there is an active, vibrant and supportive community spirit. The proposals take a significant part of the village and places it in the new West Uckfield Ward whilst the rest remains in Danehill and Fletching. This will create a group of rural electors mixed into an urban ward and portion of a village with no electoral link to its other component part.

I feel that it is important to note that I live in the portion of Piltdown that remains in the Danehill and Fletching Ward and therefore am not motivated by any desire to avoid moving wards personally. I purely wish to ensure that the community environment that has been created here is maintained.

It is my strong belief that the draft recommendations do not meet the three statutory criteria of the review process and I urge you in the strongest terms to revise the plans to a more suitable solution. In this submission I will present my evidence as to why each criteria has not been well met and will attempt so far as is possible to present alternative solutions.
Criteria 1 Delivering Electoral Equality for Local Voters

The current proposals still do not well deliver electoral equality across the District.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria 2 Reflecting the interests and identities of local communities

The Draft recommendations demonstrably fail to meet this criteria

Piltdown, Shortbridge, Sharpsbridge, Isfield and Little Horsted are obviously rural areas, whilst West Uckfield is an urban conurbation with significant developed land and a different community identify. This is not only my opinion, it is fact supported by the Office of National Statistics:

Fig1 – Rural / Urban Classification from Office of National Statistics

Residents Association

Piltdown Village has an active Residents Association (PRA) of which I am a member. Over the past few years, the PRA has successfully completed a number of projects for the benefit of the village and the surrounding areas. The PRA runs many events for residents of the village and its members have spent considerable time and effort integrating themselves with the Parish Council and with the neighbouring village of Fletching.

The screenshot below of the PRA website demonstrates the close nature of the work that the Residents Association does with the Parish Council. The website can be reviewed at www.pra2014.co.uk
The resident’s association also provides a social background to the community and has facilitated the making of many friendships within the village and the surrounding areas. These important functions would become harder to serve with a large section of our village being annexed into a mixed urban / rural ward.

**Fig3 – Article about PRA in TN uncovered**

Two years ago, this month, the Pittdown Residents Association was formed when local resident, Bob White, held a meeting to retain the community’s new found voice and friendships, after successfully opposing council plans for a land raise site in Fletching.

The Pittdown Action Group Against Land Raise saw residents from Pittdown, Newick, Maresfield, Splaysnes Green and Sheffield Park, unite and come together to tackle an important issue for their local area, and it was this that Bob hoped to continue, with the Residents Association.

Since 11th January 2014, the great community group have carried out ten projects including asking for flood sign warnings on vulnerable roads, tackling litter and fly tipping problems and setting up a Neighbourhood Watch scheme and have held two Meet the Residents events, providing a social opportunity for people to meet and raise funds for the local projects. The group are also working hard to help host the parish’s first festival, in July.

“The Association is open to all Pittdown Residents,” Bob said. “We want everyone of all ages to join us and be proud of the village we all live in, to make Pittdown a safer place and most importantly to have a friendly welcoming village where we all know each other.”
Fletching Parish Council

As previously mentioned, Piltdown is a component part of the Fletching Parish. There are residents of Piltdown that have been elected to this Council and help to ensure fair and balanced governance for all electors in this Parish, and specifically the Piltdown community.

In the event that a chunk of Piltdown is moved into Uckfield West, we have been informed that this would alter the makeup of the Parish Council, in effect a single seat being associated with the new Parish ward of Shortbridge. This would mean that the balance of the Parish Council would be significantly in favour of electors in the village of Fletching as they would be able to elect eight councillors compared to Shortbridge’s one.

I believe that the draft recommendations also contravene the guidance given on Parish Councils. The extract below is from Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

(2) The recommendations must secure the following results— (a) every ward of a parish having a parish council (whether separate or common) must lie wholly within a single electoral area of the district council

I understand that the creation of a Parish Ward has been proposed to resolve this issue, I feel strongly that this is not appropriate in this situation.

School

The current catchment school for Piltdown is Fletching CE Primary School. Again this strengthens the link between the entire village of Piltdown and the Parish of Fletching. To re-draw the ward boundaries with a large section of Piltdown being outside of the ward of Fletching would cause concern over future schooling arrangements and governance. The School provides an obvious evidential link between the communities of Piltdown and Fletching.

Church

The Parish of Fletching is served by the Church of St.Andrew and St. Mary the Virgin which is located in the village of Fletching, again providing substantive evidence of the link between the two villages.

Fletching Parish Festival

This year the Festival will be held on 16th July and is a celebration of the entire Parish. Whilst the event is held in Fletching, many residents of Piltdown (including those that are in danger of being annexed into Uckfield West) volunteer their services to man the stalls, judge competitions and even to marshal the soap box derby that runs the length of the High Street. This event, and many others like it prove, without doubt, a clear and intrinsic link between the two communities.
Golf Club

Piltdown Golf Club is a locally renowned course, and makes use of the beautiful natural land around Piltdown Pond. With over 500 members the Golf Club is a hub of both sporting and social activity for Piltdown and the surrounding villages.

The draft recommendations are proposing the odd approach of having the Club House and other facilities in one ward and the course itself in another. This would not again not provide for the continuity of local community spirit.

Public Houses

The villages of Piltdown and Fletching are fortunate to be well served by some fantastic public houses (there are two pubs in Piltdown and another two in Fletching). These venues act as a focal point for the social activities of the communities. As a result, friendships within the community span the two villages as residents of Piltdown will often socialise in the Public Houses in Fletching and vice versa.
Criteria 3 Promoting effective and convenient local government

I do not profess to be an expert in the mechanisms of local government, however I would find it hard to believe that it would be easier to govern a ward that consisted of a somewhat random mix of rural and urban voters, many of whom would be disenfranchised as a result of this process, than a cohesive, rural or urban only ward.

The draft recommendations would also significantly alter the makeup of the Parish Council, again giving rise to complications in government. I would think that any reasonable person would agree that it would be easier to govern a group with common goals, beliefs and sense of community than anything more divided.

The division of a community can only make government more complicated. A case in point here is the Golf Club. In the event that they needed to interact with their local councillor, they’d have to work with one Councillor for some issues and a different one if the issue related to a different part of their facility. This cannot be said to be effective or convenient local government.

The Residents Association has been able to deliver on many initiatives which have benefited the community. These include projects such as the Village Sign, a Traffic Speed Survey and the commissioning of Village “Gates”. These have all required liaison with the relevant District and County Councillors. If the Village needed to deal with two separate sets of District and County Councillors to achieve these type of project in the future, there would be considerable duplication of effort, in turn increasing the burden of government on the tax payer.

Some of the borders in the North West of the new Uckfield West and Isfield Ward are positioned somewhat confusingly on a map, with no discernible or understandable geographical boundary. This is contrary to the LGBCE’s stated aim to use natural demarcation of wards where possible. This again reduces the convenience of local government.

A Proposed Solution

In an attempt to show that it is possible to create a warding structure for the Wealden District I present below a high level approach. I have used the electoral data available on your website, but it is not possible to accurately define exact electors in some areas due to the redrawing of existing ward boundaries.

I would expect that the LGBCE have staff significantly more skilled in this technical exercise than I, and as such this is presented as a guide to what might be possible under the more finessed hand of your staff.
**Uckfield**

It is my view that Uckfield is an Urban Centre and as such should be ring-fenced separately from the rural areas that surround it. There is precedent for this in Crowborough, Hailsham, and Heathfield.

There is an area to the North of Uckfield that is in the Uckfield North Ward in the draft proposals, this is highlighted in red below. I am not familiar with this area and am therefore not best placed to recommend whether it should be part of Uckfield or Maresfield. It should be noted that this area could easily be placed in the new Buxted ward if this achieved better electoral equality.

This would give a total size of 12,782 electors (assuming the red shaded area is not included). Using a total of 4 councillors this would be within the tolerance area for Electoral Equality, would meet the requirement for reflection of local community and identity and would provide a convenient and efficient means of government. To the west there is a natural border point in the A22 road, to the east a border is formed by a mixture of Rivers and Railway line. This again meets the criteria for natural boundaries where possible.

As the Elector numbers for Uckfield are difficult to interpret as a result of the changing ward boundaries within Uckfield I have not attempted to segregate the Uckfield area into individual Wards, but I assume that the data available to you would make this a relatively straightforward task.
Danehill, Fletching and Isfield

These three communities share much in common and have historically been grouped together. There are four main Parishes within this proposed ward although I believe that there is significant interaction between Isfield and Little Horsted and that the two Parishes identify themselves as linked in spirit, as well as in some key practical ways (e.g. shared amenities and a shared parish). These rural communities also all share similar beliefs and would therefore be efficient to govern.

In order to provide for Electoral Equality the Polling District of Nutley (WBJ) remains in the Maresfield Ward as per the Draft Recommendations. The Polling District of Weir Wood (WFE) returns to the Forest Row ward. This would also ensure that the Parish and District electoral boundaries achieve conterminosity.

Summary of Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electors in Year</th>
<th>Variance from Target</th>
<th>Electors in 2021</th>
<th>Variance from Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield</td>
<td>11,732</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12,782</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danehill, Fletching</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variances above are within the thresholds deemed acceptable by LGBCE as demonstrated by its Draft Recommendations. Therefore this proposal meets the requirement for Electoral Equality.

In conclusion I would reiterate that the current draft proposals are not suitable for the residents and electors of Pitdown and Uckfield. I have presented evidence of the reasons that the proposals breach the criteria set out for the LGBCE’s work and I have given a high level, layman’s proposal for how this issue could be resolved. I sincerely hope that this information is helpful to the LGBCE in its
aim to produce a recommendation that is suitable for all the residents and electors of Wealden District.

I understand that the existing review of County Electoral Divisions would require significant review if it is found that the current district is not fit for purpose as per my comments above. I understand the need for coterminosity between district and council wards and would therefore like to register my objection to the recommendations for the County Electoral Divisions for East Sussex in their current state. I believe that all of the points I have raised in this letter apply generally to the East Sussex County draft recommendations as well. They show Uckfield, currently a single urban county council district, being re-divided and renamed to incorporate sections of surrounding rural areas including a section of Piltdown/Fletching Parish. The divisions are different, yet the issues and my objections are similar, as are the solutions. While I understand that conforming to the required ratio of electorate per councillor is a challenge, I also believe it is possible and can work.

However you and your team approach the requirement to modify the draft recommendations, I believe that it is essential to begin by ringfencing Uckfield as an urban area that can be subdivided in a number of ways to adhere to the numbers. It would also then no longer be an anomaly in our region, but would be in alignment with the other urban centres in Wealdon and East Sussex, e.g. Crowborough, which remain contained as urban areas in your current new proposals, with an urban-dwelling electorate being served by councillors who understand and can advocate for their interests. Similarly, it would ensure that the neighbouring rural areas and their electorate remain protected with their unique interests properly represented, and that no parishes or communities are separated.

I would be very happy to have further conversation with LGBCE if this would be useful during the review period and I’m happy to provide further evidence or clarification as required.

Yours Sincerely,

Wayne Emerson
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Terence Henry Faulkner
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: FAULKNER FARM PARTNERSHIP

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Proposed new Isfield Pilstdown Ridgwood & Little Horsted Council Ward - essentially Rural & small villages

Annotation 3: Proposed new Uckfield South & West Ward - essentially urban

Comment text:

Together with my wife, I am a longstanding freehold farmer [c. 380 acres] in Isfield Parish and am writing to propose that any ward boundary change should leave Isfield as part of a rural District ward [and therefore County ward] made up of more rural villages. I have highlighted one possible ward arrangement above which would reflect this. The current draft proposal to split the urban area up of Uckfield up and link its west urban area with Isfield and its south east area with Ridgwood and Little Horsted does not seem appropriate. Isfield parish is a rural community and shares very strong historical and community links with Little Horsted parish [eg via the primary school, bonfire society and its two linked churches], which should not be broken. Isfield does not share the same interests as urban Uckfield hence I would like the BC to seriously consider making no change to our current rural ward; or if need be, producing a proposal that retains the essentially rural character of the new ward containing Isfield & Little Horsted - i.e with the majority of the electorate living in a rural rather than an urban environment. Yours Terence & Cornelia Faulkner

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Elizabeth Fine
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

My husband and I live in Isfield and we are most concerned to see that it is suggested that Isfield be put in a new Uckfield West Ward, which would mean that we would be labelled as being in urban Uckfield. We would then run the risks of our more rural interests being unfairly swamped by those of the more urban Uckfield. Our opportunities for making representations covering village and rural matters would be reduced. Isfield is a thriving rural village and we wish to remain as a rural District Ward together with Danehill and Little Horsted as we are now. Therefore, we strongly object to the proposed boundary changes.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Review Officer

I wish to convey my objection to the proposed annexation of the village in which I live – Piltdown – from Fletching, the result of which Piltdown is to be incorporated in a new ward called Uckfield West and Isfield. I am particularly concerned that this proposal has been seemingly put forward without proper consultation.

Currently I am able to vote for up to 9 councillors as part of the Fletching ward, but with the new boundary I will only be able to vote for one as part of the Uckfield West ward. Therefore our democratic voice will effectively be watered down considerably.

The communication of this proposed boundary change has not been very thorough and therefore no-one has had time to object to these plans. Despite you stating that you ran consultations on two dates - writing to the relevant parishes and notifications in various local media and parish magazines, we as residents of the area were not made aware of these which seems extremely unlikely as at least someone would have seen it and made the Parish Council aware (in the unlikely event that they were themselves totally unaware of it). Our Parish Council apparently only recently knew of these boundary changes despite you stating that they were made aware in September last year. I am sure if they had been properly briefed on this situation we would have heard about it a long time before May when a meeting was held for local residents to inform them of this proposal for the first time. It would therefore be useful to know which publications and on what dates these were made as no-one appears to have seen these.

Lastly, I question why Piltdown could not be kept in the rural Fletching ward with other rural communities such as Isfield and Copwood. We are a rural community of 100 people with different needs to that of an urban community. It therefore does not seem to make sense to incorporate us with Uckfield West.

Thanks and regards

James

James Foster
Commercial Director
Bright World works in partnership with Child Protection specialists, Travel safe and holds a bronze award to show full commitment to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children and young people. Bright World expects all staff and volunteers to share this commitment.

Bright World are fully accredited by (Association for the Education and Guardianship of International Students)

Check out our website www.brightworld.co.uk
Like us on facebook
Follow us on Twitter
Read our blog to keep up to date with all our news
Dear Review Officer

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal that section of Piltdown, where I live, should be annexed from Fletching Parish and put in a new ward called Uckfield West and Isfield. The fact that I only discovered these plans very recently is even more disturbing.

The reason for my objection is that I feel an enormous sense of being part of a community in Piltdown. I take an active interest in the Piltdown Residents’ Association and join Fletching events. Being annexed would mean losing this sense of community. One of the things that you are keen not to affect when changing boundaries is exactly this and by annexing us you would not be upholding this promise.

My current rights to vote for up to 9 councillors as part of the Fletching Councillors would be effectively taken away from me and I understand I would only be allowed to vote for one and that this one would be part of the Uckfield West Ward. Again - this is seriously non-democratic and makes me feel very uncomfortable. By being in two separate wards our voice would be tiny. We would be a tiny fish in a huge pond and have little influence over matters in our hamlet.

I do not think that the 100 residents of Piltdown affected sit appropriately with Uckfield West. Looking at how the majority of Uckfield West is made up I can see it is an urban community with urban issues and priorities. Our area is rural and our needs and what is important to us are very different. We would have little power in being heard.

Having researched this matter and taken part in village meetings, I understand that there is an entirely viable solution that would meet your criteria and mean that we did not have to be annexed in this way and we could remain part of the Fletching Ward. Keeping Copwood, Isfield and the whole of Piltdown part of the Fletching Ward would satisfy your guidelines and keep communities that have common interests and links together. I strongly urge you to consider this proposal as it makes much more sense and would satisfy my objections above.

Finally I refer to your document: How to propose a pattern of wards Helping you make the strongest possible case to the Commission

I highlight in red things that you promise which you, to my knowledge, you have not done apart from having a page on your website. This affects 100 people I believe and I understand not one local person was consulted by you on this. I believe that today some people still don’t know what is being proposed - there has been no circular to the electors who will be affected to prompt them to research your website. See below in red where I believe you have not fulfilled your promise:

1. When will we ask for your view? We will ask local people for views on new warding arrangements on two occasions during an electoral review. 1. Information gathering stage - once the Commission has taken a view on the total number of councillors that should represent the authority, we will begin work on drawing up new boundaries for wards across the area to accommodate those councillors. We will ask local people for their help in drawing up draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements. WHEN WAS THIS CARRIED OUT AND WHO WAS CONSULTED?

2. Consultation on draft recommendations - once we have published our draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements (number of wards, number of councillors representing each ward, ward names and ward boundaries) for your area, you will have the chance to comment on them. We will invite you to tell us where you think we’ve got it right and, where you don’t think our boundaries meet our criteria, you can propose alternatives. At all stages of consultation, you can give us your views on the whole local authority area just a small part of it. WHEN AND WHO WERE INVITED TO COMMENT - SIMPLY HAVING A PAGE ON YOUR WEBSITE AND EXPECTING PEOPLE TO JUST HAPPEN ACROSS IT IS NOT SUFFICIENT.
This does not reflect the democratic rights that we are entitled to in this country. If I am wrong and you did, indeed, consult local people then I apologise but having not been consulted myself, could you please clarify who these people are and what their response was. I would like to see some evidence on this.

Yours faithfully

Lana Foster
Hooe is very much tied in with the villages of Ninfield and Wartling, particularly with Ninfield which it joins geographically. It shares clubs, interests, a primary school, a Post Office and shop, a garage, a church and a Dr’s surgery.

Hooe is separated geographically from Pevensey and has nothing in common with this large coastal village. It would be subsumed within its larger neighbour, lose its identity and all the good that comes from its close relationship with Ninfield.

I hope you will reconsider the proposed change.

Best wishes

Rose Franks – resident of Ninfield.
Jane and her family and friends.

Your sincerely,

Eileen Sweeney.

[Text continues on the right side of the page]
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Andy GALE
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

The present boundaries seem to work OK. However, Ninfield and Hooe don’t really have anything to do with Hailsham or Pevensey. Their closest town is Bexhill and it would seem more sensible to transfer thee parishes to neighbouring authority of Rother. The boundary would follow the Wallers Haven river course from bridge on the A269 and down to the Hooe parish boundary. This would give a more sensible geographical connection to the District of Rother. The natural boundaries of the river and the Pevensey levels cuts Ninfield and Hooe off from Wealden district and are isolated not just geographically but in all aspects. However if we are were we are and the change is to link Hurstmonceux Ninfield Boreham Street and Windmill Hill and Wartling, Ninfield again has no joint community with these places. The means of tinkering about with ward boundaries to even out the number of voters within each ward then a more dramatic solution should be found. With the expected increase in houses within Wealden this review may have to take place again within 5 to 10 years. It would be more sensible to leave the ward boundaries as they are, because there is a definite connection between Ninfield and Hooe.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Sub for either Rother or Wealden, I presume..?

---
Sub: From: K Gale
Sent: 26 May 2016 15:23
To: reviews@lgbc.org.uk
Cc:

Dear Sir

Re Ninfield Hooe and Wartling

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the current boundary of Ninfield Hooe and Wartling ward.

The criteria set out by the LGBC quite reasonably aims to ensure that each councillor represents an equal number of electors. However, the 'lumping together' of disparate communities, in order to make the numbers fit, does not in any way reflect the interests and identities of the local communities.

Ninfield parish has little geographical connection with Pevensey and Westham. Boreham bridge and Pevensey marsh marks the natural division between two distinct areas. Residents of Ninfield naturally look towards Battle and Bexhill for employment, shopping and social and community contact. Take a look at the district boundary-the fact that Ninfield is even in Wealden District, not Rother District is an anathema to many residents.

Pevensey and Westham is an urban seaside township on the outskirts of Eastbourne. How many of its inhabitants are familiar with, or ever visit, Ninfield or Hooe?

The disparity of geography, nature and outlook would make representation by a single councillor ineffective and inconvenient, and certainly less democratic than under the current arrangements.

I urge you to consider these points in the interests of the electors of both Ninfield Hooe and Wartling and Pevensey and Westham.

Yours faithfully
Kathleen Gale.
From: Corinne Gibbons
Sent: 26 May 2016 14:55
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: Ward boundary change proposals

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object most strongly to the proposed boundary ward changes which will see the village of Hooe attached to the Pevensey & Westerham ward and thus separated from its long-standing and very appropriate link with the village of Ninfield. My objections are that:

1. The two villages have long-standing community and social links;

2. Many Ninfield and Hooe families are inter-married for some generations past.

3. The two churches are served by the one minister and share a long history of co-operation.

4. Hooe has absolutely nothing in common with the wards of Pevensey & Westerham and is physically separated from these villages by the Pevensey Marshes.

The current arrangement has worked well for many years and the ward of Ninfield, Hooe & Wartling has been able served by our Councillor Pam Doodles who has an unrivalled knowledge of the villages and their inhabitants. This knowledge and experience is extremely valuable, particularly at a time when we are facing a deluge of planning applications for over-developments in our area.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of my objection before the consultation deadline.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. C.M. Gibbons
Dear Ms Starkie

I would like to support the protest of many of my friends and neighbours to the boundary changes proposed by the Boundaries Commission. My reasons are:

1. **COMMUNITY INTERESTS**: Piltdown residents have many common interests: speed limits, protection of the beautiful countryside, litter, to name but three. The Piltdown Residents’ Association has brought the community together to promote these projects. When a few years ago a land-raise rubbish dump was proposed on the banks of the River Ouse, we organised a protest meeting and won. The PRA is also busy beautifying the village: eg the village sign by Piltdown Pond and the cultivation of the triangle opposite. It organises social events, usually at Piltdown Golf Club.

2. **THE PROPOSED NEW WARD**: Uckfield West will have a large urban element, so the single councillor may well lean their way in such matters as planning. The more rural concerns of Piltdown may lack a voice.

3. **RELATIONSHIP WITH FLETCHING**: we are thoroughly at one with the parish of Fletching, of which we are at present an active and fully supportive part. We are playing an active role in the coming Fletching Festival. Between us there is a bond of mutual financial and moral support.

4. **POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS**: as the maps show boundary lines which are far from “easily identifiable”, I would like to suggest two possible solutions which would not necessitate the annexing of part of Piltdown:

   - use the rivers Ouse and Shortbridge stream as boundary markers
   - move Copwood into Isfield/Uckfield West. This would avoid the “detached parish” problem.

I hope the above contains the sort of factual evidence required to support my protest. There is more, if I may say so, than is offered by the Boundaries Commission to support their proposals, which seem based entirely on numbers: number of councillors and number of electors per councillor. The aim is numerical equality regardless of the human beings involved. The “electoral equality” principle conflicts with the aim to “reflect community interests”.

With every good wish,

Richard Glynne-Jones, agreed with my wife Anne Glynne-Jones.
To: The Review Officer (Wealden)

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England

14th Floor Millbank Tower

Millbank

London SW1P 4QP

I am writing to object to the proposal/draft recommendation of the Boundary Commission for East Sussex County and Wealden District Electoral Reviews. I live in Isfield village which is greatly affected by the proposals.

Main points of objection:

1) I understand that that one of the principles guiding the Boundary Commission changes, supported by East Sussex County Council and Wealden District Council, is that wards “should reflect the interests and identities of local communities”. Isfield and Little Horsted have long been closely linked parishes. Indeed, given the particular circumstance where Little Horsted is represented by a Parish Meeting, rather than a Parish Council, it has frequently been the case that residents of Little Horsted have been elected members of Isfield Parish Council. When action was needed to speed the development of a broadband network within the villages, both bodies acted together to achieve their requirements. Children from both villages attend the same school, in Little Horsted; younger children from both villages attend the pre-school, which is in Isfield village hall. Community activities are frequently shared between the two villages; for example, the Bonfire Society, a significant part of many rural communities in East Sussex, is the Isfield and Little Horsted Bonfire Society. It would be incorrect to typify the two parishes as entirely independent. They are not; rather, they are semi-detached from each other with community and social links that go back for many years.

2) The proposal is that Isfield would be grouped in a ward with Uckfield West and Little Horsted with Uckfield Ridgewood. Both Isfield and Little Horsted are rural communities; the two Uckfield segments with which it is proposed to group them are urban communities, and indeed ones in which further development is to take place. Given the intention, quoted above, of wards reflecting the interests and identities of local communities, I would suggest that this grouping is inappropriate. The interests and requirements of rural communities are very different from those of urban ones, and, given the relative sizes of the populations, I am convinced that the rural voice would be lost. It cannot be otherwise; the inhabitants of the rural parishes would always be able to be outvoted by the greater number of those in the urban area, with an obvious conclusion as to the direction which would have to be taken (on pure democratic grounds) by the councillor representing them.

The Solution:
3) All Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill/ Fletching/Isfield/Little Horsted (much as it is now, but without Nutley) with 3,138 electors projected in 2021. The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22 which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood. Total projected Electoral numbers in 2021 for the existing 5 wards of Uckfield (12,272) could be split up into 4 district wards, (or even 3 wards with one a two member ward,) the average for each ward being 3,195, which is less than the numbers of electors being proposed in a Hailsham district ward.

Regards, Mandy Gould
I strongly object to a third of Piltdown being annexed into West Uckfield and Isfield ward. The majority of Uckfield electors are living in an urban area, sharing few interests with the rural community of Piltdown.

I am a committee member for The Friends of Fletching Church for the last seven years, raising money to keep the church in good order, and organise the church cleaning etc every month, which without out the support of other members, living outside your proposed boundaries would be a huge problem. Piltdown has a well known identity and should not be divided. Mrs J Greenish
I write, as a resident of Isfield, to object as strenuously as possible to the Boundary Commission's proposal to form a new ward of West Uckfield and Isfield.

Grounds for objection
1. The proposal to remove Isfield, an entirely rural village with its stated 500 electors, from its existing rural ward and dump it in with an entirely urban and industrial part of Uckfield with 2,300 electors appears to be a simple way to make up the required numbers in the new Uckfield ward. It disregards the resulting effect on the Isfield electors.
2. Isfield is a rural area which does not share the same interests, needs and requirements as the urban, residential and industrial West Uckfield.
3. Uckfield is bounded to the west by the A22 bypass which clearly and efficiently separates the urban and rural wards' needs and requirements.
4. Planning and Highways issues are materially different between rural and urban areas.
5. There are innumerable examples of interests that a rural area does not share with an urban area.
6. The proposal will effectively create a new urban ward at the expense of Isfield's residents.
7. The political parties in choosing their candidates will inevitably a person who has an understanding of the needs and requirements of the majority of its electorate; urban Uckfield.
8. Any, inevitable conflicts of interest between the urban and rural needs will inevitably result in decisions being made in favour of the urban majority.
9. The result of the proposal will effectively disenfranchise the Isfield electorate.

Solution
1. There should be a District Council ward of Danehill/ Fletching/Isfield/Little Horsted (much as it is now, but without Nutley) with 3,138 electors projected in 2021.
2. The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.
The Review Officer (Wealden)  
LGBCE  
14th Floor,  
Millbank Tower,  
London  
SW1P 4QP  

Date 11th June 2016  

Dear Madam  

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex  

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.  

These are my objections:  
- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.  
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.  
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.  
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.  
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.  

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.
Yours faithfully

Andrew Hatter
Review Officer (East Sussex)
Local government Boundary Commission for England
14th floor
Millbrook Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

1st June 2016

Dear Sir or Madam

Re: Ward boundary changes – Wealden District Council, East Sussex – Parish of Hooe

I wish to comment on the proposed boundary changes with regard to the Parish of Hooe, within the Wealden District Council area.

Hooe is currently linked with both Ninfield and Wartling parishes, which creates one single ward. I understand that under the proposed boundary changes, Hooe is to be linked instead with the parishes of Pevensey and Westham.

I am very concerned that this proposal will have a detrimental effect on the village with regard to District Council decisions. Hooe is a small, rural community with links going back hundreds of years with its close neighbours, Wartling and Ninfield. These three villages are integrated in that we share similar business and other activities – we are small villages, immediate neighbours, agriculture is the main occupation and with a shortage of local amenities and public transport. Ninfield is the only one of these three villages with direct access to a major (A) road – Hooe and Wartling both have problems with large, heavy vehicles using their narrower country roads. There has traditionally been significant co-operation between the inhabitants of these villages, going back to the days of smuggling and well beyond, because of their proximity to each other and the similarity of their respective economies.

Pevensey and Westham villages, on the other hand, have vastly different economies to those already mentioned, in that they are closer to the coast, far less reliant on agriculture and more dependent on the tourist and holiday trade. They are served by a number of major roads, including the main A259 between the channel ports and the West Country. Both villages also have railway stations on the East / West Coast line. There is also six miles of marshland between Hooe and Pevensey / Westham, which creates a significant physical separation of the two areas.

I am not sure what consideration has been given to the information I have set out above when setting out the proposed ward changes, but I can only assume that the originators were not aware of these substantial divergences between Hooe and Pevensey / Westham. I firmly believe that it is better to have a ward made up of villages with similar physical, economic and geographic environments, than to combine two with considerably contrasting backgrounds, as is being proposed, especially in terms of the distance between the villages.

The Hooe / Ninfield / Wartling ward has existed in perfect harmony within Wealden for very many years and I see no valid reason why this amalgamation should end. This is a natural unification of three villages that has existed for a very long time and should be respected as such. It would not benefit any of the five villages I have mentioned for this change to take place, on the contrary, it would probably be detrimental all round. I hope this proposal will be reconsidered and returned to something close to the existing arrangement.

Yours Faithfully,

Peter Hayward
Starkie, Emily

From: reviews
Sent: 14 June 2016 14:10
To: Starkie, Emily
Subject: FW: New plans

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

-----Original Message-----
From: Zoe Healy [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 June 2016 13:52
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: New plans

Sir
We strongly object to the new proposals to merge the very rural village of Isfield with the large urban district of West Uckfield.
We are totally different with priorities that are completely opposite to a town environment, Please delete these from any future plans and let us continue as a rural village ZA Healy

Sent from my iPad
Starkie, Emily

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 15 June 2016 12:29
To: Starkie, Emily
Subject: FW: Boundary Review, Wealden District Council

From: Jackie Hodgkiss [redacted]
Sent: 15 June 2016 11:37
To: reviews <reviews@lbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Review, Wealden District Council

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed draft Boundary change which affects my house.

I own a house in [redacted]).

The proposed boundary change will move my property from the village of Forest Row to the village of Hartfield. I need to point out that I live in Forest Row, the centre of which is less than 1 mile from my property. Hartfield village centre is over 3 miles from my property.

Therefore, by moving my property into the Hartfield parish will result in me and my family not being able to vote for the counsellors and council which controls my place of residence.

I strongly object to this and suggest that you review your draft and move the Forest Row/Hartfield boundary west from its proposed location. Its not right that I should be made to vote in a neighbouring parish rather than my own.

Yours faithfully.

Jacqueline Hodgkiss
From: Steve Hodgkiss
Sent: 05 June 2016 14:54
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Review for Wealden District Council

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed draft Boundary change which affects my house.

I own a house in [redacted].

The proposed boundary change will move my property from the village of Forest Row to the village of Hartfield. I need to point out that I live in Forest Row, the centre of which is less than 1 mile from my property. Hartfield village centre is over 3 miles from my property.

Therefore, by moving my property into the Hartfield parish will result in me and my family not being able to vote for the counsellors and council which controls my place of residence.

I strongly object to this and suggest that you review your draft and move the Forest Row/Hartfield boundary west from its proposed location. Its not right that I should be made to vote in a neighbouring parish rather than my own.

Yours faithfully.

Stephen Hodgkiss
Dear Sir,

On behalf of Hooe Parish Council I would like to lodge a strong objection to the joining of Hooe and Pevensey Parishes in the current draft boundary review.

At present the existing Wealden Ward covers the three parishes of Ninfield, Hooe and Wartling and is named 'Ninfield and Hooe with Wartling. These three parishes have similar profiles. They are all farming communities, and as such, the concerns, problems and challenges are similar ensuring that the Councillors can meet the needs of all the parishes. The residents of Hooe and Ninfield are geographically close neighbours. Children from Hooe attend Pre-school and Primary school at Ninfield, residents share the village shop, Post Office and Doctor's surgery which are also situated in Ninfield. Also the churches of St. Mary's at Ninfield and St. Oswald's at Hooe have always shared the same incumbent. Clubs and Groups are attended by residents from both communities. The present Wealden Ward has been extremely successful and effective.

The proposed Ward will be called 'Pevensey and Westham'. This area has no similarity or connection with the parish of Hooe. The characteristics of the communities are totally different. In contrast with Hooe, Pevensey and Westham are larger coastal villages with totally different needs. They have a strong seaside tourism trade. The two areas are physically divided by the busy A259 coastal road and a large expanse of land known as Pevensey Levels and so are remote from each other. If the proposed ward was to be adopted the parishioners of Hooe would suffer hugely from a lack of representation as the main focus would obviously need to be on the large urban part of the ward.

The Councillors feel that the boundary change is totally unsuitable and would like their views considered by the Commission.

Yours sincerely

Sally Durman

On behalf of Hooe Parish Council.
I am a resident of Piltdown and to my horror find that our rural community is about to be split in two for the sake of electoral numbers!! Rural areas are special places and the need for a strong community are extremely important. Piltdown Residents Association have worked long and hard (with Fletching Parish Council/Wealden District Council) and have united the village into a strong and resourceful community improving facilities for all residents and have the Police Neighbourhood Watch support.

The village central hub is the Piltdown Golf Club where meetings and social events are held so it is with dismay that half of Piltdown Golf Club will be in the current Fletching area and the other half into the proposed Uckfield West. A natural boundary would be the river that runs through Shortbridge and should provide Uckfield with the necessary numbers and so leaving the village of Piltdown as a community. For people who do not live or have experience of village life just changing a boundary without thought is surely incompetent.

Sue Hopkins
I write, as a resident of Isfield, to object as strenuously as possible to the Boundary Commission’s proposal to ward of West Uckfield and Isfield.

Grounds for objection

1. The proposal to remove Isfield, an entirely rural village with its stated 500 electors, from its existing rural ward of Uckfield and dump it in with an entirely urban and industrial part of Uckfield with 2,300 electors appears to be a simple way to make up the required numbers in the new Uckfield ward. It disregards the resulting effect on the Isfield electors.

2. Isfield is a rural area which does not share the same interests, needs and requirements as the urban, industrial West Uckfield.

3. Uckfield is bounded to the west by the A22 bypass which clearly and efficiently separates the urban and rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

4. Planning and Highways issues are materially different between rural and urban areas.

5. There are innumerable examples of interests that a rural area does not share with an urban area.

6. The proposal will effectively create a new urban ward at the expense of Isfield’s residents.

7. The political parties in choosing their candidates will inevitably a person who has an understanding of the political requirements of the majority of its electorate; urban Uckfield. Any, inevitable conflicts of interest between the urban and rural needs will inevitably result in decisions in favour of the urban majority.

8. The result of the proposal will effectively disenfranchise the Isfield electorate.

Solution

1. There should be a District Council ward of Danehill/ Fletching/Isfield/Little Horsted (much as it is now, without Nutley) with 3,138 electors projected in 2021.

2. The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which sets the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

David Houchin
East Sussex County

Personal Details:

Name: Nicholas Ib
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

We live in Eridge. We are currently within the Frant/Withyam area, which will now be called Hartfield. I've lived here for two years and I've not heard of Hartfield - why can't Eridge, which covers a wide area and includes the Eridge Estate, ever be in the names of these boundary areas? Both Groombridge and Eridge as names mean more to people in the East of this area than Hartfield. We live very near Frant, Groombridge and Crowborough, but I've never been to or heard of Hartfield. It makes no sense to be part of an area named after Hartfield. Please consider or include other names in the official name for this ward or the new division. For those of us who travel along the A26 in this area we never go to Hartfield, why would we want to be named after it, when there are large villages that we visit all the time because of the transport links across this area?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Judge
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Around Uckfield the proposals make no account of the existing Parish and town council boundaries. Small parts of Uckfield town will be included within large rural wards. I believe it would be better to retain the connection between ward and town boundaries. The rural parishes of Isfield and Little Horsted should not be included within Uckfield Wards. "The Ridings" estate, currently a part of New Town, West of the main road (New Town) will be included within Uckfield West and Isfield. This estate is bounded by the geographical features of the River and disused railway line (with potential for reopening) to the North. Beyond these there is an Industrial Estate before reaching further housing on the northern side of the B2102. This small estate will be isolated and would not get proper representation. There is an extension to New Town Ward, westward, that covers an area that is now due to have homes as well as industrial units. It would make far more sense to keep The Ridings Estate within New town and linked to the new Housing. Alternatively to include that part of the new development within West Uckfield and extend New town South along Eastbourne Road to take in Fernley Park.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Review Officer (East Sussex)

Local Government Boundary Commission for England

14th Floor

Millbank Tower

Millbank

London

SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my concern at the proposal to adjust the boundaries for our local ward. At present Hooe is joined by Ninfield and Wartling, but the new proposed ward would mean that Hooe would be joined with Pevensey and Westham.

I have many reasons for my concern:

- Hooe, Ninfield and Wartling are all very similar types of community, small, rural farming communities. Pevensey and Westham, on the other hand, have very different characteristics being both larger and more urban touristic coastal communities. This means that we have very different needs.

- Hooe and Ninfield in particular are very close physically, merging from one village to the other. Hooe seems much further away in distance to Pevensey and Westham as it is not only separated by an extremely busy main road (A259) but also by a large area of marshland (the Pevensey Levels).

- As a resident of Hooe, my family and I have always naturally used the facilities closest and most convenient to us in Ninfield. My children have all attended Ninfield Pre-school, and Ninfield School, both of which serve both Hooe and Ninfield. They have travelled to school on the school bus along with the other children in the village. We use the local shop and post office in Ninfield. There are extremely strong links between Hooe and Ninfield. We share many community events (such as the carnival and Michaelmas fayre), clubs and social groups and even shared a vicar!

Having lived in Hooe for 43 years, I feel very strongly that by changing the boundary, you would be dividing a very close knit community which has always had very strong links and pushing Hooe into a different community which is not only remote physically but also very different in its support system, needs and characteristics.

Mrs Amanda Keen
-----Original Message-----
From: Judy Keys
Sent: 16 June 2016 23:05
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary changes

I strongly object to the proposed boundary change to incorporate the village of Isfield into West Uckfield and feel Isfield should remain part of Danehill and Fletching as it is at present.

Judy Keys
Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

PA Kidd.
Dear Sirs

I would like to comment on the Boundary Commission’s draft proposals relating to the above.

In my opinion the proposals do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community because it amounts to splitting the community. It does not provide strong easily identifiable boundaries, and rural electors do not share the same interests as urban electors which the proposals fail to recognise.

Please improve the proposals by ensuring that the urban electoral area of Uckfield does not stray west of the A22.

Yours faithfully

Arthur Kidman,
31st May 2016

Review Officer (East Sussex)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir

I am writing to express my concern and dismay, and to register my objection, at the proposal that Hoee be combined with Pevensey and Westham in the new boundary review for Wealden.

Until now Hoee, Ninfield and Wartling have worked well together. Hoee supports activities in these villages, especially Ninfield. Hoee residents visit Ninfield on a regular daily basis for the post office, the doctor, nursery and primary school, clubs and societies. We share a vicar and a parish magazine. The villages are linked by relationships and friendships. Our lives are very similar in comparable farming villages.

Pevensey and Westham are remote from us, and have a very different character from our own village rural community, being more urban coastal villages with a seasonal tourist interest. There is no existing connection. Villagers here would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to relate to Pevensey and Westham which are geographically distant.

I would urge the Boundary Commission to look again at their proposal and take into account, what I feel, are my very pertinent objections with regard to the criteria set out by the LG Boundary Commission that ‘the pattern of wards and electoral divisions should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities’.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian King
New electoral arrangements for Wealden and East Sussex were based upon the two councils original submissions generally. Two (2) wards are with variance > 10% from average ie Arlington, and Hailsham NW; also 3 wards would have a 10% variance.

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;.

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.

X
========================================
===
Draft recommendations:
my response

Rural North
Forest Row       Hartfield < Forest Way >       Withyham
Frant & WADHURST HD-&-Rotherfield  < HD& >

Crowborough

Rural North Central
Mayfield & Five Ashes     Heathfield North     Heathfield So
Danehill & Fletching     Maresfield       Buxted

Central
Uckfield         Framfield & Cross-in-Hand
                     Chiddingly, East Hoathly & Waldron

South
Chiddingly, E Hoathly & Waldron     Arlington       So Downs
Horam & Punnett’s Town     Hellingly
Hailsham

Willingdon Lower     W’ngdon Upper Polegate So & Watermill
Polegate North       Polegate Central    Stone Cross
Herstmonceux, N & W   Pevensey & Westham Pevensey Bay
...
1-ward to be APPROVED, change & consolidate Withyham CP: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3097</td>
<td>7% (7.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Way (Hartfield)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>-10% (9.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-564</td>
<td>WAY: M-Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+259</td>
<td>Blackham pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rotherfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< prune FR by >=238 / <=348 electors = 5%/-5% vari >

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withyham [&amp; Er N]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>-7% (6.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-259</td>
<td>Blackham pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+564</td>
<td>WAY: M-Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rotherfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-230</td>
<td>Mark Cross pd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< WITBYHAM's 3-PWs in 2019 to be 4-pw (parish ward) >

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Row &amp; W. ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td>-3% (2.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< Forest Row, HARTFIELD and beyond WITBYHAM is Er N>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.

===

Rural North

Peter Kingswood
0-wards to be APPROVED, whilst modify both of draft-wards: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector/parish ward</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotherfield [&amp; H-Down]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>2% (2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rotherfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frant &amp; WADHURST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5343</td>
<td>-8% (7.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MAYFIELD &amp; FIVE ASHES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Rotherfield &amp;] WADHURST ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8303</td>
<td>-4% (3.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.

Crowborough

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.
2-wards to be APPROVED, whilst re-unite MAYFIELD & FIVE ASHES: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector/parish/ward</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3004</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2915</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYFIELD &amp; FIVE ASHES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3080</td>
<td>6% (6.427)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MAYFIELD & 5 ASHES) 2865 +215 Rusher’s X

Mayfield & Heathfield ED 1 8999 4% (4.18)

Framfield & Cross-in-Hand – go d’n to ...

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;.

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.

===
Rural North Central

2-wards to be APPROVED, also change **unit Fletching CP**: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector/parish ward</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danehill &amp; Fletching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>-6% (6.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fletching - WK</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>2595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maresfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td>9% (9.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>-4% (3.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdown forest ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>4% (4.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:

... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.
EAST SUSSEX County
... an administrative shire
Wealden district
... an administrative shire’s district

Draft recommendations:
my response

Central
Uckfield CP, (Buxted) Cooper’s Grn, (Framfield) Framfield

UCKFIELD environ: 5-wards that have rural 2-parish wards.

=================================================================

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2751</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>(4.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+120 West (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>(7.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>(2.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fletching - WK)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+116 Shortbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-511 ISFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+747 NT (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield North ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8253</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>(4.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c)  N of Church St
(b)  n of B2–Framfield Rd; & W of High St, Highland Inn roundabout, N of old Ridgewood ward
(a)  S of
0-wards to be APPROVED, whilst modify these 3 draft-wards: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>Ward from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield New Town (NT) &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framfield</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>-747 NT (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>-449 NT (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Framfield)</td>
<td>+1029 Framfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield Ridgewood</td>
<td>2865</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+449 NT (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-180 L.HORSTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East HOATHLY &amp; ISFIELD</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E H w H)</td>
<td>511 ISFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Framfield)</td>
<td>180 L.HORSTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1275 E.HOATHLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>634 Blackboys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield South [Framfield] &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hoathly ED</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>(2.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E H w H)</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Framfield)</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE** of forecast 2021 electorates: Electoral quantities are from the Commission’s, 25-xi-15, updated ‘xls’

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:

... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.
The following wards are approved generally with 3 (three) exceptions only ...

South

7-EDs, 20-wards, to be musical-chairs within 5-EDs

1-ward to be APPROVED, change 2-wards, and consolidate NPA: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(AD 2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ward</td>
<td>from av</td>
<td>(AD 2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ward</td>
<td>from av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldron with Cross-in-Hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>-4%  (3.81)</td>
<td>ADD Cross-in-Hand 1205;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Chiddingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMIT East Hoathly 1275.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Weald (Arlington)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>-11% ()</td>
<td>South Downs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>-5% (4.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIDDINGLY, Low Weald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8119</td>
<td>-6% (6.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; South Downs ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;.

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.
**Draft recommendations:**

**Peter Kingswood**

All wards to be APPROVED: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horam &amp; Punnett’s Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5879</td>
<td>2% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellingly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3001</td>
<td>4% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horam &amp; Hellingly ED</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8880</strong></td>
<td><strong>3% (2.80)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:

... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.

6-wards to be APPROVED: within Hailsham EDs’ area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hailsham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< prune FR by >=238 / <=348 electors = 5%/-5% vari >

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:

... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;
2-wards to be APPROVED, whilst modify Lower Willingdon:
within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Willingdon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>-9% (9.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingdon Upper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2913</td>
<td>1% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate South &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingdon Watermill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>5% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingdon &amp; Polegate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8565</td>
<td>-1% (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ward / ED name          | cllrs | elector     | variance from av |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polegate North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3152</td>
<td>9% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate &amp; Stone Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8666</td>
<td>0% (0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.
All wards to be APPROVED: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>clrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herstmonceux, Ninfield &amp; Wartling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>7% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>0% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Herstmonceux & Pevensey ED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herstmonceux &amp; Pevensey ED</td>
<td>8827</td>
<td>2% (2.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;

... best balance between the statutory criteria ...;
... good electoral equality in rural areas.

=== === ===

============================================================================
New electoral arrangements for Wealden and East Sussex were based upon the two councils original submissions generally. Two (2) draft wards, needing further diligence, are without the statutory criteria’s own de-facto variance of >10% from the average i.e. Arlington, and Hailsham NW; also 3-wards would have a 10% variance, and that is acceptable.

The Commission’s ‘statutory criteria’ has three main considerations:
... improve electoral equality;
... reflect community identity;
... effective and convenient local government;.

The Wealden’s draft scheme needs more diligent revision: the ‘full council’ (~) response reiterated their initial.

During the review period I’ve consulted with CP’s clerks and councillors, parish + district, the results are my comments with alternatives set out as 15 shire divisions.

Please where necessary remember that NPAs are the local Planning (development control) authority in South Downs.

(~) Wed 18-v-16 Full Council’s, item 19, Electoral Review response to LGBCE
r=4
para.5 cllr Galley: "... the communities of Isfield and Little Horsted ... annexed to Uckfield ..."
para.2 cllr N Collison: "... the locality of Piltdown ..."
43-wards are listed below, as necessary, with alternative names that clearly respect their identity better solution: their draft names are in brackets (…) for easy reference.

Rural North and Crowborough
Forest Row   (Hartfield) Forest Way    Withyham [& Eridge]
Frant & WADHURST    Rotherfield [& Hadlow Down]
Crowborough = 6-wards

North Central and Uckfield
Mayfield & 5 Ashes Heathfield North    Heathfield South
Danehill & Fletching Maresfield    Buxted

Uckfield = 5-wards
(Framfield & Cross-in-Hand)   Isfield & East Hoathly

South and Hailsham
(Chiddingly, East Hoathly & Waldron)
Cross-in-Hand with Waldron & Chiddingly
(Arlington) Low Weald South Downs[& Jevington]
Horam & Punnett’s Town Hellingly
Hailsham = 6-wards

Willingdon Lower    W’ngdon Upper    Polegate So. & Watermill
Polegate North    Polegate Central    Stone Cross
Herstmonceux, Ninfield & Wartling
    Pevensey & Westham    Pevensey Bay

…
FER 2015

EAST SUSSEX County
... an administrative shire
Wealden district
... an administrative shire’s district

Draft recommendations:
my response

Rural North and Crowborough

1-ward to be APPROVED, change & consolidate Withyham CP:
within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3097</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>(7.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Way (Hartfield)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>(9.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham - WFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-259</td>
<td>Blackham pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withyham [&amp; Eridge]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>(6.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham - WFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Withyham)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-259</td>
<td>Blackham pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rotherfield - WFN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+564</td>
<td>WAY: M-Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Row &amp; Withyham ED 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8415</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>(2.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Withyham CP would like to be whole in draft Withyham ward: it needs return of St John’s Withyham parish ward. How can it be achieved? Hartfield ward would need electors from Forest Row: prune >=238 /<=348 electors = -1%/-5% variance. Above, my alternative, make 4th parish ward (WFI) Blackham: the A264 (B2026) links Blackham to Hartfield hamlet.

WITHYHAM CP's 3-PWs in 2019 to be 4-pw (parish ward)

‘Forest Way’ recreational path, East Grinstead thru Forest Row to Groombridge, along dismantled railway is clear bound for Forest Row ward. Suggest revised name Forest Way ward.

OMIT Mark Cross: It is beyond my Withyham & Eridge ward. This revised ED has good electoral equality in rural areas. ED is Forest Row, HARTFIELD and beyond WITHYHAM is Eridge. Revised ED moves (Rotherfield) Mark Cross eastward:
Suggest revised name Forest Row & Withyham ED.

===

Peter Kingswood
0-wards to be APPROVED, whilst modify both of draft-wards: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>Ward from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotherfield [&amp; H-Down]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>2% (2.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rotherfield - WFN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2730</td>
<td></td>
<td>+230 Mark Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frant &amp; WADHURST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5343</td>
<td>-8% (7.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MAYFIELD &amp; FIVE ASHES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5558</td>
<td></td>
<td>-215 Rusher's X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Rotherfield &amp;] WADHURST ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8303</td>
<td>-4% (3.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMIT Rusher’s Cross from draft Wadhurst ED: ADD Mark Cross. B2100 (A267) at Mark Cross, a corridor links Rotherfield to Wadhurst: improved corridor between this ED’s twin hubs.

ED’s good rural electoral equality, effective Local Government in area, makes the criteria’s best balance solution. Revised ED’s improved community identity is in Mark Cross: Suggest revised name Rotherfield & WADHURST ED.

Crowborough, town of

The Commission’s draft 6-ward to be APPROVED: within this 2-ED’s area suggest revised name alterations. The town of Crowborough grew into & absorbed neighbouring villages: the railway station in Jarvis Brook is now within Crowborough town. These draft electoral arrangements are all within the town – it is wholly coterminous wards & EDs – allowing conveniently efficient Local Governance. Only, 5-of-6 draft wards have good urban electoral equality.

These EDs draft names are too long and they need simple clarity: Suggest new name Crowborough East ED. Suggest new name Crowborough West ED.

== == == ==
The following wards are approved with 7 (seven) exceptions only: **MAYFIELD & 5 ASHES**, 2-west of A22, and **4-Uckfield**. 

North Central and Uckfield

2-wards to be APPROVED, whilst re-unite **MAYFIELD & FIVE ASHES**: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3004</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2915</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAYFIELD &amp; FIVE ASHES</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3080</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>(6.427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(MAYFIELD &amp; ... - WWF)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>2865</td>
<td></td>
<td>+215 Rusher’s X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayfield &amp; Heathfield ED</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8999</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>(4.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heathfield & Waldron’s entitlement is 3.414 wards. Please go below to Horam & Punnett’s Town and my **Cross-in-Hand with Waldron & Chiddingly** wards.

ADD *(WWF)* Rusher’s Cross from draft Wadhurst ED. **Mayfield CP, are on record they, would like to be whole in draft Mayfield & Five Ashes ward: a coterminous CP / ward. ED’s much improved electoral equality makes effective LG in these areas: better balance between the statutory criteria. This revised ED will allow **MAYFIELD’s** coterminous identity: APPROVE the name **Mayfield & Heathfield ED**.
2-wards to be APPROVED, also change re-unite Fletching CP: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector/parish ward</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danehill &amp; Fletching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>-6% (6.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fletching - WK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maresfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td>9% (9.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>-4% (3.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdown Forest ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8659</td>
<td>0% (0.24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADD (Fletching - WK) Shortbridge
Fletching with Piltdown is a whole micro-parish: their CP held a meeting on 01-June to consult Piltdown’s residents’ views. Whilst Wealden Council met on Wednesday 18th May, 2016, to agree its own response (~) item 19 see below.

Isfield CP wants ‘no change’ however 11% electoral variance results, and for Little Horsted CP 18% electoral variance.

Birch Grove, in Danehill’s Chelwood Gate, was the family residence of Harold Macmillan, PM 1957-63, & Lady Dorothy.

ED’s improve electoral equality makes effective LG in these rural areas: better balance between the statutory criteria. This revised ED has rural, not urban, community identity: Suggest new name Ashdown Forest ED.

(~) Wed 18-v-16 Full Council's, item 19, Electoral Review response to LGBCE
http://council.wealden.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=299&MId=3993&Ver=4
para.5 cllr Galley: "... the communities of Isfield and Little Horsted ... annexed to Uckfield ..."
para.2 cllr N Collison: "... the locality of Piltdown ..."
ACKFIELD environ: 5-wards that have rural 2-parish wards.

12,782 UCKFIELD-CP
14,068 as proposed total, 4.86 wards, -2.78%
13,846 Uckfield, WB (Buxted) & Framfield -3%

1-ward to be APPROVED, whilst modify North and West wards: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>clerrs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield North</td>
<td>1 2751</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>-5% (4.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+120 West (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield East</td>
<td>1 2682</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>-7% (7.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-120 West (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield West</td>
<td>1 2820</td>
<td>2820</td>
<td>-3% (2.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-116 Shortbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-511 ISFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+747 NT (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield North ED</td>
<td>1 8253</td>
<td>8253</td>
<td>-4% (4.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-116 Shortbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMIT WK, and ISFIELD: ADD (Uckfield) pt of NT-ward so as to compensate for loss of rural electors west of A22. A22 arterial road, Uckfield by-pass, is clear separation of rural west from urban east, Uckfield looks east not west. Fletching with Piltdown is a whole micro-parish, see above.

This Uckfield EDs' draft name needs simple clarity: Suggest new name **Uckfield North ED**.

(c) N of Church St is a clearer bound for urban wards;
(b) N of B2102 Framfield Rd; & W of High St (Eastbourne Rd / Lewes Rd), from N of the 'Highland Inn' roundabout, and N of old Ridgewood ward
(a) S of Mallard Dr is the heart of Ridgewood estates.
0-wards to be APPROVED, whilst modify these 3 draft-wards: within revised ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish variance</th>
<th>Ward from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield New Town (NT) &amp; Framfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>2% (1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>-747 NT (b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>-449 NT (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Framfield - WMD)</td>
<td>+1029 Framfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield Ridgewood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2865</td>
<td>-1% (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uckfield)</td>
<td>+449 NT (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-180 L.HORSTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East HOATHLY &amp; ISFIELD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>-10% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511 ISFIELD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180 L.HORSTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E H w H - WXH)</td>
<td>1275 E.HOATHLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Framfield - WMC)</td>
<td>634 Blackboys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uckfield South [Framfield] &amp; East Hoathly ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td>-3% (2.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMIT rural areas electors: ADD Framfield
A22 arterial road, Uckfield by-pass, is clear separation of rural west from urban east, Uckfield looks east not west.

East HOATHLY & ISFIELD Ward is generally west/south of A22:
all these CPs have rural identity.
Uckfield’s Uckfield Ridgewood draft ward has very weak urban electoral variance.
Uckfield’s Uckfield New Town draft ward, along B2102,
is Framfield-centric: suggest its combined with Framfield.

This Uckfield EDs’ draft name needs simple clarity:
Suggest new name Uckfield South [Framfield] & E Hoathly ED.
The following wards are approved with 3 (three) exceptions only: Chiddingly ... Waldron, So. Downs, and Lwr Willingdon.

South and Hailsham

7-EDs, 20-wards, to be musical-chairs within their 5-EDs

1-ward to be APPROVED, change 2-wards, and consolidate NPA: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish / parish</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>(AD 2021)</th>
<th>ward from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-in-Hand with Waldron &amp; Chiddingly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>-4% (3.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD Cross-in-Hand 1205;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMIT East Hoathly 1275.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Weald (Arlington)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>-11% ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>-5% (4.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+144 Jevington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIDDINGLY, Low Weald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8119</td>
<td>-6% (6.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; South Downs ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMIT Hellingly: ADD South Downs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A267 arterial road links Hellingly to Horam and Heathfield. NPA is Downlands hamlets, Jevington is a Downlands hamlet: NPAs are Development Control authority: draft 3-wards to be better as 2-wards ie Low Weald (Arlington) &amp; South Downs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My initial scheme suggested 2-wards: South Downs Rural -9% &amp; South Downs Coastal -7%, their electoral variances makes effective Governance, better balance between the criteria; both cover the South Downs NPA’s rural parishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-in-Hand with Waldron & Waldron are both Heathfield & Waldron CP.

This revised ED has wholly rural community identity:
Suggest new name CHIDDINGLY, Low Weald & South Downs ED.
Draft recommendations:
my response

All wards to be APPROVED: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>clirs (AD 2021)</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horam &amp; Punnett’s Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5879</td>
<td>2% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellingly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3001</td>
<td>4% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horam &amp; Hellingly ED</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8880</strong></td>
<td><strong>3% (2.80)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This revised ED’s dual-spine is the railway & trunk-road:
Suggest new name **Horam & Hellingly ED**.

OMIT Herstmonceux, Ninfield & Wartling: ADD **Hellingly**
Herstmonceux borders the Pevensey Levels’s hamlets eg Hooe.
A267 arterial road links **Hellingly & Horam** to Heathfield.
ED’s good electoral equality makes effective LG in these rural areas: better balance between the statutory criteria.
This revised ED includes High Weald AONB’s eastern hamlets: Suggest new name **Horam & Hellingly ED**.

Hailsham, town of

The Commission’s draft 2-EDs / 6-wards to be APPROVED:
within this area, with respect may it be, suggest a ward's electoral variance is outside the statutory criteria's spirit: could prune >=45 /<=187 electors = 10%/5% variance.

These draft electoral arrangements are all within the town and allow conveniently efficient Local Governance. Only, 2-of-6 draft wards have good urban electoral equality.

**These EDs draft names are APPROVED.**

=== === ===
Draft recommendations: my response

2-wards to be APPROVED, whilst modify Lower Willingdon:
within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector/parish</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Willingdon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W + J)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-144 Jevington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingdon Upper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2913</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate South &amp;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingdon Watermill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingdon ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8565</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMIT South Downs: ADD ... Willingdon Watermill
NPA is Downlands hamlets: Jevington is a Downlands hamlet.
ED's improve electoral equality makes effective urban Local Governance: better balance between the statutory criteria.
Revised ED has wholly Willingdon urban community identity: Suggest new name Willingdon ED.

All wards to be APPROVED: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllrs</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3152</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polegate &amp; Stone Cross ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8666</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMIT Willingdon Watermill: ADD Stone Cross ...
S of A27, Polegate & Stone Cross, are B2247 linear suburbs. ED’s much improved electoral equality makes effective LG in these areas: better balance between the statutory criteria. This revised ED has linear suburban community identity: Suggest new name Polegate & Stone Cross ED.

Peter Kingswood
All wards to be APPROVED: within changed ED’s area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / ED name</th>
<th>cllr</th>
<th>elector</th>
<th>variance from av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herstmonceux,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>7% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninfield &amp; Wartling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>0% ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey &amp; Westham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herstmonceux &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8827</td>
<td>2% (2.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMIT Stone Cross: ADD Herstmonceux ... Polegate & Stone Cross are B2247 linear suburbs.

Herstmonceux borders the Pevensey Levels’s hamlets eg Hooe. ED’s improve electoral equality makes effective LG in these rural areas: better balance between the statutory criteria. This revised ED has coastal Low Weald community identity: Suggest new name Herstmonceux & Pevensey ED.

Conclusion

14-Wards, of 43 draft wards, are considered for change so as to clarify and strengthen their community identity: to be more respectful of these parishes’ own integrity.

5-EDs, of 15 draft EDs, are considered for change so as to clarify and strengthen their community identity, improve electoral equality: thus making a better balance between the statutory criteria.

* District’s future size to be 45-members with 43-wards;
* This County’s Wealden envelope to be 15-members;
* Rural areas may use multi-cllrs eg “Frant & WADHURST”;
* Honest rigour needed: 5% urban/7% rural for wards/ED.

=== === ===

FIN

Peter Kingswood
Starkie, Emily

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 15 June 2016 09:30
To: Starkie, Emily
Subject: FW: Objecting to proposed boundaries for Wealden District Electoral Reviews

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: [Redacted] on behalf of reviews
Sent: 14 June 2016 19:30
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Objecting to proposed boundaries for Wealden District Electoral Reviews

To: The Review Officer (Wealden)

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP
14th June 2016.

I am writing to object to the proposal/draft recommendation of the Boundary Commission for East Sussex County and Wealden District Electoral Reviews. I live in Isfield village which is greatly affected by the proposals.

Main points of objection:
1) I understand that that one of the principles guiding the Boundary Commission changes, supported by East Sussex County Council and Wealden District Council, is that wards “should reflect the interests and identities of local communities”. Isfield and Little Horsted have long been closely linked parishes. Indeed, given the particular circumstance where Little Horsted is represented by a Parish Meeting, rather than a Parish Council, it has frequently been the case that residents of Little Horsted have been elected members of Isfield Parish Council. When action was needed to speed the development of a broadband network within the villages, both bodies acted together to achieve their requirements. Children from both villages attend the same school, in Little Horsted; younger children from both villages attend the pre-school, which is in Isfield village hall. Community activities are frequently shared between the two villages; for example, the Bonfire Society, a significant part of many rural communities in East Sussex, is the Isfield and Little Horsted Bonfire Society. It would be incorrect to typify the two parishes as entirely independent. They are not; rather, they are semi-detached from each other with community and social links that go back for many years.

2) The proposal is that Isfield would be grouped in a ward with Uckfield West and Little Horsted with Uckfield Ridgewood. Both Isfield and Little Horsted are rural communities; the two Uckfield
segments with which it is proposed to group them are urban communities, and indeed ones in which further development is to take place. Given the intention, quoted above, of wards reflecting the interests and identities of local communities, I would suggest that this grouping is inappropriate. The interests and requirements of rural communities are very different from those of urban ones, and, given the relative sizes of the populations, I am convinced that the rural voice would be lost. It cannot be otherwise; the inhabitants of the rural parishes would always be able to be outvoted by the greater number of those in the urban area, with an obvious conclusion as to the direction which would have to be taken (on pure democratic grounds) by the councillor representing them.

The Solution:

3) All Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill/ Fletching/Isfield/Little Horsted (much as it is now, but without Nutley) with 3,138 electors projected in 2021. The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22 which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood. Total projected Electoral numbers in 2021 for the existing 5 wards of Uckfield (12,272) could be split up into 4 district wards, (or even 3 wards with one a two member ward,) the average for each ward being 3,195, which is less than the numbers of electors being proposed in a Hailsham district ward.

Regards, Sharon Knight
Starkie, Emily

From: reviews
Sent: 03 June 2016 10:52
To: Starkie, Emily
Subject: FW: Proposed changes to the Wealden Ward of Ninfield, Hooe and Wartling

And another..?

(Let me know if these need to go elsewhere)

From: Jackie Langley
Sent: 31 May 2016 18:02
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Proposed changes to the Wealden Ward of Ninfield, Hooe and Wartling

I would like to strongly object to the proposal to change the above by attaching Hooe to Pevensey and proposing a new ward of Pevensey and Westham.

The proposed change makes no sense whatsoever. It would disrupt a good and close relationship between Hooe and Ninfield, its next door neighbour. The two parishes share a school, church, Post office, GP surgery. The bus, such as it is serves both parishes.

The parish of Hooe joins Ninfield seamlessly. It is totally separate in every way from Pevensey. Pevensey and Westham are large villages on the coast. Hooe is a small agricultural village.

If you remove Hooe, you will not only damage Hooe village, but also the neighbouring villages of Ninfield and Wartling, particularly Ninfield.

Please think again about what I feel is the most ridiculous proposal I have read in a long time. This proposed change will not in any way ‘reflect the interests and identities of local communities’.

Best wishes

Jackie Langley – a Ninfield resident.

Virus-free. www.avast.com
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Andrew Latham
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Why would you determine that properties within the welcome to/leaving forest row sign should no longer belong to the forest row ward? I am referring to the properties on Hartfield road from 100 onwards. I live at [Redacted]. Why has this apparent 'public' consultation not made any attempt to contact those properties affected, I have only found out the day before the consultation completes from my neighbour, who only found out yesterday from a chance conversation with someone else. Forest Row Councillors have yet again shown themselves to be incompetent at public consultations. They have a very good recent history of that.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Paul Lovatt Smith
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: Mr

Comment text:

What a muddle you have got yourselves into with Herstmonceux! The top priority should be to keep to the parish boundary. This has existed for many hundreds of years and forms the basis of local ties, characteristics, services, schools, communities, GP services, transport links, farms etc etc. Your proposal splits the parish into 4 parts and is just not viable. Chapel Row, Golden Cross, Flowers Green, Stunts Green, Gingers Green, Cowbeech Hill are all intimately connected to Herstmonceux village services and should be in the same ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Caroline Lucas
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I find the current proposals for changing the boundaries in my postcode area [REDACTED] totally ludicrous. To suggest that we become part of pevensey and westham ward is nonsense, we have no connection with these villages, do not know anything about what is going on there and certainly would not class ourselves as part of these communities. If we were to be included in a vote in this constituency we would not know any background of the candidates or what they were standing for, and on the other side of things imagine if we were to stand as a candidate, no one would know who we were or understand why we would want to put ourselves forward to represent an area that we did not feel part of. Our postal address is herstmonceux with a BN27 postcode this is the village we chose to live in, be part of that community and have our say in, not somewhere 8/9 miles away. It seems that this is just a numbers juggling game to even up wards, which in itself is ludicrous as if Wealden persists in allowing the current levels of housing developments to keep increasing this will all change in the relatively short term. My proposals are: 1. Flowers Green, Church Road and Chapel Row move from Pevensey & Westham to the Herstmonceux, Ninfield and Wartling ward. 2. Hooe moves from Pevensey & Westham to the Herstmonceux, Ninfield and Wartling ward. 3. Land to the south of the A259 moves from Pevensey & Westham to Pevensey Bay. 4. Hankham, Glynleigh and Rickney move from Stone Cross to Pevensey & Westham. The northern boundary of Stone Cross should be the A27. 5. Stone Cross west moves from Polegate Central to Stone Cross. The numbers may not be quite so even, but to consider that Chapel Row and Church Road have a better link with Pevensey than Herstmonceux, is nonsense. Re map haven't been able to annotate it so my suggestions are as above

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

We have lived in Forest Row for over 29 years and are active members of the village community, our house being located just one mile from the centre of the village.

We were therefore extremely unhappy to learn, by chance, of your commission’s recommendation to change the existing boundary of the Parish of Forest Row with the result that our property would become part of Hartfield Parish. We have not been informed, let alone consulted about this change by any official body.

The centre of Hartfield is over three miles from here and is a completely separate community from Forest Row. We have little connection to Hartfield whereas we are very much part of Forest Row and feel very strongly that we should not be deprived of the ability to vote in elections for our local parish council.

Furthermore the proposed new boundary runs down the centre of Rystwood Road which means that some of the residents will remain in Forest Row parish while others including ourselves will not. Such an arrangement may well be unavoidable in an urban area such as London but it is inappropriate and unnecessary in a rural area such as this.

A final point - Rystwood Road and Forest Road are unadopted roads which are owned and managed by Rystwood Estate Ltd. to which all residents of the estate pay an annual subscription for road maintenance, drain clearing etc. It surely does not make sense to change the existing Parish boundary so that parts of Rystwood Estate will be in two different parishes.

We very much urge you to take account of our objections and retain the existing parish boundary so that all the properties in Rystwood Road and Forest Road are located within the Parish of Forest Row.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew & Julie Martin
9 June 2016

Review Officer (Wealden)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

By email

Electoral Arrangements for Wealden District Council - Danehill & Fletching Ward

Dear Sir

1 Introduction

I refer to ‘Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Wealden District Council – Electoral Review’ dated March 2016. In this letter I will refer to this document as the Draft Electoral Review.

Under section 58 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (LDEDCA 2009), there is provision for interested parties to make representations with regard to the Draft Electoral Review. Please treat this letter as containing my representations.

Schedule 2 LDEDCA 2009 sets out the legislative framework within which the Electoral Commission must operate when making recommendations. Accordingly, my representations comment on the recommendations in the Draft Electoral Review by reference to the provisions of schedule 2.

2 Background

I have been a resident of Piltdown in the parish of Fletching since August 1991. There has been a considerable effort made, particularly in recent years, to build a greater cohesion and community spirit among the residents of Piltdown. The Piltdown Residents Association was formed a few years ago and has been active in promoting measures to improve the local environment and in bringing people together.
3 Reflect the identities and interests of local communities – Paragraph 2(3)(b)

It is therefore extremely disappointing to see in the Draft Electoral Review a proposal to draw a boundary in a haphazard manner through the middle of Piltdown. To me this seems to be clearly in contravention of paragraph 2(3)(b) of Schedule 2 LDEDCA2009, which states:

‘In making any such recommendations, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England must have regard to—

... (b) the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities, and in particular—

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable, and

(ii) the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties,’

Your proposal does not reflect the identities and interests of the local community (i.e. Piltdown). The boundary is not one that anyone resident in the area would call easily identifiable. It certainly does not follow any natural feature. The proposed boundary drives a wedge between parts of Piltdown and will undermine the success we have achieved in building our community spirit and getting things done locally.

4 Secure effective and convenient local government – Paragraph 2(3)(c)

Another curious feature of the Draft Electoral Review is that the part of Piltdown that has been excluded from the proposed new area of the Danehill & Fletching ward has then been lumped together with part of Uckfield in the proposed Uckfield West & Isfield ward. Piltdown is a rural community whereas Uckfield is not. The needs of each may well not coincide. It is hard to see how such a hotch-potch of an area can do other than militate against the requirements of paragraph 2(3)(c) of Schedule 2 LDEDCA2009 which states that you must have regard to:

‘the need to secure effective and convenient local government’.

By proposing such a boundary you are making the task of the relevant Wealden District Councillor all the more difficult in representing the views of a widely divergent community. This cannot be said to assist in the aim of securing effective and convenient local government.
5 Electoral equality – Paragraph 2(3)(a)

It seems to me that your proposal with regard to the ward of Danehill & Fletching has been driven excessively by paragraph 2(3)(a) of Schedule 2 LDEDCA2009 which states that you must have regard to:

‘the need to secure that the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of members of the district council to be elected is, as nearly as possible, the same in every electoral area of the council’.

I am not suggesting that this requirement be disregarded. However, I am suggesting that appropriate weight should also be placed on the other requirements of paragraph 2(3) of Schedule 2 LDEDCA2009, as referred to above.

I also find it curious that the Draft Electoral Review notes that the 2021 variance for the proposed ward of Danehill & Fletching is ‘-10%’. Paragraph 2(4) of Schedule 2 LDEDCA2009 states that:

‘For the purpose of sub-paragraph (3)(a) the Local Government Boundary Commission for England must have regard to any change in the number or distribution of local government electors in the area of the district council which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the making of the recommendations.’

However, by your own estimates the boundary you propose will create a ward where the variance from the average will have moved from -8% now to -10% in five years. Given this prediction, it seems odd that you are proposing to reduce the ward’s size.

6 Conclusion

While I have based my representations above on the underlying legislation in Schedule 2 LDEDCA2009, I have also read the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s publication ‘How to propose a pattern of wards’. In an ideal world I would have access to the same data as you and would have enough time to be able to use it to come up with an alternative proposal that, looking at Wealden as a whole, I believe better fitted the statutory requirements than the recommendations in your Draft Electoral Review. However, as a private individual, I have neither the ready access to that data nor the time to construct such an alternative proposal.
I hope however that you will have regard to the ways in which I feel your recommendations for the ward of Danehill & Fletching violates more of the requirements of schedule 2 LDEDCA2009 than it satisfies. While I appreciate that you must balance conflicting requirements across the whole of Wealden, I strongly urge you to reconsider these proposals as, from a Danehill & Fletching perspective, the balance most assuredly does not feel right. The current boundary has served us well. I would encourage you to continue with it.

If you feel obliged to adjust the boundary of the Danehill & Fletching ward, can I urge you to find another way of doing so that does not do such ‘violence’ to the community in Piltdown.

Michael McGowan
Dear Ms. Starkie,

I write to object most strongly to the proposal that the boundaries of Uckfield be altered to include the village of Isfield, as well as part of Piltdown. Presently there is a very clear boundary between Uckfield town and Isfield, formed by the A22. This is more than a notional boundary, it also marks the line between two entirely different kinds of community. Isfield and Piltdown are rural parishes with the kind of problems and concerns that are to be expected in this kind of area. Uckfield is a mid sized town where questions relating to, for example, agriculture, footpaths, verges and lanes do not apply at all. Those living in isolated areas or on farms, given that representation would be much reduced, would have no voice, should the boundary alteration go ahead. Isfield and Piltdown are NOT West Uckfield, they are no better, no worse, than Uckfield but as different as chalk and cheese. It does not make any sense to suggest that they are part of Uckfield or that they should be lumped together for convenience. I very much hope that this proposal will go no further.

Yours sincerely,
Annie McManus

Sent from my iPad
Dear Ms Starkie,

I am writing to lodge objections to the Boundaries Commission’s (BC) draft recommendation to create a new District ward (West Uckfield and Isfield) incorporating what is a rural Parish ward (Isfield) into an urban area, and, in order to provide a territorial link between the Isfield and Uckfield area, also splitting the existing rural Fletching Parish ward by annexing electors from the southern area of Piltdown into a proposed separate Parish ward (Shortbridge) within the proposed West Uckfield and Isfield District ward.

**Objections:**

1. Neither Isfield nor Piltdown, as rural areas, share the same interests as the urban area of Uckfield. Planning and Highways issues are materially different between rural and urban areas, and the requirement to deal with different County and District Councillors for electors, because of the way that boundaries are proposed to be split on all the roads and lanes in Piltdown, is confusing and will require duplication of Councillors time and, therefore, is ineffective government.

2. Electors in the rural areas of Piltdown and Isfield do not share the same concerns as urban Uckfield. The desire to preserve the countryside environment, reduce speeding on country lanes (especially in Buckham Hill, Isfield where the expanding deer population and speeding is causing great concern to residents), waste collections from remote locations, maintenance of footpaths, maintenance of grass verges and hedges/overhanging trees on roads, need for ditching to avoid flooding are all examples of concerns that are not those of an urban area.

3. Isfield has a very active Parish Council and a strong community spirit and identity evidenced by support for:
   i) The multiplicity of events at the (self-funded and independent charity Trust) local Village Hall with its thriving Pre School, Play Scheme, Art Group, Dancing Club, over 55s club, Women’s Club, many talks and workshops, Open days, Race nights and Frost Fairs.
   ii) The Isfield Community Enterprise field with its fund raising events such as the village fete which provided a bus shelter for the community recently.
   iii) The Isfield and Little Horsted Bonfire Society again with its fund raising events.

4. Piltdown has a very active Residents Association which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment, like the village sign, speed survey, proposed village gates. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for licences for proposals such as these is ineffective government. Piltdown has a strong identity too evidenced by the Piltdown Golf Club and the nationally known Piltdown Man.
5. The BC’s requirement to create a Parish ward for Shortbridge (which is a little known name even within the Parish) means that electors in the proposed new ward would only have one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas now they have the ability to vote up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly creates an inequality of voting through limiting the choice between electors in different parts of Piltdown and the rest of Fletching.

**Solution:**
The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22 which the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development Ridgewood. Total projected Electoral numbers in 2021 for the existing 5 wards of Uckfield (12,272) can split into 4 District wards (or even 3 wards with a one or two member ward) the average for each war 3,195 which is less than the number of electors being proposed in a Hailsham District ward. All Piltdown electors should be kept in the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a being comprised of a District ward (of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted) with 3,138 elector projected in 2021.

Yours sincerely
Begin forwarded message:

From: Helen Metcalf  
Date: 14 June 2016 at 17:07:00 BST  
To: reviews@lgbc.org.uk  
Subject: Boundaries Commission

Dear Sirs

I am writing to express my deep concern to the proposed splitting up of Fletching and the Piltdown community.

I have lived here for nearly 7 years and we are a delightful rural community, complete with a Piltdown Residents Association, Golf Club and Pond. I am surrounded by like minded families and we do not want to become part of Urban Uckfield.

I therefore would like to strongly disagree with your proposed changes to become part of a new West Uckfield.

It is about time that local governing bodies took the views of local residents into consideration.

Yours faithfully

Mrs H Metcalf
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: David Minns
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I live in Forest Row [REDACTED]. So make use of the services provided by Forest Row Parish Council. Under these boundary changes you will be denying me the democratic right to vote for the council in the village I live in. I don't, nor never have wished to live in Hartfield.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date 14 June 2016

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

• I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
• They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
• Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
• The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
• The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Pildown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

T. Montfort Begg
The Review Officer (Wealden),
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
14th Floor, Millbank Tower,
Millbank,
London,
SW1P 4QP.  13th June, 2016

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you to strongly object to the recent proposals resulting from the Boundaries Commission Review for Electoral Divisions and Wards for East Sussex County Council and Wealden District Council.

Quite apart from any other consideration, I regard these proposals to be one of the most undemocratic acts of government I have ever witnessed and would like to make the following points:

1. By creating a new Parish of Shortbridge (to be part of the wider District ward of West of Uckfield and Isfield) these proposals will divide a close-knit community who have collectively and tirelessly worked for the interests of Piltdown, Shortbridge and Fletching (among others).

2. Should such a division take place, the proposals would mean that in any local election the interests of a predominantly Urban Community would be up against those of a predominantly Rural Community – while it is vitally important than everyone is able to “have their say” it is not realistic or egalitarian to ask two such conflicting interest groups to potentially compete against each other.

3. The current structure of our Parish Council allows each Parishioner to have nine votes to elect their Councillors – my understanding is that with the Boundary Changes this would go down to one.

4. As well as individual efforts, Piltdown has a long established Residents Association which exists, inter alia, to protect the identity and interest of our community – it is my understanding that this is a clear statutory objective of the Boundaries Commission.

From a personal perspective, I have lived in Golf Club Lane, Piltdown for 11 years and have been actively involved in trying to help and improve many elements of Parish work - I have been particularly focussed on the provision of Sport for the Children (and Adults!) of the Parish and have been a Coach for seven years and Treasurer for five years of the Local Cricket Club – in addition I
have managed to secure Grant Money to improve the facilities of our local Recreation Ground as well as working with others on a continuous basis to raise funds.

I feel privileged to be part of this Parish and have been uplifted by the collective spirit and determination of the community to achieve the best for all who live in it.

I very much hope therefore that these proposals are reconsidered so that all Piltdown Electors can be kept within the same District and County Council wards, with Fletching in a Rural ward, to preserve the many long years of dedication from so many for the greater good of others.

Yours faithfully,

CHARLES MYRTLE>
12 June 2016

The Review Officer (Wealden)
The Local Government Boundary
Commission of England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sirs

East Sussex County and Wealden District Electoral Reviews

I am writing concerning the proposed change of boundary within the Wealden District. I feel extremely concerned about this having lived in Piltdown, for 11 years and been very much part of the Fletching Parish.

My husband has been involved in the running of Fletching cricket club for all these years and I am secretary for the Friends of Fletching Committee and involved with the keeping of the church. Living in rural Piltdown we have been part of a wonderful community and the current proposal will divide this community.

We believe we should be kept within the same district and county council wards with Fletching in a rural ward and not part of urban Uckfield.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Emma C Myrtle
From: Barrie Page  
Sent: 02 June 2016 11:29  
To: reviews@lgbc.org.uk  
Subject: Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Wealden District Council

To the Review Officer, (East Sussex)  
Our details are:  
Names:  
W Barrie Page, and Eithne M Page  
Address: [Redacted]  

Submission.  
As residents of Golf Club Lane we find that the proposed changes to electoral arrangements for this parish are not acceptable.  
We understand that objections may only sensibly be made on one or more of three parameters, namely Electoral Equality, Community Identity, and Effective and Convenient Local Government.  
So far as Electoral Equality is concerned we are not qualified to say much, as this matter seems to be concerned solely with numbers of electors per councillor. The government regulation seem to be founded on a determination to even out the numbers within very tight parameters which take little account of the actual location of the electors concerned, nor of the historic connections made over many years between neighbours. So our feeling is that we are being used like pawns in a game of chess in order to satisfy requirements determined at a high level of government, producing a feeling that democracy no longer flourishes.  
We feel that we have a great deal more to say about Community Identity. Though we live south of the A272 we have much in common with the parish of Fletching. In our case this extends to being members of the congregation of Fletching Church. I also am a Life member of Piltdown Golf Club, which seems now to have been split between two wards, Danehill/Fletching and West Uckfield. The recently formed Piltdown Residents Association has been, and remains, an important feature helping with the bonding between those living north and south of the main road. However the apparently arbitrary removal of Golf Club Lane and the Shortbridge Road area from Danehill/Fletching leaves us seriously disenfranchised. It seems that in future we will be able to vote for only one councillor, not nine as now  
This last point I imagine more properly comes within the Effective and Convenient Local Government aspect of the changes. I would simply ask “Convenient for whom please?”  
We are advised that any complaint about the proposed changes should contain a suggested alternative proposal. This is not easy for an ordinary lay member of the public to do. We are advised though that one solution would be to combine the 10 voters of the Copwood enclave within the Isfield parish. May I please ask that this possibility be seriously considered.  
Barrie Page  
Home phone No: [Redacted]
From: Isabel Page
Sent: 14 June 2016 13:39
To: reviews <reviews@lbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundaries Commission Review for Electoral Divisions and Wards for ESCC and Wealden District Council

To:
The Review Officer (Wealden)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

From: Isabel Page

Dear Sirs,
I object the the following matter concerning Boundaries Commission Review for Electoral Divisions and Wards for ESCC and Wealden District Council. I have included a possible solution at the end of my document.
Yours sincerely
Isabel Page

- BC proposals do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown with one third of electors (Shortbridge) being part of a predominately urban West Uckfield ward, and the other two thirds in a rural Danehill and Fletching, ward. Shortbridge is hardly known as a name even within the Parish, but Piltdown Golf Club and The Piltdown Man are well known, even nationally in the case of The Piltdown Man, and are evidence of the Piltdown identity.

- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment, like village sign, speed survey, proposed village gates. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for licenses for proposals such as these is not effective local government.

- Piltdown as a rural area does not share the same interests as the urban area of Uckfield, Planning and Highways issues are materially different between rural and urban areas, and the requirement to deal with different County and District Councillors for electors in the way the boundaries have been split on all the roads and lanes in Piltdown is confusing and will require duplication of Councillors time and therefore is ineffective government.
The BC’s suggested splitting up of the boundaries on the same roads/lanes does not provide strong easily identifiable boundaries.

Electors in the rural area of Piltdown do not share the same interests or concerns as the urban area of Uckfield. The desire to preserve the countryside environment, reduce speeding on country lanes, waste collection from remote locations, ‘quiet lanes” initiative, maintenance of footpaths in the countryside, maintenance of grass verges and hedges/overhanging trees on roads/lanes, are some examples of interests that a rural area does not share with an urban area.

The BC’s requirement to create a Parish Ward for Shortbridge means electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting through limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.

The Solution
All Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill/ Fletching/Isfield/Little Horsted (much as it is now, but without Nutley) with 3,138 electors projected in 2021. The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood. Total projected Electoral numbers in 2021 for the existing 5 wards of Uckfield (12,272) could be split up into 4 district wards, (or even 3 wards with one a two member ward,) the average for each ward being 3,195, which is less than the numbers of electors being proposed in a Hailsham district ward.
Review Officer (East Sussex)
Local Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Milbank Tower
London SW1P 4QP.

Dear Sir or Madam,

Wealden District Council – Ward Boundary Review
Proposed Ward: “Pevensea & Westham”
To include the Parish of Hooc.

I am writing to suggest that the inclusion of the parish of Hooc with Pevensey and Westham might be a mistake.

My concern about you getting the boundary wrong is, relatively, objective in that I have no life-long ties with Hooc. I have lived here since 1992, which represents the longest period of my life I have spent in any one “home”, but I suggest that, as an outsider, I can consider the position of the village as a community without undue emotion or subjective bias.

If the purpose of the boundary change is “administrative convenience” perhaps you could persuade someone to explain it to you. I have failed to elicit any explanation for my own satisfaction.

I was unaware, until one of our immediate neighbours’ children (the oldest of several cousins), was allotted a place in the infant class of a fairly, local primary school, that the parish church (St Oswald’s) stood outside the “catchment area” of the Church Primary School which serves our two Villages. It had never occurred to our neighbours that they did not live in the “catchment area” of our village school. The child in question was born in the parish as was his mother and her father.

The Hooc Cof E Primary school had been closed in 1963(?) and the children had, mostly, been transferred to the Ninfield School. As Hooc, since the end of WW2, had been part of a plurality with Ninfield being served by the same incumbent (Rector of Ninfield & Vicar of Hooc) it seemed not unreasonable to assume that the Church School, which was served by the incumbent, ex officio, as a governor in addition to which one foundation governor was appointed from each parish, would serve the needs of both villages.
The exclusion of the Church from the catchment area of the, de facto, village school was, I assume, brought about by some official in the Education Department of the County Council working out, with the aid of a map and a ruler, that administratively it made sense. By the stroke of a pen a civil servant, in effect, excluded the place in which Anglicans in the parish worshipped from the place in which their children were educated. Of course the educational bureaucrat’s action can, and has, been remedied on appeal so not much harm, so far as I can am aware, has been done; but it might be of interest to you to know that that the school to which our children were directed was not in either Pevensey or Westham but to the east of us, Little Common, separated from them by the natural barrier of Hooe Level.

Which brings me to the question of Geography: were you to look for contours on a suitable Ordnance Survey Map (1:50,000 Landranger sheet 199 or 1:25,000 Explorer sheets 123 & 124) you might notice, North of the coastline between Cooden in the East and Pevensey in the West, an odd-looking piece of land crisscrossed with small blue lines and almost no contours.

I cannot presume to try and explain these symbols as I can’t distinguish between a ditch, a dyke a drain or a sewer but The Environment Agency certainly has the knowledge. I can, however, draw your attention to two fairly substantial blue lines wending their ways southwards to the sea the more easterly one called Wallers Haven (passing between Hooe and Wartling) and to the west Pevensey Haven (separating Wartling and Hailsham).

“Before the Romans came to Rye...” - if Chesterton has anything to say in the matter - there was no sea defence between Pevensey and Barnhorn, where contours indicate that the land rises behind Bexhill to the east. As a result the land from Horse Eye Level below Hailsham and Hooe Level was more or less tidal and was inundated twice every twenty-four hours.

When the Romans had reached Hooe they could look west and see the garrison in Pevensey Castle; just as we can today see the castle from the tower of Hooe Church. They could signal but were they to travel, dry-shod from Hooe (in effect a peninsula) to Pevensey (almost an island connected to the mainland at Stone Cross) the route would have to be via Ninfield, Boreham Street, Hailsham and Polegate.

To join Pevensey to Hoee flies in the face of both History and Geography. I do urge you to think again.

This bit of the South Coast, between Beachy Head where the Downs fall into the sea and Barnhorn where it rises again behind Bexhill and Hastings via Fairlight and down to Rye Bay is a beautiful and fascinating bit of land. It may be overcrowded and have all sorts of disadvantages but it is home to distinct communities which would be easy to extingush by rash overdevelopment or at the whim of an impatient or uncomprehending bureaucrat. I speak of human communities – wildlife and areas of special scientific interest have very competent advocates to argue their cases.

As a churchwarden I have a duty to draw your attention to the fact that Hoee as a parish is, and has been for many years part of the Deanery of Bexhill and Battle. All the other parishes are established to the east of the Wallers Haven but if we have to
change the fellow parishes with which we work, as certainly we will have to as the
church gets to grips with the financial state it is in let alone with changing patterns of
worship that may emerge, let us be joined to fellow Christians with whom we have a
good deal in common.

If you turn again to the map you will see that all we have in common with Pevensey
and Westham is that are on the margin of a huge drained area of marsh and that we
are at opposite ends of a long chain of communities on the landward side. We may not
be very far from each other but, in fact, we are “poles apart”.

Please look at the map.

Simon Pattisson,
Churchwarden & Resident.
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Lorraine Pearce-Altendorff
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I would like to suggest that the western part of the Wealden ward currently called Framfield and to become Framfield and Cross in Hand that it to the west of the Eastbourne Road that joins the A22 to Uckfield town centre should be part of Uckfield Ridgewood and Little Horsted. This part of the Eastbourne Road offers a natural division between these two wards. The area I live in at TN22 5QW used to be part of Little Horsted before the A22 was built. Some of the residents in this small area still use Little Horsted in their address. We still recieve the Little Horsted Parish News. Framfield and Cross in Hand which is broad and narrow from East to West does not serve us in terms of shopping and community interests. For these amenities one has to drive or catch the 54 bus into Uckfield. The traffic from the A22 that goes past our home goes to Uckfield. In a recent referendum regarding the development of Uckfield town centre, we had no say even though this is arguably the heart of our community. There are a number of developments in the Uckfield area, notably at Ridgewood, which are adjacent to where we live. Uckfield is expanding in a south west direction, but with the wards boundaried as they are, we are not included in this.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Martin Perry
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1:

Comment text:
I would like to see an end to running boundaries down the centre of residential roads e.g. Whitehill Road, Crowborough. It means that raising community problems has to involve two councillors rather than just one. This is inefficient for both sides.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Jan Phillips
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Isfield, together with the adjacent parish of Little Horsted, is a rural parish. To include Isfield with the urban West Uckfield area will always slant local government decisions in favour of the larger urban population. This will inevitably disadvantage Isfield where the needs of a rural community are totally different from those in West Uckfield. Isfield and Little Horsted should continue to remain in the Danehill, Nutley, Fletching ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Wealden District

Personal Details:

Name: Jerome Phillips
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Isfield, together with the adjacent parish of Little Horsted, is a rural parish. To include Isfield with the urban West Uckfield area will always slant local government decisions in favour of the larger urban population. This will inevitably disadvantage Isfield where the needs of a rural community are totally different from those in West Uckfield. Isfield and Little Horsted should continue to remain in the Danehill, Nutley, Fletching ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir/Madam,

Proposed Ward Pevensey & Westham.

How can they include the Parish of Hooe in the new Ward of Pevensey & Westham?

The Pevensey Marshes separate them which is S.S.I., Pevensey & Westham are only interested in Seaside Tourism trade, they have no interest in Hooe and vice versa.

Hooe & Winfield have always gone together, they are farming villages, so much going on between them.

The Village shop in Winfield, Church of England shared with Hooe, Doctors Surgery, Winfield and Hooe, regularly socialised.

I travel to Winfield every day, the boundaries merge into one another.

Leave us alone, the redunclous proposal with separated communities, different concerns, etc. will make local government impossible.

Yours Faithfully,
7th June 2016

Dear Sirs

Re the proposed re-structuring of the election boundaries, Hooe with Pevensey.

I am also on the Hooe Parish council and you have heard from the clerk, but I am also on the Conservative Battle and Bexhill executive committee, these plans do not need to be done in this way.

I do think it is appalling that with these changes, there has not been any consideration as to the local community; a line is drawn on a map, though equal representation in equal numbers is important cannot be done in this way.

We are a very rural community and we have had bonds in the area over the ages with Ninfield and Wartling called (Hooe Ninfield Wartling Ward). To be suddenly removed and lumped with a totally urban community some miles away with sea boundaries, there are a few miles of fields between us and Pevensey. To be called Pevensey and Westham ward, with not a mention of Hooe in that mix shows the lack of interest we will have in any campaigns, with not a sight of a house from my window, makes the suggestion ludicrous and thought less, wasting time and money.
We have not likely any interest on Pevensey with urban problems in shops and business we do not know about let alone there sea boundary, nor they with us and our rural interests, it is like suddenly removing Sicily the island off Italy with all its Italian connections and ways saying you now have to be part of Africa.

We need to stay with Watling and Ninfield as before, resume out local interest when it comes to elections, rural affairs the local village shops, churches schools and relations we will have none if this if it goes ahead. My family will have been in this village for 100 years in 2020 a solid base, myself I have been here since birth for 56 years and in all those times we have never had contact with Pevensey and nor we will in the future so why change now.

My house is the last house in the village and I look across our fields towards Pevensey and not a house in sight except in the far distance. What interests have I electorally with them and them with me? NONE

So the request is more thought in future, add Pevensey with more of their local interests and community keep us where we belong and have to saty geographically.

Reject this proposal!!!

Yours Faithfully

Robert Pilbeam
The Review Officer (Wealden)
LGBCE
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

Date 14 - 06 - 2016

Dear Madam

Re: New Ward Boundaries for Wealden and East Sussex

I write to you to express my strong objections to the draft recommendations for new district ward boundaries for Wealden as well as new county council divisions for East Sussex. My specific area of objection is in relation to the Parish of Fletching and the existing ward of Danehill, Fletching, Piltdown, Nutley, Isfield and Little Horsted.

These are my objections:

- I do not believe that the draft recommendations meet the three statutory criteria of the review process.
- They do not reflect the identity and interests of the Piltdown Local Community by splitting the community geographically within Piltdown.
- Piltdown has a very active Residents Association, which has brought the community together and instigated various initiatives to improve the environment. To have to deal with two separate County Councillors and District Councillors for proposals such as these is not effective local government.
- The creation of a Parish Ward for Shortbridge would mean electors in this newly created ward have only one vote in a Fletching Parish Council election, whereas before they had the ability to vote for up to nine Parish Councillors. This clearly produces an inequality of voting by limiting of choice between electors in both the different parts of the Piltdown community and the rest of Fletching Parish.
- The urban area of Uckfield should not stray west of the clearly identifiable boundary of the A22, which separates the rural areas of Fletching, Piltdown, Isfield and Little Horsted from Uckfield and its new development in Ridgewood.

I believe all Piltdown electors should be kept within the same District and County Council wards with Fletching in a rural ward, which, for equality of electoral numbers, should comprise a District Council ward of Danehill, Fletching, Isfield and Little Horsted.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]