



Governance Committee – 3 June 2016

Please find attached item 5 (East Sussex Electoral Boundary Review) for consideration at the Governance Committee meeting being held on 3 June 2016. This item was marked as to follow on the agenda published on 25 May.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to: **Governance Committee**

Date: **3 June 2016**

By: **Assistant Chief Executive**

Title of report: **New electoral arrangements for East Sussex County Council**

Purpose of report: **To consider the County Council's submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in respect of the review of East Sussex County Council electoral boundaries.**

RECOMMENDATION: The Governance Committee is recommended to approve the County Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's proposals for East Sussex County Council electoral divisions as set out in the appendix to this report.

1. Supporting Information

1.1 Further to the County Council's submission agreed by Council on 1 December 2015, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) has published a set of draft proposals for consultation. The thirteen-week consultation period ends on 16 June 2016.

1.2 The draft proposals are for new county electoral division (CED) boundaries and new ward boundaries for each of East Sussex's five district and borough councils. The Commission is proposing that East Sussex County Council has 50 councillors in the future, one more than the current arrangements.

1.3 The full LGBCE recommendations and interactive maps are available on the Commission's website at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk and www.lgbce.org.uk. The website also includes: a table of electoral figures on which the proposals are based; technical guidance on the review process and details of the supporting legislation.

1.4 The LGBCE has stated that the aims of the boundary review are to:

- deliver *electoral equality* for local voters so that each councillor represents a similar number of electors;
- ensure that our proposals reflect the *interests and identities of local communities* across East Sussex; and
- ensure that the pattern of wards or divisions helps the Council to deliver *effective local government* to local people.

1.5 Hard copies of the Commission's report and maps were distributed to Council buildings and libraries, and were made available in the Member and Cabinet rooms.

1.6 On 10 May 2016, County Council agreed to delegate authority to the Governance Committee to consider all proposed amendments from County Councillors and the Boundary Review Reference Group and agree the Council's final submission to the LGBCE.

1.7 The Reference Group has met and made the following comments which have been incorporated into the proposed County Council response at Appendix 1:

- Eastbourne: Old Town / Ratton CEDs boundary: The Reference Group reemphasised the critical importance of coterminosity between ward and divisions in Eastbourne. It supported the pattern that provides for best electoral equality which equates to the proposed changes by Eastbourne Borough Council (and endorsed by ESCC in its previous submission).

- Eastbourne: Sovereign / St Anthony's CEDs boundary: The Reference Group agreed with the proposal by Eastbourne Borough Council to retain the current boundary and not to support the changes proposed by the Commission.
- Lewes: Seaford North, Seaford South and Newhaven & Bishopstone proposed CEDs: Although there were only very minor differences between the ESCC submission and the LGBCE proposals, the Commission specifically invited comments on its proposed Newhaven & Bishopstone proposed division. In making a suggested boundary change affecting the proposed Seaford North and Seaford South divisions, the Reference Group sought to address the 13% variance in this division and suggested an outline pattern of CEDs that appears to be more acceptable locally and has more similarities to the current pattern.
- Wealden: Hooe: The Group unanimously supported WDC's proposal to retain Hooe parish within the proposed Horam & Eastern Villages CED and not in the Pevensey & Stone Cross CED as proposed by the Commission.
- Name changes: The reference Group proposed name changes for the following CEDs:
 - Hartfield to Wealden North
 - Horam and Eastern Villages to Wealden East
 - Wadhurst to Wealden North East

1.8 Appendix 1 to this report comprises the proposed submission from the County Council to the LGBCE's consultation for East Sussex.

1.9 The Commission aims to publish its final recommendations in September – October 2016. Assuming that Parliament is satisfied with the recommendations, the new boundaries will come into effect at the next local elections: 2017 for East Sussex County Council, 2018 for Hastings Borough Council and 2019 for Eastbourne Borough Council, Lewes District Council, Rother District Council and Wealden District Council.

2. Conclusion and decision

2.1 The Governance Committee is recommended to consider the draft submission in the appendix to this report and approve the County Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's review of East Sussex County Council boundaries.

PHILIP BAKER
Assistant Chief Executive

Contact Officer: Paul Dean, Member Services Manager. Tel: 01273 481751

Local Member: All

Background Documents: None

Submission by East Sussex County Council on the new electoral arrangements for East Sussex

3 June 2016

Electoral review

This document contains the comments by East Sussex County Council on the Commission's proposals. In reaching its views, ESCC has taken account of following three main considerations:

- *Electoral equality*: each local county councillor represents a similar number of voters
- *Community identity*: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- *Effective and convenient local government*: helping the county council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

East Sussex County Council currently has 49 councillors. Based on the evidence submitted during previous phases of the review, LGBCE considers that a slight increase in council size by one to 50 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively. ESCC endorses the proposal that East Sussex County Council shall comprise 50 county councillors with 50 single-member Divisions (CEDs) allocated to each district and borough as follows:

- Eastbourne Borough 9
- Hastings Borough 8
- Lewes District 9
- Rother District 9
- Wealden District 15

The following tables detail East Sussex County Council's response to LGBCE's draft proposals for each area of East Sussex.

EASTBOURNE BOROUGH

ESCC comments are set out in the table below.

Eastbourne CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Devonshire	+4%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. It considers that the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has included these divisions as part of their draft recommendations.	ESCC is content with LGBCE proposals.
Hampden Park	-9%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.		
Langney	-5%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.		
Meads	-1%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.		

Eastbourne CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Old Town	+2%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions.	ESCC considers it essential to maintain coterminosity between ward and CED boundaries whichever alternative the Commission decides upon.
Ratton	-10%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.	<p>LGBCE proposes retaining the existing boundaries (between Old Town and Ratton) and rejects the alternative proposals.</p> <p>The existing arrangements allow for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries.</p>	ESCC supports the pattern in respect of this boundary that provides for best electoral equality which equates to the proposed changes by Eastbourne Borough Council (and endorsed by ESCC in its previous submission).

Eastbourne CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Sovereign	+6%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.	The whole-county submission proposed to keep Sovereign division the same as at present. However, LGBCE considers that the	ESCC concurs with the unanimous view of Eastbourne Borough Council that LGBCE proposals to change the boundary between St. Anthony's and Sovereign wards/CEDs are unnecessary. LGBCE is requested to reconsider its proposals on the grounds that:
St Anthony's	5%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.	<p>Queen's Crescent area looks more towards St Anthony's than to the centre of Sovereign division; LGBCE proposes including this area in St Anthony's instead of Sovereign.</p> <p>LGBCE also considers that the Langney Green and Monarch Gardens area is more a part of the Sovereign area than it is of St Anthony's as it is separated from the remainder of St Anthony's by the Langney Sewer. LGBCE is therefore including this area in its draft Sovereign division.</p>	<p>ESCC concurs with the unanimous view of Eastbourne Borough Council that LGBCE proposals to change the boundary between St. Anthony's and Sovereign wards/CEDs are unnecessary. LGBCE is requested to reconsider its proposals on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current boundary is well defined in comparison to the LGBCE proposal • There are no perceived community cohesion benefits • There have been no community representations to change the boundary • The outcome of the change will be unnecessarily disruptive.

Eastbourne CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Upperton	-3%	This division is coterminous with LGBCE's draft ward of the same name.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to this division. It considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.	ESCC is content with LGBCE proposals.

HASTINGS BOROUGH

ESCC is content with all LGBCE proposals for Hastings.

Hastings CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals
Ashdown & Conquest	-5%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Ashdown and Conquest.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to this division. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.
Baird & Ore	-8%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Baird and Ore.	LGBCE received two submissions regarding this division. One proposed including the parts of Baird & Ore west of Pine Avenue in St Helens & Silverhill. This would create a CED with a particularly high level of electoral inequality and, as such, LGBCE does not consider this would best reflect the statutory criteria. LGBCE considers the boundaries proposed in the whole-county scheme provide good electoral equality and are clearly identifiable. LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.
Braybrooke & Castle	-10%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Braybrooke and Castle.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. It considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries.
Central St Leonards & Gensing	-4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Central St Leonards and Gensing.	LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.

Hastings CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals
Hollington & Wishing Tree	+2%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Hollington and Wishing	
Maze Hill & West St Leonards	0%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Maze Hill and West St Leonards.	
St Helens & Silverhill	-4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of St Helens and Silverhill.	<p>LGBCE received two submissions regarding this division. As referred to in the Baird & Ore division above, one respondent proposed including the area of the current Baird & Ore division that lies west of Pine Avenue in LGBCE's St Helens & Silverhill division. The effect would have been to create a division with a particularly high level of electoral inequality and, as such, LGBCE does not consider this best reflects the statutory criteria.</p> <p>LGBCE considers the boundaries proposed in the whole-county scheme provide good electoral equality and are clearly identifiable. LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.</p>
Old Hastings & Tressell	-7%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft borough wards of Old Hastings and Tressell.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to this division. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.

LEWES DISTRICT

The LGBCE's current proposals for the Newhaven and Bishopstone CED includes the comment: "We would particularly welcome comments on that division". This division, as proposed by the LGBCE, currently has a projected variance of 13% and is the only CED with a proposed variance of greater than 10% in the county.

To help address this issue, ESCC proposes that the LGBCE consider an alternative pattern for the eastern most divisions in Lewes district. Instead of Seaford North and Seaford South LGBCE-proposed CEDs, the alternative suggestion for Seaford and Newhaven & Bishopstone CEDs would now comprise:

- (1) A 'Seaford Sutton' CED which would encompass: Seaford East ward, Seaford South ward, plus LR parish ward.
- (2) A 'Seaford Blatchington' CED which would encompass: Seaford North ward, Seaford Central ward (less LR parish ward), the LM parish ward and part of Seaford West ward/LN parish ward.
- (3) The proposed Newhaven & Bishopstone CED could potentially be reduced in size by a portion of Seaford West/LN parish ward.

The advantages of this proposal are that:

- It provides a better alignment with Lewes District Council wards; greater coterminosity is less confusing for residents and will assist with joint delivery of services and easier working between local authorities
- it keeps existing communities together, better reflecting natural clusterings produced by the built environment and local geographical and environmental features
- the community in parish ward 'LM' is part of the town of Seaford. The ward sits at the western end of the town, forming a clear urban boundary with the A259 to the north and the country park to the west.
- The village of Bishopstone, including Old Bishopstone is separated from Seaford by the A259 and also by fields and a valley which mark the western edge of Seaford.

The proposal could potentially reduce the variance for Newhaven & Bishopstone CED if it were possible to allocate some streets from this proposed division to the neighbouring CED to the east. However, it has not been possible to identify an exact boundary that would achieve this

and provide an optimum balance to the numbers. The solution might for example entail splitting the proposed Seaford West ward/LN parish ward and this may or may not find favour with other interested parties such as the district council.

Nonetheless, if this outline solution to the variance concern of Newhaven & Bishopstone division and the above arguments are accepted by the LGBCE and other parties, then indications are that it would have a number of advantages over the current LGBCE proposal.

Other ESCC comments are identified in the table below.

Lewes CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Chailey	+6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Chailey, Barcombe & Hamsey; Newick; Wivelsfield; and the parishes of East Chiltington and St John from LGBCE's draft Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington & St John ward.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to the external boundaries of these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.	ESCC is content with these proposals.
Lewes	+9%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district ward of Lewes Priory, and the part of its draft Lewes Castle ward that lies west of the railway line.		

Lewes CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Newhaven & Bishopstone	+13%	This division consists of the South Heighton and Tarring Neville parishes and the Mount Pleasant area from LGBCE's draft Newhaven North ward, the Bishopstone area of LGBCE's draft Seaford West ward, and the majority of LGBCE's draft Newhaven South ward, excluding the area between Brighton Road and The Highway.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to this division. While this division does have a higher than average level of electoral inequality, LGBCE considered the proposed boundaries are clearly identifiable. LGBCE did investigate alternative division patterns but considered these would not provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria.	See above comments for ESCC's alternative proposal affecting this division.
Ouse Valley West & Downs	-1%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Ditchling & Westmeston, Kingston, and the Plumpton and Streat parishes of its draft Plumpton, Streat, East Chiltington & St John ward.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	ESCC is content with these proposals but has some concerns at the size of the Ouse Valley West & Downs division and the challenges of managing such an area for an individual Councillor. However, ESCC has worked to establish alternative patterns that meet the statutory criteria but has been unable to identify any.

Lewes CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Peacehaven	-4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Peacehaven East, Peacehaven West, and the part of its draft Peacehaven North ward that is south of Firle Road.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries.	ESCC is content with these proposals.
Ringmer & Lewes Bridge	+8%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Lewes Bridge, Ouse Valley & Ringmer, the part of its draft Lewes Castle ward that lies east of the railway line, and the Beddingham and Firle parishes of LGBCE's Newhaven North ward.	LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	

Lewes CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
<u>Seaford North</u>	+3%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Seaford East, Seaford North, and the Princess Drive area of LGBCE's Seaford West ward.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	See above comments for ESCC's alternative proposals affecting these divisions.
<u>Seaford South</u>	+6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Seaford Central, Seaford South, and the coastal part of LGBCE's Seaford West ward, as far north as Newhaven Road.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	

Lewes CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Telscombe	+6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district ward of East Saltdean & Telscombe Cliffs, and the area of LGBCE's Peacehaven North ward that is north of Firle Road.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	ESCC is content with this proposal.

ROTHER DISTRICT

ESCC is content with all LGBCE proposals for Rother.

Rother CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals
Battle & Crowhurst	-5%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Battle & Telham; Battle, Netherfield & Watlington; and Catsfield & Crowhurst, except for Dallington parish.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.
Bexhill East	+5%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Bexhill Old Town & Worsham, Bexhill Pebsham & St Michaels, and the part of Bexhill St Stephens ward east of Combe Valley Way.	
Bexhill North	-1%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district ward of Bexhill North, the part of Bexhill St Stephens ward that lies west of Combe Valley Way, and the part of Bexhill Kewhurst ward that lies north of Little Common Road.	

Rother CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals
Bexhill South	+8%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Bexhill Central, Bexhill Sackville, Bexhill St Marks, and the part of LGBCE's Bexhill Collington ward that lies south of the railway line.	
Bexhill West	+9%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district ward of Bexhill Kewhurst, south of Little Common Road, and the part of LGBCE's Bexhill Collington ward that is north of the railway line.	
Brede Valley & Marsham	-7%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district ward of Sedlescombe & Westfield, Brede parish from LGBCE's Brede & Udimore ward and the Guestling and Fairlight parishes from LGBCE's Southern Rother ward.	

Rother CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals
Northern Rother	-6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Northern Rother, Robertsbridge, Udimore parish from LGBCE's Brede & Udimore ward and the Peasmash and Rye Foreign parishes from LGBCE's Eastern Rother ward.	<p>LGBCE received one submission specifically relating to the Rother North West division.</p> <p>The county-wide pattern proposed that a small area to the north of the Salehurst and Robertsbridge parish be included in the proposed Northern Rother division. However, whilst this would provide for good electoral equality, it would create an unviable parish ward of only 59 electors.</p> <p>LGBCE considers a parish ward with fewer than 100 electors to be unviable and for that reason proposes to include the entirety of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge parish in the proposed Rother North West division.</p> <p>With that exception, LGBCE considers that the county-wide proposed ward meets the statutory criteria, and subject to the above amendment, has included it as part of its draft recommendations.</p>
Rother North West	-9%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Hurst Green & Ticehurst, Burwash, Etchingam and Brightling parishes from Burwash & The Weald ward, and the Dallington parish of Catsfield & Crowhurst.	

Rother CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals
Rye & Eastern Rother	-3%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of: Rye & Winchelsea, Eastern Rother ward except for the parishes of Peasmarsch and Rye Foreign, and the Icklesham and Pett parishes from the draft Southern Rother ward.	Five of the submissions received during consultation referred to the proposals for the Rye & Winchelsea area, all of which were positive. LGBCE considers that the county- wide proposals in this area provide for good adherence to the statutory criteria, and reflect the views of local residents, and has therefore included this division as part of its draft recommendations.

WEALDEN DISTRICT

ESCC comments are set out in the table below.

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Arlington, East Hoathly & Hellingly	-2%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Arlington; Chiddingley, East Hoathly & Waldron; and Hellingly.	<p>LGBCE received 11 submissions directly regarding this area. One of these submissions was positive, agreeing with the decision to include Berwick parish in its entirety in this entirely rural division.</p> <p>The remaining 10 submissions all commented on the proposal to include two small areas of the parish of Arlington in a division with Hailsham and stated that this was not reflective of community identity in the area.</p> <p>LGBCE visited the area and observed that the A22 provides a strong boundary between the parish of Arlington and the town of Hailsham, with few crossing points. The two areas identified by the county-wide proposal for inclusion in the Hailsham wards are also very small, and would lead to the creation of two unviable parish wards of fewer than 100 electors.</p> <p>For these reasons, LGBCE proposes to include the entirety of the parish of Arlington in the Arlington, East Hoathly & Hellingly division.</p>	ESCC is content with this proposal.

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Crowborough North & Jarvis Brook	+3%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Crowborough Central, Crowborough Jarvis Brook and Crowborough North.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE has moved the properties on the north side of Blackness Road and east of Whitehill Road into the Crowborough South & St Johns division in order to improve the electoral variances.	ESCC is content with these proposals.
Crowborough South & St Johns	+4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Crowborough South East, Crowborough South West and Crowborough St Johns.	The resulting divisions have strong and identifiable boundaries, and provide for good electoral equality.	
Hailsham Market	+6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Hailsham Central, Hailsham East and Hailsham North.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries.	ESCC is content with these proposals.
Hailsham New Town	+6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Hailsham North West, Hailsham South and Hailsham West.	LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
<u>Hartfield</u>	-1%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Hartfield, Forest Row and Withyham.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries.	ESCC is content with these proposals but suggests an alternative name for the Hartfield CED: Wealden North . ESCC considers that 'Hartfield' does not adequately reflect the spread of communities present within this CED.
Heathfield & Mayfield	+2%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Heathfield North, Heathfield South and Mayfield & Five Ashes.	LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
<u>Horam & Eastern Villages</u>	+5%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Herstmonceux, Ninfield & Wartling and Horam & Punnetts Town.	<p>LGBCE received one submission for this area, which referred to the allocation of councillors but did not comment on a particular division pattern.</p> <p>Building on the suggested scheme in this area, LGBCE proposals do not include the parish of Hooe in this division.</p> <p>LGBCE's investigations indicated that including Hooe parish in the Pevensey & Westham division provides for improved levels of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.</p>	<p>ESCC suggests an alternative name for this division: Wealden East. The reason is that 'Eastern Villages' accurately reflects their location within Wealden but does not make sense in the context of East Sussex as a whole.</p> <p>ESCC proposes that Hooe be moved back into this division based on the boundaries in Wealden District council's original warding arrangements submission. The communities of Hooe and Pevensey/Westham have no obvious natural affinity, whereas Hooe does have a community identity with Ninfield and Wartling.</p>

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Maresfield & Buxted	-1%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Buxted; Danehill & Fletching; and Maresfield.	<p>The county-wide submission proposed that a very small area of the parish of Fletching be included in the proposed Uckfield North with Isfield division. However, the resulting division pattern formed an unviable parish ward of fewer than 100 electors.</p> <p>To improve both the boundaries of the parish ward and the access in the proposed division, LGBCE proposes to include the Shortbridge area of Fletching in Uckfield North with Isfield, removing it from the proposed Maresfield & Buxted division.</p> <p>Subject to this amendment, LGBCE are proposing this division as part of its draft recommendations.</p>	ESCC is content with this proposal.
Pevensey & Stone Cross	-3%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Pevensey Bay, Pevensey & Westham and Stone Cross.	<p>LGBCE received one submission for this area which referred to the allocation of councillors but did not comment on a particular warding pattern.</p> <p>Building on the county-wide scheme in this area, LGBCE has included the parish of Hooe in this division to allow for a better level of electoral equality between divisions as well as using clear and identifiable boundaries.</p>	See above comments under Horam and Eastern Villages.

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Polegate & Watermill	+4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Polegate Central, Polegate North and Polegate South & Willingdon Watermill.	<p>Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to this division. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries.</p> <p>LGBCE has therefore decided to include this division as part of its draft recommendations.</p>	ESCC is content with this proposal.
Uckfield North with Isfield	-6%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Uckfield East, Uckfield North and Uckfield West with Isfield.	<p>The county-wide submission proposed that a very small area of the parish of Fletching be included in the proposed Uckfield North with Isfield division. However, the area included under this proposal would result in creating an unviable parish ward of fewer than 100 electors.</p> <p>To improve both the boundaries of the parish ward and the access in the proposed division, LGBCE proposes to include the Shortbridge area of Fletching in Uckfield North with Isfield, removing it from the proposed Maresfield & Buxted division.</p> <p>Subject to this amendment, LGBCE is proposing this division as part of its draft recommendations.</p>	ESCC is content with these proposals.

Wealden CED	Variance 2021	Description	LGBCE proposals	ESCC comments
Uckfield South with Framfield	-1%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Framfield & Cross-in-Hand, Uckfield New Town and Uckfield Ridgewood & Little Horsted.	Other than the whole-county proposal, LGBCE did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions. LGBCE considers the proposed boundaries provide good electoral equality and make use of clearly identifiable boundaries. LGBCE has therefore decided to include these divisions as part of its draft recommendations.	ESCC is content with these proposals but proposes an alternative name for the Wadhurst division: <u>Wealden North East</u> to better reflect its location in the area.
<u>Wadhurst</u>	-4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Frant & Wadhurst and Hadlow Down & Rotherfield.		
Willingdon & South Downs	-4%	This division consists of LGBCE's draft district wards of Lower Willingdon, South Downs and Upper Willingdon.		

This page is intentionally left blank