

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Arun 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?	v
SUMMARY	vii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	5
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	9
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	11
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	29
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Arun: Detailed Mapping	31
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	35

Two large maps illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Aldwick, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Rustington and East Preston are 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 Periodic Electoral Reviews 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 Arun'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 Arun:

- **In 17 of the 27 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **By 2006 this situation is expected to worsen with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 17 wards and by more than 20 per cent in six wards.**

Our main proposals for Arun's future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 90-91) are that:

- **Arun District Council should have 56 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 26 wards, instead of 27 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and two 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 24 of the proposed 26 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 further, with the number of electors per councillor in 25 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 and town council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parishes of Aldwick and Rustington;**
- **revised warding arrangements for the parishes of Bognor Regis, Felpham and Littlehampton;**
- **new warding arrangements for the parish of Yapton.**

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  
Arun Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V7JU**

**Fax: 202 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)  
Website: [lgce.gov.uk](http://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	Aldwick East	2	The proposed Aldwick East parish ward of Aldwick parish,	Large map and Map 2
2	Aldwick West	2	The proposed Aldwick West parish ward of Aldwick parish,	Large map and Map 2
3	Angmering	3	The parishes of Angmering and Poling,	Map 2
4	Arundel	2	The parishes of Arundel, Burpham, Houghton, Lyminster, South Stoke and Warningcamp,	Map 2
5	Barnham	3	The parishes of Aldingbourne, Barnham and Eastergate,	Map 2
6	Beach	2	The proposed Beach parish ward of Littlehampton parish,	Large map and Map 2
7	Bersted	3	<i>Unchanged</i> - the parish of Bersted,	Map 2
8	Brookfield	2	The proposed Brookfield parish ward of Littlehampton parish,	Large map and Map 2
9	Felpham East	2	Part of Yapton parish (the proposed Hoe Lane parish ward) and the proposed Felpham East parish ward of Felpham parish,	Maps 2 and A2
10	Felpham West	2	The proposed Felpham West parish ward of Felpham parish,	Maps 2 and A2
11	Ferring	2	<i>Unchanged</i> - the parish of Ferring,	Map 2
12	Findon	1	The parishes of Findon, Clapham and Patching,	Map 2
13	Ham	2	The proposed Ham parish ward of Littlehampton parish,	Large map and Map 2
14	Hotham	2	The proposed Hotham parish ward of Bognor Regis parish,	Large map and Map 2
15	Marine	2	The proposed Marine parish ward of Bognor Regis parish,	Large map and Map 2
16	Middleton-on-Sea	2	The parish of Middleton-on-Sea,	Map 2
17	Orchard	2	The proposed Orchard parish ward of Bognor Regis parish,	Large map and Map 2
18	Pagham & Rose Green	3	Part of Aldwick parish (the proposed Pagham & Rose Green parish ward) and Pagham parish,	Large map and Map 2
19	Pevensey	2	The proposed Pevensey parish ward of Bognor Regis parish,	Large map and Map 2
20	River	2	The proposed River parish ward of Littlehampton parish,	Large map and Map 2
21	Rustington East	2	The proposed Rustington East parish ward of Rustington parish,	Large map and Map 2
22	Rustington West	3	The proposed Rustington West parish ward of Rustington parish,	Large map and Map 2
23	Preston with Kingston	3	Part of Rustington parish (the proposed West Preston parish ward); the parishes of East Preston and Kingston,	Large Map and Map 2

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
24	Walberton	1	The parishes of Walberton, Slindon and Madehurst,	Map 2
25	Wick with Toddington	2	The proposed Wick with Toddington parish ward of Littlehampton parish,	Large map and Map 2
26	Yapton	2	The proposed Yapton Village parish ward of Yapton parish; the parishes of Climping and Ford,	Maps 2 and A2

*Notes: 1 The whole district is parished*

*2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and Maps A1 and A2 in Appendix A, and on the large map in the back of the report.*

Table 2: Draft Recommendations for Arun

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2001)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2006)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Aldwick East	2	4,201	2,101	7	4,184	2,092	3
2	Aldwick West	2	4,254	2,127	9	4,226	2,113	4
3	Angmering	3	4,694	1,565	-20	5,702	1,901	-6
4	Arundel	2	3,535	1,768	-10	3,570	1,785	-12
5	Barnham	3	6,274	2,091	7	6,362	2,121	5
6	Beach	2	3,600	1,800	-8	3,725	1,863	-8
7	Bersted	3	6,021	2,007	2	6,448	2,149	6
8	Brookfield	2	3,900	1,950	0	4,004	2,002	-1
9	Felpham East	2	4,072	2,036	4	4,258	2,129	5
10	Felpham West	2	3,943	1,972	1	4,243	2,122	5
11	Ferring	2	3,848	1,924	-2	3,786	1,893	-6
12	Findon	1	1,990	1,990	2	1,982	1,982	-2
13	Ham	2	3,600	1,800	-8	3,922	1,961	-3
14	Hotham	2	3,777	1,889	-4	3,957	1,979	-2
15	Marine	2	3,892	1,946	-1	4,070	2,035	1
16	Middleton-on-Sea	2	4,161	2,081	6	4,199	2,100	4
17	Orchard	2	4,044	2,022	3	4,138	2,069	2
18	Pagham & Rose Green	3	5,852	1,951	0	6,025	2,008	-1
19	Pevensy	2	3,933	1,967	0	4,099	2,050	1
20	River	2	3,727	1,864	-5	3,918	1,959	-3
21	Rustington East	2	4,185	2,093	7	4,155	2,078	3
22	Rustington West	3	6,363	2,121	8	6,318	2,106	4
23	Preston with Kingston	3	5,891	1,964	0	5,856	1,952	-3
24	Walberton	1	2,203	2,203	12	2,202	2,202	9
25	Wick with Toddington	2	3,890	1,945	-1	4,032	2,016	0

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 %
26 Yapton	2	3,856	1,928	-2	3,852	1,926	-5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>109,706</b>	–	–	<b>113,233</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,959</b>	–	–	<b>2,022</b>	–

*Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Arun 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 Arun 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 Arun. Arun's last review was carried out by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in 1980 (Report no. 369). The electoral arrangements of West Sussex County Council were last reviewed in 1984 (Report no. 473). We expect to begin reviewing 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 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 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, or 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*

Stage	Description
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 Arun 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 Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South East Region and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Arun 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. The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order and decide when any changes come into effect.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

15 With a population of 144,630, Arun district covers an area of approximately 22,092 hectares and lies in the south of West Sussex, bordering Chichester district to the west and north, Worthing to the east and Horsham to the north-east, with the English Channel forming the southern boundary. The name of the district is taken from the River Arun, which runs through the heart of the district. Arun is fairly rural, with a coastal strip of more urban settlements, including Bognor Regis and Littlehampton. The historic town of Arundel lies further inland to the north of these. The urban coastal strip around Bognor Regis and Littlehampton accounts for 66 per cent of the total electorate. In the rural areas there are a host of villages, large and small. The district is parished in its entirety, containing 31 parishes.

16 Arun district has an electorate of 109,706, which is forecast to increase over the next five years to 113,233. The Council presently has 56 members who are elected from 27 wards, of which nine are mainly rural, with the remainder forming the more urban coastal area.

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 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,959 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 2,022 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 17 of the 27 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, in five wards by more than 20 per cent and in one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Aldingbourne ward where the councillor represents 40 per cent more electors than the district average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Arun*

Table 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2001)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2006)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Aldingbourne	1	2,750	2,750	40	2,841	2,841	41
2	Aldwick East	2	4,474	2,237	14	4,456	2,228	10
3	Aldwick West	3	4,977	1,659	-15	4,957	1,652	-18
4	Angmering	3	5,160	1,720	-12	6,171	2,057	2
5	Arundel	2	3,461	1,731	-12	3,499	1,750	-13
6	Barnham	3	6,985	2,328	19	6,990	2,330	15
7	Bersted	3	6,021	2,007	2	6,448	2,149	6
8	East Preston & Kingston	3	5,400	1,800	-8	5,389	1,796	-11
9	Felpham East	2	4,304	2,152	10	4,204	2,102	4
10	Felpham West	2	3,621	1,811	-8	4,200	2,100	4
11	Ferring	2	3,848	1,924	-2	3,786	1,893	-6
12	Findon	1	1,524	1,524	-22	1,513	1,513	-25
13	Hotham	2	4,427	2,214	13	4,601	2,301	14
14	Littlehampton Beach	2	4,282	2,141	9	4,483	2,242	11
15	Littlehampton Central	2	4,982	2,491	27	5,210	2,605	29
16	Littlehampton Ham	2	2,796	1,398	-29	2,930	1,465	-28
17	Littlehampton River	1	2,423	2,423	24	2,540	2,540	26
18	Littlehampton Wick	2	4,236	2,118	8	4,436	2,218	10
19	Marine	2	4,357	2,179	11	4,529	2,265	12
20	Middleton-on-Sea	2	4,646	2,323	19	4,679	2,340	16
21	Orchard	2	3,142	1,571	-20	3,267	1,634	-19
22	Pagham	3	4,856	1,619	-17	5,022	1,674	-17
23	Pevensey	2	3,720	1,860	-5	3,867	1,934	-4
24	Rustington East	2	4,180	2,090	7	4,142	2,071	2
25	Rustington North	2	3,667	1,834	-6	3,634	1,817	-10
26	Rustington South	2	3,192	1,596	-19	3,164	1,582	-22

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 %
26 Rustington South	2	3,192	1,596	-19	3,164	1,582	-22
27 Walberton	1	2,275	2,275	16	2,275	2,275	13
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>109,706</b>	–	–	<b>113,233</b>	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>1,959</b>	–	–	<b>2,022</b>	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Arun 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 Littlehampton Ham ward were relatively over-represented by 29 per cent, while electors in Aldingbourne ward were relatively under-represented by 40 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

19 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 Arun District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE 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 eight submissions during Stage One, including a district-wide scheme from the District Council, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

#### **Arun District Council**

21 The District Council proposed retaining the existing council size of 56 members and had consulted on its proposals before submitting them to the Commission. The District Council submitted two options, 'Option 1' and 'Option 2', for the area covering the parishes of Rustington, East Preston and Kingston due to the lack of agreement between the parishes involved. Under both options the proposals for the remainder of the district were identical. Under the Council's proposals, two wards would retain their existing boundaries. There would be consequential parish warding in the parishes of Aldwick, Bognor Regis, Felpham, Littlehampton, Rustington and Yapton, and, under 'Option 1', in the parish of East Preston. All but two wards would have variances of less than 10 per cent from the district average, with one ward varying by more than 20 per cent. By 2006 this level of electoral equality was projected to improve, with only one ward, Arundel, expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average.

#### **Parish and Town Councils**

22 We received responses from three parish and town councils. Littlehampton Town Council supported the District Council's proposal to increase Littlehampton River ward's representation from one to two members and also supported the District Council's proposed Beach, Ham and River wards. However, it objected to the District Council's proposed Brookfield and Wick with Toddington wards, providing alternative arrangements in this area. It proposed that its revised Littlehampton Central ward be renamed North Beaumont ward.

23 East Preston Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposals for East Preston parish under 'Option 1', stating that this option failed "to reflect the identity and interests of the community of East Preston". It supported the District Council's 'Option 2' proposals, arguing that they "would maintain East Preston and Kingston as a complete entity". However, East Preston Parish Council also submitted an alternative proposal, proposing to retain the parishes of East Preston and Kingston in a single three-member ward, but moving the northern boundary to include an area from Angmering parish which lies between the railway line and the A259. Its proposals also involved joining the parishes of Angmering, Clapham, Findon, Patching and Poling in a four-member ward. It also proposed dividing the parish of Rustington into two wards: Rustington East and West wards.

24 Yapton Parish Council opposed the Council's proposal for the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish. It supported the District Council's main proposals for Yapton parish. However, it

commented that “members were unanimous in their opposition to the suggestion that the Hoe Lane area of Yapton be included within the proposed new Felpham East ward”. It provided argumentation for retaining the area of Hoe Lane in the District Council’s proposed Yapton ward on the grounds of electoral equality.

## **Other Submissions**

25 We received a further four submissions, from the County Council, local political parties and a local resident. West Sussex County Council stated that in relation to Arun district and the future review of county divisions “it is difficult to see how it will be able to achieve coterminosity with a pattern of district wards based on a building block of 2,000 and with the majority of wards with a population of 4,000, without prejudicing electoral equality”.

26 Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party proposed a number of alternative boundaries to the District Council’s proposals. It proposed alternative boundaries for the wards in the town of Bognor Regis, stating that they “better define the areas of community interest”. In Littlehampton it expressed support for Littlehampton Town Council’s proposals. It also opposed the District Council’s proposals for the area of Felpham, proposing an alternative boundary that divided the area into north and south wards rather than east and west wards. Under this proposal it would also retain the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish in a ward with the remainder of Yapton parish. It expressed support for the District Council’s proposed Aldwick West and Pagham & Rose Green wards. It broadly supported the Council’s proposed Bersted ward, subject to an amendment which would include the area of Shripney, currently in the existing Bersted ward, in a revised two-member Aldingbourne ward. The scheme provided for good levels of electoral equality, with only one ward forecast to be 10 per cent above the district average (2006 figures were not provided).

27 Arun Liberal Democrat Group supported the majority of the District Council’s proposals but objected to the proposals for the Rustington and East Preston area. It expressed support for the District Council’s proposed Rustington North and South wards under ‘Option 1’ but objected to the proposals for the remainder of the area. It proposed dividing the area by an east/west boundary as opposed to the north/south boundary that currently exists. The boundary would divide East Preston parish between two new wards, although providing for good levels of electoral equality.

28 A local resident (who is a parish councillor for Felpham) expressed support for the District Council’s proposal for the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish to be included in the proposed Felpham East ward.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

30 As described earlier, our primary aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Arun 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”.

31 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.

32 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.

33 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**

34 Since 1975 there has been a 25 per cent increase in the electorate of Arun district. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3 per cent from 109,706 to 113,233 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Angmering ward, although a significant amount is also expected in Felpham West and Bersted wards. However, a number of wards, particularly in the Rustington, East Preston and Kingston areas, would see a slight decline in electorate. 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.

35 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**

36 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.

37 Arun District Council presently has 56 members. The District Council proposed retaining the existing council size, as it considered that the existing number of councillors provides for effective and convenient local government. The Council stated, “It was felt that convenient and effective local government was already delivered and there would be no advantage in varying the current arrangements.”

38 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 by a council of 56 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

39 We have carefully considered all the representations received. We have noted the County Council’s comments relating to its forthcoming review. However, the purpose of this review is to secure the best electoral arrangements for Arun at the current time, having regard to the five-year forecast electorate, rather than to facilitate the formulation of the future electoral arrangements of West Sussex County Council.

40 In view of the support given to large elements of the Council’s proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have based our recommendations on the District Council’s scheme and its proposed ‘Option 2’ in the Rustington/East Preston area. We consider that this scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. However, bearing in mind local community identities and interests, we are moving away from the District Council’s proposals in two areas in order to secure more identifiable boundaries. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Angmering, Ferring and Findon wards
- (b) East Preston & Kingston, Rustington East, Rustington North and Rustington South wards,
- (c) Littlehampton (five wards),
- (d) Arundel and Walberton wards,
- (e) Aldingbourne, Barnham and Bersted wards,
- (f) Felpham East, Felpham West and Middleton-on-Sea wards,
- (g) Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy wards,
- (f) Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham wards,

41 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.

## **Angmering, Ferring and Findon wards**

42 The three wards of Angmering, Ferring and Findon are situated in the east of the district, adjacent to Horsham and Worthing districts. The three-member Angmering ward comprises the parishes of Angmering, Clapham, Patching and Poling. Ferring ward is currently represented by two councillors and is coterminous with the parish of Ferring. The single-member Findon ward is coterminous with the parish of Findon. Findon ward is relatively over-represented at present, with 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (25 per cent fewer by 2006). Angmering and Ferring wards have 12 per cent fewer and 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (2 per cent more and 6 per cent fewer respectively by 2006). Findon ward is relatively over-represented at present, with 22 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (25 per cent fewer by 2006).

43 At Stage One, the District Council proposed transferring Clapham and Patching parishes from the current Angmering ward to a revised single-member Findon ward. It proposed that the remaining part of Angmering ward, the parishes of Angmering and Poling, be included in a revised three-member Angmering ward, arguing that “Angmering and Poling parishes are linked by the main A27 trunk road and have been joined electorally for many years”. The Council proposed retaining the existing two-member Ferring ward. Under the District Council’s proposals Angmering ward would have 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average initially, improving to 6 per cent fewer than the average by 2006. Ferring and Findon wards would have 2 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent fewer and 2 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2006).

44 Having considered the District Council’s proposals, we are content to put them forward as part of our draft recommendations, without amendment. We consider the District Council’s proposals provide acceptable levels of electoral equality and would continue to reflect local community identities well. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the District Council’s proposals. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

## **East Preston & Kingston, Rustington East, Rustington North and Rustington South wards**

45 East Preston & Kingston, Rustington East, Rustington North and Rustington South wards are situated in the urban area to the east of Littlehampton, in the south-east of the district. At present, East Preston & Kingston ward is represented by three councillors and comprises the parishes of East Preston and Kingston. The three wards of Rustington East, Rustington North and Rustington South are each currently represented by two councillors, and are coterminous with Rustington East, Rustington North and Rustington South parish wards of Rustington parish respectively. At present, East Preston & Kingston ward has 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (11 per cent fewer by 2006). Rustington North and Rustington South wards have 6 per cent and 19 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average (10 per cent and 22 per cent fewer respectively by 2006), while Rustington East ward has 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the average (3 per cent more by 2006).

46 At Stage One, the District Council submitted two options for the parishes of Rustington, East Preston and Kingston due to the lack of agreement between the parishes involved during its local consultation. Under ‘Option 1’ the District Council proposed retaining the existing number of wards overall. It proposed that the area to the west of Sea Lane, The Street, Clarence Drive and Warren Crescent, at present in East Preston & Kingston ward, be included in a new two member West Preston ward. This area would be combined with the properties to the east of Sea Avenue, to the north of Bushby Avenue, to the east of Broadway Lane and Ash Lane, to the south of Station Road and to the east of Lawrence Avenue, from Rustington East ward, to form the proposed West Preston ward. The remainder of the existing East Preston & Kingston ward would form the proposed two-member East Preston with Kingston ward. The Council broadly proposed retaining the existing Rustington North and Rustington South wards, subject to a number of boundary amendments. The area to the north of Station Road, to the west of Sea Lane and around Fircroft Crescent, currently in Rustington East ward, would be combined with the existing Rustington North ward to form a revised two-member Rustington North ward. The properties to the west of Sea Avenue and to the south of Bushby Avenue, currently in Rustington East ward, would be combined with the current Rustington South ward to form a revised two-member Rustington South ward.

47 Under the District Council’s ‘Option 1’, its proposed Rustington North and Rustington South wards would have initially 7 per cent and 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (3 per cent and 2 per cent more by 2006). The proposed West Preston and East Preston with Kingston wards would have equal to the average and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4 per cent less and 3 per cent more by 2006).

48 Under the District Council’s ‘Option 2’, there would be a reduction in the total number of district wards from 27 to 26 as a consequence of the area of Rustington, Preston and Kingston would be represented by three wards instead of the existing four. It proposed that the existing East Preston & Kingston ward be combined with part of the existing Rustington East ward, the area to the east of Pidgeon House Lane, to the north of Station Road, to the east of Guildford Road and around Hurst Road, to form a new three-member Preston with Kingston ward. The District Council also proposed combining the remainder of Rustington East ward with those properties to the east of Woodlands Avenue and to the south of Albert Road, currently in Rustington North ward, to form a revised Rustington East ward. The existing Rustington South ward and the remainder of Rustington North ward would be combined to form a new three-member Rustington West ward.

49 Under the District Council’s ‘Option 2’ it proposed Rustington East and Rustington West wards would have 7 per cent and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (3 per cent and 4 per cent more respectively by 2006). Preston with Kingston ward would have equal to the district average number of electors per councillor initially (3 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

50 We received two further representations in relation to this area. Arun Liberal Democrat Group expressed support for the District Council’s proposed Rustington North and South wards under ‘Option 1’ but objected to the proposals for the remainder of the area. It proposed dividing the area by an east/west boundary as opposed to the north/south boundary that currently exists, arguing that the former boundary would “improve the efficiency of democratic representation” and “divide the area into two wards, each of mostly similar

development". It proposed a two-member Station ward comprising the area to the north of Meadow Park, to the west of Vermont Way and to the north of Michael Grove/Mrtyle Grove from east Preston & Kingston ward, and the area to the north of Station Road and around Preston Paddock and to the east of Fircroft Crescent, from Rustington East ward. It further proposed a two-member Coast ward comprising the remainder of East Preston & Kingston ward, the area to the east of Sea Avenue, to the north of Bushby Avenue, to the east of Ash Lane and to the South of Station Road from Rustington East ward. The proposed Coast and Station wards would both have five per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (1 per cent more by 2006).

51 East Preston Parish Council opposed the District Council's proposals for East Preston parish under 'Option 1', stating that they failed "to reflect the identity and interests of the community of East Preston". It supported the District Council's 'Option 2' proposals, arguing that it "would maintain East Preston and Kingston as a complete entity". However, East Preston Parish Council also submitted an alternative to the District Council's submission, stating that this also had the support of Kingston Parish Council. It proposed retaining the parishes of East Preston and Kingston in a single three-member ward, but proposed moving the northern boundary to include the area from Angmering parish that lies to the south of the A259 (Roundstone Bypass Road), consequently creating a parish ward. Its proposals also involved joining the remainder of Angmering parish with the parishes of Clapham, Findon, Patching and Poling in a four-member ward. The proposed East Preston with Kingston and Angmering & Findon wards would have 5 per cent more and 25 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2 per cent more and 15 per cent fewer by 2006). It argued that the over-representation in its four-member ward would "compensate District Councillors for greater travelling distances in this rural area". It also proposed dividing the parish of Rustington into two wards: Rustington East and West wards. As a result, Rustington East and West wards would have 19 per cent more and 8 per cent more electors than the district average respectively (14 per cent more and 4 per cent more by 2006).

52 Having carefully considered the representations received in relation to this area, we have decided to adopt the 'Option 2' proposals. The District Council's 'Option 2' provides for very good levels of electoral equality and would retain the parishes of East Preston and Kingston in a single ward, would not necessitate the consequential warding of East Preston parish. While we acknowledge the views expressed by East Preston Parish Council and Arun Liberal Democrats, we consider that the District Council's 'Option 2' provides for a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the alternative options put forward for the area.

53 East Preston Parish Council's alternative proposals would result in the consequential warding of Angmering parish and a four-member ward in the north-east of the District. However, as we state in our *Guidance*, "we are of the view that the number of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, as numbers in excess of three could result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate". Furthermore, its proposals provided insufficient justification for the ward's high level of electoral inequality. The Liberal Democrat's submission would also result in the consequential warding of East Preston parish, which would not be supported by the parish itself. In addition, the District Council's 'Option 2' proposal was supported by East Preston Parish Council as an alternative to its own proposal. Under our draft recommendations, Rustington East and Rustington West wards would have 7 per cent and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the district

average initially, improving to 3 per cent and 4 per cent more than the average respectively by 2006. Preston with Kingston ward would initially have equal the district average number of electors per councillor (3 per cent fewer than the average respectively by 2006). Our draft recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Littlehampton (five wards)**

54 The five wards of Littlehampton Beach, Littlehampton Central, Littlehampton Ham, Littlehampton River and Littlehampton Wick are situated in the south of the district and cover the town of Littlehampton. Beach, Central, Ham and Wick wards are each represented by two councillors, and are coterminous with Beach, Central, Ham and Wick parish wards of Littlehampton parish. River ward is currently a single-member ward. Beach, Central, River and Wick wards are relatively under-represented at present, with 9 per cent, 27 per cent, 24 per cent and 8 per cent more electors per councillor than the average respectively (11 per cent, 29 per cent, 26 per cent and 10 per cent more electors than the average respectively by 2006). Under the existing electoral arrangements Ham ward is over-represented, with 29 per cent fewer electors than the average (28 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

55 At Stage One, the District Council broadly proposed retaining the five existing wards in Littlehampton, subject to boundary amendments and an increase of one councillor in Littlehampton River ward. It proposed that the new development in Toddington, to the north of the A259, should be included in a new Wick with Toddington ward, stating that “this would enable new development planned for the Toddington area and the existing area known as Toddington to remain in a single ward”. The new two-member Wick with Toddington ward would comprise the majority of the existing Wick ward, less the area to the south of the A259 and to the west of Wick Street, together with the area to the north of the A259 from the existing Central ward. The Council further proposed that the area to the west of Wick Street and south of the A259 be included in the revised two-member Ham ward. The Council argued that “this boundary change would link areas already joined which have established community links”. The Council proposed that the area to the north of South Terrace, to the west of St Augustine Road, St Winifrides Road and St Floras Road and south of East Street from the current Beach ward should be included in the revised River ward, together with the area to the west of Horsham Grove West and south of Grove Crescent from the current Central ward. The remainder of the existing Littlehampton Beach ward would be combined with properties to the north of Parkside Avenue, east of The Winter Knoll and south of Southfield Road (currently in Littlehampton Central ward) to form a new Beach ward. Finally, it proposed that the revised Littlehampton Beach, Littlehampton Central, Littlehampton Ham, Littlehampton River and Littlehampton Wick wards be renamed simply Beach, Brookfield, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington to better reflect community identities and the constituent parts of the proposed wards.

56 Under the District Council’s proposals, the proposed Beach, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington wards would have 6 per cent, 8 per cent, 7 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent, 3 per cent, 5 per cent fewer and equal to the average respectively by 2006). The proposed Brookfield ward would have equal the average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent fewer than the average by 2006).

57 We received two further representations in relation to this area. Littlehampton Town Council supported the District Council's proposed Beach, Ham and River wards. However, it objected to the District Council's proposed Brookfield and Wick with Toddington wards. It proposed an alternative boundary between the two wards which would include the properties in Elm Grove Road, Grove Crescent, Hill Road, Townsend Crescent, Thorncroft Road and the properties on Horsham Road West (from Elm Grove up to Oakcroft Gardens), currently in Littlehampton Central ward, in its proposed Wick ward. The Town Council's proposed boundary would then follow the east boundary of the playing field to the A259 before following the east of Toddington Lane through Westholme Nurseries. Littlehampton Town Council put forward the alternative name of North Beaumont for the revised Littlehampton Central ward.

58 Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party expressed support for Littlehampton Town Council's proposals, stating that "the proposals made by Littlehampton Town Council, which we believe to be rational, achieve equality in the numbers of the electorate and adequately reflect the areas of community interest within Littlehampton".

59 Having carefully considered the representations received in relation to this area, we have decided to adopt the District Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations, with one minor amendment. While we noted the concerns of Littlehampton Town Council and Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party regarding the boundary between the District Council's proposed Wick with Toddington and Brookfield wards, we have not been persuaded that their alternative proposals offer more clearly identifiable and convenient boundaries nor a better reflection of community identity and interests. In the north of Littlehampton, the proposed boundary between the Town Council's proposed Wick and North Beaumont wards would not follow ground detail and would divide the community of Toddington and the future housing development in the area. We have decided to adopt the District Council's proposals as they would result in the existing and the proposed new development of Toddington being in the same ward and provide for a better boundary and reflection of community identity. We propose renaming Littlehampton Central ward as Brookfield ward, renaming Littlehampton Wick as Wick with Toddington ward and removing the 'Littlehampton' prefix from the district ward names, as proposed by the District Council.

60 However, we propose one minor amendment to the boundary between the proposed Beach and River wards, which would include Beach Crescent in River ward in order to secure a more identifiable boundary.

61 Under our draft recommendations, Beach, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington wards would have 8 per cent, 8 per cent, 5 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8 per cent, 3 per cent, 3 per cent fewer and equal to the average respectively by 2006). Brookfield ward would be equal to the average and have 1 per cent fewer electors than the average by 2006. Our draft recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

## **Arundel and Walberton wards**

62 The largely rural wards of Arundel and Walberton are situated in the north and west of the district. The single-member Walberton ward comprises the parishes of Houghton, Madehurst,

Slindon and Walberton. Arundel ward is currently a two-member ward and comprises the parishes of Arundel, Burpham, Lyminster, South Stoke and Warningcamp. At present, Arundel and Walberton wards have 12 per cent fewer and 16 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (13 per cent fewer and 13 per cent more respectively by 2006).

63 At Stage One, the District Council proposed enlarging the existing Arundel ward to include Houghton parish, from the existing Walberton ward, to form a revised two-member Arundel ward. The Council also proposed retaining the remaining parts of Walberton ward, the parishes of Madehurst, Slindon and Walberton, in a revised single-member Walberton ward. Under the Council's proposals, the proposed Arundel ward would have 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, increasing to 12 per cent fewer than the average by 2006. The proposed Walberton ward would have 12 per cent more electors per councillor than the average (9 per cent more than the average by 2006). It provided justification for the electoral inequality in the proposed Arundel ward, stating that "due to the extreme rural nature of the new ward a special case needs to be made to accept this variation". It also argued that "to include other additional parishes would have disturbed the existing equilibrium, created an unworkably large ward and resulted in knock on extreme variations in neighbouring wards".

64 Having considered the District Council's proposals, we are of the view that they provide for a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and have decided to adopt them as part of our draft recommendations. In adopting the District Council's proposed Arundel ward we have taken into consideration the rural nature of the area and we have been unable to determine any viable alternatives which would not have a negative effect on electoral equality, or require the consequential warding of parishes. We also consider that, in an entirely parished district such as Arun, the configuration and location of parishes is restrictive. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the District Council's proposals. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

### **Aldingbourne, Barnham and Bersted wards**

65 The wards of Aldingbourne, Barnham and Bersted are situated in the west of the district and to the north and north-east of Bognor Regis. Aldingbourne ward is currently a single-member ward and is coterminous with the parish of Aldingbourne. Barnham ward is currently represented by three councillors and comprises the parishes of Barnham, Ford, Eastergate and Yapton. The three-member ward of Bersted is coterminous with the parish of Bersted. Aldingbourne ward is currently the most under-represented ward in the district, with 40 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (41 per cent more than the average by 2006). Barnham and Bersted wards have 19 per cent more and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (15 per cent more and 6 per cent more respectively by 2006).

66 At Stage One, the District Council proposed combining the existing single-member Aldingbourne ward with the parishes of Barnham and Eastergate, currently in Barnham ward, to form a new three-member Barnham ward. The Council also proposed combining the remaining part of the current Barnham ward, the parishes of Ford and Yapton, with the parish of Clymping (currently in Middleton-on-Sea ward) to form a new two-member Yapton ward, arguing that "the three parishes have a closely linked community and are all adjacent to a

connecting road running from Clymping, through the other parishes to Arundel”. However, it also proposed warding Yapton parish, including the area around Hoe Lane in the proposed Felpham East ward. The Council proposed retaining the existing three-member Bersted ward. Under the District Council’s proposals the revised Barnham ward would have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent more by 2006). The proposed Yapton ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent fewer by 2006). Bersted ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (6 per cent more by 2006).

67 Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party expressed broad support for the District Council’s proposed Bersted ward, subject to an amendment, which would include the area of Shripney, currently in the existing Bersted ward, in the revised Aldingbourne ward.

68 Yapton Parish Council opposed the Council’s proposal for the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish to be included in Felpham East ward. It stated that “members were unanimous in their opposition to the suggestion that the Hoe Lane area of Yapton be included within the proposed new Felpham East ward”. It provided argumentation for retaining the area of Hoe lane in the District Council’s proposed Yapton ward, contending that “the proposals...to create a separate ward for parish elections for such a small number of people seems to be creating a complicated and restrictive structure for parish elections in Yapton”.

69 A local resident (who is a parish councillor for Felpham) expressed support for the District Council’s proposals for the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish. He argued that that Hoe Lane area “is accessible from within Felpham...but is nowhere near Yapton”.

70 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, we have decided to adopt the District Council’s proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. While we note the concerns of Yapton Parish Council and Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party, we consider that a better reflection of local communities would be secured if the area of Hoe Lane were included in the proposed Felpham East ward. Officers from the Commission, having visited the area, are aware that the small community of Hoe Lane is physically detached from the larger settlement of Yapton and is geographically linked to Felpham. Moreover, for residents of Hoe Lane to gain access to Yapton they would first have to travel through the proposed Middleton-on-Sea ward and the parish of that name. We therefore consider that the District Council’s proposals provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the alternative options put forward. Furthermore, we have noted that during the Council’s own consultation on whether this area should be included in Felpham East ward, the majority of local residents agreed with this proposal.

71 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the District Council’s proposals. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

### **Felpham East, Felpham West and Middleton-on-Sea wards**

72 The three wards of Felpham East, Felpham West and Middleton-on-Sea are situated in the south of the district to the east of Bognor Regis. Felpham East and Felpham West wards are

coterminous with Felpham East and Felpham West parish wards of Felpham parish and are both represented by two-members. Middleton-on-Sea ward comprises the parishes of Middleton-on-Sea and Clymping and is represented by two members. Felpham East, Felpham West and Middleton-on-Sea have 10 per cent more, 8 per cent fewer and 19 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4 per cent, 4 per cent and 16 per cent more by 2006).

73 At Stage One, the District Council proposed amending the boundary between the existing Felpham East and Felpham West wards to improve electoral equality. It proposed that the area to the west of New Barn Lane around Westmorland Drive, currently in Felpham East ward, be included in the proposed Felpham West ward. It also proposed including the area of Hoe Lane from Yapton parish, currently in Barnham ward, in the proposed Felpham East ward, as detailed earlier. Under the District Council's proposals the revised Felpham East and Felpham West wards would have 4 per cent and 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (5 per cent more by 2006 for both wards). The proposed Middleton-on-Sea ward would have 6 per cent more electors than the district average (4 per cent more electors by 2006).

74 Yapton Parish Council opposed the Council's proposal for the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish. It supported the District Council's main proposals for Yapton parish as outlined earlier.

75 A local resident (and parish councillor for Felpham) proposed that the Felpham parish area should be represented by five district councillors overall, contending that as a consequence of the proposed housing development contained in the draft Local Plan there will also be a significant increase in electorate.

76 Having carefully considered the representations received in relation to this area, we have decided to adopt the District Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations, without amendment. As outlined earlier, while we note the concerns of Yapton Parish Council and Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party, we consider that the area of Hoe Lane should be included in the proposed Felpham East ward in order to better reflect local community identity. We consider that the District Council's proposals provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the alternative options put forward.

77 We have also noted the proposal put forward by a local resident that the Felpham area should be represented by an additional councillor. However, as outlined in our *Guidance*, in formulating our draft recommendations we can only take into account the current electorate and the five-year forecast electorate. Under a council size of 56, the Felpham area would be entitled to four councillors overall, both initially and by 2006. Therefore, we confirm that the Felpham area should be represented by four councillors overall, and are adopting the Council's two-member ward pattern as part of our draft recommendations.

78 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in each ward will be the same as under the District Council's proposals. Our draft proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2.

## **Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy wards**

79 The four wards of Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy are situated in the south-west of the district and cover the town of Bognor Regis. The four wards are each represented by two councillors and are coterminous with the Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy parish wards of Bognor Regis parish. At present, Hotham and Marine wards are under-represented with 13 per cent and 11 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average (14 per cent and 12 per cent more than the average respectively by 2006). Orchard and Pevensy wards are over-represented with 20 per cent and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (19 per cent and 4 per cent fewer by 2006).

80 The District Council proposed minor amendments to the existing boundaries in Bognor Regis in order to improve electoral equality in the four wards. The Council stated that “this has been done in areas which have a logical association with the neighbouring ward and has the full support of the Town Council”. The Council proposed modifying the boundary between Pevensy and Marine wards to follow the centre of Cockley Road, The Parade and Argyle Road southwards, turning westwards to follow the centre of Cavendish Road, then northwards along the centre of Southdown Road and finally following the centre of Wellington Road to the existing boundary on Victoria Drive. The Council also proposed including the area to the north-west of the railwayline and to the south-west of Upper Bognor Road, currently in Hotham ward, in the revised Orchard ward. It also proposed transferring the area to the north-west of Hampshire Avenue and to the south-west of Chichester Road from the exiting Pevensy ward, to the revised Orchard ward. Under the District Council’s proposals, the proposed Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy wards would have 4 per cent fewer, 1 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more and equal to the district average number of electors per councillor respectively (2 per cent fewer, 1 per cent more, 2 per cent more and 1 per cent more respectively by 2006).

81 Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party objected to the District Council’s proposals for this area. It proposed a number of alternative boundaries, stating that they “better define the areas of community interest”. It proposed transferring the area to the south of Canada Grove, to the East of Queensway and to the north of the High Street, currently in Marine ward, into the proposed Hotham ward. It further proposed including the area to the south of the High Street and to the west of Gloucester Road, currently in Hotham ward, in the proposed Marine ward. It also proposed including the area to the north-west of Havelock Road in the proposed Orchard ward. The proposals would result in Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy wards having 1 per cent more, 4 per cent more, 2 per cent fewer and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2006 figures were not provided).

82 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to adopt the District Council’s proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. We have noted that the District Council based its proposals on the suggestions submitted by Bognor Regis Town Council during its consultation period and that they would therefore have support locally. The minor amendments to the existing boundaries of the four wards were put forward in order to “remove electorate variances”. The Council argued that “this has been done in areas which have a logical association with the neighbouring ward and has the full agreement of the Town Council”. We noted the concerns expressed by Bognor Regis & Littlehampton

Constituency Labour Party regarding the District Council's proposals for Bognor Regis. However, we have not been persuaded that its alternative proposals offer more clearly identifiable and convenient boundaries. The District Council's proposed boundaries follow the railway line and retain a majority of the existing boundaries, thus in our view, providing a better reflection of community identity and interests.

83 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the revised wards would be the same as under the District Council's proposals. Our draft recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

### **Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham wards**

84 The three-member Aldwick West and Pagham wards and the two-member Aldwick East ward are situated in the south-west of the district to the west of Bognor Regis. Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards currently have 14 per cent more and 15 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average (10 per cent more and 18 per cent fewer respectively by 2006). At present, Pagham ward is over-represented with 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in 2006.

85 At Stage One, the District Council proposed amending the boundary between the existing Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards to improve the levels of electoral equality and "to reflect local representations". In addition, the area of Rose Green, currently in Aldwick West ward, would be included in a revised Pagham ward. The Council argued that "this was necessary to achieve electoral equality and the area concerned is directly connected to the urban development of Pagham". The proposed boundary would follow the centre of Nyetimber Lane, Carlton Avenue and Frobisher Road until the parish boundary. The Council proposed amending the boundary between Aldwick East and West wards, so that the area around Larchfield Close, Grangefield Way, Aldbourne Drive and Cheveley Gardens would be transferred into Aldwick West ward. As a consequence of these modifications, Aldwick West ward would become a two-member ward as the size of the electorate would no longer justify three-members, although Aldwick East would remain a two-member ward. The Council also proposed that the revised three-member Pagham ward be renamed Pagham & Rose Green ward.

86 Under the District Council's proposals, the revised Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards would have 7 per cent and 9 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average, improving to 3 per cent and 5 per cent more by 2006. The new Pagham & Rose Green ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (1 per cent more by 2006).

87 Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party expressed support for the District Council's proposed Pagham & Rose Green and Aldwick East and West wards.

88 Having considered all the representations received for this area, we consider that the District Council's proposals provide for a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria and we have decided to adopt them as part of our draft recommendations. We have noted that they have received a degree of local support and agree that they would facilitate a better reflection of local communities. However, we are proposing one very minor amendment to the boundary between Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards so that all the

properties on the east side of Kingsway are included in Aldwick East ward. This amendment would affect three electors and have a negligible effect on electoral equality. Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed wards would be the same as under the District Council's proposals, with the exception of Aldwick West ward. Aldwick West ward will have 9 per cent more electors than the district average (5 per cent more by 2006). Our draft recommendations are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

89 We received one representation regarding the District Council's electoral cycle. The District Council stated that there should be no change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years. Accordingly, having received no other proposals in relation to the electoral cycle of the district during Stage One, we make no recommendations for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

## **Conclusions**

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

- a council of 56 members should be retained;
- there should be 26 wards;
- the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and two wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

91 Our draft recommendations would involve modifying all but two of the existing wards in Arun district. As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the District Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in the following areas:

- We propose amending the boundary between the proposed Beach and River wards to include Beach Crescent in the proposed River ward.
- We propose amending the boundary between the revised Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards to include all of Kingsway in the revised Aldwick East ward.

92 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will effect 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 councillors	56	56	56	56
Number of wards	27	26	27	26
Average number of electors per councillor	1,959	1,959	2,022	2,022
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	17	2	17	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	5	0	6	0

93 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Arun District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from 17 to two. By 2006 only one ward, Arundel, is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Arun District Council should comprise 56 councillors serving 26 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold whole-council elections every four years.

### **Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

94 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government 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 Aldwick, Bognor Regis, Felpham, Littlehampton, Rustington and Yapton to reflect the proposed district wards.

95 We have noted that the Council's Stage One submission included a copy of a letter from Clymping Parish Council received during its own consultation which stated that "with Clymping growing in size rapidly at the moment....consideration should be given to increasing the size of the parish council too, from 7 to 9". However, the District Council did not put forward any proposals to increase the number of councillors representing Clymping Parish Council. We would therefore welcome views on this, particularly from Clymping Parish Council, at Stage Three.

96 The parish of Aldwick is currently served by 14 councillors representing two parish wards, Aldwick East and Aldwick West, returning seven councillors each. At Stage One, the District Council proposed transferring the Rose Green area, currently in Aldwick West ward, to a new Pagham & Rose Green ward, with the remainder becoming the revised Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards. In our draft recommendations, we have proposed adopting the Council's proposed Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham & Rose Green wards without amendment.

97 As a consequence of our draft recommendations, we propose creating revised Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards and a new Rose Green ward of Aldwick parish. Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards will be coterminous with the district wards of the same name and Rose Green ward will reflect the Rose Green area of the proposed Pagham & Rose Green district ward. The revised Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards will return six councillors each and the new Rose Green ward will return two councillors.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Aldwick Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Aldwick East ward (returning six councillors), Aldwick West ward (returning six councillors) and Rose Green ward (returning two councillors). The boundaries between the three wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map in the back of this report.

98 The parish of Bognor Regis is currently served by 16 councillors representing four parish wards: Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensey each represented by four councillors. In our draft recommendations we propose modifying the boundaries of Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensey district wards. In order to reflect the revised district warding arrangements we propose that the boundaries of Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensey parish wards are amended accordingly. The revised Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensey parish wards would continue to be represented by four councillors each.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Bognor Regis Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensey, each returning four councillors. The boundaries between the four parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of this report.

99 The parish of Felpham is currently served by 16 councillors representing two parish wards, Felpham East and Felpham West, returning eight councillors each. As part of our draft recommendations we propose modifying the boundaries of Felpham East and Felpham West district wards. In order to reflect the revised district wards we therefore propose creating revised Felpham East and Felpham West parish wards. The revised Felpham East and Felpham West parish wards would continue to be represented by eight councillors each.

**Draft Recommendation**

Felpham Parish Council should comprise 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Felpham East (returning eight councillors) and Felpham West (returning eight councillors). The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary, as illustrated and named on Map A2.

100 The parish of Littlehampton is currently served by 16 councillors representing five parish wards: Beach, Central, Ham, River and Wick, returning three councillors each. As part of our draft recommendations we propose modifying the boundaries of Beach, Central, Ham, River and Wick district wards. Therefore, in order to reflect the revised district warding arrangements we propose that the boundaries of Beach, Central, Ham, River and Wick parish wards are amended accordingly. We also propose that the revised Central and Wick parish wards be renamed Brookfield and Wick with Toddington parish wards to reflect the proposed district ward names. The proposed Beach, Brookfield, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington parish wards would be represented by three councillors each.

**Draft Recommendation**

Littlehampton Town Council should comprise 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Beach, Brookfield, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington, returning three councillors each. The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map at the back of the report.

101 The parish of Rustington is currently served by 16 councillors representing three wards: Rustington East, Rustington South and Rustington North, returning six, five and five councillors respectively. In order to reflect our draft recommendations for district wards in this area, we propose creating a revised Rustington East parish ward and new Rustington West and West Preston parish wards of Rustington parish. The proposed Rustington East and Rustington West wards would be coterminous with the district wards of the same name and the proposed West Preston ward would comprise that part of Rustington parish to be included in the proposed East Preston with Kingston district ward. The revised Rustington East ward will return six councillors and the new Rustington West and West Preston wards would return nine councillors and one councillor respectively.

**Draft Recommendation**

Rustington Parish Council should comprise 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Rustington East (returning six councillors), Rustington West (returning nine councillors) and West Preston (returning one councillor). The boundaries between the three wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area as illustrated and named on the large map in the back of the report.

102 The parish of Yapton is currently served by ten councillors. In order to reflect our draft recommendations for district warding purposes, we propose creating new Hoe Lane and

Yapton Village wards of Yapton parish. Hoe Lane ward would reflect the Hoe Lane area to be included in the proposed Felpham East district ward and the Yapton Village ward would comprise the remainder of Yapton parish. The new Hoe Lane and Yapton Village wards would return one and nine councillors respectively.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Yapton Parish Council should comprise ten parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hoe Lane (returning one councillor) and Yapton Village (returning nine councillors). The boundary between the two wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundary in the area as illustrated on Map A2 in Appendix A.

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

**Draft Recommendation**  
Parish and town council elections should continue to take place every four years, at the same time as elections for the district wards of which they are part.

*Map 2: Draft Recommendations for Arun*

## 5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

104 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Arun 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.

105 Express your views by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Arun 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)  
[www.lgce.gov.uk](http://www.lgce.gov.uk)

106 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 Arun: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Arun 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 maps at the back of this report.

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

The **large maps** inserted at the back of this report illustrate the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Aldwick, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Rustington and East Preston.

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

*Map A2: Proposed Warding of Yapton 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.