

**Chichester DC's response to the Boundary Commission England's
Parliamentary Boundary Review 2023**

In response to your initial proposals as part of the 2023 Parliamentary Boundary Review, Chichester District Council (CDC) makes the following representation:

1. Whilst it is understood that the purpose of the review is to create a more even distribution of the number of electors in each Constituency, the constraints used when developing proposals pose significant challenges as they do not allow new Constituency boundaries to be drawn up that are appropriate for representing the communities within our District.
2. There is significant concern over the proposals and the splitting of geographical areas that will not reflect the strong community linkages that are centred on major local centres such as Chichester City. This has the potential to negatively affect how those communities are represented in Parliament.
3. There is major concern with the proposal to split the Manhood Peninsula in two, with the Witterings Ward being part of Chichester CC and the rest of the peninsula being part of Bognor CC. The Manhood has a shared identity with many consistent issues and challenges including environmental, infrastructure, planning, tourism, education, demographic and employment factors with several partnerships and organisations established that cover the whole area, these include the Manhood Peninsula Partnership, Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group, the Manhood Community Forum as well as single secondary school for the area.
4. The peninsula has a strong link to Chichester City as its nearest major settlement and this is not reflected in the proposed Constituency. The proposed removal of part of the Manhood Peninsula from Chichester would mean that there could not be a coherent representation for the local area and its communities.
5. The proposals will also separate Chichester City from the areas in the North Mundham and Tangmere Ward immediately East and South East of the city that are very closely associated and linked to the City with regards to transport, planning, education and economic activity, with further ongoing major development in this Ward.
6. Given this level of concern we would like you to publish the details of the coastal strip proposals that were considered as mentioned in paragraph 80 in the proposals for the South East and for these to be reassessed, taking into consideration the impact of overall breakage of local linkages in the South Eastern part of Chichester District.
7. We note that you have created a sub region of West and East Sussex and Brighton, which does not take into account the boundary and identity of the South Downs National Park. If there was flexibility on the newly created sub region then it would allow the proposals to be redesigned in a way that allowed some Northern Wards

within Chichester District to be within the boundaries of Constituencies based on the local major settlements within Hampshire (Petersfield) and Surrey (Haslemere), to which they are closely associated. We would then need to consider the potential impact of creating further orphan Wards but this would feel more appropriate for electors living in these areas, noting there is sufficient headroom in those adjacent proposed Constituencies to accommodate the additional numbers.

8. There is significant concern that you are proposing a small orphan Ward of Fittleworth with an electorate of just 2,666. The Ward has little in common with the rest of the proposed Constituency which is predominately made up of Littlehampton and Arundel. This goes against the aims of your proposals contained in Paragraph 37 of the Guidance.
9. CDC undertook a boundary review which concluded in 2017. This review reduced the number of Councillors from 48 to 36, as a result of this several larger Wards were created and in some cases we recognise this has already been a compromise in terms of local identity. Therefore using these District Wards as building blocks is not appropriate in some cases and using Parish boundaries would provide more flexibility and better capture the local sense of place.
10. Providing a tolerance level of plus or minus 5% of the average electorate significantly limits the flexibility required to create more satisfactory Constituencies centred on major local centres such as Chichester City. It is suggested that the 10% tolerance used in local government boundary reviews would be more appropriate. The priority given to achieving the electorate numbers within the narrow tolerance creates a damaging impact on the link between MPs and their constituents by requiring very substantial changes and by breaking linkages within local areas. The requirements of the Act should be reconsidered.
11. The proposed Bognor Regis CC is at the top end of the tolerance levels in terms of number of electors. Given the significant levels of underway and planned development in both the West of Arun District and the North Mundham and Tangmere Ward, the number of electorates in this proposed Constituency would very quickly rise significantly above the +5% tolerance.
<https://www.chichester.gov.uk/newlocalplan> <https://www.arun.gov.uk/adopted-local-plan/>
12. Given the constraints of the Act governing this process and the restrictions of the Sussex sub-region, in order to address the main concerns CDC has in relation to the splitting of the Manhood Peninsula and the orphaning of Fittleworth Ward, please find attached an alternative proposal for the Arundel and Littlehampton (proposed amended name Arundel, Littlehampton East and South Downs), Bognor Regis (proposed amended name Bognor Regis and Littlehampton West) and Chichester CCs. Given the strength of the concern over the proposed splitting of the Manhood Peninsula, and to achieve an alternative that addresses this whilst meeting the required upper limit of number of electors, we propose splitting the Ward of Easebourne so that the Parish of Lodsworth moves into the Arundel, Littlehampton and South Downs CC as set out in option A. An alternative to this proposal, option B,

would maintain the whole of Easebourne Ward within Chichester CC, however this would take the electorate numbers above the proposed ceiling by 0.5%.

13. Both of these options are preferable to your proposals as they maintain the strong and obvious links between the Manhood Peninsula and Chichester City, some Ward in the north of Chichester District are used to being in a separate constituency (previously Arundel and Southdowns) and this reflects the linkages with Chichester as a major settlement being less exclusive in the northern Wards.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Map for Option A

Appendix 2 – Map for Option B

Appendix 3 – Electorate numbers for Options A & B