

Draft recommendations

The
Boundary
Committee
for England

Part of the Electoral Commission



Future electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council

July 2008

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Boundary Committee:

Tel: 020 7271 0500

Email: publications@boundarycommittee.org.uk

© The Boundary Committee 2008

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

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements (by district council area)	9
Adur	9
Arun	11
Chichester	13
Crawley	14
Horsham	17
Mid Sussex	20
Worthing	22
Conclusions	24
Parish electoral arrangements	25
3 What happens next?	29
4 Mapping	31
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	33
B Code of practice on written consultation	37
C Table C1: Draft recommendations for West Sussex	39
D Table D1: Existing arrangements for West Sussex	47
E Additional legislation we have considered	55

Summary

The Boundary Committee for England is the body responsible for conducting electoral reviews of local authorities. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority.

Following a request from West Sussex County Council, the Electoral Commission has directed that this review be undertaken with the presumption of single-member electoral divisions being recommended.

Current electoral arrangements

Under the existing arrangements, 19 divisions currently have electoral variances of more than 10% from the county average with one division varying by more than 20%.

This review is being conducted in four stages:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
One	26 February 2008	Submission of proposals to us
Two	22 April 2008	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	1 July 2008	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	26 August 2008	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Submissions received

We received 34 representations overall during Stage One, including a county-wide scheme from the County Council whose proposals were based on a council size of 71. We also received a county-wide scheme from a former county councillor who is a local resident of Arun. The other representations were generally of a localised nature, many from parish and town councils, district or borough councils, or from individual county councillors. Some submissions opposed the County Council's proposal to move to single-member divisions, particularly in Crawley.

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

The County Council projected an increase in the electorate of 4.3% from 606,979 to 633,182 over the five year period between 2007 and 2012. We did not receive any comments in relation to those electorate figures and have used them as the basis for developing our recommendations.

Council size

We received a proposal for a council size of 71 from the County Council, and a proposal for a council size of 76 from a local resident. Having considered the information received we have adopted a council size of 71 members.

General analysis

We are proposing an entire pattern of 71 single-member divisions based on the County Council's proposals, with some modifications to improve the level of electoral equality and to strengthen boundaries. In terms of electoral equality, only 15 of the 71 divisions would vary by more than 10% from the county-wide average, forecast to improve to only nine divisions varying by more than 10% from the average by 2012.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on our draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council contained in this report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft recommendations.** We believe that the more feedback we receive, based on clear evidence, the better informed we will be in forming our final recommendations. We will take into account all submissions received by **25 August 2008**. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

Express your views by writing directly to us:

**Review Officer
West Sussex Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

**reviews@boundarycommittee.org.uk
Tel: 020 7271 0512**

The full report is available to download at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

1 Introduction

1 The Electoral Commission has directed the Boundary Committee to conduct a review of the electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council. The review commenced on 26 February 2008 when we invited the submission of proposals to us on the electoral arrangements for the County Council. The submissions we received from the County Council and others have informed our own draft proposals on which we are now consulting and are contained in this report.

What is an electoral review?

2 The main aim of an electoral review is to improve levels of electoral fairness in a single local authority. To do this, we seek to ensure that each councillor who is elected to the county council represents approximately the same number of electors – thus achieving electoral fairness. When we make our recommendations, we will also seek to reflect communities in the area, and provide for convenient and effective local government.

3 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for convenient and effective local government – are set out in legislation and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations.

4 Our powers, as well as the guidance under which we conduct electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

Why are we conducting a review of West Sussex County Council?

5 The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (LGPIH Act) allows a local authority that holds whole council elections every four years to request the Electoral Commission to direct the Boundary Committee to undertake an electoral review with the presumption of recommending single-member wards or divisions.

6 West Sussex County Council requested the Electoral Commission direct this 'single-member review' and on 17 January 2008 the Electoral Commission agreed to this request and directed the Committee to undertake a review.

7 The legislation makes clear that, when conducting such a review, the Boundary Committee must continue to have regard to the statutory criteria that governs all electoral reviews, as outlined in paragraph 13.

8 This in effect means that the Committee is not required to recommend single-member wards or divisions – reflecting the statutory criteria must be the primary objective of the review. The Committee must however seek to recommend single-member wards or divisions where the criteria can also be reflected in that pattern.

9 The population of any local authority area is constantly changing, with inward or outward migration, as well as people moving between different areas within the same

authority. This is particularly the case where areas are subject to major growth or regeneration initiatives. As a result of these changes in population, the levels of electoral fairness change, with some councillors representing considerably more – or fewer – electors than their colleagues. This review will also seek to reduce these imbalances across the local authority.

How will our recommendations affect you?

10 Our recommendations may affect the county electoral division in which you vote (and, as a result, which councillor represents you), the boundaries of electoral divisions and, in some instances, parish or town council wards. Your electoral division name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area.

11 It is therefore important that you give us your comments and views on our draft proposals. We take our consultation stages very seriously and invite comment from anyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with our draft recommendations or not. We will be accepting submissions until 25 August 2008. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish on 31 October 2008. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on our website, www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

What is the Boundary Committee for England?

12 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. We are responsible for conducting reviews as directed by the Electoral Commission or the Secretary of State.

Members of the Committee are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Jane Earl
Robin Gray
Professor Ron Johnson
Joan Jones CBE
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Professor Colin Mellors

Director:

Archie Gall

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

13 As described earlier, the prime aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for West Sussex is to achieve electoral fairness. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended), with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities
- secure the matters in respect of equality of representation referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972

14 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'. In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing clearly identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

15 Absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is to keep variances to a minimum.

16 If electoral imbalances are to be minimised, electoral fairness should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should also make this their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate should also be taken into account and we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over this period.

17 Our recommendations do not affect county, district or parish external boundaries, local taxes, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

18 At the start of the review, West Sussex County Council, district and borough councils in the county, parish and town councils and other interested parties were invited to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for the County Council.

19 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Committee visited the area and met with officers and members from the County Council. We also held two briefing sessions with parish and town councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 34 representations during Stage One, including county-wide schemes from the County Council and a local resident of Arun district (a former councillor, who is referred to throughout this report as 'the local

resident'), all of which may be inspected both at our offices and those of the County Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

Electorate figures

20 We are required to take into account any changes to the number and distribution of electors that are likely to take place within the next five years following the start of the review¹. The County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2012, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 4.3% from 606,979 to 633,182 over the five-year period from 2007 to 2012. The figures were based on estimates provided to the county council by the seven district and borough councils in West Sussex.

21 We did not receive any representations in relation to the electorate figures that the County Council provided during Stage One from any other respondents.

22 We recognise that forecasting electorate figures is difficult and, having considered the County Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We consider the County Council has considered all known planning applications likely to be implemented in the county within the timeframe, and are satisfied that the electorate figures it has provided reflect the growth anticipated at the start of this review.

Council size

23 West Sussex County Council presently has 70 members. The County Council proposed a revised council size of 71 members. The County Council's proposal was made in the context of its internal political management structure while taking account of councillors' representative roles. The County Council provided evidence of the roles of county councillors, including job descriptions for key roles and responsibilities which councillors were expected to fulfil. The County Council argued that this management structure currently worked well with a council size of around 70 members, and that the additional member was to ensure that all districts received an allocation of councillors which could provide for convenient and effective local government. With greater predicted growth in the town of Horsham than in many other parts of the county, the County Council proposed that an additional member be allocated to Horsham district. We note that Horsham is entitled to this additional member under a 71-member scheme.

24 The County Council took account of the likely distribution of electors within the county over the five-year period from December 2007. The County Council commented that the political management requirements included that 'apart from being members of the County Council, all county councillors serve on the appropriate CLC [County Local Committee]'. Although the County Council provided little information of the requirement for division of committee membership and other councillor responsibilities, they argued that the number of roles was roughly appropriate for a council size of 70 or 71, and that this size currently works well.

¹ Schedule 11 of the Local Government Act 1972.

25 The County Council said that its Executive Committee structure was established to enable councillors to have more time to devote to duties within their divisions, and that 'ongoing assessment of the impact of the current management structure on workloads is that overall there is no justification for any significant increase or decrease in the membership of the County Council'.

26 The only other representation we received in relation to council size was from the local resident. He proposed allocating each district council except Adur one extra councillor, thereby bringing the overall council size to 76. The local resident also provided division patterns for each district based on the current allocation, inviting the Boundary Committee to consider the allocation by district and so to create a scheme which could result in any council size of between 70 and 76. The local resident stated that his preference was for an increased council size to 76, but did not provide sufficient evidence to justify this increase.

27 The Boundary Committee makes its decisions in relation to council size before considering the allocation of councillors to individual districts. Having noted that the local resident did not provide specific evidence in relation to a specific council size, we have not been persuaded to adopt his preferred council size of 76.

28 Having considered the information received from the County Council, we are proposing an increase in the existing council size from 70 to 71. We are satisfied that the County Council have provided sufficient information to demonstrate that this new council size will provide effective and convenient local government in the context of the County Council's internal political management structure and the representational role of councillors.

Electoral fairness

29 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. The Electoral Commission expects the Boundary Committee's recommendations to provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for convenient and effective local government.

30 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor in the county. The council size and total county electorate determines this average. It is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (606,979 in December 2007 and 633,182 by December 2012) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 71 under our draft proposals. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 8,549 in 2007 and is forecast to be 8,918 by 2012.

31 Under our draft recommendations, initially 15 divisions will have variances of greater than 10%. This is forecast to improve to nine divisions by 2012 when forecast housing development should have been completed. We are satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our draft recommendations for West Sussex whilst taking into account all other factors.

General analysis

32 Having proposed an increase in council size to 71, we have developed proposals which are broadly based on those proposed by the County Council. This was the only county-wide submission we received that would provide a consistently good level of electoral equality under a council size of 71.

33 We received a county wide scheme from the local resident, a former county councillor who represented the Hotham area of Bognor Regis until 2005. We considered the local resident's proposals, but note that they would not provide a good level of electoral equality across the county by 2012. We also note that a number of his proposed divisions are two-member. We are undertaking this review with a presumption in favour of single-member divisions. Consequently, where we consider that single-member divisions will provide good levels of electoral equality, reflect community identities and provide effective and convenient local government we are unlikely to be persuaded to adopt any two-member divisions.

34 In the districts of Adur and Chichester we decided to adopt the proposals of the County Council without modification while in the districts of Arun, Horsham, Mid Sussex and Worthing we made a number of minor adjustments to the proposals. In Crawley we have made a modification to the proposed divisions comprising the areas of Bewbush, Gossops Green and Ifield.

35 Whilst the County Council provided little evidence in support of its proposals for division boundaries and they have not been locally consulted on, we acknowledge that they would provide for good levels of electoral fairness throughout the county. The last electoral review of the county was carried out in 2004, and some areas have not undergone significant change. We note that the County Council's proposals are characterised by an absence of community identity evidence especially where it has proposed retaining the existing single-member divisions. However, in light of the good levels of electoral equality that the scheme provides across the county we have been persuaded to adopt it.

36 Where we have modified the County Council's proposals to improve electoral equality we have sought to provide for a stronger boundary and to tie the boundary to more easily identifiable geographical features.

37 Adur district currently returns six county councillors. On projected figures this entitlement decreases to 5.47 county councillors. However, the County Council have argued that because of the presence of the River Adur and the lack of crossings, the district should retain six members. The County Council argue that to reduce to five members would necessitate the strong river boundary being breached when formulating divisions which would result in a poor reflection of community identities. We have accepted the County Council's argument in this respect and propose Adur should return six county councillors to reflect this.

38 Our proposals are for a uniform pattern of single-member divisions across the county. We believe our proposals meet our aims of achieving good levels of electoral equality while generally reflecting community identities and interests. We have sought to use existing parishes as the 'building blocks' of the proposed county divisions.

39 During Stage Three we welcome further comments on our draft recommendations, in particularly in relation to our division arrangements where we did not receive representations other than those made by the County Council. We are also particularly keen to receive comments in relation to Horsham and Crawley where we faced difficulty recommending a scheme that would reflect community identity and secure a good level of electoral equality.

Electoral division arrangements

40 For county division purposes, the following district council areas are considered in turn:

- Adur (page 9)
- Arun (page 11)
- Chichester (page 13)
- Crawley (page 14)
- Horsham (page 17)
- Mid Sussex (page 20)
- Worthing (page 22)

41 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and C1 (on pages 28 and 39, respectively), and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Adur

42 Adur, in the south east of West Sussex, contains the coastal settlements of Shoreham and Lancing. It lies between the town of Worthing and the city of Brighton and Hove. The district of Adur is split in two by the river Adur, with the electoral divisions of Saltings ED, Lancing ED and Sompting ED on the west side and the electoral divisions of Kingston Buci ED, Shoreham ED and Southwick ED on the east side.

43 Appendix C outlines the existing electoral variances for 2007 and the variances which the divisions are forecast to have by 2012 if the existing arrangements were to remain in place.

44 Under a 71-member scheme Adur would be entitled to 5.55 county councillors in 2007 and 5.47 in 2012. The County Council argued that Adur should retain six councillors. The river Adur bisects the district, with roughly equal numbers of electors on either side. There are few crossings, particularly to the north of the district, and the County Council argued that to reduce to five members would necessitate the strong river boundary being breached when formulating divisions, which would in turn result in a poor reflection of community identities. A former county councillor (who represented Hotham ED in Arun until 2005) also proposed that Adur retain six councillors.

45 We agree with the County Council that the river Adur is a very strong boundary with few crossings, and should not be breached when forming electoral divisions. We therefore propose that in order to maintain this boundary and to provide a fair level of electoral equality and to reflect community identities Adur should retain six

councillors. This does, however, mean that there will be poorer levels of electoral quality.

46 During Stage One we received two submissions in relation to the district of Adur, which can be viewed on our website. Both the submission from the County Council and the submission from the local resident were county wide. The County Council submitted a scheme with a uniform pattern of single-member divisions. The local resident submitted two schemes: one for five county councillors which included a two-member division and a second scheme for six single-member divisions. Having decided on a council size of 71 we did not consider we could adopt the local resident's scheme for five divisions, as each division would have resulted in poor levels of electoral equality.

47 The County Council did not propose any change to the divisions of Kingston Buci ED, Shoreham ED and Southwick ED to the east of the river. Under a 71-member council scheme these divisions will have 12%, 16% and 13% fewer electors than the county average by 2012, respectively. We recognise that these provide poor levels of electoral equality, but given the use of the river as a boundary and the fact that all divisions will be over-represented, we acknowledge that it is not possible to have excellent levels of electoral equality in Adur. The boundaries are strong, following the railway line and busy roads. The local resident supported the current Southwick ED, saying that 'the Southwick division covers virtually all the area popularly known as "Southwick" locally'.

48 The local resident's proposals were based on coterminosity with the existing district ward boundaries and would result in two divisions with 24% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. The local resident did not provide any persuasive evidence to justify divisions with such poor levels of electoral equality. He argued that his proposals preserved 'the identities of the parishes and towns of Sompting, Lancing, Shoreham and Southwick', although he did not provide any specific evidence for community identity in Adur.

49 To the west of the river, the County Council proposed no change to the existing Saltings ED, which would have 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2012. In order to improve the level of electoral equality in both the remaining divisions, it proposed to transfer part of the Lancing ED to Sompting ED. It proposed transferring the parish of Coombes and part of the parish of Lancing which lies to the north of the A27. This would result in the A27 forming the boundary between the two divisions.

50 The County Council argued that the A27 (Upper Brighton Road) is a strong barrier between the communities to the north of the road and the rest of Lancing. The County Council noted that the houses directly to the north of the A27 are separated from the rest of Lancing and that their proposal would 'bring together the communities that run in a continuous line along the north of the A27'. They also argued that the area north of the A27 is the only part of the parish of Lancing which could be included in the Sompting division. It argued that the only other options are the Churchill area, which is separated from Sompting by the Churchill industrial estate, or the central area of Lancing, which 'includes the town centre heart of Lancing and should not, therefore be included with another village'.

51 The local resident proposed that the Churchill area be transferred to Sompting ED. However, as mentioned by the County Council, much of this area is separated

from Sompting by an industrial estate, and we did not consider it appropriate to combine these two areas as we felt that there would be a lack of a strong boundary and of community identity.

52 We propose adopting the proposals of the County Council in Adur, in their entirety. We note that four of its proposed divisions are identical to the existing arrangements. We note that the modifications it has proposed to the existing Lancing and Sompting divisions would provide a reasonable level of electoral equality by 2012, given the constraints already discussed in relation to the optimum electoral equality in Adur.

53 We consider that the boundary of the A27 as suggested by the County Council is strong and easily identifiable. While the electoral arrangements throughout the district do not provide particularly good electoral fairness, with 12%, 7%, 3%, 16%, 2% and 13% fewer electors per councillor than the county average by 2012, they do provide easily recognisable boundaries and on the basis of the information received, reflect community identities. With all divisions containing fewer he proposals allow for relative electoral fairness within the district. We welcome further views in relation to our proposals in this area during Stage Three.

54 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Adur district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 3c accompanying this report.

Arun

55 Arun lies in the south of the county, along the coast. The 2007 electorate is 115,112, predicted to increase 3.4% to 119,026 in 2012. Appendix C outlines the existing electoral variances for 2007 and the variances which the divisions are forecast to have by 2012 if the existing arrangements were to remain in place. Under a 71-member scheme Arun is entitled to 13 councillors, which is the current allocation.

56 During Stage One we received two submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and the local resident. Arun District Council made no comment. A submission from Councillor O'Neill (Littlehampton Town ED) supported the proposals made by the local resident, but provided no evidence.

57 The County Council proposed that the existing arrangements be retained in seven of the thirteen divisions, with a number of changes in the other six divisions to improve electoral equality. The County Council proposed that two changes take place in the Bognor Regis area. One was to transfer approximately 1,100 electors from Bersted ED into Bognor Regis East ED to provide an improved level of electoral equality in Bersted ED. Under this proposal Bersted ED would contain 12% more electors and Bognor Regis East would contain 13% more electors than the average in 2012. It proposed to transfer the area to the north of Bognor Regis, including the A29 and several residential streets. This area is shown on Map 5b.

58 The local resident objects to the proposal to move part of Bersted ED into Bognor Regis East ED. He states that this proposal is 'drawing an artificial line down one residential road which is very much together as part of one community'. We acknowledge the local resident's concern, but have received no other suggestion for

another area of 1,100 electors which it would be better to transfer in order to address the electoral inequality.

59 The second transfer in the Bognor Regis area proposed by the County Council is to transfer approximately 1,200 electors from Nyetimber ED into Bognor Regis West and Aldwick ED. The area to be transferred is a group of residential roads to the north of the Aldwick area and bordered by two busier residential roads. This would improve the level of electoral equality in Nyetimber ED.

60 While we consider it necessary to improve the levels of electoral equality in both these areas, we note that we have received little or no evidence from the County Council for the particular areas to be transferred. The area it proposed transferring from Nyetimber ED appears to be bordered by a relatively busy residential road and we consider this to be a strong boundary. We note that the area proposed to be transferred from Bersted ED is not particularly clearly defined. However, given the need to improve electoral equality we propose adopting the County Council's proposals in this area with one small modification. This modification is to include within Bognor Regis ED the industrial estate to the west of the A29 and the area around and including Old Farm Cottages. We feel that this provides a stronger boundary and links Old Farm Cottages with their nearest neighbours, rather than with the more distant settlements in Bersted ED.

61 The County Council also proposed to transfer approximately 850 electors from Littlehampton East ED to Littlehampton Town ED in order to provide an improved level of electoral equality. The electoral variances would be 2% more and 2% fewer electors than the county average respectively. The area proposed is a small triangle of the town bordered by a busy road and the coast.

62 The local resident argues against this transfer in Littlehampton, saying that the 'disadvantages of doing it are massively disproportionate compared to the relatively small benefits it would give, and that the 'current Littlehampton Town division is a very coherent division'.

63 The local resident's proposal for a 13-member division pattern in Arun would provide for a poor level of electoral equality, with five divisions above 10% in 2012, including one at 25%. We did not consider that his scheme was better than that proposed by the County Council. However, we were able to consider part of his division pattern in the Arundel, Angmering and Findon areas as it would have no impact on the surrounding area. The local resident proposed that the parishes of Ferring, Findon, and Kingston form one electoral division as they look towards Worthing and have similar interests. He further suggested that Wick with Toddington district ward should not be joined with Arundel, but with other Littlehampton district wards, and that Beach district ward should be joined with Rustington West district ward. These new divisions would contain 11% fewer (Findon and Ferring), 7% fewer (Arundel and Angmering), 2% fewer (Littlehampton East), 11% more (East Preston), 10% more (Rustington) and 3% fewer (Littlehampton) electors in 2012.

64 We acknowledge that it is possible to include this with the scheme proposed by the County Council for the rest of the district, but note that it would involve dividing the parish of Angmering. The local resident argues that the eastern part of Angmering, which includes many more recent developments than the village of

Angmering, has a character 'similar to the environment to be found in Findon and Ferring'.

65 We are reluctant to divide parish communities unless we have received sufficient evidence to justify doing so. We do not consider that the local resident's proposals are supported by such evidence. We also note that we have not received any representations from residents or other groups in this area and welcome further views on his proposal during Stage Three. We therefore propose adopting the County Council's proposals for this area.

66 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Arun district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 5a and Map 5b accompanying this report.

Chichester

67 Chichester lies in the west of the county. Under a 71-member scheme Chichester is entitled to 10 councillors. Appendix C provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Chichester district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

68 During Stage One we received three submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and the local resident. We received a submission from Chichester District Council which stated that 'it is felt that there was no valid reason for any changes in the number of electoral divisions or county councillors within the Chichester District'. Marden Parish Council requested that no change be made to electoral divisions. Sidlesham Parish Council argued that it should form an electoral division with Selsey, which is to the south of Sidlesham, rather than with the urban part of Chichester.

69 The County Council proposed that the existing divisions are retained, noting that they will all have an electoral variance of 10% or less by 2012. The County Council did not provide any evidence to support the existing divisions.

70 The local resident submitted a proposal for a 10-member division pattern which included a two-member division in the city of Chichester, but the scheme did not provide for good electoral equality: one division would have 21% more electors than the average in 2012. His proposals were based on coterminosity with the district ward boundaries and an effort 'to reduce the mixing of rural and urban wards where I consider it most appropriate'. The local resident argued that 'some of the towns and villages surrounding Chichester have their own issues, not particularly common to the city wards and would benefit from a County Councillor more focused on their needs'.

71 Having considered both district-wide schemes for Chichester, we are adopting the County Council's proposals without modification. They provide a better level of electoral equality than the local resident's proposals and we do not consider his proposals provide sufficient evidence that they would better reflect community identity.

72 We considered the potential for transferring a number of electors from Chichester East ED into Chichester North ED to improve electoral equality in

Chichester ED. However, the division boundary follows a major road around the village of Tangmere and remains strong and easily identifiable in the city of Chichester, where electors are separated from the electoral division of Chichester North by university and hospital buildings.

73 We also explored options to achieve a better level of electoral equality than the County Council's proposed Petworth ED, which would contain 10% more electors than the average in 2012. We considered transferring the parishes of Lurgashall and Northchapel from Petworth ED to Fernhurst ED. This would result in improved electoral equality in Petworth ED, but would have a knock-on effect, with the electoral equality in Midhurst ED slightly worsening from 0% to 8% more electors than the average as a result.

74 We considered the request by Sidlesham PC to form a division with Selsey and note that the current South Chichester ED mixes rural and urban areas. However, we also note that it contains two other rural parishes besides Sidlesham. The proposed Selsey ED would provide a good level of electoral equality and we have not received sufficient justification to move to an alternative pattern which would have poorer levels of electoral equality.

75 We propose adopting the County Council's proposals for the divisions in Chichester district. We note the poorer levels of electoral equality in Petworth ED and Chichester East ED than in the rest of the district. However, we do not judge that alterations to them would be in the best interests of the communities involved, or that the electoral inequality justifies doing so.

76 We consider the divisions we have proposed in Chichester will provide for single-member divisions with good levels of electoral equality and generally will provide strong boundaries. We do not consider the alternative proposals in this area provide sufficient evidence to justify poorer levels of electoral equality. We consider that there are single-member divisions that reflect the criteria that we must consider when conducting electoral reviews and therefore are not persuaded to adopt any two-member divisions.

77 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Chichester district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

Crawley

78 Crawley lies in the north of the county, with strong road and rail links to Surrey and London. The 2007 electorate is 74,111, predicted to increase by 5.1% to 77,893 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Crawley is entitled to nine councillors.

79 During Stage One we received nine submissions in addition to the county wide schemes proposed by the County Council and the local resident. County Councillors Joyce (Northgate & Three Bridges ED), McGough (Broadfield ED), Mortimer (Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED), Mullins (Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED), Smith (Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED) and Sully (Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED) signed a joint letter objecting to the review, on the basis that the last review of the electoral divisions was carried out in 2004, and to proposals for single-member divisions. Five of these councillors also submitted separate

representations in support of the existing two-member divisions in their respective areas.

80 The local resident's submission for this area included a proposal that the Northgate and Three Bridges ED be combined with the existing Tilgate & Furnace Green ED to create a two-member division. He did not provide any evidence in support of this proposal. In the rest of Crawley he proposed retaining the existing electoral arrangements.

81 The six councillors raised concerns that single-member divisions would move away from the 'neighbourhood principle' on which Crawley district wards have long been based. It was felt that the current two-member divisions reflect the communities they represent because they are coterminous with the district ward boundaries. Many of the submissions from the county councillors in Crawley expanded on this suggestion, arguing that Crawley, as a relatively new town, had been built in distinct neighbourhood areas. The councillors argued that the district wards had been carefully drawn to support these community neighbourhoods, and that therefore splitting district wards would invariably divide communities.

82 Councillor Mortimer argued that multi-member electoral areas worked well in Crawley, citing the multi-member district wards of Crawley Borough Council. He said that 'because the division is comprised of whole wards and not bits' he and his colleague had 'been able to build up a huge awareness' of their area.

83 Councillor Smith argued that he had previously been opposed to multi member divisions, but that he now believes 'there are benefits to two-member divisions for residents'. The same view was expressed by the Crawley Borough Council Labour Group, which argued that although the two-member divisions were initially confusing, they were now well understood.

84 We also received support for the existing two-member divisions from a Crawley resident and Crawley Borough Council Labour Group. Crawley Borough Council did not express any particular view beyond noting the preferences of the Labour borough councillors for the existing two-member divisions and the preferences of the Liberal Democrat and Conservative district councillors for single-member divisions.

85 The County Council proposed changes to all three of the current two-member divisions and one of the current single-member divisions. It proposed retaining the remaining single-member divisions. It proposed that the two-member division of Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower ED be split to become two single-member divisions. The County Council proposed that the two-member divisions of Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED and Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate ED and the single-member division of Northgate & Three Bridges ED be split into five single-member divisions.

86 The County Council proposed that an area of land be removed from the existing single-member Northgate and Three Bridges ED and be combined with Southgate district ward to form a Southgate & Crawley Central ED to improve electoral equality. This area is predicted to grow in the next five years, as new flats are in the process of being completed. Its transfer would ensure the division would have a reasonable level of electoral equality by 2012 (6% fewer electors than the county average). This division would have some very strong boundaries, including a dual carriageway. The

remaining Northgate & Three Bridges division would have 4% fewer electors than the average by 2012.

87 The County Council proposed dividing the two-member division of Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower ED by using existing district ward boundaries and Balcombe Road, a busy through road joining Maidenbower in the south of Crawley to Pound Hill in the north of the district. The boundary proposed would result in a Worth & Pound Hill North ED with 5% fewer electors than the county average by 2012. The proposed Maidenbower & Pound Hill South ED would contain 2% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

88 The County Council proposed that the district wards of Langley Green & West Green, which are currently part of Ifield, Langley Green & West Green ED, become a single-member division called Langley Green & West Green ED. These areas are both residential areas north of the railway line. We received no other evidence regarding this particular area. This division would have 5% more electors than the district average by 2012.

89 The County Council proposed an electoral division, called Gossops Green & Ifield East ED, combining the district ward of Gossops Green with part of the district ward of Ifield. This division would cross the railway line, but there are strong road links providing good access between the two areas, and a strong focal point in the form of Ifield station.

90 The County Council also proposed a Bewbush & Ifield ED combining the district ward of Bewbush with the western part of the district ward of Ifield. This western part of Ifield is a distinct area on the edge of the district borough. There is no direct road between the two communities, and while we recognise that the western part of Ifield is somewhat geographically separated from the rest of Ifield we have received no evidence that it looks across the railway line to Bewbush. Councillor Mortimer objected to this proposal.

91 We propose to adopt the proposal from the County Council for all of Crawley with two modifications. We note that the County Council's proposed divisions in this area will all have good levels of electoral equality by 2012. We also generally consider that the boundaries for these divisions are strong and easily identifiable. The modifications we have proposed ensure access within divisions and also improve the strength of one boundary.

92 The first modification we propose is to the County Council's Northgate & Three Bridges division and its Southgate & Crawley Central division. This modification is proposed in order to better tie the boundary between these divisions to local features. The northern boundary of this division was proposed by the County Council as running behind houses: we recommend instead using a wide road in the shopping area. We consider that this modification will provide for a stronger boundary in this area and will affect fewer than 100 electors. This is shown on Map 2b.

93 The second modification we propose is in relation to the County Council's Bewbush and Ifield West division. There is no direct road that links Ifield and Bewbush in this division. We see no merit in linking two areas together that have no direct access and we have therefore proposed an alternative arrangement for this area.

94 We propose that the entire Ifield area should be combined with part of Gossops Green, as Ifield does not have direct access to Bewbush. We have proposed including Ifield with the area of Gossops Green immediately to the south of Ifield railway station. This division of Ifield & Gossops Green North ED would have 10% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

95 In order to reflect this change, we propose that the southern part of the area of Gossops Green be included with Bewbush. We have received no submissions on a particular area to transfer, so have attempted to provide the best level of electoral equality and to provide as strong boundaries as possible. The area we have proposed is shown on Map 2b. This division of Bewbush & Gossops Green South ED would have 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2012.

96 We note the submissions that oppose the proposed single-member divisions. However, none of the respondents provide persuasive evidence in relation to how a particular two-member division in Crawley provides either a better reflection of specific community identities or results in more effective and convenient local government than single-member divisions would in the same area. While we accept that a number of councillors sought to base their views on two-member divisions on the concept of neighbourhoods, we do not consider that the evidence received demonstrates that the single-member divisions proposed would adversely affect community identities.

97 The local resident opposed the two new divisions proposed by the County Council, arguing that Worth does not look to Maidenbower. The local resident did not propose any alternative single-member divisions. We received no submissions for single-member divisions or evidence for retaining a two-member division in relation to this area.

98 We consider the divisions we have proposed in Crawley will provide for single-member divisions with good levels of electoral equality and generally will provide strong boundaries. We do not consider the alternative proposals in this area provide sufficient evidence to justify poorer levels of electoral equality or to justify two-member divisions. We consider that there are single-member divisions that reflect the criteria that we must consider when conducting electoral reviews and therefore are not persuaded to adopt any two-member divisions.

99 We welcome further comments during Stage Three, particularly on our proposed Ifield & Gossops Green North ED and Bewbush & Gossops Green South ED.

100 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Crawley district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 2b accompanying this report.

Horsham

101 Horsham lies in the middle of the county. The 2007 electorate is 100,198, predicted to increase by 5.7% to 105,890 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Horsham is entitled to 12 councillors. The increase in councillors from 11 to 12 means that, unlike in the rest of the county, it is not possible for the existing divisions

to be retained. Consequently, unlike in the other districts the County Council have proposed a different pattern of divisions than the existing arrangements.

102 During Stage One we received five submissions in addition to the county-wide submissions from the County Council and The local resident. Two of these came from Liberal Democrat county councillors in Horsham and broadly supported the proposals from the County Council. Broadbridge Heath and Slinfold parish councils and Councillor Michael Hodgeson (Warnham & Rusper ED) objected to the proposal to combine Broadbridge Heath parish with part of the town of Horsham.

103 The County Council proposed a number of changes within the town of Horsham, as well as three changes to the rural area of the district. Its proposed divisions are based on providing good levels of electoral equality and strong boundaries. All of these divisions would vary from the county average by 10% or less by 2012.

104 The County Council have proposed creating a new single-member division, called Horsham Tanbridge, to include Broadbridge Heath parish and the Denne area in the south west of Horsham. The two communities are divided by the A24. Broadbridge Heath Parish Council considered that the parish has a stronger identity with the parishes outside of Horsham town, than with Horsham itself. This view was supported by Slinfold Parish Council and Councillor Hodgeson (Warnham & Rusper ED).

105 Broadbridge Heath Parish Council commented twice that they were content with the current arrangements (ie, being in a division with Itchingfield) and did not wish to be joined to Horsham. They said that they felt the proposal from the County Council did not take into account the separate identity of Broadbridge Heath, but gave no indication of how that separate identity manifested itself.

106 Slinfold Parish Council has argued that the area outside of Horsham, including Broadbridge Heath, should be served by one county councillor who 'has empathy for the issues and concerns of people living in the country and can represent the whole area'. They believed that 'mixing a rural area such as Broadbridge Heath with a suburb of a large town like Horsham... will not be the best approach to ensure that people living in either environment will get the best service from their county councillor'.

107 Two submissions were received from Councillor Millson and Councillor Dennis, who currently represent divisions in the urban area of Horsham. Both supported the proposals from the County Council, arguing that in order to achieve good electoral equality there would have to be a division which combined rural areas with parts of Horsham, and that Broadbridge Heath was the most appropriate area. Both councillors also supported the other divisions in Horsham. We received no other submissions regarding the divisions in the town of Horsham.

108 The local resident proposed a 12 member division pattern based on coterminosity with existing district wards. He also suggested a two-member division for Horsham. His scheme did not provide for good levels electoral equality, with six of the divisions having variances of more than 10% from the average, one of which, Warnham & Rusper ED, would contain 26% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

109 The local resident made specific proposals in relation to one parish which we consider have some merit. He considered that Ashington parish should be included in a division with Storrington parish rather than moved to Billingshurst ED, stating that there 'is not enough common interest between the communities to justify [the proposed Billingshurst division]'

110 Having considered the proposals received, we are adopting the proposals from the County Council for the whole of Horsham district with a number of minor modifications. We have considered the alternative division patterns proposed locally, but have received no evidence from other respondents to justify moving away from the County Council's proposals which would provide good electoral equality.

111 We note the local resident's proposals. However we do not consider that they provide for good electoral equality. The local resident gave little evidence for his proposals, although we note that Ashington parish has closer road links to Storrington and that the transfer of Ashington would split the district ward of Chanctonbury between three different county divisions. We therefore welcome further views on including Ashington parish with the County Council's proposed Storrington ED during Stage Three. We note that not transferring Ashington parish to Billingshurst ED will result in Storrington ED containing 14% more electors, and Billingshurst ED containing 17% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

112 We note the opposition to the inclusion of Broadbridge Heath parish with Horsham town. However, for the purposes of electoral equality it is necessary that an area outside of Horsham is linked with part of the town. Linking Broadbridge Heath parish with more rural divisions would also require a complete alternative division pattern to be devised, and we have received no such proposal. We also consider that Broadbridge Heath parish has closer links to the town of Horsham than any other parish, and while it is separated by the A24, it is also directly linked into the town.

113 In order to help maintain the separate character of Broadbridge Heath, we propose to change the name of this division. We propose that the new division be called Horsham Tanbridge & Broadbridge Heath ED instead of Horsham Tanbridge ED. We also propose a modification within Horsham to tie the boundary of Horsham Riverside ED and Horsham Hurst ED to easily identifiable ground detail. As this modification would move 25 electors, it would have no effect on the overall electoral equality of the two divisions, and is shown on Map 2a.

114 We consider the divisions we have proposed in Horsham will provide for single-member divisions with good levels of electoral equality and generally will provide strong boundaries. We did not receive any alternative proposal which provided sufficient evidence to justify poorer levels of electoral equality or which would include two-member divisions.

115 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Horsham district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 2a accompanying this report.

Mid Sussex

116 Mid Sussex lies in the east of the county, with links to Brighton and Lewes. The 2007 electorate is 102,055, predicted to increase by 6.8% to 108,987 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Mid Sussex is entitled to 12 councillors.

117 During Stage One we received nine submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and the local resident, including submissions from the town councils of East Grinstead and Burgess Hill. The Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats suggested schemes for East Grinstead and Burgess Hill similar to the schemes suggested by the County Council. The Mid Sussex Conservatives proposed different arrangements for single-member divisions in East Grinstead and Burgess Hill. Mid Sussex District Council made no specific comments.

118 Ashurst Wood Parish Council suggests that the division containing Ashurst Wood should include the name of the parish. We also received submissions from a parish councillor in West Hoathley and from Turners Hill Parish Council. Both submissions concerned links with East Grinstead, and argued for a different pattern of divisions in the rural area around East Grinstead. A parish councillor in Fulking supported two-member divisions in principle, but gave no evidence relating to Mid Sussex.

119 The County Council proposed that the two-member divisions of East Grinstead ED and Burgess Hill ED be split into single-member divisions. They proposed no other changes to divisions in Mid Sussex district.

120 The County Council proposed that East Grinstead ED be divided into East Grinstead South ED and East Grinstead Meridian ED, which would contain 1% more electors and 6% more electors than the county average in 2012, respectively. The new boundary proposed was the A22, which is one of the main roads through the centre of East Grinstead. The proposals were supported by the Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats, who argued that this is the 'most logical split of East Grinstead'.

121 We received a submission from East Grinstead Town Council arguing for single-member divisions. The arguments given included greater accountability, fairer workloads and avoiding conflict and confusion between councillors. East Grinstead Town Council also argued that the East Grinstead parish ward currently in Imberdown ED should be included in East Grinstead ED. This last point was not a view shared by Mid Sussex Liberal Democrats, who considered that the link between the Imberdown area of East Grinstead and 'the adjacent village of Crawley Down' is the 'most reasonable link geographically'.

122 The County Council proposed that the existing two-member Burgess Hill ED be divided into Burgess Hill West ED and Burgess Hill East ED. The new boundary would be a busy road to the north of the station. This division arrangement was also proposed by the Mid Sussex Liberal Democrat Group. The proposal would mean that Burgess Hill East ED would contain 9% more electors and Burgess Hill West ED would contain 4% more electors than the county average in 2012.

123 The Mid Sussex Conservatives proposed a scheme for Burgess Hill and Hassocks. Their proposal produced high levels of electoral inequality, including a division which contained 23% fewer electors than the county average. The Mid

Sussex Conservatives also proposed that Burgess Hill should be represented by three, rather than two, county councillors. A similar scheme was proposed by Burgess Hill Town Council.

124 The local resident suggested a scheme for Mid Sussex which contained two multi-member wards, one of which, covering East Grinstead and Ashurst Wood, would contain 23% more electors than the county average by 2012. He did not provide evidence beyond asserting that 'this [current] artificial construct should be abolished with haste, as it was never a true representation of community identity'. His proposal sought to 're-unite the parishes of East Grinstead, Worth and Slaugham which have for too long been split with other parishes and separated from each other'.

125 Having considered the proposals received in Mid Sussex we have decided to adopt the proposals from the County Council for the whole of the district with two modifications. We note that we have received no evidence to support retaining the existing single-member divisions. However, we note that they will all provide a good level of electoral equality by 2012 and we have received no alternative proposals with better levels of electoral equality or which better reflect community identities.

126 We considered very carefully options for improving electoral equality within Mid Sussex, concentrating in particular on Hassocks & Victoria ED. We did not find any option which would provide for good electoral equality without further dividing parishes. We also considered possible division patterns in the East Grinstead area, and in particular the submissions received from Turners Hill Parish Council and parish councillor Mr Brown of West Hoathly parish. We did not find any option which provided for good electoral equality without adversely affecting other areas of the district.

127 Having taken into consideration the requests from Burgess Hill and East Grinstead Town Councils for single-member divisions, we did not consider that the local resident's proposal for two-member divisions provided evidence that it reflected the interests of the local community. In other areas of the district we noted that these proposals did not provide good electoral equality.

128 We are proposing two minor modifications to the County Council's proposals in East Grinstead. We note that East Grinstead Meridian ED borders Imberdown ED, which, under the County Council's proposals, would have a variance of 12% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. We propose transferring around 250 electors from East Grinstead Meridian ED into Imberdown ED, which would create electoral variances in East Grinstead Meridian ED of 3% more and in Imberdown ED of 9% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. This can easily be achieved by using London Road, a busy road into East Grinstead, as a boundary. We consider that the transfer is justified by the benefit to electoral variances and provides an easily identifiable boundary.

129 We also propose that the new divisions be called East Grinstead Meridian ED and East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood ED in order to better reflect the constituent parts of these divisions.

130 We propose adopting the County Council's proposals in Burgess Hill. We consider that the boundary proposed by the County Council and the Mid Sussex

Liberal Democrat Group provides for good electoral equality in the area and a strong and easily identifiable boundary.

131 We consider the divisions we have proposed in Mid Sussex will provide for single-member divisions with good levels of electoral equality and generally will provide strong boundaries.

132 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Mid Sussex district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 3a accompanying this report.

Worthing

133 Worthing lies in the south of the county, along the coast. The 2007 electorate is 79,244, predicted to increase by 2.2% to 81,009 in 2012. Under a 71-member scheme Worthing is entitled to nine councillors.

134 During Stage One we received two submissions in addition to the county-wide schemes from the County Council and the local resident. The West Worthing Liberal Democrats supported the proposals from the County Council. A representation from the Conservative county councillors in the two-member division of Salvington argued that their division worked well and should be retained, but did not give any other evidence.

135 The County Council did not propose any change to the single-member divisions in Worthing, nor did it provide any evidence justifying their retention. The County Council proposed dividing each of the three two-member divisions into two single-member divisions.

136 The County Council propose dividing Goring & Northbrook ED into the single-member divisions of Goring ED and Northbrook ED. The boundary between the two divisions would be The Strand, a wide shopping road which runs parallel to the railway line. Goring ED and Northbrook ED would contain 9% fewer electors than the county average and 8% more electors by 2012 under these proposals. There are a number of road crossings over the railway track in the proposed division of Goring ED, including the railway stations of Goring and Durrington.

137 The County Council proposed dividing Salvington ED into the single-member divisions of Durrington ED and Offington ED. The boundary between the two divisions would be the A27. Durrington ED and Offington ED would contain 8% more electors and 8% fewer electors than the county average in 2012.

138 The County Council proposed dividing Gaisford ED into the single-member divisions of Broadwater ED and Tarring ED. The proposed boundary between the two divisions was South Farm Road, a busy road between Broadwater Green and Worthing Station. Broadwater ED and Tarring ED would contain 11% more electors and 9% more electors than the county average in 2012. Broadwater ED is bordered by the A27 to the north, the railway line (with few crossings) to the south, and the edge of the district to the east.

139 The local resident proposed a nine-member scheme which included three two-member divisions. Two of these divisions would have electoral variances greater

than 10% in 2012, with one, West Durrington ED, containing 23% more electors than the county average.

140 Having considered the proposals received we propose adopting the proposals from the County Council for the divisions of Goring ED, Northbrook ED, Tarring ED and Durrington ED without modification. We did not consider that the local resident's proposal provided good electoral equality, or that he had provided sufficient evidence for a West Durrington division with such a poor variance.

141 We considered altering the County Council's proposal by transferring a small number of electors into Goring ED from Northbrook ED. However, we felt that the improvement that could be made to electoral equality by breaching this road would not be justified, given an absence of any strong feature to which we could tie a boundary. We consider that Tarring ED and Durrington ED provide for good levels of electoral equality and are contained within strong and easily identifiable boundaries. In particular, we consider that the A27 provides a strong boundary throughout the county.

142 We propose adopting the proposals from the County Council for the divisions of Broadwater ED and Offington ED with one modification. We note that Broadwater ED would contain 11% more electors than the county average, while Offington would contain 8% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. We propose that, in order to improve electoral equality, a number of electors are transferred from Broadwater ED into Offington ED. The proposal will create a variance of respectively 8% more and 4% fewer electors than the county average in 2012. This area to be transferred is a group of approximately 300 electors in the triangle between the A27 (Upper Brighton Road) and Broadwater Green. This area is on the edge of the Broadwater division, and is shown in detail on Map 4.

143 We propose adopting the County Council's proposals to retain the remainder of the electoral divisions on existing boundaries as the electoral variances are acceptable. We note that the County Council has not provided evidence in support of these proposals. However, we consider the County Council's proposals provide for single-member divisions with good levels of electoral equality and generally will provide strong boundaries. We do not consider the alternative proposals in this area provide sufficient evidence to justify poorer levels of electoral equality or which would include two-member divisions. We consider that there are single-member divisions that reflect our criteria and therefore are not persuaded to adopt any two-member divisions.

144 Table C1 on page 39 provides details of the electoral variances of our draft recommendations for county divisions in Worthing district. Our draft recommendations are shown on Map 4 accompanying this report.

Conclusions

145 Table 1 shows how our draft recommendations will affect electoral fairness, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on the December 2007 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for December 2012.

Table 1: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	Current arrangements		Draft recommendations	
	2007	2012	2007	2012
Number of councillors	70	70	71	71
Number of divisions	62	62	71	71
Average number of electors per councillor	8,671	9,045	8,549	8,918
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	19	16	15	9
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	2	2	0

146 As shown in Table 1, our draft recommendations for West Sussex County Council would result in a reduction in the number of divisions with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 19 to 15. By 2012 only nine divisions are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%. We propose to increase council size from 70 to 71 members, and we are also proposing an entire pattern of single-member divisions across the county. During Stage Three we invite respondents to let us have their views on our draft recommendations, including whether or not they agree with these proposals.

Draft recommendation

West Sussex County Council should comprise 71 councillors serving 71 divisions, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and C1, and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

147 As part of an electoral review we can make recommendations for new electoral arrangements for parish and town councils. Where there is no impact on the county council's electoral arrangements, the Committee will generally be content to put forward for consideration proposals from parish or town councils for changes to parish or town council electoral arrangements in our electoral reviews. However, we will usually wish to see some rationale for the proposal from the parish or town council concerned. Proposals should be supported by evidence, illustrating why changes to parish or town electoral arrangements are required. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review of a county council.

148 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different electoral divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division. Accordingly, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Lancing, Bersted, Littlehampton, Aldwick, Burgess Hill and East Grinstead.

149 Under the existing arrangements, the parishes of Rustington, Slaugham and Worth are divided between two different divisions. We do not recommend any changes to any of the divisions containing wards of these parishes, and therefore recommend no changes to the parish wards of the parishes of Rustington, Slaugham and Worth.

150 The parish of Lancing is currently served by 16 councillors representing four wards: Churchill parish ward, Manor parish ward, Mash Barn parish ward and Widewater parish ward.

Draft recommendations

Lancing Parish Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Churchill parish ward (returning four councillors), Manor North parish ward (returning two councillors), Manor South parish ward (returning two councillors), Mash Barn parish ward (returning four councillors) and Widewater parish ward (returning four councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3c.

151 The parish of Bersted is currently served by 13 councillors representing the un-warded parish.

Draft recommendations

Bersted Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: West parish ward (returning 11 councillors) and East parish ward (returning two councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5b.

152 The parish of Littlehampton is currently served by 15 councillors representing five wards: Beach parish ward, Brookfield parish ward, Ham parish ward, River parish ward and Wick with Toddington parish ward.

Draft recommendations

Littlehampton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Beach parish ward (returning two councillors), Brookfield parish ward (returning three councillors), Central parish ward (returning one councillor), Ham parish ward (returning three councillors), River parish ward (returning three councillors) and Wick with Toddington parish ward (returning three councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5a.

153 The parish of Aldwick is currently served by 14 councillors representing three wards: Aldwick East parish ward, Aldwick West parish ward and Rose Green parish ward.

Draft recommendations

Aldwick Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Aldwick East parish ward (returning six councillors), Aldwick West parish ward (returning four councillors), St Richards parish ward (returning two councillors) and Rose Green parish ward (returning two councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5b.

154 The parish of Burgess Hill is currently served by 18 councillors representing six wards: Dunstall parish ward, Franklands parish ward, Meeds parish ward, Leylands parish ward, St Andrew's parish ward and Victoria parish ward.

Draft recommendations

Burgess Hill Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Dunstall parish ward (returning three councillors), Franklands parish ward (returning three councillors), Meeds North parish ward (returning one councillor), Meeds South parish ward (returning two councillors), Leylands parish ward (returning three councillors), St Andrew's parish ward (returning three councillors) and Victoria parish ward (returning three councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3b.

155 The parish of East Grinstead is currently served by 18 councillors representing six wards: Ashplats parish ward, Baldwins parish ward, Herontye parish ward, Imberhorne parish ward, Town parish ward and Worsted parish ward.

156 East Grinstead Town Council proposed that Worsted parish ward be divided along the A22, with the area to the west of the A22 becoming part of Herontye parish ward and the area to the east of the A22 forming a new parish ward with part of the existing Ashplats parish ward.

157 Having recommended the new divisions of East Grinstead Meridian ED and East Grinstead South and Ashurst Wood ED, we are unable to propose a parish ward combining Worsted parish ward with parts of Ashplats parish ward. This is due to the division boundary running between the two areas.

Draft recommendations

East Grinstead Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Ashplats parish ward (returning four councillors), Baldwins parish ward (returning three councillors), Herontye parish ward (returning three councillors), Imberhorne parish ward (returning four councillors), Town North parish ward (returning one councillor), Town South parish ward (returning two councillors) and Worsted parish ward (returning one councillor). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3a.

3 What happens next?

158 There will now be a consultation period of eight weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 25 August 2008. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

159 Before finalising our recommendations on the electoral arrangements for West Sussex County Council we invite views on our initial thoughts as expressed in these draft recommendations. We welcome comments from all those interested relating to the number of councillors, proposed division boundaries, division names, and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

160 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer
West Sussex Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

reviews@boundarycommittee.org.uk

Submissions can also be made on our website at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk.

161 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, the Committee makes available for public inspection full copies of all representations it takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all Stage Three representations will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of West Sussex County Council, at the Committee's offices in Trevelyan House (London) and on its website at www.boundarycommittee.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

162 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Electoral Commission. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Electoral Commission, which cannot make the electoral change Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after it receives them.

4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for West Sussex

115 The following maps illustrate our proposed electoral division boundaries for West Sussex County Council

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for West Sussex County Council, including constituent parish and town council areas.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Horsham.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Crawley.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3a** illustrates the proposed divisions in East Grinstead.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Burgess Hill.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3c** illustrates the proposed divisions in Adur.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4** illustrates the proposed divisions in Worthing.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Littlehampton.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Bognor Regis.

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its mission is to foster public confidence and participation by promoting integrity, involvement and effectiveness in the democratic process
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's

Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 12 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'

Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Committee for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average

Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council
------	--

Appendix B

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation* (http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/servicefirst/2000/consult/code/_consultation.pdf) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Boundary Committee for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

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

Table B1: The Boundary Committee for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

We comply with this requirement.

Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

We comply with this requirement.

Appendix C

Table C1: Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Adur							
1 Kingston Buci	1	7,466	7,466	-13	7,832	7,832	-12
2 Lancing	1	8,156	8,156	-5	8,306	8,306	-7
3 Saltings	1	8,091	8,091	-5	8,608	8,608	-3
4 Shoreham	1	7,394	7,394	-14	7,486	7,486	-16
5 Sompting	1	8,663	8,663	1	8,720	8,720	-2
6 Southwick	1	7,709	7,709	-10	7,797	7,797	-13
Arun							
7 Angmering & Findon	1	7,908	7,908	-7	7,949	7,949	-11
8 Arundel & Wick	1	7,337	7,337	-14	7,870	7,870	-12

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
9 Bersted	1	9,265	9,265	8	9,952	9,952	12
10 Bognor Regis East	1	9,359	9,359	9	10,099	10,099	13
11 Bognor Regis West & Aldwick	1	9,454	9,454	11	9,686	9,686	9
12 East Preston Ferring	1	9,849	9,849	15	9,993	9,993	12
13 Felpham	1	7,929	7,929	-7	8,943	8,943	0
14 Fontwell	1	9,051	9,051	6	9,119	9,119	2
15 Littlehampton East	1	8,975	8,975	5	9,084	9,084	2
16 Littlehampton Town	1	8,603	8,603	1	8,733	8,733	-2
17 Middleton	1	8,612	8,612	1	8,738	8,738	-2
18 Nyetimber	1	9,197	9,197	8	9,229	9,229	3
19 Rustington	1	9,573	9,573	12	9,631	9,631	8

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Chichester							
20 Bourne	1	9,279	9,279	9	9,333	9,333	5
21 Chichester East	1	9,419	9,419	10	9,829	9,829	10
22 Chichester North	1	8,138	8,138	-5	9,016	9,016	1
23 Chichester South	1	8,925	8,925	4	9,245	9,245	4
24 Chichester West	1	9,245	9,245	8	9,327	9,327	5
25 Fernhurst	1	8,488	8,488	-1	9,050	9,050	1
26 Midhurst	1	8,792	8,792	3	8,921	8,921	0
27 Petworth	1	9,505	9,505	11	9,824	9,824	10
28 Selsey	1	8,854	8,854	4	8,884	8,884	0
29 The Witterings	1	8,135	8,135	-5	8,199	8,199	-8

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Crawley							
30 Bewbush & Gossops Green South	1	8,782	8,782	3	8,664	8,664	-3
31 Broadfield	1	8,644	8,644	1	8,571	8,571	-4
32 Ifield & Gossops Green North	1	7,734	7,734	-10	8,048	8,048	-10
33 Langley Green & West Green	1	8,973	8,973	5	9,321	9,321	5
34 Maidenbower & Pound Hill South	1	8,602	8,602	1	8,757	8,757	-2
35 Northgate & Three Bridges	1	7,847	7,847	-8	8,626	8,626	-3
36 Worth & Pound Hill North	1	8,443	8,443	-1	8,516	8,516	-5
37 Southgate & Crawley Central	1	6,256	6,256	-27	8,323	8,323	-7
38 Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	8,830	8,830	3	9,067	9,067	2

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Horsham							
39 Billingshurst	1	8,836	8,836	3	9,456	9,456	6
40 Bramber Castle	1	9,182	9,182	7	9,438	9,438	6
41 Henfield	1	8,372	8,372	-2	8,694	8,694	-3
42 Holbrook	1	8,530	8,530	0	8,548	8,548	-4
43 Horsham Hurst	1	7,970	7,970	-7	8,170	8,170	-8
44 Horsham Riverside	1	7,918	7,918	-7	8,484	8,484	-5
45 Horsham Tanbridge & Broadbridge Heath	1	6,714	6,714	-21	8,142	8,142	-9
46 Pulborough	1	9,133	9,133	7	9,773	9,773	10
47 Roffey	1	7,688	7,688	-10	8,039	8,039	-10

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
48 Southwater Nuthurst	1	9,552	9,552	12	9,846	9,846	10
49 Storrington	1	7,791	7,791	-9	8,137	8,137	-9
50 Warnham & Rusper	1	8,512	8,512	0	9,163	9,163	3
Mid Sussex							
51 Burgess Hill East	1	9,184	9,184	7	9,698	9,698	9
52 Burgess Hill West	1	9,051	9,051	6	9,278	9,278	4
53 Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	7,676	7,676	-10	9,329	9,329	5
54 East Grinstead Meridian	1	8,464	8,464	-1	9,212	9,212	3
55 East Grinstead South & Ashurst Wood	1	8,343	8,343	-2	8,993	8,993	1
56 Hassocks & Victoria	1	9,692	9,692	13	10,220	10,220	15
57 Haywards Heath East	1	7,431	7,431	-13	8,431	8,431	-5

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
58 Haywards Heath Town	1	7,993	7,993	-8	8,317	8,317	-7
59 Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	7,758	7,758	-9	8,146	8,146	-9
60 Imberdown	1	7,869	7,869	-8	8,130	8,130	-9
61 Lindfield & High Weald	1	9,415	9,415	10	9,599	9,599	8
62 Worth Forest	1	9,179	9,179	7	9,634	9,634	8
Worthing							
63 Broadwater	1	9,564	9,564	12	9,603	9,603	8
64 Durrington	1	9,634	9,634	13	9,615	9,615	8
65 Goring	1	8,160	8,160	-5	8,137	8,137	-9
66 Northbrook	1	8,431	8,431	-1	9,635	9,635	8
67 Offington	1	8,571	8,571	0	8,523	8,523	-4

Table C1 (continued): Draft recommendations for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
68 Tarring	1	9,802	9,802	15	9,689	9,689	9
69 Worthing East	1	8,060	8,060	-6	8,317	8,317	-7
70 Worthing Pier	1	8,312	8,312	-3	8,737	8,737	-2
71 Worthing West	1	8,710	8,710	2	8,753	8,753	-2
Totals	71	606,979	-	-	633,182	-	-
Averages	-	-	8,549	-	-	8,918	-

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

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

Appendix D

Table D1: Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Adur							
1 Kingston Buci	1	7,466	7,466	-14	7,832	7,832	-13
2 Lancing	1	10,005	10,005	15	10,188	10,188	13
3 Saltings	1	8,091	8,091	-7	8,608	8,608	-5
4 Shoreham	1	7,394	7,394	-15	7,486	7,486	-17
5 Sompting	1	6,814	6,814	-21	6,838	6,838	-24
6 Southwick	1	7,709	7,709	-11	7,797	7,797	-14
Arun							
7 Angmering & Findon	1	7,908	7,908	-9	7,949	7,949	-12
8 Arundel & Wick	1	7,337	7,337	-15	7,870	7,870	-13

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
9 Bersted	1	10,351	10,351	19	11,144	11,144	23
10 Bognor Regis East	1	8,273	8,273	-5	8,907	8,907	-2
11 Bognor Regis West & Aldwick	1	8,230	8,230	-5	8,453	8,453	-7
12 East Preston Ferring	1	9,849	9,849	14	9,993	9,993	10
13 Felpham	1	7,929	7,929	-9	8,943	8,943	-1
14 Fontwell	1	9,051	9,051	4	9,119	9,119	1
15 Littlehampton East	1	9,828	9,828	13	9,937	9,937	10
16 Littlehampton Town	1	7,750	7,750	-11	7,880	7,880	-13
17 Middleton	1	8,612	8,612	-1	8,738	8,738	-3
18 Nyetimber	1	10,421	10,421	20	10,462	10,462	16
19 Rustington	1	9,573	9,573	10	9,631	9,631	6

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Chichester							
20 Bourne	1	9,279	9,279	7	9,333	9,333	3
21 Chichester East	1	9,419	9,419	9	9,829	9,829	9
22 Chichester North	1	8,138	8,138	-6	9,016	9,016	0
23 Chichester South	1	8,925	8,925	3	9,245	9,245	2
24 Chichester West	1	9,245	9,245	7	9,327	9,327	3
25 Fernhurst	1	8,488	8,488	-2	9,050	9,050	0
26 Midhurst	1	8,792	8,792	1	8,921	8,921	-1
27 Petworth	1	9,505	9,505	10	9,824	9,824	9
28 Selsey	1	8,854	8,854	2	8,884	8,884	-2
29 The Witterings	1	8,135	8,135	-6	8,199	8,199	-9

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name		Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Crawley								
30	Bewbush, Gossops Green & Southgate	2	16,146	8,073	-7	16,114	8,057	-11
31	Broadfield	1	8,644	8,644	0	8,571	8,571	-5
32	Ifield, Langley Green & West Green	2	15,526	7,763	-10	16,197	8,099	-10
33	Northgate & Three Bridges	1	7,920	7,920	-9	10,671	10,671	18
34	Pound, Hill Worth & Maidenbower	2	17,045	8,523	-2	17,273	8,637	-5
35	Tilgate & Furnace Green	1	8,830	8,830	2	9,067	9,067	0
Horsham								
36	Billinghurst	1	9,130	9,130	5	9,701	9,701	7
37	Bramber Castle	1	9,182	9,182	6	9,438	9,438	4
38	Henfield	1	8,372	8,372	-3	8,694	8,694	-4

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
39 Holbrook	1	8,530	8,530	-2	8,548	8,548	-5
40 Horsham Carfax	1	9,229	9,229	6	9,979	9,979	10
41 Horsham Riverside	1	8,921	8,921	3	9,489	9,489	5
42 Pulborough	1	9,133	9,133	5	9,773	9,773	8
43 Roffey	1	9,807	9,807	13	10,301	10,301	14
44 Southwater Nuthurst	1	9,552	9,552	10	9,846	9,846	9
45 Storrington	1	9,647	9,647	11	10,150	10,150	12
46 Warnham & Rusper	1	8,695	8,695	0	9,971	9,971	10
Mid Sussex							
47 Burgess Hill	2	18,235	9,118	5	18,976	9,488	5
48 Cuckfield & Lucastes	1	7,676	7,676	-11	9,329	9,329	3

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
49 East Grinstead	2	17,241	8,621	-1	18,663	9,332	3
50 Hassocks & Victoria	1	9,692	9,692	12	10,220	10,220	13
51 Haywards Heath East	1	7,431	7,431	-14	8,431	8,431	-7
52 Haywards Heath Town	1	7,993	7,993	-8	8,317	8,317	-8
53 Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	1	7,758	7,758	-11	8,146	8,146	-10
54 Imberdown	1	7,435	7,435	-14	7,672	7,672	-15
55 Lindfield and High Weald	1	9,415	9,415	9	9,599	9,599	6
56 Worth Forest	1	9,179	9,179	6	9,634	9,634	7
Worthing							
57 Gaisford	2	19,674	9,837	13	19,600	9,800	8
58 Goring & Northbrook	2	16,591	8,296	-4	17,772	8,886	-2

Table D1 (continued): Existing arrangements for West Sussex

Electoral division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2007)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
59 Salvington	2	17,897	8,949	3	17,830	8,915	-1
60 Worthing East	1	8,060	8,060	-7	8,317	8,317	-8
61 Worthing Pier	1	8,312	8,312	-4	8,737	8,737	-3
62 Worthing West	1	8,710	8,710	0	8,753	8,753	-3
Totals	70	606,979	-	-	633,182	-	-
Averages	-	-	8,671	-	-	9,045	-

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

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

Appendix E

Equal opportunities

In preparing this report we have had regard to the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination
- promote equality of opportunity
- promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Broads

We have also had regard to:

- Section 11A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as inserted by section 62 of the Environment Act 1995). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in a National Park, any relevant authority shall have regard to the Park's purposes. If there is a conflict between those purposes, a relevant authority shall attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park.
- Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of the AONB.
- Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act (as inserted by section 97 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in the Broads, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purposes of the Broads.

The Boundary Committee

Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW

Tel 020 7271 0500
Fax 020 7271 0505
info@boundarycommittee.org.uk
www.boundarycommittee.org.uk

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by the UK Parliament. The Committee's main role is to conduct electoral reviews of local authorities in England with the aim of ensuring the number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same. Other duties include reviewing local authority boundaries and advising the Government on local authority bids for unitary status.