

Brighton and Hove City Council

Personal Details:

Name:

E-mail:

Postcode:

Organisation Name: None

Comment text:

The proposed Regency seta is unwieldy and crosses the historic Brighton-Hove boundary, Why is the Portslade boundary left untouched but the distinction between Brighton and Hove lost? This proposed Regency ward covers many areas with inner-city type social issues and would involve a very heavy caseload coming from an actual population that considerably outstrips the number of registered voters. The present Regency seat is better balanced by covering a considerable inland area. Brunswick and Adelaide could be similarly expanded by taking in part of Goldsmid ward to the north. Goldsmid is itself a large and unwieldy entity. The proposed Hove Park and Westdene seat also crosses the historic Brighton-Hove boundary, which ought to be respected. Like many of the outer wards it is enormous. What is the rationale of having two member wards at the seafront, but three member wards in outlying areas? Would it not make more sense to arrange this the other way around, so that the suburban wards cover more manageable areas?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded