

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Philip Coleman, Member Services Manager
Tel: 01243 534655 Email: pcoleman@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



A special meeting of **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Thursday 31 March 2016 at 11.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs S Taylor

AGENDA

Part 1

- 1 **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 14)
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 8 March 2016.
- 2 **Urgent Items**
Chairman to announce any urgent items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under agenda item 7(b).
- 3 **Declarations of Interests**
Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.
- 4 **Public Question Time**
Questions submitted by members of the public in writing by noon on the previous working day (for a period up to 15 minutes).

RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

- 5 **Chichester Electoral Review: Creating a Pattern of Wards** (Pages 15 - 116)
To recommend the Council to adopt the recommendations of the Boundary Review Panel and approve the submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of a pattern of wards for a 36 member Council.
- 6 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**
There are no restricted items for consideration.
- 7 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**
 - a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
 - b) Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

NOTES

1. The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business

wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of “exempt information” as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972

2. Restrictions have been introduced on the distribution of paper copies of supplementary information circulated separately from the agenda as follows:
 - a) Members of the Cabinet and Chairmen of Corporate Governance & Audit Committee and Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Senior Officers receive paper copies of the supplements (including appendices). Other members may request a copy of the supplementary information or a copy is available in the Members’ Room, East Pallant House.
 - b) The press and public may view this information on the Council’s website at [Chichester District Council - Minutes, agendas and reports](#) unless they contain exempt information.
3. Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intentions before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided. (Standing Order 11.3)
4. A key decision means an executive decision which is likely to:
 - result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council’s budget for the service or function to which the decision relates or
 - be significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising one or more wards in the Council’s area or
 - incur expenditure, generate income, or produce savings greater than £100,000.

Non-Cabinet member Councillors speaking at Cabinet

Standing Order 22.3 provides that members of the Council may, with the chairman’s consent, speak at a Committee meeting of which they are not a member, or temporarily sit and speak at the Committee table on a particular item but shall then return to the public seating area.

The Leader of the Council intends to apply this Standing Order at Cabinet meetings by requesting that members should normally seek his consent in writing by email in advance of the meeting. They should do this by noon on the day before the meeting, outlining the substance of the matter that they wish to raise. The word “normally” is emphasised because there may be unforeseen circumstances where a member can assist the conduct of business by his or her contribution and where he would therefore retain his discretion to allow the contribution without notice.



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on Tuesday 8 March 2016 at 9.30 am

Members Present: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr B Finch, Mrs P Hardwick, Mrs G Keegan and Mrs S Taylor

Members not present: Mr R Barrow

In attendance by invitation:

Officers present all items: Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr P E Over (Executive Director) and Mr P Coleman (Member Services Manager)

155 **Minutes**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday, 9 February 2016, be signed as a correct record.

156 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

157 **Declarations of Interests**

No interests were declared at this meeting.

158 **Public Question Time**

No public questions had been submitted.

159 **Timing of Council Meetings**

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Hardwick introduced the report. She reminded the Cabinet that, following members' disquiet at the length of two successive Council meetings, the Chief Executive had sent an email to members to survey their opinions on the length, frequency and timing of Council meetings. The results of the survey were set out in Appendix 2, and summarised in paragraph 5.3 of the report. These showed a wide spread of opinion. It was, therefore, proposed to put the two most favoured meeting times to the Council for decision. Paragraph 5.3 of the report also set out some

other suggested changes to the conduct of meetings, including the establishment of a task and finish group (TFG) under her chairmanship to review the Constitution. She proposed that the other members of the TFG should be Councillors Apel, Lintill, Ridd and Tull.

The Chief Executive corrected recommendation 2.2(a), which should refer to a morning start time of 11.00am. She added that this was a difficult issue as the Council consisted of 48 individuals who all had different circumstances and preferences. The aim was to achieve the best fit, but it would not suit everybody.

The Chairman agreed that the Council ought to choose between the broad options of morning or afternoon meetings and then decide the actual start time. The TFG should review the Constitution to see whether meetings could be streamlined without imperilling backbench councillors' right to hold the Cabinet to account.

Mr Finch suggested that a 10.30 am start time would best suit members who were in employment. Mrs Hardwick pointed out that the survey showed this was not necessarily the case, and suggested consideration should be given to alternating the start times of the Council meetings, in order to give all councillors the opportunity to participate at some. Mrs Lintill commented that an experiment with alternate start times had been carried out previously, but had not increased attendance. Mrs Keegan asked that the numbers attending Council meetings of different times should be made available to members. The Cabinet decided that the choice before the Council should be kept simple, as too many permutations could lead to confusion.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

- (1) That the proposed changes to Council meetings as listed in paragraph 5.3(a) and (b) be approved.
- (2) That, as there was no clear majority for changing the time of Council, the Council considers either:
 - (a) A morning start time of 11:00am (with briefing sessions starting at 9:30am); or
 - (b) An afternoon start time. If the majority of Members vote for an afternoon meeting they will subsequently be asked to vote on either:
 - i. A 2:00pm start time (with briefing sessions starting at 12:30pm); or
 - ii. A 2:30pm start time (with briefing sessions starting at 1:00pm).

RESOLVED

That, subject to approval of (1) above, Councillors Apel, Lintill, Ridd and Tull be appointed to the Task and Finish Group on the Constitution.

160 Recommendations of the Grants Task and Finish Group

The Cabinet considered the report and appendices circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Lintill introduced the report, explaining that, having regard to the future financial settlement and concerns about the longevity of the grants pot, the Grants and Concessions Panel had established a task and finish group to consider the various discretionary funding sources made available by the Council. The group's recommendations were set out in full in the report, and aimed to ensure sustainability of both the New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Scheme and the discretionary grants scheme. The main points were:-

- The annual allocation for the New Homes Bonus scheme should be reduced from £400,000 to £250,000. This was generally in line with actual past payments. It would be subject to annual confirmation by the Cabinet, in view of uncertainties about the future of the New Homes Bonus. The maximum allocation per parish would be £100,000, and parishes which had had less than five houses built in the preceding three years would no longer be eligible. Projects already identified in the Infrastructure Business Plan would have a shortened application form.
- The annual general grants pot would be reduced from £250,000 to £175,000, again reflecting past payments. Typically the maximum grant would be £15,000, reduced from £25,000, although this could be exceeded in exceptional circumstances. More specific criteria would be set for what the Council would and, by exception, would not fund, and these priorities were set out in Appendix 6.
- Demand for the Low Carbon Chichester District fund had virtually ceased and the unexpended balance would be transferred to the private sector renewal budget.

Mrs Lintill thanked the Task and Finish Group for their work on these challenging issues.

Mrs Taylor welcomed the proposed transfer of the Low Carbon Chichester District fund to the private sector renewal budget to help tackle fuel poverty.

The Cabinet discussed the possibility of a loans scheme, alongside the grants scheme. Mrs Lintill pointed out that this was referred to in paragraph 6.9 of the report. Outside of the scope of the Task and Finish Group, this had been found to be more complex than originally considered in view of legislation governing the making of loans. It was an outstanding piece of work that was yet to be undertaken by the Economic Development service.

Mrs Lintill added that she had discussed with the Economic Development team the number of large requests from businesses for grants, which the Panel had not been able to support. Grants in this area would be limited to a maximum of £2,500.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the revisions to the New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Policy as set out in Appendix 2 be approved.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the unspent balance of the Low Carbon Chichester District Fund be transferred to the Private Sector Renewal Budget for the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative.
- (2) That the revisions to the Grants and Concessions Policy as set out in Appendix 4 of the report be approved.
- (3) That the draft "Priorities and Principles for Funding" for the financial year 2016-17 (Appendix 6) be approved.
- (4) That, at the appropriate time, consideration be given to including the funding of the grants programme within the base budget once these funds have been exhausted; currently forecasted to be from 2020-21.

161 Replacement Telephone System

Further to minute 67 of 6 October 2015, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mr Finch introduced the report, adding that recommendation 2.3 should be amended to include consultation with the Cabinet Member before the exercise of delegated powers.

He reminded the Cabinet that, at their meeting on 6 October 2015, they had approved a Project Initiation Document (PID) for a replacement for the Council's current telephone system, which was now 25 years old and would be unsupported by the current suppliers by July 2017. Officers were also authorised to undertake a joint procurement with Arun District Council who also needed to replace their telephone system. The rationale for this was to reduce procurement costs, but also to give opportunity to procure a shared system. This would provide resilience between the two authorities to overcome a weakness in business continuity for the telephone system and to provide a key piece of infrastructure for the sharing of services and resources.

Through a joint tendering exercise both Councils had identified the same preferred supplier, after a detailed evaluation of 14 submissions. For Chichester, the capital cost would be £149,849, with an annual revenue cost of £15,945. Arun's Cabinet would be considering their side of the offer on 21 March 2016.

If it was decided to proceed with a shared solution, additional costs would be incurred to cover the additional items set out in the second table in paragraph 6 of the appendix. A further report identifying integration requirements and itemising these costs and savings would be made before seeking agreement to a shared service.

Mr Finch emphasised that it was necessary to move forward with replacing the telephone system without waiting for a decision on integration, but the proposed new system would enable many improvements.

Mrs Ryan (ICT Manager) underlined the need to replace the current system. The cost was below the initial budget. A very comprehensive evaluation of the submissions had been carried out to ensure that the replacement system was fit for purpose and provided a responsive, flexible and resilient system. The additional functionality of the new system was exciting and would involve a big cultural change for the organisation.

Mrs Hardwick drew attention to the contrast between Chichester and Arun in the size of the Project Team listed in paragraph 10 of the appendix. Mrs Ryan explained that the relative strength of the Chichester team was because the replacement of the telephone system was a more urgent priority than for Arun. The teams would be more even if a shared service was to be progressed.

Mrs Lintill expressed the hope that a shared solution would be agreed, for business continuity reasons. She asked whether the report took account of the outsourcing of the Leisure service. Mrs Ryan replied that the Leisure service's requirements had been included in the tender. The outsourcing now meant that there would be a reduction in the number of handsets required, which would leave more funding for additional hardware and consultancy.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That up to £175,000 (including contingency) be released from the Asset Replacement Programme in order to allow a contract to be awarded to the preferred contractor.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the replacement of the current telephone system be approved.
- (2) That the Head of Business Improvement Services be authorised, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Support Services, to conclude a contract with the preferred contractor.

162 Revised Local Development Scheme 2016-2019

Further to minute 18 of 7 July 2015, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda, together with an update providing amendments suggested by the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel (DPIP) (copies attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, explaining that the Local Development Scheme (LDS) contained information about the current Development Plan for Chichester District and the timetable for the future production of planning policy documents. It was an important document for keeping the community informed and as such was published on the Council's website.

The LDS had last been updated and approved by the Council in July 2015. It had to be subject to constant review to take account of new documents, not least the review of the Local Plan. It covered a rolling three year time frame from 2016 – 2019.

The LDS enabled residents and interested parties to know the timetables of the documents and when they could participate in the planning process. The LDS gave the profile of each document, setting out its scope and the proposed timetable. The timings were indicative and would be kept under review.

The document had been discussed by the DPIP on 25 February resulting in some amendments set out on the update sheet. She also added a recommendation to enable minor amendments to be made under delegated authority.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

(1) That the revised Local Development Scheme, as updated, be approved.

(2) That the Head of Planning Services be authorised to make typographical and other minor amendments to the Scheme before it is published.

163 Making the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan

Further to minute 101 of 1 December 2015, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, pointing out that 93.8% of those who had voted in the referendum on 11 February 2016 were in favour of the Plan, on a turn-out of 30.2%. She congratulated the residents of Fishbourne on this success.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan be made part of the Development Plan for Chichester District (excluding the area within the South Downs National Park).

164 Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan

The Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, pointing out that the examiner had found that, subject to modifications, the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan met the basic conditions. Subsequently the Parish Council had agreed to make the suggested modifications.

RESOLVED

(1) That the Decision Statement as set out in the Appendix be published.

- (2) That the examiner's recommendation that the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan proceed to referendum, subject to modifications as set out in the Decision Statement, be approved.

165 Enterprise Gateway Project: Plot 12, Terminus Road, Chichester

Further to minute 19 of 7 July 2015, the Cabinet considered the report (copy attached to the official minutes) and exempt appendix circulated with the agenda.

Mrs Keegan introduced the report, and reminded the Cabinet of the previous history of this project. The architect and design team had been appointed, planning permission had been granted and a design and build EU procurement process had been carried out. The Cabinet was now being asked to appoint a preferred contractor and release funding from the approved budget to enable the contractor and design team to develop the detailed design and report a fixed build price. If that final build cost, together with the expenditure to date, was within the approved budget as expected, delegated authority was sought to enter into the contract.

The Chairman welcomed the progress and pointed out that the project offered a very healthy return on investment, especially given the element of guaranteed income. The scheme was well-sited adjacent to a key junction on the A27 trunk road, and was important for job creation.

RESOLVED

- (1) That, having regard to the revised Return on Investment, £140,000 be released from the approved budget to allow the project to proceed to the next stage.
- (2) That a pre-construction agreement be entered into with the preferred contractor, contractor A, to complete the design and provide a fixed price for construction.
- (3) Following the contractor providing the Council with a detailed fixed price, and subject to the total project costs being within the budget approved by Council, that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services, to conclude a design & build contract with contractor A.

166 Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2016-2021

Further to minute 91 of 3 October 2006, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, commenting that private sector stock, both rented and owner occupied, was becoming more and more important, especially in view of the challenges facing the social rented sector. However, it was essential to ensure that the private sector provided warm and safe accommodation. There was a strong link between poor housing and health, which in turn created additional costs for the NHS and other social services.

Chichester District was an affluent area, and yet at 14% it had double the national category 1 hazard for excess cold compared to the rest of England (7%). The highest concentrations were found in the central and northern part of the District.

The Council was working in co-operation with a number of partners (e.g. the CAB, health professionals) to identify vulnerable residents and target resources.

There were four strands to the Strategy:-

- Improving the standard of accommodation in the private rented sector.
- Reducing the level of hazards in the private sector stock.
- Deceasing the high level of fuel poverty and excess cold.
- Providing adaptations to meet the needs of residents with disabilities.

Two key changes were proposed in the Strategy: The first was the introduction of a Chichester Warm Homes initiative to assist vulnerable home owners and landlords to improve the heating provision and energy efficiency of their homes; the second was to dispense with the home loans provided to owner occupiers due to lack of uptake and to provide Home Repair assistance to owner occupiers in the form of interest free loans, repayable on the sale of the property.

Most of the funding was already available. However, allocation of funding was sought as follows:-

- Approximately £325,000 over a five year period from the Warm Homes Initiative.
- £24,200 from the ceased Care & Repair Home Improvement Agency.
- £95,221 funding from the Low Carbon Chichester Fund referred to previously in minute 160.
- £208,000 was approved by the Council in March 2016 as part of the Housing Strategy.

It is important that a good working partnership was built up with landlords, in particular the rural estate landlords. A number of constructive meetings had taken place between officers from both the Housing and Environmental Teams with the rural estate landlords, resulting in the formation of a working partnership to improve the accommodation in the District.

Mr Finch asked how 'excess cold' was defined. Mr Dunmall (Housing Operations Manager) explained that this derived from a risk rating in a hazard points system introduced by the Housing Act 2004.

Mr Finch also asked how the provision of Home Repair assistance to owner occupiers in the form of interest free loans would be more likely to succeed than the previous home loans to owner occupiers. Ms Reed (Environmental Housing Manager) explained that the new loans would be interest free and payable on sale of the property. Previously owner occupiers had been reluctant to take credit.

Cabinet Members discussed whether there would be legal issues and costs associated with making loans, and the Chief Executive agreed that assurance from legal and financial officers would be sought before proceeding with the scheme.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2016-2021 be approved, together with accompanying financial assistance options for implementation commencing on 1 April 2016.
- (2) That the repurposing of the Care and Repair Home Improvement Agency grant funding of £24,200 be approved to be used for the provision of heating and insulation for vulnerable members of the community as part of the Chichester Warm Homes Initiative.

167 Update of the Housing Allocation Scheme regarding the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report, and reminded the Cabinet of the Government's commitment to relocating 20,000 Syrian refugees. West Sussex County Council had made a commitment to accepting one family of four per month for five years. This would equate to around two families per year for Chichester District. In order to enable these families to be placed directly in accommodation to meet their needs, an amendment to the Housing Allocation Scheme was required. Mrs Taylor added that both the County Council and the voluntary sector would provide support to help the families settle in and feel welcomed.

Mr Finch supported the proposal, but asked whether this would increase waiting times for families on the register and whether this could be managed.

Mr Dunmall (Housing Operations Manager) explained that the Council made about 420 allocations per year, so the addition of two more would be a very small proportion. The Council could place them on the housing register and their exceptional needs would give them priority anyway, but the proposed amendment would avoid the need for the families to undergo form-filling processes. It would not have a significant impact on waiting times for others.

The Chairman emphasised that the families would be taken directly from refugee camps in and around the Syrian border and would have been vetted by the United Nations and the Home Office.

Mrs Lintill commended the community response to the refugees' plight and added that the local member should be involved as the refugees were found homes.

RESOLVED

That the Housing Allocation Scheme be updated to include the following statement to allow direct allocation of homes to people arriving in the Chichester District via the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme:-

“Section 17 Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme

17.1 Where an individual or family is to be relocated to the Chichester District through the Government’s Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme they will be directly allocated a home without the need to provide a local connection or to be placed on the Housing Register.”

168 **Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement Adoption (LSS2)**

Further to minute 529 of 7 January 2014, the Cabinet considered the report and appendix circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Taylor introduced the report. She reminded the Cabinet that the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Area Board had been formed in 2012 comprising the local planning authorities of coastal West Sussex, together with Brighton and Hove City Council, Lewes District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. In 2015 the area had been expanded to include both Mid Sussex and Horsham District Councils. The purpose of the Board was to facilitate joint work on strategic planning priorities.

In 2013 the Board had produced the Local Strategic Statement (LSS1) which provided the context for sustainable growth over the period for 2013 – 2031.

In 2015, to take account of the inclusion of Horsham and Mid Sussex and the implementation of the Greater Brighton City Deal (which had been at an early stage when LSS1 was initially prepared), the original LSS had been updated. In effect it was a refresh of the original LSS1.

LSS2 had drafted by an independent planning consultant with input and comment from the senior officers from the participating local authorities and the final draft agreed by the participants was set out in the appendix.

The updated LSS had been managed as a focused ‘refresh’ rather than a full review. The strategic context (government policy, outcome of devolution proposals etc.) was likely to change and a full review would be needed to address longer term issues, in particular the housing shortfall across the Sussex Coast area.

Spatial Priority 2 which covered Chichester/Tangmere/Bognor Regis dealt with familiar issues i.e. A27 and sewage disposal. The “refreshed” Statement as regards Chichester was little different from the Statement agreed by the Cabinet in 2014.

By participating in the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Board, Chichester was contributing towards meeting its Duty to Co-operate which was a legal requirement of the Localism Act 2011. Fulfilment of this duty was an important factor in the Examiner finding the Council's Local Plan sound.

Cabinet members commented that Chichester District seemed rather peripheral in the LSS, which appeared to add little value to the District, In fact it gave the misleading impression that Arun and Chichester were the areas with spare capacity for housing development. The Council's officers should seek improvements in the intended full review.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the updated Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Local Strategic Statement (LSS2) including Annexes 1-3 be approved.
- (2) That Annex 4, the Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Monitoring and Delivery Framework (Update January 2016), be noted.

169 Support to the Community and Voluntary Sector

Further to minute 527 of 7 January 2014, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Lintill introduced the report, reminding the Cabinet that, at the meeting on 11 March 2013, they had agreed to enter into an agreement with West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) to receive their contributions to commission a support service for the voluntary and community sector for 2013/14 – 2015/16. Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC) was now the local provider of this infrastructure support to the voluntary sector in the District, with a funding agreement in place until 31 March 2016. VAAC's performance had been monitored by the Grants and Concessions Panel who were satisfied with it, and recommended extending the Council's contribution for a further year.

Unfortunately, it was not yet known whether and to what extent WSSCC would continue to fund the service in 2016/17, although it remained informally committed to continue funding, and Arun District Council was waiting for a decision from WSSCC before committing their own funds. If this Council also waited for confirmation from the other two councils there was a risk that VAAC might incur staff losses, and be less able to supply an effective support service, which could result in more financial and other support being sought from the Council by voluntary and community organisations.

Clearly if the Council became the only funder of VAAC, or the other Councils reduced their contribution, the specification for service provided would need to be reviewed.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the existing funding provided by Chichester District Council for a support service for the voluntary and community sector in Chichester be extended, by

allocating base budget funding of £44,000 to Voluntary Action Arun and Chichester (VAAC) for one year from 1 April 2016.

- (2) That a specification for expected outcomes of a support service for the voluntary and community sector be agreed by officers, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, once Partner funding is known.
- (3) That the Head of Community Services, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services, be authorised to enter into a contract from WSCC for local provision of support for the voluntary and community sector, if it is offered.

170 **Financial Monitoring 2015-16**

The Cabinet considered the report and appendices circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

Mrs Hardwick introduced the report, and invited Cabinet Members to comment on whether there were any points of interest in their portfolios.

Mrs Belenger (Accountancy Services Manager) made a correction to Appendix 1 (page 175) in relation to Estates, explaining that the "Terminus Road income", included the "Investment property woodruff centre", which had thus been double-counted. This reduced the total projected variance 2015-16 from -£1,701,000 to -£1,600,200.

The Chairman commented on the effect of the buoyancy of the economy on planning and car parking income, the return on the Council's property investments as compared with bank deposits, and the underspends resulting from holding staff vacancies.

Mrs Hardwick asked that the tables should show the % variances, and asked whether there were materiality thresholds. Mrs Belenger replied that variances of over £20,000 were considered significant.

Officers answered a number of members' questions about individual variances.

RESOLVED

That the 2015-16 forecast revenue outturn position on the Council's General Fund (Appendix 1 as amended) and progress made to date on the 2015-16 capital projects (Appendix 2) be noted.

171 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

RESOLVED

That the public, including the press, be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' of the description specified in Paragraph 3 (information relating

to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

172 Investment Opportunity

The Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda. Mrs Keegan introduced the report. The report proposed that, subject to due diligence, the Council should acquire a retail property in Chichester (with accommodation above to be leased back to the vendor) with a net return on investment that exceeded the bank deposit rate.

Mr Regan (Senior Estates Surveyor) reported on the heads of terms that had been agreed, subject to due diligence. The Cabinet discussed the terms, including the lease back of the upper floors, the expected return on investment, and the risks in terms of capital value and rental income.

RESOLVED

That the purchase of the investment described in this report be authorised, subject to approval of the recommendation below, and that the Head of Commercial Services be authorised, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services, to approve the final terms of this acquisition following completion of due diligence investigations.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That £1,010,000 be allocated from reserves for this purchase.

173 Development of Land at Barnfield Drive, Chichester

Further to minute 391 of 9 April 2013, the Cabinet considered the report circulated with the agenda. Mrs Keegan introduced the report, which sought approval for a variation to the original development agreement relating to the Council's land at Barnfield Drive, Chichester, and authority for negotiations relating thereto. Cabinet Members were shown a map of the Council's land holdings and the proposed development.

Mr Harrison (Strategic Asset Management Surveyor) reported that phase 1 of the development was almost complete, but the Council's development partner was seeking a variation of the agreement in relation to the development of phase 2, in order to reflect changed market conditions in the retail warehousing sector, increased construction costs, and the impact of planning conditions and highway requirements. The impact of these changes had been confirmed by a feasibility review by the Council's development consultants.

RESOLVED

- (1) That a variation to the original development agreement relating to the Joint Venture Development Agreement with the Brookhouse Group for the development of the land owned by the Council at Barnfield Drive, Chichester be approved on the principle set out in paragraph 5 of the report.
- (2) That the Head of Commercial Services be authorised to negotiate and, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services, to agree terms in respect of matters that may arise as the legal documentation is processed and to grant ground leases relating to individual sites, in accordance with the principles of the Development Agreement as revised.

The meeting ended at 12.16 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date:

Chichester District Council

CABINET and COUNCIL

31 March 2016

Chichester Electoral Review: Creating a Pattern of Wards

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Philip Coleman, Member Services Manager,
Tel: 01243 534655 E-mail: pcoleman@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum, Leader of the Council,
Tel: 01243 538585 E-mail: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1. That the Council adopts the recommendations of the Boundary Review Panel and approves the submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England of the proposals in Appendix 3 as their preferred pattern of wards for a 36 member Council.**

3. Background

- 3.1. At its meeting on 10 March 2016, the Council approved submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) of a proposal for a reduction in the number of councillors to approximately 35 or 36, to be implemented for the district council elections in 2019.
- 3.2. On 26 January 2016 the LGBCE announced that it was minded to recommend that 36 councillors should be elected to Chichester District Council in future and invited proposals on a pattern of wards to accommodate those councillors to be submitted by 4 April 2016.
- 3.3. A series of three member workshops drew up some initial proposals for different geographical areas of the District. Having taken into account the output from the workshops, the Boundary Review Panel agreed a consultation document setting out a proposed pattern of wards. The consultation document is attached as Appendix 1.
- 3.4. On 18 February, the consultation document was sent to all members, all parish councils and chairmen of parish meetings, West Sussex County Council, South Downs National Park Authority, the local Police commander and political parties in the Chichester and Arundel and South Downs constituencies. The consultation document was also put on the Council's website and a press release was issued. Comments were invited by 14 March.

- 3.5. The Boundary Review Panel met again on 21 March to consider the responses to the consultation document. This report sets out the Panel's recommendations.

4. Outcomes to be achieved

- 4.1. The outcome is that the Council should propose to the LGBCE by the end of their consultation on 4 April a pattern of wards which meets the Commission's three statutory criteria: electoral equality; community interests and identities; and effective and convenient local government.
- 4.2. **Electoral Equality:** This means that each councillor should represent roughly the same number of voters. The projected number of voters in the District is 98,781. (This is based on projections to 2021, as required by the LGBCE to help future-proof the new arrangements) This means that, on average, each councillor should represent about **2,744** voters. Of course, this cannot be achieved perfectly, but the further the number of voters in a proposed ward departs from the average (especially if it is by more than $\pm 10\%$), the more persuasive the justification required on the other criteria.
- 4.3. **Interests and identities of local communities:** This means respecting local ties and setting easily identifiable boundaries. The patterns of community life, represented by transport links, community groups, facilities such as shops, health services and community halls, and shared interests should be taken into account. In many cases parishes can be used as building blocks.
- 4.4. **Effective and convenient local government:** This means ensuring that the wards can be represented effectively by their elected councillor(s) – that wards are neither too big nor too small in extent and all parts of the wards are linked together. Wards may have more than one councillor, but not more than three.

5. Responses to consultation

- 5.1. The responses to the consultation document are set out in Appendix 2, together with comments upon them. Responses received by Monday morning 21 March were taken into account by the Boundary Review Panel. Some responses have been received subsequently and the Appendix lists those received up until Wednesday morning 23 March. Responses received subsequently will be reported at the Cabinet meeting.
- 5.2. Some of the responses are not directed to the pattern of wards proposed in the consultation document but raise other issues, such as the reduction in size of the Council. This applies, particularly to the responses received from Mr Jonathan Brown, 'Make Votes Count In West Sussex', Chichester Liberal Democrats and Mrs Sarah Sharp.

6. Issues and Proposals

- 6.1. **Chichester City.** With a projected electorate of 23,276 voters, Chichester City would need 8.5 members to produce warding arrangements of average size. Having considered the scope for transferring areas of the city to outlying wards or for bringing adjoining settlements into district wards for the city, the consultation document concluded that Chichester City should be dealt with as a

separate unit and that district ward boundaries should not cross the city boundary. Given the pattern proposed in the rest of the district, it needs nine councillors to achieve an overall number of 36 councillors for the whole district. This choice is supported by the fact that the Local Plan identifies Chichester City North as the focus for substantial new development, which will not all be complete by 2021, and a strategic development location at Chichester West, which will be started by 2021 but continue to develop after that date. Both these areas lie wholly within the city. The consultation document, therefore, proposed a pattern of wards to provide for nine district councillors in Chichester city.

- 6.2.** The consultation responses support keeping Chichester City as a single entity, with no district wards crossing the city boundary. There is also support, and no counter-proposals, for the proposed division into five wards, with a single-member central ward and four two-member wards named after compass points. Co-terminosity with proposals for county electoral divisions has been sought where possible, but these have not been settled yet, with WSCC putting forward counter-proposals to the LGBCE's draft recommendations. It is to be hoped that the LGBCE will seek co-terminosity as far as possible in producing final recommendations for WSCC and draft recommendations for Chichester District Council. This will not always be possible and there are divergences in places, notably East Broyle and Arundel Park.
- 6.3.** Given the proposal for nine district councillors in the city, it is inevitable that the average size of ward will be below the district average. The proposed Chichester West ward exceeded the 10% tolerance below the average, justified by giving headroom for continued development of the West of Chichester Strategic Development Location. The Panel suggests that this is addressed by additionally transferring Woodlands Lane (adjacent to East Broyle) with 122 electors from Chichester North to Chichester West. This reduces the variance to -8.69%.
- 6.4. Selsey and Sidlesham.** There has been strong objection to combining Sidlesham parish with Selsey town. These objections are set out in Appendix 2 and appear to be well-founded. As a result, a workshop session of councillors from the Manhood area was held at Selsey, which proposed an alternative pattern of wards based on a 35 member council, described in the comments column in Appendix 2. This had the advantage of making positive variances in other areas more acceptable. However, it made negative variances worse, and pushes the Chichester Central, East and West Wards over the -10% tolerance. It also required the transfer of Shopwyke (including Shopwyke Lakes) to Tangmere Ward, thus splitting Oving parish. This means that the headroom for electorate growth arising from new development in Tangmere Ward would quickly be exhausted, as it would contain two strategic development locations.
- 6.5.** The Panel advises the Council to comply with the LGBCE's request for a pattern of wards for a 36 member Council, and does not support the proposal for a 35 member council. It did consider whether an alternative pattern could be devised for a 36 member council, but linking Sidlesham with other parishes, such as Donnington. However, none of these alternatives seemed to the Panel to be more advantageous than the original proposal, which the Panel, therefore, supports. This will involve devising a pattern of wards whereby most of Selsey

forms a three-member ward, and Sidlesham and part of Selsey form a single-member ward.

- 6.6. The Witterings.** The consultation sought views on whether The Witterings should be one three-member ward, three single-member wards, or one two-member and one single-member ward. There were mixed views in response. The proposal for one three-member ward avoids dividing West Wittering parish between wards, and seems to reflect the unity of interest of the western Manhood Peninsula. This is the option supported by the Panel.
- 6.7. Bosham Ward.** This proposed ward is over the +10% tolerance – in fact at +15.23% the largest proposed ward in the district. This reflects the fact that it comprises three large parishes (Chidham & Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne) which are separated from other parts of the south of the district by creeks of Chichester Harbour. The only practical way to deal with the excess variance is to ward Fishbourne parish and move some electors into Donnington ward. However, there is little headroom in Donnington for this. On the basis that every little helps, perhaps Apuldram Lane (about 60 electors) could be moved into Donnington ward. This would decrease the variance on Bosham ward to 14.14%, and increase that in Donnington to 9.77%. The small gains in electoral equality do not seem to justify the complication of splitting Fishbourne parish.
- 6.8. Harting Ward.** Despite its size, this Ward is supported from those of its constituent parish councils that have responded. There has been no dissent.
- 6.9. Fernhurst and Lynchmere Wards.** There is support from local members and constituent parish councils for these to be combined as a two member ward. This seems well-founded, especially in view of the way the parish boundary cuts across Vann Road and the communities along it. The dissenting voice is Lurgashall Parish Council, which does not want to be part of it, but would prefer to be united with Northchapel and other parishes to its east or south. There does not seem to be an acceptable solution that enables this. See Appendix 2, comments in relation to Lurgashall Parish Council's and Cllr Caroline Neville's responses. The Panel, therefore, recommends that the Fernhurst and Lynchmere (locally preferred spelling) wards, as proposed, should be combined as a two-member ward.
- 6.10. Midhurst and surrounding parishes.** Midhurst on its own is too large to be a single member ward and too small to be a two member ward. The original proposals unite it with a number of parishes to the west and south in a two-member ward. There has been a suggestion that Midhurst should be divided into two roughly equal sized wards (North and South) each of which should be joined with neighbouring parishes to form two single-member wards. The local members and the Town Council do not support this. The Panel recommends one two-member ward, as in the original consultation document, except that Woolbeding and Redford Parish has expressed a preference to be grouped with Stedham with Iping, Bepton and Midhurst, rather than Easebourne. This can be accommodated without electoral imbalance.
- 6.11. North East Parishes.** There is a comment that ward boundaries should not cross the Parliamentary Constituency boundary. However, the Panel does not believe this is a relevant criterion, especially as a further review of such

boundaries is likely to take place soon. It is also incompatible with a request from the parishes of Kirdford and Plaistow & Ifield to be in a two member ward with Loxwood and Wisborough Green, in recognition of formal joint working arrangements that take place between them. This really only works if Northchapel and Ebernoe stay included. The Panel recommends one two-member ward for the Wisborough Green and Plaistow Wards as proposed.

6.12. **Names of wards.** In general, the consultation document adopted the previous practice of naming wards after the largest settlements within them. The consultation document did offer alternatives in two wards, and one suggestion has arisen in relation to a third:-

(a) **Westbourne Ward or Ems Valley Ward?** WSCC prefers Westbourne. No response has yet been received from the local member or any of the affected parish councils. The Panel suggests the ward should be named Westbourne

(b) **Lavant Valley or Westhampnett Ward.** WSCC suggested a further option, Goodwood. The Panel supports this suggestion as being preferable to the alternatives. Westhampnett village lies in one corner of the ward. Boxgrove and Earham are parishes within the ward which lie outside the Lavant Valley, and Lavant parish itself is in a different ward to which it gives its name.

(c) **Harting or Western Weald.** The local member for Harting suggests Western Weald as an alternative name. The Panel does not support this, as being vague and not sufficiently descriptive of the place.

7. Alternatives that have been considered

7.1. The alternative options have been described above and are considered in more detail in the Comments column in Appendix 2

8. Resource and legal implications

8.1. There are no direct resource and legal implications arising from this stage of the review. The main costs are the time of members and officers in preparing and consulting on proposals for the LGBCE. These costs are being met within existing budgets. The project is managed by the Member Services Manager under the direction of the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance and Governance Services.

9. Community impact and corporate risks

9.1. The impact of a reduction in Council size is that ward sizes will increase and include larger populations and, in rural areas, more parishes. Some reviews have divided councils, usually on party political lines, with the result that there is a submission from a minority political party alongside the Council's official submission, but there has been little evidence of party political implications being brought to bear on this review. The LGBCE recognises that its recommendations may have local political implications, but that is not a factor it takes into account.

- 9.2. When ward boundaries are considered, there is the potential for controversy and objections. It can be very difficult to reconcile incompatibilities between the statutory criteria of electoral equality, community interests and identities, and effective and convenient local government. This is already apparent in such cases as Selsey and Sidlesham and Lurgashall, Northchapel and Lodsworth.
- 9.3. The LGBCE tries to use parishes as building blocks for district wards. It can neither create nor abolish a parish council, nor change its boundaries. However, it may create or change the boundaries of parish wards. The recommended proposals also seek to use parishes as building blocks, and only in the two largest settlements, Chichester City and Selsey (where it is already the case), are there proposals to divide parishes between wards.
- 9.4. The LGBCE will consider the Council's proposals and any other representations it receives by 4 April, some of which may not yet be known to the Council. It will put forward its own recommendations for consultation between 7 June and 2 August 2016. There is certainly the possibility that these may differ from the Council's preferred solution.

10. Other Implications

Crime & Disorder:	None
Climate Change:	None
Human Rights and Equality Impact:	None
Safeguarding:	None
Health Impact	None

11. Appendices

- 11.1. Appendix 1 – Original Consultation Document
 Appendix 2 – Responses to Consultation
 Appendix 3 – Recommended proposal

12. Background Papers

- 12.1. Report to Boundary Review Panel meeting on 21 March 2016.

**CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL
ELECTORAL REVIEW 2016
CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

For response by Monday 14 March 2016

Introduction

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is carrying out an electoral review of Chichester District.

The LGBCE is minded to recommend that Chichester District Council should have 36 councillors in future, compared with 48 now.

This means that new council ward boundaries need to be drawn and the LGBCE is asking for proposals, with evidence to support them, to be submitted by 4 April 2016.

Chichester District Council will be submitting its own proposals, and this consultation paper sets out its draft proposals, with possible alternatives and questions, in order to give local people and organisations an opportunity to comment.

Any pattern of ward boundaries needs to take into account three statutory criteria:

- 1. Electoral Equality:** This means that each councillor should represent roughly the same number of voters. The projected number of voters in the District is 98,781. (This is based on projections to 2021, as required by the LGBCE to help future-proof the new arrangements) This means that, on average, each councillor should represent about 2,744 voters. Of course, this is cannot be achieved perfectly, but the further the number of voters in a proposed ward departs from the average (especially if it is by more than $\pm 10\%$), the more persuasive the justification required on the other criteria.
- 2. Interests and identities of local communities:** This means respecting local ties and setting easily identifiable boundaries. The patterns of community life, represented by transport links, community groups, facilities such as shops, health services and community halls, and shared interests should be taken into account. In many cases parishes can be used as building blocks.
- 3. Effective and convenient local government:** This means ensuring that the wards can be represented effectively by their elected councillor(s) – that wards are neither too big nor too small in extent and all parts of the wards are linked together. Wards may have more than one councillor, but not more than three.

Interested parties may make representations direct to the LGBCE by 4 April. See www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk.

However, Chichester District Council invites you to comment on its draft proposals and the questions set out in this document by 14 March 2016 in order to influence its submission to the LGBCE. Please note that if you propose a change to the proposals in one area, this may have knock-on effects elsewhere and if possible you should explain how you would deal with those.

Representations should be sent to MemberServices@chichester.gov.uk or to Member Services Manager, Chichester District Council, East Pallant House, Chichester, PO19 1TY

Important Note: Nothing in what follows affects the boundaries of existing city, town or parish councils.

Chichester City

Covering existing wards: Chichester East, Chichester North, Chichester South, Chichester West.

Introduction

With a projected electorate of 23,276 voters, Chichester City would need 8.5 members to produce warding arrangements of average size.

There seems little reasonable scope for transferring any areas of the City to outlying wards in order to achieve an entitlement closer to 8 members.

We have looked at the scope for including areas which lie outside the city within the warding arrangements for the city. (This would not imply any change to the boundary of the area served by Chichester City Council). The built-up areas which lie closest to the City boundary are Fishbourne, Stockbridge (part of Donnington parish) and Westhampnett. All of these lie outside the Chichester By-pass (A27 trunk road), which forms a strong natural boundary along the southern perimeter of Chichester. All have long-established distinct community identities with a range of community facilities such as shops and community halls within them.

There is, however, one area that lies outside the city boundary and the trunk road that has not yet developed a community identity. This is the Shopwhyke Lakes strategic development location, which lies in the parish of Oving.

This is estimated to include about 240 new dwellings by 2021 (425 electors included in the projected electorate) and a further 260 in the following five years (probably another 460 electors). In addition, about 111 existing electors live along Shopwhyke Road and in the hamlet of Shopwhyke. The new development is being constructed so as to offer good cycle and pedestrian links (but less so for motor vehicles) to the city.

We have considered whether this area, which seems to have little existing identity with Oving village, should be included in part of the Chichester East ward. On balance, we feel that the disadvantages in its effect on the distinctive separate community identity of Chichester City and effective and convenient local government in breaking co-terminosity with the city boundary outweigh the advantages in terms of electoral equality.

QUESTION:

Q1: Do you agree that Shopwhyke Lakes should be included in Oving ward?

Chichester City Proposals and Questions

We believe that Chichester City has a strongly distinct community identity, separate from the surrounding rural areas and the rest of the district with its pattern of villages and small towns. It is the only substantial urban area in the district and forms a centre for its extensive hinterland, with its cathedral, hospital, retail and employment centres, secondary schools, college and university, and county and district council offices. It is also a transport hub with main railway and bus stations and roads radiating out to the rest of the district and beyond.

Chichester City is also served by an active and historic city council. Although this review does not change the city boundary, it does impact on the pattern of city council wards. Each district council ward and each county electoral division boundary create a city council ward boundary. Where electoral division and district ward boundaries diverge, they create city wards between them. Whilst the LGBCE is not required to take account of this we believe that the three statutory criteria are relevant at city council level, and the impact for city ward boundaries is a relevant consideration in terms of effective and convenient local government.

We, therefore, believe that Chichester City should be dealt with as a separate unit and that district ward boundaries should not cross the city boundary.

QUESTION:

Q2: Do you agree that Chichester City should be dealt with as a separate unit and that district ward boundaries should not cross the city boundary?

The next question is how many district councillors Chichester City should have.

If it has 8 members, the average ward size will be 2,910 electors. It will be under-represented on the Council.

9 members, the average ward size will be 2,586 electors. It will be over-represented on the Council.

Given the pattern that we propose in the rest of the district, it needs nine councillors to achieve an overall number of 36 councillors for the whole district. This choice is supported by the fact that the Local Plan identifies Chichester City North as the focus for substantial new development, which will not all be complete by 2021, and a strategic development location at Chichester West, which will be started by 2021 but continue to develop after that date. Both these areas lie wholly within the city.

We, therefore propose a pattern of wards to provide for nine district councillors in Chichester city.

Proposals

Central Ward (1 member) (Electorate: c2,506) (Variance -8.67%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHN1 Chichester North [1] Except Broyle Road [46 electors]	City centre north of East Street, extending to Oaklands Way	c515
CHS2 Chichester South [2]	The north-west, south-east and south-west quadrants of the city centre, the Southgate area, and south of Westgate extending to the by pass between the Canal and Fishbourne roundabout	1,751
Part of CHE1 Chichester East [1]	St Pancras/Hornet area	c240

Chichester East Ward (2 members) (Electorate: c4,940 ÷ 2 = 2,470)
(Variance -9.99%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHE1 Chichester East [1], except St Pancras, Hornet, East Walls area	Area between St Pancras and The hornet east of Needlemakers and the triangle bounded by New Park Road, Spitalfield Lane, St Pancras	c1,496
CHE2 Chichester East [2]	The Swanfield Estate	1,681
CHE4 Chichester East [4]	The area between Green Lane and the by-pass bounded by Oving Road and Westhampnett Road	1,469
Part of CHE3 Chichester East [3]	South side of Oving Road,	109
Part of CHN3 Chichester North [3]	The Bostock Road area and the arc south of Kingsmead Avenue	185

Chichester North Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $c5,275 \div 2 = 2,638$)

(Variance -3.88%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHN2 Chichester North [2], except the East Broyle Estate, but adding Broyle Road [46 electors] from CHN1	Area between Broyle Road/Lavant Road and St Paul's Road/Old Broyle Road, except the East Broyle Estate	c1,548
CHN3 Chichester North [3], except the Bostock Road area and the arc south of Kingsmead Avenue	Area East of Broyle Road including Summersdale and new developments at Rousillon Park, Graylingwell Park and Lower Graylingwell Graylingwell	3,727

Chichester South Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $c5,666 \div 2 = 2,833$) (Variance +3.24%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHS1 Chichester South [1]		2,007
CHS3 Chichester South [3]		2,010
CHE3 Chichester East [3], except south side of Oving Road		c1,649

Chichester West Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $c4,889 \div 2 = 2,445$) (Variance -10.91%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHW1 Chichester West [1]	The area around Clay Lane and Fishbourne Road East and the southern end of Parklands, around Bishop Luffa School	966
CHW2 Chichester West [2]	The area between Westgate and St Paul's Road, including most of the Parklands Estate and West Broyle	3,134
Part of CHN2 Chichester North[2]	The East Broyle Estate	c789

NB High negative variance but allows headroom for continued development at West of Chichester strategic development location.

South of Chichester District Area

Covering existing wards: Bosham, Boxgrove, Donnington, East Wittering, Fishbourne, Funtington, Lavant, North Mundham, Selsey (North and South), Sidlesham, Southbourne, Tangmere, Westbourne, West Wittering

Proposals and Questions

Selsey and Sidlesham Wards (2 wards 4 members) (Electorate: $10,323 \div 4 = 2581$)
(Variance: -5.95%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
SEN1 Selsey North [1]	Selsey	2,620
SEN2 Selsey North [2]	Selsey	3,064
SES1 Selsey South	Selsey	3,611
SID2, Sidlesham	Sidlesham	1,028

QUESTION:

There are very strong community identity grounds for treating Selsey as a separate entity. However, its projected electorate of 9,295 produces a variance of +12.9% if treated as one three-member ward, which would mean the electors of Selsey would be under-represented on the Council.

If Selsey is to be combined with a neighbouring parish or parishes, this must involve Sidlesham, as Selsey's only adjoining neighbour. It could, conceivably also include Earnley, and we ask a question about this under "The Witterings". If Sidlesham is not combined with Selsey, it makes it very difficult to produce a solution for the rest of the area south and west of Chichester. Another parish or parishes elsewhere would have to be split between district wards.

Q3: Would you prefer:

- 1. Selsey to be treated as one three-member ward on community identity grounds, and accept that residents will consequently be under-represented on Chichester District Council and that another parish will almost certainly have to be split between district wards?**

or

- 2. Selsey and Sidlesham are combined and represented by four councillors. This is our preferred option.**

Q4: If option 2 is followed, how should the area be divided into wards? Options are 4 single member wards; two two-member wards; a three-member ward with a single member ward. Can you suggest appropriate boundaries between wards that respect the three statutory criteria?

The Witterings Ward(s) (3 members) (Electorate: 8,518 ÷ 3 = 2,839) (Variance +3.46%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
ESW1 Earnley	Earnley	395
ESW2 East Wittering	East Wittering & Bracklesham	1,329
ESW3 Bracklesham	East Wittering & Bracklesham	2,480
WEW1 Birdham	Birdham	1,442
WEW2 Itchenor	West Itchenor	418
WEW3 West Wittering[1]	West Wittering	1,154
WEW4 West Wittering[2]	West Wittering	1,300

QUESTION:

There are various options for this area on which we should like opinions.

Option 1 is to leave the whole area as one three-member ward.

Option 2 is to create three single member wards as follows:-

Bracklesham Ward (Electorate: 2,875) (Variance +4.77%), comprising ESW1 Earnley and ESW3 Bracklesham

East Wittering Ward (Electorate: 2,629) (Variance -4.19%) comprising ESW2 East Wittering and WEW4 West Wittering[2]

Birdham Ward (Electorate: 3,014) (Variance +9.84%) comprising WEW1 Birdham, WEW2 Itchenor and WEW3 West Wittering[1]

Option 3 is to create a two-member ward and a single-member ward as follows:

East Wittering & Bracklesham Ward (Electorate: 5,504 ÷ 2 = 2,752) (Variance +0.29%), combining the Bracklesham and East Wittering wards from option 2.

Birdham Ward – as option 2.

Single member wards provide the best accountability.

Options 2 and 3 involve dividing the parish of West Wittering between two different wards (although the parish boundary would not change). Polling District WEW4, although in West Wittering parish, is part of the built-up area of East Wittering and Bracklesham. In options 2 and 3 the boundary between the polling districts of East Wittering and Bracklesham could, if desired, be adjusted in the interests of electoral equality.

The parish of Earnley has been included in this area. Is that where its affiliations lie, or would it be better combined with Sidlesham? This could be accommodated under options 1 and 2 above, but not option 3.

Q5: Do you prefer option 1, 2 or 3 for this area?

Q6: Do the residents of Earnley feel that their affinities lie with this area or with Sidlesham?

Oving Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,341) (Variance -14.69%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
NOM1 North Mundham	North Mundham	1,125
NOM2 Oving	Oving	1,216

QUESTION:

This ward is very small, nearly 15% below the norm. However, it includes, in Oving parish, the Shopwhyke Lakes Strategic Development location. This is estimated to include about 240 new dwellings by 2021 (425 electors included in the projected electorate) and a further 260 in the following five years (probably another 460 electors).

This assumes that the Shopwhyke Lakes development forms part of this ward (our preference) and not part of Chichester East ward – see questions in relation to Chichester City.

Another option is to combine this ward with the Donnington Ward as a two-member ward. This would even out the variances between the two wards, but create a ward that arcs around the southern perimeter of the Chichester By-pass including a number of villages that have little common identity.

Q7: Should this ward be combined with the Donnington Ward to form a two member ward?

NB If Selsey is to be dealt with as a separate entity (see Q3 above), then Sidlesham might have to be added to Donnington Ward in place of Hunston, that would be added to this ward. This would produce a projected electorate for Oving Ward, including Hunston, of 3,172 and a variance of +15.6%.

Donnington Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,952) (Variance +7.58%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
DON1 Appledram	Appledram	132
DON2 Donnington	Donnington	1,899
SID1 Hunston	Hunston	921

QUESTION:

The proposal above appears to work reasonably well in relation to all three statutory criteria (electoral equality, community identity, and effective and convenient local government). However, a number of issues arise in relation to this ward, arising from questions in neighbouring wards.

Should part of Fishbourne parish be added to this ward to reduce the variance on the Bosham Ward? – see Q8 below. If about 100 electors are transferred from the east of Fishbourne parish to the proposed Donnington Ward, this would increase the variance to about 11.2%.

Should this ward be combined with the Oving Ward as a two-member ward? This would even out the variances between the two wards. See Q7 above.

If Selsey is to be dealt with as a single entity, it would probably require that Sidlesham parish would be added to this ward, in place of Hunston, producing a projected electorate of 3,059 and a variance of +11.48%. See Q3 above.

Bosham Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $6,324 \div 2 = 3,162$) (Variance **+15.23%**)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FIS1 Fishbourne	Fishbourne	2,059
BOS1 Bosham	Bosham	1,599
BOS2 Broadbridge	Bosham	893
BOS3 Chidham & Hambrook	Chidham & Hambrook	1,385
SOU6 Southbourne [Chidham]	Chidham & Hambrook	388

QUESTION:

This ward is very large, over 15% above the norm, with the result that its electors would be under-represented on the Council.

There are two alternatives to reduce its size:

1. Transfer SOU6 back to Southbourne Ward. This would reduce the variance to +8.16%, but increase the variance on the Southbourne Ward to +12.55%. It would also mean dividing the parish of Chidham & Hambrook, which would be a pity after this polling district has recently been added to it following a Community Governance review. **We do not favour this option.**
2. Transfer about 100 electors from the east of Fishbourne parish (Appledram Lane South and part of Fishbourne Road West) to Donnington Ward. This would mean dividing the parish of Fishbourne. But it would reduce the variance on the proposed Bosham Ward to about +13.4%.

Q8: Are either of the above options preferred to a ward that is over 15% above the norm?

Southbourne Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $5,789 \div 2 = 2,895$) (Variance **+5.5%**)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
SOU1 Southbourne [1]	Southbourne	394
SOU2 Southbourne [2]	Southbourne	1,756
SOU3 Southbourne [3]	Southbourne	1,514
SOU4 Southbourne [4]	Southbourne	1,640
SOU5 Thorney Island	West Thorney	485

Westbourne Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,820) (Variance +2.77%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
WES1 Westbourne	Westbourne	1,840
FUN1 Compton	Compton	329
FUN3 Marden	Marden	76
FUN4 Stansted	Stoughton	283
FUN5 Stoughton	Stoughton	292

QUESTION:

Under our normal naming policy this ward would be named Westbourne after the largest settlement. But would Ems Valley be a better name?

Q9: Which name is preferred – Ems Valley or Westbourne?

Lavant Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,726) (Variance -0.66%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FUN2 Funtington	Funtington	1,318
LAV1 Lavant	Lavant	1,408

Lavant Valley Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,881) (Variance +4.99%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
BOX1 Boxgrove	Boxgrove	830
BOX2 Eartham	Eartham	78
BOX3 East Dean	East Dean	181
BOX4 Singleton	Singleton	393
BOX5 Upwaltham	Upwaltham	15
BOX6 West Dean	West Dean	339
LAV2 Westhampnett	Westhampnett	1,045

QUESTION:

Under our normal naming policy this ward would be named Westhampnett after the largest settlement.

Q10: Which name is preferred – Lavant Valley or Westhampnett?

Tangmere Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,472) (Variance -9.91%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
TAN1 Tangmere	Tangmere	2,472

NB Although nearly 10% below the average projected electorate, Tangmere is a strategic development location and can be expected to continue to grow after 2021.

North of the Downs Area

Covering existing wards: Bury, Easebourne, Fernhurst, Harting, Midhurst, Petworth, Plaistow, Rogate, Stedham and Wisborough Green

Proposals and Questions

Harting Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 3,054) (Variance: +11.3%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
HAR1 Elsted & Treyford	Elsted & Treyford	220
HAR2 Harting	Harting	1,042
HAR3 Nyewood	Harting	211
HAR4 Trotton	Trotton with Chithurst	285
ROG2 Rake	Rogate	462
ROG3 Rogate	Rogate	834

QUESTION:

This ward is large, over 10% above the norm. There are two alternatives to reduce its size:

1. Transfer Elsted & Treyford to proposed Midhurst Ward
2. Transfer Trotton with Chithurst to proposed Linchmere Ward

Our preference is to accept that these parishes have more affinity with Harting and Rogate than with parishes to the east and north.

Q11: Where do the residents of Elsted & Treyford and Trotton with Chithurst feel that their affinities lie?

Linchmere Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,726) (Variance: -0.66%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FER2 Linchmere	Lynchmere	1,092
FER3 Hammer	Lynchmere	908
ROG1 Milland	Milland	688
ROG4 Linch	Linch	38

QUESTION:

Q12: What is the preferred spelling of the name of this ward?

Fernhurst Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,705) (Variance: -1.42%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FER1 Fernhurst	Fernhurst	2,199
PLA2 Lurgashall	Lurgashall	506

NB This ward includes the potential Syngenta development, which is assumed to occur after 2021.

Midhurst Ward (2 members) (Electorate: 5,564 ÷ 2 = 2,782) (Variance: +1.38%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
MID1 Midhurst	Midhurst	4,086
STE1 Bepton	Bepton	207
STE2 Cocking	Cocking	350
STE4 Iping	Iping	102
STE5 Stedham	Stedham	579
STE6 West Lavington	West Lavington	240

Easebourne Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,904) (Variance: +5.83%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
EAS1 Easebourne	Easebourne	2,015
EAS2 Lodsworth	Lodsworth	540
STE3 Heyshott	Heyshott	223
STE7 Woolbeding with Redford	Woolbeding with Redford	126

QUESTION:

Heyshott could be included either in this Easebourne Ward or in the Midhurst Ward.

Q13: Where do the residents of Heyshott feel that their affinities lie?

Fittleworth Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,780) (Variance: +1.31%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
BUR1 Barlavington	Barlavington	114
BUR2 Bignor	Bignor	89
BUR3 Bury	Bury	582
BUR4 Duncton	Duncton	296
BUR5 East Lavington	East Lavington	154
BUR6 Graffham	Graffham	464
BUR7 Sutton	Sutton	182
PET2 Fittleworth	Fittleworth	817
PET4 Stopham	Stopham	82

NB This ward crosses a parliamentary constituency boundary. East Lavington and Graffham are in Chichester constituency. The rest are in Arundel & South Downs.

Petworth Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,899) (Variance: +5.65%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
PET3 Petworth	Petworth	2,462
PET5 Tillington	Tillington	437

Wisborough Green Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,867) (Variance: +4.48%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
PET1 Ebernoe	Ebernoe	181
PLA3 Northchapel	Northchapel	580
WIS1 Kirdford	Kirdford	849
WIS2 Wisborough Green	Wisborough Green	1,257

NB This ward crosses a parliamentary constituency boundary. Ebernoe and Northchapel are in Chichester constituency. The rest are in Arundel & South Downs.

Plaistow Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,860) (Variance: +4.28%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
PLA1 Loxwood	Loxwood	1,254
PLA4 Plaistow & Ifold	Plaistow & Ifold	1,606

CHICHESTER DISTRICT ELECTORAL REVIEW 2016
RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

Respondent	Representation	Comment
General		
Chief Insp Justin Burtenshaw District Commander Sussex Police 18/02/16	<p>Whilst I am happy to complete the questions you set out if you feel it necessary, I do not believe that some of the questions are relevant to the Policing of Chichester. I am a strong supporter of fewer councillors taking responsibility of a wider area. This will ensure that they can bring areas together to work for a common purpose rather than seeing issues in isolation. Often a problem or issue affects more than one Parish. However each currently deal with them very differently.</p> <p>As we embed the new model of Policing, I will not be allocating officers including PCSOs specific areas to cover. My teams from across Chichester and Arun will deploy based on Threat Harm and Risk. This will ensure the right resources equipped with the right skills go to areas in order to problem solve and tackle crime.</p> <p>Boundaries will have little if no impact on how we police Chichester going forward, but having fewer will undoubtedly galvanise communities.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any more information.</p>	If individual ward boundaries have little or no impact on policing, reasoned support for fewer councillors taking responsibility for a wider area is helpful.
Robin Parr Governance and Support Services Manager	I have reviewed the draft proposals on behalf of the National Park Authority and have no comments to make upon these.	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
South Downs National Park Authority 29/02/16		
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	We note with concern the proliferation of wards spanning county division boundaries. A greater number of district wards than we are comfortable with will have their territory divided between two county councillors. We recognise that this is in part inevitable given the 25% reduction in the number of district councillors; however we strongly feel that a simultaneous, whole-county review would have produced a more sympathetic result, to the benefit of all our residents. This is particularly the case given that the County Council is currently in the later stages of its own review and Horsham and Crawley are also scheduled for review in the near future. We are aware that a pilot whole-county review of both districts wards and county divisions is currently underway in East Sussex and, pending successful completion, we hope that this will be adopted as standard practice in future.	Whilst co-terminosity with county electoral division boundaries may be desirable, this is not one of the three statutory criteria that the LGBCE takes account of. The Council has not, therefore, taken this into account in preparing its own proposals, except in the City of Chichester, where divergence between county electoral division and district ward boundaries impacts on city council ward boundaries. The option of a simultaneous whole-county review is a matter for the LGBCE.
Cllr Simon Oakley Ward Councillor, Tangmere 11/03/16 Response to Selsey Revision	By reducing the Council to 35 Members this revised proposal results in 5 of the 9 City Cllrs having average electorates below the -10% threshold and the City being significantly over represented. Logically this would progress to a view that the City should only have 8 Members (probably in 4 two Member Wards) and an overall Council size of 34. Is a departure of two from the Commissions minded size of 36 appropriate? If we did go with this revised, 35 Member scheme the following issues arise: There would be 5 City and 2 Bosham Cllrs with electorates outside of the +/-10% range and the three	These comments have been persuasive in the Panel's decision to recommend the Council to adopt a 36 member scheme.

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>Selsey Members within 6 voters (0.02%) of the upper threshold (note it appears the +12.91% variance in the revision doc. appears to be based on the 36 Member average). With 10 Members at or marginally near the +/- 10% threshold this would be very near the Commissions automatic 30% trigger for considering a further review. Would we want to start off so near to the limit?</p> <p>...Overall it is worth remembering that we are considering the electoral system for electing District Cllrs to run a District Council, not just Parish/Town/City Reps. It is on that basis that I believe we should be emphasising electoral equality and future proofing that equality as much as possible.</p>	<p>Correct. For a 35 member council the variance at Selsey would be +9.78%.</p>
<p>James Fanshawe CBE Chairman Chichester Conservative Association 13/03/16 Response to Selsey Revision</p>	<p>Thank you for the various documents about the CDC Electoral Review 2016, including the revised version of your Consultation document which takes into account recent discussions about Selsey, Sidlesham et al. This was discussed on Friday with the CCA Executive Council and I offer some thoughts. There seem to be three areas of particular debate – Selsey & Sidlesham, the North East and the Midhurst District. See below for comments on these three areas of debate.</p>	
<p>Jonathan Brown Southbourne Parish Councillor 14/03/16</p>	<p>I am writing this feedback in my capacity as a Parish Councillor and as a former candidate for election to the District Council. However, I am also attempting to put myself in the shoes of other young-ish potential candidates for election to Parish or District Council now or in the future. For that reason I will restrict my comments to the local area specifically rather than to the district as a whole – in addition to making a number of points regarding the principle upon which this consultation is based. In my time as a Parish Councillor I have heard concerns</p>	<p>These comments, while interesting, do not really address the scope of this consultation which is about how to devise a pattern of wards for a council of close to 36 members that meets the Commission's three criteria.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>expressed by members of the public, by other Councillors representing Councils from across the district and by employees of CDC. These concerns revolve around the difficulty in finding sufficient people interested in becoming candidates, and especially candidates who represent the diversity of our communities (including gender, age, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity and so on). I have heard the view expressed by senior employees of CDC that because the political parties find it difficult to recruit sufficient candidates to contest all of the available places, the solution is to reduce the size of the council.</p> <p>In my view this is taking completely the wrong approach, and the proposals cover up deep-seated problems rather than fix them. When people are asked why they do not vote and/or stand for election, they usually reply that there is no point: their vote won't count; that no one represents them; that they don't identify with any of the candidates or parties. The obvious solution is to reform our electoral system so that everyone's vote actually does matter, parties are incentivised to serve all voters rather than only those they need to win and we don't have near or total one-party states at local level all over the country. I appreciate that it is not in the power of CDC to change our electoral system but that does not mean we should pursue alternative measures if there is a strong chance of them making things worse.</p> <p>I say this for a number of reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Equalising ward sizes, while not a bad idea in principle, is not very relevant. If the intention is to make votes count equally, electoral reform is needed. If the intention is just to tidy up local government, that is a laudable aim, but not one 	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>which should take priority over ensuring that communities are represented by people who actually represent them.</p> <p>2) While I have heard it argued that thanks to citizens accessing services online there is less work for councillors to do, I suggest that this is a matter for the electorate to judge. There are still a lot of people who need assistance, a lot of community work to be done and a growing population, a growing proportion of whom are going to be hit by cuts and other changes brought about by central government. Even as a Parish Councillor I am only too aware that there is no shortage of work to be done.</p> <p>3) When I chose to put myself forward to join the Parish Council, I did so because I wanted to and felt that I could represent my community – the village I had grown up in. When I stood for election to represent Southbourne at District Council level, I did so because I felt that I had something to offer Southbourne. If I had grown up in Nutbourne, I might have done the same. But it is unlikely I would have felt comfortable putting myself forward as a representative of Fishbourne and Bosham too: completely separate villages the proposals push into the same ward in the name of equalising ward size. <i>Shrinking the number of District Councillors, enlarging the wards and equalising their sizes means subjecting real community identities to the</i></p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p><i>arbitrary needs of a bureaucracy and will create wards that other potential young councillors are unlikely to identify with.</i></p> <p>4) As a Parish Councillor I am pleased to serve residents in a non-party-political fashion. I am a member of a political party however, and so was happy to stand for election under my party's banner when I stood for election to the District Council. <i>But no one should feel that they have to belong to a party to stand for election and have any chance of winning.</i> And to use the example given above, it is highly unlikely that anyone without a party 'machine' behind them would be able to seriously contest a ward that included three separate villages. The larger the wards, the harder you make it for independents and smaller parties to contest elections: democracy suffers and voter choice suffers. As larger, established parties (the Conservatives in the context of Chichester, but the principle applies to other parties elsewhere) become more firmly entrenched, anyone who does not identify as a supporter or member of that party is less likely to even stand for election, never mind actually get elected.</p> <p>5) It looks very much to me as though this review and the wish to reduce the number of councillors is being driven by a national government agenda to equalise District Council level ward boundaries in the same way that parliamentary constituency</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>boundaries are being redrawn in the name of population equalisation. While I do not accuse the governing party in Chichester, nor employees of CDC, of seeking to gerrymander electoral boundaries, it looks very much to me as though the Conservative government in Westminster is attempting to push through a range of measures that will unfairly benefit themselves at the expense of opposition parties. I have no problem with CDC considering the merits of the idea of reducing the number of councillors, but if there is even the chance that doing so could be seen as an attempt to benefit a single political party by making it harder for opposition parties – and independents – to compete, then the idea should be abandoned.</p> <p>6) Larger wards, especially those which cover multiple settlements, make it harder for non-drivers to stand for election and to serve their residents if elected. Larger wards, especially those which cover multiple settlements, make it harder for those who work full time, to do their work as a councillor.</p> <p>In summary, I think these proposals will on balance put off people from standing for election, will make it less likely that candidates from a diverse range of backgrounds will have a chance of being elected, will increase the unfairness inherent in our electoral system and will increase disconnect between communities and their elected representatives.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
<p>Anthony Tuffin Chairman Make Votes Count In West Sussex 14/03/16</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is an all-party/non-party group and we are writing to express our views on the proposed revisions of ward boundaries. 2. Rather than comment on the details of individual wards and the knock-on effect on other wards, we would prefer to comment on the bigger picture; i.e. the basic principles. 3. We recognise that fewer Councillors could reduce the cost of elections and the subsequent expense of paying Councillors but, if that was the only consideration, democracy would be abolished and there would be no elections. So there has to be compromise between democracy and economy. 4. We urge present Councillors to be wary of any changes that will reduce democratic accountability. We particularly urge members of the majority group on Chichester DC to avoid taking any action that will be perceived as entrenching their dominant position. 5. Democratic accountability requires a viable opposition group. 6. Fewer Councillors representing larger wards would favour larger parties and discriminate against smaller ones and independents. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1. This is partly because larger parties have more resources than small ones and small ones usually have more resources than independents. 	<p>These comments, while interesting, do not really address the scope of this consultation which is about how to devise a pattern of wards for a council of close to 36 members that meets the Commission's three criteria.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>6.2. It is also because, when a small local stronghold of Party B is attached to a larger area that is dominated by Party A to create a new ward, Party A is likely to win the enlarged ward.</p> <p>7. Elections by Single Transferable Vote (STV) in multi-member wards would be the best long-term solution. By ensuring minority representation, it would mitigate the problem, but that would need primary legislation so it is, unfortunately, outside the scope of this review.</p> <p>8. So long as the present voting system is used, we believe the Council should be very wary of reducing the number of Councillors and increasing ward sizes and should be especially wary of reducing opposition representation by attaching areas of opposition strongholds to wards controlled by the majority group.</p>	
<p>Adrian Moss Secretary Chichester Liberal Democrats 14/03/16</p> <p>NB Mr Moss has also written a letter in a personal capacity. It has much the same introductory paragraphs as his representation on behalf of Chichester Liberal Democrats, but also includes comments on individual proposed wards.</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of Chichester Liberal Democrats with regard to the proposed new District Council boundaries.</p> <p>This document is written in haste as we had anticipated a formal consultation and briefing on your proposals and it is subject to revision should we identify other alternatives.</p> <p>We understand the reasons behind the proposed reduction of Councillor numbers but would urge the Council to consider how a specific number of councillors can really provide effective community representation when covering what could be disparate communities</p>	<p>These comments, while interesting, do not really address the scope of this consultation which is about how to devise a pattern of wards for a council of close to 36 members that meets the Commission's three criteria.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
<p>These comments are to be found throughout this document.</p>	<p>especially in our more rural areas of the District.</p> <p>The current totals have enabled District Councillors to typically represent single communities or multiple communities that have close connections. With reduced Councillor numbers Councillors will be representing much larger communities and will lose those community connections.</p> <p>Our first principle when considering new boundaries is to ensure that a Councillor is really representing a single community wherever possible. We believe this is the way both, to make Councillors' work more practicable and more effective, and to encourage new candidates (including Independents) to stand for election.</p> <p>Accordingly we would respectfully ask the Council to consider these questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How was the proposed new total of Councillors arrived at? The drop from 48 to 36 is large, and not explained. Why not 37, or 39, or 42? 2. Our necessarily brief study of the proposed wards gives us concerns that disparate communities are being artificially put together in several places, e.g. Selsey/Sidlesham, Fishbourne/Bosham, Lavant/Funtington, to name no others. Can these links be reviewed please? 3. Accepting the difficulty of making adjustments in only one or two places, owing to the knock-on effects, can the Council give us a) more time to offer a properly considered alternative solution, and (b) access to the 	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>spreadsheet used internally to formulate your proposals?</p> <p>In summary we request the Council relook at the proposed changes with a more focused look at balancing communities and the ability for them to be represented.</p>	
Chichester City		
Rodney Duggua RD BA (Hons) Town Clerk Chichester City Council 10/03/16	The City Council support the arrangements for the City wards i.e. five wards represented by nine CDC members and that City Parish/District ward boundaries be coterminous.	
Cllr Clare Apel Ward Councillor, Chichester West 14/03/16	As a Lib Dem I was not happy about the reduction in Councillors to 36 as a real minority there was not a great deal I could do. However I would not be happy to see a further reduction to 35 thus meaning the City Council total being 8. I am just o.k. with 9 but not 8.	
Cllr Richard Plowman Ward Councillor, Chichester West 14/03/16	I concur with Clare's remarks. To go down to 8 would not future proof us for the new strategic site housing developments in Chichester.	
Adrian Moss 14/03/16	Chichester City I support the proposed recommendations.	
Sarah Sharp City Councillor Chichester City Council 14/03/16	<p>I am writing as a City Councillor representing a minority party.</p> <p>I am concerned that the changes being proposed to ward boundaries and the numbers of councillors in the district will have a negative effect on the workings of democracy.</p> <p>At the moment we have a huge majority of one party in the District. I have not done the calculations but my feeling is that actually the numbers of people who did not</p>	These comments, while interesting, do not really address the scope of this consultation which is about how to devise a pattern of wards for a council of close to 36 members that meets the Commission's three criteria.

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>vote Conservative are not fully represented at the moment. There are no councillors at CDC level who can put forward important views on the other side of the political spectrum and represent Green or Labour concerns.</p> <p>If the system is changed to reduce the number of councillors this will make it even harder for an effective opposition to be elected. From a position of great majority, these changes will only make it easier for the single party to retain more seats. Having single member seats obviously makes it very difficult for any opposition party to get elected. Reducing the Members from 3 to 2 in some wards also makes the ruling party stronger.</p> <p>If these changes have been designed with the aim to reduce the cost of elections then we could perhaps push the theory to its limits and perhaps we should abolish many more seats. When are we going to stop? We might as well get rid of all councillors as they cost money. This obviously isn't democratic –but where does one draw the line?</p> <p>My personal fear is that these changes can be seen as further reinforcing the strength of the dominant party at Chichester District Council.</p> <p>My other great concern is that the end result of these changes is that there will be even less chance of there being a properly functioning opposition group at CDC level. It is clear that if we increase the size of wards and limit the numbers of councillors we could end up favouring larger parties and smaller parties will find it nearly impossible to ever be elected. There will be no</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>opposition and people will end up not bothering to vote as there will be no chance of any other party getting in – which is almost the case at the moment. There is however a great need for there to be an effective opposition to any dominant party.</p> <p>The whole problem would not arise of course if there were to be some sort of proportional representation. As this is not on the cards, it is likely that anybody who votes Green or Labour will have a very small chance of being elected. There is also almost very little chance of the Lib Dems having a voice at this level of council.in many wards up and down the District.</p> <p>Obviously this review will be reviewed and decided upon by people who are in the majority and so I very much doubt that alternative votes or ideas will be listened to. I do not have much faith in the transparency of local or national government or the way in which decisions are reached. This seems to be a cost-cutting exercise which will not help our local democracy to function better - as a proper functioning democracy needs a strong opposition - and these changes will not give wider representation to the many people who aren't represented at the moment.</p> <p>The ward boundary changes being different at City/District/County level will lead to confusion among the electors and will lead to local government being seen as unclear and confusing and this could lead to all local government being seen as overly bureaucratic. The reputations of the councils will suffer as a result in the eyes of the electors. Councils are often criticised now – these changes will not improve the reputation of the councils.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Q1 Shopwyke Lakes		
Cllr Pam Dignum Ward Councillor, Chichester South 19/02/16	Shopwhyke in Oving? Yes	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	We agree that Shopwhyke Lakes should be included in Oving ward.	
Cllr Simon Oakley Ward Councillor, Tangmere 11/03/16 Response to Selsey Revision	<p>The proposal to incorporate Shopwyke into the single Member Tangmere Ward runs into the probability that that Ward would exceed the (single Ward) +30% threshold for a District wide review on its own by the early 2020's due to the build out of the balance of the Shopwyke Lakes Development and start of the Tangmere SDL. Though the contents of the Local Plan and the 5 year housing land supply review are not considered to be evidence by Officers, should we disregard it? Note the currently proposed 2 Member City West Ward could absorb about 800 houses on the W of Chichester SDL before exceeding the +10% threshold and the currently proposed N Mundham/Oving Ward can absorb all of Shopwyke Lakes and more before reaching the same.</p> <p>It seems inconsistent to want to have an overall preference not to split Parishes, but to then advocate doing just that to Oving Parish. Remember there are existing residents in Shopwyke.</p>	
Louise Beaton, Clerk,	The new proposals concerning Shopwyke, North Mundham and Tangmere were discussed at the Oving Parish Council meeting on 17 th March 2016. It was	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Oving Parish Council 21/03/16	<p>agreed to support Chichester District Council's original proposal, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council considered that the two strategic development locations would create a very large ward for Tangmere and Shopwyke and create the risk of triggering further review within a few years, which would be undesirable. 2. The Council supported the view of CDC that Shopwyke is not a good blend with Chichester. 3. Historically Shopwyke has been part of Oving parish. For reasons of community identity Shopwyke residents are therefore most likely to identify with Oving. For reasons of convenient and effective local government it would assist ward councillors and District and Parish Council administration if they remain as one ward. To put it another way, placing Shopwyke within a different ward would split the parish into two wards ie among different councillors, adding to administration, and potentially undermine community identity. 	
Q2 City separate		
Cllr Pam Dignum Ward Councillor, Chichester South 19.02.16	Chi city separate unit? Yes I am happy with the decision for 9 CDC councillors with a new central ward.	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	We agree that Chichester City should be dealt with as a separate unit and that district ward boundaries should not cross the city boundary.	
South of Chichester District		
Q3 and Q4: Selsey and		

Respondent	Representation	Comment																																										
<p>Sidlesham</p> <p>Cllr Carol Purnell Ward Councillor, Selsey North 21/02/16</p>	<p>I believe that a strong case can be made to keep Selsey as a single ward, despite being just over the 10% variance. I don't feel Sidlesham would get decent representation if they were combined with Selsey as the electorate tend to vote for candidates in the locale only. Additionally, politically the associations would need to combine in order to select their candidates and I am not sure that Sidlesham would want to combine with Selsey on that front.</p> <p>I have attached a spreadsheet which shows how it could work in the South of the Manhood whilst keeping the number of members as proposed and without having a knock on effect on the other areas.</p> <p>These are my personal views and I have not talked to the other members either in Selsey or Sidlesham so have copied those members in for their comment.</p>	<p>Carol's alternative:- Selsey (1 ward 3 members) (Electorate: 9,295 ÷ 3 = 3,098) (Variance: +12.91%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 349 1989 480"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SEN1 Selsey North [1]</td> <td>Selsey</td> <td>2,620</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEN2 Selsey North [2]</td> <td>Selsey</td> <td>3,064</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES1 Selsey South</td> <td>Selsey</td> <td>3,611</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Birdham Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,470) (Variance -9.99%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 552 1989 655"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SID2 Sidlesham</td> <td>Sidlesham</td> <td>1,028</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WEW1 Birdham</td> <td>Birdham</td> <td>1,442</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Witterings Ward(s) (3 members) (Electorate: 7,076 ÷ 3 = 2,359) (Variance -14.03%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 754 1989 1137"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESW1 Earnley</td> <td>Earnley</td> <td>395</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESW2 East Wittering</td> <td>East Wittering & Bracklesham</td> <td>1,329</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESW3 Bracklesham</td> <td>East Wittering & Bracklesham</td> <td>2,480</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WEW2 Itchenor</td> <td>West Itchenor</td> <td>418</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WEW3 West Wittering[1]</td> <td>West Wittering</td> <td>1,154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WEW4 West Wittering[2]</td> <td>West Wittering</td> <td>1,300</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	SEN1 Selsey North [1]	Selsey	2,620	SEN2 Selsey North [2]	Selsey	3,064	SES1 Selsey South	Selsey	3,611	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	SID2 Sidlesham	Sidlesham	1,028	WEW1 Birdham	Birdham	1,442	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	ESW1 Earnley	Earnley	395	ESW2 East Wittering	East Wittering & Bracklesham	1,329	ESW3 Bracklesham	East Wittering & Bracklesham	2,480	WEW2 Itchenor	West Itchenor	418	WEW3 West Wittering[1]	West Wittering	1,154	WEW4 West Wittering[2]	West Wittering	1,300
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																																										
SEN1 Selsey North [1]	Selsey	2,620																																										
SEN2 Selsey North [2]	Selsey	3,064																																										
SES1 Selsey South	Selsey	3,611																																										
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																																										
SID2 Sidlesham	Sidlesham	1,028																																										
WEW1 Birdham	Birdham	1,442																																										
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																																										
ESW1 Earnley	Earnley	395																																										
ESW2 East Wittering	East Wittering & Bracklesham	1,329																																										
ESW3 Bracklesham	East Wittering & Bracklesham	2,480																																										
WEW2 Itchenor	West Itchenor	418																																										
WEW3 West Wittering[1]	West Wittering	1,154																																										
WEW4 West Wittering[2]	West Wittering	1,300																																										
<p>Cllr John Connor Ward Councillor, Selsey North 22/02/16</p>	<p>It's not often that I disagree with Carol- and this isn't one of those times, either! I agree with her wholeheartedly; by combining Sidlesham with the northern part of Selsey, residents of Sidlesham would in effect be disenfranchised. We would have two x 2-member wards, each with just over 5000 electors, which would leave Sidlesham residents outnumbered in their ward by four to</p>																																											

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>one and separated from the main body of the electorate by an average of four miles.</p> <p>I think it would be very difficult to get a candidate from Sidlesham elected to represent such a large part of Selsey; and even if political party associations were able to agree to join forces to choose candidates, I suggest that it's very likely that candidates from the most heavily populated area (i.e. northern Selsey) would prevail. As for the likelihood of local political associations agreeing to merge for the purpose; when I was Chairman of Selsey Branch of Chichester Conservative Association, we made tentative suggestions to Sidlesham Conservatives about such a merger, only to be very firmly rebuffed! Whilst I cannot speak for other political parties, I think the outcome would be much the same.</p> <p>The fact is that the "other" wards and Selsey have one thing in common when it comes to what we each need- and that's the fact that we all live on the Manhood Peninsula. The reaction by the northern and eastern wards on the peninsula to three recent planning applications are typical of this. The recent "Landlink/Asda/Park Farm" was welcomed in SEN1, SEN2, and SES1 by a large (though not the most vociferous!) majority of Selsey electors; the other wards outside Selsey (via their Parish Councils) were almost totally opposed to the development. The same thing happened about 5 years ago with the application for 80 acres of greenhouses at Earnley; Selsey electors were largely indifferent to the proposal, or supported it because of the perceived employment prospects; few were opposed. The whole of the northern and eastern peninsula (including Sidlesham) was up in arms at the</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>prospect.</p> <p>Finally, we have the Manhood Managed Realignment proposal for coast defences between Earnley and Selsey; whilst the whole peninsula was initially opposed to the scheme (remember the “Save Our Selsey” campaign, known locally as “SOS”?), once the proposal was explained more fully, Selsey by and large welcomed it- and 4 years later the two Selsey Independent (SOS) CDC Cllrs were re-elected as Conservative Cllrs! Unfortunately, large numbers of electors in the N & E wards were not so readily convinced that the scheme would work, and many continue to oppose it to this day, because of concerns about the long-term outcome of the scheme.</p>	
<p>Cllr Elizabeth Hamilton Ward Councillor, West Wittering 23/02/16</p>	<p>I feel Towns like Selsey are ideals for multiple councillor wards, while in more rural areas multiple members can give too wide a geographical area so that a members local knowledge lost in a wider area. The idea of Sidlesham with Birdham as a single member ward seems to work. the band across the middle of the Manhood.</p> <p>I do totally agree with John that Sidlesham would be badly served if part of a greater Selsey. It was a bit how Lodsworth felt 500 residents in with Easebourne 1500 electors. !!</p>	
<p>Cllr John W Elliott Ward Councillor, Selsey South 23/02/16</p>	<p>I have had a number of conversations with Carol Purnell and John Connor regarding the implications of a part of Selsey North Ward combining with Sidlesham.</p> <p>I endorse the comments they have made and believe such a solution would be detrimental to the residents in view of the diversity of the locations. In view of this, it</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>would be very difficult for the elected member to properly represent residents' interests.</p>	
<p>Cllr Roger Barrow Ward Councillor, Selsey South 23/02/16</p>	<p>I have noted the points put forward by Councillors Connor and Purnell regarding their view of the disadvantages of linking Selsey with Sidlesham . They are both experienced Councillors and will have had more experience than me with the possible issues, especially regarding the merger of Selsey and Sidlesham Conservatives.</p> <p>However, after much thought I am coming to a different view. Yes, Selsey is very much a self-contained community, but in my view, that is to Selsey's detriment and the cause of some of the tensions Cllr Connor refers to. As chairman of the Selsey Business Partnership, I am aware we have some Sidlesham businesses among our membership, who see themselves very much part of Selsey's Business Community, rather than Earnley or the Witterings. A number of Sidlesham residents that I know would also feel themselves to be closer to Selsey. That may not be the case in everyone's mind however and Carol may well be right, that the electorate prefer vote for candidates in the locale only, I don't know.</p> <p>I would also add that in my limited experience as a Councillor, our 2-member ward of Selsey South works very well, with each councillor being able to support each other and share issues in the ward, and in my view is preferable to a 3 or 4 member ward.</p> <p>My recommendation therefore is that the panels preferred option 2 be accepted, and that Selsey and Sidlesham are combined and represented by four councillors. To be divided into 2 x 2 member wards, with</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
<p>Cllr Tricia Tull Ward Councillor, Sidlesham 29/02/16</p>	<p>boundaries adjusted to equalise the populations.</p> <p>I can confirm from the Parish clerk that Sidlesham is unhappy about combining with Selsey for the same reasons I.e. That Sidlesham will be swallowed up by a larger town. I was happy with our original proposals to put Sidlesham with Birdham as we discussed at our workshop but this seems to be being avoided in these conversations. I know this is a more difficult mix but I am also sure that Elizabeth Hamilton agrees that it is a better fit for the residents. Sidlesham has more community connection with Birdham than with Selsey and I also appreciate that Selsey sits as a separate identity, that is as a town in its own right.</p>	
<p>Cllrs John Connor, Carol Purnell, & Darren Wakeham (Selsey North), and Cllr John W. Elliott (Selsey South) 06/03/16</p>	<p>Statement by Cllrs J. Connor, C. Purnell, & D. Wakeham (Selsey North), and Cllr J. W. Elliott (Selsey South) re Electoral Review of Chichester District.</p> <p>The past sixty-five years has seen huge advances in communications technology, particularly in the last fifteen years. As a result, the work of an elected Ward Cllr has become much less demanding, both in terms of communication and the need to travel to meetings away from the Ward. Whilst the actual work load may not have lessened (and may even have increased), and there is still a need to be seen and heard out among the community, these advances mean that fewer Cllrs can do the same amount of work without compromising their duty to the electorate. We welcome this opportunity to reduce the number of CDC Cllrs, and believe that three elected Ward Members is the most appropriate number for Selsey.</p> <p>We note the comments by our Selsey South Ward colleague Cllr Roger Barrow regarding a proposal to</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>merge the two existing Selsey Wards with Sidlesham Ward to form two new, larger, Wards. Our concern is that no matter which way these Wards are configured in terms of elector numbers, electors in the rural Sidlesham Ward would be subsumed into the larger, entirely urban, Selsey wards.</p> <p>Cllr Barrow agrees with our view that Selsey is a self contained entity; he also agrees with us that this is the cause of tensions between Selsey & Sidlesham- but that, in our view, is because the needs and desires of Selsey and Sidlesham as communities are rarely the same. Joining the two communities would not, in our view, improve matters, because the cause of the friction- both communities wanting different outcomes for much of the time- would still be there. We base our view on regular and frequent engagement with Parish Councils, community forums and similar neighbourhood groups, individual electors, and long-time knowledge of the area- not only of Sidlesham, but of other rural Wards throughout the Manhood Peninsula.</p> <p>Issues that individual electors raise about CDC services are much the same throughout the District; the needs of an individual or family unit will rarely affect matters in another Ward or the wider community. However, a great deal of our work as Ward Cllrs in Selsey involves matters of more general concern; either for our Wards, or for the larger Selsey community. What suits urban Selsey North is almost always what suits urban Selsey South, and <i>vice versa</i>; but it is frequently the case that what suits urban Selsey will create a problem for rural Sidlesham; and this can often have an adverse knock-on effect for other rural wards on the Manhood Peninsula.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>With a projected (for 2021) electorate of over 9,000, Selsey outnumbers Sidlesham by 9-1. With such diverse needs, and with the two communities separated by 4 miles of open, largely un-populated (less than 100 electors), countryside, Pagham Harbour, Medmerry tidal inlet, and two nature reserves, the communities have no natural affinity. It is difficult to see how the Sidlesham community could be adequately represented by elected Members who would be duty bound to promote the majority (i.e. Selsey) opinion. In our opinion, Sidlesham would be best served electorally by joining a neighbouring rural ward, which is more likely to be similar in both outlook and aspiration.</p> <p>We agree with Cllr Barrow's view that the two Member Selsey (South) Ward "works very well", and in fact the three Member North Ward works equally well; but there is no reason why they shouldn't work well together, or as one. It is the very "tightness" of this relatively isolated small town- bounded on three sides by the sea, only connected to Sidlesham and the wider District by a causeway at the northern extremity of the ward, and at the end of what is allegedly the longest <i>cul-de-sac</i> (and the only road in or out of the town) in the south of England - that gives Selsey its sense of "oneness". Geographically and historically Selsey is an island, as the name attests (Selsey - Seal's Lea or Ley - Seal Island); isolated, independent and self-sustaining (as much as it's allowed to be!); at times the bane of bureaucracy, and the curse of the body corporate. We note Cllr Barrow's comment about the difficulty of merging local political Associations; but that, in our view, is a matter for the various Political Parties or independent</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>candidates to deal with, and can have no bearing on Ward boundaries or Cllr numbers. We also note his comment about a small number of Sidlesham based businesses having chosen to become members of the Selsey Business Partnership. We agree that the views of business on local matters must always be considered and represented when those matters could affect them; but again in our opinion, membership of a business organisation is more likely to be a matter of commercial advantage than allegiance to a locality.</p> <p>We are aware that a single, 3 Member “Selsey” Ward would leave Selsey electors numerically under-represented. It is our belief, however, that because Selsey is such a close-knit community it can be adequately represented and best served by 3 Members. It can even, at a pinch, be represented by two members without ill-effect, as was recently demonstrated. For the last two years of the previous Council (and for good, valid reasons), three of Selsey’s five CDC Members were unable to carry out much more than the bare minimum of their Council duties; the other two CDC Cllrs (both CDC Cabinet Members at that time) acted as their <i>locums</i> in the community, whilst at the same time carrying out their own Ward and Cabinet duties. Obviously this was not an ideal situation, but we do not believe that the electors of Selsey suffered in any respect as a consequence. In our considered opinion, three active and committed elected CDC Members (who truly represent the electorate) can provide an appropriate service in our community.</p> <p>It has been suggested that a three Member Selsey “Ward plus a one Member “Selsey and Sidlesham “Ward could provide an alternative scenario. Whilst it would</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>allow the “correct” number of electors per Member, it would still create a Ward largely dominated by Selsey electors; and no matter which part of northern Selsey was selected to join Sidlesham, it would create an artificial division between neighbours on either side of the back-garden fence.</p> <p>The argument for two x 2-Member Selsey Wards (to include Sidlesham) is based on a projected electorate of 10,323, or 2,581 per elected Member- a 6% variance. Without Sidlesham, Selsey would require another 7-800 electors to qualify for 2 x 2-member Wards in its own right. It is almost certain that the population (and thus the electorate) will increase by that amount within the next 10 years- possibly sooner. Local landowners have already earmarked land both inside and adjacent to Selsey Town’s northwest SPA boundary for development; and whilst there are currently environmental restrictions on building in these areas, it is likely that these will be lifted in the next 2-3 years. Given that housing numbers in the Local Plan are minimum, not maximum numbers, it is almost certain that pressure to build another 300 new homes on this land will follow the completion of current builds, i.e within the next three to four years; and we have little doubt that this will happen. By 2025 (and almost certainly sooner), Selsey is likely to have an electorate in excess of 10,000. Perhaps the case for 2 x 2-Member exclusively Selsey wards could and should be made sooner rather than later!</p> <p>Cllr John Connor (Selsey North Ward) Cllr John W. Elliott (Selsey South Ward) Cllr Carol Purnell (Selsey North Ward) Cllr Darren Wakeham (Selsey North Ward)</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment																								
<p>Tessa MacIntyre Clerk to Sidlesham Parish Council 8/03/16</p>	<p>The Parish Council of Sidlesham is adamant that a tie up with Selsey is absolutely not in the interests of Sidlesham.</p> <p>The cultures of the two communities are totally different. Selsey is urban, maritime, coastal, a tourist seaside resort, a dormitory town (overspill) for Chichester, a housing development area, very much a small town with its own preoccupations as befits a town of its size. Sidlesham is rural, horticultural, a self-sustaining village without development. The only thing that joins us is the road, which is considered to be a curse.</p> <p>Although the numbers are convenient in the proposed arrangement, a fourth Selsey representative for Sidlesham belonging to the Selsey ward would be unable to retain sufficient independence to represent a ward whose features are so different from those of Selsey. It is the way of human nature for a grouping to stick together and not represent a minority and totally different paradigm. With the best will in the world, Sidlesham would not get effective representation, and this fatally undermines the value of your exercise. With all due respect, the numbers might be right but the democratic essentials are not.</p> <p>The communality of interest and therefore representation lies in the smaller communities of the Manhood Peninsula. The council believes that you have attended a Peninsula Forum meeting where the communality of interests, or better call them problems, was evident: roads, sewage, drainage to name the principal concerns. These issues clearly unite the rural communities of the Manhood. The groupings should be organised to bring</p>	<p>Following receipt of this and preceding comments, a members' workshop was held in Selsey on 9 March 2016 to see whether an alternative acceptable solution can be found to meet the LGBCE criteria of electoral equality, community identity, and effective and convenient local government. The workshop proposed a solution for a 35 member council (NB not 36), which may achieve this. To include Sidlesham with another cluster of parishes clearly has knock on effects on other proposed wards. These effects result in the following changes from those in the consultation document:-</p> <p>Selsey becomes one three member ward.</p> <p>Selsey Ward (3 members) (Electorate: 9,295 + 3 = 3,098) (Variance: +9.78%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 863 2027 994"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SEN1 Selsey North [1]</td> <td>Selsey</td> <td>2,620</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEN2 Selsey North [2]</td> <td>Selsey</td> <td>3,064</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SES1 Selsey South</td> <td>Selsey</td> <td>3,611</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Proposed Oving/North Mundham Ward – add Hunston and transfer Shopwyke (part of Oving parish) to Tangmere Ward</p> <p>North Mundham Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,726) (Variance -3.40%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 1238 2027 1369"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NOM1 North Mundham</td> <td>North Mundham</td> <td>1,125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NOM2 Oving (part)</td> <td>Oving (part)</td> <td>..680</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SID1 Hunston</td> <td>Hunston</td> <td>921</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	SEN1 Selsey North [1]	Selsey	2,620	SEN2 Selsey North [2]	Selsey	3,064	SES1 Selsey South	Selsey	3,611	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	NOM1 North Mundham	North Mundham	1,125	NOM2 Oving (part)	Oving (part)	..680	SID1 Hunston	Hunston	921
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																								
SEN1 Selsey North [1]	Selsey	2,620																								
SEN2 Selsey North [2]	Selsey	3,064																								
SES1 Selsey South	Selsey	3,611																								
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																								
NOM1 North Mundham	North Mundham	1,125																								
NOM2 Oving (part)	Oving (part)	..680																								
SID1 Hunston	Hunston	921																								

Respondent	Representation	Comment																					
	<p>these interests together so that we have strong representation before the District Council.</p> <p>We can suggest two possible groupings:</p> <p>A. Birdham Earnley Sidlesham – (Almodington shares LSA heritage with Sidlesham) to become a single member ward</p> <p>Or</p> <p>B. Sidlesham Donnington, Apuldram, North Mundham, Hunston, Oving - a double member ward, all rural communities to the south of Chichester.</p> <p>At least one of these permutations works within the numbers game and would give us the binding interest groups that leads to better representative local government.</p>	<p>Proposed Donnington Ward – add Sidlesham and transfer Hunston to Oving/North Mundham Ward</p> <p>Donnington Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 3,059) (Variance +8.40%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 480 2045 612"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DON1 Appledram</td> <td>Appledram</td> <td>132</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DON2 Donnington</td> <td>Donnington</td> <td>1,899</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SID2 Sidlesham</td> <td>Sidlesham</td> <td>1,028</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Proposed Tangmere Ward – add Shopwyke (incl Shopwyke Lakes development)</p> <p>Tangmere Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 3,008) (Variance +6.59%)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1447 831 2029 935"> <thead> <tr> <th>Polling District</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Projected Electorate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TAN1 Tangmere</td> <td>Tangmere</td> <td>2,472</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NOM2 Oving (part)</td> <td>Oving (part)</td> <td>..536</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In addition to the above changes, the impact of a 35 member council is to raise the average number of electors per councillor from 2,744 to 2,822. This, therefore, alters the variances on all wards.</p> <p>This proposal was the subject of a supplementary consultation with stakeholders and members, but the Panel does not recommend it to the Council.</p>	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	DON1 Appledram	Appledram	132	DON2 Donnington	Donnington	1,899	SID2 Sidlesham	Sidlesham	1,028	Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate	TAN1 Tangmere	Tangmere	2,472	NOM2 Oving (part)	Oving (part)	..536
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																					
DON1 Appledram	Appledram	132																					
DON2 Donnington	Donnington	1,899																					
SID2 Sidlesham	Sidlesham	1,028																					
Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate																					
TAN1 Tangmere	Tangmere	2,472																					
NOM2 Oving (part)	Oving (part)	..536																					
Charles Gauntlett, Senior	Our preference is for option 2, with a single-member																						

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	ward for Sidlesham (comprising the village and the northern edge of Selsey) and a three-member ward for the core community of Selsey. The proposed County Council division puts Sidlesham in with the Witterings, so it will be better for a single member Sidlesham district ward to be 100% within the County Wtterings division.	
James Fanshawe CBE Chairman Chichester Conservative Association 13/03/16 Response to Selsey Revision	I do not think I can add further comment on the revised Selsey options except to note that they appear to reduce the overall number of councillors by one to 35.	
Adrian Moss 14/03/16	<p>Selsey and Sidlesham</p> <p>Sidlesham should not be merged with Selsey. Sidlesham has no relationship with Selsey and would be badly represented.</p> <p>The options proposed are not suitable and need revising.</p>	
Q5: The Witterings		
Cllr Graeme Barrett Ward Councillor, West Wittering 19/02/16	<p>In my view here is only one option, that being Option 1 as it does not split West Wittering between two Wards. If the split were to be adopted there would be a significant backlash from the Parish and West Wittering would lose its identity. Also, bringing the settlement area of East side of West Wittering, East Wittering and Bracklesham under a single Ward could lead to a Town Council being formed with the inevitable growth in housing.</p> <p>My other concern is with the revised boundaries do not take account of the new WSCC Division boundaries, in particular Sidlesham is now in the Witterings Division.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	So, my preference is Option 1.	
Cllr Susan Taylor Ward Councillor, East Wittering 21/02/16	My preferred option is option 3. The division of West Wittering (WEW4) would have little effect on the residents concerned as the parish boundaries would remain the same and that is what residents relate to rather than ward boundaries. In my experience many of the residents already think that they are in East Wittering as the area concerned forms part of the East Wittering settlement area.	Mrs Taylor subsequently withdrew her preference for option 3 and supported option 1 for one three-member ward.
Cllr Elizabeth Hamilton Ward Councillor, West Wittering 23/02/16	<p>The idea of Sidlesham with Birdham as a single member ward seems to work.the band across the middle of the Manhood.</p> <p>For the Witterings,Bracklesham and Earnley a 3 member ward seems to be the only answer for not splitting the current west wittering parish boundary and does mean that "Greater Wittering " would perhaps have as much of a voice as Selsey. But here I will discuss options at parish council meetings.</p>	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	On balance, our preference is for option 2. We acknowledge that whilst the western end of East Wittering/Bracklesham Bay is within West Wittering Parish, residents are oriented to the community facilities of East Wittering.	
Adrian Moss 14/02/16	<p>The Witterings Wards</p> <p>I support Option Two for three single member wards. This would be an improvement on the current arrangement.</p>	
Carol Smith Parish Clerk	West Itchenor Parish Council as a small parish is very strongly in favour of either of the two options that put this	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
West Itchenor Parish Council 16/03/16	parish in a single member ward. The Parish Council feels that single member wards provide far greater accountability for the residents that the Councillors would be representing.	
David J Siggs Clerk to Birdham Parish Council 17/03/16	I can confirm that all relevant documents had been distributed to all Parish Councillors at least twice with reminders. There were just two responses which do not even form a quorate contribution.	
Joyce Griffith Parish Clerk E. Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council 18/03/16	East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council discussed this at its recent meeting and agreed that it had no comment to make.	
Mrs JKM Brown Clerk, West Wittering Parish Council 21/03/16	At the PC meeting in March West Wittering agreed that they would prefer to see West Itchenor included within the West Wittering ward.	
Q6: Earnley		
Cllr Susan Taylor Ward Councillor, East Wittering 21/02/16	Earnley covers a very wide but sparsely populated area. Most of the settlement and the heart of the village, that is the Church and greater density of population, is adjacent to Bracklesham/East Wittering.	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	No view	
Louise Chater MILCM Clerk	In response to question 6 Earnley Parish Council would like to confirm that its affiliation is with East Wittering &	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Earnley Parish Council 21/03/16	Bracklesham Parish Council or Birdham Parish Council as the services used by the parish council and the residents are mainly located in these parishes. The Parish Council does not consider that it has a strong affiliation with the Sidlesham area.	
Q7: Oving & Donnington		
Cllr Paul Jarvis Ward Councillor, North Mundham 04/03/16	I feel a 2 member ward is not the way to go here. It's a big area and in actuality the two members would look after their own patch anyway. The ward North Mundham & Oving will continue to grow significantly in the next 5 years and will require a member just to look after this.	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	In general, we have a preference for single member wards; however we recognise in this case that owing to the variance a two-member ward is preferable.	
Cllr Paul Jarvis Ward Councillor, North Mundham 11/03/16 Response to Selsey Revision	For North Mundham ward this is fine. There is a very close relationship between Hunston and North Mundham. They are both in the same church parish.	
Adrian Moss 14/02/16	<p>Oving Ward</p> <p>I understand your concern over size but feel it is better to combine Oving and North Mundham as a single member ward as opposed to creating a multi member ward with Donnington.</p> <p>Donnington Ward</p> <p>I support the principle of creating a single member ward</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	with Hunston but would suggest there may be better options. A fuller review needs to be undertaken.	
Nicola Jones Clerk & RFO Donnington Parish Council 15/03/16	Further to last night's meeting of Donnington Parish Council, I can confirm that the Council would support the proposal to add Sidlesham to Donnington Ward as outlined in your email. I understand this is currently known as SID2.	
Q8: Bosham		
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	In our view, either option is preferable to a ward that is over 15% above the norm. On balance, our preference is for option 1, as this would keep the defined community of Fishbourne intact.	
David J Siggs Clerk to Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council 10/03/16	At its recent Council Meeting Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council strongly supported the recommendations made concerning their Parish.	
Adrian Moss 14/02/16	<p>Bosham Ward</p> <p>This ward is too large and the communities are unconnected. This needs revising. I propose that a Nutbourne and Chidham/Hambrook ward is created but need to undertake a more detailed review to see if this can work.</p> <p>Southbourne Ward</p> <p>Southbourne and Nutbourne have been a combined ward for many years and it really should be possible to take this opportunity to create single member wards in this area.</p>	
Q9: Westbourne/Ems Valley		

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	Our preference is for Westbourne as the ward name.	
Adrian Moss 14/02/16	Westbourne I understand the challenge here but the very rural parishes of Compton, Marden, Stansted and Stoughton have little in common with Westbourne. The Parishes of Compton, Marden, Stansted and Stoughton have only relatively recently been merged with Funtington to form a single ward.	
Q10: Westhampnett/Lavant Valley		
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16	We suggest ‘Goodwood’ as a more appropriate alternative ward name. the Goodwood estate is right across this ward and is preferable to a village at one end of the proposed ward.	
Adrian Moss 14/02/16	Lavant Ward This is far from ideal as Lavant and Funtington have little in common. It is however a single member ward..... Lavant Valley Ward Not ideal however I understand why this is proposed. Tangmere Ward I support this on the basis it is a single community with a single member.	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
North of the Downs		
Midhurst and surrounding parishes		
<p>Cllr Caroline Neville Ward Councillor, Stedham 23/02/16</p> <p>Added on 13/03/16</p>	<p>It does concern me that Cocking and West Lavington and Heyshott are put in with Midhurst... and Bepton. Bepton is already extremely unhappy that Midhurst councillors have proposed a housing development at the start of their parish</p> <p>They will not want to be swallowed up by the town, which they and I can foresee they will believe may happen. I still feel as I stated at the meeting that rural villages are better together... I know that it is said that ward boundaries aren't relevant to being together, however...</p> <p>Neighbouring West Lavington and Heyshott being in two different wards seems rather untidy to say the least...equally with Iping and Stedham in Midhurst. These parishes are all crisscrossing over each other...</p> <p>Also I actually do still believe that Easebourne is better with Midhurst as it is more of a suburban area, whereas Lodsworth and Redford are rural... Redford has much more in common with Stedham and Iping and Milland than going East. Lodsworth is much better placed with Lurgashall, Tillington, Graffham, East Lavington and if necessary Duncton...</p> <p>It seems to me that Midhurst has the most challenges with the largest population north of the Downs, together with the shops, businesses and tourist trade to be looked after and encouraged. I wonder if it can be treated differently from the other Wards and stand alone with the</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>number of councillors necessary to keep it all running smoothly and effectively, progressing and offering more for all age groups.</p> <p>Then rural areas can stay rural without fears of being gobbled up!!</p>	
<p>Cllr Andrew Shaxson Ward Councillor, Harting 10/03/16</p>	<p>A 35 member council would 'allow' the currently oversized 'Western Weald' ward (Harting, Rogate, Elsted and Trotton) to stand on its own two feet.</p> <p>More importantly, I attended Trotton with Chithurst PC last night, and they considered the current proposals. They noted that, as proposed, Stedham is part of the Midhurst 2 member ward, and Woolbeding with Redford is part of Easebourne.</p> <p>They said, and on checking it is correct, that Woolbeding completely separates Midhurst from Stedham. They don't touch at any point. Stedham would subsequently become an 'island'. Oh dear!</p>	<p>The simple solution from an electoral equality viewpoint is to transfer Woolbeding with Redford from Easebourne to Midhurst. The variances for a 36 member Council would then be +3.68% for Midhurst and +1.24% for Easebourne. For a 35 member Council, would be +0.82% for Midhurst and -1.56% for Easebourne.</p>
<p>Cllr Gordon McAra Ward Councillor, Midhurst 11/03/16</p>	<p>Andrew, you are not accurate in what you say. Stedham is attached to Bepton, which in turn is attached to Midhurst. There is no particular reason why Stedham should be glued to Midhurst as opposed to Bepton. So I would leave this as it is.....</p>	
<p>Cllr Francis Hobbs Ward Councillor, Easebourne 11/03/16</p>	<p>Woolbeding and Redford would more naturally stand with Easebourne than Heyshott.</p> <p>What seems clear is both Easebourne and Midhurst will have to include some surrounding areas - and it seems reasonable to assume there will be 3 councillors to cover those areas.</p> <p>The key is finding a way of making sure any "minority"</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	does not feel overwhelmed by their grouping and feels it will be represented well at the Council.	
Amy Harte Clerk and RFO to East Lavington Parish Council 10/03/16	Following the March meeting of East Lavington Parish Council I can confirm that this consultation was discussed and that East Lavington Parish Council have no objections to the proposed changes.	
James Fanshawe CBE Chairman Chichester Conservative Association 13/03/16	<p>Midhurst is a more complex issue. The question is whether this should be a one ward, two member area or the other way round. The Midhurst CCA Branch Chairman offered some thoughts which I copy below for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homing in on Midhurst, Stedham and Easebourne, it is immediately apparent that Midhurst is currently too small at 4086 electors to carry 2 seats and too large to carry one. It is I believe the second or third largest urban area in the District and there must be a strong case for dividing it into wards in a manner similar to Chichester rather than being a single ward with two seats. The number of wards would need to be two, but their elector numbers would need to be increased to get close either to the District ideal average or the North of the Downs average. That can be achieved by adding some parts of Stedham to each. • In terms of the mathematics, one option is to divide Midhurst into two wards - North and South, each of about 2043 electors. Further work would be needed to be done at a more granular level to divide Midhurst by street to fit in with the geography. I cannot make a more concrete proposal for that since I do not have the number of electors by street, but dividing the town in this 	<p>In terms of electoral equality this works, provided it is possible rationally to divide Midhurst Town into two wards of roughly equal size that meet the other criteria of community identity and interests and effective and convenient local government.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>way should be feasible. To the South would be added Bepton (207) and Cocking (350) and West Lavington (240) making a total electorate of 2810 and to the North Iping (102), Stedham (579) and Woolbeding (126) making a total electorate of 2850.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Midhurst North is then too large, Iping and Woolbeding could be added to the new Easebourne (2515) • Heyshott (223) and Iping are the furthest from Midhurst and the allocation of Heyshott to Easebourne would seem appropriate. Alternatively, it could be allocated to the new Fittleworth ward, although the latter's variance might be then considered too high. • Does this option work in terms of Midhurst and the components of Stedham as communities? I think it does. • Midhurst falls broadly into two halves with the older part of the town to the North and the new part to the South. The South is primarily residential with a broad mix of social and private housing and two small industrial sites at Holmbush and on the road towards Bepton. It links naturally to Cocking via Cocking Causeway and to West Lavington. Although there are residential parts to North Midhurst, particularly to the north west, it is the principal commercial area of the town with the High Street and community hub at the Grange, bars and restaurants, police and fire station and the schools. There is a good case for the community to be better served by two DC's in separate wards, one having a focus on residential and housing issues and the other 	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>on commercial and central services for the community. Midhurst has a particular challenge in attracting commercial investment as the failure thus far to develop a supermarket site near the Grange has shown. Opinions from the electors in May 2015 indicated that elected representatives of the DC needed to devote more time to dealing with that aspect of local administration. Midhurst electors do not see the town as divided and having elected representatives with effectively different mandates for the future well-being of the town is unlikely to be seen as divisive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absorption of the rural components of Stedham is more difficult because each has a separate community identity, is a separate parish and has a community focal point in its village hall. However, apart from Cocking, they have limited retail facilities and rely on Midhurst for such services, as well as police, fire and similar public facilities. Electors in the current Stedham ward appear to accept that the ward already covers a large geographical area populated by communities which retain identities distinct from the ward. 	
<p>Adrian Moss 14/02/16</p>	<p>Midhurst Ward</p> <p>Could two single member wards be created from this, based on the Town Council boundaries?</p> <p>Easebourne Ward</p> <p>I support the creation of a single member ward, with concerns that the councillor will be representing one large community and three small communities.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
<p>Cllr Caroline Neville Ward Councillor, Stedham 14/03/16</p>	<p>I have just come back from Lodsworth parish meeting. Helen Cruikshank will be emailing you and what I shall now tell you will also be echoed by Francis Hobbs who attended the meeting.</p> <p>Lodsworth has a Petworth Postal code..GU28 and GU29...not a Midhurst one.... It would prefer to be linked with the smaller neighbouring rural villages/parishes with whom they have much in common. And already link with on issues such as flooding and dangers and problems on the roads.</p> <p>ie. Lurgashall, Tillington, Graffham...(Lodsworth consists of Lickfold, which borders Lurgashall,. Lodsworth and Selham which borders Graffham. if more is needed then perhaps Northchapel as it links to Lurgashall and East Lavington that links to Graffham</p>	<p>I have been looking at a proposal such as the one you make in trying to solve Lurgashall's wish to be detached from the proposed Fernhurst Ward – see comments below on the Lurgashall PC's representation.</p> <p>The combined projected electorate of Lurgashall, Northchapel, Lodsworth, Tillington and Graffham is 2,527, which gives a variance of -7.91 for a 36 member council and -10.45 for a 35 member council, thus pushing the boundaries of acceptability. Adding Heyshott increases it to 2,750, which would work. However, it impinges on the proposed Fittleworth Ward, which works as drafted, but becomes too small if Graffham is removed. Working west instead of east from Heyshott brings in Cocking and/or West Lavington, and I think we have probably gone beyond the bounds of community identity or effective and convenient local government.</p>
<p>Anna Leach Clerk to Woolbeding with Redford Parish Council 15/03/16</p>	<p>After discussion at our EGM last night, WwRPc agreed that we would prefer to be in a ward with Stedham with Iping, Bepton and Midhurst. We share our parish boundaries with these neighbouring parishes and often find that planning applications in their areas affect the parish of Woolbeding with Redford and it is useful to work together and have a councillor who understands the shared concerns.</p>	<p>This confirms the desirability of including this parish in Midhurst Ward rather than Easebourne Ward – see comments above from Cllrs Shaxson, McAra and Hobbs.</p>
<p>Jane Crawford Clerk Stedham with Iping Parish</p>	<p>Stedham with Iping Parish Council is concerned about the proposed new ward of Midhurst.</p> <p>While we do not mind being in the Midhurst ward, we</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
<p>Council 17/03/16</p>	<p>would point out that we have no common boundary with Midhurst and would be a virtual satellite of Midhurst under the current proposal.</p> <p>The map of the parishes is incorrect in that it only marks the northern half of Woolbeding and Redford parish as being within the Easebourne ward. The southern part of Woolbeding with Redford is between our parish and Midhurst and appears to have been included in the Midhurst ward.</p> <p>If you draw the whole of the Woolbeding and Redford parish on to your map, you will see that it would be more sensible to have it in the Midhurst Ward rather than the Easebourne ward.</p> <p>We hope you will take our comments into account when responding to the Boundary Commission.</p>	<p>The map sent to stakeholders was indeed inaccurate in this respect.</p>
<p>Cllr Caroline Neville Ward Councillor, Stedham 18/03/16</p>	<p>Following the parish meeting last night Bepton is also happy to be with Midhurst</p>	
<p>Denise Meek Clerk to Midhurst Town Council 22/03/16</p>	<p>Midhurst Town Council discussed the review last night at the Town Council meeting.</p> <p>The Town Council notes that, in terms of the proposed arrangement, its two elected members will be shared with neighbouring parishes, and it raises no objection.</p>	
Q11: Harting Ward		
<p>Linzi Martin Parish Clerk - Elsted and Treyford 29/02/16</p>	<p>Elsted and Treyford Parish Council have read and considered the proposals for amended boundaries as suggested by CDC and support the inclusion of Elsted and Treyford Parish within the Harting Ward that also includes Rogate/Rake and Trotton with Chithurst</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>parishes.</p> <p>Our specific response to Question 11 of the CDC Consultation Document is:-</p> <p>Concerning the 'interests and identities of local communities' we would like it noted that the proposed Harting/Rogate Ward would be rural in nature. Elsted and Treyford Parish has many traditional ties with Harting and all the Parishes within the proposed Ward. Harting parish and Elsted, Treyford cum Diding and Rogate with Terwick and Trotton with Chithurst - are long-established United ecclesiastical Benefices.</p> <p>Recently Trotton with Chithurst Parish approached Elsted and Treyford to establish whether there was the possibility of joint working, including the creation of a Common Parish Council, or mutual benefit and to improve efficiency. This approach is currently under review. Following the closure of Elsted School in 1985 children from this Parish are within the catchment area of the replacement Harting Primary School, built to serve both communities. Harting Parish borders Hampshire and many Elsted and Treyford residents tend to use community and commercial facilities in either South Harting or nearby Petersfield, where there is a far wider range available than in Midhurst.</p> <p>For these reasons we would not support transferring the Parish of Elsted to Midhurst ward or seeing Trotton transferred to a new ward centred on Lynchmere.</p>	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member	In our view the community connections for residents of Elsted & Treyford and Trotton with Chithurst lie to the west.	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16		
Darren Stiles For Trotton with Chithurst Parish Council. 12/03/16	<p>Trotton with Chithurst Parish Council have read and considered the proposals for amended boundaries as suggested by CDC and support the inclusion of Trotton with Chithurst Parish within the Harting Ward, including Rogate and Elsted parishes.</p> <p>Our specific response to Question 11 of the CDC document is:</p> <p>Trotton no longer has a school, shop, village green, sports ground, village hall or public house and must rely on its neighbours' facilities. Our population centre (albeit a small one) is situated to the south of the parish, about a mile from the public house at Lower Elsted, which hosts events for Trotton residents each month. The Village hall and sports ground at Elsted give a good view across Trotton and are often used by Trotton residents. Trotton and Elsted Parishes are similar in size and nature and the two Parish councils have recently been exploring options for closer working, including the potential for a Common Parish Council. We have strong links to Elsted, which in turn has strong links with Harting Parish.</p> <p>Trotton also has strong links to its larger neighbour Rogate as the two parishes share a Rector across the four churches which make up the United Benefice. This is similar to our neighbours in Harting and Elsted parishes. There is a small village shop and post office at Rogate, which is the closest for most Trotton residents.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>The A272 provides good east-west transport links to Midhurst and Petersfield, via Rogate, and a minor but still two-lane C road connects us to Elsted and Harting to the southwest. By contrast, Milland and Linchmere are some distance to the north involving narrow, mainly single track roads or a long detour. A bus service connects us eastwards to Midhurst or westwards to Petersfield via Rogate, with a less frequent service to Elsted and Harting. There is no direct service north to Milland or Linchmere.</p> <p>Midhurst is closer, but much smaller than Petersfield. Most Trotton people look to Petersfield for their main weekly shopping, Royal Mail and rail services. This is broadly reflected among Rogate, Harting and Elsted residents. By contrast we believe that most residents of Linchmere and Milland will look to Liphook or Haslemere as their local towns, including rail links, postal delivery and postal addresses.</p> <p>For these reasons: We welcome the addition of Rogate to the Harting ward, where we already have strong links, notably with Elsted parish. We object most strongly to Trotton being removed to join Milland and Linchmere, with whom we share very few common bonds. We also object to the proposal to move Elsted parish from the ward.</p>	
Adrian Moss 14/02/16	<p>Harting Ward</p> <p>This is acceptable.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Cllr Andrew Shaxson Ward Councillor, Harting 17/03/16	On top of satisfying councillors and parishes concerning the make-up of the proposed wards, has anyone yet considered names for them, over and above the usual method of using the largest centre of population? I was wondering about the name 'Western Weald' for the ward that currently includes Harting, Rogate, Trotton and Elsted parishes.	It would help if you had the chance to canvass some local opinion at least so we know by 31 March whether that's a proposal that has the backing of the area.
Mrs Carola Brown Chair Trotton with Chithurst Parish Council 17/03/16	I'd be happy with Western Weald - so long as it contains Chithurst!	
Lynchmere/ Fernhurst		
Cllr Philippa Hardwick Ward Councillor, Fernhurst 09/03/16	As you know I think, Lynchmere and Fernhurst seem keen (though I have not seen their final submissions) to stay together given their shared interests (particularly being arguably both satellite villages to Haslemere and both on A286) and shared history. I do sympathise with this view. I have also always seen the virtue of 2 man wards in these rural districts for diversity of representation, flexibility of representation and support on more major issues. I also am anxious to keep headroom for Syngenta as the developer is keen for a very much more accelerated timetable than planners might think. They are talking of first houses being occupied in perhaps 2 or 3 years! Clearly this is highly contingent but headroom is clearly necessary on any view at some point in near future. So it might make sense to let Lurgashall sit back with its Eastern neighbours and combine Fernhurst again with Lynchmere....	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member	No view on Q12 re spelling	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Support, West Sussex County Council 10/03/16		
Kate Bain Clerk & RFO to Lynchmere Parish Council 10/03/16	<p>Lynchmere Parish Council has considered the proposals for the boundary change as per the consultation. The Council feels very strongly that the suggested ward boundary change should keep Fernhurst & Lynchmere together; these should be combined with Milland and Lurgashall to form one ward served by two district councillors. The reasons for this are outlined below:</p> <p><u>1. Geographical ties</u> Lynchmere and Fernhurst share boundaries at the end of Camelsdale road, on Marley Common and along Vann Road. Until a few years ago part of Camelsdale was in Fernhurst Parish. There are at least 2 properties on Vann road where the drives are in Lynchmere and the houses are in Fernhurst. Marley Common was only moved to Lynchmere from Fernhurst Parish 2 years ago following a boundary commission review.</p> <p><u>2. Historical and community ties</u> Lynchmere and Fernhurst both had connections to Shulbrede Priory originally built in the 12th century. Following the dissolution of the monasteries stones from Shulbrede are believed to have been used to build houses in both Fernhurst and Lynchmere Parishes. The two Parishes were also historically connected by the ironworks just off Vann Road which provided local employment. The Cowdray estate has owned and farmed land across both Parishes for many years.</p> <p>Several issues continue to have a direct impact on both</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>Parishes as well as some effect on surrounding areas such as the proposed development of the Syngenta site and the 2013 application to explore for oil and gas which was referred to as being in Fernhurst although the actual drilling site was a few metres into Lynchmere Parish. There is a proposal that the Fernhurst vicar might combine with at least part of Lynchmere parish in future and this would also strengthen our ecclesiastical ties. Some crime prevention issues have been dealt with on a ward basis in recent years. It is felt important that we continue to work closely together.</p> <p>Lynchmere residents use many of the facilities in Fernhurst on a regular basis including the shops and Post Office, the village hall, the Fernhurst Centre, the pub and the surgery. The facilities in Milland are further away although Lynchmere residents go there to a lesser extent for the community shop, village hall and pub.</p> <p>At present the 2 District Councillors covering the Fernhurst ward run monthly surgeries in Fernhurst for parishioners to raise issues of concern. This service is widely used by residents of Lynchmere as well as Fernhurst.</p> <p><u>3. Advantages of a wider Ward with 2 District Councillors</u></p> <p>Lynchmere and Fernhurst at present make up one ward with 2 District Councillors. This is generally thought to have worked well. It means Councillors can share ideas and give each other support. If one Councillor is unavailable it often means the other one can provide cover. As we understand the present arrangement</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>cannot continue owing to the growing number of residents in both Parishes we feel a combination of Lynchmere, Fernhurst, Milland and Lurgashall with 2 District Councillors offers a better alternative than Lynchmere joining with Milland alone and having only one District Councillor. The current District Councillors have said they could support this move.</p> <p>Yes Lynchmere is preferred spelling.</p>	
<p>Lorraine Grocott, Clerk to Milland PC, 11/3/16</p>	<p>Milland Parish Council discussed the proposal for this area and would be happy to change from Rogate Ward to Linchmere Ward which would include Milland, Linch and Linchmere.</p> <p>Milland identifies with Linch/Hollycombe and Linchmere through community life, the church, facilities such as shops, post offices, health, transport i.e. train services.</p> <p>Recently we had a problem with our website and the IT person at Fernhurst PC was very helpful.</p>	
<p>Helen Cruikshank Clerk to Lurgashall PC 14/03/16 See also further response on 15/03/16</p>	<p>Having discussed the proposed new boundaries at its parish council meeting last Thursday, Lurgahall has the following comments:</p> <p>Lurgashall PC is not happy with the new proposed boundary. The consultation proposes that it will be moved into the Fernhurst ward therefore being included with Fernhurst parish, a significantly larger and quite different parish. It has nothing in common with Fernhurst, it has no shared facilities or links to Fernhurst.</p> <p>The Parish Council feels it is imperative that the District Council re-look at this proposal. Currently Lurgashall sits with Northchapel, Loxwood and Plaistow in the Plaistow</p>	<p>It seems very difficult to arrive at a solution which puts Lurgashall and Northchapel in the same ward.</p> <p>Detaching Lurgashall from Fernhurst can be achieved, although in a less satisfactory way from an electoral equality viewpoint – see comment immediately below.</p> <p>Adding Lurgashall and Northchapel to the proposed Plaistow Ward creates an electorate of 3,946. This does not work for either a one-member or a two-member ward.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>ward. Lurgashall feels it is essential that it is kept with Northchapel as not only are they similar sized parishes but they share a school, a vicar and both have significant ties with The Leconfield Estate. Northchapel and Lurgashall have similar patterns of community life, similar issues and ties which naturally set them together. It is appreciated that numbers need to be achieved but it would seem to make much more sense to put the smaller parishes in the area together i.e Northchapel, Ebernoe, Lurgashall, Lodsworth, Tillington and Graffham all of which have links and are of a similar size so there is not one dominant parish.</p>	<p>Combining the proposed Plaistow and Wisborough Green Wards, with Lurgashall, produces a combined projected electorate of 6,233. If this were a three member ward the average number of electors per councillor would be 2,078, a variance of -24.28% for a 36 member council, which is unlikely to be acceptable.</p> <p>If it were a two member ward, the average number of electors per councillor would be 3,117, a variance of +13.59% for a 36 member council, and +10.45 for a 35 member council. This would be pushing the boundaries of acceptability and be hard to justify, (See comments below in relation to Cllr Denise Knightley's representations)</p> <p>Looking to see whether Lurgashall and Northchapel can be combined with parishes to the south, the combined projected electorate of these two with Lodsworth and Tillington is 2,063 – too small for a viable ward. To go beyond that impinges on the proposed Fittleworth Ward, which works as drafted, or combining with Petworth and Ebernoe, which is still too small for a two-member ward.</p>
<p>Mrs Rebecca Knifton Clerk to Fernhurst Parish Council 14/03/16</p>	<p>Fernhurst Parish Council met last week to discuss its views on the boundary review, along with our District Cllr Norma Graves.</p> <p>The Council felt that the connection with its western boundary Parishes is closer than that of Lurgashall. We also understand that Lurgashall are looking to link up</p>	<p>Combining the proposed Linchmere and Fernhurst Wards, without including Lurgashall, gives an electorate of 4,925. For a two-member ward this produces an average of 2,463 a variance of -12.74% for a 35 member council and -10.24% for 36 members. Although this gives headroom for</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>with their eastern boundary.</p> <p>The other factor that was considered is the imminent development at the old Syngenta site with 210 new properties scheduled to be built which will needless to say increase the electorate substantially.</p> <p>With this in mind, Fernhurst Parish Council recommends that Fernhurst is linked with Lynchmere, Lynch and Milland therefore remaining as a two District Cllr Ward.</p>	<p>the Syngenta development, these variances are hard to justify.</p> <p>If Rake is added, the electorate increases to 5,387, with an average for a two-member ward of 2,693, producing a variance for 35 members of -4.55% and for 36 members of -1.86%. It would reduce the variance on Harting Ward to -8.15% for 35 members and -5.54% for 36 members.</p> <p>However, this splits Rogate Parish and still leaves an alternative solution to be found for Lurgashall.</p> <p>If Woolbeding and Redford (but not Rake) is added the electorate increases to 5,051, with an average for a two-member ward of 2,526, producing a variance for 35 members of -10.51% and for 36 members of -7.94%.</p>
<p>Cllr Norma Graves Ward Councillor, Fernhurst 14/03/16</p>	<p>I have waited to reply until I had attended both Lynchmere and Fernhurst Parish Councils. I have also been approached by a good number of residents. The general feeling is that Fernhurst and Lynchmere have a long standing and natural bond. Also given the boundary lines they are very much intertwined and even the Planning Department have recently been sending applications to the wrong Parish Council because of the unusual boundary lines!</p> <p>Fernhurst Parish Council do not feel that they have any affinity with Lurgashall and are very much against being joined with Lurgashall. They are also very much aware</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>of the Syngenta site and the new application which is being prepared by Comer Homes. The first tranche of which is expected to be for 90 houses and could be built well before 2021. In one of your memos you did say that you could possibly make the case for Fernhurst being with Lynchmere, Milland and Linch because of the fact that Syngenta was a live application.</p> <p>I agree and support all that Philippa has said although we have not spoken. Both Fernhurst & Lynchmere definitely prefer to be together in a 2 member ward, including Milland and Linch and, if necessary, we could increase the numbers before Syngenta, somewhat, by including Woolbeding & Redford.</p> <p>Both Fernhurst and Lynchmere Parish Councils will be replying to you.</p>	
<p>Adrian Moss 14/03/16</p>	<p>Linchmere Ward</p> <p>I support the single member ward.</p> <p>Fernhurst Ward</p> <p>I support the single member ward.</p>	
<p>Cllr Philippa Hardwick Ward Councillor, Fernhurst 17/03/16 Follow up to comment on 09/03/16</p>	<p>Is it possible to run the numbers including the planned 210 Syngenta development (perhaps 450 new electors on a conservative estimate)? As both Norma and I have mentioned, it seems increasingly clear from policy changes and developer pressure that there is a growing likelihood that these will come on stream earlier than has been presumed.</p>	<p>We made no allowance for any development at Syngenta in the electorate forecasts we put to the LGBCE last December.</p> <p>Looking at the supporting spreadsheet, prepared by Robert Davidson in Development Management, on which the forecasts were based, I see he has 200 dwellings there predicted in the years 2024/25 to 2027/28. I believe, since I asked him to check this</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
		<p>particular forecast, that he contacted the National Park Authority about that.</p> <p>The LGBCE strongly urged us to be conservative in our forecasting. Their guidance in relation to future housing development states: "The selection should be based on firm evidence and realistic expectations... The inclusion of a site which does not even have a planning permission will require particular justification". Therefore, our forecasts are lower than those contained in the 5 year housing land supply review, which is produced for different purposes. For this reason I have resisted revising the forecast we gave to the LGBCE, because that re-introduces a variable that we hoped was settled.</p> <p>For the purposes of forecasting, what is important is the number of dwellings to be built and occupied by the key date - 2021. If the Syngenta development did take place in this timescale and gave rise to an additional 450 electors, and assuming all other forecasts are unchanged, this would increase the total electorate of the district from 98,781 to 99,231. For a 36 member council, the average electorate would be 2,756; for a 35 member council, it would be 2,835. This, of course, would change the variances across all the wards in our proposals. It would reduce positive variances and increase negative variances. This would require a considerable</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	That is very interesting and helpful.	<p>amount of re-working of the proposals. For example, the proposals for 9 members for Chichester would be unsustainable. We would probably have to reduce Chichester to 8 members, reducing the Council size to 34, which changes the average again and means re-working all the variances yet again!</p> <p>As far as this impacts on Fernhurst, the parish electorate would increase from 2,199 to 2,649. On its own, therefore, Fernhurst parish would have a variance of -3.88% for a 36 member council or -6.56% for a 35 member council. As a ward consisting of Fernhurst and Lurgashall with a combined electorate of 3,155 the variances become +14.48% for a 36 member council or +11.29% for a 35 member council (clearly too large).</p> <p>Combining the proposed Linchmere and Fernhurst Wards, but without including Lurgashall, gives an electorate of 5,375. For a two-member ward this produces an average of 2,688 a variance of -5.20% for a 35 member council and -2.49% for 36 members (which would work).</p> <p>But of course the Syngenta development does nothing for Lurgashall and doesn't make it any more practical to join it to parishes to the east or south.</p> <p>Perhaps I should have added that, if the</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>I fully understand the policy not to include sites that are uncertain, but this is a preferred/allocated site in the Fernhurst neighbourhood plan (now very nearly adopted) and the emerging plan of the national park. The only issue is timing and after our meeting with developers it is clear they are completely set on pressing on ahead of expected schedules. The park is likely to be powerless to slow this down given central government policy on delivering housing and attitude of inspectors in relation to appeals. Even if you cannot take the numbers strictly into account, it is plainly a factor justifying any large negative variance in relation to any Fernhurst ward.</p> <p>That does look perfectly sensible, and does indeed give headroom. I also happen to know Lurgashall well having represented them for 5 years and whilst the school is the obvious link with Northchapel, I cannot see it being a problem being allied to the west not east. I would suggest they share more interests with Lynchmere/Fernhurst (all Haslemere looking villages) than they ever did with Loxwood and Ifold (more Billingshurst/Surrey leaning).</p>	<p>Fernhurst and Lynchmere Wards (as drafted – i.e. polling districts of Fernhurst, Lurgashall, Linchmere, Hammer, Milland and Linch) are combined as one two-member ward, which seems to be the preferred solution (except by Lurgashall), the combined electorate, with no allowance for Syngenta, is 5,431. Divided by two, the average per councillor is 2,716, giving variances of -1.04% for a 36 member council, and -3.77% for 35 members.</p> <p>This does build in a bit of headroom for at least a start on the Syngenta development.</p>
Q13: Heyshott		
Cllr Caroline Neville Ward Councillor, Stedham 23/02/16	Neighbouring West Lavington and Heyshott being in two different wards seems rather untidy to say the least...equally with iping and stedham in Midhurst. these parishes are all crisscrossing over each other...	
Charles Gauntlett, Senior Advisor – Council and Member Support, West Sussex County Council	In our view, Heyshott should be included in the Easebourne Ward as it is a largely rural settlement and also as Midhurst will continue to experience considerable development pressure. This would provide better co-	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
<p>10/03/16</p> <p>John Murray Chairman. Heyshott Parish Council 11/03/16</p>	<p>terminosity with the County Division.</p> <p>Reference the consultation on the proposed boundaries, Heyshott Parish Council would make the following comments:-</p> <p>1. The Parish Council is concerned that villages are included as part of the Midhurst Ward for the following reasons.</p> <p>a). The size and population of Midhurst will dominate the the voice of the smaller parishes included in the Ward.</p> <p>b). Midhurst with the SDNP Offices and largest business centre will dominate the control of the ward and ignore the concerns and needs of the smaller rural villages and the Ward not be representative of the rural communities.</p> <p>c) The presence of the Cowdray Estate as the largest landowner in the ward has a major influence on Midhurst and will seek to maintain its influence to the detriment of the rural community.</p> <p>We firmly believe that the representation of the rural villages should be reflected in the re-organisation of the wards as a separate ward and not dominated by one large town just to make up the ward numbers.</p>	<p>This confirms the draft proposal to include Heyshott in Easebourne, not Midhurst Ward.</p>
North East Parishes		
<p>Kirdford Parish Council 24/02/16</p>	<p>The Parish Council would like to comment on the recommendations that were attached to your e-mail of the 18th February, 2016.</p> <p>It is proposed in those documents that Kirdford Parish should be in a Ward with Wisborough Green, Ebernoe and North Chapel. Unfortunately the Parish of Kirdford has nothing in common or links with Ebernoe or North Chapel whereas it does have with Wisborough Green.</p>	<p>The combined projected electorate of the four Parishes that are within the North East Parishes Cluster is 4,966. This is too big for a single member ward, but could be a two member ward, but with a variance of -9.51, which is at the extreme end of the range.</p> <p>If Ebernoe and Northchapel are retained in the combined ward the variance is +4.35, well</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>Kirdford has extremely strong links with Plaistow and Ifold as follows :-</p> <p>(a) Education – Plaistow and Kirdford Primary School is in Plaistow. Pre-schools are in Plaistow and Ifold. Kirdford, Plaistow and Ifold Toddler Group is in Kirdford.</p> <p>(b) Religion - Kirdford and Plaistow PCC Kirdford Chapel (Plaistow Chapel was closed and sold)</p> <p>(c) Organizations – Scout and Guide Group is in Ifold. Junior Football, Cricket, Stoolball and Tennis Clubs are all in Kirdford. Kirdford, Plaistow and Ifold Bellringers) Ifold History Society) All have members Kirdford Players) from both Parishes Festival Choir) Gourmet Gardeners)</p> <p>(d) There are many occasions when the residents of the two Parishes come together.</p> <p>Kirdford residents have links with Loxwood as follows :-</p> <p>(a) Use doctors' surgery</p>	<p>within acceptability.</p> <p>The only alternative for Northchapel would be to place it in Fernhurst Ward, with adjoining Lurgashall. This would increase the electorate of Fernhurst Ward to 3,285, with a variance of +19.71%, which would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Ebernoe could be combined with Petworth Ward increasing its electorate to 3,080, with a variance of +12.24%, also hard to justify.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>(b) Some children attend the Loxwood School</p> <p>Kirdford Parish Council is a member of the North East Parishes Cluster which consists of Kirdford, Plaistow and Ifold, Wisborough Green and Loxwood Parish Councils and it meets to discuss and work together on items of common interest and concern.</p> <p>The Parish Council feels strongly that it would be more logical for it to be in the same Ward as Plaistow and Ifold and if at all possible it would seem sensible if the Ward could perhaps cover the same four Parishes that are within the North East Parishes Cluster.</p> <p>It would be very much appreciated if you could kindly arrange to take these comments into account when making your representations.</p>	
<p>Cllr Denise Knightley Ward Councillor, Plaistow 09/03/16</p>	<p>I have discussed this with Plaistow and Ifold PC and while it would be desirable to have the North East Parishes Cluster in the same ward it would result in too large a variance as you point out.</p> <p>I believe that there is a possibility of up to a 3 member ward though.</p> <p>If we also included Wis Green, Ebernoe, Northchapel and Lurgashall and combined as a 3 member ward would that result in a more acceptable variance?</p> <p>I do think that it's very important to ensure that the northern parishes are kept together and represented by councillors who understand the special characteristics of these small rural areas and I worry that their amalgamation into areas such as Fernhurst may result in less cohesion and more isolation.</p>	<p>I take it that your proposal is to combine the proposed Wisborough Green and Plaistow Wards with Lurgashall, thus bringing together the parishes of Ebernoe, Kirdford, Loxwood, Lurgashall, Northchapel, Plaistow & Ifold, and Wisborough Green.</p> <p>The combined projected electorate of this area is 6,233. If this were a three member ward the average number of electors per councillor would be 2,078, a variance of -24.28%, which is unlikely to be acceptable. If it were a two member ward, the average number of electors per councillor would be 3,117, a variance of +13.58%, which would be hard to justify.</p> <p>Moreover, the inclusion of Lurgashall creates a problem of how to deal with Fernhurst. On</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
		<p>its own, Fernhurst parish has a projected electorate of 2,199, which is too small, although the Syngenta development (if it takes place) might correct that in the long term.</p> <p>Combining Fernhurst parish with the adjoining proposed Linchmere ward gives a combined projected electorate of 4,925, which for a two-member ward gives a variance of -10.26%, which is pushing the bounds of acceptability (although it does provide headroom for Syngenta).</p> <p>I feel the Council's consultation proposal offers a better solution from an electoral equality point of view. However, if a convincing case can be made for including Lurgashall with the other north east parishes (rather than with Fernhurst) on community identity and effective local government grounds, then it might just be acceptable.</p>
<p>Cllr Philippa Hardwick Ward Councillor, Fernhurst 09/03/16</p>	<p>It might make sense to let Lurgashall sit back with its Eastern neighbours and combine Fernhurst again with Lynchmere....</p>	
<p>Cllr Joseph Ransley Ward Councillor, Wisborough Green 10/03/16</p>	<p>I've already expressed some views on the Wisborough Green proposal but would support Denise's view that the 4 NE Parishes, Kirdford, Wisborough Green, Plaistow & Ifold and Loxwood do work together on a number of issues under a formal cluster arrangement they established some years ago. Notably by pooling resources they have been able to support our LPA in resisting major inappropriate development such a Commercial Biogas Plant in Kirdford/Plaistow and Oil & Gas exploration in Kirdford/Wisborough Green.</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>Further their willingness to work in partnership has resulted in 3 out of the four having Neighbourhood Plans adopted with common policies and objectives for the area as a whole. The 4 Parishes share two primary schools, one in Wisborough Green and one in Plaistow and residents share many other facilities and organisations including Kirdford community shop, junior football, cricket, Amdram group, junior playgroups, etc. Kirdford and Plaistow also share a vicar and church activities.</p> <p>From my knowledge there are very few links with Northchapel or Ebernoe at Parish or community level. I appreciate the numbers for the combined electorate may not work, but then again 36 isn't a magic number either, however you can't impose artificial boundaries upon a community as post colonial history and now current affairs show!!</p>	
<p>Cllr Nick Thomas Ward Councillor, Plaistow 10/03/16</p>	<p>There have been long held connections between the NE FORUM PARISHES. FERNHURST is firmly in the NWFORUM cluster. Not easy to accommodate historical links and I presume numbers will dictate..... AGREE WITH CLLR RANSLEY!</p>	
<p>Beverley Weddell Clerk to Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council 10/03/16</p>	<p>I write to confirm that Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council concur with Kirdford Parish Council's response on the Electoral Review.</p> <p>It is our understanding that it is proposed to alter our ward so that we are grouped only with Loxwood Parish Council and have one District Councillor and Northchapel and Lurgashall are removed from our Ward. Although this amendment will have no significant impact on our Parish, as we have no connections with</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>Lurgashall nor Northchapel and our two District Councillors divided up the Ward by Parish, we do consider an opportunity is being lost to make a more logical grouping based on the connections between the Parishes in this Northern cluster forum, namely Kirdford, Loxwood, Wisborough Green and ourselves.</p> <p>We lie outside the SDNP and as a consequence are isolated in the North of the District. We already have quarterly meetings as a cluster and share many common issues and some services, infrastructure, schools, both Primary and Secondary, and medical services. Plaistow's links with Kirdford are stronger than with Loxwood; historically we were one Parish and remain today one Ecclesiastical Parish.</p> <p>In general, because our secondary school for the four Parishes is located out of the District in Billingshurst and we are so close to the border of both Horsham District Council and Surrey, we tend to access other facilities out of Chichester District Council area, to the East and North and not toward Midhurst or Chichester.</p> <p>We consider that Northchapel, Lurgashall and Ebernoe have greater connections with Petworth and Midhurst, which are also situated in the SDNP.</p> <p>Therefore, in terms of good and meaningful representation, Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council considers that it would be preferable if the four Parishes were grouped as one Ward with two District Councillors to represent us. Good representation should not purely be a matter of balancing numbers.</p>	<p>A small part of Plaistow & Ifold parish is within the SDNP, as are parts of Kirdford and Wisborough Green. Ebernoe also lies partly outside the SDNP. Loxwood lies entirely outside the SDNP and Northchapel almost entirely inside.</p>
James Fanshawe CBE	In the North East area, I would like to correct two factual	The proposed wards that are in the Arundel &

Respondent	Representation	Comment
Chairman Chichester Conservative Association 13/03/16	errors in the consultation document. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the note below Fittleworth Ward, East Lavington and Graffham are not in the Chichester constituency. • In the note below the Wisborough Green Ward, Ebernoe is not in the Chichester Constituency. • Although there are precedents in the County Divisions in this area, I would suggest that you might choose to propose the preservation of the revised wards such that they do not cross the Parliamentary Constituency boundaries. • My understanding is that there is some debate about the grouping of Lurgashall with Fernhurst and there are some interesting points in the various bits of feedback you have received. As there may be an additional councillor available within the total of 36, subject to the Selsey decision being agreed, it might be feasible to re-allocate this councillor to the north and preserve the current Plaistow Ward 2 member option to include Plaistow & Ifold, Loxwood, Lurgashall and Northchapel as currently configured. 	<p>South Downs Constituency are Fittleworth (Electorate 2,780), Petworth (Electorate 2,899) and Wisborough Green, except Northchapel (Electorate 2,287, which is too small).</p> <p>This area could be warded by leaving Fittleworth Ward as proposed (variance - 1.49% for 35 members +1.31% for 36) and combining the proposed Petworth Ward with the remainder of Wisborough Green Ward (Ebernoe, Kirdford and Wisborough Green) in a 2 member ward with a total electorate of 5,186 (variance -8.11% for 35 members, -5.50% for 36).</p> <p>However, this depends on finding an alternative solution for Northchapel, and it ignores the ties between the north-east parishes, which are the subject of representations from Kirdford and Plaistow & Ifold Parish Councils.</p> <p>Adding Lurgashall and Northchapel to the proposed Plaistow Ward creates an electorate of 3,946. This does not work for either a one-member or a two-member ward.</p>
Adrian Moss 14/03/16	<p>Fittleworth Ward</p> <p>I support the creation of a single member ward, however are concerned that the Councillor will represent one larger community and eight small communities.</p> <p>Petworth Ward</p>	

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>I support this single member ward.</p> <p>Wisborough Ward</p> <p>I support this single member ward</p> <p>Plaistow Ward</p> <p>I support this single member ward</p>	
<p>Helen Cruikshank Clerk to Northchapel Parish Council 14/03/16</p>	<p>Northchapel Parish Council has examined the review consultation and has the following comments:</p> <p>Whilst the Parish Council do not see it as a major issue for Northchapel being aligned with Wisborough Green and Kirdford, it is very concerned that the proposals indicate that it will lose its link with Lurgashall. There are many long standing and on going structural ties with Lurgashall as the parishes share a primary school and a vicar. They also share a long common boundary and have very similar issues both being small rural villages with links to the Leconfield Estates. Northchapel has more shared community life and events with Lurgashall than for example Kirdford. Northchapel and Lurgashall also have the same Parish Clerk which helps with the joint working of the two parishes.</p> <p>It's hoped CDC will take these comments into account and re-work the the proposals.</p>	<p>See comments in relation to representation from Lurgashall.</p>
<p>Helen Cruikshank Clerk to Lodsworth and Lurgashall Parish Councils Further response on 15/03/16</p>	<p>I appreciate this is a numbers game but having had Lodsworth Parish Council meeting last night where this was discussed, they also would prefer to be grouped with similar smaller sized parishes ie Lurgashall, Tillington, Graffham and Northchapel. Lodsworth shares a</p>	<p>My addition of the projected electorates of the suggested parishes is 2,708, which gives variances of -1.31% for a 36 member council and -4.04% for 35 members. This is well within the bounds of acceptability, but has</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
	<p>boundary with Graffham and they have half of Selham each in their parishes. Lodsworth also shares a postcode with these parishes and has a Petworth address so is more akin to them as rural villages. They all have similar patterns of community life and issues.</p> <p>Suggestion: Lurgashall Northchapel Ebernoe Lodsworth Tillington Graffham TOTAL: 2,797 I think</p> <p>Seems to make sense to put Petworth on its own as it is a town or could it go with the Fittleworth ward (exc Graffham) and make a two member ward . Then put Plaistow, Loxwood, WG and Kirdford together to make a two member ward? Or do the numbers not work?</p>	<p>consequences for adjoining wards which are almost certainly unacceptable.</p> <p>Petworth alone has projected electorate of 2,462, a variance of -10.28% for a 36 member council and -12.77% for 35 members, which is really too small.</p> <p>Combining Petworth alone with the rest of Fittleworth ward (after removing Graffham), has a projected electorate of 4,778, far too big for a single-member ward. For a two member ward this would have an average electorate of 2,389, giving variances of -12.93% for a 36 member council and -15.34% for 35 members.</p> <p>The proposed Fittleworth Ward without Graffham would have a projected electorate of 2,316 (variance -15.6% for 36 members; -17.93% for 35 members)</p> <p>Furthermore, removing Ebernoe and Northchapel from the proposed Wisborough Green Ward leaves that too small. It would need to be combined with the proposed Plaistow Ward, but that is too big for a single-member ward. As a two-member ward, it would have a variance of -9.51%, for a 36 member council and -12.01% for 35 members.</p> <p>Notice that all variances produced are heavily negative. This is because the suggested</p>

Respondent	Representation	Comment
		grouping carves out another ward, increasing the number of members on the Council to 37 (or back to 36 if the Selsey alternative is followed).
<p>Louise Davies Clerk, Wisborough Green Parish Council 16/03/16</p>	<p>Having reviewed the comments submitted by both Kirdford and Plaistow & Ifold Parish Councils, I write to confirm that Wisborough Green Parish Council supports the responses made by both Councils.</p> <p>Over the years, the Parishes in the north east of the Chichester District have established a close working relationship as the communities share similar issues and many common facilities. Although the proposal to alter the Wisborough Green Ward to include Ebernoe and Northchapel can be understood as a numbers exercise, there is little commonality at present. It should also be noted that both these Parishes are within the South Downs National Park with all its' implications.</p> <p>Although this amendment will have no significant impact on our Parish, we have no connections with Ebernoe nor Northchapel. As Wisborough Green has significant connections with the Parishes in this northern cluster, Kirdford, Loxwood, Plaistow & Ifold and Wisborough Green, this would appear to be a more logical grouping.</p>	<p>See comments in relation to Kirdford PC's response.</p> <p>The grouping of the four north-eastern parishes proposed here as a two-member ward is at the limit of acceptability (variance - 9.51%) for a 36 member council, and probably unacceptable (variance -12.01%) for a 35 member council.</p> <p>Northchapel is on record as wishing to be joined with Lurgashall. For comments on this see comments in relation to Lurgashall PC's responses.</p>

**CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL
ELECTORAL REVIEW 2016**

CREATING A PATTERN OF WARDS

**SUBMISSION TO
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR
ENGLAND**



Introduction

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is carrying out an electoral review of Chichester District.

The LGBCE is minded to recommend that Chichester District Council should have 36 councillors in future, compared with 48 now.

This means that new council ward boundaries need to be drawn and the LGBCE is asking for proposals, with evidence to support them, to be submitted by 4 April 2016.

This submission is Chichester District Council's own proposals for a pattern of wards for a 36 member council, to take effect for the District Council elections in 2019.

These proposals have been drawn up after a consultation exercise. An initial set of draft proposals was sent on 18 February 2016 to all members, all parish councils and chairmen of parish meetings, West Sussex County Council, South Downs National Park Authority, the local Police commander and political parties in the Chichester and Arundel and South Downs constituencies. The consultation document was also put on the Council's website and a press release was issued. Comments were invited by 14 March. All comments received by the Council are being made available to the LGBCE, whether or not the Council has adopted them.

The Statutory Criteria

Any pattern of ward boundaries needs to take into account three statutory criteria:

- 1. Electoral Equality:** This means that each councillor should represent roughly the same number of voters. The projected number of voters in the District is 98,781. (This is based on projections to 2021, as required by the LGBCE to help future-proof the new arrangements) This means that, on average, each councillor should represent about 2,744 voters. Of course, this is cannot be achieved perfectly, but the further the number of voters in a proposed ward departs from the average (especially if it is by more than $\pm 10\%$), the more persuasive the justification required on the other criteria.
- 2. Interests and identities of local communities:** This means respecting local ties and setting easily identifiable boundaries. The patterns of community life, represented by transport links, community groups, facilities such as shops, health services and community halls, and shared interests should be taken into account. In many cases parishes can be used as building blocks. The Council believes that, with the benefit of input from the public consultation and especially the comments from parish councils and its own members, it is in a uniquely strong position to be aware of this interests and identities of local communities.
- 3. Effective and convenient local government:** This means ensuring that the wards can be represented effectively by their elected councillor(s) – that wards are neither too big nor too small in extent and all parts of the wards are linked together. Wards may have more than one councillor, but not more than three.

Important Note: Nothing in what follows affects the boundaries of existing city, town or parish councils.

Chichester City

Covering existing wards: Chichester East, Chichester North, Chichester South, Chichester West.

Introduction

With a projected electorate of 23,276 voters, Chichester City would need 8.5 members to produce warding arrangements of average size.

There seems little reasonable scope for transferring any areas of the City to outlying wards in order to achieve an entitlement closer to 8 members.

We have looked at the scope for including areas which lie outside the city within the warding arrangements for the city. (This would not imply any change to the boundary of the area served by Chichester City Council). The built-up areas which lie closest to the City boundary are: Fishbourne, Stockbridge (part of Donnington parish), the hamlet of Shopwyke including the future Shopwhyke Lakes strategic development location (part of Oving parish), and Westhampnett. All of these lie outside the Chichester By-pass (A27 trunk road), which forms a very strong natural boundary along the southern perimeter of Chichester. All, except Shopwyke, have long-established distinct community identities with a range of community facilities such as shops and community halls within them.

We believe that Chichester City has a strongly distinct community identity, separate from the surrounding rural areas and the rest of the district with its pattern of villages and small towns. It is the only substantial urban area in the district and forms a centre for its extensive hinterland, with its cathedral, hospital, retail and employment centres, secondary schools, college and university, and county and district council offices. It is also a transport hub with main railway and bus stations and roads radiating out to the rest of the district and beyond.

Chichester City is also served by an active and historic city council. Although this review does not change the city boundary, it does impact on the pattern of city council wards. Each district council ward and each county electoral division boundary create a city council ward boundary. Where electoral division and district ward boundaries diverge, they create city wards between them. Whilst the LGBCE is not required to take account of this we believe that the three statutory criteria are relevant at city council level, and the impact for city ward boundaries is a relevant consideration in terms of effective and convenient local government.

Therefore, in proposing a pattern of wards for the City, we have sought co-terminosity with proposals for county electoral divisions where possible. However, these have not been settled yet, with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) putting forward counter-proposals to the LGBCE's draft recommendations. We believe that, given the overlap in time of the two reviews, the LGBCE is in a position to ensure seek co-terminosity as far

as possible in producing its final recommendations for WSCC and its draft recommendations for Chichester District Council. It would be unfortunate if divergences between district ward and county electoral divisions produce tiny single-member city council wards, which consequently greatly over-represent these areas on the City Council. In our proposals there are divergences in places, notably East Broyle and Arundel Park, but these are on sufficient scale for the creation of additional city wards to be justifiable.

In sum, we believe that Chichester City should be dealt with as a separate unit, that district ward boundaries should not cross the city boundary, and that there should be reasonable co-terminosity with county electoral division boundaries.

The next question is how many district councillors Chichester City should have.

If it has 8 members, the average ward size will be 2,910 electors. It will be under-represented on the Council.

If it has 9 members, the average ward size will be 2,586 electors. It will be over-represented on the Council.

Given the pattern that we propose in the rest of the district, it needs nine councillors to achieve an overall number of 36 councillors for the whole district. This choice is supported by the fact that the Local Plan identifies Chichester City North as the focus for substantial new development, which will not all be complete by 2021, and a strategic development location at Chichester West, which will be started by 2021 but continue to develop after that date. Both these areas lie wholly within the city

We, therefore propose a pattern of wards to provide for nine district councillors in Chichester city.

The consultation responses we have received support keeping Chichester City as a single entity, with no district wards crossing the city boundary. There is also support, and no counter-proposals, for the proposed division into five wards.

Proposals

Central Ward (1 member) (Electorate: c2,506) (Variance -8.67%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHN1 Chichester North [1] Except Broyle Road [46 electors]	City centre north of East Street, extending to Oaklands Way	c515
CHS2 Chichester South [2]	The north-west, south-east and south-west quadrants of the city centre, the Southgate area, and south of Westgate extending to the by pass	1,751

	between the Canal and Fishbourne roundabout	
Part of CHE1 Chichester East [1]	St Pancras/Hornet area	c240

The proposed Central Ward comprises the historic centre of Chichester, within the inner ring road and the city walls. It extends further to the south and west, as far as the by-pass, but these areas are mainly occupied by Chichester College and an industrial estate, with relatively few dwellings.

Chichester East Ward (2 members) (Electorate: c4,940 ÷ 2 = 2,470)
(Variance -9.99%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHE1 Chichester East [1], except St Pancras, Hornet, East Walls area	Area between St Pancras and The Hornet east of Needlemakers and the triangle bounded by New Park Road, Spitalfield Lane, St Pancras	c1,496
CHE2 Chichester East [2]	The Swanfield Estate	1,681
CHE4 Chichester East [4]	The area between Green Lane and the by-pass bounded by Oving Road and Westhampnett Road	1,469
Part of CHE3 Chichester East [3]	South side of Oving Road.	109
Part of CHN3 Chichester North [3]	The Bostock Road area and the arc south of Kingsmead Avenue	185

Chichester North Ward (2 members) (Electorate: c5,153 ÷ 2= 2,577)
(Variance -6.10%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHN2 Chichester North [2], except the East Broyle Estate and Woodlands Lane, but adding Broyle Road [46 electors] from CHN1	Area between Broyle Road/Lavant Road and St Paul's Road/Old Broyle Road, except the East Broyle Estate	c1,426
CHN3 Chichester North [3], except the Bostock Road area and the arc south of Kingsmead Avenue	Area East of Broyle Road including Summersdale and new developments at Rousillon Park, Graylingwell Park and Lower Graylingwell Graylingwell	3,727

Chichester South Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $c5,666 \div 2 = 2,833$) (Variance +3.24%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHS1 Chichester South [1]	The Whyke area south of the railway line, including Kingsham and the Willowbed Drive area east of Whyke Road	2,007
CHS3 Chichester South [3]	The Whyke area north of the railway line	2,010
CHE3 Chichester East [3], except south side of Oving Road	The Arundel Park Estate	c1,649

Chichester West Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $c5,011 \div 2 = 2,506$) (Variance -8.69%)

Polling District	Description	Projected Electorate
CHW1 Chichester West [1]	The area around Clay Lane and Fishbourne Road East and the southern end of Parklands, around Bishop Luffa School	966
CHW2 Chichester West [2]	The area between Westgate and St Paul's Road, including most of the Parklands Estate and West Broyle	3,134
Part of CHN2 Chichester North[2]	The East Broyle Estate and Woodlands Lane	c911

NB High negative variance but allows headroom for continued development at West of Chichester strategic development location.

South of Chichester District Area

Covering existing wards: Bosham, Boxgrove, Donnington, East Wittering, Fishbourne, Funtington, Lavant, North Mundham, Selsey (North and South), Sidlesham, Southbourne, Tangmere, Westbourne, West Wittering

This area excludes Chichester City, and is bounded on its northern edge by the crest of the South Downs – a long-established natural boundary. Although some parish boundaries do not precisely follow the crest of the Downs, there is virtually no population in the areas where the parish boundary and the crest diverge.

The area comprises a projected electorate of 47,146. Divided by the average ward size of 2,744, produces 17.18 members. The Council's proposal is for 17 members, which means that the area will be slightly under-represented on the Council.

Proposals

Selsey and Sidlesham Wards (One 3-member ward and one single-member ward)
(Electorate: $10,323 \div 4 = 2581$) (Variance: -5.95%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
SEN1 Selsey North [1]	Selsey	2,620
SEN2 Selsey North [2]	Selsey	3,064
SES1 Selsey South	Selsey	3,611
SID2, Sidlesham	Sidlesham	1,028

There are very strong community identity grounds for treating Selsey as a separate entity. It is the second biggest urban area in the district and, virtually, an island. However, its projected electorate of 9,295 produces a variance of +12.9% if treated as one three-member ward, which would mean the electors of Selsey would be under-represented on the Council.

If Selsey is to be combined with a neighbouring parish or parishes, this must involve Sidlesham, as Selsey's only adjoining neighbour.

Local members and Sidlesham Parish Council have strongly objected to combining Sidlesham parish with Selsey town. These objections are set out in the schedule of responses to consultation and appear to be well-founded. The Council has considered three alternative proposals.

One is to combine Sidlesham with neighbouring Birdham parish, with which it has much in common. However, this does not produce an acceptable solution on electoral equality for the rest of the Manhood.

A workshop session of councillors from the Manhood area proposed an alternative pattern of wards based on a 35 member council, described in the comments column in the schedule of responses to consultation. This combined Sidlesham with the

Donnington Ward in substitution for Hunston, which was combined with North Mundham and Oving. This has the advantage of making positive variances in other areas more acceptable. However, it makes negative variances worse, and pushes the Chichester Central, East and West Wards over the -10% tolerance. It also required the transfer of Shopwyke (including Shopwyke Lakes) to Tangmere Ward, thus splitting Oving parish. This would mean that the headroom for electorate growth arising from new development in Tangmere Ward would quickly be exhausted, as it would contain two strategic development locations. The Council believes that the pros and cons of this option are finely balanced, but that it should comply with the Commission's request for a pattern of wards for a 36 member council.

The third option took account of the excess size of the proposed Bosham Ward. It suggested adding Sidlesham to Hunston, Donnington Appledram, and a little over half of Fishbourne in a two-member ward. However, this leaves the three-member Selsey Ward with a variance of +12.9%, and creates an unwieldy ward with a mix of two urban centres (Stockbridge and Fishbourne) with nothing in common and several small rural settlements. The Council does not support this option.

The Witterings Ward(s) (3 members) (Electorate: 8,518 ÷ 3 = 2,839) (Variance +3.46%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
ESW1 Earnley	Earnley	395
ESW2 East Wittering	East Wittering & Bracklesham	1,329
ESW3 Bracklesham	East Wittering & Bracklesham	2,480
WEW1 Birdham	Birdham	1,442
WEW2 Itchenor	West Itchenor	418
WEW3 West Wittering[1]	West Wittering	1,154
WEW4 West Wittering[2]	West Wittering	1,300

The Council sought opinions on various options for this area:-

Option 1 is to leave the whole area as one three-member ward.

Option 2 is to create three single member wards as follows:-

Bracklesham Ward (Electorate: 2,875) (Variance +4.77%), comprising ESW1 Earnley and ESW3 Bracklesham

East Wittering Ward (Electorate: 2,629) (Variance -4.19%) comprising ESW2 East Wittering and WEW4 West Wittering[2]

Birdham Ward (Electorate: 3,014) (Variance +9.84%) comprising WEW1 Birdham, WEW2 Itchenor and WEW3 West Wittering[1]

Option 3 is to create a two-member ward and a single-member ward as follows:

East Wittering & Bracklesham Ward (Electorate: $5,504 \div 2 = 2,752$) (Variance +0.29%), combining the Bracklesham and East Wittering wards from option 2.

Birdham Ward – as option 2.

Options 2 and 3 involve dividing the parish of West Wittering between two different wards (although the parish boundary would not change). Polling District WEW4, although in West Wittering parish, is part of the built-up area of East Wittering and Bracklesham. In options 2 and 3 the boundary between the polling districts of East Wittering and Bracklesham could be adjusted in the interests of electoral equality.

There were mixed views in response. The proposal for one three-member ward avoids dividing West Wittering parish between wards, and seems to reflect the unity of interest of the western Manhood Peninsula. This is the option supported by the Council.

Oving Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,341) (**Variance -14.69%**)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
NOM1 North Mundham	North Mundham	1,125
NOM2 Oving	Oving	1,216

This ward is very small, nearly 15% below the norm. However, it includes, in Oving parish, the Shopwhyke Lakes Strategic Development location. This is estimated to include about 240 new dwellings by 2021 (425 electors included in the projected electorate) and a further 260 in the following five years (probably another 460 electors).

Another option is to combine this ward with the Donnington Ward as a two-member ward. This would even out the variances between the two wards, but creates a ward that arcs around the southern perimeter of the Chichester By-pass including a number of villages that have little common identity.

Donnington Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,952) (Variance +7.58%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
DON1 Appledram	Appledram	132
DON2 Donnington	Donnington	1,899
SID1 Hunston	Hunston	921

The proposal above appears to work reasonably well in relation to all three statutory criteria (electoral equality, community identity, and effective and convenient local government). However, a number of issues arise in relation to this ward, arising from questions in neighbouring wards.

Bosham Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $6,324 \div 2 = 3,162$) (Variance **+15.23%**)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FIS1 Fishbourne	Fishbourne	2,059
BOS1 Bosham	Bosham	1,599
BOS2 Broadbridge	Bosham	893
BOS3 Chidham & Hambrook	Chidham & Hambrook	1,385
SOU6 Southbourne [Chidham]	Chidham & Hambrook	388

This ward is very large, over 15% above the norm, the largest proposed ward in the district. Its electors would be under-represented on the Council.

This reflects the fact that it comprises three large parishes (Chidham & Hambrook, Bosham and Fishbourne) which are united by the A259, but separated from other parts of the south of the district by creeks of Chichester Harbour.

We have considered two alternatives to reduce its size:

1. Transfer SOU6 back to Southbourne Ward. This would reduce the variance to +8.16%, but increase the variance on the Southbourne Ward to +12.55%. It would also mean dividing the parish of Chidham & Hambrook, which would be a pity after this polling district has recently been added to it following a Community Governance review. **We do not favour this option.**
2. Ward Fishbourne parish and transfer some electors into Donnington ward. However, there is little headroom in Donnington for this. On the basis that every little helps, perhaps Apuldram Lane (about 60 electors) could be moved into Donnington ward. This would decrease the variance on Bosham ward to 14.14%, and increase that in Donnington to 9.77%. The small gains in electoral equality do not seem to justify the complication of splitting Fishbourne parish.

Southbourne Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $5,789 \div 2 = 2,895$) (Variance **+5.5%**)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
SOU1 Southbourne [1]	Southbourne	394
SOU2 Southbourne [2]	Southbourne	1,756
SOU3 Southbourne [3]	Southbourne	1,514
SOU4 Southbourne [4]	Southbourne	1,640
SOU5 Thorney Island	West Thorney	485

With the exception of Polling District SOU6, which has recently been transferred to Chidham & Hambrook Parish, this is identical with the existing three member ward. Thorney Island is a military establishment, whose electorate can, therefore, be subject to change, the only land access to which is from Southbourne.

Westbourne Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,820) (Variance +2.77%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
WES1 Westbourne	Westbourne	1,840
FUN1 Compton	Compton	329
FUN3 Marden	Marden	76
FUN4 Stansted	Stoughton	283
FUN5 Stoughton	Stoughton	292

This combines the large village of Westbourne with a hinterland of small downland villages in the River Ems valley to which it is connected by roads.

Lavant Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,726) (Variance -0.66%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FUN2 Funtington	Funtington	1,318
LAV1 Lavant	Lavant	1,408

This ward combines two parishes on the souther fringe of the South Downs, each with a medium sized village and, in Funtington's case, a number of smaller settlements. Lavant and Funtington do not have much in common, but this works well from an electoral equality viewpoint.

Goodwood Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,881) (Variance +4.99%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
BOX1 Boxgrove	Boxgrove	830
BOX2 Eartham	Eartham	78
BOX3 East Dean	East Dean	181
BOX4 Singleton	Singleton	393
BOX5 Upwaltham	Upwaltham	15
BOX6 West Dean	West Dean	339
LAV2 Westhampnett	Westhampnett	1,045

This combines the existing Boxgove Ward, which is a cluster of small downland villages mostly in the upper Lavant Valley and the larger village of Boxgrove outside the National Park, with the growing village of Westhampnett to which it is linked by the converging A285 and A27. Under our normal policy this ward would be named Westhampnett after the largest settlement, but this is in the corner of the ward, and we therefore propose the name Goodwood, as a very well-known estate which extends across much of the ward.

Tangmere Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,472) (Variance -9.91%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
TAN1 Tangmere	Tangmere	2,472

Although nearly 10% below the average projected electorate, Tangmere is a strategic development location and can be expected to continue to grow significantly after 2021.

North of the Downs Area

Covering existing wards: Bury, Easebourne, Fernhurst, Harting, Midhurst, Petworth, Plaistow, Rogate, Stedham and Wisborough Green

This is the part of the District which lies north of the crest of the South Downs. The area comprises a projected electorate of 28,359. Divided by the average ward size of 2,744, produces 10.33 members. The Council's proposal is for 10 members, which means that the area will be slightly under-represented on the Council.

Proposals

Harting Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 3,054) (**Variance: +11.3%**)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
HAR1 Elsted & Treyford	Elsted & Treyford	220
HAR2 Harting	Harting	1,042
HAR3 Nyewood	Harting	211
HAR4 Trotton	Trotton with Chithurst	285
ROG2 Rake	Rogate	462
ROG3 Rogate	Rogate	834

This ward is large, over 10% above the norm. There are two alternatives to reduce its size:

1. Transfer Elsted & Treyford to proposed Midhurst Ward
2. Transfer Trotton with Chithurst to proposed Linchmere Ward

However, both these parishes have confirmed that they have more affinity with Harting and Rogate than with parishes to the east and north. Their supporting evidence on community identity is set out in the schedule of responses to consultation.

The local member for Harting suggests Western Weald as an alternative name. The Panel does not support this, as being vague and not sufficiently descriptive of the place.

Fernhurst Ward (2 members) (Electorate: 5,431 ÷ 2 = 2716) (Variance: -1.04%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
FER1 Fernhurst	Fernhurst	2,199
FER2 Linchmere	Lynchmere	1,092
FER3 Hammer	Lynchmere	908
PLA2 Lurgashall	Lurgashall	506
ROG1 Milland	Milland	688
ROG4 Linch	Linch	38

Our consultation proposal suggested two separate single-member wards of Fernhurst (comprising Fernhurst and Lurgashall) and Lynchmere (comprising the parishes of Lynchmere, Linch and Milland).

However, Lynchmere and Milland Parishes Council have put forward a well argued case (set out in the schedule of responses to consultation) for combining them in one two-member ward. This is supported by the local district councillors. Certainly the contortions of the Fernhurst/Lynchmere parish boundary, especially in the Vann Road area, underline this case.

Lurgashall Parish Council does not want to be part of it, feeling that it has nothing in common with Fernhurst, but links more with adjoining Northchapel. The Council considers that Lurgashall's case is well-founded, but has been unable to devise a pattern of wards that provides acceptable electoral equality by which Lurgashall is detached from Fernhurst and connected to other parishes with which it feels it has more in common. Lurgashall Parish Council's representation and comments on the search for an alternative are set out in the schedule of responses to consultation.

This proposed ward includes the potential Syngenta development in Fernhurst Parish, which may produce about 450 electors and is assumed in our electorate projections to occur after 2021. Local councillors have recently come to believe that this development may come on stream earlier. The implications of this are discussed in the schedule of responses to consultation. The proposed ward does have a small negative variance, which suggests that there is some headroom for at least a start to be made on this development.

Midhurst Ward (2 members) (Electorate: $5,690 \div 2 = 2,845$) (Variance: +3.68%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
MID1 Midhurst	Midhurst	4,086
STE1 Bepton	Bepton	207
STE2 Cocking	Cocking	350
STE4 Iping	Iping	102
STE5 Stedham	Stedham	579
STE6 West Lavington	West Lavington	240
STE7 Woolbeding with Redford	Woolbeding with Redford	126

Midhurst is the third largest town in the District. On its own is too large to be a single member ward and too small to be a two member ward. Our original consultation proposals unite it with a number of parishes to the west and south in a two-member ward. There has been a suggestion (set out in the schedule of responses to consultation) that Midhurst should be divided into two roughly equal sized wards (North and South) each of which should be joined with neighbouring parishes to form two single-member wards. The local members and the Town Council do not support this.

The Council recommends one two-member ward, as in the original consultation document, except that Woolbeding and Redford Parish has expressed a preference to be grouped with Stedham with Iping, Bepton and Midhurst, rather than Easebourne. This can be accommodated without serious damage to electoral equality.

Easebourne Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,778) (Variance: +1.24%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
EAS1 Easebourne	Easebourne	2,015
EAS2 Lodsworth	Lodsworth	540
STE3 Heyshott	Heyshott	223

Easebourne is a large parish with urban characteristics where it adjoins Midhurst, but with a separate large development in progress at the former King Edward VII hospital. The parishes of Lodsworth and Heyshott do not have particularly strong ties to it, but Easebourne is not big enough to form a ward on its own. The alternative of combining Easebourne with Midhurst would require a large number of small villages to make up a corresponding rural ward, many of which would have little in common, and place a significant burden on a local district councillor to attend all their meetings.

Lodsworth has objected to being coupled with Easebourne, in much the same way as Lurgashall has objected to being paired with Fernhurst. Again, it has not been possible to devise a pattern of wards that provides acceptable electoral equality by which Lodsworth is detached from Easebourne and connected to other parishes with which it feels it has more in common. See the schedule of responses to consultation.

Fittleworth Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,780) (Variance: +1.31%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
BUR1 Barlavington	Barlavington	114
BUR2 Bignor	Bignor	89
BUR3 Bury	Bury	582
BUR4 Duncton	Duncton	296
BUR5 East Lavington	East Lavington	154
BUR6 Graffham	Graffham	464
BUR7 Sutton	Sutton	182
PET2 Fittleworth	Fittleworth	817
PET4 Stopham	Stopham	82

This ward comprises the existing Bury ward, which comprises a row of small springline villages at the foot of the scarp of the South Downs, together with the larger village of Fittleworth, to which it is connected by the B2138, and adjoining Stopham parish. It lies entirely in the Arundel & South Downs parliamentary constituency and the South Downs National Park.

Petworth Ward (1 member) (Electorate: 2,899) (Variance: +5.65%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
PET3 Petworth	Petworth	2,462
PET5 Tillington	Tillington	437

This ward comprises the small town of Petworth and adjoining parish of Tillington, to which it is connected by the A272. It lies entirely in the Arundel & South Downs parliamentary constituency and the South Downs National Park.

Loxwood Ward (2 members) (Electorate: 5,727 ÷ 2 = 2,864) (Variance: +4.35%)

Polling District	Parish	Projected Electorate
PET1 Ebernoe	Ebernoe	181
PLA1 Loxwood	Loxwood	1,254
PLA4 Plaistow & Ifold	Plaistow & Ifold	1,606
PLA3 Northchapel	Northchapel	580
WIS1 Kirdford	Kirdford	849
WIS2 Wisborough Green	Wisborough Green	1,257

Our consultation proposal suggested two separate single-member wards of Plaistow (comprising the parishes of Plaistow & Ifold and Loxwood) and Wisborough Green (comprising the parishes of Ebernoe, Kirdford, Northchapel and Wisborough Green). These work well from an electoral equality viewpoint, although there is little community identity between Ebernoe and Northchapel, which are largely in the South Downs National Park, and Kirdford and Wisborough Green, which lie almost entirely outside it.

The Council received strong representations from Kirdford Parish Council, which have been supported by Plaistow & Ifold and Wisborough Green Parish Councils, that the four north east parishes form a cluster of parish councils that work together formally on matters of common concern, and that there are patterns of local life that bring them together. These four parishes are also the main components of an area outside of the National Park that is separated from the rest of the Chichester Local Plan area by the National Park. They, therefore, have much in common on town and country planning, which is one of the District Council's major services and a large part of a district councillor's workload.

Ebernoe and Northchapel have much less in common with the four north east parishes, but the grouping only works from an electoral equality viewpoint if they are included in this ward.

Representations from the parish councils, local members and other interested parties, and comments upon them, are set out in the schedule of responses to consultation.

Naming the ward is difficult. Although Plaistow and Ifold is the largest parish it is made up of two separate villages. Loxwood appears to be, just, the largest settlement in the group, although this might be disputed by Wisborough Green or Ifold.

This ward crosses a parliamentary constituency boundary. Northchapel, Loxwood and Plaistow & Ifold are in Chichester constituency. The rest are in Arundel & South Downs. The Council does not believe this is a relevant criterion, especially as a further review of such boundaries is likely to take place soon.
