

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Arun 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: 308

CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	13
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	19
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	21
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	23
6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	43
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Arun: Detailed Mapping	45

Two large maps illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Aldwick, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Rustington and East Preston are 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
Kru Desai
Robin Gray
Joan Jones
Ann M Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

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

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

SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of Arun'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 Arun:

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

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 106-107) 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.**

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% from the district average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in only one ward, Arundel, expected to vary by more than 10% 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.**

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

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

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
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	East 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
10	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
11	Felpham West	2	The proposed Felpham West parish ward of Felpham parish.	Maps 2 and A2
12	Ferring	2	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Ferring.	Map 2
13	Findon	1	The parishes of Findon, Clapham and Patching.	Map 2
14	Ham	2	The proposed Ham parish ward of Littlehampton parish.	Large map and Map 2
15	Hotham	2	The proposed Hotham parish ward of Bognor Regis parish.	Large map and Map 2
16	Marine	2	The proposed Marine parish ward of Bognor Regis parish.	Large map and Map 2
17	Middleton-on-Sea	2	The parish of Middleton-on-Sea.	Map 2
18	Orchard	2	The proposed Orchard parish ward of Bognor Regis parish.	Large map and Map 2
19	Pagham & Rose Green	3	Part of Aldwick parish (the proposed Rose Green parish ward) and Pagham parish.	Large map and Map 2
20	Pevensey	2	The proposed Pevensey parish ward of Bognor Regis parish.	Large map and Map 2
21	River	2	The proposed River parish ward of Littlehampton parish.	Large map and Map 2
22	Rustington East	2	The proposed Rustington East parish ward of Rustington parish.	Large map and Map 2
23	Rustington West	3	The proposed Rustington West parish ward of Rustington parish.	Large map and Map 2

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
24	Walberton	1	The parishes of Madehurst, Slindon and Walberton.	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: Final recommendations for Arun

	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	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	3,690	1,845	-6	3,815	1,908	-6
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	East Preston with Kingston	3	5,891	1,964	0	5,856	1,952	-3
10	Felpham East	2	4,072	2,036	4	4,258	2,129	5
11	Felpham West	2	3,943	1,972	1	4,243	2,122	5
12	Ferring	2	3,848	1,924	-2	3,786	1,893	-6
13	Findon	1	1,990	1,990	2	1,982	1,982	-2
14	Ham	2	3,600	1,800	-8	3,922	1,961	-3
15	Hotham	2	3,777	1,889	-4	3,957	1,979	-2
16	Marine	2	3,892	1,946	-1	4,070	2,035	1
17	Middleton-on-Sea	2	4,161	2,081	6	4,199	2,100	4
18	Orchard	2	4,044	2,022	3	4,138	2,069	2
19	Pagham & Rose Green	3	5,852	1,951	0	6,025	2,008	-1
20	Pevensey	2	3,933	1,967	0	4,099	2,050	1
21	River	2	3,637	1,819	-7	3,828	1,914	-5
22	Rustington East	2	4,185	2,093	7	4,155	2,078	3
23	Rustington West	3	6,363	2,121	8	6,318	2,106	4

	Ward name	Number of Councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24	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
26	Yapton	2	3,856	1,928	-2	3,852	3,852	-5
	Totals	56	109,706	-	-	113,233	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,959	-	-	2,022	-

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 final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Arun 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 Arun's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 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 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 Arun was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fourth edition, published in December 2000). This guidance sets out the approach to the review.

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

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

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

8 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 10 July 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Arun District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified West Sussex County Council, West Sussex Police Authority, the Local Government Association, 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. 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 Arun 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 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% 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.

11 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.

12 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'.

13 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% from the district average, in five wards by more than 20% and in one ward by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Aldingbourne ward where the councillor represents 40% more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing wards in Arun

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	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

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
Totals	56	109,706	-	-	113,233	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,959	-	-	2,022	-

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%, while electors in Aldingbourne ward were significantly under-represented by 40%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

14 During Stage One the LGCE received eight representations, including a district-wide scheme from Arun District Council, and representations from West Sussex County Council, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party, Arun Liberal Democrat Group, three parish and town councils and a local resident. 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 Arun in West Sussex*.

15 The LGCE's draft recommendations were based on the District Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality, and provided a pattern of single, two and three-member wards throughout the district. However, it moved away from the District Council's scheme in two areas making a minor boundary amendment, between the proposed Beach and River wards and between the revised Aldwick East and Aldwick West wards. It proposed that:

- Arun District Council should be served by 56 councillors, as at present, representing 26 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified, while two wards should retain their existing boundaries.

Draft recommendation

Arun District Council should comprise 56 councillors, serving 26 wards. The whole council should continue to be elected every four years.

16 The LGCE's proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 24 of the 26 wards varying by no more than 10% from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only Arundel ward varying by more than 10% from the average in 2006.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

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

Arun District Council

18 Arun District Council expressed support for the draft recommendations, stating, 'This Council has considered the Local Government Commission's draft recommendations for the district of Arun and fully supports the proposals of the Commission'. However, it did point out two anomalies in the draft recommendations report regarding a mis-spelling and a boundary shown on Map 2.

West Sussex County Council

19 West Sussex County Council reiterated its Stage One concerns about coterminosity, arguing 'that the Commission's decision not to take account of coterminosity in the district review will mean that the problems in achieving coterminous boundaries when the county review is undertaken will remain'. In relation to Arun district, the County Council objected to the draft recommendations for Hotham and Orchard wards in Bognor Regis. It proposed that the area being transferred from Hotham ward to Orchard ward should remain in Hotham ward, arguing that 'the existing ward boundary reflects local community identity'. It also opposed the draft recommendations for the area of Felpham, proposing an alternative boundary that divided the area into north and south wards rather than east and west wards. Finally, it proposed two ward name changes. It proposed that Preston with Kingston and Wick with Toddington be renamed East Preston & Kingston and Wick & Toddington wards respectively.

Parish and town councils

20 We received representations from two parish and town councils. Littlehampton Town Council expressed support for the retention of five parish wards in Littlehampton and the change of name of Central ward to Brookfield ward. It reiterated its Stage One proposals for Wick ward, proposing that the new development of Toddington be included in the new Brookfield ward. It also objected to the proposal to include Beach Crescent in River ward, arguing that 'Beach Crescent, the site of the former Beach Hotel, has a long association with Beach ward, also known as Beach Town'. The Town Council enclosed copies of 11 letters reiterating its proposal to include Beach Crescent in Beach ward and not River ward.

21 East Preston Parish Council accepted the draft recommendations in the East Preston area, subject to one amendment. It proposed that the proposed Preston with Kingston ward be renamed East Preston with Kingston, arguing that 'The name "East Preston with Kingston ward" will also help to differentiate it from the new adjoining "West Preston" Parish ward'.

Other representations

22 A further two representations were received in response to the LGCE's draft recommendations from a local political group and a district councillor. Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party broadly reiterated its Stage One proposals for Bognor Regis, Felpham and Bersted. Furthermore, it brought into question the 2006 projected electorate figures for Pevensy ward, stating that 'We consider the projected figures from Arun for 2006 likely to be an underestimate of Pevensy ward's population total in 2006'.

23 Councillor Dodd expressed concern for the warding arrangements in the proposed Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham & Rose Green wards, stating, 'I would respectfully suggest

that the new ward of Pagham & Rose Green ... should be matched to a full coterminosity situation between District and Parish boundaries'. Councillor Dodd further proposed retaining the existing Pagham ward stating, 'Pagham to be as now three District Councillors but two extra Parish Councillors for Pagham Parish Council. This will lead to a full coterminosity ... no dual working by District Councillors and much less confusion to the residents'.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

24 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Arun 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’.

25 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.

26 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.

27 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

28 Since 1975 there has been a 25% increase in the electorate of Arun district. At Stage One the District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% 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. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, the LGCE stated in its draft recommendations report that it was satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

29 At Stage Three, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party expressed concern about the Council’s electorate forecasts, stating that ‘We consider the projected figures from Arun for 2006 likely to be an underestimate of Pevensy ward’s population total in 2006’. We sought clarification from the District Council at Stage Three. Arun District Council stated that ‘The proposed re-development of the elderly care home known as Nyewood House [in Pevensy ward] began in October 2001 when the County Council submitted an outline planning application for residential development of ‘an unspecified number’ of units. This possible future development was obviously not taken into account in this Council’s submission as the proposal

did not exist at the time'. Therefore, we accept the figures provided by the District Council as the best estimates currently possible.

Council size

30 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.

31 At Stage One, 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'. In its draft recommendations report, having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, the LGCE adopted the Council's proposal for a council of 56-members as it agreed that the existing number of councillors provides for effective and convenient local government.

32 During Stage Three, we received no representations relating to council size, therefore we are confirming the draft recommendations for a council size of 56 as final.

Electoral arrangements

33 As set out in the LGCE's draft recommendations report, all the representations received during Stage One were carefully considered, including the district-wide scheme from Arun District Council. In view of the support given to large elements of the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, the LGCE based its draft recommendations on the District Council's scheme and its proposed 'Option 2' in the Rustington/East Preston area. The LGCE moved away from the District Council's proposals in two areas in order to secure more identifiable boundaries.

34 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations in full. West Sussex County Council and Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party objected to the proposals for Bognor Regis and Felpham, proposing alternative warding arrangements. Littlehampton Town Council objected to the proposed boundary between the Wick with Toddington and Brookfield wards. It reiterated its Stage One proposal to include the new development of Toddington in the new Brookfield ward. A number of responses were also received proposing new ward names. Having considered all the representations received during Stage Three, we propose confirming the majority of the LGCE's draft recommendations as final.

35 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. Given the local support for the majority of the draft recommendations, we propose confirming the majority of them as final, with only one boundary amendment and a ward name change. 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;
- (h) Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham wards.

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

Angmering, Ferring and Findon wards

37 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% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (25% fewer by 2006). Angmering and Ferring wards have 12% fewer and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (2% more and 6% fewer respectively by 2006). Findon ward is relatively over-represented at present, with 22% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (25% fewer by 2006).

38 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, should 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.

39 Having considered the District Council's proposals, the LGCE were content to put them forward as part of its draft recommendations, without amendment. The LGCE considered the District Council's proposals provided for acceptable levels of electoral equality and would continue to reflect local community identities well.

40 Under the draft recommendations, Angmering ward would have 20% fewer electors per councillor than the district average initially, improving to 6% fewer than the average by 2006. Ferring and Findon wards would have 2% fewer and 2% more electors per councillor than the district average (6% fewer and 2% fewer than the average respectively by 2006).

41 At Stage Three, the District Council expressed support for the draft recommendations for this area.

42 Given the support received at Stage Three for the LGCE's draft recommendations we confirm the proposed Angmering, Ferring and Findon wards as final. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

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

43 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% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (11% fewer by 2006). Rustington North and Rustington South wards have 6% and 19% fewer electors per councillor than the average (10% and 22% fewer respectively by 2006), while Rustington East ward has 7% more electors per councillor than the average (2% more by 2006).

44 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.

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

46 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 being 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.

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

48 The LGCE 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 and 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 5% more electors per councillor than the district average (1% more by 2006).

49 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% more and 25% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2% more and 15% 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% more and 8% more electors than the district average respectively (14% more and 4% more by 2006).

50 Having carefully considered the representations received in relation to this area, the LGCE decided to adopt the 'Option 2' proposals. The District Council's 'Option 2' provided for very good levels of electoral equality, retained the parishes of East Preston and Kingston in a single ward and would not necessitate the consequential warding of East Preston parish. While the LGCE acknowledged the views expressed by East Preston Parish Council and Arun Liberal Democrats, it considered that the District Council's 'Option 2' provided for a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the alternative options put forward for the area.

51 The LGCE noted that 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 the LGCE stated in its *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 also resulted 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.

52 Under the draft recommendations, Rustington East and Rustington West wards would have 7% and 8% more electors per councillor than the district average initially, improving to 3% and 4% more than the average respectively by 2006. Preston with Kingston ward would initially have equal to the district average number of electors per councillor (3% fewer than the average by 2006).

53 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. West Sussex County Council proposed that Preston with Kingston ward be renamed East Preston & Kingston ward.

54 East Preston Parish Council expressed support for the draft recommendations, subject to one amendment. It proposed that the proposed Preston with Kingston ward be renamed East Preston with Kingston, arguing that 'The name "East Preston with Kingston ward" will also help to differentiate it from the new adjoining 'West Preston' Parish ward'.

55 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three, and given the local support for them, we propose confirming the LGCE's draft recommendations as final, subject to one amendment. We propose that the proposed Preston with Kingston ward be renamed East Preston with Kingston ward to better reflect the constituent areas. We note that West Sussex County Council proposed the new ward name of East Preston & Kingston, however, we propose adopting East Preston Parish Council's proposal as the parish concerned

is contained within the ward affected. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Littlehampton (five wards)

56 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%, 27%, 24% and 8% more electors per councillor than the average respectively (11%, 29%, 26% and 10% more electors than the average respectively by 2006). Under the existing electoral arrangements Ham ward is over-represented, with 29% fewer electors than the average (28% fewer than the average by 2006).

57 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.

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

59 The LGCE 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.

60 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'.

61 Having carefully considered the representations received in relation to this area, the LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposals for this area as part of its draft recommendations, with one minor amendment. While it 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, it was not persuaded that their alternative proposals offered 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. The LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposals as they resulted in the existing and the proposed new development of Toddington being in the same ward and provided for a better boundary and reflection of community identity. It proposed 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.

62 However, the LGCE proposed one minor amendment to the boundary between the proposed Beach and River wards, including Beach Crescent in River ward in order to secure a more identifiable boundary.

63 Under the draft recommendations, Beach, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington wards would have 8%, 8%, 5% and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (8%, 3%, 3% fewer and equal to the average respectively by 2006). Brookfield ward would be equal to the average and have 1% fewer electors than the average by 2006.

64 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. Littlehampton Town Council reiterated its Stage One proposals for Wick ward. It expressed support for the retention of five parish wards in Littlehampton and the change of name of Central ward to Brookfield ward. However, it did object to the proposal to include Beach Crescent in River ward arguing that, 'Beach Crescent, the site of the former Beach Hotel, has a long association with Beach ward, also known as Beach Town'. The Town Council enclosed copies of 11 letters reiterating its proposal to include Beach Crescent in Beach ward and not River ward.

65 We have carefully considered all the responses received. We note the concerns of Littlehampton Town Council with regard to the boundary between the proposed Wick with Toddington and Brookfield wards. We maintain, however, that the A259 offers a more identifiable boundary. In addition, we note that the railway line forms a significant divide in this area, with no direct links by road between the areas to the north and south of the railway line. Therefore, we concur with the view that the Toddington area has better links with the area to its west than to its south. We also note that the LGCE asserted at Stage One that the proposed boundary between the Town Council's proposed Wick and Brookfield wards would not follow ground detail and would divide the community of Toddington and the future housing development in the area and that it was not persuaded that the proposed boundary would offer a better reflection of community identity and interests. We concur with this view, and remain of the opinion that the draft recommendations for this area provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria, and propose confirming them as final.

66 We note that West Sussex County Council proposed renaming the proposed Wick with Toddington ward as Wick & Toddington ward. However, we remain of the opinion that the ward name proposed in the draft recommendations provides a better reflection of the area and was supported locally. The Town Council objected to the proposal to include Beach Crescent in the

proposed River ward and we note the level of local opposition to this proposal together with evidence provided of Beach Crescent having historical links with Beach ward. Therefore, in the interest of community identity and interests we propose retaining Beach Crescent in Beach ward, particularly as this would only have a minimal effect on electoral equality.

67 Under our final recommendations the proposed Beach, Ham, River and Wick with Toddington wards would have 6%, 8%, 7% and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6%, 3%, 5% fewer and equal to the average respectively by 2006). Brookfield ward would be equal to the average and have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the average by 2006. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Arundel and Walberton wards

68 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% fewer and 16% more electors per councillor than the district average (13% fewer and 13% more respectively by 2006).

69 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% fewer electors per councillor than the district average, increasing to 12% fewer than the average by 2006. The proposed Walberton ward would have 12% more electors per councillor than the average (9% 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'.

70 Having considered the District Council's proposals, the LGCE was of the view that they provided for a good balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria and decided to adopt them as part of its draft recommendations. In adopting the District Council's proposed Arundel ward the LGCE took into consideration the rural nature of the area and was unable to determine any viable alternatives which would not have a negative effect on electoral equality, or require the consequential warding of parishes. The LGCE also considered that, in an entirely parished district such as Arun, the configuration and location of parishes was restrictive. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the District Council's proposals.

71 At Stage Three, the District Council expressed support for the draft recommendations for this area.

72 Given the support received at Stage Three for the LGCE's draft recommendations we confirm the proposed Arundel and Walberton wards as final. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are illustrated on Map 2.

Aldingbourne, Barnham and Bersted wards

73 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% more electors per councillor than the district average (41% more than the average by 2006). Barnham and Bersted wards have 19% more and 2% more electors per councillor than the district average (15% more and 6% more respectively by 2006).

74 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 Climping (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 Climping, 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% more electors per councillor than the district average (5% more by 2006). The proposed Yapton ward would have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (5% fewer by 2006). Bersted ward would have 2% more electors per councillor than the district average (6% more by 2006).

75 Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party expressed broad support for the District Council's proposed Bersted ward, subject to an amendment, which included the area of Shripney, from the existing Bersted ward, in the proposed Barnham ward.

76 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'.

77 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'.

78 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One, the LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposals for this area as part of its draft recommendations. While it noted the concerns of Yapton Parish Council and Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party, it considered 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. The LGCE therefore considered that the District Council's proposals provided a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the alternative options put forward. Furthermore, the LGCE 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. Under the draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the District Council's proposals.

79 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party reiterated its Stage One proposals for Bersted.

80 We note the concerns of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party with regard to retaining the village of Shripney in Bersted ward. However, the proposal to include the village of Shripney in the revised Barnham ward would require the creation of a parish ward. We are not minded to create a parish ward in this area as, in our view, the creation of a parish ward would not facilitate a good scheme across the district. We are also of the view that Shripney is directly linked to the main urban settlement of Bersted by the A29 (Shripney Road) and is indeed not 'remote from the rest of Bersted', as stated in the Labour Party's representation. We also note that there is insufficient ground detail to tie the boundary to in order to create a parish ward. It was argued that Bersted 'will be faced with far greater pressure for development than Barnham ward'. However, we are unable to take into consideration speculative development as evidence, and only take into account the new developments projected in the electorate figures for 2006 provided by Arun District Council. We therefore propose confirming the draft recommendations as final. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

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

81 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 Climping and is represented by two members. Felpham East, Felpham West and Middleton-on-Sea have 10% more, 8% fewer and 19% more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (4%, 4% and 16% more by 2006).

82 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% and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average (5% more by 2006 for both wards). The proposed Middleton-on-Sea ward would have 6% more electors than the district average (4% more electors by 2006).

83 Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party proposed dividing the area of Felpham into north and south wards rather than east and west wards. Under this proposal it would retain the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish in the proposed Yapton ward. We did not receive the 2006 figures for this proposal at Stage One.

84 Yapton Parish Council opposed the Council's proposal for the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish, as detailed earlier.

85 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.

86 Having carefully considered the representations received in relation to this area, the LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposals as part of its draft recommendations, without amendment. As outlined earlier, while the LGCE noted the concerns of Yapton Parish Council and Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party, it considered that the area of Hoe Lane should be included in the proposed Felpham East ward in order to better reflect local

community identity. It considered that the District Council's proposals provided a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the alternative options put forward.

87 Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party reiterated its Stage One proposals for a north and a south ward in Felpham.

88 West Sussex County Council opposed the draft recommendations for the area of Felpham, proposing an alternative boundary that divided the area into north and south wards rather than east and west wards, arguing that 'this would better reflect community identity'.

89 We have considered the alternative proposals put forward by Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party and West Sussex County Council, which would divide Felpham into north and south wards. However, having considered the representations received, we propose confirming the draft recommendations as final. We have not been persuaded by the evidence and argumentation put forward that such a change is justified. Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party's proposals would also not facilitate the creation of a parish ward from the Hoe Lane area of Yapton parish, which we maintain should be included in Felpham East ward to better reflect community identity. Furthermore, the proposed Felpham North ward would also provide for a high level of electoral inequality (11% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2006) which we do not believe is acceptable. Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and Map A2 in Appendix A.

Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy wards

90 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% and 11% more electors per councillor than the district average (14% and 12% more than the average respectively by 2006). Orchard and Pevensy wards are over-represented with 20% and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (19% and 4% fewer by 2006).

91 At Stage One, 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 railway line 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 existing Pevensy ward, to the revised Orchard ward. Under the District Council's proposals, the proposed Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensy wards would have 4% fewer, 1% fewer, 3% more and equal to the district average number of electors per councillor respectively (2% fewer, 1% more, 2% more and 1% more respectively by 2006).

92 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% more, 4% more, 2% fewer and 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (2006 figures were not provided).

93 Having carefully considered the representations received, the LGCE decided to adopt the District Council's proposals for this area as part of its draft recommendations. The LGCE 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'. The LGCE noted the concerns expressed by Bognor Regis & Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party regarding the District Council's proposals for Bognor Regis. However, it was not persuaded that its alternative proposals would offer the more clearly identifiable and convenient boundaries. The District Council's proposed boundaries followed the railway line and retained a majority of the existing boundaries, thus in the view of the LGCE, providing a better reflection of community identity and interests. Under the draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the revised wards would be the same as under the District Council's proposals.

94 At Stage Three, Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party broadly reiterated its Stage One proposals for Bognor Regis with particular emphasis on retaining the area to the south-east of Annandale Avenue in Hotham ward. It expressed support for including both sides of Annandale Avenue in the revised Orchard ward. Furthermore, it brought into question the 2006 projected electorate figures for Pevensy ward, stating that 'We consider the projected figures from Arun for 2006 likely to be an underestimate of Pevensy ward's population total in 2006.' (2006 figures were provided to show the elector:councillor ratio in its proposed wards). As detailed above, we sought clarification on the electorate forecasts for 2006 from the District Council and accept the figures provided by them as the best estimates currently possible. Therefore, we are not minded to take into consideration the revised estimates provided by Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party.

95 West Sussex County Council objected to the draft recommendations for Hotham and Orchard wards in Bognor Regis. It proposed that the area being transferred from Hotham ward to Orchard ward should remain in Hotham ward, arguing that 'the existing ward boundary reflects local community identity'.

96 We have considered Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party's proposal for a revised Marine ward in Bognor Regis. The proposal would combine a majority of the coastal area of Bognor Regis in a single ward by combining significant parts of the existing Marine and Hotham wards. However, its proposed Marine ward would require a fundamental change to the existing arrangements and to the draft recommendations. The proposal would also divide the coastal area of Hotham ward and transfer a significant part of the town centre from Marine ward to Hotham ward. We have not been persuaded by the argumentation and evidence provided that the Labour Party's proposals would provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria in this area. Therefore, we maintain that the draft recommendations provide for the more convenient and identifiable boundaries based on the use of the railway line and retaining the majority of the existing boundaries.

97 We note the concerns of Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party and West Sussex County Council with regard to the draft recommendations for Hotham ward in Bognor Regis. However, we are not persuaded by the evidence provided and are of the view that the draft recommendations offer the best balance between community identity and electoral equality. Retaining the Havelock Road/Longford Road area (to the north-west of the railway

line), in Hotham ward, and subsequently including Collyers Avenue and Wadhurst Close in Orchard ward would have a negative effect on electoral equality. Under this boundary amendment the revised Hotham, Orchard and Pevensey wards would have 9% more, 4% fewer and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the district average respectively (10% more, 5% fewer and 4% fewer than the average by 2006 respectively). Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party expressed concern about the Havelock Rd/Longford Road area having a greater affinity with the area of Bognor Regis Town Centre that is in Hotham ward. While we note the concerns expressed, we are not of the view that the identities and interests of the local community would be adversely effected if the draft recommendations in this area were to be confirmed. In addition, we concur with the view that the railway line forms a strong boundary in this area. We therefore propose confirming the draft recommendations as final. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham wards

98 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% more and 15% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (10% more and 18% fewer respectively by 2006). At present, Pagham ward is over-represented with 17% fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in 2006.

99 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.

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

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

102 Having considered all the representations received for this area, the LGCE considered that the District Council's proposals provided for a good reflection of the statutory criteria and decided to adopt them as part of its draft recommendations. The LGCE noted that they received a degree of local support and agreed that they would facilitate a better reflection of local communities. However, it proposed 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 would be included in Aldwick East ward. This amendment would affect three electors and have a negligible effect on electoral equality. Under the draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed wards would be the same as under the District Council's proposals.

103 At Stage Three, the District Council supported the draft recommendations. Councillor Dodd expressed concern for the warding arrangements in the proposed Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham & Rose Green wards, stating, 'I would respectively suggest that the new ward of Pagham & Rose Green ... should be matched to a full coterminosity situation between District and Parish boundaries'. Councillor Dodd further proposed retaining the existing Pagham ward stating, 'Pagham to be as now three District Councillors but two extra Parish Councillors for Pagham Parish Council. This will lead to a full coterminosity ... no dual working by District Councillors and much less confusion to the residents ...'.

104 We note the concerns of Councillor Dodd with regard to the creation of Rose Green parish ward. However, to achieve coterminosity between the Pagham district ward boundary and the Pagham parish boundary would create unacceptable levels of electoral equality. The existing arrangements in Pagham achieve coterminosity but the ward is over-represented with 17% fewer electors per councillor than the district average, both now and in 2006. In conjunction with this, the existing Aldwick West ward is under-represented with 15% fewer electors per councillor than the district average (18% fewer by 2006). We maintain that in order to secure an acceptable level of electoral equality, the only viable option is to create a parish ward of the Rose Green area, currently in Aldwick West ward, and combine it with the existing Pagham ward to create the Pagham & Rose Green ward. We therefore propose confirming the draft recommendations as final. The number of electors per councillor in each ward would be the same as under the draft recommendations. Our final recommendations for these wards are illustrated on Map 2 and on the large map at the back of the report.

Electoral cycle

105 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

106 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:

- We propose amending the boundary between the proposed Beach and River wards to include Beach Crescent in the proposed Beach ward;
- We propose changing the name of the proposed Preston with Kingston ward to East Preston with Kingston ward.

107 We conclude that, in Arun:

- A council of 56 members should be retained;
- there should be 26 wards, one fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 25 of the existing wards should be modified.

108 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	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

109 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 17 to two, with no wards varying by more than 20% from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further in 2006, with only one ward, Arundel, varying by more than 10% from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final 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.

Parish and town council electoral arrangements

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

111 At Stage One the LGCE noted that the Council's submission included a copy of a letter from Climping Parish Council received during its own consultation which stated that 'with Climping 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 Climping Parish Council. The LGCE therefore stated that it welcomed views on this, particularly from Climping Parish Council, at Stage Three.

112 At Stage Three, we did not receive any comments in relation to Climping parish and therefore do not propose any modifications to the draft recommendations.

113 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 the draft recommendations, the LGCE proposed adopting the Council's proposed Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham & Rose Green wards without amendment.

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

115 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, we received one representation. Councillor Dodd expressed concern for the warding arrangements in the proposed Aldwick East, Aldwick West and Pagham & Rose Green wards, stating, 'I would respectively suggest that the new ward of Pagham & Rose Green ... should be matched to a full coterminosity situation between District and Parish boundaries'. Councillor Dodd further proposed retaining the existing Pagham ward stating, 'Pagham to be as now three District Councillors but two extra Parish Councillors for Pagham Parish Council. This will lead to a full coterminosity ... no dual working by District Councillors and much less confusion to the residents'.

116 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Aldwick parish as final. We note the concerns of Councillor Dodd with regard to the creation of Rose Green parish ward. However, to achieve coterminosity between the Pagham district ward boundary and the Pagham parish boundary would create unacceptable levels of electoral imbalance, as detailed earlier.

Final 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.

117 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. Under its draft recommendations the LGCE proposed modifying the boundaries of Hotham, Marine, Orchard and Pevensey district wards. In order to reflect the revised district warding arrangements the LGCE proposed 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.

118 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, we received no representations in relation to the parish warding arrangements for this area.

119 Therefore, in light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendations for warding Bognor Regis parish as final.

Final 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.

120 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 the draft recommendations the LGCE proposed modifying the boundaries of Felpham East and Felpham West district wards. In order to reflect the revised district wards the LGCE therefore proposed 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.

121 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, West Sussex County Council and Bognor Regis and Littlehampton Constituency Labour Party proposed dividing the area of Felpham into north and south district wards rather than east and west district wards.

122 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendations for warding Felpham parish as final.

Final 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.

123 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 the draft recommendations the LGCE proposed modifying the boundaries of Beach, Central, Ham, River and Wick district wards. Therefore, in order to reflect the revised district warding arrangements the LGCE proposed that the boundaries of Beach, Central, Ham, River and Wick parish wards are amended accordingly. It also proposed 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.

124 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, Littlehampton Town Council reiterated its Stage One proposal for Wick district ward. It also proposed including Beach Crescent in the revised Beach district ward, as detailed earlier.

125 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendations for warding Littlehampton parish as final, subject to one amendment. As detailed earlier, we propose including Beach Crescent in Beach district ward and not River district ward, as proposed by Littlehampton Town Council. Therefore, in order to reflect the revised district warding arrangements we propose that the boundaries of Beach and River parish wards are amended accordingly.

Final 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.

126 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 the draft recommendations for district wards in this area, the LGCE proposed 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 the part of Rustington parish to be included in the proposed Preston with Kingston district ward. The revised Rustington East ward would return six councillors and the new Rustington West and West Preston wards would return nine councillors and one councillor respectively.

127 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, we received no representations in relation to the parish warding arrangements for this area. However, East Preston Parish Council proposed that Preston with Kingston district ward, within which the proposed West Preston parish ward would be included, be renamed East Preston with Kingston.

128 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed district wards in the area, albeit with the revised East Preston with Kingston ward name, we confirm the draft recommendations for warding Rustington parish as final.

Final 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.

129 The parish of Yapton is currently served by ten councillors. In order to reflect the draft recommendations for district warding purposes, the LGCE proposed 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.

130 In response to the LGCE's consultation report, we received no representations in relation to the parish warding arrangements for this area and therefore propose confirming the draft recommendations as final.

Final 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.

Map 2: Final recommendations for Arun

6 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

131 Having completed the review of electoral arrangements in Arun 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).

132 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.

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

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

APPENDIX A

Final recommendations for 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 proposed warding arrangements for Aldwick, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Rustington and East Preston.

Map A1: Final recommendations for Arun: Key map

Map A2: Proposed warding of Yapton Parish