

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Horsham in West Sussex

*February 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 Local Government 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 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	<i>27</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Horsham: Detailed Mapping	<i>29</i>
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	<i>33</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Horsham town is inserted inside the back cover of this report.



# WHAT IS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND?

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations on whether there should be changes to local authorities' electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)  
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)  
Peter Brokenshire  
Kru Desai  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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, ward names and the frequency of elections. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils.

With effect from 1 April 2002, the Electoral Commission will assume the functions of the Local Government Commission for England and take over responsibility for making Orders putting in place the new arrangements resulting from periodic electoral reviews (powers which currently reside with the Secretary of State). As part of this transfer the Electoral Commission will set up a Boundary Committee for England which will take over responsibility for the conduct of PERs from the Local Government Commission. The Boundary Committee will conduct electoral reviews following the same rules and in the same manner as the Local Government Commission for England. Its final recommendations on future electoral arrangements will then be presented to the Electoral Commission which will be able to accept, modify or reject the Boundary Committee's findings. Under these new arrangements there will remain a further opportunity to make representations directly to the Electoral Commission after the publication of the final recommendations. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to send comments to the Electoral Commission.



## SUMMARY

We began a review of Horsham's electoral arrangements on 10 July 2001.

- **This report summarises the submissions we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Horsham:

- **in 14 of the 25 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and eight wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to improve marginally, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 13 wards and by more than 20 per cent in nine wards.**

Our main proposals for Horsham's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 75 and 76) are that:

- **Horsham District Council should have 44 councillors, one more than at present;**
- **there should be 22 wards, instead of 25 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three, and six 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 20 of the proposed 22 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve only marginally with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Henfield and North Horsham.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 26 February 2002. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission which, with effect from 1 April 2002, will be responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also decide when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 22 April 2002:

**Review Manager  
Horsham Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)**

Table 1: Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Billingshurst	3	the parishes of Billingshurst and Shipley	Map 2
2	Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote	2	the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote; the proposed Small Dole parish ward of Henfield parish	Map 2
3	Broadbridge Heath	1	<i>Unchanged</i> ; the parish of Broadbridge Heath	Map 2 and the large map
4	Chanctonbury	3	the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, West Chiltington and Wiston	Map 2
5	Cowfold, Shermanbury & West Grinstead	2	the parishes of Cowfold, Shermanbury and West Grinstead	Map 2
6	Denne	2	part of Denne ward; part of Trafalgar ward	Large map
7	Henfield	2	the proposed Henfield parish ward of Henfield parish	Large map and Map A2
8	Holbrook East	2	the proposed Holbrook East parish ward of North Horsham parish	Large map
9	Holbrook West	2	part of Denne ward; the proposed Holbrook West parish ward of North Horsham parish	Large map
10	Horsham Park	3	part of Denne ward; part of Riverside ward; part of Trafalgar ward	Map 2
11	Itchingfield, Slinfold & Warnham	2	the parishes of Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham	Map 2 and the large map
12	Nuthurst	1	the parishes of Lower Beeding and Nuthurst	Map 2 and the large map
13	Pulborough & Coldwatham	2	<i>Unchanged</i> ; the parishes of Coldwatham and Pulborough	Large map
14	Riverside	1	part of Forest ward; part of Riverside ward	Large map
15	Roffey North	2	<i>Unchanged</i> ; the proposed Roffey North parish ward of North Horsham	Large map
16	Roffey South	2	part of Riverside ward; the proposed Roffey South parish ward of North Horsham parish	Large map
17	Rudgwick	1	<i>Unchanged</i> ; Rudgwick parish	Map 2
18	Rusper	1	the parishes of Colgate and Rusper; the proposed North Horsham parish ward of North Horsham parish	Large map
19	Southwater	3	<i>Unchanged</i> ; the parish of Southwater	Map 2
20	Steyning	2	<i>Unchanged</i> ; the parishes of Ashurst and Steyning	Map 2

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
21	Storrington	3	the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington, Sullington and Washington	Map 2
22	Trafalgar	2	part of Trafalgar ward	Large map

*Notes: 1 Horsham town is the only unparished part of the district.*

*2 The wards on the above table are illustrated on Maps 2, A1, A2 and the large map inserted inside the back cover.*

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Horsham

	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	Billingshurst	3	6,055	2,018	-7	6,552	2,184	-3
2	Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote	2	4,198	2,099	-3	4,199	2,100	-7
3	Broadbridge Heath	1	2,270	2,270	5	2,253	2,253	0
4	Chanctonbury	3	6,798	2,266	5	6,373	2,124	-5
5	Cowfold, Shermanbury & West Grinstead	2	4,075	2,038	-6	4,154	2,077	-8
6	Denne	2	4,162	2,081	-4	4,688	2,344	4
7	Henfield	2	3,981	1,991	-8	4,199	2,100	-7
8	Holbrook East	2	4,253	2,127	-2	4,253	2,127	-5
9	Holbrook West	2	4,187	2,094	-3	4,277	2,139	-5
10	Horsham Park	3	6,395	2,132	-2	6,449	2,150	-4
11	Itchingfield, Slinfold & Warnham	2	3,987	1,994	-8	4,145	2,073	-8
12	Nuthurst	1	2,184	2,184	1	2,307	2,307	3
13	Pulborough & Coldwatham	2	4,433	2,217	2	4,779	2,390	6
14	Riverside	1	2,073	2,073	-4	2,073	2,073	-8
15	Roffey North	2	4,896	2,448	13	4,896	2,448	9
16	Roffey South	2	4,559	2,280	5	4,559	2,280	1
17	Rudgwick	1	2,102	2,102	-3	2,132	2,132	-5
18	Rusper	1	2,026	2,026	-7	2,158	2,158	-4
19	Southwater	3	6,807	2,269	5	7,272	2,424	8
20	Steyning	2	4,890	2,445	13	4,930	2,465	10
21	Storrington	3	6,552	2,184	1	7,382	2,461	10
22	Trafalgar	2	4,527	2,264	4	4,829	2,415	7
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>95,410</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>98,859</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,168</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,247</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Horsham 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our proposals for the electoral arrangements for the district of Horsham in West Sussex, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the seven districts in West Sussex as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. Our programme started in 1996 and is expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Horsham. Horsham's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1978 (Report no. 305). The electoral arrangements of West Sussex County Council were last reviewed in June 1984 (Report no. 473). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of the year.

3 In carrying out these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, i.e. the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* contained in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Full details of the legislation under which we work are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (fourth edition published in December 2000). This *Guidance* sets out our approach to the reviews.

5 Our task is to make recommendations to the Electoral Commission 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 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been created locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local people are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configurations are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while also reflecting the identities and interests of local communities.

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

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the assumption that the size of the existing council already secures effective and convenient local government, but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do 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.

9 The review is in four stages (see Table 3).

*Table 3: Stages of the Review*

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Description</b>
One	Submission of proposals to us
Two	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Electoral Commission

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper called *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one, half of the district council would be elected, in year two, half of the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral wards in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. The proposals were taken forward in the Local Government Act 2000 which, among other matters, states that the Secretary of State may make Orders to change authorities' electoral cycles. However, until such time as the Secretary of State makes any Order under the 2000 Act, we will continue to operate on the basis of existing legislation, which provides for elections by thirds or whole-council elections in two-tier areas, and our current *Guidance*.

11 Stage One began on 10 July 2001, when we wrote to Horsham District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified West Sussex County Council, West Sussex Police Authority, the local authority associations, West Sussex Association of Local Councils, 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. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Horsham District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of submissions (the end of Stage One) was 15 October 2001.

12 At Stage Two we considered all the submissions received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

13 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 26 February 2002 and will end on 22 April 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

14 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to modify them, and submit final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. It will then be for it to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order. The Electoral Commission will decide when any changes come into effect.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 The district of Horsham is situated in the county of West Sussex to the north of Adur and Arun districts and extends to the county boundary with Surrey. The district is predominately rural with the major urban area, Horsham, lying in the north of the district and is linked by both rail and the M23 to London and the South Coast. The district has a certain amount of light engineering and other industry.

16 The district contains 33 civil parishes, but Horsham town itself is unparished. Horsham town comprises 31 per cent of the district's total electorate.

17 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we 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 figure may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

18 The electorate of the district is 95,410 (February 2001). The Council presently has 43 members who are elected from 25 wards, six of which are relatively urban in Horsham town, with the remainder being mainly rural. Four of the wards are each represented by three councillors, 10 are each represented by two councillors and 11 are single-member wards. The Council is elected as a whole every four years.

19 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,219 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 2,299 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 14 of the 25 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, eight wards by more than 20 per cent and seven wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Holbrook ward where the councillor represents 70 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Horsham*

Table 4: 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	Billingshurst	2	5,100	2,550	15	5,590	2,795	-26
2	Bramber & Upper Beeding	2	3,626	1,813	-18	3,608	1,804	-19
3	Broadbridge Heath	1	2,270	2,270	2	2,253	2,253	2
4	Chanctonbury	2	4,666	2,333	5	4,801	2,401	8
5	Cowfold	1	2,237	2,237	1	2,264	2,264	2
6	Denne	3	5,809	1,936	-13	6,335	2,112	-5
7	Forest	3	5,708	1,903	-14	5,708	1,903	-14
8	Henfield	2	4,943	2,472	11	5,208	2,604	17
9	Holbrook	2	7,559	3,780	70	7,649	3,825	72
10	Itchingfield & Shipley	1	2,076	2,076	-6	2,129	2,129	-4
11	Nuthurst	1	1,392	1,392	-37	1,489	1,489	-33
12	Pulborough	2	4,433	2,217	0	4,779	2,390	8
13	Riverside	3	6,620	2,207	-1	6,674	2,225	0
14	Roffey North	2	4,896	2,448	10	4,896	2,448	10
15	Rudgwick	1	2,102	2,102	-5	2,132	2,132	-4
16	Rusper	1	1,886	1,886	-15	2,018	2,018	-9
17	Slinfold	1	1,368	1,368	-38	1,474	1,474	-34
18	Southwater	2	6,807	3,404	53	7,272	3,636	64
19	Steyning	2	4,890	2,445	10	4,930	2,465	11
20	Storrington	2	3,988	1,994	-10	4,281	2,141	-4
21	Sullington	1	1,731	1,731	-22	1,681	1,681	-24

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 %
22 Trafalgar	3	4,600	1,533	-31	4,902	1,634	-26
23 Warnham	1	1,498	1,498	-32	1,504	1,504	-32
24 West Chiltington	1	2,965	2,965	34	2,992	2,992	35
25 West Grinstead	1	2,240	2,240	1	2,290	2,290	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>95,410</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>98,859</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,219</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,299</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Horsham 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 Holbrook ward were relatively under-represented by 70 per cent, while electors in Slinfold ward were relatively over-represented by 38 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

20 At the start of this review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Horsham District Council and its constituent parish councils.

21 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 10 submissions, including one district-wide submission from the District Council during Stage One, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

#### **Horsham District Council**

22 The District Council submitted a district-wide scheme, which incorporated changes in line with some of the comments it received in response to its local consultation exercise. The Council requested that we consider this amended submission as its final response. The District Council proposed a council of 44 members, one more than at present, serving 23 wards, compared to the existing 25 wards.

23 The Council proposed that the district be substantially re-warded with changes to all but one of the existing 25 wards, resulting in a reduction in the number of wards to 23. The District Council argued that its scheme would result in a much-improved level of electoral equality across the district with the number of electors varying from the district average by no more than 10 per cent in all but one of the wards.

#### **West Sussex County Council**

24 The County Council made comments on the District Council's scheme, outlining the effect it would have on present county council electoral divisions in the district.

#### **Horsham Liberal Democrats**

25 The Horsham Liberal Democrats submitted alternative warding arrangements for the Horsham Town area. They proposed a mixed-member pattern of two- and three-member wards and minimal change to the existing ward boundaries in the Horsham town area. They argued that the District Council's proposed electoral arrangements for the Horsham town area would result in the division of communities, as opposed to their own arrangements which "respect most of the existing neighbourhood council boundaries and parish boundaries and creates coherent communities".

#### **Parish Councils**

26 We received responses from three parish councils. Ashurst Parish Council argued that its community links with the parish of Steyning should be respected and that it should be warded at district level with Steyning parish. It stated, "such facilities as School, Health centre, local mini-bus, library, leisure facilities, Community Centre, shopping facilities etc, are used by both communities." Henfield Parish Council objected to the possible parish warding of

Henfield parish and argued that the parish should comprise a district ward. Slinfold Parish Council objected to the District Council's proposal to place the parish in a district ward with the parishes of Itchingfield and Warnham, arguing that the resultant ward would cover too large a geographical area.

## **Other Submissions**

27 We received a further four submissions from Councillor Marsh, Heath Common Residents Association, Southwater Action Group and a local resident. The submissions made by Councillor Marsh, Heath Common Residents Association and a local resident referred to the scheme that the Council put out for local consultation. Councillor Marsh objected to the proposal contained in the consultation scheme to ward the parish of Henfield and argued that the parish of Henfield should be placed in a ward of its own at district level or should be warded with neighbouring parishes in order to reflect community identity. He also proposed four different warding arrangements for the parishes of Henfield and Woodmancote, utilising neighbouring parishes in order to avoid the splitting of the parish of Henfield. Heath Common Residents' Association objected to the warding of Washington parish with Amberley, Parham, Storrington and Sullington parishes in a district ward. It argued that the historic linkages in the area should be respected and that the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, Washington and Wiston should be in the same district. A local resident of Thakeham objected to the District Council's proposal in its consultation document to place the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington, Sullington and Washington in the same ward and to the consequential placing of the parishes of West Chiltington and Thakeham in the same ward at a district level. The local resident argued that the former ward covered too large a geographical area and did not effectively reflect community identity. She also argued that the parish of Washington has more in common with the parish of Thakeham and proposed that Thakeham, Washington and West Chiltington parishes should be placed together in a ward, and that Amberley, Parham, Storrington and Sullington parishes should also form a district ward. Southwater Action Group argued that the increase in electorate in the Southwater area necessitated a rise in the level of representation at district level for the area.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

**28 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Horsham and welcome comments from all those interested relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.**

29 As described earlier, our primary aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Horsham is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

30 In relation to Schedule 11, our 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. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and maintaining local ties.

31 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, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

32 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for an authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We 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 we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

33 Since 1975 there has been a 44 per cent increase in the electorate of Horsham district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of 4 per cent from 95,410 to 98,859 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Southwater 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. Advice from the District Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

34 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having looked at the District Council’s figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

## **Council Size**

35 As explained earlier, we start by assuming that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

36 Horsham Council presently has 43 members. The District Council proposed increasing the present council size by one to 44 members. It argued that the existing levels of electoral inequality could be addressed through a revision of the ward structure of the district rather than a significant change in the existing council size.

37 We considered the District Council's proposal, and having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met under a council size of 44 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

38 After publishing a consultation document, which it submitted to us, the District Council put forward a revised district-wide scheme containing amendments made in the light of its consultation exercise. The Council asked that we regard this amended scheme as its official submission. In the light of its consultation, the Council proposed new arrangements in the south-west, south-east and urban north of the district in order to address concerns raised over the placement of Washington parish and the parish warding of Henfield parish, and the latter's links with surrounding areas in the south-east of the district. In Horsham town the District Council proposed a uniform pattern of eight two-member wards, while Horsham Liberal Democrats proposed a mixed pattern of two- and three-member wards. The District Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed similar warding arrangements in the south-east of Horsham town but their proposed schemes differed in the rest of the town with the Liberal Democrats proposing minimal change, amending only the boundaries between Denne and Trafalgar wards and Forest and those between Roffey North wards.

39 Having considered the representations received, we have adopted some of the final proposals submitted by the Council, some of the proposals contained within its consultation scheme and some proposals of our own. We propose adopting the District Council's consultation proposals in the rural south-east and south-west of the district, as we are of the opinion that the achievement of the best balance between electoral equality and community identity necessitates parish warding, although this also includes creating a ward covering a large geographical area. In the Horsham town area we propose adopting, for the most part, the Council's final submission for the area and, in order better to reflect community identity, we are putting forward proposals of our own in the centre and east of Horsham town. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Chanctonbury, Pulborough & Coldwaltham, Storrington, Sullington and West Chiltington wards;
- (b) Bramber & Upper Beeding, Henfield, Steyning and West Grinstead wards;
- (c) Cowfold, Nuthurst, Rusper, Southwater and Warnham wards;
- (d) Billingshurst, Itchingfield & Shipley, Rudgwick and Slinfold wards;

- (e) Broadbridge Heath, Denne, Forest, Holbrook, Riverside, Roffey North and Trafalgar wards.

40 Details of our draft 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.

### **Chanctonbury, Pulborough & Coldwaltham, Storrington, Sullington and West Chiltington wards**

41 The existing wards of Chanctonbury (a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, Washington and Wiston), Pulborough & Coldwaltham (a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Colwaltham and Pulborough), Storrington (a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Amberley, Parham and Storrington), Sullington (a single-member ward comprising the parish of Sullington) and West Chiltington (a single-member ward comprising West Chiltington parish) cover the south-western area of the district. The wards of Chanctonbury and West Chiltington currently have councillor:elector ratios of 5 per cent and 34 per cent above the district average respectively (8 per cent and 35 per cent above by 2006). The wards of Storrington and Sullington currently have councillor:elector ratios 10 per cent and 22 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent and 24 per cent below by 2006). The ward of Pulborough & Coldwaltham currently has a councillor:elector ratio equal to the district average (8 per cent above by 2006).

42 At Stage One the District Council proposed that this area should comprise four wards. It proposed retaining the existing Chanctonbury, Pulborough & Coldwaltham and Storrington wards and creating a new two-member Sullington & West Chiltington ward comprising the parishes of Sullington and West Chiltington. It argued that these wards would provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting the outcome of local consultations. Under the District Council's proposals its two-member Chanctonbury, two-member Pulborough & Coldwaltham and two-member Sullington & West Chiltington wards would have councillor:elector ratios 8 per cent, 2 per cent and 8 per cent above the district average respectively (7 per cent, 6 per cent and 4 per cent above by 2006). Its two-member Storrington ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 8 per cent below the district average (5 per cent below by 2006).

43 We also received a representation from the Heath Common Residents Association and a local resident of the Thakeham area. The Heath Common Residents Association argued that the parish of Washington should not be placed in a district ward with the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington and Sullington, arguing that the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, Washington and Wiston have been historically linked in the same ward since 1975. It also argued that the rural parish of Washington should not be warded with the mainly urban parishes of Storrington and Sullington, stating "this also has the potential of creating some conflicts in priorities since urban and rural communities have different requests and environments." A local resident of Thakeham also argued against any proposals to place the parish of Washington in a ward with the more urban parishes of Storrington and Sullington and argued that Washington parish should be in a ward with Thakeham and West Chiltington due to the strong community links between them.

44 Having considered the representations received regarding this area we have decided to draw upon the Council's consultation scheme as well as some of our own proposals. We have noted that the District Council has formulated warding arrangements which allow for the parish of Washington to be warded with the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham and Wiston at district level in order to respect the historical and community links between the parishes and as a consequence it has perpetuated the existing anomalous situation whereby the parishes of Storrington and Sullington are split between the two district wards. It has placed Storrington parish in the district ward of Storrington and Sullington in the district ward of West Chiltington & Sullington. Having visited the area, we consider that the parishes of Sullington and Storrington merge into one another and that there is no clear break between them. We are of the opinion that the two parishes should be placed together in the same district ward in order to reflect the strong linkages between them. We have therefore decided to adopt the proposal put forward in the Council's consultation document to place the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington, Sullington and Washington in the same district ward. We are of the opinion that despite the large geographical size of the ward, there are good transport links from one end to the other and that the ward would reflect the close links between Storrington and Sullington.

45 We also propose adopting the Council's proposed Pulborough ward, comprising Coldwaltham and Pulborough parishes. We are of the opinion that this proposed ward places two parishes with good transport links in the same district ward. We also propose amending the Council's Chanctonbury ward in order to create a new three-member ward comprising the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, West Chiltington and Wiston. This would place a number of similarly rural parishes in the same district ward and reflect the prevailing transport links in the area. However, we would welcome views on these proposed warding arrangements in the area at Stage Three.

46 Our proposed three-member Chanctonbury ward (comprising the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, West Chiltington and Wiston) would have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent above the district average (5 per cent below by 2006). Our proposed two-member Pulborough & Coldwaltham ward (comprising the parishes of Coldwaltham and Pulborough) would have a councillor:elector ratio 2 per cent above the district average (6 per cent above by 2006) and our proposed three-member Storrington ward (comprising the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington, Sullington and Washington) would have a councillor:elector ratio 1 per cent above the district average (10 per cent above by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Bramber & Upper Beeding, Henfield, Steyning and West Grinstead wards**

47 The existing wards of Bramber & Upper Beeding (a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Bramber and Upper Beeding), Henfield (a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Henfield, Shermanbury and Woodmancote), Steyning (a two-member ward comprising the parishes of Ashurst and Steyning) and West Grinstead (a single-member ward comprising the parish of West Grinstead) cover the south-eastern area of the district. The wards of West Grinstead, Steyning and Henfield currently have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent, 10 per cent and 11 per cent above the district average respectively (3 per cent, 11 per cent and 17 per cent above by 2006) and the ward of Bramber & Upper Beeding currently has a councillor:elector ratio 18 per cent below the district average (19 per cent below in 2006).

48 At Stage One the District Council proposed that this area should comprise four wards. It proposed a new two-member Bramber & Upper Beeding ward (comprising the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote), a new two-member Cowfold ward (comprising the parishes of Cowfold, Shermanbury and West Grinstead) and a new two-member Henfield ward (comprising the parish of Henfield). It proposed retaining the existing two-member Steyning ward. It argued in its final submission that the proposed wards avoided the necessity to create a parish ward in Henfield parish for the Small Dole area of the parish. Small Dole is a settlement which is currently divided by both a parish administrative boundary and a district ward boundary. Part of it currently lies within Henfield parish and Henfield district ward, while the remainder lies within Upper Beeding parish and Bramber & Upper Beeding district ward. The District Council stated that the creation of a parish ward in Henfield parish to unite the Small Dole area in its entirety in Bramber & Upper Beeding ward, as proposed in its consultation scheme, would result in the isolation of the new parish ward from the rest of Henfield parish and its marginalisation on Henfield Parish Council. The Council put forward the view that the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote should be warded together at district level and that Henfield parish should be kept intact as a district ward in its own right. It went on to state that this particular warding arrangement would go some way towards recognising the prevailing community links in the area. However, it also argued that, in order to reflect community identity in the area, the parish of Henfield should be warded with the neighbouring parishes of Shermanbury and Woodmancote with which it has extensive community and transport links. It further argued that its proposed Steyning ward, comprising the parishes of Ashurst and Steyning, recognised the community ties between the parishes of Ashurst and Steyning. It stated that “the Council accepted that Ashurst has strong connections with Steyning and does not appear to have links with any of the other adjoining parishes.”

49 Under the District Council’s proposals the wards of Henfield, Cowfold, and Bramber & Upper Beeding would have councillor:elector ratios 4 per cent, 6 per cent and 8 per cent below the district average respectively (2 per cent, 8 per cent and 11 per cent below by 2006). Steyning ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 13 per cent above the district average (10 per cent above by 2006).

50 We also received a detailed representation from Councillor Marsh regarding the Henfield area. He objected to the proposal in the Council’s consultation scheme for a new parish ward for the Small Dole area of Henfield parish and put forward four alternative warding arrangements for the area. The first warding arrangement suggested by Councillor Marsh, which had the particular support of Henfield Parish Council, placed the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote together in a two-member district ward and Henfield parish on its own in a two-member ward, as had the District Council. Councillor Marsh stated that there are good community and transport links between the Small Dole and Oreham Common area of Henfield parish and the rest of Henfield parish and argued that, as well as weakening these community links, the creation of a Small Dole parish ward would create confusion in the electorate when parish and district elections occur on the same day. Under this particular warding arrangement, Councillor Marsh’s Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote and Henfield wards would have a councillor: elector ratio 8 per cent and 4 per cent below the district average respectively. (11 per cent and 2 per cent below by 2006). The second alternative warding arrangement put forward by Councillor Marsh had the particular support of Woodmancote Parish Council and involved placing the parishes of Bramber and Upper Beeding and the parishes of Henfield and Woodmancote together in a district ward.

Councillor Marsh argued that there are strong community links between Henfield and Woodmancote parishes and stated that “the residents of the Parish of Woodmancote look to Henfield for all their day-to-day local shopping needs, doctors, dentists, local clubs and pubs, and local recreation.” Under this particular warding arrangement, Councillor Marsh’s Bramber & Upper Beeding ward and his proposed Henfield & Woodmancote ward would have a councillor:elector ratio of 29 per cent and 5 per cent above the district average respectively (20 per cent and 6 per cent above by 2006).

51 The third alternative proposed by Councillor Marsh had the particular support of Shermanbury Parish Council and involved placing Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote parishes in the same district ward, Henfield and Shermanbury parishes in the same district ward and Cowfold & West Grinstead parishes in the same district ward. Councillor Marsh’s Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote and Cowfold & West Grinstead wards would have councillor:elector ratio of 7 per cent and 15 per cent below the district average respectively (11 per cent and 17 per cent below by 2006). His proposed Henfield & Shermanbury ward would have a councillor:elector ratio of 2 per cent above the district average (7 per cent above by 2006) Councillor Marsh also proposed a fourth alternative warding arrangement for the area which involved creating three two-member wards by placing the parishes of Bramber and Upper Beeding, the parishes of Henfield, Shermanbury and Woodmancote, and the parishes of Cowfold and West Grinstead together in a district ward. Councillor Marsh argued that the parishes of Henfield, Shermanbury and Woodmancote have strong community affiliations and should be warded together in a district ward. He also stressed that, despite the high levels of electoral inequality that result from the fourth alternative, it reflects community links in the area. Councillor Marsh’s proposed Bramber & Upper Beeding and Cowfold & West Grinstead wards would have a councillor:elector ratios 16 per cent and 15 per cent below the district average respectively (20 per cent and 17 per cent below by 2006). His proposed Henfield, Shermanbury & Woodmancote ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 14 per cent above the district average (16 per cent above by 2006).

52 We also received a representation from Henfield Parish Council objecting to the District Council’s consultation proposal to ward Henfield parish and create a new Small Dole parish ward. The Parish Council argued that the Small Dole area should not be represented by a different district councillor from the rest of the parish.

53 Having considered the representations received at Stage One we propose to draw largely upon the consultation scheme of the District Council and to adopt one of the wards proposed in its final submission. We have not been persuaded in general by the proposals put forward by the District Council or Councillor Marsh. We are of the opinion that the District Council’s proposals do not provide for effective and convenient local government by creating an almost detached ward containing the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote. In order to travel from the parish of Woodmancote to the other two constituent parishes of the ward it is necessary to leave the district itself. This particular warding arrangement results in a councillor:elector ratio 11 per cent below the district average. Similarly we are of the opinion that the four alternatives provided by Councillor Marsh provide unacceptably high levels of electoral inequality, with a councillor:elector ratio 20 per cent below the district average in his proposed Bramber & Upper Beeding ward. Also, the proposal with the best level of electoral equality put forward by Councillor Marsh resulted in the creation of the

almost detached ward of Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote, which was also proposed by the District Council.

54 Therefore, we have decided to adopt the warding arrangements proposed by the District Council in its consultation scheme and create a new Small Dole parish ward to be placed in a two-member district ward with the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote, while the rest of Henfield parish would form a two-member district ward. We visited the area and we are of the opinion that the creation of a Small Dole parish ward containing the area of Small Dole to the north-west of the A2037 and the Oreham Common area to the south of Horn Lane would serve to unite the hamlet of Small Dole within a single district ward. This would resolve the current anomalous situation whereby the north-western part of Small Dole is in a district ward with the rest of Henfield parish while the rest of Small Dole is included in a district ward with the parishes of Bramber and Upper Beeding. We are also of the opinion that there are good transportation links between the two boundaries of our proposed Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote ward. Therefore we propose creating a two-member Henfield ward and a two-member Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote ward.

55 We have also noted the representations of the District Council and Ashurst Parish Council which both propose placing Ashurst and Steyning parishes in the same district ward. Having visited the area, we have been persuaded by these arguments and propose creating a two-member Steyning ward.

56 Under our draft recommendations our proposed two-member Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote (comprising the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding, Woodmancote and the proposed Small Dole parish ward of Henfield parish) ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent below the average (7 per cent below the average by 2006). Our proposed two-member Cowfold, Shermanbury & West Grinstead ward (comprising the parishes of Cowfold, Shermanbury and West Grinstead) would have a councillor:elector ratio 6 per cent below the district average (8 per cent below by 2006). Our proposed two-member Henfield ward (comprising the proposed Henfield parish ward of Henfield parish) and two-member Steyning ward (comprising the parishes of Ashurst and Steyning) would have councillor:elector ratios 8 per cent below and 13 per cent above the district average respectively (7 per cent below and 10 per cent above by 2006 respectively). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and on Map A2.

### **Cowfold, Nuthurst, Rusper, Southwater and Warnham wards**

57 The existing wards of Cowfold (a single-member ward comprising the parishes of Cowfold and Lower Beeding), Nuthurst (a single-member ward comprising the parish of Nuthurst), Rusper (a single-member ward comprising the parishes of Colgate and Rusper), Southwater (a two-member ward comprising the parish of Southwater) and Warnham (a single-member ward comprising Warnham parish) cover the north-eastern area of the district. The wards of Cowfold and Southwater currently have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent and 53 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent and 64 per cent above by 2006). The wards of Nuthurst, Rusper and Warnham currently have councillor:elector ratios 37 per cent, 15 per cent and 32 per cent below the district average respectively. (33 per cent, 9 per cent and 32 per cent below by 2006 respectively).

58 At Stage One the District Council proposed that this area should contain five wards. It proposed creating a new two-member Cowfold ward comprising the parishes of Cowfold, Shermanbury and West Grinstead; a new single-member Nuthurst ward comprising the parishes of Lower Beeding and Nuthurst; a new Rusper ward comprising the parishes of Colgate and Rusper and the proposed North Horsham parish ward of North Horsham; a three-member Southwater ward comprising the parish of Southwater; and a new two-member Itchingfield, Slinfold & Warnham ward, comprising the parishes of Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham.

59 We also received representations from Slinfold Parish Council and the Southwater Residents Action Group. Slinfold Parish Council objected to the parishes of Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham being placed together in a district ward. It argued that such a ward would cover too large a geographical area and would dilute the effectiveness of the elected member and stated that, “whilst the proposed changes may achieve electoral average figures and equality, the Parish Council did not find the proposed changes to be in the interests of the residents of Slinfold.” Southwater Residents Action Group argued that the increased electorate in the Southwater area justifies an increase in representation at district level, as proposed by the District Council.

60 Having considered the representations received at Stage One we have decided to adopt fully the District Council’s proposals for this area. We are of the opinion that the Council’s proposals serve to link parishes with good transportation links and to provide for better electoral equality than the alternatives suggested in response to the Council’s consultation scheme. We have not been persuaded by the representation received from Slinfold Parish Council as we consider that it failed to provide any evidence in support of its objection to the proposed Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham district ward and provided no alternative warding arrangement for the area.

61 Under our draft recommendations our proposed two-member Itchingfield, Slinfold & Warnham ward (comprising the parishes of Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham) and our proposed single-member Rusper ward (comprising the parishes of Colgate and Rusper and the proposed North Horsham parish ward of North Horsham parish) would have councillor:elector ratios 8 per cent and 7 per cent below the district average (8 per cent and 4 per cent below by 2006). Our proposed single-member Nuthurst ward (comprising the parishes of Lower Beeding and Nuthurst) and three-member Southwater ward (comprising the parish of Southwater) would have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent and 5 per cent above the district average (3 per cent and 8 per cent above by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Billingshurst, Itchingfield & Shipley, Rudgwick and Slinfold wards**

62 The existing wards of Billingshurst (a two-member ward comprising the parish of Billingshurst), Itchingfield & Shipley (a single-member ward comprising the parishes of Itchingfield and Shipley), Rudgwick (a single-member ward comprising the parish of Rudgwick) and Slinfold (a single-member ward comprising the parish of Slinfold) cover the north-west of the district. The wards of Billingshurst and Itchingfield & Shipley currently have councillor:elector ratios 15 per cent above and 6 per cent below the district average (26 per cent above and 4 per cent below by 2006). Rudgwick and Slinfold wards currently have

councillor:elector variances 5 per cent and 38 per cent below the district average (4 per cent and 34 per cent below the district average by 2006).

63 At Stage One the District Council proposed that this area should comprise three wards. It proposed creating a new three-member Billingshurst & Shipley ward comprising the parishes of Billingshurst and Shipley, a new two member Itchingfield, Slinfold & Warnham ward as discussed earlier, and retaining the existing single-member Rudgwick ward.

64 Having considered the representations received at Stage One we have decided to adopt the District Council's proposals for this area. We are of the opinion that its proposed wards link together parishes with good transportation links and provide good levels of electoral equality. Under our draft recommendations our proposed three-member Billingshurst ward (comprising the parishes of Billingshurst and Shipley) would have a councillor:elector ratio 7 per cent below the district average (3 per cent below by 2006). Our proposed two-member Itchingfield, Slinfold & Warnham ward (comprising the parishes of Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham) would have a councillor:elector ratio 8 per cent below the district average (8 per cent below by 2006) and our proposed single-member Rudgwick ward (comprising the parish of Rudgwick) would have a councillor:ratio 3 per cent below the district average (5 per cent below by 2006). Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Broadbridge Heath, Denne, Forest, Holbrook, Riverside, Roffey North and Trafalgar wards**

65 The existing wards of Broadbridge Heath (a single-member ward comprising the parish of Broadbridge Heath), Denne (a three-member ward), Forest (a three-member ward), Holbrook (a two-member ward), Riverside (a three-member ward), Roffey North (a two-member ward) and Trafalgar ward (a three-member ward) cover the urban area of Horsham town and the area just outside it. The wards of Denne, Forest and Riverside and Trafalgar currently have councillor:elector ratios 13 per cent, 14 per cent, 1 per cent and 31 per cent below the district average respectively (5 per cent and 14 per cent below, equal to and 26 per cent below the district average by 2006). Broadbridge Heath, Holbrook and Roffey North wards currently have councillor:elector ratios 2 per cent, 70 per cent and 10 per cent above the district average respectively (2 per cent, 72 per cent and 10 per cent above the district average respectively by 2006).

66 At Stage One the District Council proposed that this area comprise nine wards. It proposed a new two-member Denne ward comprising the existing Denne ward less the area to the north of Albion Way and Park Way; a new two-member Holbrook East ward comprising the area of the existing Holbrook ward to the east of North Heath Lane; a new two-member Holbrook West ward comprising the area of the existing Holbrook ward to the west of North Heath Lane and the area of the existing Trafalgar ward to the south of the railway line and the north of Warnham Road. It proposed a new two-member Horsham Park ward comprising the area of the existing Denne ward to the west of the railway line and the east of North Parade and the area of the existing Riverside ward to the west of Orchard Road, to the south of Depot Road and to the north of Brighton Road and Bennets Road; and a new two-member Riverside ward comprising the area of the existing Riverside ward to the north of Depot Road, to the east of Orchard Road and to the south of Bennets Road and Brighton Road and the area of the existing Forest ward to the south of the North Horsham parish boundary. It proposed retaining the existing two-member Roffey North ward; a new two-member Roffey South ward

comprising the area of the existing Roffey parish ward to the south of Crawley Road; and a new two-member Trafalgar ward comprising the area of the existing Trafalgar ward less the Parkfield area to the east of North Parade. It also proposed retaining the existing ward of Broadbridge Heath comprising the parish of Broadbridge Heath

67 Under the District Council's proposals Denne, Holbrook East, Holbrook West and Riverside wards would have councillor:elector ratios 4 per cent, 2 per cent, 3 per cent and 5 per cent below the district average respectively (4 per cent above and 5 per cent, 5 per cent and 8 per cent below the district average respectively by 2006). Its proposed Horsham Park ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the district average (2 per cent below by 2006) and its proposed Roffey North, Roffey South and Trafalgar wards would have councillor:elector ratios 13 per cent, 5 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (9 per cent, 1 per cent and 7 per cent above by 2006). Its proposed single-member Broadbridge Heath ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 5 per cent above the district average (equal to in 2006).

68 We also received a representation from the Horsham Liberal Democrats proposing an alternative warding arrangement for the Horsham town area. They proposed amending the boundaries between the existing Denne and Trafalgar wards and transferring the area of Denne ward to the east of North Road and Wimblehurst Road to their proposed Trafalgar ward in order to create a new two-member Denne ward and a new three-member Trafalgar ward. They argued that their proposed boundary amendment between Denne and Trafalgar wards would reflect the existing Hurst county electoral division and would better reflect community identity in the Denne and Trafalgar areas. They stated that "the Denne No 3 (NP) polling district, which contains the area around Hurst Road and Ashleigh Road, has much greater affinity with Trafalgar than the rest of Denne ward." The Liberal Democrats also proposed amending the boundary between the existing Forest and Roffey North wards and transferring the area to the east of Crawley Road from the existing Roffey North to their proposed Forest ward in order to create a new two-member Forest ward and a new three-member Roffey North ward. They argued that their proposed amendment of the boundary between Forest and Roffey North create a stronger boundary between the two wards which "follows the 'spine' road running east-west within Roffey". They also proposed retaining the existing three-member Holbrook & Riverside wards, arguing that no changes would be required to the Forest and Riverside Neighbourhood Council boundaries or the Horsham Town and North Horsham parish boundary.

69 The Liberal Democrats' proposed Holbrook and Forest wards would have councillor:elector ratios 16 per cent and 2 per cent above the district average respectively (13 per cent above and 2 per cent below in 2006). Its proposed Denne, Trafalgar, Riverside and Roffey North wards would have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent, 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 5 per cent below the district average respectively. (3 per cent above and 2 per cent, 1 per cent and 9 per cent below by 2006)

70 In the north of the Horsham town area the Liberal Democrats proposed no change to the existing Holbrook ward despite its relatively poor level of electoral equality, arguing that the existing Holbrook ward has strong boundaries and stated that "it is an extremely well defined area, being bounded by two railway lines and the Horsham by-pass." They further argued that such a well-defined area should be maintained at district level and that the District Council's proposals to divide the area using North Heath Lane do not "reflect community links in terms

of e.g. shops and schools”. They then went on to argue that, if it is considered “essential” to bring the level of electoral equality to under 10 per cent in the Holbrook area, then part of the existing Holbrook ward should be be warded with Roffey North or Trafalgar wards. The Liberal Democrats justified this proposal by arguing that such a crossing of strong boundaries would be consistent with the District Council’s proposals for its Denne and Trafalgar wards, where a railway line and major road have also been breached.

71 Having considered the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the District Council’s proposals for the whole of Horsham town, with the exception of its proposed Horsham Town and Riverside wards where we are putting forward our own warding arrangements. We are of the opinion that the District Council’s proposal to amend the boundary between its Denne and Horsham Park wards and its Horsham Park and Trafalgar wards utilises strong boundaries and provides a balance between good electoral equality and community identity. The former avoids splitting the Carfax area of the town centre, and the latter amends the boundary between its proposed Horsham Park and Trafalgar wards in order to ensure that Parkfield is included in a district ward to the east of North Parade by running the boundary along North Parade. We are also of the opinion that the District Council’s proposal to create a ward in the centre of Horsham town, which straddles the railway line, is a sensible one given the road links between the two areas. However, we are of the opinion that the boundary between the proposed Horsham Park and Riverside wards arbitrarily splits the area to the east of Horsham town centre and does not adequately reflect community identity in the area. Consequently, in order to better reflect community identity we propose amending the boundary between the District Council’s proposed Horsham Town and Riverside wards by moving the area to the west of Comptons Lane and North of Depot Road from the Council’s proposed Riverside ward to the proposed Horsham Park ward. This would create a single-member Riverside ward and a three-member Horsham Park ward which, we consider, would better reflect community identity in the area.

72 We have considered the Horsham Liberal Democrats’ warding arrangements for the Horsham town area and noted that they provide good levels of electoral equality in all the proposed wards other than the proposed Holbrook ward, which would have a councillor:elector ratio 13 per cent above the district average by 2006. We have also noted that the scheme makes only two amendments to the existing boundaries within Horsham town and uses strong natural boundaries such as St Leonards and Crawley Roads and the railway line. However, we are of the opinion that their proposed Holbrook ward has an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality and note that their proposals in the centre of the town would create a Trafalgar ward that stretches from the western boundaries of Horsham town to the town centre. We do not believe such a ward would adequately reflect community identity in this area.

73 Under our draft recommendations our proposed two-member Holbrook East ward (comprising the proposed Holbrook East parish ward of North Horsham parish), two-member Holbrook West ward (comprising the proposed Holbrook West parish ward of North Horsham parish), two-member Denne ward and single-member Riverside wards would have councillor:elector ratios 2 per cent, 3 per cent, 4 per cent and 4 per cent below the district average respectively (5 per cent and 5 per cent below, 4 per cent above and 8 per cent below by 2006). Our proposed three-member Horsham Park ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 2 per cent below district average (4 per cent below by 2006) and our proposed single-member Broadbridge Heath ward (comprising the parish of Broadbridge Heath), two-member

Roffey South ward, two-member Roffey North and two-member Trafalgar ward would have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent, 5 per cent, 13 per cent and 4 per cent above the district average respectively (equal to, 1 per cent, 9 per cent and 7 per cent above by 2006) Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map at the back of the report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

74 At Stage One we did not receive any comments relating to the electoral cycle of the district. We therefore make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

## **Conclusions**

75 Having considered all the evidence and submissions received during the first stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be an increase in council size from 43 to 44;
- there should be 22 wards;
- the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three, and six wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

76 As already indicated, we have largely based our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in the following areas:

- we propose that the parishes of Amberley, Parham, Storrington, Sullington and Washington should be combined to form the district ward of Storrington;
- we propose that the parishes of Ashington, Thakeham, West Chiltington and Wiston should be combined to form the district ward of Chanctonbury;
- we propose that the parish of Henfield should be parish warded and the proposed Small Dole parish ward should be combined with the parishes of Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote to form the district ward of Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote;
- the boundary between the proposed Horsham Park and Riverside wards should be amended and Riverside ward should become a single-member ward and Horsham Park should become a three-member ward.

77 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will affect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2001 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2006.

*Table 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements*

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councilors	43	44	43	44
Number of wards	25	22	25	22
Average number of electors per councilor	2,219	2,168	2,299	2,247
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	14	2	13	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	8	0	9	0

78 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Horsham District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 14 to two. By 2006 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

**Draft Recommendation**  
 Horsham District Council should comprise 44 councillors serving 22 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A, and the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

**Parish Council Electoral Arrangements**

79 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible 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 must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Henfield and North Horsham to reflect the proposed district wards.

80 The parish of Henfield is currently served by 15 councillors and is unwarded. In order to facilitate our draft recommendations at a district level we are proposing the creation of new Small Dole and Henfield parish wards. Small Dole parish ward would cover the south-eastern

part of Henfield parish comprising the area to the south of a boundary running westwards along Horn Lane and Henfield Stream and would comprise part of Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote district ward. Henfield parish ward would cover the remainder of the parish and comprise Henfield district ward.

**Draft Recommendation**

Henfield Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Small Dole (returning two councillors) and Henfield (returning 13 councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

81 The parish of North Horsham is currently served by 19 councillors representing three wards: Holbrook (returning eight councillors), Roffey North (returning six councillors) and Roffey South (returning five councillors). At Stage One the District Council proposed creating five new district wards in the area. We have decided to adopt the Council's recommendations at district level in this area and consequently we propose creating new Holbrook East, Holbrook West, North Horsham and Roffey South parish wards and retaining the existing Roffey North parish ward. North Horsham parish ward would cover the area of North Horsham parish to the north of the A264 and would make up part of the Rusper district ward. Holbrook East parish ward would cover the area of Holbrook to the east of North Heath Lane and would form Holbrook East district ward. Holbrook West parish ward would cover the area to the west of North Heath Lane and would form part of Holbrook West district ward. Roffey North and Roffey South parish wards would cover the areas to the north and south of Crawley Road and would form Roffey North and Roffey South district wards respectively.

**Draft Recommendation**

North Horsham Parish Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: North Horsham (returning four councillors), Holbrook East (returning one councillor), Holbrook West (returning three councillors), Roffey North (returning six councillors) and Roffey South (returning five councillors). The boundary between the four parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

82 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

**Draft Recommendation**

Parish council elections should continue to take place every four years, at the same time as elections for the district ward of which they are part.

*Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Horsham*



## 5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

83 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Horsham contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 22 April 2002. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

84 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Horsham Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

Website: [www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

85 In the light of responses received, we will review our draft recommendations to 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 our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Electoral Commission, which cannot make the Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after it receives them.



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for Horsham: Detailed Mapping**

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

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

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed warding of Henfield parish.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Horsham town.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Horsham: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Henfield Parish*



## APPENDIX B

### Code of Practice on Written Consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, [www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm](http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm), requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Non-Departmental Public Bodies, such as the Local Government Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

*Table B1: LGCE compliance with Code criteria*

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Compliance/departure</b>
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods.
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.	We comply with this requirement.
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.	We comply with this requirement.