

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Greater Bognor Regis	8
Central Rural Arun	10
Greater Littlehampton	12
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	18
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	20
B Table B1: Final recommendations for Arun District Council	24

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Arun to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in August 2011.

This review was conducted in four stages:

Stage starts	Description
28 February 2012	Initial consultation – all interested parties invited to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
8 May 2012	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
4 September 2012	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
4 December 2012	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 53 members, comprising a pattern of 16 two-member and seven three-member wards. The recommendations were broadly based on a combination of Arun District Council's submission and a joint submission from the opposition groups. Our draft recommendations for Arun sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

Submissions received

During Stage Three, the Commission received 104 submissions, including one from Sir Peter Bottomley MP (Worthing West), 13 from local councillors, a submission from Arun District Council comprising further comments from local councillors, 11 from parish and town councils, one from a local organisation, and 77 from members of the public. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

Arun District Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 8.2% over this period. The electorate forecasts include large-scale

developments in Littlehampton, Bersted and Felpham. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations. As a result, we have proposed amendments to ward boundaries in the south-east of the district, to wards in Littlehampton, Rustington, East Preston, Angmering and Ferring.

Our final recommendations for Arun are that the Council should have 54 members, with 15 two-member wards and eight three-member wards. Two of the wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2018.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Arun District Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Arun District Council, in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

You can also view our final recommendations for Arun District Council on our interactive maps at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Arun District Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submission received from Arun District Council during the initial stage of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Arun District Council*, which were published on 4 September 2012. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 3 December 2012.

What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Arun?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2010 electorate figures, more than 30% of the existing wards have 10% more or fewer electors per councillor than the district average, and the Council requested an electoral review.

How will our recommendations affect you?

6 Our recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also determine which electoral ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish ward you vote in. Your electoral ward name may change, as may the names of parish wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Arun.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Arun District Council is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

10 Legislation also requires that our recommendations are not based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but reflect estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward.

11 The achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. In all our reviews we therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

12 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Arun District Council or the external boundaries or names of parish or town councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that our recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions Received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Arun District Council (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received a submission from the Council relating to council size, 11 submissions during the formulation of our draft recommendations, and 101 submissions during our consultation on the draft recommendations. A further three submissions were received shortly after the consultation closed on draft recommendations which we were able to take into account in reaching our conclusions. All submissions may be inspected at both our

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

14 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have been assisted by officers at Arun District Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

Electorate Figures

15 As part of this review, Arun District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2018, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 8.2% over the six-year period from 2012–18.

16 While this is a relatively large increase in electorate, we are satisfied that the largest developments – in the Bersted, Felpham and Littlehampton – are correctly projected to add a large number of electors to the district by 2018. Outside of specific development and urban areas, growth in the electorate is modest within the six-year period.

17 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content to use their figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

Council Size

18 Arun District Council currently has 56 councillors elected from 26 district wards, comprising two single-member, 18 two-member and six three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed a council size of 53, a reduction of three from the existing council size.

19 In support of its proposal, the Council provided extensive evidence relating to the representative role of councillors and the increased complexity of councillor workloads. The Council argued that a small reduction would improve efficiency, but had concerns that a large reduction would damage the ability of councillors to represent their communities and effectively conduct council business. We carefully considered the evidence received and were minded to agree a council size of 53. We invited the Council and other interested parties to submit proposals for warding arrangements based on a council size of 53.

20 During the initial consultation on warding arrangements, the Council argued that only a council size of 56 enabled a satisfactory pattern of wards. However, the submission did not discuss the council size in relation to governance and management of council business, or the representational role and workload of councillors. As we had received stronger evidence from the Council for a council size of 53 than 56 earlier in the review, we based our draft recommendations on 53 members.

21 During consultation on our draft recommendations, we again received submissions based on a council size of 56. These made the assertion that as a council size of 53 created an unsatisfactory warding arrangement, the council should retain 56 members. We do not consider that a case has been made to move to a council size of 56.

22 However, we are able to consider a council size either one above or below that which we had been previously minded to adopt that better reflects our statutory criteria. During consultation on the draft recommendations a number of submissions suggested warding arrangements requiring one additional councillor. We therefore considered alternative warding arrangements based on council sizes of 52 and 54. In order to reflect consultation responses in the east of the district, we have based our final recommendations on a council size of 54.

Electoral fairness

23 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

24 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (114,477 in 2011 and 123,886 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 54 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,119 in 2011 and 2,294 by 2018.

25 Under our final recommendations, only two of our proposed 23 wards will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the district by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our final recommendations for Arun.

General Analysis

26 We received 104 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations.

27 In the Greater Bognor Regis area, we received submissions concerning the boundary between Felpham East and Yapton, in the Flansham area. We also received objections to the revised parish warding consequential to our draft recommendations.

28 In Central Rural Arun, we received objections from residents of Walberton to our proposal for a ward covering both Arundel and Walberton. We also received objections from residents of Findon to our proposal to place Findon in a three-member ward with Angmering.

29 In the Greater Littlehampton area, we received a large number of submissions from residents in the East Preston area, expressing opposition to the proposal to place part of East Preston parish in a Rustington East ward. We also received submissions objecting to part of southern Angmering being included in our proposed Ferring ward. Submissions also objected to the proposed Brookfield ward containing part of Rustington parish. In the Littlehampton area we received an alternative warding arrangement from Littlehampton Town Council.

30 Our final recommendations result in 54 councillors representing 15 two-member

and eight three-member wards. A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table B1 (on pages 24–25) and the map accompanying this report.

Electoral Arrangements

31 This section of the report details the submissions received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Arun. The following areas are considered in turn:

- Greater Bognor Regis (page 8)
- Central Rural Arun (page 10)
- Greater Littlehampton (page 12)

Greater Bognor Regis

32 The draft recommendations for greater Bognor Regis were for 10 two-member wards and one three-member ward. During the first stage of consultation, we received submissions concerning Bognor Regis from Bognor Regis Town Council and two local residents, in addition to the warding patterns from the Council and opposition groups on the Council. We also received three submissions relating to the Felpham and Yapton area.

33 Our draft recommendations for Bognor Regis and Bersted were broadly based on the opposition groups' scheme, with some minor modifications. We departed from their proposal for the boundary between Bersted and Orchard wards, using the centre of Fairlands (a residential road) as a boundary. We also made a minor change to the boundary between the proposed Pevensey and Marine wards around Burnham Avenue, in order to improve electoral equality.

Bognor Regis and Bersted

34 During our consultation on draft recommendations, we received five submissions specifically relating to Bognor Regis and Bersted. Of these, two were from parish and town councils, and two from parish and town councillors. We also received comments from the Council relating to this area.

35 Bersted Parish Council argued for the entirety of Bersted parish to fall within one district ward. It stated that this would ensure effective community representation for all residents of Bersted. It also argued for the removal of parish warding in Bersted, on the grounds that the existing parish warding arrangement had not provided convenient and effective parish governance.

36 We note that a Bersted ward entirely coterminous with Bersted parish would contain 13% more electors per councillor than the district average. Although Bersted Parish Council provided some community evidence in support of a coterminous parish and district ward, we do not consider that the evidence provided is sufficient to justify this level of electoral inequality.

37 Although we acknowledge Bersted Parish Council's concerns regarding parish warding, we must have regard to district wards when creating parish warding arrangements. We cannot remove the parish wards in this instance. We are therefore confirming as final our draft recommendations in Bersted.

38 In Bognor Regis, we received submissions from Councillor Nash (Pevensey ward), Bognor Regis Town Council, and two councillors on Bognor Regis Town Council. All representations were broadly supportive of our draft recommendations. However, Bognor Regis Town Council and the two town councillors also requested amended parish warding arrangements, suggesting that parish wards remain entirely coterminous with district wards.

39 When creating parish wards, we are required to ensure that no parish ward crosses either a district ward or a county electoral division boundary. We explored the possibility of amending our draft recommendations in order to simplify the parish warding arrangements. However, we found that the draft recommendations for district wards would have to be significantly changed in order to provide a simpler pattern of parish wards. As all submissions received were supportive of the district warding arrangements, we are not minded to amend our draft recommendations, so are therefore unable to change the parish warding arrangements in Bognor Regis.

40 As the submissions received were broadly supportive of the district warding arrangements in Bognor Regis, we are confirming as final our draft recommendations for this area.

Felpham and Yapton

41 During our consultation on draft recommendations, we received six submissions relating to the Flansham area, between Felpham and Yapton. Councillor English (Felpham ward) supported our draft recommendation to place Flansham in Felpham East. The other five representations, from Yapton Parish Council, Flansham Residents Association, and three residents, disagreed and suggested Flansham should be placed in Yapton ward.

42 When drawing up our draft recommendations, we noted that the settlement of Flansham is not directly linked to the remainder of Yapton parish. Instead, residents must travel through neighbouring Middleton-on-Sea parish in order to reach the village of Yapton. The submissions received from Yapton Parish Council, Flansham Residents Association, Councillor Holman (Felpham East ward) and two local residents acknowledged this, but also argued that a relief road being built between the settlements of Felpham and Flansham would provide a strong boundary between the two communities. While we accept that the relief road may become a strong boundary, we note that the settlement of Flansham is still significantly closer geographically to Felpham than to Yapton.

43 Yapton Parish Council also stated that it was seeking to have the parish boundary with Middleton-on-Sea parish amended, so that in future Flansham would have access to the remainder of Yapton parish. Were this to be the case, the issue of access within Yapton parish would be resolved. It is, of course, open to the district council to undertake a community governance review to address the parish boundary issue and, subject to the outcome of that review, to seek related alterations to district ward boundaries. We will consider any such request received. However, we are only able to make our recommendations based on the boundaries as they exist at the moment. Accordingly, we are confirming as final our draft recommendations for Felpham and Yapton.

44 We did not receive any submissions relating to ward boundaries in Aldwick, Middleton-on-Sea, or Pagham. We are confirming as final our draft recommendations in these areas.

45 We received a submission from a member of the public concerning alternative names for wards, including some in the Greater Bognor Regis area. However, we consider that the ward names proposed in our draft recommendations suitably describe the wards and so confirm those names.

46 Our final recommendations for the Greater Bognor Regis area are for 11 two-member Aldwick East, Aldwick West, Felpham East, Felpham West, Hotham, Marine, Middleton-on-Sea, Orchard, Pagham, Pevensey and Yapton wards, and one three-member Bersted ward. These wards are projected to have 3% fewer, 8% more, 6% more, 9% more, 5% fewer, 3% more, 8% fewer, 3% fewer, 8% more, 7% fewer, 4% fewer and 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

47 These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

Central Rural Arun

48 Our draft recommendations for Central Rural Arun were for the three-member wards of Angmering & Findon, Arundel & Walberton, and Barnham.

Arundel, Walberton and Barnham

49 During our consultation on draft recommendations, we received six submissions relating to our proposed Arundel & Walberton and Barnham wards. Submissions were received from Walberton and Slindon parish councils, from Councillor Dingemans (Walberton ward) and Councillor Dendle (Arundel ward), jointly from councillors Charles, Goad and Maconachie (Barnham ward), and from a local resident.

50 Councillors Charles, Goad and Maconachie stated that they were satisfied with the proposed Barnham ward.

51 The remaining submissions relating to this area objected to our proposal for a three-member Arundel & Walberton ward, arguing that Walberton and Arundel did not share community identity. The local resident stated that the A27 road was not a link between the areas containing Fontwell and Walberton and the Arundel area. The local resident also argued that Fontwell's and Walberton's needs would be damaged by being placed in a ward with Arundel.

52 Slindon Parish Council stated that it supported a single-member Walberton ward, and suggested that a multi-member ward covering Arundel and Walberton would cause confusion for local residents about which member to approach.

53 We accept the central argument that Arundel and Walberton are two separate communities without close links. However, we also note that an Arundel and Walberton ward would not divide communities between different wards, but rather unite two different communities. We do not accept the local resident's argument that the communities in the Walberton area would be disadvantaged by including the entire area in a ward with Arundel.

54 Although a single-member Walberton ward would have good electoral equality, containing 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, this would have a detrimental effect on Arundel. A two-member Arundel ward containing

the remainder of the Arundel & Walberton ward proposed in our draft recommendations would have 16% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. We are not persuaded by the evidence received that there is sufficient reason to justify this high level of electoral inequality. The only way to create wards with acceptable electoral equality would therefore be to split either Slindon or Walberton parishes and, as the evidence received points to these being strong communities or parishes, we do not believe this presents the best balance of the statutory criteria.

55 Therefore, in order to ensure a reasonable level of electoral equality while ensuring that no communities are split between wards, we are confirming as final our draft recommendations for Arundel & Walberton, and Barnham. These wards would have 4% fewer and equal to the district average electors per councillor by 2018 respectively.

Angmering and Findon

56 We received four submissions regarding our proposed Angmering & Findon ward. These were from Findon Parish Council, Councillor Jones (Findon ward), and two local residents.

57 All submissions argued that Findon was a distinct community, separate to Angmering, with different community links, and notably without a direct public transport link. Findon Parish Council expressed a concern that being included in a ward with Angmering would lead to Findon's interests not being adequately represented. Councillor Jones noted that Findon, Patching and Clapham were rural, historic villages of different character to 'the more modern Angmering'.

58 Although a single-member Findon ward, incorporating the parishes of Findon, Patching and Clapham, would have good electoral equality, containing 5% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, this would have a detrimental effect on electoral equality in Angmering. A two-member Angmering ward containing the remainder of the Angmering & Findon ward proposed in our draft recommendations would have 19% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018 – an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality which could only be addressed by dividing Angmering between wards.

59 Although we accept that including Findon in a ward with Angmering is not an ideal situation for residents of Findon, we consider that it is preferable to place two communities together than to divide one community. Under our final recommendations a three-member Angmering & Findon ward would contain 11% more electors per councillor than the district average.

60 Therefore, in order to ensure a reasonable level of electoral equality while ensuring that no communities are divided between wards, we are confirming our draft recommendations for Angmering and Findon with a small modification to include the area around Ecclesden Manor in order not to create an unviable parish ward.

61 Our final recommendations for Central Rural Arun are for three three-member wards of Angmering & Findon, Arundel & Walberton, and Barnham. These wards would have 11% more, 4% fewer and equal to the district average number of electors per councillor by 2018 respectively.

62 These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

Greater Littlehampton

East Preston, Ferring and Rustington East

63 We received 71 representations on the boundaries between East Preston, Ferring and Rustington East. All these submissions objected to our draft recommendations in this area. Those that offered an alternative expressed a preference for the current ward boundaries to remain unchanged.

64 In the East Preston area the predominant objection was that our proposed boundary between East Preston and Rustington East divided the community. Under our draft recommendations, St Mary's Church, Langmead Recreation Ground and the Willowhayne Estate would be placed in a ward with Rustington East. Submissions, including those from Sir Peter Bottomley MP and East Preston Parish Council, asserted that these areas were integral parts of the community of East Preston. Local residents were particularly concerned at the prospect of St Mary's Church being placed in Rustington East ward, arguing that this split the village of East Preston and divided a community.

65 Our proposed Ferring ward also drew comment, particularly regarding the inclusion of the southern part of Angmering parish. While respondents agreed with our rationale for keeping Ferring and Kingston in separate wards, they argued that the same reasoning should be applied to keep Ferring and South Angmering in separate wards. Ferring Parish Council also argued that Ferring was a natural community and that its strong sense of separation from the remainder of the district made a case for a Ferring ward comprising only Ferring parish.

66 We note that, as argued in submissions, Ferring is a disconnected community, with its own unique identity distinct from the remainder of the district. However, South Angmering is separated from Ferring by what a respondent referred to as a 'strategic gap', and looks either to Angmering or East Preston. Including South Angmering with Ferring places a small section of a different community with an area to which it does not have community ties.

67 A two-member Ferring ward incorporating only Ferring parish would contain 16% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018 under a council size of 53. Several submissions suggested that we depart from the figure of 53 councillors which was adopted following the submission made by Arun District Council during initial discussions on council size. Submissions including that by Ferring Parish Council suggested adopting a council size of 56 in order to facilitate a two-member Ferring ward.

68 In light of the representations received, we considered whether an adjusted council size might resolve the concerns expressed to us in relation to this area. A two-member Ferring ward under a council size of 54 rather than 56 would contain 14% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. While we would often consider that a poor level of electoral equality was undesirable, in this instance we are content that a sufficient level of community evidence has been received to support a two-member Ferring ward incorporating Ferring parish only.

69 As a result of our recommendations for Ferring, the South Angmering area needs to be included in a ward with either East Preston or Angmering. We note that

in the submissions received, there was no strong case made regarding which of these it identified with, merely that it did not identify with Ferring.

70 When touring the area, we noted that the South Angmering area, south of the A259, is part of a contiguous development with the northern part of East Preston. Angmering Village is separated from South Angmering by the A259, and is less urban in character. Furthermore, in East Preston, a large number of submissions suggested that the ward boundaries should be identical to those currently existing. Without including South Angmering, East Preston would contain 10% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. By including South Angmering, it would have 2% more. Accordingly, we propose to place South Angmering in East Preston ward.

71 Our proposals for Angmering would have a knock-on effect on Rustington East ward, making it a two-member ward with 24% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. To counter this, we are proposing the boundary between Rustington East and Rustington West should be identical to the current ward boundary.

72 Overall, this means that in order to better reflect community identities, we are amending our draft recommendations in this area to provide two two-member Ferring and Rustington East wards, and a three-member East Preston ward.

Littlehampton and Rustington West

73 In Rustington West and Littlehampton, we received seven submissions relating to our draft recommendations, including a warding pattern in Littlehampton from Littlehampton Town Council. The majority of these representations argued against the inclusion of the north-western part of Rustington parish in Brookfield ward. In particular, Councillor Clayden's submission highlighted the strength of the community of Rustington as a whole, and argued that those residents of north-western Rustington look towards Rustington centre for their shopping and other community needs.

74 As a consequence of our final recommendations for Rustington East (paragraphs 64–72), the remainder of our proposed Rustington West ward would have 10% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. In order to take account of the arguments made during consultation and to improve electoral equality, we are proposing to include the north-western part of Rustington in Rustington West ward.

75 In Littlehampton, Littlehampton Town Council proposed an alternative warding pattern to reflect community identities. This included a two-member Courtwick with Toddington ward entirely north of the A259, an amended Brookfield ward including the small area around Oakcroft Gardens, a Ham ward running from the A259 in the west to the area around Littlehampton Community School in the east, and a slightly amended boundary between Beach and Central (named River in their scheme) wards.

76 We received further support for a two-member Wick with Toddington ward from a local resident, saying that the socio-economic differences between the two areas meant the two did not share a common identity, and had different issues.

77 Littlehampton Town Council's scheme was supported by evidence of community identities. However, it did not provide for good electoral equality. Given our final recommendations are based on a council size of 54, Littlehampton Town Council's proposed Courtwick with Toddington ward would contain 14% fewer electors than the district average by 2018. Given current electoral figures, this ward would contain 37% fewer electors per councillor than the district average directly upon implementation. We consider that there is insufficient justification for such a poor level of electoral equality.

78 Additionally, Littlehampton Town Council's proposed Wick ward would have no internal access, with residents of the Grove Crescent and Thorncroft Road area being cut off from the remainder of the ward.

79 As a result of our final recommendations for Rustington West (paragraph 74), the remainder of our proposed Brookfield ward would contain 14% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. Therefore, we are proposing to place the areas east of Elm Grove School, Cornfield School and Littlehampton Community School in a two-member Brookfield ward. This ensures a good level of electoral equality throughout the Littlehampton area.

80 Littlehampton Town Council also suggested alternative ward names in Littlehampton. As such, we are proposing to rename our proposed Central ward as 'River', and our proposed Wick with Toddington ward as 'Courtwick with Toddington'.

81 Littlehampton Town Council also expressed a preference for coterminous parish and district wards. However, as in the Bersted and Bognor Regis areas (paragraphs 34–40), we are required to recommend parish warding which takes into account both district wards and county divisions.

82 Our final recommendations for the Greater Littlehampton area are for four two-member Beach, Brookfield, Ferring and Rustington East wards, and four three-member Courtwick with Toddington, East Preston, River and Rustington West wards. These wards would have 6% fewer, 1% more, 14% fewer, 1% fewer, 1% more, 2% more, 4% fewer and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

83 These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

Conclusions

84 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements – final recommendations

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2018
Number of councillors	54	54
Number of wards	23	23
Average number of electors per councillor	2,119	2,294
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation
 Arun District Council should comprise 54 councillors serving 23 wards, as detailed and named in Table B1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

85 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

86 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the respective principal authority (the district or borough council in the area) has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

87 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Aldingbourne, Aldwick, Angmering, Bersted, Bognor Regis, Eastergate, Felpham, and Littlehampton.

88 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Aldingbourne parish.

Final recommendations

Aldingbourne Parish Council should return 10 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Racecourse (returning one member) and Aldingbourne & Westergate (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

89 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Aldwick parish.

Final recommendations

Aldwick Parish Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Aldwick East (returning six members), Aldwick West (returning five members), Barrack Lane (returning one member) and St Richard's (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

90 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Angmering parish.

Final recommendations

Angmering Parish Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Angmering Village (returning 11 members) and South Angmering (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

91 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Bersted parish.

Final recommendations

Bersted Parish Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Bersted Brooks (returning two members), Bersted Green (returning one member) and Bersted North (returning 11 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

92 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Bognor Regis parish.

Final recommendations

Bognor Regis Town Council should return 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Hatherleigh (returning one member), Hotham (returning four members), Marine (returning three members), Marine North (returning one member), Orchard (returning four members) and Pevensy (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

93 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Eastergate parish.

Final recommendations

Eastergate Parish Council should return nine parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Fontwell (returning one member), and Eastergate and West Barnham (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

94 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Felpham parish.

Final recommendations

Felpham Parish Council should return 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Felpham East (returning eight members), and Felpham West (returning eight members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

95 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Littlehampton parish.

Final recommendations

Littlehampton Town Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Beach (returning three members), Brookfield (returning two members), Cornfield (returning one member), Courtwick with Toddington (returning two members), Elm Grove (returning one member), Ham (returning two members), River (returning three members), and Wick (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

96 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Arun District Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Arun District Council in 2015.

Equalities

97 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Arun

98 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Arun District Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Arun District Council.

You can also view our final recommendations for Arun District Council on our interactive maps at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority

Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or ward represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town Council'
Parish (or Town) Council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council

PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Committee for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or ward varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

Appendix B

Table B1: Final recommendations for Arun District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2018)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Aldwick East	2	4,478	2,239	6%	4,447	2,224	-3%
2	Aldwick West	2	4,951	2,476	17%	4,954	2,477	8%
3	Angmering & Findon	3	7,179	2,393	13%	7,642	2,547	11%
4	Arundel & Walberton	3	6,511	2,170	2%	6,619	2,206	-4%
5	Barnham	3	6,433	2,144	1%	6,871	2,290	0%
6	Beach	2	3,874	1,937	-9%	4,327	2,164	-6%
7	Bersted	3	5,687	1,896	-11%	7,197	2,399	5%
8	Brookfield	2	4,479	2,240	6%	4,639	2,320	1%
9	Courtwick with Toddington	3	5,410	1,803	-15%	6,978	2,326	1%
10	East Preston	3	6,835	2,278	7%	6,993	2,331	2%
11	Felpham East	2	4,177	2,089	-1%	4,849	2,425	6%
12	Felpham West	2	3,752	1,876	-11%	4,986	2,493	9%

Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Arun District Council

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2018)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13 Ferring	2	3,996	1,998	-6%	3,944	1,972	-14%
14 Hotham	2	3,832	1,916	-10%	4,367	2,184	-5%
15 Marine	2	4,160	2,080	-2%	4,704	2,352	3%
16 Middleton-on-Sea	2	4,191	2,096	-1%	4,238	2,119	-8%
17 Orchard	2	4,243	2,122	0%	4,442	2,221	-3%
18 Pagham	2	4,942	2,471	17%	4,967	2,484	8%
19 Pevensey	2	3,639	1,820	-14%	4,252	2,126	-7%
20 River	3	6,219	2,073	-2%	6,614	2,205	-4%
21 Rustington East	2	4,459	2,230	5%	4,541	2,271	-1%
22 Rustington West	3	6,679	2,226	5%	6,894	2,298	0%
23 Yapton	2	4,321	2,161	2%	4,421	2,211	-4%
Totals	54	114,477	–	–	123,886	–	–
Averages	–	–	2,119	–	–	2,294	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Arun District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.