

**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 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 these 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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%**)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%**)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%**)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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%)

<b>Polling District</b>	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Projected Electorate</b>
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.

---