

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Mid Sussex

Report to The Electoral Commission

*July 2002*

© Crown Copyright 2002

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by The Electoral Commission with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no. 311

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	13
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	19
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	21
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	23
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	41
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Mid Sussex: Detailed Mapping	43

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath is inserted inside the back cover of this report.



## WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of The Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to The Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No 3692). The Order also transferred to The Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)  
Professor Michael Clarke CBE  
Kru Desai  
Robin Gray  
Joan Jones  
Ann M Kelly  
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Mid Sussex in West Sussex.



## SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Mid Sussex's electoral arrangements on 10 July 2001. It published its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 26 February 2002, after which it undertook an eight-week period of consultation. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us, the Boundary Committee for England, to complete the work of the LGCE and submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations received by the LGCE during consultation on its draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

We found that the existing arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Mid Sussex:

- **in 21 of the 30 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the district and 11 wards vary by more than 20%;**
- **by 2006 the situation is expected not to have improved, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 20 wards and by more than 20% in 12 wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 101–102) are that:

- **Mid Sussex District Council should have 54 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 26 wards, instead of 30 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of four, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place every four years.**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each district councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 23 of the proposed 26 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by more than 9% from the average for the district by 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Burgess Hill, Cuckfield Rural, East Grinstead, Haywards Heath, Lindfield Rural and Slaugham.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 20 August 2002:

**The Secretary  
The Electoral Commission  
Trevelyan House  
Great Peter Street  
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Ardingly & Balcombe	2	The parishes of Ardingly and Balcombe; part of Slaugham parish (the proposed Handcross & Pease Pottage parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
2	Ashurst Wood	1	The parish of Ashurst Wood; part East Grinstead parish (the proposed East Grinstead Worsted parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
3	Bolney	1	The parishes of Albourne, Bolney, Twineham, part of Slaugham parish (the proposed Slaugham & Warninglid parish ward)	Maps 2 and A2
4	Burgess Hill Dunstall	2	Part of Burgess Hill parish (the proposed Burgess Hill Dunstall parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
5	Burgess Hill Franklands	2	Part of Burgess Hill parish (the proposed Burgess Hill Franklands parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
6	Burgess Hill Leylands	2	Part of Burgess Hill parish (the proposed Burgess Hill Leylands parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
7	Burgess Hill Meeds	2	Part of Burgess Hill parish (the proposed Burgess Hill Meeds parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
8	Burgess Hill St Andrews	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – Burgess Hill St Andrews parish ward	Map 2 and Large Map
9	Burgess Hill Victoria	2	Part of Burgess Hill parish ( the proposed Burgess Hill Victoria parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
10	Copthorne & Worth	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Copthorne & Worth ward	Map 2
11	Crawley Down & Turners Hill	3	The parishes of Crawley Down and Turners Hill	Map 2
12	Cuckfield	2	The parishes of Cuckfield and Cuckfield Rural	Map 2 and A2
13	East Grinstead Ashplats	2	Part of East Grinstead parish (the proposed East Grinstead Ashplats parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
14	East Grinstead Baldwins	2	Part of East Grinstead parish (the proposed East Grinstead Baldwins parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
15	East Grinstead Herontye	2	Part of East Grinstead parish (the proposed East Grinstead Herontye parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
16	East Grinstead Imberhorne	2	Part of East Grinstead (the proposed East Grinstead Imberhorne parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
17	East Grinstead Town	2	Part East Grinstead parish (the proposed East Grinstead Town parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
18	Hassocks	3	The parish of Hassocks	Map 2
19	Haywards Heath Ashenground	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish ward of Haywards Heath Ashenground	Map 2 and Large Map
20	Haywards Heath Bentswood	2	Part of Haywards Heath parish (the proposed Haywards Heath Bentswood parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
21	Haywards Heath Franklands	2	Part of Haywards Heath parish (the proposed Haywards Heath Franklands parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
22	Haywards Heath Heath	2	Part of Haywards Heath parish (the proposed Haywards Heath Heath parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
23	Haywards Heath Lucastes	2	Part of Haywards Heath parish (the proposed Haywards Heath Lucastes parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map
24	High Weald	2	The parishes of Horsted Keynes and West Hoathly; part of Lindfield Rural parish (the proposed Lindfield Rural East parish ward)	Map 2
25	Hurstpierpoint & Downs	3	The parishes of Fulking, Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common, Newtimber, Poynings and Pyecombe	Map 2
26	Lindfield	3	Lindfield parish; part Lindfield Rural parish (the proposed Lindfield Rural West parish ward)	Map 2 and Large Map

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished.*

*2 Map 2 and Appendix A, including the large map in the back of the report, illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

*We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.*

Table 2: Final recommendations for Mid Sussex

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Ardingly & Balcombe	2	3,934	1,967	8	4,059	2,030	7
2	Ashurst Wood	1	2,038	2,038	12	2,038	2,038	8
3	Bolney	1	2,024	2,024	11	2,024	2,024	7
4	Burgess Hill Dunstall	2	3,589	1,795	-2	3,589	1,795	-5
5	Burgess Hill Franklands	2	3,784	1,892	4	3,993	1,997	6
6	Burgess Hill Leylands	2	3,603	1,802	-1	3,691	1,846	-2
7	Burgess Hill Meeds	2	3,487	1,744	-5	3,646	1,823	-3
8	Burgess Hill St Andrews	2	3,462	1,731	-5	3,581	1,791	-5
9	Burgess Hill Victoria	2	3,923	1,962	7	3,923	1,962	4
10	Copthorne & Worth	2	3,621	1,811	-1	3,621	1,811	-4
11	Crawley Down & Turners Hill	3	5,429	1,810	-1	5,479	1,826	-3
12	Cuckfield	2	3,699	1,850	1	3,790	1,895	0
13	East Grinstead Ashplats	2	3,733	1,867	2	3,794	1,897	0
14	East Grinstead Baldwins	2	3,679	1,840	1	3,679	1,840	-3
15	East Grinstead Herontye	2	3,627	1,814	-1	3,627	1,814	-4
16	East Grinstead Imberhorne	2	3,565	1,783	-2	3,608	1,804	-5
17	East Grinstead Town	2	3,301	1,651	-10	3,426	1,713	-9
18	Hassocks	3	5,715	1,905	4	5,733	1,911	1
19	Haywards Heath Ashenground	2	3,914	1,957	7	3,914	1,957	4
20	Haywards Heath Bentswood	2	3,984	1,992	9	4,057	2,029	7
21	Haywards Heath Franklands	2	3,333	1,667	-9	3,801	1,901	1
22	Haywards Heath Heath	2	3,657	1,829	0	4,132	2,066	9
23	Haywards Heath Lucastes	2	2,702	1,351	-26	3,858	1,929	2

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24 High Weald	2	3,926	1,963	7	3,926	1,963	4
25 Hurstpierpoint & Downs	3	5,497	1,832	0	5,558	1,853	-2
26 Lindfield	3	5,460	1,820	0	5,460	1,820	-4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>98,686</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>102,007</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,828</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,889</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Mid Sussex District Council. Since the publication of draft recommendations, the electorate figures have been revised by Mid Sussex District Council, with an additional 728 voters being added to the proposed Haywards Heath Harlands ward. Following the ward boundary amendments it is proposed that this ward be renamed Haywards Heath Lucastes to better reflect community identity.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Mid Sussex in West Sussex. The seven districts in West Sussex have now been reviewed as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England started by the LGCE in 1996. We have inherited that programme, which we currently expect to complete in 2004.

2 Mid Sussex's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in February 1980 (Report no. 374). The electoral arrangements of West Sussex County Council were last reviewed in June 1984 (Report no. 473). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No.3692), i.e. the need to:
  - a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
  - b) secure effective and convenient local government; and
  - c) achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Mid Sussex was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition, published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the district.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes that would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10% in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20% or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 The LGCE was not prescriptive on council size. Insofar as Mid Sussex is concerned, it started from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but was willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, the LGCE found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and that any proposal for an increase in council size would need to be fully justified. In particular, it did not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 10 July 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Mid Sussex District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified West Sussex County Council, Sussex Police Authority, the local authority associations, Sussex Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South East region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further.

The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 15 October 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

9 Stage Three began on 26 February 2002 with the publication of the LGCE's report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Mid Sussex*, and ended on 22 April 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 The district of Mid Sussex in the county of West Sussex borders Surrey to the north and Brighton & Hove to the south. Mid Sussex is a largely rural area with a number of village communities, and the Ouse Valley running through the northern part of the district. It also includes the urban towns of Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath. East Grinstead is home to a number of distinctive buildings of considerable age and interest. Haywards Heath is a mainly residential area and the administrative centre of the district while Burgess Hill features a thriving light industrial area.

11 The district is completely parished, containing 24 civil parishes. The towns of Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath comprise approximately 60% of the district's total electorate.

12 The electorate of the district is 98,686 (February 2001). The Council presently has 54 members who are elected from 30 wards, 14 of which are relatively urban in Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath, with the remainder being mainly rural. Six of the wards are each represented by three councillors, 12 are each represented by two councillors and 12 are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

13 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, the LGCE calculated, in percentage terms, the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the district average. In the text which follows, this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

14 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,828 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,889 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic change and migration since the last review, the number of electors per councillor in 21 of the 30 wards varies by more than 10% from the district average, 11 wards by more than 20% and four wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Burgess Hill North ward where the councillor represents 188% more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing wards in Mid Sussex*

Table 3: Existing electoral arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Ardingly	1	1,188	1,188	-35	1,162	1,162	-38
2	Balcombe	1	1,431	1,431	-22	1,431	1,431	-24
3	Bolney	1	1,591	1,591	-13	1,591	1,591	-16
4	Burgess Hill Chanctonbury	1	1,884	1,884	3	1,994	1,994	6
5	Burgess Hill Franklands	2	3,946	1,973	8	4,155	2,078	10
6	Burgess Hill North	1	5,268	5,268	188	5,359	5,359	184
7	Burgess Hill St Andrews	2	3,462	1,731	-5	3,581	1,791	-5
8	Burgess Hill Town	2	2,693	1,347	-26	2,739	1,370	-28
9	Burgess Hill Victoria	2	4,595	2,298	26	4,595	2,298	22
10	Clayton	1	1,559	1,559	-15	1,577	1,577	-17
11	Copthorne & Worth	2	3,621	1,811	-1	3,621	1,811	-4
12	Crawley Down	2	4,143	2,072	13	4,143	2,072	10
13	Cuckfield	2	3,371	1,686	-8	3,462	1,731	-8
14	East Grinstead East	1	1,300	1,300	-29	1,300	1,300	-31
15	East Grinstead North	3	6,257	2,086	14	6,379	2,126	13
16	East Grinstead South	3	6,131	2,044	12	6,195	2,065	9
17	East Grinstead West	3	6,255	2,085	14	6,298	2,099	11
18	Haywards Heath Ashenground	2	3,914	1,957	7	3,914	1,957	4
19	Haywards Heath Bentswood	2	2,545	1,273	-30	2,618	1,309	-31
20	Haywards Heath Franklands	2	4,772	2,386	31	5,240	2,620	39
21	Haywards Heath Harlands	2	3,405	1,703	-7	4,981	2,491	32
22	Haywards Heath Heath	2	2,954	1,477	-19	3,009	1,505	-20
23	Horsted Keynes	1	1,177	1,177	-36	1,177	1,177	-37
24	Hurstpierpoint	3	5,335	1,778	-3	5,396	1,799	-5
25	Keymer	3	4,318	1,439	-21	4,318	1,439	-24
26	Lindfield Rural	1	2,040	2,040	12	2,040	2,040	8
27	Lindfield Urban	3	4,507	1,502	-18	4,507	1,502	-20
28	Slaugham	1	2,076	2,076	14	2,227	2,227	18

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
29 Turners Hill	1	1,286	1,286	-30	1,336	1,336	-29
30 West Hoathly	1	1,662	1,662	-9	1,662	1,662	-12
<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>98,686</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>102,007</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,828</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,889</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Mid Sussex District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Horsted Keynes ward were relatively over-represented by 36%, while electors in Burgess Hill North ward were significantly under-represented by 188%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

15 During Stage One the LGCE received 22 representations, including district-wide schemes from Mid Sussex District Council and the Liberal Democrats. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Mid Sussex*.

16 The LGCE's draft recommendations were generally based on Mid Sussex District Council's 54-member consultation proposals which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and proposed a mixed warding pattern across the district. However, it also adopted the proposals of the Liberal Democrats in East Grinstead. It proposed that:

- Mid Sussex District Council should be served by 54 councillors, as at present.
- There should be 26 wards, four fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified, while three wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for the parishes of Burgess Hill, Cuckfield Rural, East Grinstead, Haywards Heath, Lindfield Rural and Slaugham.

**Draft recommendation**

Mid Sussex District Council should comprise 54 councillors, serving 26 wards. The Council should continue to hold whole council elections elected every four years.

17 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in three of the 26 wards varying by no more than 10% from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only no ward varying by more than 10% from the average in 2006.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

18 During the consultation on its draft recommendations report, the LGCE received 36 representations. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Mid Sussex District Council.

### **Mid Sussex District Council**

19 The District Council expressed support for a council size of 54 members representing 26 wards. The District Council also proposed a revision of the electorate forecast for 2006 that it had submitted at Stage One, and consequential amendments to the proposed Haywards Harlands ward. It further proposed ward name changes and amendments to town and parish electoral arrangements.

### **West Sussex County Council**

20 The County Council proposed alternative ward and parish ward names.

### **The Liberal Democrats**

21 The Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats, hereafter referred to as 'the Liberal Democrats' supported the draft recommendations for a council size of 54 members and the warding pattern for Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath. They restated a preference for single-member wards in the rural areas and proposed an alternative ward pattern to that submitted by the District Council. They also supported a revision of the electoral forecast.

### **Parish and town councils**

22 We received a further 14 responses from parish and town councils. Albourne, Ardingly, Cuckfield Rural, East Grinstead, Lindfield, Twineham, and Worth all supported the draft recommendations. However Ardingly Parish Council objected to the proposed ward name of Balcombe. East Grinstead Town Council proposed alternative town council arrangements. Bolney Parish Council objected to 'Slaugham Village' as a parish ward name. Burgess Hill Town Council supported a ward pattern of six two-member wards for the town and proposed a town council of 18 parish councillors. Hassocks Parish Council stated that it had voted 7:4 against the warding of Hassocks parish. Horsted Keynes Parish Council objected to being placed in a ward with Lindfield and West Hoathly parishes. Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council objected to the parish of Albourne not being included in the proposed Low Weald & Downs ward. Slaugham Parish Council objected to the warding of Slaugham parish. Turners Hill Parish Council objected to the parish being placed with the urban area of Crawley Down. Worth Parish Council stated that it had no comment to make on the composition of the proposed Cophorne & Worth ward.

### **Other representations**

23 A further 19 representations were received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations, councillors and residents. Crawley Down Turners Hill & Cophorne Conservative Association proposed that the new Cophorne & Worth ward be renamed Wallage. Ashurst Wood Community Association, Fox Hill Association and Sackville College all expressed support for the draft recommendations. Six district councillors expressed support for the draft recommendations. Councillor Chapman, member for Haywards Heath - Franklands ward, proposed a change of ward name. Councillor Horman, member for East Grinstead-North ward, objected to the draft recommendations for Ashurst Wood parish. Councillor Seward, member for Bolney ward, proposed alternative 50- and 54-member schemes. Councillor Burns, member for Hurstpierpoint ward, proposed a ward

name changes. Councillor Martin, member for Keymer ward, supported the proposals for the Hassocks area but objected to the proposed Bolney ward. Councillor Knight member for Burgess Hill – Town ward proposed that the areas of Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint, Cuckfield and Lindfield/Lindfield should be warded. Councillor Matthews, member for East Grinstead - South, proposed alternative ward name and town council arrangements for East Grinstead. County Councillor Collins supported the proposals for the Ashurst Woods area.

24 Councillor Webster, member for Horsted Keynes ward objected to the draft recommendations for Horsted and Lindfield wards. Hassocks parish councillor, Jose Gargett, commented on the warding arrangements for Clayton parish ward. One local resident proposed Turners ward be renamed Crawley Down & Turners Hill.

## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

25 As described earlier, the LGCE's prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Mid Sussex is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so the LGCE have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended) – the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being 'as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough'.

26 In relation to Schedule 11, the LGCE's recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. The LGCE also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

27 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, the LGCE's approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

28 The LGCE accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, the LGCE considers that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. The LGCE therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and the LGCE would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

### **Electorate forecasts**

29 Since 1975 there has been a 23% increase in the electorate of Mid Sussex district. At Stage One the District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% from 98,686 to 102,007 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expected most of the growth to be in Haywards Heath Harlands ward. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

30 During Stage Three the LGCE received submissions from the District Council and the Liberal Democrats proposing the revision of electorate forecasts. They both proposed that as a result of an increase in urban capacity within the proposed Haywards Heath ward, the initial electorate forecast should be revised by an additional 728 electors. Councillor Gillard, member for Haywards Heath Harlands ward supported this amendment. However, there were significant differences between the 2006 forecasts of the District Council and the Liberal Democrats, with them proposing forecasts for 2006 of 102,007 and 102,776 respectively.

31 We sought further confirmation from the District Council with regard to the proposed amendment of the electorate forecast. We were particularly concerned to establish that the density forecasts and estimates of likely completions for Haywards Heath Harlands ward would

fall within the five-year period to 2006. This proposed amendment would result in an electoral variance of 13% for the new Haywards Harlands ward. We also sought further clarification on the ward boundary amendments proposed by the District Council to improve the electoral equality in the area. The District Council responded by confirming that it stood by its submission of the revised forecast and the consequential warding amendments required to secure a balance between the statutory criteria.

32 We accept that forecasting electorates is difficult, and having looked at the District Council's figures, and the argumentation it put forward to justify the proposed revision, we are satisfied that in the light of consequential amendments to the ward boundaries, that the revised forecasts represent the best estimates that are currently available.

## **Council size**

33 As already explained, the LGCE started its review by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although it was willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

34 In its draft recommendations report the LGCE adopted the retention of the present council size of 54-members. It noted that there was no local consensus as to the appropriate future council size and having received no evidence to the contrary it assumed the existing council size of 54-members would continue to secure effective and convenient local government.

35 During Stage Three, Councillor Seward, member for Bolney ward, proposed schemes based on council sizes of both 50- and 54- members with a preference for the former. However, no further evidence was submitted that supported the reduction in council size. We have therefore not been persuaded to change the draft recommendations for a council size of 54-member.

## **Electoral arrangements**

36 In view of support given to large elements of the Council's consultation proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, the LGCE decided to base the majority of the draft recommendations on the District Council's 54-member consultation Stage One proposals. The LGCE considered that this scheme provided a better balance between the statutory criteria than the current arrangements and other schemes submitted at Stage One. However to improve electoral equality further and bearing in mind local community identities and interests, the LGCE moved away from the District Council's proposals in two areas. Within East Grinstead it decided to adopt the Liberal Democrats' warding pattern for the town as this provided the correct allocation of 11 members and the best balance between the statutory criteria. Within Burgess Hill the LGCE also recommended minor boundary modifications to the District Council's proposals in order to achieve a better balance between the statutory criteria.

37 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations report, the majority of the respondents expressed support for the council size of 54-members and the general ward pattern. The District Council commented on the proposed wards and proposed a number of alternative ward names and amendments to town and parish council arrangements. The Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations in the urban areas, however in the rural areas they proposed an alternative ward pattern of one single-member, six two-member and three three-member wards.

38 Councillor Seward, member for Bolney ward, proposed various alternative warding patterns within the rural areas based on a 54-member council size. Within these schemes the Councillor Seward proposed that Horsted Keynes and Hurstpierpoint parishes be warded, however these proposals did not provide any evidence of public consultation or support from either of these parishes. Councillor Seward also proposed that some urban areas should be considered rural,

however no detailed proposals or mapping were submitted of the proposed urban ward patterns making it difficult to assess the whether allocations between the rural and urban areas within these schemes were correct.

39 We have given careful consideration to the views that we have received at Stage Three. We noted the alternative rural warding patterns proposed by the Liberal Democrats and Councillor Seward and acknowledge the good levels of electoral that these schemes achieved. However, during Stage Three the draft recommendations received considerable support from the rural parish councils and other submissions. In view of the support given to large elements of LGCE's draft recommendations for the rural areas and the general consensus achieved concerning the urban areas we have not been persuaded to move substantially away from the LGCE's draft recommendations.

40 As stated above, the major issue to arise at Stage Three was the revision of the forecast electorate. The additional electors within the proposed Haywards Harlands ward would have resulted in an electoral variance of 13%. The District Council therefore proposed consequential warding amendments to secure good electoral equality in the area. After further consultation with the District Council and assurance that it is certain this projected increase will occur by 2006, we have accepted this, and will adopt the ward boundary amendments to secure a continued balance between our statutory criteria.

41 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Bolney, Clayton, Cuckfield, Hurstpierpoint and Keymer wards;
- (b) Ardingly, Balcombe, Copthorne & Worth, Crawley Down, Horsted Keynes, Lindfield Rural, Slaugham, Turners Hill and West Hoathly wards;
- (c) Burgess Hill-Chanctonbury, Burgess Hill-Franklands, Burgess Hill-North, Burgess Hill-Town, Burgess Hill-St Andrews and Burgess Hill-Victoria wards;
- (d) East Grinstead East, East Grinstead North, East Grinstead South and East Grinstead West wards;
- (e) Haywards Heath-Ashenground, Haywards Heath-Bentswood, Haywards Heath-Franklands, Haywards Heath-Harlands, Haywards Heath-Heath and Lindfield Urban wards.

42 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

### **Bolney, Clayton, Cuckfield, Hurstpierpoint and Keymer wards**

43 These five wards are located in the south of the district. The wards of Bolney and Clayton are each represented by a single councillor, Cuckfield ward is represented by two councillors and Hurstpierpoint and Keymer wards are each represented by three councillors. Bolney ward comprises the parishes of Albourne, Bolney and Twineham. Clayton ward comprises the parish of Pyecombe and the parish wards of Clayton, part of Keymer South and Stonepound parish wards of Hassocks parish. Cuckfield ward comprises Cuckfield parish. Keymer ward comprises the whole of the Keymer North parish ward and parts of the parish wards of Clayton, Keymer South and Stonepound, all of which are part of Hassocks parish. Hurstpierpoint ward comprises the parishes of Fulking, Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common, Newtimber and Poynings. The number of electors per councillor is 13% below the district average in Bolney ward (16% below by 2006), 15% below the district average in Clayton ward (17% below by 2006), 8% below the district average in Cuckfield ward (unchanged by 2006), 3% below the district average in Hurstpierpoint ward (5% below by 2006) and 21% below the district average in Keymer ward (24% below by 2006).

44 The District Council's 54-member consultation option proposed that this area should be represented by a pattern of one single-member ward, one two-member ward and two three-member wards. It proposed a single-member Bolney ward comprising the parishes of Albourne, Bolney and Twineham parishes and a proposed Slaugham Village parish ward of Slaugham parish, comprising that part of the parish to the south of Brantridge Road. It further proposed that the remainder of Slaugham parish, the area to the north of Brantridge Road form a new Handcross & Pease Pottage parish ward, which would be included in a proposed Balcombe ward. The District Council proposed a two-member Cuckfield ward comprising both the parishes of Cuckfield and Cuckfield Rural. It also proposed a new three-member ward comprising the present Clayton and Hurstpierpoint wards. The District Council further proposed a new three-member Hassocks ward comprising the parish wards of Hassocks Clayton, Hassocks Keymer North, Hassocks Keymer South and Hassocks Stonepound.

45 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the rural area of the district be represented by a pattern of seven single-member wards.

46 Albourne Parish Council expressed support for a single-member ward for its area under the District Council's 54-member options. Cuckfield Rural Parish Council supported the proposal to combine the parishes of Cuckfield Rural and Cuckfield in a two-member ward. Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council proposed that the parish be included within a ward comprising the parishes of Albourne, Fulking, Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common, Newtimber, Poynings, Pyecombe and Twineham. These proposals were also supported by two local residents.

47 Poynings Parish Council stated that it would prefer that the current Hurstpierpoint ward be maintained. Slaugham Parish Council stated that it would prefer the retention of existing warding arrangements.

48 The LGCE considered the various options for this area put forward by the District Council, the Liberal Democrats and the parish councils. It considered the proposal of Poynings Parish Council to maintain the current Hurstpierpoint ward and the objection of Slaugham Parish Council to the parish being warded. However, it stated that it could not view any area in isolation and noted the high levels of electoral equality that currently exist in the area. The LGCE also noted that Slaugham parish comprises a number of settlements that are geographically distinct and were of the view that warding the parish between district wards would not significantly impact on community identity in the area and would achieve the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria for the area as a whole. The LGCE also considered the proposals of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council but noted that its proposals would not achieve as good a level of electoral equality in the area as those achieved under the District Council's 54-member scheme. The LGCE therefore adopted these proposals as part of its draft recommendations.

49 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 11% above the district average in Bolney ward (8% above by 2006), 1% above the district average in Cuckfields ward (1% above by 2006), 4% above the district average in Hassocks ward (2% above by 2006) and equal to the district average in Low Weald & Downs ward (1% below by 2006).

50 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the LGCE's recommendations in the area. However, it objected to the ward names of Low Weald & Downs and Cuckfields and proposed that they be renamed Hurstpierpoint & Downs and Cuckfield wards respectively. The Liberal Democrats stated that they still believed that the proposed Hassocks and Low Weald & Downs areas would be better represented as single-member wards. They agreed with the proposed Cuckfields ward and stated that it had 'no reason for strong objection' to the proposed Bolney ward. However, they stated that the name Hurstpierpoint would more accurately reflect the

nature of the proposed Low Weald & Downs ward than the name Low Weald. It also proposed that Cuckfields ward be renamed Cuckfield ward. West Sussex County Council proposed that Low Weald & Downs ward be renamed Hurstpierpoint or Hurst ward.

51 The parish councils of Albourne and Cuckfield Rural fully supported our proposals for their area while Twineham Parish Council stated that it had no objection to the proposals for its area. Bolney Parish Council objected to 'Slaugham Village' as a parish ward name. Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council objected to the draft recommendations that excluded Albourne parish from the former ward of Hurstpierpoint. It also stated that the proposed ward name of Low Weald & Downs was inappropriate.

52 Councillor Burns proposed that Low Weald & Downs ward be named Hurstpierpoint & Downs ward. She also objected to the proposed Bolney ward, arguing that the ward would be too spread out when compared to an urban area. Councillor Martin supported the proposals for the Hassocks area but objected to the proposed Bolney ward, arguing that the ward would be 'extremely large'. He proposed that the parish of Albourne be combined with the proposed Low Weald & Downs ward. Councillor Knight argued that Hassocks, Hurstpierpoint, Cuckfield and Lindfield/Lindfield Rural were small urban towns and that 'warding would fit them well'. Hassocks Parish Councillor Gargett commented on the parish arrangements for Hassocks parish.

53 We have carefully considered the representations received. We have noted the proposals of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council, Councillor Knight and Councillor Martin to place Albourne parish within the same ward as Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common parish. However, Albourne parish and the District Council expressed support for the draft recommendations. We are therefore of the view that the draft recommendations provide a better reflection of local identity than the alternative proposals and would better reflect the statutory criteria. We have also considered the alternative ward names proposed at Stage Three and note the District Council's objection to the proposed Low Weald & Downs and Cuckfields as ward names. Given the submissions received we are therefore of the view that the name Hurstpierpoint & Downs ward would be more appropriate than Low Weald & Downs ward and that Cuckfield would be more appropriate name than the proposed Cuckfields ward.

54 Under the final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 11% above the district average in Bolney ward (7% above 2006), 1% above the district average in Cuckfield ward (equal to the average by 2006), 4% above the district average in Hassocks ward (1% above by 2006) and equal to the district average in Hurstpierpoint & Downs ward (2% below 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

### **Ardingly, Balcombe, Copthorne & Worth, Crawley Down, Horsted Keynes, Lindfield Rural, Slaugham, Turners Hill and West Hoathly wards**

55 These nine wards are located in the north of the district. Ardingly, Balcombe, Horsted Keynes, Lindfield Rural, Slaugham, Turners Hill and West Hoathly wards are each represented by a single member. Copthorne & Worth and Crawley Down wards are each represented by two members. Ardingly, Balcombe, Horsted Keynes, Lindfield Rural, Turners Hill and West Hoathly are all coterminous with the parishes of the same names. Copthorne & Worth ward comprises the Copthorne and Worth parish ward of Worth parish. Crawley Down ward comprises the Crawley Down parish ward of Worth parish. Slaugham ward comprises Slaugham parish and Cuckfield Rural-Staplefield parish ward. The number of electors per councillor is 35% below the district average in Ardingly ward (38% below by 2006), 22% below the district average in Balcombe ward (24% below by 2006), 1% below the district average in Copthorne & Worth ward (4% below by 2006), 13% above the district average in Crawley Down (10% above by 2006), 36% below the district average in Horsted Keynes ward (38% below by 2006), 12% above the district average in Lindfield Rural ward (8% above by 2006), 30% below the district

average in Turners Hill ward (29% below by 2006), 14% above the district average in Slaugham ward (18% above by 2006) and 9% below the district average in West Hoathly ward (12% below by 2006).

56 At Stage One the District Council, as part of its 54-member consultation proposals, proposed that the area should have a pattern of three two-member wards and one three-member ward. As mentioned above it proposed a two-member Balcombe ward comprising Ardingly and Balcombe parishes along with the proposed Handcross & Pease Pottage parish ward of Slaugham parish. It further proposed a ward comprising the parishes of Horsted Keynes, West Hoathly and a proposed Lindfield East parish ward of Lindfield Rural parish to form a two-member Horsted ward. The District Council also proposed a three-member Crawley Down & Turners Hill ward comprising the current Crawley Down and Turners Hill wards. It further proposed that Copthorne and Worth ward remain within its present boundaries.

57 Ardingly Parish Council stated that it would prefer to be placed in a ward with Turners Hill, and either Balcombe or West Hoathly. Balcombe Parish Council objected to the District Council's 50-member scheme. Turners Hill Parish Council supported proposals for a 54-member council. Councillor Curtis, member for Copthorne & Worth ward, objected to proposals that the parishes of Turners Hill and Balcombe be combined within a three-member ward with Copthorne & Worth on the grounds of community identity. Horsted Keynes Parish Council supported a single-member ward consisting of Horsted Keynes parish and the village of Scaynes Hill.

58 The LGCE adopted the District Council's 54-member consultation proposals for this area. It noted Turners Hill Parish Council objections to being placed in the proposed Turners ward. However, it was persuaded that in order to facilitate the best balance between the statutory criteria, within a 54-member scheme, the District Council's proposals provided the best warding pattern for this area. It also adopted the name Horsted for the ward comprising Horsted Keynes, West Hoathly and the proposed Lindfield East parish ward of Lindfield Rural parish.

59 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 8% above the district average in Balcombe ward (8% above by 2006), 1% below the district average in Copthorne & Worth ward (3% below by 2006), 7% above the district average in Horsted ward (5% above by 2006) and 1% below the district average in Turners ward (3% below by 2006).

60 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the proposed Copthorne & Worth ward and stated that local opinion should be used to determine the proposed ward names of Balcombe, Horsted and Turners wards. It stated that the ward name High Weald would be preferable to Horsted ward and that Crawley Down & Turners Hill ward would be preferable to Turners ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the parishes of Ardingly, Balcombe and Turners Hill be combined to form a two-member ward, while parts of Slaugham parish be combined with Bolney parish in a two-member ward. It further proposed that the parishes of Horsted Keynes and West Hoathly be combined with the Scaynes Hill area of Lindfield Rural parish.

61 West Sussex County Council proposed that Copthorne & Worth ward be renamed Copthorne ward and objected to the use of Turners as a ward name. It also proposed that Slaugham Village parish ward be renamed Slaugham and Warninglid parish ward. Slaugham Parish Council objected to the draft proposals for its area stating that it preferred Slaugham ward to remain the same. Ardingly Parish Council stated that it was content to be combined with the parish of Balcombe in a district ward but that it would prefer its 'own dedicated councillor'. It also objected to the proposed Balcombe ward name and proposed that the ward be renamed Ardingly & Balcombe. Turners Hill Parish Council objected to the proposals for its area and proposed that it be combined in a two-member ward with the parishes of Ardingly and West Hoathly. Worth Parish Council proposed that Turners ward be renamed Crawley Downs & Turners Hill ward. Horsted Keynes Parish Council argued that the proposed Horsted ward was

too large an area for two councillors. Crawley Down, Turners Hill & Copthorne Conservative Association proposed that Copthorne & Worth ward be renamed Wallage ward.

62 Councillor Field supported the composition of the proposed Horsted ward but objected to the proposed ward name, proposing that it be named High Weald ward. Councillor Snowling supported the draft recommendations for Lindfield Urban ward, however he proposed the two new parish wards should be named Lindfield Rural East and Lindfield Rural West. Councillor Webster objected to the proposed Horsted ward proposing instead that the West Hoathly, Scaynes Hill, Sharpthorne and Horsted Keynes areas be combined to form a new ward named Borders, Bluebell or High Weald. A local resident objected to the proposed Turners ward but stated that should it be confirmed, then it should be renamed Crawley Down & Turners Hill ward.

63 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three. We have noted the alternative proposals submitted by the Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats and Turners Hill Parish Council, and the objections of Slaugham Parish Council. However, we also noted support for the proposals in this area from the District Council, Ardingly Parish Council, Worth Parish Council and Councillor Field. We have therefore not been persuaded that these alternative proposals would better reflect the statutory criteria than the draft recommendations. We therefore propose adopting the draft recommendations subject to the ward name changes proposed by the District Council in this particular area and the County Council in Slaugham parish.

64 Under the final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 8% above the district average in Ardingly & Balcombe ward (7% above by 2006), 1% below the district average in Copthorne & Worth ward (4% below by 2006), 1% below the district average in Crawley Downs & Turners Hill ward (3% below by 2006) and 7% above the district average in High Weald ward (4% above by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Burgess Hill-Chanctonbury, Burgess Hill-Franklands, Burgess Hill-North, Burgess Hill-Town, Burgess Hill-St Andrews and Burgess Hill-Victoria wards**

65 The town of Burgess Hill is located in the south of the district. Burgess Hill-Chanctonbury and Burgess Hill-North wards are both represented by a single councillor. Burgess Hill-Franklands, Burgess Hill-St Andrews, Burgess Hill-Town and Burgess Hill-Victoria wards are each represented by two councillors. Burgess Hill-Chanctonbury, Burgess Hill-Franklands, Burgess Hill-St Andrews, Burgess Hill-Town and Burgess Hill-Victoria wards are coterminous with the parish wards of the same name. Burgess Hill-North ward comprises Burgess Hill-Dunstall and Burgess Hill-Leylands parish wards. The number of electors per councillor is 3% above the district average in Burgess Hill-Chanctonbury ward (6% above by 2006), 8% above the district in Burgess Hill-Franklands ward (10% above by 2006), 188% above the district average in Burgess Hill-North ward (184% above by 2006), 5% below the district average in Burgess Hill-St Andrews ward (5% below the average in 2006), 26% below the district average in Burgess Hill-Town ward (28% below by 2006) and 26% above the district average in Burgess Hill-Victoria ward (22% above by 2006).

66 At Stage One the District Council, as part of its 54-member consultation scheme, proposed that Burgess Hill town should be represented by a pattern of six two-member wards. It proposed that Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward would comprise all the present Burgess Hill-Chanctonbury ward with the boundary extended northwards to run along Park Road. It further proposed that an area to the east of the railway line along Silverdale Road, including the Tower House properties, be located within this ward. Burgess Hill Dunstall ward would comprise part of the present Burgess Hill-North ward, west of the boundary with the proposed Burgess Hill Leylands ward, part of the present Burgess Hill-Victoria ward including West Park Crescent and Denham Road, and the area to the north of and including Robin Road.

67 The District Council also proposed a new Burgess Hill Franklands ward comprising the current Burgess Hill-Franklands ward, less the area along Church Road mentioned above. It further proposed a new Burgess Hill Leylands ward comprising that part of the present Burgess Hill-Town ward to the north of the properties on Park Road and that part of the current Burgess Hill-North ward to the east of London Road. It proposed that the majority of the current Burgess Hill-Victoria ward be maintained except for an area in the north-west of the ward. The District Council also proposed that Burgess Hill St Andrews ward should maintain its present boundaries.

68 The Liberal Democrats proposed that Burgess Hill be divided into six two-member wards, Dunstall, Franklands, Leylands, St Andrews, Town Centre and Victoria. Its proposals were similar to those contained within the District Council's 54-member proposals.

69 Burgess Hill Town Council proposed that the town should be represented by 12 district councillors, as proposed by the District Council under its draft 53- and 54-member options and the Liberal Democrats. The Town Council proposed that West Park Crescent and Denham Road should be located in Burgess Hill Victoria ward as opposed to Burgess Hill Dunstall ward. On the grounds of community identity it also proposed that Tower House be located in Burgess Hill Franklands ward. The Town Council further proposed that the northern boundary of Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward run to the rear of the properties on Park Road as 'their natural community is 'the town', they face south and are part of the Conservation Area'.

70 Within a council size of 54 members Burgess Hill merits representation by 12 councillors. Having considered the various proposals submitted at Stage One, the LGCE considered that the District Council's 54-member proposals for this area provided the best balance between the statutory criteria and decided to adopt them as the basis for the draft recommendations. However, to further improve electoral equality within Burgess Hill the LGCE made two amendments proposed by Burgess Hill Town Council. Between the Burgess Hill Leylands and Burgess Hill Chanctonbury wards it proposed moving the boundary on Park Road to the rear of the properties on the northern side of the road. In Burgess Hill Dunstall ward it proposed the boundary run to the north of West Park Crescent along Malthouse Lane and then south to the west of the Nature Reserve. The LGCE considered that given the need to achieve acceptable levels of electoral equality within the Burgess Hill area the Tower House area should be located within the proposed Burgess Hill Franklands ward.

71 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 5% below the district average in Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward (3% below by 2006), 2% below the district average in Burgess Hill Dunstall ward (4% below by 2006), 4% above the district average in Burgess Hill Franklands ward (6% above by 2006), 1% below the district average in Burgess Hill Leylands ward (2% below by 2006), 5% below the district average in Burgess Hill St Andrews ward (5% below by 2006) and 7% above the district average in Burgess Hill Victoria ward (5% above by 2006).

72 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the majority of the proposals in the town. However, it stated that its preferred name for the proposed Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward was Burgess Hill Meeds ward. The Liberal Democrats generally supported the draft proposals but proposed that Tower House be transferred from the proposed Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward to the proposed Burgess Hill Franklands ward. It also proposed that Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward be renamed Burgess Hill Meeds ward. Burgess Hill Town Council generally supported the draft recommendations. However, it proposed that the Committee look again at two properties off London Road in the proposed Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward which it stated would be able to vote for Burgess Hill district councillors but not Burgess Hill town councillors. It also proposed that Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward be renamed either Burgess Hill St Johns or Burgess Hill Meeds. It further proposed that Tower House remain within the proposed Burgess Hill Franklands ward. Councillor Knight, generally supported the proposals for Burgess Hill but also proposed that Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward be renamed Burgess Hill Meeds ward.

73 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three. We have noted that both the Liberal Democrats and Burgess Hill Town Council's proposed the transfer of Tower House into the Burgess Hill Franklands ward. However, in seeking achieve the best balance between our statutory criteria in this area we have not been persuaded that Tower House should be removed from the proposed Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward. We cannot look at this area in isolation and we still consider that in order to facilitate the best possible ward pattern for the whole of Burgess Hill the Tower House area should remain in the proposed Burgess Hill Meeds ward. In view of the proposal of both the District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council we recommend that the ward name for the proposed Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward be changed to Burgess Hill Meeds ward to better reflect local identity.

74 Under the final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2% below the district average in Burgess Hill Dunstall ward (5% below by 2006), 4% above the district average in Burgess Hill Franklands ward (6% above by 2006), 1% below the district average in Burgess Hill Leylands ward (2% below by 2006), 5% below the district average in Burgess Hill Meeds ward (3% below by 2006), 5% below the district average in Burgess Hill St Andrews ward (5% below by 2006) and 7% above the district average in Burgess Hill Victoria ward (4% above by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

### **East Grinstead East, East Grinstead North, East Grinstead South and East Grinstead West wards**

75 The town of East Grinstead is located in the north-east of the district. East Grinstead North, East Grinstead South and East Grinstead West wards are each represented by three members while East Grinstead East ward is represented by a single member. East Grinstead East ward comprises Ashurst Wood parish. East Grinstead North, East Grinstead South and East Grinstead South wards are all coterminous with the parish wards of East Grinstead parish that share the same name. The number of electors per councillor is 29% below the district average in East Grinstead East ward (31% below by 2006), 14% above the district average in East Grinstead North ward (13% above by 2006), 12% above the district average in East Grinstead South ward (9% above by 2006) and 14% above the district average in East Grinstead West ward (11% below by 2006).

76 At Stage One the District Council, as part of its 54-member consultation proposals, proposed that this area be allocated 11 councillors. Under this option the area would be represented by three three-member wards and a single two-member East Grinstead East ward incorporating Ashurst Wood.

77 The Liberal Democrats proposed a pattern of five two-member wards and one single-member ward for this area. Their proposed Ashplats, Imberhorne, New South, North-West and Town Centre wards would all be represented by two members while the Ashurst Wood area would remain within a single-member ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed that Ashurst Wood ward comprise the present Ashurst Wood ward and an area in the east of East Grinstead. The area would extend from Horseshoe Farm in the south to Dutton Homestall Farm in the north-west. The Liberal Democrats also proposed that Ashplats ward comprise the current East Grinstead North ward, less the areas generally surrounding Woodbury Avenue, that are accessed by Lewes Road to the south and on the western boundary the area, generally west of Blackwell Hollow and Bourg-De-Peage Avenue.

78 The Liberal Democrats further proposed that Imberhorne ward should comprise part of the current East Grinstead West ward less the area generally north and to the rear of the properties on Halsford Road and London Road which would then comprise the whole of a new North West ward.

79 The proposed New South ward would comprise part of the present East Grinstead South ward less that area it proposed transferring into a new Ashurst Wood ward. The Liberal Democrats also proposed that the northern boundary of this ward run to the rear of the properties on Hurst Farm Road, Hermitage Lane and the area generally north of Glendyne Way. It further proposed that the Town Centre ward should comprise the area north of the proposed New South ward and west of the proposed East Grinstead Ashplats ward. It proposed that the western boundary of this ward should follow the dismantled railway from the district boundary in the north to its intersection with Garden Wood Road towards the south.

80 Ashurst Wood Community Association proposed that the Ashurst Wood area form a single-member ward within its 'present parish council boundary' or be combined with a sufficient number of the electorate from the eastern areas of East Grinstead. It argued that this arrangement would continue to provide more effective local government for the recently created parish. East Grinstead Town Council expressed support for the Liberal Democrat proposals for a pattern of five two-member wards and one single-member ward for the East Grinstead and Ashurst Wood area.

81 While the District Council's 54-member scheme provided good levels of electoral equality, the LGCE considered that the ward boundaries would not adequately reflect community identities within East Grinstead. The Liberal Democrats' proposals provided the correct allocation of 11 members for this area within the context of a 54-member scheme. The LGCE considered that these proposals achieved acceptable levels of electoral equality and provided ward patterns that reflected local communities. This scheme also received the support of the East Grinstead Town Council and would accommodate the proposals of Ashurst Wood Community Association for a single-member Ashurst Wood ward. The LGCE considered that the Liberal Democrat proposals would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria for this area and therefore adopted them without amendment.

82 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 12% above the district average in Ashurst Wood ward (9% above the by 2006), 1% above the district average in East Grinstead North West ward (2% below by 2006), 10% below the district average in East Grinstead Town Centre ward (9% below by 2006), 2% above the district average in East Grinstead Ashplats ward (1% above by 2006), 1% below the district average in East Grinstead New South ward (3% below by 2006) and 2% below the district average in East Grinstead Imberhorne ward (4% below by 2006).

83 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations for the area but proposed that East Grinstead New South ward be renamed East Grinstead Herontye ward, the proposed East Grinstead North West ward be renamed East Grinstead Baldwins ward and that the proposed East Grinstead Town Centre ward be renamed East Grinstead Town ward. Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats supported the draft proposals in the area. However, it proposed that East Grinstead New South ward be renamed East Grinstead South ward.

84 West Sussex County Council proposed a number of amendments to ward names in the area. It proposed the alternative ward names of Herontye, Dunnings Mill, Coombe Hill or Weir Wood for the proposed East Grinstead New South ward. It also proposed the ward name Baldwins Hill for the proposed East Grinstead North West ward and East Grinstead Town as an alternative for East Grinstead Town Centre ward. East Grinstead Town Council supported the proposals in the area, however it also proposed a town council comprising of 18 members.

85 Councillor Matthews proposed alternative ward names and town council arrangements for East Grinstead parish. County Councillor Collins supported the proposals for the area, however she proposed that East Grinstead Ashurst be represented by one town councillor and that this parish ward be renamed East Grinstead Worsted. Sackville College supported the draft recommendations but also supported using 'Worsted' to describe the area of the parish that is not the village of Ashurst Wood. Councillor Horman objected to the proposals for the Ashurst

Wood area. Ashurst Wood Community Association also supported the proposed East Grinstead Ashurst Wood ward.

86 We have noted the general support expressed for the LGCE's draft recommendations in this area. We are therefore content to adopt them for the final recommendations subject to the amendment of town council arrangements in accordance with the proposals submitted by Councillor Matthews. These proposals also accord with the District Council's proposal to rename the proposed East Grinstead New South, East Grinstead North West and East Grinstead Town Centre wards East Grinstead Herontye, East Grinstead Baldwins and East Grinstead Town wards respectively.

87 Under the final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 12% above the district average in Ashurst Wood ward (8% above by 2006), 2% above the district average in East Grinstead Ashplats ward (equal to the average in 2006), 1% above the district average in East Grinstead Baldwins ward (3% below by 2006), 1% below the district average in East Grinstead Herontye ward (4% below by 2006), 2% below the district average in East Grinstead Imberhorne ward (5% below by 2006) and 10% below the district average in East Grinstead Town ward (9% below by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

### **Haywards Heath-Ashenground, Haywards Heath-Bentswood, Haywards Heath-Franklands, Haywards Heath-Harlands, Haywards Heath-Heath and Lindfield Urban wards**

88 The town of Haywards Heath is located towards the centre of the district while Lindfield Urban lies to the east of the town. Haywards Heath-Ashenground, Haywards Heath-Bentswood, Haywards Heath-Franklands, Haywards Heath-Harlands and Haywards Heath-Heath wards are all represented by two members while Lindfield Urban ward is represented by three members. Each district ward within the town is coterminous with the parish of the same name. Lindfield Urban is also coterminous with the parish ward of Lindfield. The number of electors per councillor is 7% above the district average in Haywards Heath-Ashenground ward (4% above by 2006), 30% below the district average in Haywards Heath-Bentswood wards (31% below by 2006), 31% above the district average in Haywards Heath-Franklands ward (39% above by 2006), 7% below the district average in Haywards Heath-Harlands ward (32% above by 2006), 19% below the district average in Haywards Heath-Heath ward (20% below above 2006) and 18% below the district average in Lindfield Urban ward (20% below by 2006).

89 At Stage One, the District Council, as part of its 54-member consultation option, proposed that Haywards Heath town be represented by five two-member wards. It proposed that Haywards Ashenground ward would retain the same boundaries as the present Haywards Heath-Ashenground ward. The District Council also proposed that Haywards Bentswood ward should comprise the present Haywards Heath-Bentswood ward and the area to the rear of properties on Woodlands Road, Fields End Close and Oathall Road. It further proposed that Haywards Franklands ward should comprise the present Haywards Heath Franklands ward less the area transferred to the proposed Haywards Bentswood ward mentioned above.

90 The District Council proposed that Haywards Harlands ward should comprise the current Haywards Heath Harlands ward, less areas west of Balcombe Road up to the rear of the properties on Penland Road and a small area west of Milton Road, both of which it proposed to transfer into the proposed Haywards Heath ward. It further proposed that Haywards Heath ward would comprise all of the current Haywards Heath-Heath ward and those areas transferred from the proposed Haywards Harlands ward as mentioned above.

91 The District Council also proposed a new Lindfield ward comprising the present Lindfield Urban ward and a proposed Lindfield East parish ward of Lindfield Rural. The parish ward boundaries would extend from the Scrace Stream on the side west of Lindfield parish along to Great Walstead Farm and down to Lyoth Lane.

92 The Liberal Democrats proposed that Haywards Heath be represented by 10 councillors representing five wards. Their proposed Ashenground, Bentswood, Franklands, Harlands and Heath wards would each be represented by two councillors. Their proposals in the Haywards Heath area were almost identical to those of the District Council's 54-member scheme. They proposed that the parish of Lindfield Urban be divided between three single-member wards, Lindfield Central, Lindfield South-East and Lindfield West.

93 The LGCE considered that the District Council's proposals for this area provided the best balance between the statutory criteria, and adopted them without amendment.

94 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 26% below the district average in Haywards Harlands ward (5% below by 2006), equal to the district average in Haywards Heath ward (1% below by 2006), 7% above the district average in Haywards Ashenground ward (4% above by 2006), 9% above the district average in Haywards Bentswood ward (8% above by 2006), 9% below the district average in Haywards Franklands ward (1% above by 2006) and equal to the district average in Lindfield ward (3% below by 2006).

95 At Stage Three, the District Council proposed the revision of its projected electorate forecast for the Haywards Heath Harlands area. It proposed that an extra 728 electors be allocated to the proposed Haywards Harlands ward which would result in a 13% variance. It therefore proposed amending the boundary between the proposed Haywards Heath Harlands and Haywards Heath Heath wards. It proposed that Turners Mill Close, Turners Mill Road, Sugworth Close, The Spinney and Penland Road (nos. 65–109 and 52–110) be transferred to the proposed Heath ward, that Winnals Park and Great Heathmead be retained within Harlands ward and that the eastern side of Paddockhall Road also be transferred to Harlands ward. The District Council also proposed that Haywards Heath Heath ward be renamed Haywards Heath Lucastes ward.

96 The Liberal Democrats supported this revision, however they proposed the ward boundaries in the draft recommendations be maintained and objected to the District Council's proposed boundary amendments. They argued that future development in the area would even out initial electoral variances. The Liberal Democrats also proposed that this ward should be named 'Haywards Heath' ward. Lindfield Parish Council expressed support for the draft recommendations. Councillor Burns argued that all the wards within Haywards Heath town should all be prefixed with 'Haywards Heath'.

97 Councillor Chapman, member for Haywards Heath Franklands ward proposed that Haywards Franklands ward be renamed Haywards Heath Southdowns, arguing that the draft recommendations would result in the retention of two wards named Franklands within the district. Councillor Gillard, member for Haywards Heath Harlands, supported the amended electorate forecasts and the consequential boundary amendments proposed by the District Council for the proposed Haywards Heath Lucastes ward. Councillor Gilks, member for Haywards Heath Harlands ward, supported the draft recommendations however he proposed that Haywards Harlands ward be renamed Haywards Heath Lucastes ward and proposed that Haywards Heath Franklands ward be renamed Haywards Heath Southdowns ward. Fox Hill Association supported the proposed boundaries of Haywards Heath Franklands ward.

98 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for this area as these would achieve reasonable electoral equality and has received local support. However, we have decided to move away from the draft

recommendations and modify the proposed boundary between Haywards Heath Lucastes and Haywards Heath Heath wards. Having obtained further assurance from the District Council, we are content to accept the amended electoral forecast and the consequential ward boundary amendments proposed between the new Haywards Heath Lucastes and Haywards Heath Heath wards.

99 Under the final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 7% above the district average in Haywards Heath Ashenground ward (4% above by 2006), 9% above the district average in Haywards Heath Bentswood ward (7% above by 2006), 9% below the district average in Haywards Heath Franklands ward (1% above by 2006), equal to the district average in Haywards Heath Heath ward (9% below by 2006), 26% below the district average in Haywards Heath Lucastes ward (2% below by 2006), and equal to the district average in Lindfield ward (4% below by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

## **Electoral cycle**

100 By virtue of the amendments made to the Local Government Act 1992 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001, we have no powers to make recommendations concerning electoral cycle.

## **Conclusions**

101 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to the LGCE's consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse its draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- In Burgess Hill town – we propose renaming the proposed Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward Burgess Hill Meeds ward In Haywards Heath town – we propose inserting the word 'Heath' within all the town ward names.
- In East Grinstead town – we propose renaming the proposed wards East Grinstead New South, East Grinstead New West, and East Grinstead Town Centre wards, East Grinstead Herontye, East Grinstead Baldwins and East Grinstead Town respectively.
- In Haywards Heath town – we propose boundary amendments between the renamed Haywards Heath Lucastes ward and Haywards Heath Heath ward.
- In the rural areas of the district we propose renaming the proposed Balcombe, Horsted, Cuckfields, Turners and Low Weald & Downs wards; Ardingly & Balcombe, High Weald, Cuckfield, Hurstpierpoint & Downs and Crawley Downs & Turners Hill wards respectively.
- We propose renaming East Grinstead Ashurst, Slaugham Village, Lindfield East and Lindfield West parish wards; East Grinstead Worsted, Slaugham & Warninglid, Lindfield Rural East and Lindfield Rural West parish wards respectively.

102 We conclude that, in Mid Sussex:

- a council size of 54 members should be retained;
- there should be 26 wards;

- the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of four, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

103 Table 4 shows the impact of the final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

*Table 4: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements*

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	54	54	54	54
Number of wards	30	26	30	26
Average number of electors per councillor	1,828	1,828	1,889	1,889
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	21	3	21	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	11	0	12	0

104 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 21 to three initially. By 2006 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%.

**Final recommendation**

Mid Sussex District Council should comprise 54 councillors serving 26 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A including the large map inside the back cover.

**Parish and town council electoral arrangements**

105 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule states that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards, it should also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. In the LGCE’s draft recommendations report it proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for the parishes of Burgess Hill, Cuckfield Rural, East Grinstead, Haywards Heath, Lindfield Rural and Slaugham to reflect the proposed district wards.

106 The parish of Burgess Hill is currently served by 19 councillors representing seven wards: Burgess Hill–Chantonbury, Burgess Hill–Dunstall and Burgess Hill–Leylands each returning two councillors, Burgess Hill–Franklands, Burgess Hill St Andrews, Burgess Hill–Town each returning three councillors and Burgess Hill–Victoria returning four councillors. We propose modifying the parish ward boundaries to correspond with those of the district council wards within the town.

107 At Stage One, the LGCE proposed that, in the light of its proposed district warding arrangements Burgess Hill parish should comprise 19 councillors, representing the wards: Burgess Hill Chantonbury, Burgess Hill Dunstall, Burgess Hill Franklands, Burgess Hill Leylands, Burgess Hill St Andrews each returning three councillors and Burgess Hill Victoria returning four councillors.

108 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, the District Council proposed that Burgess Hill Chanctonbury ward be renamed Burgess Hill Meeds ward and stated that they supported the views of Burgess Hill Town Council that there should be 18 town councillors, one less than at present. The Liberal Democrats supported these proposals.

109 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we recommend the adoption of these proposals by Burgess Hill Town Council as part of our final recommendations.

**Final recommendation**

Burgess Hill Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, Burgess Hill Dunstall, Burgess Hill Franklands, Burgess Hill Leylands, Burgess Hill Meeds, Burgess Hill St Andrews and Burgess Hill Victoria wards (each returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

110 The parish of Cuckfield Rural is currently served by nine councillors representing two wards: Ansty ward returning six councillors and Staplefield ward returning three councillors.

111 At Stage One Cuckfield Rural Parish Council proposed that the parish be divided into three parish wards. It proposed that Ansty ward be represented by five councillors, Staplefield ward be represented by three councillors and a new Brook Street & Borde Hill ward be represented by one councillor. The LGCE proposed modifying the parish ward boundaries of Cuckfield Rural parish to correspond with those proposed by Cuckfield Rural Parish Council.

112 At Stage Three, the District Council and Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats supported the proposed warding arrangements for the parish.

113 We propose amending the boundary between Cuckfield Rural parish and Haywards Heath parish to correspond with the Mid Sussex (Parishes) Order 2002. Given the support for the proposals and subject to the parishes order we confirm these proposals as final.

**Final recommendation**

Cuckfield Rural Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Ansty (returning five councillors), Staplefield (returning three councillors) and Brook Street & Borde Hill (returning one councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A3.

114 The parish of East Grinstead is currently served by 18 councillors representing three wards: East Grinstead-North, East Grinstead-South and East Grinstead-West each returning six councillors. The LGCE proposed that in the light of the proposed district warding arrangements East Grinstead parish should comprise six parish wards: East Grinstead Ashurst returning two councillors, East Grinstead Ashplats returning four councillors, East Grinstead Imberhorne

returning three councillors, East Grinstead New South returning three councillors, East Grinstead North West returning three councillors and East Grinstead Town Centre returning three councillors.

115 At Stage Three, the District Council proposed that East Grinstead Ashurst parish ward be renamed East Grinstead Worsted and be represented by a single councillor. Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats also proposed that East Grinstead Ashurst ward be renamed East Grinstead Worsted ward. East Grinstead Town Council supported the proposals that the town be represented by six wards. It also proposed that East Grinstead Ashurst parish ward be renamed East Grinstead Worsted and represented by a single councillor with the proposed East Grinstead North West parish ward being allocated the extra councillor. These proposals were supported by County Councillor Collins. Councillor Matthews proposed that East Grinstead Ashplats and East Grinstead Imberhorne each be represented by four councillors. He proposed that East Grinstead New South, East Grinstead North West and East Grinstead Town Centre wards be renamed East Grinstead Herontye, East Grinstead Baldwins and East Grinstead Town respectively and be represented by three councillors each and that East Grinstead Ashurst be renamed East Grinstead Worsted and be represented by a single councillor. Councillor Russell also proposed that East Grinstead Ashurst be renamed East Grinstead Worsted.

116 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we recommend the adoption of Councillor Matthews proposals as part of our final recommendations.

#### **Final recommendation**

East Grinstead Town Council should comprise 18 councillors representing six ward: East Grinstead Ashplats (returning four councillors), East Grinstead Baldwins (returning three councillors), East Grinstead Imberhorne (returning four councillors), East Grinstead Herontye (returning three councillors), East Grinstead Town (returning three councillors) and East Grinstead Worsted (returning one councillor). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

117 The parish of Haywards Heath is currently served by 16 councillors representing five wards. Haywards Heath–Ashenground (returning three councillors), Haywards Heath–Bentswood (returning three councillors), Haywards Heath–Franklands (returning four councillors), Haywards Heath–Harlands (returning three councillors) and Haywards Heath–Heath (returning three councillors). The LGCE proposed that in the light of the proposed district warding arrangements, Haywards Heath parish should comprise five parish wards: Haywards Ashenground returning three councillors, Haywards Bentswood returning four councillors, Haywards Franklands returning three councillors, Haywards Harlands returning three councillors and Haywards Heath returning three councillors.

118 At Stage Three, the District Council proposed ward boundary amendments between the proposed Haywards Harlands and Haywards Heath wards. It also proposed that the word Heath be retained in all of the proposed ward names and that Haywards Harlands be renamed Haywards Heath Lucastes. The Liberal Democrats proposed that representation within the parish be reduced from 16 to 15 councillors so that each ward has three parish councillors.

119 Given the support of the District Council for the draft recommendations (particularly the town representation) we are content to confirm these as final.

**Final recommendation**

Haywards Heath Town should comprise 16 councillors representing five wards: Haywards Heath Ashenground ward (returning three councillors), Haywards Heath Bentswood ward (returning four councillors) Haywards Heath Franklands ward (returning three councillors), Hayward Heath Heath ward (returning three councillors) and Haywards Heath Lucastes ward (returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated on the large map at the back of the report.

120 The parish of Lindfield Rural is currently served by nine councillors and is not warded. The LGCE proposed that, in the light of the proposed district warding arrangements, Lindfield Rural parish should comprise two parish wards: Lindfield East returning four councillors and Lindfield West returning five councillors.

121 At Stage Three, Councillor Snowling proposed that the parish wards within Lindfield Rural Parish be renamed Lindfield Rural East and Lindfield Rural West. In light of our proposed district warding arrangements we propose that Lindfield Rural East parish ward return four councillors and Lindfield Rural West parish ward return five councillors. This proposal was supported by the District Council. In the light of these proposals we recommend adopting the amended names as part of our final recommendations.

**Final recommendation**

Lindfield Rural Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two parish wards: Lindfield Rural East (returning four councillors) and Lindfield Rural West (returning five councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

122 The parish of Slaugham is currently served by 13 councillors wards. The LGCE proposed warding this parish in order to facilitate the district ward pattern for this area. It proposed that in the light of its proposed district warding arrangements, Slaugham parish should comprise two parish wards: Handcross & Pease Pottage, returning seven councillors and Slaugham Village, returning six councillors.

123 At Stage Three, the District Council and Liberal Democrats proposed that the new Hands Cross & Pease Pottage and Slaugham Village parish wards return ten and three councillors respectively. In light of objections received regarding the appropriateness of Slaugham Village as a parish ward name we propose renaming it Slaugham & Warninglid parish ward. In the light of these proposals we recommend adopting these parish wards as part of the final recommendations.

**Final recommendation**

Slaugham Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two parish wards: Hands Cross & Pease Pottage ward (returning ten councillors) and Slaugham & Warninglid ward (returning three councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A2.

*Map 2: Final recommendations for Mid Sussex*

## 6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

124 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in Mid Sussex and submitted the final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692).

125 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 20 August 2002.

126 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

The Secretary  
The Electoral Commission  
Trevelyan House  
Great Peter Street  
London SW1P 2HW



## APPENDIX A

### **Final recommendations for Mid Sussex: Detailed mapping**

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Mid Sussex area.

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the district and indicates the areas that are shown in more detail on Maps A2, A3 and the large map at the back of this report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed parish warding of Slaugham Parish.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed parish warding of Cuckfield Rural Parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the proposed warding arrangements for Burgess Hill, East Grinstead and Haywards Heath & Lindfield.

*Map A1: Final recommendations for Mid Sussex: Key map*

*Map A2: Proposed warding of Slaugham Parish*

*Map A3: Proposed warding of Cuckfield Rural Parish (map does not include proposed district warding)*