

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Adur in West Sussex

Report to The Electoral Commission

July 2002

© Crown Copyright 2002

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

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

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report No: 306

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	11
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	13
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	17
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	19
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	21
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	37

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Adur is inserted at the back of this report.

WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

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

SUMMARY

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

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

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

- **in five of the 14 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and three wards vary by more than 20 per cent;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to continue with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in five wards and by more than 20 per cent in two wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 78-79) are that:

- **Adur District Council should have 29 councillors, 10 fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 14 wards, as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 13 of the existing wards should be modified.**

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 13 of the proposed 14 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 5 per cent from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **new warding arrangements for Lancing and Sompting parishes.**

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

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

Table 1: Final Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1	Buckingham	2	part of Buckingham ward; part of Hillside ward
2	Cokeham	2	part of Sompting parish (the proposed Cokeham parish ward)
3	Eastbrook	2	part of Eastbrook ward
4	Elms	2	part of Lancing parish (the proposed Elms parish ward)
5	Hillside	2	part of Buckingham ward; part of Hillside ward
6	Manor	2	Coombes parish; part of Lancing parish (the proposed Manor parish ward)
7	Marine	2	<i>Unchanged</i>
8	Mash Barn	2	part of Lancing parish (the proposed Mash Barn parish ward)
9	Peverel	2	part of Sompting parish (the proposed Peverel parish ward)
10	St Mary's	2	St Mary's ward; part of Southlands ward; part of St Nicolas ward; part of Southwick Green ward
11	St Nicolas	2	part of Buckingham ward; part of St Nicolas ward
12	Southlands	2	part of Southlands ward; part of Southwick Green ward
13	Southwick Green	2	part of Eastbrook ward; part of Southlands ward; part of Southwick Green ward
14	Widewater	3	part of Lancing parish (the proposed Widewater parish ward)

Notes: 1 The district contains three parishes: Coombes, Lancing and Sompting. The remainder of the district is unparished.

2 The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Table 2: Final Recommendations for Adur

	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	Buckingham	2	3,243	1,622	0	3,348	1,674	1
2	Cokeham	2	3,345	1,673	4	3,327	1,664	0
3	Eastbrook	2	3,238	1,619	0	3,228	1,614	-3
4	Elms	2	3,379	1,690	5	3,372	1,686	1
5	Hillside	2	3,412	1,706	6	3,351	1,676	1
6	Manor	2	3,221	1,611	0	3,251	1,626	-2
7	Marine	2	2,911	1,456	-10	3,421	1,711	3
8	Mash Barn	2	3,273	1,637	1	3,306	1,653	-1
9	Peveler	2	3,353	1,677	4	3,407	1,704	2
10	St Mary's	2	2,843	1,422	-12	3,490	1,745	5
11	St Nicolas	2	3,166	1,583	-2	3,148	1,574	-5
12	Southlands	2	3,322	1,661	3	3,412	1,706	3
13	Southwick Green	2	3,424	1,712	6	3,382	1,691	2
14	Widewater	3	4,673	1,558	-3	4,803	1,601	-4
	Totals	29	46,803	-	-	48,246	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,614	-	-	1,664	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Adur 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 final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Adur in West Sussex. The seven districts in West Sussex have now been reviewed as part of the programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England started by the LGCE in 1996. We have inherited that programme, which we currently expect to complete in 2004.

2 Adur's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in September 1977 (Report no. 251). The electoral arrangements of West Sussex County Council were last reviewed in June 1984 (Report no. 473). We expect to begin reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements towards the end of 2002.

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

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

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

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

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes 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.

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

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 10 July 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Adur District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified West Sussex County Council, West Sussex Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Sussex Association of Parish & Town Councils, parish councils in the district, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the South East region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the

local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 15 October 2001. At Stage Two it considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared its draft recommendations.

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

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

10 The district of Adur is situated on the south coast in the south-eastern corner of West Sussex county. It has a light industrial character and there are both sea and air ports located in Shoreham. There are four residential centres: Lancing, Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Sompting. To the north of the district are areas of open parkland and farmland stretching on towards the South Downs.

11 The district contains three civil parishes, but Shoreham-by-Sea and Southwick are unparished. The parishes of Coombes, Lancing and Sompting comprise 45 per cent of the district's total electorate with the unparished area comprising the remainder.

12 The electorate of the district is 46,803 (February 2001). The Council presently has 39 members who are elected from 14 wards. Twelve of the wards are each represented by three councillors, one is represented by two councillors and there is one single-member ward. The Council is elected by thirds.

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

14 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,200 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 1,237 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 five of the 14 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, three wards by more than 20 per cent and one ward by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in St Mary's ward, where the councillor represents 31 per cent fewer electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Adur

Table 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Buckingham	3	3,944	1,315	10	4,043	1,348	9
2	Churchill	3	3,798	1,266	5	3,809	1,270	3
3	Cokeham	3	3,535	1,178	-2	3,515	1,172	-5
4	Eastbrook	3	3,477	1,159	-3	3,474	1,158	-6
5	Hillside	3	3,412	1,137	-5	3,351	1,117	-10
6	Manor	3	3,338	1,113	-7	3,368	1,123	-9
7	Marine	2	2,911	1,456	21	3,421	1,711	38
8	Mash Barn	3	2,877	959	-20	2,910	970	-22
9	Peverel	3	3,163	1,054	-12	3,219	1,073	-13
10	St Mary's	1	830	830	-31	1,095	1,095	-11
11	St Nicolas	3	3,862	1,287	7	3,928	1,309	6
12	Southlands	3	3,300	1,100	-8	3,669	1,223	-1
13	Southwick Green	3	3,823	1,274	6	3,781	1,260	2
14	Widewater	3	4,533	1,511	26	4,663	1,554	26
	Totals	39	46,803	-	-	48,246	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,200	-	-	1,237	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Adur 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 St Mary's ward were relatively over-represented by 31 per cent, while electors in Widewater ward were significantly under-represented by 26 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

15 During Stage One the LGCE received four representations, including district-wide schemes from Adur District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance. Representations from West Sussex County Council and the East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association were also received. In the light of these representations and evidence available to it, the LGCE reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in its report *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Adur in West Sussex*.

16 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on elements of the District Council's and the Conservative Independent Alliance's submissions, as well as a number of its own proposals, with particular regard to council size, which it proposed should be 29. These draft recommendations achieved improvements in electoral equality, and provided a general pattern of two-member wards, with the exception of a single-member Widewater ward. It proposed that:

- Adur District Council should be served by 29 councillors, compared with the current 39, representing 15 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 13 of the existing wards should be modified, while one ward should retain its existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for Lancing and Sompting parishes.

Draft Recommendation

Adur District Council should comprise 29 councillors, serving 15 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

17 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all of the 15 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 4 per cent from the average in 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

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

Adur District Council

19 The District Council welcomed the LGCE's decision to reduce the council size. However, it stated that the draft recommendations did not provide an improvement on its Stage One proposals, which were based on a council size of 28. The Council also made a number of comments on warding arrangements throughout the district.

West Sussex County Council

20 The County Council commented on the problems it envisaged in achieving coterminosity during a future PER of the county electoral divisions. It also commented on the proposed South Lancing ward.

Lancing Parish Council

21 Lancing Parish Council stated that the District Council's Stage One proposals for Lancing, which it had supported, should be adopted. It expressed concern that only a limited number of locally generated proposals were adopted in its parish following Stage One. It also opposed the proposed increase by two of its council size.

Political Groups

22 The Conservative Independent Alliance made some general comments on the PER as well as making detailed comments on the draft recommendations for Churchill, St Mary's, St Nicolas, South Lancing, Southlands and Widewater wards.

23 Adur District Council Labour Group welcomed the District Council's comments. It supported a number of the LGCE's proposals although it was concerned about the draft recommendations for Lancing and Shoreham, stating that the District Council's Stage One proposals should be adopted in these areas. The Southwick & Shoreham Branch Labour Party supported the draft recommendations for Eastbrook, Hillside and Marine wards. It put forward amendments to the draft recommendations for Buckingham, St Mary's, St Nicolas, Southlands and Southwick Green wards.

Other Representations

24 A further two representations were received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from a local organisation and a local resident. Church Lane Residents' Association commented on the proposed Southwick Green ward. A resident of Lancing stated that the District Council's Stage One proposal "is a much better way of moving the boundaries" in Lancing parish, as well as proposing some new ward names in the area.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

28 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the 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

29 Since 1975 there has been a 5 per cent increase in the electorate of Adur district. At Stage One the District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3 per cent from 46,803 to 48,246 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expected most of the growth to be in Marine and St Mary’s wards. 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 was obtained. At Stage One the Conservative Independent Alliance stated that the 2006 electorate for Adur would be 48,107 – 139 electors fewer than the District Council stated. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that the District Council’s electorate forecasts represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

30 At Stage Three the Conservative Independent Alliance stated that it did not disagree with the District Council’s electorate forecasts and the discrepancy arose due to pressures on time, during Stage One. The LGCE received no further comments on their electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and we remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

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

32 Adur District Council presently has 39 members. At Stage One the District Council proposed a council of 28 members, which it argued “would have enough members to carry out its business”. It briefly outlined a new committee structure and noted that it could “increase allowances at no additional cost to the Council, or make modest savings”. The Conservative Independent Alliance broadly supported the District Council’s proposal for a reduced council size. However, it proposed a council size of 30 in order to provide improved electoral equality in a number of wards between 2001 and 2006. This proposal was supported by the East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association. At the end of Stage One Adur District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance both provided the LGCE with further argumentation in support of their proposed council sizes. The Conservative Independent Alliance’s main argument for a reduction in council size was to facilitate the best available electoral arrangements for Marine ward.

33 The LGCE did not adopt the Conservative Independent Alliance proposal for a council size of 30 as it did not consider that council size should be determined by the electoral arrangements of one ward, especially as by 2006 the electoral equality of Marine ward was better under the District Council’s proposals. The LGCE considered the argumentation received from the District Council for a council size of 28 and was pleased to note that the District Council had given serious consideration to the implications of such a significant reduction. In particular, it provided the LGCE with argumentation that, given the current role of councillors, the existing council size of 39 could not be justified. The LGCE noted that Adur District Council had given the necessary consideration to the internal political management, the role of councillors and the implications, which would result from such a significant decrease both for the council and for residents in the proposed new structure. The LGCE also noted that although the Conservative Independent Alliance and East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association proposed a council size of 30 they were both in favour of a significant reduction. It therefore proposed a significant decrease in council size. However, under a council size of 28 it was not possible to provide the correct allocation of councillors between the three areas of Lancing, Sompting and the unparished east of the district on the basis of electorate forecasts for 2006. Consequently, the LGCE considered a council size of 29 members, which would provide the correct allocation of councillors between the three different areas, while also securing a better level of electoral equality throughout the district than under a 28-member council. The LGCE proposed a council size of 29 as part of its draft recommendations.

34 During Stage Three Adur District Council welcomed “the LGCE’s acceptance of a reduced size in the size of the Council”. The District Council did consider that its original Stage One submission would provide a better solution than the draft recommendations, however, it did not resubmit any detailed arguments for a council size of 28. The Adur District Council Labour Group agreed “that the reduced council size will still allow the council to function appropriately”. We received no further comments directly relating to council size. Therefore, having considered the representations received and looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 29 members.

Electoral Arrangements

35 At Stage One Adur District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance both wished to retain the district ward boundary between Lancing parish and the unparished part of the district, as they did not wish to include parished and unparished areas in the same ward. The LGCE developed its draft recommendations with this in mind. Having decided on a council size

of 29 and given the desire to retain the Lancing parish boundary as a ward boundary, the LGCE's next objective was to allocate the correct number of councillors across the district. Under the District Council's proposals for a council size of 28 it allocated four councillors to Sompting, eight councillors to Coombes and Lancing and 16 councillors to the unparished part of the district. By 2006, under a council size of 28, with a councillor:elector ratio of 1:1,723, these three areas would be entitled to 3.9 (rounded up to 4) councillors, 8.56 (rounded up to 9) councillors and 15.53 (rounded up to 16) councillors respectively. These entitlements total 29, and consequently it was not possible to provide the correct allocation of councillors under a council size of 28 without breaching the Lancing parish boundary. Having decided on a council size of 29 and acknowledging that the district ward boundary between Lancing parish and the unparished area should be retained, the LGCE was unable to put forward draft recommendations based on a uniform pattern of two-member wards across the district, as proposed by both the District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance. The LGCE allocated nine district councillors to Coombe and Lancing parishes and, consequently, proposed the creation of a single-member Widewater ward with four two-member wards in Lancing, as detailed later in the chapter.

36 West Sussex County Council made comments on the District Council's proposals, especially relating to the west of the district. It stated that if "the County PER were to result in there being five county electoral divisions in Adur a pattern of 15 two-member wards would offer the basis for coterminosity". The LGCE stated that its approach in two-tier county areas is first to review the electoral arrangements of the district council and then, once the necessary electoral change orders have been made for the districts, review those of the county council. The future recommendations for electoral division boundaries in all counties, including West Sussex, will utilise the new district wards as building blocks.

37 In response to the LGCE's draft recommendations report, the District Council, Lancing Parish Council and a resident of Lancing expressed the view that Lancing parish should continue to be represented by four two-member wards. As outlined in the draft recommendations this would only be possible, while providing the correct allocation of councillors, if electors of Lancing parish were to be transferred into a ward with electors from Shoreham. We have carefully considered such a proposal, however, we remain convinced that the boundary between Lancing parish and the unparished part of the district should not be breached. Therefore, we propose allocating the wards covering Lancing parish nine district councillors, as the electorate of the parish are entitled to. However, we have attempted to modify our draft recommendations for individual wards in the light of evidence received from local respondents at Stage Three, as outlined later in the chapter.

38 West Sussex County Council once again made comments on the effect the draft recommendations for districts across the county would have on coterminosity when a county council review is conducted. We adopt the same approach as the LGCE to PER's of both districts and counties, therefore we do not have any regard for existing or future county council divisions during this review. A PER of the county council electoral divisions will be started later this year.

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

- (a) Eastbrook, Hillside and Southwick Green wards;
- (b) Buckingham, Marine, St Mary's, St Nicolas and Southlands wards;
- (c) Churchill, Manor, Mash Barn and Widewater wards;
- (d) Cokeham and Peverel wards.

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

Eastbrook, Hillside and Southwick Green wards

41 Eastbrook and Southwick Green wards are situated in Southwick, while Hillside ward covers part of Southwick as well as a large rural part of the South Downs. These wards are situated to the east of the district and all three wards each return three councillors. Under the existing arrangements Eastbrook and Hillside wards have councillor:elector ratios 3 per cent and 5 per cent below the district average respectively (6 per cent and 10 per cent by 2006). Southwick Green ward has a councillor:elector ratio 6 per cent above the district average (2 per cent by 2006).

42 At Stage One Adur District Council proposed that all three of these wards should return two councillors each. It proposed retaining the existing boundaries of Hillside ward. The Council proposed transferring those electors to the south of Kings Manor School and west of Kingston Lane, currently in Southwick Green ward, into a new St Julians ward. It proposed that the remainder of the existing Southwick Green ward should form a revised Southwick Green ward with those electors currently in Eastbrook ward, to the west of Southwick Road, north of The Twitten and west of Twitten Close and Watling Close and north of the Brighton to Shoreham railway. The Council proposed no further modifications to the boundaries of Eastbrook ward. The Conservative Independent Alliance proposed that all three of these wards should return two councillors each and that all three wards should have their boundaries amended to provide better levels of electoral equality. It put forward minor boundary modifications to Eastbrook and Hillside wards. It proposed transferring the Butts Road area from Eastbrook ward into Southwick Green ward. It also proposed transferring those electors currently in Southwick Green ward, situated to the west of Kingston Lane and north of Rectory Road into a revised Southlands ward. These proposals were supported in full by the East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association.

43 The LGCE carefully considered the representations received at Stage One concerning these three wards. It proposed including those electors currently in Southwick Green ward, west of Kingston Lane and north of Kings Manor School in Southlands ward, as proposed by the Conservative Independent Alliance. However, it retained those electors between Rectory Road and Kings Manor School in Southwick Green as it considered that the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposal to use Rectory Road as a boundary would divide an established housing estate and provide a weak boundary. It proposed including in Southwick Green ward those electors currently in Southlands ward, in Chiltern Close, St Julians Close and numbers 159–193 Middle Road. It noted that these electors have good access into Southwick Green ward along Stoney Lane, and this modification provided much improved electoral equality in both Southlands and Southwick Green wards. The LGCE based its proposed Eastbrook ward on the District Council's proposals with one minor modification. It utilised Southwick Street as its western boundary from Old Shoreham Road to the Brighton to Shoreham railway line to provide a clearer boundary. It adopted the District Council's proposal to retain Old Shoreham Road as Hillside ward's southern boundary. However, it proposed modifying the boundary between Hillside and Buckingham wards, tying it to firm ground detail.

44 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Eastbrook ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the district average (3 per cent below by 2006). Hillside and Southwick Green wards would both have a councillor:elector ratio 6 per cent above the district average (1 per cent and 2 per cent respectively by 2006).

45 At Stage Three Adur District Council stated that it "does not believe that the [LGCE] has improved on its own submission" which "reflected local knowledge". However, it stated that the draft recommendations for Eastbrook and Hillside wards "represent a close fit with this Council's proposals". The District Council made no detailed comments on the proposed boundaries in these three wards.

46 Adur District Council Labour Group broadly agreed with the LGCE's proposals for Eastbrook and Hillside wards. However, it felt that the District Council's original proposal for St Julian's and Southwick Green wards "would be a better solution". Southwick & Shoreham Branch Labour Party also agreed with the proposals for Eastbrook and Hillside wards. However, it proposed including Chiltern Close and St Julians Close in Southlands ward rather than Southwick Green ward.

47 Church Lane Residents' Association commented on the draft recommendations for Southwick Green ward, stating "the existing western boundary seems to make far more sense than that proposed". It also stated that the eastern boundary should continue down Southwick Street to the railway.

48 We have carefully considered the representations received during Stage Three concerning these three wards. We are pleased to note that the draft recommendations for Eastbrook and Hillside wards have received general support – we therefore propose endorsing them as final. We noted that there was some general opposition to our proposals for Southwick Green ward and we considered the proposal to transfer Chiltern Close and St Julians Close back into Southlands ward. However, such a modification would provide a higher level of electoral inequality than the draft recommendations and as we have been provided with no strong arguments or evidence as to why the draft recommendations would not reflect community identities in the area, we do not propose adopting this modification. We propose endorsing the draft recommendations as final. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as under the draft recommendations. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Buckingham, Marine, St Mary's, St Nicolas and Southlands wards

49 The wards of Marine, St Mary's, St Nicolas and Southlands are situated in Shoreham-by-Sea. Buckingham ward covers part of Shoreham-by-Sea as well as a large rural part of the South Downs. These five wards are situated in the centre of the district and under the existing arrangements Buckingham, St Nicolas and Southlands wards each return three councillors, Marine ward returns two councillors and St Mary's ward returns a single councillor. The wards of Buckingham, Marine and St Nicolas have councillor:elector ratios 10 per cent, 21 per cent and 7 per cent above the district average respectively (9 per cent, 38 per cent and 6 per cent by 2006). St Mary's and Southlands wards have councillor:elector ratios 31 per cent and 8 per cent below the district average respectively (11 per cent and 1 per cent by 2006).

50 At Stage One Adur District Council stated that all five wards should return two councillors each. It proposed that the boundaries of Marine ward should remain unchanged. The Council proposed transferring those electors currently in Buckingham ward, to the east of Fennel Walk and Tarragon Way, into a new St Julians ward. It also proposed transferring those electors south of Erringham Road, The Street and Lesser Foxholes, currently in Buckingham ward, into a new St Nicolas & St Mary's ward with those electors to the west of Mill Lane and Brunswick Road, currently in St Nicolas ward; and those electors west of Humphrey's Gap, currently in St Mary's ward. The Council proposed a modified Southlands ward comprising the remainder of the existing St Mary's and St Nicolas wards and those electors to the west of Hammy Lane, Glebelands Day Care Centre and Kingsland House currently in the existing Southlands ward. The remainder of Southlands ward would form a new St Julians ward with those electors transferred from Buckingham ward and those electors to the south of Kings Manor School and west of Kingston Lane, currently in Southwick Green ward.

51 The Conservative Independent Alliance stated that all five wards should return two councillors each. It also proposed that the boundaries of Marine ward should remain unchanged. It proposed transferring into a revised St Nicolas ward those electors of Buckingham ward, south of The Avenue, Erringham Road, The Street and Lesser Foxholes and west of Downsway, together with those electors to the west of Buckingham Road currently in

the existing St Nicolas ward. The Conservative Independent Alliance proposed that a revised St Mary's ward be created, comprising the current St Mary's ward, the remainder of the existing St Nicolas ward, and the electors currently in Southlands ward, situated south of Southlands General Hospital, west of the rear of the properties on Crown Road, south of Middle Road up to and including Kingsland Close. It proposed that the remainder of the existing Southlands ward should form a revised Southlands ward with those electors currently in Southwick Green ward, situated to the west of Kingston Lane and north of Rectory Road. These proposals were supported in full by the East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association.

52 The LGCE carefully considered the proposals put forward for these five wards during Stage One. It based its proposed Buckingham ward on the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposal as it considered that crossing the Upper Shoreham Road in one place is preferable to crossing it in two different areas, which would result in a weaker boundary and a less cohesive ward. However, it proposed a minor modification to the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposed ward, running the boundary between Buckingham and St Nicolas wards behind the properties on the northern side of The Avenue so that all the electors in The Avenue are included in St Nicolas ward. It also proposed modifying the boundary between Buckingham and Hillside wards, tying it to firm ground detail. Having decided to base its proposals for Buckingham ward on those put forward by the Conservative Independent Alliance, due to the knock-on effect on neighbouring wards, the draft recommendations for St Mary's, St Nicolas and Southlands wards were also broadly based on the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposals. It proposed including the area west of Victoria Road, currently in St Mary's ward, in the proposed St Nicolas ward, including the new development known as the Ropetackle site. This modification provided improved electoral equality in both the proposed St Mary's and St Nicolas wards. The LGCE proposed two modifications to the eastern boundary of the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposed St Mary's ward. It included Kingsland Close in Southlands ward as the electors in Kingsland Close are separated by the Dolphin Industrial Estate from the electors in St Mary's ward in which the Conservative Independent Alliance proposed they should be included. The LGCE transferred Southlands Hospital, which includes a new housing development, into St Mary's ward to improve the level of electoral equality in both St Mary's and Southlands wards. It proposed including those electors, currently in Southlands ward, of Chiltern Close, St Julians Close and numbers 159–193 Middle Road in Southwick Green ward, as detailed earlier in the chapter. It noted that both Adur District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance proposed that Marine ward should retain its existing boundaries. The LGCE was content that as the boundaries of this ward are the sea, Adur River and the Lancing parish boundary there should be no change to the ward's boundaries.

53 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Buckingham ward would have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the district average (1 per cent above by 2006). Marine, St Mary's and St Nicolas wards would have councillor:elector ratios 10 per cent, 9 per cent and 5 per cent below the district average respectively (3 per cent above, 2 per cent below and 1 per cent above by 2006). Southlands ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent above the district average both initially and in 2006.

54 At Stage Three Adur District Council stated that it "does not believe that the [LGCE] has improved on its own submission" which "reflected local knowledge". The Council stated that its original submission "reflected appropriate boundaries that kept Shoreham centre in one ward (including the Ropetackle site)". It commented on the draft recommendations for St Mary's and St Nicolas wards, that "it seems inappropriate to link [the Ropetackle site] solely with the much more residential area north of the railway, when its very purpose is to contribute to the quality of town centre life". The District Council also restated that at Stage One its proposal had included "the old town" within St Nicolas ward as it has a "separate feel" to the rest of Buckingham ward, in which it is currently situated. It stated that the LGCE's proposals for Marine ward "represent a close fit with this Council's proposals".

55 The Conservative Independent Alliance stated that it considered “it essential to keep the western tip of the present St Mary’s ward (Ropetackle area) within the ward, not to move it into St Nicolas ward”. It outlined why the Ropetackle site was an important part of the town centre and therefore should remain in St Mary’s ward. The Conservative Independent Alliance proposed transferring those electors on the east side of Buckingham Road into St Nicolas ward from the proposed St Mary’s ward. This modification would allow the Ropetackle site to be retained in St Mary’s ward. It stated “there is more commonality between the properties on either side of Buckingham Road than with the properties to the east”. The Conservative Independent Alliance also stated that the Southlands hospital site should be retained in Southlands ward, rather than St Mary’s ward, with “compensating adjustments by moving the remainder of the western boundary slightly eastwards” being made. It stated that the vehicle access from the residential development on the hospital site will only be from the north, with pedestrian access to the south and east, therefore it should be included in Southlands ward.

56 The Adur District Council Labour Group broadly agreed with the draft recommendations for Buckingham and Marine wards. However, it stated that Adur District Council’s “original proposal for the wards of St Julian’s, Southlands, St Mary’s and St Nicolas [wards] would be a better solution if adapted rather than the [LGCE’s] proposals which do not reflect the differing communities in this area”. The Labour Group stated that Southlands ward should be renamed as it would not contain Southlands Hospital and Marine ward should be renamed as “the area is known universally as Shoreham Beach or The Beach”. Southwick & Shoreham Branch Labour Party supported the draft recommendations for Marine ward. It stated that the Ropetackle site should be included in St Mary’s ward and the Southlands hospital site should be transferred out of St Mary’s ward into Southlands ward, “to adjust the imbalance caused by moving the Ropetackle site”. It also recommended that Buckingham Avenue and The Avenue should be included in St Nicolas ward. The Southwick & Shoreham Branch Labour Party also stated that Chiltern Close and St Julians Close should be transferred into Southlands ward from the proposed Southwick Green ward. It stated that all of these modifications would make the boundaries “more acceptable to local electors”.

57 We have carefully considered the representations received during Stage Three concerning these five wards. We are pleased to note that the draft recommendations for Marine ward received general support, we therefore propose endorsing them as final. We noted the proposal to rename Marine ward, however, due to the lack of local support for this proposal we are retaining the existing ward name. We noted the draft recommendations for Buckingham ward received some local support and the Southwick & Shoreham Branch Labour Party stated that Buckingham Avenue and The Avenue should be included in St Nicolas ward, as proposed in the draft recommendations. We noted the District Council’s comments on Buckingham ward – however, having revisited the area we remain of the opinion that the draft recommendations continue to provide the best balance of the statutory criteria. We therefore propose endorsing them as final.

58 We have noted that all representations received concerning this area were opposed to our proposal to transfer the western tip of St Mary’s ward, including the Ropetackle site, into St Nicolas ward. Both the District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance stated that the development of the Ropetackle site was strongly linked to Shoreham town centre, and therefore St Mary’s ward. We were pleased to note that the Conservative Independent Alliance put forward a viable alternative, transferring the Ropetackle site into St Mary’s ward with the electors on the east side of Buckingham Road being transferred into St Nicolas ward. This modification would not provide as good levels of electoral equality as under the draft recommendations. However, both wards would have an electoral variance of 5 per cent by 2006 and we have been convinced that the reflection of community identities in the area would be improved if this modification were adopted. We therefore propose modifying the draft recommendations in this area by adopting the Conservative Independent Alliance’s proposed boundary between St Mary’s and St Nicolas wards. We considered the proposal put forward by the Conservative Independent Alliance to retain the Southlands Hospital site in Southlands

ward. The Conservative Independent Alliance argued that the hospital site should be included in Southlands ward as the vehicle access from the new housing development will be from the north. However, we do not consider that the access from the Hospital site to Southlands ward is any better than to St Mary's ward, as both wards are connected to the site by Upper Shoreham Road. Under the draft recommendations there is good pedestrian access into St Mary's ward from the south of the proposed site. However, in light of the comments from the Adur District Council Labour Group regarding a ward name for Southlands ward, we propose transferring the hospital from St Mary's ward back into Southlands ward, while retaining the proposed housing development in St Mary's ward. This boundary modification would not affect any electors. We do not propose adopting the proposal to retain Chiltern Close and St Julians Close in Southlands ward, as detailed earlier in the chapter. We propose endorsing the remainder of the draft recommendations for St Mary's, St Nicolas and Southlands wards.

59 Our final recommendations for Buckingham, Marine and Southlands wards would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Under our final recommendations St Mary's and St Nicolas wards would have councillor:elector ratios 12 per cent and 2 per cent below the district average respectively (5 per cent above and 5 per cent below by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Churchill, Manor, Mash Barn and Widewater wards

60 The wards of Churchill, Mash Barn and Widewater are situated within Lancing parish, while Manor ward comprises part of Lancing parish and the whole of Coombes parish. These four wards are situated in the centre of the district and each return three councillors. Under the existing arrangements Churchill and Widewater wards have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent and 26 per cent above the district average respectively (3 per cent and 26 per cent by 2006). Manor and Mash Barn wards have councillor:elector ratios 7 per cent and 20 per cent below the district average respectively (9 per cent and 22 per cent by 2006).

61 At Stage One Adur District Council proposed that these four wards should each return two councillors and should all be subject to boundary modifications to provide improved levels of electoral equality. It proposed a new boundary between Churchill and Widewater wards – running down South Street before following Ingleside Crescent, Ingleside Road and Penhill Road to the coast. It also proposed modifications to Churchill ward's northern boundary. It proposed transferring into Manor ward those electors north of Field Close and Vincent Close and west of Annweir Avenue, and proposed transferring into Mash Barn ward the electors situated to the east of Annweir Avenue and north of Sompting Road, Rosecroft Close and St Bernards Court. It proposed a minor modification between Manor and Mash Barn wards to include in Mash Barn ward the electors on the western side of First Avenue. The Conservative Independent Alliance proposed five two-member wards covering this area. It proposed transferring into a revised Churchill ward those electors currently situated in Widewater ward, to the west of Kings Close and Kings Road together with the electors of the existing Churchill ward, to the south of the Shoreham to Worthing to railway line. It proposed a new Monks ward comprising the remainder of the existing Churchill ward, and electors currently in Cokeham and Peverel wards. It also proposed a minor boundary modification between Manor and Mash Barn wards to include in the latter those electors on the western side of First Avenue. These proposals were supported in full by the East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association.

62 The LGCE carefully considered both sets of proposals for these four wards. Under a council size of 29 Coombe and Lancing parishes are entitled to nine district councillors, consequently the LGCE was unable to provide a uniform pattern of two-member wards in this area. It also decided not to adopt the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposal to include electors of Sompting parish in a new Monks ward, as the existing boundary is more easily identifiable than the boundary put forward. The LGCE proposed creating a new single-member Widewater ward, covering the area between the parish boundary and the Happy Days Caravan Park. Having

decided to propose a new single-member Widewater ward the LGCE developed its own proposals for Churchill ward and the remainder of the existing Widewater ward. It proposed a revised two-member Churchill ward and a new two-member South Lancing ward. The LGCE proposed that a new two-member South Lancing ward should comprise those electors south of Marlborough Road, including all those situated on Brighton Road currently in Churchill ward, together with the majority of the remainder of Widewater ward. It proposed a minor modification to Churchill ward's eastern boundary, transferring those electors on the eastern side of South Street currently in Widewater ward into Churchill ward. The proposed Churchill ward comprised the majority of the remainder of the existing Churchill ward with only a minor modification to its northern boundary. The LGCE noted that its proposed South Lancing ward would have limited access, only along Brighton Road, between its two constituent parts. In the remainder of Lancing the LGCE adopted the Conservative Independent Alliance's proposed Mash Barn ward. It proposed a minor boundary modification between Churchill and Manor wards to provide improved electoral equality, transferring those electors of Lancing Close and the southern side of Crabtree Lane into a revised Manor ward.

63 Under the LGCE's draft recommendations Manor and Widewater wards would both have a councillor:elector ratio equal to the district average (2 per cent below and 4 per cent above respectively by 2006). Churchill and Mash Barn wards would have councillor:elector ratios 1 per cent and 2 per cent below the district average respectively (3 per cent and 4 per cent by 2006). South Lancing ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 4 per cent above the district average (1 per cent by 2006).

64 At Stage Three Adur District Council stated that it "does not believe the [LGCE] has improved on its own submission" which "reflected local knowledge". It stated "there is substantial concern at the proposed revision of boundaries in Lancing". The Council was particularly concerned with the LGCE's proposed boundary between Churchill and South Lancing wards, stating that those electors to the south of Marlborough Road would be "in an isolated position well away from the bulk of the South Lancing ward". The Council stated that if the proposal for nine councillors covering Lancing is retained then those electors south of Marlborough Road should be transferred back into Churchill ward with boundary modifications being made in the South Street area to retain good electoral equality. The District Council also commented that its Stage One proposals had been designed to include the whole of Lancing town centre in a single ward, however the LGCE proposals divide it. West Sussex County Council stated that "the proposed South Lancing ward should be redrawn to give it stronger definition and to reflect more fully community identity, particularly east and west of South Street". It also proposed renaming South Lancing ward, either as Penhill or Saltings.

65 Lancing Parish Council stated "the changes for Lancing do not reflect the ideas put forward by the Parish Council, District Council or the Conservative Independent Alliance". It requested "reconsideration of the original proposal for the retention of the four existing wards" as put forward by Adur District Council at Stage One. The Parish Council stated that the proposed South Lancing ward "has effectively two separate communities in two separate areas, this will undoubtedly cause confusion in terms of a cohesive community identity". It also noted that under the draft recommendations the Lancing Business Park would be divided between three different wards.

66 The Conservative Independent Alliance suggested the adoption of its original proposals in this area. However it did make some detailed comments on the draft recommendations, stating "it would prefer not to have a single-member ward". It "would prefer to see a three-member ward, which would suggest combining Widewater ward with the proposed South Lancing ward". It commented that such a proposal would remove the draft recommendations boundary between these two wards which divides an existing community. It supported the District Council's proposal to include the electors south of Marlborough Street in Churchill ward while making boundary modifications in the South Street area. The Conservative Independent Alliance also stated that the Churchill Industrial Estate has been renamed Lancing Business

Park and that “there is no longer any reference to the original title” of Churchill ward. It proposed Elms as a new ward name. The Adur District Council Labour Group broadly agreed with the draft recommendations for Manor and Mash Barn wards. However, it stated that the draft recommendation for South Lancing ward “does not enable any form of shared community within itself”. It requested that the boundaries of Churchill, South Lancing and Widewater wards be reconsidered. The Labour Group also proposed renaming Churchill ward. It put forward Station ward as a possible alternative as Lancing police and rail stations are both in this ward.

67 A resident of Lancing stated that she “does not approve of [the LGCE’s] plans for a single-member Widewater ward or the shape of the South Lancing ward”. The resident stated that the District Council’s Stage One proposal was “a much better way of moving the boundaries, keeping as it does the current four wards and bringing both the town centres north and south of the railway line into their own wards”. The local resident also proposed renaming South Lancing ward as Saltings. She also stated that Churchill ward should be renamed as either Elms or Station.

68 We have carefully considered the representations received during Stage Three concerning these four wards. We have noted that the District Council, Lancing Parish Council, Conservative Independent Alliance and a local resident opposed our proposal to allocate Lancing and Coombes parishes nine councillors. As stated in the draft recommendations, under a council size of 29 by 2006 this area is entitled to nine councillors. Although a number of respondents have requested that we allocate eight councillors to the area this would result in the electorate of Coombes and Lancing parishes being under-represented at district level. It is our approach in Adur, as well as all other districts in England, to allocate the correct number of councillors to distinct areas as this enables the provision of the best available levels of electoral equality. We have noted that the LGCE considered the possibility of a ward spanning the boundary between Lancing parish and the unparished area. However, the LGCE was convinced by the arguments put forward for the retention of this clearly identifiable boundary, we concur with this proposal and endorse it as final. Consequently, we also propose endorsing the allocation of nine councillors to Coombes and Lancing parishes as final.

69 We have carefully considered the comments received concerning the draft recommendations concerning boundaries in Lancing parish. We noted there was general opposition to the proposals for South Lancing and Widewater wards as they did not provide a good reflection of community identities. We noted that the Conservative Independent Alliance proposed combining the proposed South Lancing and Widewater wards in a three-member Widewater ward to provide a stronger boundary, which would not divide existing communities. We have noted that this proposal would provide a ward similar to the existing Widewater ward. We propose broadly adopting the Conservative Independent Alliance’s proposal – however we propose running the boundary between a three-member Widewater ward and a two-member Churchill ward along the rear of the properties on the west side of South Street. This would enable us to transfer those electors south of Marlborough Road back into Churchill ward, as proposed by the District Council and the Conservative Independent Alliance, to provide a better reflection of community identities. We also propose one minor modification to the draft recommendations boundary between Churchill and Mash Barn wards in light of comments from the District Council, which wished to see this boundary moved to include that part of Lancing town centre to the west of North Street in Mash Barn ward. We therefore propose including the electors of Culver Road and North Road, as well as the Morris Recreation Ground, in Mash Barn ward under the final recommendations. We consider that this modification will provide a strong boundary in the area and reflect the local community interests while continuing to provide a high level of electoral equality. We are proposing to rename Churchill ward following the renaming of the former Churchill Industrial Estate. We have considered the proposals for Elms and Station ward names, however, as there are rail and police stations in other parts of the district we have decided to rename Churchill ward as Elms.

70 We propose endorsing the draft recommendations for Manor ward as final. Therefore, our final recommendations will provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Under our final recommendations Elms and Mash Barn wards would have councillor:elector ratios 5 per cent and 1 per cent above the district average respectively (1 per cent above and 1 per cent below by 2006). Widewater ward would have a councillor:elector ratio 3 per cent below the district average (4 per cent by 2006). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of the report.

Cokeham and Peverel wards

71 The wards of Cokeham and Peverel are situated to the west of the district, covering the entirety of Sompting parish. Under the existing arrangements both wards return three councillors each. Cokeham and Peverel wards have councillor:elector ratios 2 per cent and 12 per cent below the district average respectively (5 per cent and 13 per cent by 2006).

72 At Stage One Adur District Council stated that these two wards needed “to be evened out...to get both wards within the tolerances of the PER. The proposed boundary revision was formulated by the parish”. It proposed moving the boundary between Cokeham and Peverel wards to run to the rear of the properties on the northern side of Grafton Drive. The Conservative Independent Alliance supported the District Council’s proposal to move the boundary between Cokeham and Peverel wards to run to the rear of the properties on the northern side of Grafton Drive as far as Greentree Crescent. However, it proposed transferring into a new Monks ward those electors to the east of Cokeham Lane and north of Tower Road, currently in Peverel ward, and those electors east and south of Greentree Crescent, currently in Cokeham ward, together with electors from the existing Churchill ward. These proposals were supported in full by the East Worthing & Shoreham Conservative Association.

73 The LGCE carefully considered the proposals put forward for these two wards during Stage One. It noted that the District Council’s proposal had the support of both Lancing and Sompting parish councils and did not require any parish warding, as proposed by the Conservative Independent Alliance. It therefore decided to adopt the District Council’s proposed Cokeham and Peverel wards as part of its draft recommendations.

74 Under the LGCE’s draft recommendations Cokeham and Peverel wards would both have councillor:elector ratios 4 per cent above the district average (equal to and 2 per cent above by 2006 respectively).

75 At Stage Three Adur District Council stated that “the proposals for Sompting are identical to those put forward by the Council and therefore should be welcomed”. It also stated that Sompting Parish Council supported the proposals. The Adur District Council Labour Group broadly agreed with the draft recommendations for Cokeham and Peverel wards.

76 We have carefully considered the representations received during Stage Three concerning these two wards. We are pleased to note that the draft recommendations for Cokeham and Peverel wards have received support and we therefore propose endorsing them as final. Our final recommendations would provide the same levels of electoral equality as the draft recommendations. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Electoral Cycle

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

Conclusions

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

- in Lancing parish a new three-member Widewater ward should be formed from the proposed two-member South Lancing ward and single-member Widewater ward. The boundaries of Churchill and Mash Barn wards should be amended while Churchill ward should be renamed Elms;
- in the unparished part of the district the boundary between St Mary's and St Nicolas wards should be modified, as well as a minor amendment to the boundary of Southlands ward.

79 We conclude that, in Adur:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 39 to 29;
- there should be 14 wards, as at present;
- the boundaries of 13 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

Table 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	39	29	39	29
Number of wards	14	14	14	14
Average number of electors per councillor	1,200	1,614	1,237	1,664
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	5	1	5	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	3	0	3	0

81 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from five to one, with no wards varying by more than 20 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2006, with no wards varying by more than 5 per cent from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final Recommendation

Adur District Council should comprise 29 councillors serving 14 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover.

Parish Council Electoral Arrangements

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

83 The parish of Lancing is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Churchill, Manor, Mash Barn and Widewater wards, each returning four parish councillors. As detailed earlier in the report the LGCE proposed five district wards covering Lancing parish as part of its draft recommendations. Consequently, it created five parish wards and in order to try and provide a good level of electoral equality at parish ward level it proposed that Lancing Parish Council should return 18 councillors, an increase of two. This increase in council size enabled the LGCE to retain four four-member Churchill, Manor, Mash Barn and South Lancing parish wards and a new two-member Widewater parish ward with each parish ward reflecting the district ward of the same name.

84 In response to the LGCE’s consultation report, Lancing Parish Council were opposed to the increase in council size from 16 to 18 due to “the problems and cost implications that will go with this”. In light of this opposition from the Parish Council we propose recommending that Lancing Parish Council continue to return 16 councillors. We received a number of submissions concerning our draft recommendations for wards in Lancing and we have decided to modify the draft recommendations at district ward level, as outlined earlier in the chapter. We therefore propose that the four parish wards of Elms, Manor, Mash Barn and Widewater should reflect the district wards of the same names.

Final Recommendation
Lancing Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Elms, Manor, Mash Barn and Widewater (returning four councillors each). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

85 The parish of Sompting is currently served by 12 councillors representing four wards: Cokeham North, Cokeham South, Peverel North and Peverel South wards, each returning three parish councillors. As detailed earlier in the report the LGCE adopted the District Council’s proposed boundary modification at district ward level as part of its draft recommendations. Consequently, it proposed modifying the parish ward boundaries to reflect the new district ward boundaries.

86 In response to the LGCE’s consultation report, the District Council and Adur District Council Labour Group supported the draft recommendations for Sompting parish. No further comments were received concerning Sompting parish.

87 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of the proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Sompting parish as final.

Final Recommendation

Sompting Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Cokeham North, Cokeham South, Peverel North and Peverel South wards (each returning three councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

Map 2: Final Recommendations for Adur

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

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

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

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

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