

# Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for East Sussex County Council

Electoral review

March 2016

## **Translations and other formats**

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

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2016

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	5
Eastbourne	7
Hastings	8
Lewes	10
Rother	12
Wealden	16
Conclusions	20
Parish electoral arrangements	20
3 Have your say	28

## Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for East Sussex County Council	30
B Submissions received	36
C Glossary and abbreviations	37

# Summary

## Who we are

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

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

## Electoral review

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

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

## Why East Sussex?

We are conducting an electoral review of East Sussex County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in East Sussex. Overall, 34% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county. Chailey division currently has 21% more electors than the average for East Sussex.

## Our proposals for East Sussex

East Sussex County Council currently has 49 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a slight increase in council size by one to 50 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

## Electoral arrangements

Our draft recommendations propose that East Sussex County Council's 50 councillors should represent 50 single-member divisions across the county. One of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for East Sussex by 2021.

**You have until 16 June 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 28 for how to have your say.**

# 1 Introduction

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

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

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

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

## Consultation

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

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
8 September 2015	Council size decision
22 September 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for division arrangements to LGBCE
1 December 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 March 2016	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
17 June 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
20 September 2016	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council

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

wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

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

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

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of East Sussex	397,253	431,902
Number of councillors	50	50
Average number of electors per councillor	7,945	8,638

10 Under our draft recommendations, one of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021. The outlier, Newhaven & Bishopstone, will have 13% more electors than the county average by 2021. We are satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for East Sussex.

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

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of East Sussex County Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

### Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

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

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

## Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our draft recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 8.7% to 2021. The growth will largely be driven by developments in Wealden and Lewes.

15 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

16 Prior to consultation, East Sussex Council submitted a proposal to us to retain the existing council size of 49 members. The proposal also noted that, if necessary to address electoral inequalities, the Council would support an increase in size to 50. As part of our preliminary investigations we carried out an allocation exercise to determine how many county councillors should represent each borough or district. We concluded that a council size of 50 provided for the best allocation.

17 We received no submissions concerning council size in response to our consultation on division patterns. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 50, allocated across the districts and boroughs in East Sussex. In brackets, we have also listed the percentage of district and borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity:

- Eastbourne Borough – nine councillors (100%)
- Hastings Borough – eight councillors (100%)
- Lewes District – nine councillors (71%)
- Rother District – nine councillors (62%)
- Wealden District – 15 councillors (100%)

## Division patterns

18 During consultation on division patterns, we received 27 submissions, including one county-wide proposal, from the County Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county.

19 The county-wide scheme provided a pattern of all single-member divisions for the county. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of divisions largely resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the county and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. However, there are areas in which we have recommended changes to provide for clearer boundaries.

20 Our draft recommendations are for 50 single-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting

community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

21 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 30–34) and on the large map accompanying this report.

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

## Draft recommendations

23 The tables on pages 7–19 detail our draft recommendations for each area of East Sussex. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>4</sup> criteria of:

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

---

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

## Eastbourne Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Devonshire</b>	1	4%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Hampden Park</b>	1	-9%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	
<b>Langney</b>	1	-5%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	
<b>Meads</b>	1	-1%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	
<b>Old Town</b>	1	2%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	
<b>Ratton</b>	1	-10%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	
<b>Sovereign</b>	1	6%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	The whole-county submission proposed to keep Sovereign division the same as at present. However, we considered that the Queen's Crescent area looks more towards St Anthony's than to the centre of Sovereign division. Our draft recommendations therefore include this area in St Anthony's instead of in Sovereign. We also considered that the Langney Green and Monarch Gardens area is more a part of the Sovereign area than it is of St Anthony's, as it is separated from the remainder of

				St Anthony's by the Langney Sewer. We are therefore including this area in our draft Sovereign division.
<b>St Anthony's</b>	1	5%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	The whole-county submission proposed to keep St Anthony's division the same as at present. We received no other submissions relating to this area. However, we considered that the Queen's Crescent area looks more towards St Anthony's than to the centre of Sovereign division. Our draft recommendations therefore include this area in St Anthony's. We also considered that the Langney Green and Monarch Gardens area is more a part of the Sovereign area than it is of St Anthony's, as it is separated from the remainder of St Anthony's by the Langney Sewer. We are therefore including this area in our draft Sovereign division instead of in St Anthony's.
<b>Upperton</b>	1	-3%	This division is coterminous with our draft ward of the same name.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.

### Hastings Borough

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Ashdown &amp; Conquest</b>	1	-5%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Ashdown and Conquest.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.

<b>Baird &amp; Ore</b>	1	-8%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Baird and Ore.	<p>We received two submissions regarding this division. One proposed including the parts of Baird &amp; Ore west of Pine Avenue in St Helens &amp; Silverhill. This would create a division with a particularly high level of electoral inequality and, as such, we do not consider this would best reflect our statutory criteria.</p> <p>We consider the boundaries proposed in the whole-county scheme provide good electoral equality and are clearly identifiable. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Braybrooke &amp; Castle</b>	1	-10%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Braybrooke and Castle.	<p>Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Central St Leonards &amp; Gensing</b>	1	-4%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Central St Leonards and Gensing.	
<b>Hollington &amp; Wishing Tree</b>	1	2%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Hollington and Wishing Tree.	
<b>Maze Hill &amp; West St Leonards</b>	1	0%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Maze Hill and West St Leonards.	
<b>St Helens &amp; Silverhill</b>	1	-4%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of St Helens and Silverhill.	
				<p>We received two submissions regarding this division. As referred to in the Baird &amp; Ore division, above, one respondent proposed including the area of the current Baird &amp; Ore division that lies west of Pine Avenue in our St Helens &amp; Silverhill division. The effect would have been to create a division with a particularly high level of electoral</p>

				<p>inequality and, as such, we do not consider this to best reflect our statutory criteria.</p> <p>We consider the boundaries proposed in the whole-county scheme provide good electoral equality and are clearly identifiable. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.</p>
<b>Old Hastings &amp; Tressell</b>	1	-7%	This division consists of our draft borough wards of Old Hastings and Tressell.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.

#### Lewes District

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Chailey</b>	1	6%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Chailey, Barcombe & Hamsey; Newick; Wivelsfield; and the parishes of East Chiltington and St John from our draft Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington & St John ward.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to the external boundaries of these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Lewes</b>	1	9%	This division consists of our draft district ward of Lewes Priory, and the part of our draft Lewes Castle ward	

			that lies west of the railway line.	
<b>Newhaven &amp; Bishopstone</b>	1	13%	This division consists of the South Heighton and Tarring Neville parishes and the Mount Pleasant area from our draft Newhaven North ward, the Bishopstone area of our draft Seaford West ward, and the majority of our draft Newhaven South ward, excluding the area between Brighton Road and The Highway.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. While this division does have a higher than average level of electoral inequality, we considered the proposed boundaries are clearly identifiable. We did investigate alternative division patterns but considered these would not provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations. We would particularly welcome comments on this division.
<b>Ouse Valley West &amp; Downs</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Ditchling & Westmeston, Kingston, and the Plumpton and Streat parishes of our draft Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington & St John ward.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Peacehaven</b>	1	-4%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Peacehaven East, Peacehaven West, and the part of our Peacehaven North ward that is south of Firle Road.	
<b>Ringmer &amp; Lewes Bridge</b>	1	8%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Lewes Bridge, Ouse Valley & Ringmer, the part of our	

			draft Lewes Castle ward that lies east of the railway line, and the Beddingham and Firle parishes of our Newhaven North ward.	
<b>Seaford North</b>	1	3%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Seaford East, Seaford North, and the Princess Drive area of our Seaford West ward.	
<b>Seaford South</b>	1	6%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Seaford Central, Seaford South, and the coastal part of our Seaford West ward, as far north as Newhaven Road.	
<b>Telscombe</b>	1	6%	This division consists of our draft district ward of East Saltdean & Telscombe Cliffs, and the area of our Peacehaven North ward that is north of Firle Road.	

#### Rother District

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Battle &amp; Crowhurst</b>	1	-5%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Battle & Telham; Battle,	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality

			Netherfield & Watlington; and Catsfield & Crowhurst, except for Dallington parish.	and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Bexhill East</b>	1	5%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Bexhill Old Town & Worsham, Bexhill Pebsham & St Michaels, and the part of Bexhill St Stephens ward east of Combe Valley Way.	
<b>Bexhill North</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of our draft district ward of Bexhill North, the part of Bexhill St Stephens ward that lies west of Combe Valley Way, and the part of Bexhill Kewhurst ward that lies north of Little Common Road.	
<b>Bexhill South</b>	1	8%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Bexhill Central, Bexhill Sackville, Bexhill St Marks, and the part of our Bexhill Collington ward that lies south of the railway line.	
<b>Bexhill West</b>	1	9%	This division consists of our draft district ward of Bexhill Kewhurst, south of Little Common Road, and the part of our Bexhill Collington	

			ward that is north of the railway line.	
<b>Brede Valley &amp; Marsham</b>	1	-7%	This division consists of our draft district ward of Sedlescombe & Westfield, Brede parish from our Brede & Udimore ward and the Guestling and Fairlight parishes from our Southern Rother ward.	
<b>Northern Rother</b>	1	-6%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Northern Rother, Robertsbridge, Udimore parish from our Brede & Udimore ward and the Peasmash and Rye Foreign parishes from our Eastern Rother ward.	The county-wide pattern proposed that a small area to the north of the Salehurst and Robertsbridge parish be included in the proposed Northern Rother division. However, whilst this would provide for good electoral equality, it would create an unviable parish ward of only 59 electors (we consider a parish ward with fewer than 100 electors to be unviable). For this reason, we have decided not to include this area in the Northern Rother division. With this exception, we consider that the county-wide proposed ward meets the statutory criteria, and subject to the above amendment, have included it as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Rother North West</b>	1	-9%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Hurst Green & Ticehurst, Burwash, Etchingham and Brightling parishes from our Burwash & The Weald ward, and the Dallington parish of Catsfield & Crowhurst.	We received one submission specifically relating to this division. As mentioned above, the county-wide pattern suggested that a small area in the north of the Salehurst and Robertsbridge parish be included in the proposed Northern Rother division. However, whilst this would provide for good electoral equality, it would create an unviable parish ward of only 59 electors (we consider a parish ward with fewer than 100 electors to be unviable). For this reason, we have decided to include the entirety of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge parish in the proposed

				Rother North West ward. Subject to the above amendment, we have included the proposed Rother North West division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Rye &amp; Eastern Rother</b>	1	-3%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Rye & Winchelsea, our Eastern Rother ward except for the parishes of Peasmarsch and Rye Foreign, and the Icklesham and Pett parishes from our Southern Rother ward.	Five of the submissions received during consultation referred to the proposals for the Rye & Winchelsea area, all of which were positive. We consider that the county-wide proposals in this area provided for good adherence to the statutory criteria, and reflect the views of local residents, and therefore have included this division as part of our draft recommendations.

## Wealden District

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Arlington, East Hoathly &amp; Hellingly</b>	1	-2%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Arlington; Chiddingley, East Hoathly & Waldron; and Hellingly.	We received 11 submissions directly regarding this area. One of these submissions was positive, agreeing with the decision to include Berwick parish in its entirety in this entirely rural division. The remaining 10 submissions all commented on the proposal to include two small areas of the parish of Arlington in a division with Hailsham, and stated that this was not reflective of community identity in the area. We visited the area as part of a tour of the area, and observed that the A22 provides a strong boundary between the parish of Arlington and the town of Hailsham, with few crossing points. The two areas identified by the county-wide proposal for inclusion in the Hailsham wards are also very small, and would lead to the creation of two unviable parish wards of fewer than 100 electors. For these reasons, we propose to include the entirety of the parish of Arlington in the Arlington, East Hoathly & Hellingly division.
<b>Crowborough North &amp; Jarvis Brook</b>	1	3%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Crowborough Central, Crowborough Jarvis Brook and Crowborough North.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. However, we have moved the properties on the north side of Blackness Road and east of Whitehill Road into the Crowborough South & St Johns division in order to improve the electoral variances. The resulting Crowborough North & Jarvis Brook division has strong and identifiable boundaries, and provides for good electoral equality.
<b>Crowborough South &amp; St Johns</b>	1	4%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Crowborough South East,	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. However, we have moved the properties on the north side of Blackness

			Crowborough South West and Crowborough St Johns.	Road and east of Whitehill Road into the Crowborough South & St Johns division in order to improve the electoral variances. The resulting Crowborough South & St Johns division has strong and identifiable boundaries, and provides for good electoral equality.
<b>Hailsham Market</b>	1	6%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Hailsham Central, Hailsham East and Hailsham North.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Hailsham New Town</b>	1	6%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Hailsham North West, Hailsham South and Hailsham West.	
<b>Hartfield</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Hartfield, Forest Row and Withyham.	
<b>Heathfield &amp; Mayfield</b>	1	2%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Heathfield North, Heathfield South and Mayfield & Five Ashes.	
<b>Horam &amp; Eastern Villages</b>	1	5%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Herstmonceux, Ninfield & Wartling and Horam & Punnetts Town.	
				We received one submission for this area, which referred to the allocation of councillors but did not comment on a particular division pattern. Building on the suggested scheme in this area, we have decided not to include the parish of Hooe in this division. Our investigations indicated that including Hooe parish in the Pevensy & Westham division provides for improved levels of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.

<b>Maresfield &amp; Buxted</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Buxted; Danehill & Fletching; and Maresfield.	The county-wide submission proposed that a very small area of the parish of Fletching be included in the proposed Uckfield North with Isfield division. However, the area included under the proposal division pattern formed an unviable parish ward of fewer than 100 electors. To improve both the boundaries of the parish ward and the access in the proposed division, we propose to include the Shortbridge area of Fletching in Uckfield North with Isfield, removing it from the proposed Maresfield & Buxted division. Subject to this amendment, we are proposing this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Pevensey &amp; Stone Cross</b>	1	-3%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Pevensey Bay, Pevensey & Westham and Stone Cross.	We received one submission for this area, which referred to the allocation of councillors but did not comment on a particular warding pattern. Building on the county-wide scheme in this area, we have included the parish of Hooe in this division, which allows a better level of electoral equality between divisions, as well as using clear and identifiable boundaries
<b>Polegate &amp; Watermill</b>	1	4%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Polegate Central, Polegate North and Polegate South & Willingdon Watermill.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to this division. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Uckfield North with Isfield</b>	1	-6%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Uckfield East, Uckfield North and Uckfield West with Isfield.	The county-wide submission proposed that a very small area of the parish of Fletching be included in the proposed Uckfield North with Isfield division. However, the area included under this proposal would result in creating an unviable parish ward of fewer than 100 electors. To improve both the boundaries of the parish ward and the access in the proposed division, we propose to include the Shortbridge area of Fletching in Uckfield North with Isfield,

				removing it from the proposed Maresfield & Buxted division. Subject to this amendment, we are proposing this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Uckfield South with Framfield</b>	1	-1%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Framfield & Cross-in-Hand, Uckfield New Town and Uckfield Ridgewood & Little Horsted.	Other than the whole-county proposal, we did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. We consider the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. We have therefore decided to include this division as part of our draft recommendations.
<b>Wadhurst</b>	1	-4%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Frant & Wadhurst and Hadlow Down & Rotherfield.	
<b>Willingdon &amp; South Downs</b>	1	-4%	This division consists of our draft district wards of Lower Willingdon, South Downs and Upper Willingdon.	

## Conclusions

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

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	50	50
Number of electoral divisions	50	50
Average number of electors per councillor	7,945	8,638
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	3	1
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

### **Draft recommendation**

East Sussex County Council should comprise 50 councillors serving 50 single-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

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

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

27 As a result of our proposed ward and division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Lewes, Newhaven, Peacehaven and Seaford parishes in Lewes; Battle, Guestling and Icklesham parishes in Rother; and Buxted, Crowborough, Fletching, Forest Row, Frant, Hailsham, Heathfield & Waldron, Herstmonceux, Polegate, Uckfield, Westham, Willingdon & Jevington and Withyham parishes in Wealden.

**Lewes District**

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

**Draft recommendation**  
Lewes Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Lewes Bridge (returning five members), Lewes Castle (returning four members), Lewes Central (returning one member) and Lewes Priory (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**  
Newhaven Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Newhaven Central (returning two members), Newhaven Denton (returning four members), Newhaven North (returning four members) and Newhaven South (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**  
Peacehaven Town Council should comprise 17 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Peacehaven Central (returning one member), Peacehaven East (returning five members), Peacehaven North (returning five members) and Peacehaven West (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Seaford Parish Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing nine wards: Seaford Bay (returning one member), Seaford Bishopstone (returning two members), Seaford Central (returning two members), Seaford East Blatchington (returning one member), Seaford East (returning four members), Seaford Esplanade (returning two members), Seaford North (returning four members), Seaford South (returning three members) and Seaford Sutton (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**Rother District**

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

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

**Draft recommendation**

Battle Town Council should comprise 17 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Battle North (returning 10 members) and Battle South (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Guestling Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Guestling Green (returning four members) and Guestling Three Oaks (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Icklesham Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Icklesham (returning six members), Rye Harbour (returning three members) and Winchelsea (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**Wealden District**

36 As a result of our proposed ward and division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised

parish electoral arrangements for Buxted, Crowborough, Fletching, Forest Row, Frant, Hailsham, Heathfield & Waldron, Herstmonceux, Polegate, Uckfield, Westham, Willingdon & Jevington and Withyham parishes.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Buxted Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Buxted (returning nine members), Coopers Green (returning one member) and High Hurstwood (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Crowborough Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Crowborough Central (returning three members), Crowborough Jarvis Brook (returning two members), Crowborough North (returning three members), Crowborough South East (returning three members), Crowborough South West (returning three members) and Crowborough St Johns (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Fletching Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Fletching (returning eight members) and Shortbridge (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Forest Row Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Charlwood (returning one member), Hammerwood (returning two members) and Forest Row (returning 12 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Frant Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Bells Yew Green (returning three members), Frant (returning seven members) and Eridge Green (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Hailsham Town Council should comprise 24 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Hailsham Central (returning four members), Hailsham East (returning four members), Hailsham North West (returning four members), Hailsham North (returning four members), Hailsham South (returning three members), Hailsham West (returning four members) and Magham Down (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Waldron (returning one member), Cross-in-Hand (returning three members), Heathfield North (returning six members), Heathfield South (returning six members), and Punnetts Town (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Herstmonceux Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Golden Cross (returning one member), Trolliloes

(returning two members), Castle (returning seven members) and Cowbeech (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Pevensey Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Pevensey Bay (returning 12 members), and Pevensey Rural (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Polegate Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Polegate North (returning seven members), Polegate South (returning five members) and Polegate Central (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Uckfield Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Uckfield East (returning three members), Uckfield New Town (returning four members), Uckfield North (returning three members), Uckfield Ridgewood (returning three members) and Uckfield West (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**

Westham Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Westham (returning five members), Stone Cross (returning six members) and Dittons (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

49 As a result of our proposed ward and division boundaries and having regard to

the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Willingdon & Jevington parish.

**Draft recommendation**  
Willingdon & Jevington Parish Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Upper Willingdon (returning nine members), Lower Willingdon (returning eight members) and Watermill (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

**Draft recommendation**  
Withyham Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Groombridge (returning 10 members) and Marden’s Hill (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 Have your say

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A good pattern of divisions should:

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

Electoral equality:

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

Community identity:

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

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?

- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed division? Is there any form of public transport?

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

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

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

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

## Equalities

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

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Draft recommendations for East Sussex County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
<b>Eastbourne Borough</b>							
1 Devonshire	1	8,623	8,623	9%	9,006	9,006	4%
2 Hampden Park	1	7,411	7,411	-7%	7,854	7,854	-9%
3 Langney	1	7,817	7,817	-2%	8,197	8,197	-5%
4 Meads	1	8,094	8,094	2%	8,566	8,566	-1%
5 Old Town	1	8,339	8,339	5%	8,793	8,793	2%
6 Ratton	1	7,403	7,403	-7%	7,765	7,765	-10%
7 Sovereign	1	8,725	8,725	10%	9,085	9,085	6%
8 St Anthony's	1	8,468	8,468	7%	9,096	9,096	5%
9 Upperton	1	8,018	8,018	1%	8,420	8,420	-3%
<b>Hastings Borough</b>							
10 Ashdown & Conquest	1	7,461	7,461	-6%	8,170	8,170	-5%

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
11 Baird & Ore	1	7,209	7,209	-9%	7,993	7,993	-8%
12 Braybrooke & Castle	1	7,183	7,183	-10%	7,823	7,823	-10%
13 Central St Leonards & Gensing	1	7,680	7,680	-3%	8,261	8,261	-4%
14 Hollington & Wishing Tree	1	7,788	7,788	-2%	8,827	8,827	2%
15 Maze Hill & West St Leonards	1	7,325	7,325	-8%	8,668	8,668	0%
16 Old Hastings & Tressell	1	7,169	7,169	-10%	8,069	8,069	-7%
17 St Helens & Silverhill	1	7,497	7,497	-6%	8,277	8,277	-4%
<b>Lewes District</b>							
18 Chailey	1	7,945	7,945	0%	9,137	9,137	6%
19 Lewes	1	8,043	8,043	1%	9,408	9,408	9%
20 Newhaven & Bishopstone	1	8,467	8,467	6%	9,768	9,768	13%
21 Ouse Valley West & Downs	1	7,810	7,810	-2%	8,590	8,590	-1%
22 Peacehaven	1	7,616	7,616	-4%	8,313	8,313	-4%
23 Ringmer & Lewes Bridge	1	8,536	8,536	7%	9,301	9,301	8%

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24 Seaford North	1	8,750	8,750	10%	8,894	8,894	3%
25 Seaford South	1	8,766	8,766	10%	9,176	9,176	6%
26 Telscombe	1	8,547	8,547	7%	9,135	9,135	6%
<b>Rother District</b>							
27 Battle & Crowhurst	1	7,330	7,330	-7%	8,233	8,233	-4%
28 Bexhill East	1	7,856	7,856	0%	9,067	9,067	6%
29 Bexhill North	1	7,690	7,690	-2%	8,554	8,554	0%
30 Bexhill South	1	9,048	9,048	15%	9,287	9,287	9%
31 Bexhill West	1	8,813	8,813	12%	9,412	9,412	10%
32 Brede Valley & Marsham	1	7,437	7,437	-5%	8,066	8,066	-6%
33 Northern Rother	1	7,403	7,403	-6%	8,104	8,104	-5%
34 Rother North West	1	7,307	7,307	-7%	7,903	7,903	-8%
35 Rye & Eastern Rother	1	7,943	7,943	1%	8,406	8,406	-2%

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
<b>Wealden District</b>							
36	Arlington, East Hoathly & Hellingly	7,469	7,469	-6%	8,437	8,437	-2%
37	Crowborough North & Jarvis Brook	8,274	8,274	4%	8,883	8,883	3%
38	Crowborough South & St Johns	8,457	8,457	6%	8,998	8,998	4%
39	Hailsham Market	7,833	7,833	-1%	9,165	9,165	6%
40	Hailsham New Town	7,894	7,894	-1%	9,162	9,162	6%
41	Hartfield	8,133	8,133	2%	8,567	8,567	-1%
42	Heathfield & Mayfield	8,489	8,489	7%	8,784	8,784	2%
43	Horam & Eastern Villages	8,582	8,582	8%	9,079	9,079	5%
44	Maresfield & Buxted	8,134	8,134	2%	8,546	8,546	-1%
45	Pevensey & Stone Cross	6,953	6,953	-13%	8,349	8,349	-3%
46	Polegate & Watermill	8,486	8,486	7%	8,968	8,968	4%
47	Uckfield North with Isfield	7,996	7,996	1%	8,130	8,130	-6%
48	Uckfield South with Framfield	7,266	7,266	-9%	8,580	8,580	-1%

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

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
49 Wadhurst	1	7,722	7,722	-3%	8,288	8,288	-4%
50 Willingdon & South Downs	1	8,000	8,000	1%	8,289	8,289	-4%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>397,253</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>431,902</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,945</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,638</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by East Sussex County Council.

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



# Appendix B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/east-sussex/east-sussex-county-council>

### Local Authority

- East Sussex County Council

### Parish and Town Councils

- Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council
- Falmer Parish Council
- Fletching Parish Council
- Heathfield Waldron Parish Council
- Herstmonceux Parish Council
- Mayfield & Five Ashes Parish Council
- Polegate Town Council
- Rotherfield Parish Council
- Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council
- Willingdon & Jevington Parish Council

### Local Organisations

- Willingdon Residents' Association

### Councillors

- Cllr Lambert (East Sussex County Council)
- Cllr Simmons (East Sussex County Council)
- Cllr Whetstone (East Sussex County Council)

### Residents

- 12 local residents

# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

