

**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: $8,518 \div 3 = 2,839$) (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: $5,504 \div 2 = 2,752$) (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