

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND**

**PROCEEDINGS**

AT THE

**2018 REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN ENGLAND**

HELD AT

**JURYS INN HOTEL, BRIGHTON**

ON

**MONDAY 31 OCTOBER 2016**  
**DAY ONE**

Before:

**Mr Colin Byrne, The Lead Assistant Commissioner**

---

Transcribed from audio by W B Gurney & Sons LLP  
83 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0HW  
Telephone Number: 0203 585 4721/22

---

Time Noted: 10.00 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to what is the fourth public hearing for the Boundary Commission for England regarding the initial proposals for new parliamentary constituencies in the South East region. My name is Colin Byrne. I am an Assistant Commissioner of the Boundary Commission for England and I was appointed by the Commission to assist them in their task of making recommendations for new constituencies in the South East region.

I am responsible for chairing today's hearing. I am also responsible, with my fellow Assistant Commissioners, Alan Nesbitt and Stephen Laws, for analysing all the representations and making recommendations to the Commission as to whether or not those initial proposals should be revised.

I am assisted here today by members of the Commission staff, led by Gerald Tessier, who is sitting beside me. Gerald will shortly provide an explanation of the Commission's initial proposals for new constituencies in this region. He will tell you how to make written representations and he will deal with one or two administrative matters.

The hearing today is scheduled to run from 10 am until 8 pm and tomorrow it is scheduled to run from 9 am to 5 pm. We have divided up the slots today into ten minute chunks and we have about 30 people booked in to speak, though clearly 30 people are not here now, but they will have ten minutes each and, if everybody does come, we will have to stick fairly rigidly to that ten minutes. We may also have people who may come in ad hoc who will also want the opportunity to speak but I should point out that, under the legislation that governs the Commission's review, each public hearing must be held over two days and cannot be extended into a third.

The purpose of this public hearing is to allow people to make oral representations about the initial proposals for the South East region. A number of people have already registered. The purpose of the hearing is not to engage in a debate over the Commission's proposals; nor is it an opportunity for people to cross-examine each other about their presentations, but people will be able to put questions to the speakers for clarification. They will have to do that through me as chair.

I will now hand over to Gerald, who will provide a brief explanation of the Commission's initial proposals for the South East region.

MR TESSIER: Thank you very much and good morning. As Colin has mentioned, my name is Gerald Tessier and I am a member of the Commission staff. I am responsible for supporting the Commissioners in their role to recommend new parliamentary constituency boundaries and, at this hearing, I lead the team of staff responsible for ensuring that the hearing runs smoothly.

As Colin has already stated, he will chair the hearing itself. It is his responsibility to run the hearing at his discretion and take decisions about speakers, questioners and timings. My team and I are here to support Colin in carrying out his role. Please ask any one of us outside the hearing if you need any help or assistance.

I would like to talk now about the Commission's initial proposals for new constituency boundaries in the South East region, which were published on 13 September 2016. In considering the composition of each electoral region, we noted that it might not be possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties. Therefore, we have grouped some local authorities into sub-regions.

The Commission's proposals for the South East region are for 83 constituencies, a reduction of one. Our proposals leave 15 of the existing constituencies unchanged. We propose only minor changes to a further 47 constituencies, with two wards or fewer altered from the existing constituencies.

We use the European electoral regions as a template for the allocation of the 499 constituencies to which England is entitled, not including the two constituencies to be allocated to the Isle of Wight. This approach is permitted by the legislation and has been supported by previous public consultation. This approach does not prevent anyone from putting forward counter-proposals that include one or more constituencies being split between the regions. It is likely that compelling reasons will need to be given to persuade us to depart from the regional-based approach was adopted in formulating our initial proposals.

The rules that we work to state that we must allocate two constituencies to the Isle of Wight. Neither of these constituencies is required to have an electorate that is within the requirements of an electoral size set out in the rules. In Berkshire, two of the eight existing constituencies are unchanged, while four are changed only by the transfer of one ward.

In Brighton and Hove, East Sussex, Kent and Medway, two of the 25 existing constituencies are unaltered and one is reconfigured slightly due to re-warding. A further four are altered only by the transfer of one ward.

In Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes, one of the seven existing constituencies is unchanged. In Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton, three of the 18 existing constituencies are unaltered, while a further four are altered only by the transfer of one ward.

In the county of Oxfordshire, one of the six existing constituencies is unchanged, while one is changed only by the transfer of one ward. In Surrey, five of the existing 11 constituencies are unaltered, while three of the remaining six are altered only by the transfer of one ward.

In West Sussex, one of the existing eight constituencies is unchanged and one is reconfigured slightly due to re-warding. A further five are changed only by the transfer of one ward.

As it has not always been possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, we have grouped some county and local authority areas into sub-regions. The number of constituencies allocated to each sub-region is determined by the electorate of the combined local authorities. Consequently, it has been necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries.

We have proposed one constituency that contains electors from Brighton and Hove and East Sussex. It crosses the boundary on the south coast, combining the east of the city of Brighton and Hove with Newhaven and Seaford we propose one constituency that contains electors from East Sussex and Kent. It crosses the boundary at The Weald, combining the towns of Crowborough and Tenterden.

We further propose two constituencies that contain electors from Kent and Medway. One crosses the boundary at Higham, combining it with Rochester, and the other at Chatham, combining it with East and West Malling.

The statutory rules allow us to take into account local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015. These include both the external boundaries of local councils and their internal boundaries, known as wards or electoral divisions. We seek to avoid dividing wards between constituencies wherever possible. Wards are well defined and well understood units which are generally indicative of areas which have a broad community of interest. We consider that any division of these units between constituencies would be likely to break local ties, disrupt political party organisations and cause difficulties for electoral registration and returning officers, who are responsible for running elections.

It is our view that only in exceptional and compelling circumstances will splitting a ward between constituencies be justified and our initial proposals do not do so. If an alternative scheme proposes to split wards, strong evidence and justification will need to be provided and the extent of such ward splitting should be kept to a minimum.

The scale of change in this review is significant and we look forward to hearing the views of people at this hearing and throughout the rest of the consultation period. We are consulting on our proposals until Monday 5 December, so there is still time after this hearing for people to contribute in writing.

There are also reference copies of the proposals present at this hearing and they are also available on our website and in a number of places deposited around the region. You can make written representations to us through our consultation website at [www.bce2018.org.uk](http://www.bce2018.org.uk). I do urge everyone to submit written representation to us before the deadline of 5 December.

Finally, I would like to remind all participants that this hearing is part of a public consultation and you will be asked to provide us with your name and address if you make an oral representation. The Commission is legally obliged to take a record of the public hearings and, as you can see, we are taking a video recording from which we will create a verbatim transcript. The Commission is required to publish the record of the public hearing, along with all written representations, for a four week period during which members of the public have an opportunity to comment on those representations. We expect this to occur during the spring of next year.

The publication of the hearing records and written representations includes certain personal data of those who have made representations. I therefore invite all of those contributing to read the Commission's data protection and privacy policy, a copy of which we have with us and which is also available on our website.

There are a couple of housekeeping matters. If you need the toilets, they are just outside the room by the desk where you signed in. There will be a fire alarm test at 11 o'clock, so there is no need to panic at that but, if there is a repetition of the fire alarm, then it will not be a test and we will have to evacuate the building. My staff will assist you in that matter.

At this stage, I will now hand you back to the chair to begin the public hearing and thank you for your attendance today.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. The first speaker we have is Mr Barney Miller. If you would like to take the stand, so to speak, could you just say who you are and where you are from for the public record because, as Gerald said, we videoing everything. Then you will have ten minutes and then, if there are points of clarification, people will ask you at the end.

MR MILLER: Thank you very much, Mr Byrne. My name is Barney Miller. It is actually Hugh Barney Miller but I do not use the "Hugh". I am not representing anybody. I am a member of the public. I have, currently and for a long time, lived in the ward of St Peter's and North Laine. I just wanted to make some remarks about the proposed changes to Pavilion.

Introducing one of the reasons I am here, I note the call most recently reiterated in the *New Scientist* magazine for more evidence-based policy making and, albeit the views of an individual, though the opinions you will hear are quite properly treated equally, I am sure individual experiences can shed some extra light on the matters at hand.

I approach this as a matter primarily of constitutional importance and I do not address it as a party political issue. I should not be interpreted as making one, but I do have a

political history. I would like to say that my experience has helped me a great deal in understanding the makeup of Brighton.

I read the introduction to the Commission's information put out and it starts by having regard to the formula for electorates to have an electoral quota. It seems to me quite a simple and sound approach if the data on electorates is, as far as possible, correct; but it should be qualified by those eligible to vote, rather than those merely registered to vote on the electoral role.

There are some points that I would like to address on that particular part. Every ten years we have a national census which contains the best data for achieving the closest match to equal weighting of the electorate. Additionally, being that we are a student town, we also have universities and I believe they also have roles. It could easily be found out how many people actually live here for substantial parts, if not the majority, of the year, which plays an important part in Brighton.

Citizens who are on the electoral role but do not vote and those who do not register are nonetheless important to our concept of democracy and I think should be taken account of. I think this was highlighted in the recent EU referendum and mass increase in registration. It revealed the inaccuracy of the electoral role and why the electoral role is, in my view, an inappropriate measure to produce the quota that you are looking for.

My opinions are based, as I said, in the past. I was involved in party politics but I have not been involved at all since 2004 and I ceased to be a local councillor in 1992. I was a parliamentary candidate in 2001 for Brighton Kemptown.

The wards that I either represented or would have been a candidate for are Marine Ward, which no longer exists as it is part of East Brighton now, Regency, which is on the seafront on the old border between the towns of Brighton and Hove, Hanover to the east and Patcham to the north. The interconnectivity between communities and the overlapping of them are something that have been of great value to me in doing a number of voluntary jobs in the city. Also I think quite relevant are the main transport links, the road links that come in, the main route that comes into Brighton right through into the centre past the Pavilion and the railway links. I think the benefit and advantage of having one Member of Parliament for that are pretty clear.

I also believe the makeup of constituencies should have regard to a degree of coherence with regard to locality, its communities and their sense of place and their interactions, which I have experienced in hundreds and hundreds of door step discussions in the past.

The reason why I stood back from politics, which was a personal choice - I did not have to - was because I became a member of the magistracy. That is why I highlighted that this is a personal view and should not be misinterpreted and why I address it constitutionally and not politically.

I have a series of notes here. I am jumping through them because I did not prepare this.

As regards the proposal that I have seen online and this strangely lumpy, banana shape - I mean the east, northern part of this strange shape - the idea that St Peter's and North Laine has a lot of communication or really a lot of any other connection with Portslade and Hove leaves us, in my area, when I have discussed it with my neighbours, as feeling somewhat stuck out, away from things.

We also consider that "Pavilion" is an important name. It is the symbol of the city and the centre of the city plays a huge part in how people view Brighton, the way that we connect with other residents' associations which I have been involved with for many years and for other community safety groups. I was involved for quite a long time with the Lesbian and Gay Community Safety Groups as well, where you glean a lot of information about how people view and interconnect.

I think my contention is that the heart of central Brighton and specifically my ward, which I have just referred to, has little cross-community connection with Hove and Portslade. The connections between different parts of Brighton lead me to the conclusion that the proposed boundary change should keep Brighton Pavilion as it is but include Regency Ward and Brunswick and Adelaide Wards to the east. To the west, Brighton Pavilion should widen to include the St James's Street area and Queens Park, Hanover and Elm Grove areas and, to the north, Moulescoomb and Falmer.

I think this would make a very coherent and interconnected constituency, from my experience. I have referred to the transport links that run through it.

There are many community organisations of different natures. I have referred to the tenants' and residents' associations. There are also social groups, the community safety groups I referred to and other minority groups, not just mine. I believe their views should be sought too and should be weighted accordingly.

I would expect most communities to consider their areas as special and I believe the same for mine. Brighton Pavilion is the symbol of central Brighton, as I referred to, and it should remain so. Brighton Pavilion should not be lost. It should be enhanced and that enhancement should be based on a clear sense of place in the interlinked communities that it has. I think it would be even more enhanced with the inclusion of the areas that I have put forward today.

In passing, I have to note in your documents that the House of Commons and the House of Lords must give their approval. With reference to the House of Lords, it has no quota system itself. Indeed, it has increased by extraordinarily large numbers and all by patronage. It is larger year by year. Should we lose the argument as it refers to Brighton

Pavilion nevertheless on a larger scale, I think the addressing of a quota system for the democratic side is not mirrored by the unelected side. I think it is extremely worrying.

Those are my subjective and anecdotal comments. I would probably take up the offer of putting some more details in writing at a later date.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be very welcome. Thank you. Can I ask whether anybody has a question? Do not forget you have to say who you are and where you are from.

MR BEAMENT: My name is Tom Beament. I am from Ditchling. I am sorry that I did not manage to catch the beginning of your presentation. It is the train service. I meant to arrive earlier.

I was interested in your proposal. Some of the things that you were saying I found absolutely right. The centre of Brighton where the Pavilion is and Regency as well do not seem naturally connected to Hove, but when you actually outlined your proposal you were putting Brunswick and Adelaide into a constituency along with Queens Park and Moulescoomb and Bevendean. My knowledge of the figures suggests that that would be considerably over quota in terms of size. I wondered whether maybe respecting the Brighton/Hove boundary and keeping Brunswick and Adelaide and even perhaps some of Regency in a Hove constituency would work from your point of view.

MR MILLER: I think, if it is over quota, then the first part that would not be included would be Brunswick and Adelaide. Again it is anecdotal and my own experience. I have lived in both Regency ward for quite a few years and also in Brunswick and Adelaide for quite a few years. The perception of people that I knew and knew well, the large numbers of neighbours because I have always been involved in community groups in one form or another, is that they always felt part of Brighton.

If it is over quota, then Brunswick and Adelaide, yes, but I think Regency clearly is, always has been and views itself as Brighton. Indeed, I think the relationship between central Brighton and the coastal parts of it is extremely important. The two piers and the development of them - I will blow my own trumpet on this part because, when I was a councillor, it was a measure that I took as chair of licensing that actually started the regeneration of the seafront from west to east. I could give you details of that but that would be rather dry and boring and not relevant.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for that. We very much welcome your written representations as well. We must move on. Lucy Potter has pulled out.

MS POTTER: I am not speaking. That is fine.



THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is fine. There is no compulsion here. Next is Matt Traini.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we up to date okay?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: He is due at 10.30 so we have a few minutes.

MR BEAMENT: I do not think we will be able to take that slot. It is all booked under the Green Party's name but we were expecting there to be several presentations and for them to overrun, so we were giving ourselves a cushion. This is my experience of the old---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are you making a presentation, Tom?

MR BEAMENT: I am, yes, but we will not be wanting to start immediately. We are waiting for our speakers to arrive because we are ahead of time already. Caroline Lucas should be here soon.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sir, are you planning to make a presentation?

CLLR WARES: Are you speaking to me, sir?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes.

CLLR WARES: I am. I am not due to speak until 6.30 this evening. If it helps your timetable move on and earlier speakers do not mind, I am more than happy to talk now.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be brilliant. I would like to use all the time we have available.

CLLR WARES: (Conservative Party) If I give you that, it is just a handout of the PowerPoint presentation. (Same handed) It perhaps makes it slightly easier to see for your records.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Can you just state your name and where you are from? Then we will be fine.

CLLR WARES: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, for this opportunity to speak today. My name is Lee Wares. I am a life-long resident of our city. I am a city councillor at present, representing Patcham Ward. I am also chairman of Brighton and Hove Conservative Party.

I would like to start actually by just commending you and your colleagues for the hard work that you have been doing in putting forward the initial boundaries, particularly for the entire country, no small feat.

I am speaking today in support of the counter-proposals that were recently presented by the Conservative Party, relating to Brighton Central and Hove and Brighton North constituencies in Guildford earlier on. I am obviously going to leave you with hard copies and electronic copies and we will write to you at some future point.

Sir, this slide represents in its entirety a summary of our total counter-proposal, of which I will discuss the various elements. Later today, there are colleagues from our organisations who wish to come along to speak who may actually fill in some blanks and other important aspects as we go on today. As you can see, as with the previous speaker, we try to maintain the Brighton Pavilion type setup and you can see the wards that we are proposing into those particular constituencies.

Part of our counter-proposal is that we are proposing that Brighton Central and Hove, based on of course the way that we have designed the constituencies, be named Hove and North Brighton - we will speak to that soon - and that North Brighton be named Brighton Pavilion. We are also proposing that Brunswick and Adelaide, Central Hove, Regency and St Peter's and North Laine wards be moved from your Brighton Central and Hove to our proposed Brighton Pavilion. We also further propose that Hove Park, Patcham and Withdean Wards be moved from Brighton North to our proposed Hove and North Brighton.

It is important to note I believe, sir, that three of the wards - Regency, St Peter's and North Lane and Hove Park - are already in the constituencies that presently exist. In reality, what we are suggesting is the movement of three wards from the existing arrangement, noting of course Moulescoomb, Bevendean and Woodingdean are being moved in from Kemptown.

Otherwise, sir, we accept all other wards remaining in the constituencies as you propose.

Should our counter-proposal be adopted, you can see that the wards and the numbers of electorates. It would leave, we believe, two constituencies of almost equal electorate numbers that we believe will only enhance your initial proposals and provide greater electoral equality for the residents of our city, particularly given that 18 of the 21 wards within the unitary authority's boundary and therefore thus the vast majority of residents fall within these two constituencies.

Just a little bit of detail, sir. Our proposals reduce the electoral difference between the two constituencies from 3,315 down to 223. That would be a difference of just 0.3 per cent. We also feel that we have balanced out for local governance reasons the wards from a 10/8 difference to a 9/9 balance. We maintain the 22/23 councillor per constituency

proposal that you had. We have however balanced out the two councillor seat wards from a 7/2 as proposed to a 5/4. We have balanced out the number of three councillor seat wards from a 3/6 to a 4/5. As I said earlier, we do accept your proposals in respect to Moulescoomb, Bevendean and Woodingdean wards moving across.

I think it is also very important to note that our counter-proposal does not affect the boundary composition beyond the unitary authority's boundary.

We believe, sir, that it is important as practically as possible to maintain the makeup of the existing constituency boundaries. That does help the electorate. Of particular importance, both Brighton and Hove have their direct links to the coast. Brighthelmstone was mentioned in the Domesday Book in 1086, although settlements do go back to the Bronze Age and, Hove being a coastal settlement, back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century. We believe that it is vital not to have an inland constituency but that both constituencies should touch the coast.

In our proposal, we restore links between Preston Park, St Peter's and North Laine and Hanover and Elm Grove Wards and also ties in West Blatchington that are all divided by, with respect, your proposals. We also restore the ties between Hove Park, Westbourne and Wish Wards.

This is the last slide, sir. (Indicating) In our counter-proposal, we place Central Hove in Brighton Pavilion. We acknowledge that might seem an odd bedfellow. We would like to point out that Central Hove was arbitrarily named as such by the Local Government Commission for England in August 2001. In fact, it was formed by the amalgamation of Brunswick and Adelaide and Vallance wards, being part of the old Brunswick Town that also included Regency.

Our counter-proposal restores the links between Brunswick and Adelaide and Vallance, as it was, but Central Hove as it is now called, and Regency into our proposed Brighton Pavilion. Of course, subsequent to any Boundary Commission changes, it is possible through local council mechanisms to rename the ward, which is something that has happened in Brighton and Hove many times over a long period of years.

Hove has an established, long and great history from which most people will understand the words "Hove actually". That is synonymous with how many people relate to where they live. We believe that the constituency should begin with Hove and we propose Hove and Brighton North to not only respect the expectations of residents but also to reflect the shape and design of the constituency that we propose.

As our counter-proposal is similar to the existing constituency of Pavilion and to lessen confusion, we propose the retention of Brighton Pavilion. This also maintains its links with the Royal Pavilion itself that of course brought Brighton to the nation's attention during the reign of King George IV and for which it is now renowned.

Sir, to conclude, we recommend our counter-proposal - no surprise to you - to your good selves that we believe will enhance the good work that you have already done. As I said at the beginning, you have a hard copy. Your colleague has an electronic copy. You have obviously a recording of this and we will write to you in due course to meet the 5 December date. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. I will just ask whether anybody has any points of clarification that they want to ask. No. Can I just ask one question then?

CLLR WARES: Yes, sir.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You said that you thought both constituencies should touch the coast.

CLLR WARES: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could you just expand on your reasoning for that?

CLLR WARES: Yes. Brighton itself and Hove were two separate settlements and had been for years. They were brought together back in 2000 as part of a unitary proposal. They have always been on the coast. Most of our heritage, if you like, the original formation of the buildings, the fishing ports, the industrial centres down by the shoreline itself, was where Hove started and where Brighton started. They have moved inland only as a consequence of conurbation expansion. For us to have an inland constituency not only goes against how our city is a city of two parts, to be quite honest with you, and it seems wrong to have an inland constituency that you either call Brighton, which ends up almost being a mid-Sussex environment, or Hove as well. We just take away our heritage from the coast.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. We have one question at the back.

MR WALDEN: (Conservative Party) Hello. My name is Julian Walden from the Conservative Party. Of course, Brighton and Hove is known as Sussex by the Sea, is it not, Lee?

CLLR WARES: It is, yes, absolutely. Thank you for pointing that out. Absolutely. Of course. There is nothing more to add to that. Thank you for that contribution.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you for that and thank you for your presentation.

CLLR WARES: Thanks very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Our next speaker is down as Matt Traini.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is the group policy person but, as far as I am aware, they are planning to speak from 11 o'clock onwards. Caroline Lucas is I think due to speak at 11.10 and Tom Beament at 11, as I understand it. He has gone out to try and find Caroline.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Why do we not adjourn then until 11 o'clock and we can resume? If we could just try and get a bit of clarification about who is speaking when, that would be helpful. Thank you.

After a short break

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do not forget to introduce yourself.

MR BEAMENT: (Green Party) Hi, everyone. My name is Tom Beament. I am elections coordinator for Brighton and Hove Green Party, though I actually live in Ditchling. I think I qualify as the Green Party's lead speaker on the boundary review, certainly for the South East region.

I am really just going to introduce our proposal. Firstly, I am just going to go through what the Boundary Commission's proposal is. It is to take the old Hove constituency, lose Hove Park, and gain Regency and SPNL Wards to become Brighton Central and Hove. The old Brighton Pavilion constituency loses Regency and SPNL, St Peter's and North Laine, and gains Hove Park, Moulescoomb and Bevendean and Woodingdean to become Brighton North. The old Kemptown constituency loses Moulescoomb and Bevendean and Woodingdean and gains two Newhaven wards and five Seaford wards to become Brighton East and Newhaven.

We can see these proposals here. This is the current situation and this is your proposal. (Indicating) It is quite a radical change, as you can see from these. In fact, with the East Brighton and Newhaven constituency, you really need to zoom out in order to see it all the way down the coast.

In terms of the size of the constituencies, we can see from this that the currently existing seats are all below the minimum range of 71,301 so, according to your figures then, the constituencies do need to change their makeup.

Quickly, I am just going to respond to the four criteria in addition to the figures which you are responding to. Point two covers both external local authority boundaries and internal boundaries ward boundaries. In relation to ward boundaries, there is an important

consideration that you take them to be basic building blocks in designing constituencies and avoid splitting them wherever possible. You will only consider ward splitting in circumstances where all the possible whole ward options in an area would significantly cut across local ties and where splitting a single ward may prevent a significant domino effect, a kind of knock-on where other wards have to be homed in further constituencies.

In addition to that, the local community ties that you mention in point A there, you mention in particular that this is not something that the Boundary Commission is able to be expert in for all areas. It would be completely unreasonable to think that you could be and so you are particularly interested in local community ties arguments and that is precisely what we will be presenting, particularly in this presentation.

I would say however, in relation to point three as well, that one of the criteria you are working towards is preserving the boundaries of the existing communities. It seems, from the point of view of this quite radical change, that that really has not been achieved in your current proposal.

Now, I will turn to our proposal. Our proposal is essentially that, in the previous boundary review cycle in 2013, you made a proposal that was far more significant to local community ties and preserved the seats of Brighton Pavilion and Hove with only minor changes. Here is roughly what that proposal involved: the Hove constituency gained the Regency ward. That is the only change there. Brighton Pavilion constituency lost the Regency ward but gained Moulescoomb and Bevendean ward and the old Kemptown constituency lost Moulescoomb and Bevendean and gave one Newhaven ward and five Seaford wards.

In terms of the maps, here is the current situation and here is the proposal from 2013. (Indicating) As you can see, there is very minimal change, just those two wards changing colour like that. I have not bothered to show the Kemptown constituency going down the coast because it is not something that we are really speaking to, but you will notice, in relation to both the current situation and the situation that the 2013 report proposes, that the way in which these constituencies are divided up is very much in a north/south direction. One of our speakers is going to be talking later making, I thought, a quite beautiful point about people who lived by the sea. They tend to orientate themselves towards the sea. Living on the south coast as we do, that means that we orientate ourselves in a kind of north/south direction. It therefore makes sense to split things up, essentially in a north/south way; whereas the proposal that you have given us essentially cuts in an east/west direction. This is unnatural and also I will refer you to the Sussex Rapes which existed from the Norman Conquests, which also divided up Sussex in a north/south direction.

Here again is our proposal. There is your proposal. (Indicating) I did not mean to go backwards. Here are the figures. This is based on the same register that you are using. You will notice that these figures actually compare really quite favourably with yours. The

highest is not as high as your highest and the lowest is not even as low as your lowest one.

There is just one point I wanted to note: there was one ward, Newhaven Valley which, in the 2013 seats, was not part of the overall Brighton and Hove make up but, in the 2016 seats, is. The idea that we go back to the 2013 proposal means that that particular ward would need to be rehomed and there would be that knock-on effect that I talked about.

To improve on this, we would like to propose a ward splitting variation on the 2013 proposal. When I sum up, I am going to talk a little bit more about this. For the moment, I will just go through it. The idea is to keep exactly the same as the 2013 proposal, except that one of the Regency polling districts is retained within Pavilion and we also move two polling districts from Queens Park ward, which currently is in the Kemptown ward and would be in the East Brighton Seahaven ward. Here, you called it "Seahaven" and at Guildford it seemed that people felt that was a much more sensitive name.

Both of these are very much a matter of respecting local ties. The Regency ward, LZ, contains The Lanes and Churchill Square, which are very much part of Brighton rather than Hove and should really be in a Brighton constituency like Brighton Pavilion. The two Queens Park polling districts, EY and EZ, are in fact really part of Hanover. This is one of the situations where in fact actually the local authority ward boundaries cut through what is essentially an existing community.

This is the 2013 proposal. (Indicating) Unfortunately, Boundary Assistant which I used to make these does not allow you to split wards. I know that you are not terribly keen on splitting wards, so I used your own site. Essentially, this is the Regency polling district, which we are suggesting should be kept in Pavilion, and here you can see the two Queens Park polling districts which we think should be reunited with the rest of the traditional community of Hanover.

In terms of figures, what we manage to achieve with this ward splitting proposal is a set of remarkably even constituencies which are incredibly close to your target figure of 74,769. With these proposals, it would be possible to take that Newhaven Valley ward, which I was mentioning before, and bring it back into East Brighton and Seahaven. You will see that the figures go up. It is not a huge ward, so it does not make a huge amount of difference. This figure, as you can see, is actually well below your maximum amount.

The great advantage of this of course is that it will prevent any further knock-on effects. It means that our proposals, as far as Brighton and Hove constituencies are concerned, would be entirely self-contained. They would not have any implications for the rest of the South East region.

In terms of Brighton and Hove and its constituencies, our counter-proposals in order of preference are, firstly, we would love you to leave things the way they are because we

think they are fine and, if you take the numbers into account, you will find that these constituencies are easily big enough; but of course we recognise that you cannot do that.

The second and third options are that we prefer the ward splitting option for the reasons I have given. It is much more sensitive to local community ties. It also prevents knock-on effects, which is the other criterion that we need to satisfy in order for you to consider a ward splitting proposal. However, if you do not want to split wards, then we would essentially go for your 2013 proposals. They were significantly more sensitive to local community ties, although they are flawed in certain respects.

I think that brings my presentation to an end. I am happy to take questions if anyone has any.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Does anybody have a question of clarification? The microphone is coming. You just have to say your name and allegiance again.

MR MILLER: Thanks. I am Barney Miller. I have no allegiance at all at present. The division of Regency Ward: the clarification I am searching for is would that include the Churchill Square area but exclude the Montpelier Road and areas I know as Seven Dials?

MR BEAMENT: You have got it, basically.

MR MILLER: I had not finished. My question is based on whether that is the case. For clarification, do you feel that the people who live there - and I have lived there - feel part of Brighton or part of Hove? My experience is they feel part of Brighton.

MR BEAMENT: We are really sympathetic and, like I said, really, what we would like to do is to leave the boundaries as they are. We think they are fine as they are. The problem is essentially that we know that the Boundary Commission has to extend the Hove constituency in one way or another because the Hove constituency is underweight otherwise. We firmly believe that the line of the boundary between Hove and Brighton, which is Dyke Road Avenue and Dyke Road coming down to Seven Dials, is really a clear marker of that distinction between Hove and Brighton. We think it is important that there is a distinctly Hove constituency.

If you take that, then when you get to Seven Dials, if you continue on Dyke Road, you have another natural boundary. It is the boundary between the Regency constituency and the St Peter's and North Laine constituency. A lot of that area between where Dyke Road is and the sea, in terms of its character, is very much contiguous with the rest of Hove. One of my colleagues is going to be speaking to that later on, so maybe you would want to hang around and hear what our details are on that.



THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Does anybody else have any other questions? I just have a question about the revised proposals of 2013. I think this point covers both your proposal to split the wards and to go with the 2013 proposals. What happens, in your proposal, to the Seaford wards? Where would they go?

MR BEAMENT: They would be in what we have called East Brighton and Seahaven. You have called it East Brighton and Newhaven. They would be there.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: They would be included in that?

MR BEAMENT: They are all included in the numbers.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You also mention Newhaven Valley. That would also be included in those proposals?

MR BEAMENT: The initial idea is to go back to the 2013 proposal. The Newhaven Valley ward was not in the East Brighton and Seahaven ward on that occasion. By ward splitting and shifting the numbers, what we are doing essentially is taking a chunk out of Queens Park ward which is part of that East Brighton and Newhaven seat, relocating it to Brighton Pavilion. That gives us the space to be able to put the Newhaven Valley ward, which I think is that one (indicating) back into it. Therefore, that brings us in line with your 2016 proposals in covering that ward within the Brighton and Hove seat.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think I may be confused because my memory of the 2013 proposals is dim now. In the 2013, my recollection is that the Seaford wards were in Lewes.

MR BEAMENT: No, definitely not. I have the 2013 proposals.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I thought we ended up in Newhaven and we did the split at Newhaven.

MR BEAMENT: No. The 2013 proposals do this curious thing where they cut out this Newhaven Valley ward and keep that in Lewes or Lewes Uckfield, as it will become, but then do continue down the coast to do the whole of Seaford, so Seaford is not split but Newhaven is.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: The second question I have is: you rightly refer to the Boundary Commission's policy on splitting wards. In the document, it talked about exceptional and compelling circumstances and it gave a couple of examples of what those might be. Could you just expand, in relation to your proposal, on what you view as being those exceptional and compelling circumstances?

MR BEAMENT: I was dealing essentially with this situation: that we firmly believe that no whole ward option will manage not to cut across local ties. Our reasons for precisely rehoming those wards, especially the Queens Park wards, is to preserve local ties. It also prevents a domino effect.

My colleagues will be talking a lot to community ties and I hope they will accumulate a mass of evidence. In my summing up, I will talk a little bit more about ward splitting. To give you a little preview, essentially, the argument is in terms of the ward size in Brighton. As I said at Guildford, the ward sizes in Brighton are enormous and that makes your job incredibly difficult because shifting one ward here and there has enormous implications. The argument would essentially be that, where wards are enormous in an urban area like Brighton, then there is much more of a case for ward splitting. In rural areas where wards are very small and if you were worried about there being a lot of proposals coming out with ward splitting, you could limit it and say, "No, we will only consider ward splitting when we have these enormous wards to deal with because it is so difficult to build constituencies which are sensitive to local community ties".

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is very helpful.

MR BEAMENT: Thank you. Our next speaker is a familiar figure, I think.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Caroline Lucas, MP. I am afraid you will still have to introduce yourself.

MS LUCAS: (MP for Brighton Pavilion, Green Party) I am very happy to introduce myself. My name is Caroline Lucas and I am the MP for Brighton Pavilion, representing the Green Party. I want to develop a little bit some of the arguments that you have been hearing from Tom about these local community ties. First of all, let me welcome you to not just Brighton and Hove but indeed we are in Brighton Pavilion, a constituency that has a strong sense of identity. It is this idea of identity and community in particular that I want to focus my evidence on this morning. I want to do so in support of retaining the constituency boundaries as they currently stand in our city. They work well and I believe they are the best, albeit not perfect, fit for the way people in our city go about their lives and the way that they self identify.

It is very welcome that the Boundary Commission has recognised that it does not yet have the evidence and the kind of granular intelligence of how its proposals impact on local community ties. I very much hope that, having heard people here today, you will appreciate the extent to which our current boundaries precisely do reflect community ties. If it is decided that they cannot be retained, we hope very much that you will rework these initial proposals to better reflect what you have defined as "matters of culture, history, socio-economics and other possible aspects of non-physical geography".

As I said, Brighton Pavilion has a strong identity, but it is actually not the way in which this identity will be undermined by the current proposals that I want to highlight first. Rather, it is the way in which the Boundary Commission's proposals completely eradicate Hove as a separate entity.

Since certification, the ancient Borough of Hove has been preserved in its constituency form and, under these proposals, that would disappear. To even contemplate I think a new constituency of Brighton Central and Hove is to utterly misunderstand the way in which Hove residents are exactly that: residents of a distinct and very special place.

If you look at the Wikipedia page for Hove, as I am sure you have, it says:

"A well-known reply by residents of Hove, usually humorous, when asked if they live in Brighton is 'Hove, actually' thus maintaining a distinction with their less genteel neighbour".

We can argue about that.

"One source has identified the locally resident actor, Laurence Olivier (who lived in Brighton) as the origin of the phrase. In the 1990s, the Hove Borough Council used the slogan 'Hove, actually' to promote the town for tourism".

Under the Commission's proposals, not only is Hove to be twinned with Brighton Central but it is to be given second billing. To add insult to injury, that is apparently justified by the decision to rip out an important part of Hove, namely Hove Park.

The name of the new constituency derives primarily from making Hove Park essentially part of Brighton. I would argue that that is illogical and unnatural. It ignores the nature of the Hove Park community and the nature of Hove as well as the ties between the two. Hove Park not only bears the name Hove; it is also an ancient and fundamental part of Hove. It is integral to the Hove community, to Hove identity and Hove culture, all of which are completely distinct from those of Brighton. Hove is proud of being Hove and rightly so.

That Hove Park ward includes major Hove landmarks: Hove Park itself, Hove Recreation Ground and Hove Green and streets like Hove Park Road and Hove Park Way. To uproot all of that and place it in Brighton I think leaves the people of Hove Park robbed of their identity, their community and cultural ties and it leaves Hove robbed of an essential part of the essence of Hove.

The emergence of a nascent but fast-growing community campaign called "Hands Off Hove Park", which is seeking to mobilise many of the residents who were involved in a successful campaign of the same name to oppose a local school from becoming an academy, I think is one important indication of the extent to which the Boundary

Commission's current proposals do not take proper account of the cultural ties that help delineate Hove on the one side and Brighton on the other.

I think there are practical examples too where the proposals are far from ideal. For example, Brighton and Hove each has a main railway station but, in the Boundary Commission's proposals, both would be in the same constituency of Brighton Central and Hove. The traditional boundary between Brighton and Hove runs down Dyke Road, Dyke Road Avenue to Seven Dials, which is part of the existing boundary between the Hove and Brighton Pavilion constituencies. Taking Hove Park out of Hove and putting it into Brighton North means that that boundary is no longer respected.

Moving on to other parts of the proposals, I would like to highlight that the putting of St Peter's and North Laine ward, or SPNL as we call it, and all of the Regency ward into a Brighton Central and Hove constituency means separating those areas off from the rest of Brighton. Just as Hove residents have a strong sense of belonging to Hove, so too Regency and SPNL residents identify with Brighton. Regency includes Brighton Old Town and The Lanes, Churchill Square shopping centre and West Street, all of which play important roles in the modern and historical culture that defines Brighton as opposed to Hove.

Moreover, the proposed Brighton North constituency would be primarily residential, without any connection to the commercial centre of Brighton or the seafront. I think it really would be like losing its heart and focus. There would be nothing to unite it, no sense of it representing a real place. As you heard from Tom earlier, that sense in which so much of the city is focused southwards towards the coast would be lost. There would be no way of that constituency having a link to the bustling, commercial centre of the city and the seafront.

The heart of Brighton has many iconic areas and buildings, most notably the Royal Pavilion, and to disperse these across two different constituencies I think is to break up what for many is the essence of Brighton.

Under the Boundary Commission proposals, SPNL and Regency are effectively replaced in the new Brighton North constituency with, among other wards, Woodingdean. I believe that fails on the most basic grounds. The Boundary Commission's guide to the 2018 review states that wards should be adjacent to each other and not detached, such that the only physical connection between one part of the constituency and the remainder requires travel through a different constituency. However, Woodingdean is a separate village connected to the rest of Brighton North constituency by Warren Road, not all of which will be in the constituency because some of it falls into the East Brighton ward, which is part of the proposed East Brighton and Newhaven constituency. The other routes from Woodingdean to the rest of the constituency are to go south on the Falmer Road to Rottingdean, also in the East Brighton and Newhaven constituency, or north on

the Falmer Road to join the A 27 and then back on the Lewes Road, which takes one into the proposed Lewes and Uckfield constituency.

Furthermore, I would suggest that Woodingdean makes much more sense as part of a constituency that includes other places going east along the coast, particularly Rottingdean, Ovingdean, Saltdean, collectively known as “The Deans”. The Deans are currently grouped together in the Brighton Kemptown constituency and are united by ties that suggest it would be better to retain that grouping.

Rather than splitting The Deans, we believe it would make far more sense instead to reunite wards that share common cultural and community ties. The distinct community of Hanover is currently split between the Hanover and Elm Grove ward on the one hand and Queens Park ward on the other. If the current constituency makeup cannot be retained, an option that we think would fit better with the Boundary Commission’s principles than the proposals upon which you are currently consulting would be, as Tom outlined, to put the EY and EZ polling districts from the Queens Park ward into what is currently Brighton Pavilion.

EY contains several streets, the south side of Albion Hill, Stanley Street, Windmill Street and some other parts of the neighbouring streets which comprise Victorian and Edwardian built terraced housing and which are covered by the thriving Hanover Community Association. I think there is no doubt that residents of those streets would identify themselves as living in Hanover.

Furthermore, although largely replaced in the 1960s by low rise and high rise blocks, the rest of polling districts EY and EZ are areas which formerly comprised such housing and are arguably also historically part of Hanover. More importantly, in considering current links, these two polling districts are located with the rest of Hanover, locally nicknamed “Muesli Mountain”, on a very steep hill which rises from the sea level at the A23 up to Queens Park itself. Residents of the EY/EZ area live within ten minutes’ walk of the edge of Brighton city centre, some at the bottom of the hill much less far away. They have fewer links with the rest of Queens Park and are as likely to shop I think on London Road as those on St James’s Street.

Using the December 2015 registration data, reuniting the part of Hanover in the Queens Park ward with the rest of Hanover in the Hanover and Elm Grove ward could be part of delivering more equal sized constituencies if it went hand in hand with some other changes. SPNL could remain part of the Brighton Pavilion constituency for all the reasons outlined earlier and the proposal to bring Woodingdean into the mix would be dropped.

I think it does make sense for Moulescoomb and Bevendean to be part of a new look Brighton Pavilion constituency and, while I would still argue that Regency has closer community ties to Brighton than it does to Hove, incorporating it into Hove would result in far fewer community ties being undermined than the Boundary Commission’s existing

plans. Indeed, what we would end up is, as Tom outlined, not a million miles away from what the Commission itself proposed in 2013.

As I said earlier, my preferred option is very much for the three Brighton and Hove constituencies to remain as they are. They work. They have a high level of political engagement in the city and I think there is a thought about why would you try to fix something that is not broken.

In terms of the figures that I know you are having to deal with, the December 2015 figures, I think there is a strong case to say as well that areas that are particularly hard-hit by individual voter registration - and those are areas that have strong student areas like Brighton or indeed places like Oxford too - in those cases, I think there is a strong argument to leave the constituencies as they are because, once you have added in the missing votes in December 2015 and June 2016, another 7,100 people registered in Brighton Pavilion, then they are large enough anyway. If you factor in too the fact that the current Brighton Pavilion constituency has two universities, both of which are intent on expansion, this constituency is growing already. I would argue very strongly that we should not change things.

However, if it is deemed necessary to change, then reverting to the 2013 proposals or something much closer to them I think would both help address the concerns about equivalence in terms of the sizes and reflect the important cultural, historical, socio-economic and non-physical geographical factors that together constitute the somewhat ephemeral notion of community.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. I now ask for any points of clarification that people would like to ask. Do not forget to say who you are again.

MR MILLER: Good afternoon, Caroline. I asked a clarification question earlier on. I am here just as an ordinary member of the public. Having lived in Regency, I cannot think of anyone who lives there who would say, if you asked them, "Where do you live?" "Hove". Seeing that it comes up to, surrounds and adjoins the railway station and the railway station is an important hub for Brighton Pavilion, would it not make sense to include along that historical boundary Regency into your proposals?

MS CAROLINE LUCAS: I think that is another speech in favour of keeping the status quo, with which I would entirely agree. However, I think that, if you had to make a decision between Regency or SPNL, the links with SPNL are stronger to stay within Brighton but, yes, your ultimate point I have entire agreement with.

MR MILLER: It is discussing where I live.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. I will indulge you on this occasion.

MR MILLER: Thank you for the indulgence. As a resident of St Peter's and North Laine for a long time, ditto the question. They would say they were part of Brighton and central Brighton, enjoy and love being able to walk very easily, within minutes, to the seafront. Would you say the same argument applies to St Peter's and North Laine?

MS LUCAS: As I say, I think St Peter's and North Laine ought to be at the heart of what is the constituency that I still think should be Brighton Pavilion, completely.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If there are no other questions, thank you very much for coming in. Do we have Rob Shepherd? Excellent. Would you like to take the stand and just say who you are and where you are from?

MR SHEPHERD: (Green Party) My name is Rob Shepherd. I am from Brighton and Hove. I am a resident here and I speak as a member of the public. As someone who chose this place as my home more than 21 years ago, as a Hove constituent and as an owner of a business based in Hove, I want to speak today about Hove. Some of what I am saying does repeat some of the points that Caroline has made because we both feel, quite obviously, the same about Hove, but I would like to make them anyway.

I also want to speak on behalf of a nascent campaign to defend Hove as a distinct and highly distinctive constituency and not an adjunct to our so very different neighbour, Brighton.

If you were to stand a little out to sea at the foot of the border between Hove and Brighton and look back at our coastline, two things on this topic would strike you. Firstly, the boundary between the two towns is marked as clearly as it ever was before the towns became a joint unitary authority. On the beach stands the Meeting Place Cafe, so named because it is where these two very different towns of Hove and Brighton meet. A few yards inland is the Peace Statue erected 104 years ago for the princely sum of £1,000, exactly on the boundary, a joint-venture between the separate towns and bearing the arms of both. The cafe and the statue which celebrate Hove's and Brighton's differences are perhaps the only things that straddle Brighton and Hove.

The second thing to strike you would be the utterly different architecture of Hove and Brighton. On the seafront, it is a contrast between Hove's sweeping and magnificent 1820s Brunswick estate and, adjoining it, Brighton's pointedly modernist 1935 art deco Embassy Court.

This is not just symbolic; it is a contrast that strikes you wherever you go in the two towns, not least if you follow the northward running Boundary Passage, the twitten or lane built as a breathing space between the two communities. Hove looks, feels and is different from Brighton.

Back there on the seafront, Brighton is hustle and bustle, candy floss and hedonism. Cross the boundary and immediately you are on the huge expanses of Hove Lawns, acres of seafront grassland for strollers, picnickers and dogs. The pace of life plummets. As some songs have nearly said, in Brighton, you can dance the night away, but you cannot hurry Hove.

The two towns were twinned in 1997 and in 2000 became the City of Brighton and Hove, but this was a twinning of government and economy, not of place, peoples or culture. The people of both towns have since worked tirelessly to maintain their distinctiveness and the City Council has been part of that endeavour. Street furniture and lighting remain conspicuously dissimilar. Even the seafront railings are still painted in different colours. It is all because Hove and Brighton may these days share a local government, just as we have long shared a Peace Statue, but we are not homogeneous.

George Bernard Shaw famously said, “England and America are two countries separated by the same language”, so Hove and Brighton are two entirely distinct entities separated, not joined, by a common boundary. Hove and Brighton look different, think differently, are different communities and our people identify ourselves differently. If you ask anyone in the city where they live if they have been here longer than five minutes, they will say Hove or they will say Brighton. They will very rarely say Brighton and Hove.

We all identify ourselves specifically with one or the other. We are part of one or the other and we are tied to one or other community. We are proud residents of one or the other. This is why famously in these parts, as Caroline mentioned, we have the phrase “Hove, actually”, supposedly first coined by Laurence Olivier. Ask any Hove-ite if they are from Brighton and you will be politely told, “No, Hove, actually”. Over the decades, “Hove, actually” has become a rich phrase with many layers of humour and self-awareness. To the people of this city, you only have to say, “Hove, actually” and everyone will know what you mean. You cannot be from Hove and Brighton. If you are from Hove, you are from Hove. Such are Hove-ites’ ties to the Hove identity.

That humour masks something a little darker. Many Hove-ites are suspicious of what they see as the encroaching power and influence of Brighton. They may question the fair sharing of resources, especially in austere times, or they may be reflecting an unease that Hove’s nature and distinctiveness are being eroded, little by little, year by year, until, like Middlesex, Hove disappears. They are not happy with that.

The driving force behind Hove is simply that it should not disappear, that it should not merely become West Brighton. Realisation of that fear would tear communities apart and destroy the long truce between Hove and Brighton. As a city, we would no longer function or be the success that we undoubtedly are now.

So it is, I am sorry to say, that the Commission’s current proposals for Hove and Brighton threaten irreversible damage to the social fabric of our community, to the identity of Hove.



You are proposing to rip out a vital organ of Hove, Hove Park ward, and transplanted to alien Brighton. Hove's central and much loved green space, Hove Park plus Hove Park School, Hove Recreation Ground, Hove Greens, Hove Park Road, all suddenly in Brighton. With them, you are transplanting people who are Hove-ites and therefore definitely not Brightonians into something called Brighton North.

There are no immunosuppressants that will help this transplanted and cut-off community to feel at home. You are creating 4,000 strangers in a strange land. What is left of Hove you plan to turn into a form of lesser Brighton, a new constituency of Brighton Central and Hove receiving second billing. You are taking the heart of Brighton with all the Brighton landmarks, such as the seafront, its Lanes, North Laine and the Royal Pavilion and asking the people of Hove to become part of that, an adjunct to it, West Brighton in all but name.

When I think of Hove and Brighton, I often think of those other rather distinct neighbours, Yorkshire and Lancashire, once embattled in the Wars of the Roses and, through the houses of York and Lancaster, the seats of monarchical dynasties. They are more than counties; they are peoples. You would not slice the city of York out of Yorkshire and then have the rest of Yorkshire become an appendage of Lancashire.

The Commission is proposing to break community ties that have existed for centuries and you are proposing new ties in an arranged marriage that has no future. By seeing Hove as an adjunct to Brighton, you threaten what makes Hove Hove. Since we became a city, the ancient and independent parish, town and borough of Hove as a unit of government has been preserved only in its constituency form. That is now to disappear. As Caroline said, Hove as a stand alone entity is to disappear.

You are proposing to remove Hove's independence and that independence, that she, "We are not Brighton; we are Hove, actually" is the wrapper for all the characteristics that tie the Hove community together, but make Hove Hove.

The constituency boundaries we have now reflect naturally the distinctions between Hove and Brighton. I am afraid your current proposals do not. We ask you: please consider the distinctiveness of Hove and Brighton. Please see that Hove cannot be sliced and diced in this way and retain its Hove-ness, its integrity, its ability to function as a complete community and, as such, a key part of the city's social fabric. Please do not wipe the single entity of Hove off the political map.

Tom, who opened this session, has already laid out the alternatives so I will not repeat them, but they keep Hove whole as in your year 2013 proposals and enlarge it to the required size. Please consider them and reconsider your own current proposals so that singular, homogeneous Hove in its entirety can remain Hove. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any questions clarification? No. Thank you very much for coming in. We are now due a break so if we

break for 15 minutes until, say five to 12, then I think we have another three speakers and then Tom again. Okay, so we will break until five to 12. Thank you.

After a short break

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: The next speaker is Siriol Hugh-Jones.

MS HUGH-JONES: (Green Party) Hello. Siriol Hugh-Jones. I am a member of the local Green Party. As the Commission has already heard from my Green Party colleagues, we think our submission retains the existing pattern of the Hove and Brighton Pavilion constituencies with minimal change, while respecting local links and better meeting the target number of electors in each constituency. I wish to expand on our earlier arguments, specifically in relation to Regency and St Peter's and North Laine wards.

As you heard, we attach special priority to maintaining the distinction between Brighton and Hove within the city. Thus, ideally, the whole of Regency and St Peter's and North Laine wards would remain within Brighton Pavilion, but we recognise that electors in Hove alone do not fulfil the minimum quota.

The traditional boundary between Hove and Brighton follows Dyke Road, north of Seven Dials, so there is logic in our proposal to extend this boundary further along Dyke Road, south of Seven Dials, to its junction with Western Road at Queens Square, just west of the clock tower by moving polling districts LW, LX and Y of Regency ward into the Hove constituency.

These areas are mostly residential communities created during the Victorian expansion of Brighton. With a large number of listed buildings throughout the area, their character has strong similarities to the neighbouring Brunswick and Adelaide ward.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry to interrupt you. Would you just mind pointing out which polling districts those are?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is these three here. (Indicating) LW----

MS HUGH-JONES: LX and LY.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That just leaves LZ?

MS HUGH-JONES: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. That is very helpful. Thank you.

MS HUGH-JONES: There are strong transport links along Western Road connecting the area to Hove. A large number of bus services serve Western Road and shops, eating and drinking venues line the road from the clock tower all the way to Hove. Polling district

LZ is different. Firstly, to the west of West Street, it includes Churchill Square. It is one of the principal shopping areas of Brighton, redeveloped in the 1960s. This part of Regency ward also includes the iconic Grand Hotel on the seafront and the perhaps rather less iconic Brighton Centre concert and conference venue.

To the east of West Street, between North Street and the seafront, is the very heart of the old town of Brighton, including The Lanes, and its more modern addition, Brighton Square, Brighton Town Hall and Brighton Coach Station at Poole Valley. The boundary between the Regency polling district, LZ, and the St Peter's and North Laine ward is North Street, which is the main east/west thoroughfare through which nearly all of the city's bus routes pass. Brighton and Hove Bus Company lists 50 different routes as running along the street. Lined with shops, restaurants, bars and pubs, it very much unifies this area of the city, linking the North Laine area to its north with The Lanes to the south.

St Peter's and North Laine ward contains the rest of what is clearly the cultural, commercial and community centre of Brighton. The Royal Pavilion, Brighton Museum, the Theatre Royal and the North Laine area are all located within the ward, along with the Brighthelm Centre, an important community venue. Slightly further north, the ward extends up to London Road, another key central shopping and entertainment area of Brighton. From North Street, many of the city's bus routes proceed north along Old Steine and then along either London Road or Lewes Road, linking the city centre with the various residential areas in the north of the existing Brighton Pavilion constituency, such as Patcham, Preston Park, Hollingdean and Stanmer, as well as Moulescoomb and Bevendean, which both our proposals and the Commission propose should transfer from the Brighton Kempton constituency.

St Peter's and North Laine also includes Brighton Railway Station and four other stations: Preston Park on the London line and three stations on the line out towards Lewes and Eastbourne. As with the bus services, these rail services unite parts of the city. These links would be broken in the initial Commission proposals.

Moving Regency and St Peter's and North Laine into a constituency predominated by Hove would result in two rather unbalanced constituencies, with Brighton North becoming an unfocused amalgamation of largely residential areas with limited transport links between them. Transport links always tend to be to and from the centre of Brighton.

I would just like to add a comment here that I have spent a little bit of time in Canberra, which is a place that was deliberately designed to have no heart, no centre. The transport links between the various parts of Canberra were appalling, requiring people to buy cars even if they were only staying in Canberra for a matter of a few weeks. Please do not drive us all back into cars when we have perfectly good transport links.

That is why the proposed Brighton Central and Hove constituency would contain the key cultural, administrative, transport and commercial hubs of both Hove and Brighton.

It is worth noting that SPNL includes several long-standing and more recent university buildings. For example, new student residences have opened within the last few years on London Road. The University of Brighton is currently developing its campus at Circus Street. This is a point that Caroline mentioned earlier on, with the growth in the number of students. This also suggests a good fit with the northern part of the constituency, which includes the University of Brighton and the University of Sussex campuses at Falmer and along Lewes Road.

Finally, the Commission's initial proposal to move SPNL into a constituency with Hove produces an odd boundary in the Roundhill area, polling districts KW and KX, which juts out into the proposed Brighton North constituency.

In summary, we believe that the inclusion of the St Peter's and North Laine ward along with the polling district LZ, covering Churchill Square and Brighton old town in a revised Brighton Pavilion constituency, meets the Commission's goals of achieving electorate balance, retaining as far as possible existing constituencies and puts the Brighton city centre at the heart of a constituency with strong north/south links to outlying residential areas to the north and north-east of the city. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Any questions of clarification? I wonder if I might just ask one question. I understand what you are saying is that the SPNL ward and part of Regency ward are the sort of thriving heart of Brighton and Hove. I suppose my question is, to the extent that the wards in the north of the current Brighton Pavilion look to that area as their centre, how different is that to any other ward in the sweep of Brighton and Hove looking to those areas as the heart of Brighton and Hove?

MS HUGH-JONES: I think, with the areas to the west, they would look much more towards Hove itself and the areas in the north to the east would look towards Kemptown more; whereas, in the areas to the north, such as Preston Park, Patcham, you have natural transport links moving north/south. They take you through London Road and down to the seafront. Most of the bus routes swing up North Street, going to Churchill Square.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: The transport links east/west do not go down----?

MS HUGH-JONES: The east/west links tend to go along the bottom, if you like, along North Street and then Church Street and through Hove. If you are coming down from places like Preston Park, you are going south before you go west or east. Because of the geography, I cycle and that is quite a big hill. The roads are quite narrow, so there are very, very limited bus routes. The buses all tend to come south and then east or west rather than going east or west further north.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Shall we move on to our next speaker?

MS FINCH: (Green Party) I am Andrea Finch. I am from Woodingdean. I am here to speak about Woodingdean and the other Deans, Rottingdean, Ovingdean and Saltdean.

The Boundary Commission proposes to put Woodingdean into a Brighton North constituency. In doing this, Woodingdean is being separated from the other Deans, Ovingdean, Rottingdean and Saltean. I would argue that this goes against the local community ties that exist between the four villages that make up the Deans and that they belong together in the same constituency.

I grew up in Woodingdean and I moved back there ten years ago. In the years between, I have lived in Brighton Kemptown and Hove. Although Brighton borders Hove, it feels wrong that the distinct differences of those places would be blurred into mixed constituencies. The residents of Woodingdean are fiercely proud of the differences with the adjoining Brighton and Hove, not least the climate which often changes from sunshine to fog and sometimes snow as you cross the Race Hill from Brighton to Woodingdean.

As people who lived by the sea, we orientate ourselves towards the sea. My neighbourhood has always been the bit of the city around me and southwards, towards the sea, which I visit often. The Brighton North constituency just feels wrong. It cuts up the city in a way which does not feel natural to us locals.

The Deans naturally go together. Driving up Falmer Road from Rottingdean, you see that Rottingdean, Ovingdean and Woodingdean are connected together and Rottingdean and Saltdean merge together. Woodingdean blends into Ovingdean, which blends into Rottingdean and us villagers regard ourselves as connected.

Woodingdean is not connected in the same way to north or east Brighton. We have the buffer of the Downs between us and the rest of Brighton and travelling to Whitehawk or Bevendean, our nearest neighbours in Brighton as the crow flies, necessitates a bus into central Brighton and then out again.

As a school governor, I can report that there is a strong Deans partnership of schools working together, supported by Longhill, which is the secondary school we all share. Longhill is based in Rottingdean and most Woodingdean and Ovingdean children go there.

As a family living in Woodingdean, we walk down to Rottingdean once or twice a week and use the shops and library there are at least as often as we use those in the centre of Woodingdean. Falmer Road is the important artery that us villagers all share. I do not think us residents notice much distinction between the villages. Us Woodingdean folk

use the bank in Rottingdean. Ovingdeaners are registered with doctors and dentists in Rottingdean and Woodingdean. I do my Tetra Pak recycling in Rottingdean.

In the summer, we walk or bus to Rottingdean beach and feel that this is our local neighbourhood in a way that central Brighton just is not. When I think of what I mean by neighbours, the people I care about, I socialise with, friends and those I do not know by name but know their faces and stop to chat, people whose children go to school with my children and people I have grown up with, these neighbours come from Woodingdean, Ovingdean and Rottingdean. Please keep the Deans together in the same constituency. The four Deans belong with each other as a community, next to but distinct from Brighton and Hove.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any questions?

MR MILLER: Just for clarification, is one of the fears of the Deans that they may be lost, just as Roedean has been subsumed into parts of Brighton and that is what you wish to avoid, to have your own distinction?

MS FINCH: When we talk of the Deans, we do not actually include Roedean generally because we are talking about the eastward Deans, so there is a strong community connection between Woodingdean, Rottingdean, Saltdean and Ovingdean. Roedean just has a coincidence of name.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MS FINCH: Yes, we do not want them.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Any other questions? Can I just ask one question? You mentioned that in the summer you take the bus down to the beach in Rottingdean.

MS FINCH: Yes, that is ten minutes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: How frequent are the buses between Woodingdean and Rottingdean/Saltdean?

MS FINCH: Every 20 minutes you can get a bus.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It is a good bus service?

MS FINCH: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thanks very much indeed.

MS FINCH: It is quite an important transport link for us as well. If we were going into Brighton Centre, it is easier for us to drop down to Rottingdean and bus into Brighton or as easy. It would depend what we were up to on the day which way we would go.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much indeed. Our next speaker I think is Steve Harris.

MR HARRIS: (Green Party) I am Steve Harris and I represent the Green Party. I am also a resident of Queens Park ward, but just very much on the boundary of Queens Park, Hanover and Elm Grove.

As outlined earlier by Tom and Caroline, part of the Green Party submission is to argue for the movement of some parts of the existing Queens Park ward, namely polling districts EY and EZ, which are [here \(indicating\)](#) into the Brighton Pavilion constituency. I want to expand a little on our arguments in relation to this area of Brighton.

As we have said before, we do understand the Commission's initial stance to use wards as the base units, given that they may be assumed to be, in the words of the Commission, "generally indicative of areas which have a broad community of interest". However, the Commissioner will also understand that the local Boundary Commission will also have needed in the past to balance local community ties with the requirement to balance electoral numbers between wards. We believe we can improve the constituency pattern and local links by splitting the Queens Park ward between our proposed Brighton Pavilion constituency and the Commission's proposed Brighton East and Newhaven constituency.

Firstly, as Caroline mentioned, in [this area here \(indicating\)](#), EY, these streets [here](#) are very similar in nature to the streets [here](#) in Hanover ward. The southern side of Albion Hill, Stanley Street, Windmill Street and also parts of Richmond Street and Sussex Street [here](#) all comprise terraced houses built in the Victorian and Edwardian eras. For that very reason, [this](#) area of Hanover and [this area here](#) in Queens Park are all covered by the Hanover Community Association, which is a thriving local charity which manages the local Hanover Centre and supports community spirit throughout this area of dense, terraced housing.

Among its many activities, the Association contributes to the local Hanover Directory publication and runs the very popular annual Hanover Beer Festival. The rest of these two polling districts, EZ and [this](#) bit of EY, normally also comprised very similar housing and arguably are also historically part of Hanover. However, here, most of the housing was demolished in the 1960s and replaced by a mix of low rise and high rise housing.

As Caroline said earlier, we feel that it is important to note the topography of this area. [This area here](#), Albion Hill, is an extremely steep hill and I live just [here](#), so I know rather well how steep it is because I climb it every day. There is this hill [here](#). The brow of the hill runs [here](#) along Queens Park Road. [This area here](#) is very much focused much more

onto the centre of Brighton rather than out along the coast and to the rest of the Kemptown constituency.

It is probably true that some people living here might go out socialising or use supermarkets along here in St James's Street, but actually they are just as likely to do their shopping or be going out in the North Laine area here or the London Road area here. They are kind of equidistant, between the two.

In terms of whether it would break local links to split Queens Park up, Hanover Elm Grove is actually quite a cohesive ward. There is the Hanover area here and then the north bit of Elm Grove there. They are pretty self-contained really. Queens Park, on the other hand, is an amalgamation of various communities, parts of Hanover as I have just explained, multiple areas of low rise and high rise flats, both in historic Hanover here, but also stretching out all along here, the Eastern Road. You also have the commercial centre around St James's Street and, as I think one of my colleagues earlier said, the Kemptown area, which is a bit of a focus really for people who live on this side of the city.

The Queens Park conservation area, which is here, only forms a very small part around the Queens Park itself, which is here. It is only a small part of the ward to which it lends its name.

Picking up a point I think that you raised earlier that other parts of Queens Park may well also have an affinity to central Brighton, certainly down here, the rest of Queens Park is either a bus ride away from the city centre or at least has community links along the coastal roads here, out to the rest of the constituency. I know that the Commission has highlighted the coastal road, the A259, as a factor which links all the communities in that proposed constituency.

Therefore, in summary, we feel that splitting the Queens Park ward by moving polling districts EY and EZ into Brighton Pavilion and retaining the rest within Brighton East and Newhaven would do little, if anything, to damage existing local ties within Queens Park, but it would improve matters considerably by uniting the parts of the Hanover in Queens Park ward with the rest of Hanover within Brighton Pavilion and strengthen links with the city centre. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Does anyone have any questions? No. I have a question: how many councillors represent Queens Park ward?

MR HARRIS: It is a three councillor seat.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: How are they divided up? It is three representing the whole ward?

MR. HARRIS: Three for the whole ward, that is right, yes.



THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If we were not doing the parliamentary boundaries or we were not doing them in the way that is proposed, would you still propose that the ward be split up like this?

MR. HARRIS: Probably, I think, certainly in terms of local links. If you are talking about boundaries, then it would make sense for the Hanover area to be reunited with the Hanover and Elm Grove ward. It is a bit of a hotch-potch of communities, the Queens Park ward. I think it is much more of an artificial construction than HEG is.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Historically, have these wards been in a different configuration?

MR. HARRIS: I must admit I am not sure. I have been involved for the last ten years and they have been like that since then.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thanks very much. I think we are back to Tom.

MR BEAMENT: (Green Party) My name is Tom Beament and I am representing the Green Party. Really, what I want to do at this point is to focus on our ward splitting proposal. Obviously, it is because we know that this is something you are very reluctant to do and I fully understand why. If everyone was allowed to split wards left, right and centre, the number of possibilities would be astronomic and clearly that would make a major headache for you.

If I am completely honest, we are really quite proud of it in terms of the way it manages to respect local community ties. It is an impressive thing and one of the issues with your using wards as building blocks is that we know that, in many local government areas, those very wards are under review, either now or will be very soon. Precisely those very wards are going to be split up. There is a sense there to consider the possibility of splitting wards, maybe in a sensitive way which might, if the local reviews go through the right way, be mirrored in those local reviews.

Here we have the constituencies as they currently exist (indicating). This is what we are proposing in terms of it. I would also like to draw your attention to the way in which this divides up the city. It divides up the city very neatly, slicing it up into segments like this. As we have heard, in terms of the transport links that working the city, they all tend to work down towards the centre so you are likely to end up tying together cohesive communities, certainly linked by transport links, in that way.

You asked me if I was going to mention anything in relation to the Conservative Party's proposals which were put forward in Guildford. I remember that one of the points they claimed anyway is that you have this interesting leg here, a tail perhaps we could call it.

I seem to remember that is what they Conservatives put forward. In terms of the Conservatives' proposal, they also put forward this kind of thing. I do think that this is a much, much neater way of dividing the city up in terms of segments than that is.

In terms of the ward splitting proposal, you have two particular criteria that you mention. One is that no whole ward option respects local community ties. We would like to argue, particularly in the case of the Queens Park areas here, that that is something that no whole ward option could do. Obviously, you need to increase the size of Hove, we know, in terms of the numbers. Our argument is that the most sensitive way to do it is to use this bit of the Regency ward, but this final polling district here really has to stay in Brighton as part of an overall Brighton constituency.

It links this right to the very centre, which is where the transport links are going. It links essentially with the seafront and I think it really makes sense in a Brighton constituency that it has part of the seafront. That is really what Brighton is all about.

The other thing of course is that our ward splitting proposal, which is there, has this very significant thing because we rearranged the constituencies in such a way to provide really quite neat numbers. You will see that Pavilion is slightly the highest but East Brighton and Seahaven comes next. It enables us, as I said, to rehome that ward and to prevent there being any knock on effect in terms of the rest of your proposals.

However, there was one more thing that I wanted to mention. This is something that I brought up in Guildford. What we have here are all the wards from the South East region ranked in terms of size, so the highest is up here and we finish at 25 down here. All the ones highlighted in yellow are Brighton wards and many, many of the others are in the Medway area, which is another large, urban area with multi-seat wards where you have these very high wards.

If you want to make an exception in a particular case, then I think this is the place to make the exception. These ward sizes make the job of building constituencies incredibly hard to do. They are exceptionally large. The Newhaven Valley ward is just over 2,000 and there are many, many rural wards where that is a normal ward size. When you are getting up towards which are five times that size, then obviously it is really, really difficult. We think that, particularly in this case, in the case of Brighton and in the case of large, urban wards, it really does make sense to at least consider the possibility of ward splitting. If you do not split the wards, then we do suggest that the 2013 proposal is a more sensitive way of doing it, though of course it does have this appalling effect of putting the centre of Brighton, the old town of Brighton and that kind of thing, into what is called a Hove constituency.

I think that is really all I want to say in terms of summing up. I am happy to take questions.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: There is a question at the back.

MR WALDEN: (Conservative Party) Can you just clarify for me how many wards you are proposing splitting, please?

MR BEAMENT: Two wards. There are different rationales for each. The Regency ward is split precisely to allow a lot of the ward to go in to make up the numbers of that constituency but to retain the bit that really is clearly Brighton. The Hanover one is really about reuniting a community that has been separated by a ward boundary in the wrong place.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just going back to your ward list, you have not included any Portsmouth, Southampton or Milton Keynes.

MR BEAMENT: That is an interesting point.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: They also have wards which are 10,000.

MR BEAMENT: In that case, I may be mistaken. I got this from a colleague in the South East region Green Party. He may have used Sussex and Kent wards.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: The point that urban areas tend to have larger ward sizes is a valid point but I think there are more than just the ones you put in.

MR BEAMENT: You could easily be right. The slide was not mine. I borrowed it.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: There is one other question at the back. Do not forget to say who you are.

CLLR WARES: (Conservative Party) Just on your last answer to my colleague, we understood that you were proposing that polling districts EY and EZ would come from Queens Park.

MR BEAMENT: Yes, that is right.

CLLR WARES: Could you just further clarify that? Thank you.

MR BEAMENT: They are the polling districts of Queens Park. It is these two polling districts here. The Queens Park boundary goes round like that and we are suggesting that they come from Queens Park and that they go into the Brighton Pavilion seats.

MR WALDEN: That is three wards you are splitting, is it?

MR BEAMENT: No. This is the Hanover and Elm Grove ward here. We are not splitting that. We are splitting Queens Park and adding those two polling districts. Obviously, we

cannot add them to the Hanover and Elm Grove ward. This is in terms of building up a constituency. What we are doing is splitting the Queens Park ward here and we are splitting the Regency ward, which is here.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

MR BEAMENT: Thank you very much as well.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are there any more members of the Green Party?

MR BEAMENT: There are no more Green Party speakers. We have just finished early.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Our next speaker is Mr Benjamin Wetherall.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He is not here.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Is Mr Janio in the room?

CLLR JANIO: (Conservative Party, Hangleton and Knoll ward) I am afraid he is.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We never say that. Would you mind saying who you are and where you are from? Then you have ten minutes.

CLLR JANIO: Can I apologise? I did not have any motion on my PowerPoint and, with Google, I think it is going to be a bit bizarre, so please go with me. Councillor Tony Janio. I am also the deputy chairman of the Federation of Brighton and Hove Conservatives. Hopefully it will not take the full time. The other thing is I am an instructor by profession. You might not think it once you have seen me but I am and, with each slide I do, you can ask questions as we go along. That will not interrupt me at all.

Speaking today, firstly, I am supporting the Conservative proposals for the westernmost parliamentary seats in Brighton and Hove. These are the ones that have obviously been most discussed today. I am a physicist by training and I deal with numbers on a daily basis. I think what you have done in trying to reduce 50 seats and move the numbers around is unbelievably difficult and we are coming here today, moaning about what you have done. I think you have done a pretty good job.

I am one of the prime architects of our proposals here. The first thing that we were quite keen on was that there would be no ripple effects along the east and west. Certainly, I think Tim Lawton to the west is staying as he is pretty much. We would hate to see any effects going down further to the east because that would cause you all sorts of trouble in numbers and would ripple right the way through into Kent. We are not proposing that at all today. We want the boundaries to remain pretty much as they are. We can confirm

the boundaries that we are proposing to the north, west, east and obviously the south because you would have trouble with a bit of land reclamation there. It would have been difficult. We can confirm that the boundaries we are talking about today are exactly the same as the ones the Boundary Commission has proposed. We have gone along with your proposals and now we are looking more at the mix within the city.

I have a presentation later in the day from the Federation chairman but, because he is so keen and was here earlier, you have already heard that. You might hear from him again, but I am happy to answer any questions to do with that as well. We tend to work very closely together, although you might not think so sometimes.

These are our proposals. You can see they are not radically different. Over there in the west, we keep the city boundary the same. To the north along here, (indicating) we keep it pretty much the same. Certainly, over here in Woodingdean, we do believe there is a natural boundary between Woodingdean and Rottingdean. They might both be Deans but there is a sort of natural, green boundary there. We are quite happy to keep them as they are. We do not see that there is any problem with putting Woodingdean and Moulescoomb and Bevendean into Brighton. There is a fairly natural mix along there.

We are quite happy to keep the existing boundaries as they are. We do not want any ripples in East and West Sussex, just to confirm that. The boundaries are as they were.

If I can look inside the city, I suppose I must comment on some of the things I have heard today so far. I was not going to, but I have heard some ideas about splitting wards and even splitting streets. I think that, at the moment, there are no proposals as far as I know - it has been alluded to - to change any of the ward makeup in the city at the moment. Certainly, I am a councillor for Hangleton and I have 10,500 residents there. I know that Lee is there and he has a similar number there. For an inner city, I think that is about normal. I do not see there is any point in splitting the wards. I think the wards are going to remain as they are. That is another confirmation there.

If we move on and talk about the boundaries in sweeping detail, this was going to be animated but I apologise. It cannot cope. If we look at the suburbs, to be honest, North Portslade, if you take a car journey or cycle as I have today, cycling from Hangleton, if you move across these wards, the first thing that you notice is that they all look very similar. They are all very suburban. I might as well be honest with you. Any of these wards could end up in any of the constituencies.

The bypass cuts through them so a lot of these wards are farmland up here. Really, you are looking at the boundary of residents coming quite low down here. They do look like they are very large wards, but a lot of it is farmland. Suburbia: they could go anywhere, but what we have decided is that there is a very natural break. If you go up to Ditchling Road, which is here, from the bypass and you come down, in Hollingbury, there is a very large, green space with Hollingbury Golf Course. There is an Asda store down here and

retail units. If you move along from there, there is, if you like, this sort of green lung that goes across and that is a very natural boundary that comes down Ditchling Road [here](#). We have decided that that is probably the best place to propose for our ward changes. If anybody does not know Brighton, I think that is probably the place where we should start.

Of course, the main thing that has come up today is the seafront. That is key to these proposals and also the inner seafront. If we look at the seafront all the way along [here](#) and maybe inland as well, [this](#) is the residential area, because it is quite low. [This](#) is farmland. We are looking at the seafront and the inner region that sweeps across [here](#). It is really the backbone of the city and we believe that the natural boundary is at Sackville Road [here](#).

I think Lee has mentioned the old Brunswick estate. That is a very, very natural place to put a boundary. I will explain why. Hopefully, I will convince you in a minute.

If we look at, first of all, the housing, you will notice that along the seafront [here](#), right the way to Sackville Road, it is a very historic square. If you go inland only a few hundred yards or maybe a mile or so, there are some very historic squares, Regency and Georgian buildings that are quite old. Then, all of a sudden, quite abruptly as you go between [this](#) area [here](#) and [here](#), they become very residential, one and two storeys. It is very much late 19<sup>th</sup> century/20<sup>th</sup> century housing in Hove. If you were to take a drive along any of the road is going east to west, you would notice that, going along [here](#), you lose the splendour of Brighton and Hove squares and you very soon come into houses like [this](#).

Moving on to the seafront, - I do apologise to that gentleman there; this was taken from Google maps last night. I do not know who he is. Along the Brighton seafront, you will drive along, cycle or walk and you will see buildings much like [these](#). They are very splendid. A lot of them have been broken up into flats, but they do look very impressive.

Again, at Sackville Road, it looks like [this](#). It is very much more modern. [This](#) actually is Sackville Road [here](#). It goes from [these](#) types of buildings and, as you cross Sackville Road, [this](#) is the first building you see. [This](#) building [here](#), you can see, then goes all the way along Hove seafront and they are much more modern buildings. Straight away, past Sackville Road, have a drive tonight. Do not take my word. I am a politician. You should not ever take my word. As you move along [there](#), the buildings inland change dramatically and so does the seafront architecture. I think that is one of the natural breaks at Sackville Road.

If we then look at the retail in the city, everybody knows that in the centre of Brighton [here](#) there is Churchill Square. As we move from Churchill Square eastwards, there is standard retail as we move into Kemptown but also, as you move along [here](#), we have Church Road and that cuts along [here](#). It starts at Western Road and ends up at Church Road. It is very much [this](#) type of building, where you have retail on the lower floor and then you have residential, maybe solicitors or something above it. It looks very much like

this. It comes all the way along Church Road and, again very abruptly, stops at Sackville Road. You see a theme is appearing here. Very abruptly at Sackville Road, it becomes very residential. Some of these have been turned into nurseries and osteopaths but it still very much has a feel of a residential area, much like the houses up here. Again, that is a natural break at Sackville Road.

At the moment, we have a green lung, if you like, coming down here, a natural break, and we have the Sackville Road area, which splits the two areas very precisely.

I hope nobody here has a nervous disposition, because I am about to talk about the ambience of the city, so do go with me a bit. The first thing to say is that Brighton and most of these areas here have a certain tourist feel to them. They have very much a lively feel. There are hen parties. There are lots of modern hotels. It is very much a seaside resort. We like to think of it as an upmarket seaside resort in the city, but it is very much a seaside resort for having a bit of fun.

As you move across into Hove Lawns down here, it becomes much more sedate. Again, that is probably only 200 or 300 yards beyond Sackville Road. You will see the bowls club down there. I think there is the tremendously exciting pitch and putt that you will get to eventually and then the Hove Lagoon. The nature of the entertainment going across here changes dramatically, again at Sackville Road.

As we move onto the night-time, all that should have come in front of it. You can see there is a lot of night-time liveliness about Brighton, certainly in this area here. In Hove, we do things like tracking hedgehogs. You may laugh but I have done this. I am part of Hangleton Hedgehogs and that is what we do. That is how we have fun at night in Hangleton. We go out. The police stopped me one night and they said, "What you doing?" And I said, "I am looking for aliens". Then I actually admitted that we were part of Hangleton Hedgehogs, Hangleton up here, and we are part of a society.

If you look at the difference between the Brighton entertainment and the Hove entertainment, again, it is all of this area up here. There are very different types of activity in the evenings. That is just a little publicity there for Hangleton Hedgehogs.

At council I think two weeks ago, we had a deputation from somebody in Brunswick and Adelaide. This was at full council ten days ago, I think. The deputy was saying that the antisocial behaviour in Brunswick and Adelaide and along here now is becoming very similar to Brighton and Hove. You can check on the council deputation. The policing and night-time economy along here has swept all the way along Church Road. The deputation asked for similar policing tactics and cumulative impact zones, as they currently have in Brighton. I think you will find the economy is very much moving along here, similar to Brighton. As you can see, it is very different from the one you will get west of Sackville Road.

That is a sad fact of life but I think the policing and the problems that they have along this strip here are very different from the ones that we have in Hove, even if it is people rabid with hedgehog tracking devices.

Lastly are landmarks. Currently, the Boundary Commission proposals that will go down here and also some of the other parties' proposals, if you look down here, one of the landmarks that are currently associated with Brighton is the Brighton Pier, or the Palace Pier, as people have tried to keep it. We would have the Pavilion, which is in Regency ward. We would have Churchill Square shopping centre, which is the main retail outlet in the city. We would have certainly the Grand Hotel, the new I360 and then eventually the King Alfred. All of these would be taken and pushed into a Hove ward. You would effectively be putting the Brighton Pier, Brighton Pavilion, Brighton Churchill Square shopping centre, the Grand Hotel, Brighton, the new I360 Brighton and the King Alfred shopping centre all into effectively a Hove ward. We think that is probably a step too far at the moment. That is probably too much for the city to take.

The Boundary Commission's current proposals would have all of these outside of Brighton and push them into Hove. The Conservative proposal would have all these remaining within a Brighton constituency.

Just to summarise quickly, the external boundaries remain exactly as they are by the Boundary Commission. As a scientist, I would not put it upon you to have 1,000 you have to get from the east or the west. That is terrible. The architecture, the housing, is very different between the two areas. Retail, starting at Churchill Square and moving along, is very different. Sorry to do this to you again but the night-time economy and the general tourism are very different.

We believe that the Conservative proposal is a solution that will work. It retains the boundaries. It has exactly the right numbers we need for all the historical reasons and of course the Brighton Pavilion would remain within Brighton.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do we have any questions? Just give us your name and where you are from.

MS HUGH-JONES: I live in Preston Park. I have a number of points, firstly with Patcham. I understand that people in the northern wards may not want to go out at night in Patcham but they might want to come into the town centre during the day. All the existing public transport routes run north/south, so you are looking at the 5, the 5B, the 5A. They all come north/south, so it does not seem to me to make an awful lot of sense to chop out Preston Park, with all that line coming north/south, and put it in a different constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Can I just remind you that you should be asking for points of clarification, rather than making speeches?



MS HUGH-JONES: Sorry.

CLLR JANIO: I will answer that, if I may.

MS HUGH-JONES: My other point of clarification was to do with Central Hove. It is continuous with Brunswick and Adelaide and parts of Regency. The way I see it, you are putting Central Hove in Brighton Pavilion.

CLLR JANIO: Perhaps I could answer those two points because I have a very short-term memory and I can only do two points at a time.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Have you finished?

MS HUGH-JONES: No, I have one more point.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You are asking for clarification in that Central Hove is being put into Brighton Pavilion?

MS HUGH-JONES: Yes. My next point is associated with that because what you are proposing is to move the King Alfred into the same constituency as Brighton Pavilion, which already has the Prince Regent. I know. I go swimming there regularly, so you are actually putting two swimming pools into one constituency and leaving Hove without or the western part of the city without a pool.

CLLR JANIO: Can I answer those questions? First of all, there is no proposal to lift the bricks and mortar from the King Alfred into Brighton. It will remain exactly where it is. It just will be in a different constituency. The type of representation for the Prince Regent will be exactly the same type of people who use the King Alfred.

I think the Sackville Road is the important part. All the large infrastructure that is going to be built will be in Brighton. The character of Hove will very much remain the character of Hove. That is very evident by the break at Sackville Road.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Perhaps we could just stick with points of clarification.

CLLR JANIO: I understand. I am trying to be helpful.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I am very grateful but can you just confirm that you are putting Central Hove into Brighton Pavilion?

CLLR JANIO: We are. I think my colleague mentioned earlier that Central Hove was only recently, in the last 20 years, renamed Central Hove. It used to be part of Vallance ward. Central Hove was only a convenient name given to it. It is not really the centre of

Hove. The centre of Hove really is Hove Park and all the associated areas here. Central Hove might need to be renamed.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: What about the point about north/south transport links from Patcham?

CLLR JANIO: In fact, that is a good point. I did have more slides originally. The 5A, the 5B and the 5 terminate and start within 300 yards of where I live, up here in Hangleton. I originally did big arrows, sweeping down into the centre and then sweeping back into Patcham. As you can see, the 5s all pretty much go up here. People tend to start, they move across these wards and they move as their life patterns. They tend to start off here, where houses are slightly cheaper and they do tend to migrate over here and come back, so there are a lot of family ties. You threaten the 5 buses with your lives, if you are a councillor. There are a lot of family ties between these regions here. It does not go so much into here. That was one of my slides originally. The 5 buses will go down there, sweep into town and then go up to Patcham.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Just a point of clarification, rather than a debate?

MS SHANKS: (Green Party) I might have missed the very beginning. You are only proposing two constituencies? My name is Sue Shanks. I am a former councillor in Withdean. Are you just proposing two constituencies? I just wondered where the natural heart of this left-hand - I am not sure what you are calling it - if you are calling it "Hove" is. Usually in a constituency, there would be the centre of population where the MP might have their office or people might gravitate towards it. It looks to me that that does not feel like it has a heart in that left-hand one.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Your question is, "Where is the heart of the Hove constituency?"

MS SHANKS: Yes, if one needs to have one. I think community links are an important thing. I was a councillor in Withdean and Withdean sees itself very firmly in Brighton and that boundary which goes between Withdean and Hove Park, which was talked about earlier, the Dyke Road, people do not want to go to school for example in Hove Park if they live in the south of Withdean. When I was a councillor, we had a lot of fuss about the fact that they wanted to go to school in Preston Park.

CLLR JANIO: I am sorry. I have lost the point.

MS SHANKS: It is the community links really, the heart of that community, because at the moment those are two quite distinct communities and you are removing the city, anywhere that people might go to shop, find offices or whatever, and the numbers. Is that a third?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think the question really is about where is the heart of your proposed Hove constituency.

CLLR JANIO: Personally, I think it is a slightly false question. The heart of the Brighton side is very much this area round here. The heart of Brighton certainly has a lot of characteristics all along the seafront with all the landmarks, as I have said, and all the architecture. The policing problems, the typical problems that an MP would have are now, I am afraid, very much the problems of Preston Park, St Peter's and North Laine, Regency, Brunswick and Adelaide and Central Hove.

As you move across Sackville Road, you do not have to have a heart of a community. You just have to have a community that feels like it is part of the constituency. If you look at the Hove Lawns, if you look at the architecture, you move up into Hangleton and Knoll, North Portslade. We have two excellent schools. We have Hove Park. If you like, it is the green heart. I cycled through it yesterday and thought what a wonderful park Hove Park is. If you need a beating heart, you touch Hove Park at your peril. It is a lovely place. That is, if you like, the heart of it. It has no synergy at all with Preston Park. I do not see how Hove Park could be in there.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think we should try and have a bit of order here. I think what you are saying is that there is not a natural heart in the sense that the Lanes are part of this, which is a helpful point.

CLLR JANIO: No and, with respect to Sue, all constituencies around the country do not necessarily have to have that.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Indeed. You have looked at entertainment, architecture and activities. Have you looked at things like school catchment areas, parishes and that sort of thing? What would that tell us?

CLLR JANIO: I think the only real parish that is interesting is in Rottingdean, down there. We do not really have parishes within the city at all that we have to deal with. Schools are interesting. We became quite famous in Brighton for a lottery system and Sue should know all about this because of when she was a councillor. It is pretty much Hangleton that it affects. I know all about that and I get the residents' problems. The schools are just coming up with new proposals for catchment areas and they do not really affect the constituency boundaries at all. It is almost irrelevant to the constituency boundaries. There will be a catchment area up here. There will be ones here.

There is a big dispute about a catchment area here because of a free school. That is still to be decided. That is for the future. It is not clear cut at the moment.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You are saying that the proposed school catchment areas do not reflect communities.

CLLR JANIO: I wish they did but, sadly, they do not, no.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I do not want to get into a debate.

CLLR JANIO: Why not? Let's go for it!

MS SHANKS: It is actually a point to do with parishes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could you give us a question about a point of clarification?

MS SHANKS: Have you considered St John's Church in Preston Park, which technically is in Withdean.? Most of the congregation comes from a combination of Preston Park, Patcham and Withdean.

CLLR JANIO: I have no idea where that is.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: There is an opportunity when you make your written representations and a further opportunity when you can examine everybody's written representations and then comment on those written representations. It is an opportunity for people, if they so decide, to challenge the representations.

CLLR JANIO: On that last point, maybe where I have probably differed from some of the previous people doing presentations is that the Conservative Party has tried to produce two constituencies that have a natural feel to them, not necessarily splitting streets, wards and putting ward councillors from one ward into another ward and moving polling districts, which I think would cause a lot more dislocation than considering a church. We have churches in Hangleton where people come from all over the area. I think that is probably micromanaging. That is certainly something that would need to be considered if we were changing the ward boundaries. I completely agree but, to answer that point exactly, we are now talking about two distinct parliamentary constituencies and the type of representation that Members of Parliament need to give to their residents.

I have clearly shown that the areas here are very much rural and relaxed, as opposed to rural and touristy. That is the split that I was trying to get.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: This is a point of clarification?

MR HARRIS: (Green Party) Very much. I know you are talking primarily about these two constituencies and it might be that I am not seeing the shading very well on the display. Where is the boundary between----?

CLLR JANIO: The boundary is here. The exact boundary here is as the Boundary Commission proposed.

MR HARRIS: Surely the numbers----?

CLLR JANIO: There is a 300 difference between the two constituencies.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You are saying that you followed the Boundary Commission's eastern proposal?

CLLR JANIO: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You are saying that the numbers add up. Brighton and Seahaven, or whatever we call it----

MR HARRIS: It just includes Rottingdean?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Presumably, it is exactly the same as the Boundary Commission's proposal?

CLLR JANIO: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It goes from Queens Park straight through to Seaford.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CLLR JANIO: This boundary here is exactly as the Boundary Commission proposed.

MR WINTER: May I just clarify what we have proposed? We have proposed that East Brighton and Queens Park be part of that eastern constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Let us just clarify it. Shall we take a pause?

CLLR WARES: Mr Chairman, may I assist you? If your colleague could put up the presentation that I did earlier this morning, which others in the room missed, it would highlight quite clearly the boundaries that we are proposing which would more than clarify the misunderstanding we are seeing.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes. There is a misunderstanding.

CLLR WARES: There is, sir, yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you want to put up Councillor Wares's presentation, the second slide, I think? We will just pause while people absorb this. The previous slide I think was hard to interpret, shall we say. Is everyone happy?

MR BEAMENT: If we do not have a speaker coming after us, I have not met Tony before but I am looking forward to shaking his hand after this. It would be easier with the previous slide. There are just a few points of clarification. One is that my understanding is that Brighton Palace Pier is in the Queens Park ward. You were talking as if it was going to be part of your Pavilion proposal. I was going to use it myself and this is why I make the point. I looked more carefully. The boundary is very close but it is in the Queens Park ward.

CLLR JANIO: It is but, if you walk down the Pavilion to the pier it appears as if it is very close.

MR BEAMENT: That is fair enough. The second point of clarification is I think quite clearly our proposal. You have often talked about splitting streets and I do not really know what you mean because streets, ward boundaries, split streets - what exactly are you saying when you are saying that for example our proposal splits streets?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Is that the last of your clarifications?

MR BEAMENT: I had another vague point. I am a Ditchling resident and I come in on the Ditchling Road. Although it does follow your boundary to start off with, it then goes the other side of Preston Park as it comes down. This is the road I always come into Brighton on so I know it very well. It does not form the kind of natural boundary that you are talking about. It forms possibly a boundary between Patcham and Hollingdean. It does not when you get to Hollingdean and Preston Park.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: There are two questions, I think. One is about the nature of roads as boundaries and, secondly, where exactly the buses go in Ditchling Road.

MR BEAMENT: It was splitting streets. I just did not understand what you meant.

CLLR JANIO: The point I was trying to make is, if you take a ward and you split polling districts unnecessarily, you might have a street that runs along a polling district and suddenly the ward councillors will be part of a constituency that is not part of their constituency. If you are dealing with a resident and a problem down a street, you are now splitting ward councillors. Who would they contact? Would they contact one parliamentary office or another parliamentary office? It is just nice and easy if the two constituencies are delineated along ward boundaries. We have enough problems as it is. I am in Hangleton. I cross over here and there is a little area called Hangleton Bottom, but it is in North Portslade ward. We get people emailing us about problems in Hangleton

Bottom. It is not in our ward so then we have to pass those onto the councillor. The councillor then has to get in touch maybe with the MP. It is nice to have those very well-defined so that a councillor in a certain area knows which MP they should contact. To have split wards adds to the complexity of it.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: What about the Ditchling Road bus route?

CLLR JANIO: I have no idea about the Ditchling Road bus route. I am a Hangleton councillor and the 5s are very important to me.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I am going to take one final question because we do have our next speaker.

CLLR JANIO: I can confirm I have coloured in too many. I got a bit crazy with my diagram. Sorry.

CLLR WARES: I am just going to speak in my capacity as ward councillor for Patcham. I would hope Councillor Janio would agree, contrary to a comment earlier, that residents of Patcham and Hollingbury are quite content going out at night in a very safe part of our city. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for that clarification.

CLLR JANIO: I can confirm that.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for your presentation. Angela Devas, please? I do not think you were here when I made our introductory remarks. Everything is being recorded on video so that the whole thing is on public record. Could you just say, for the record, who you are and where you are from? Then you have ten minutes to make your presentation.

MS DEVAS: I will not take ten minutes. I just want to make a couple of points. I am Angela Devas and I am from Hove. First of all, I do not think there has been enough information about this process. It was very hard to get hold of and many people I have spoken to do not know about it so I think there should be a lot more publicity because it is going to greatly affect a large number of people.

My main concern is that the constituency - I think it is called Brighton North - no longer has any seafront and that is clearly completely stupid. Brighton is a sea town and to deny one of the proposed new constituencies access to the seafront just makes no sense whatsoever.

The third point I want to make is that these new boundaries no longer respect the difference between Hove and Brighton which has been there for many years. Those are my three points.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It is just possible somebody might want to ask a question of clarification. No. Thank you very much for coming in and making those points. I do not suppose Benjamin Wetherall is a Green Party member? We do not know.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I ask when the next speaker is going to be?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is a jolly good question which I am struggling to answer for you. We do have somebody who was booked in for 12.50 who, as yet, has not shown up. We will give him until maybe 1.20 and, if he is not here, we will adjourn for lunch. We have a number of speakers in the afternoon. Oliver Coulson is the first speaker in the afternoon at 2.30. We will adjourn just now until 1.20. If there is nobody, we will adjourn until 2.30.

#### After the luncheon adjournment

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: We shall reconvene. You are Mr Lloyd?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: Lloyd is my first name.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: You have to go and stand at the lectern. Everything is recorded and videoed for the public record. To begin with, you need to identify who you are and where you are from as part of that public record. Then you will have ten minutes. If there are questions of clarification, either members of the audience or myself will ask you about those and then we will be done.

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: My name is Lloyd Russell-Moyle. I am a councillor in East Brighton, elected only earlier on this year. I was the parliamentary candidate for the Labour Party in Lewes constituency at the last election and I have stood previously for council elections in both constituencies. I am currently the acting chair of the Labour Party here in Brighton, Hove and District, which covers the three current constituencies all the way to Peacehaven.

That is, I guess, the background that you wanted to know. Broadly, I wanted to focus my ten minutes mainly on the East Brighton seat. The Labour Party is fairly content with the North Brighton and Hove and Central Brighton seats. Some naming of those could be maybe improved and I am sure, particularly with the Hove and Central Brighton seat, Hove would need to be the prominent naming of that.

I am aware that of course some will want to argue minor changes around that, particularly with the way Hove Park was included but, as far as we can see it in terms of the conditions



that were put to you, which are important, there is not much else that could be done unless one were to go into West Sussex.

There is a wider discussion about moving into West Sussex. The Shoreham area is much more linked to Brighton than it ever has been, but I think there is a wider discussion beyond the scope of how you put your parameters, wanting to keep as much as possible the former counties as a whole. Unfortunately, it takes that off the table but, as I said, I think there is a wider discussion about that county boundary to be had in future years.

Apart from that, the two seats from the Labour Party point of view seem not to be a problem. I know the Labour Party nationally is content and will not argue with any of the three seats. Locally however, many of our members are slightly disappointed about the East Brighton seat. I think the feeling is a few fold and I want to go through some of those reasons with you.

First of all, in terms of the makeup of the Brighton part of the East Brighton seat, the ward that I represent, East Brighton, is probably one of the poorest wards in the South East in terms of multiple deprivation. It is one of our biggest council estates, but it also has the biggest hospital in the area and has a lot of people who work in that hospital. Health is quite an important boundary for that region. The hospital also runs satellites in Haywards Heath and there is one in Lewes town, which I will come to in a bit.

In terms of the CCGs, we have a CCG here in Brighton. There is a CCG of Lewes, the Havens and the Weald and there is a separate CCG for Seaford. If you are in an accident in Seaford, you are sent to Eastbourne, unless it is of a regional level of importance, if you understand what I mean. If you are in an accident, minor or fairly serious, in Newhaven, you are sent to East Brighton, the Royal Sussex. In fact, for out-patient appointments, you will go to the Royal Sussex, whereas for out-patient appointments in Seaford you will go to Eastbourne General predominantly, sometimes even over to Hastings. You can see where I am going with this to some extent.

The feeling I think, with a lot of local members, is that the Seaford part of the proposed constituency seems to be an element of an anomaly with the direction of where Seaford looks.

Of course, there is the naming of the Seahaven region which is sometimes used to refer to Seaford, Newhaven and Peacehaven as an integrated economy. The reality is that there are also other names that are used. The Ouse Valley, to describe the link between Newhaven and Lewes or just the Havens, to talk about Peacehaven and Newhaven as a stand alone as opposed to Seaford. Just because there happens to be a naming convention between Seaford and Newhaven and Peacehaven does not to me seem to indicate necessarily that there are stronger community ties than there are in other parts of the area.

In terms of education, again, for secondary school education, each of the towns has its own secondary school. East Brighton and Queens Park would be going over to a different education constituency. There are significant ties between Newhaven, Peacehaven and Lewes town to wider Brighton in terms of education and sixth form education. That tie does not again exist in the same way with Seaford. The Seaford head has reconstructed the sixth form and a lot of its students look to Eastbourne for their sixth form education. In fact, the further education college which covers Lewes, Newhaven and Eastbourne, which is a joint further education college for the area, operates the Newhaven campus as a satellite of the Lewes campus in terms of its technical education offered there. Again, splitting Newhaven and Lewes seems to be rather disappointing in that respect.

In terms of the numbers, it could be quite possible for you to remove Seaford and add in Lewes and the Ouse Valley. It would become a truly east of Brighton seat rather than a seat that is effectively at the moment a coastal strip seat. In terms of the political culture in those areas, they probably share much alike. There is a strong transport link between Lewes and Newhaven, both bus routes down the Ouse Valley and of course the train route. While Seaford does benefit from the train route and the road route, there are also strong links between Seaford, going through Alfriston up to Polegate.

Leaving Eastdene and Alfriston in the Lewes and Uckfield constituency would provide a bit of a dog leg of a constituency, of just a few wards there that reach down to the coast. Adding Seaford in and replacing it with Lewes could provide a real centre of focus that would be a clear two to three central focus for that constituency. No constituency is going to look sensible with the requirements that the government has put on, but there needs to be some recognition that an alternative there could be quite positive.

I have mentioned the CCGs. I also wanted to mention the Biosphere Project of Brighton and Hove, which is UNESCO recognised. That includes Lewes as a town, all the way to Newhaven. It is part of the wider environmental, sustainable economy that operates in the area and the region. It does not include Seaford. Again, in terms of thinking how that region operates environmentally and socially, to put Lewes out onto another constituency would seem disappointing and, in that respect, a shame.

Of course, one could argue that Seaford, Lewes and Newhaven have strong links. I guess our preference to some extent would be the constituencies as they look at the moment, with minor tweaks. Clearly, that is not an option for you. The question is: how can we make the best out of a bad restriction? If we look at Lewes a little bit more, its link with Uckfield was cut many years ago on the trains. It has a bus that shuffles between the two but primarily, if you take that bus, it is full not between the Uckfield and Lewes leg of that bus journey but between the Lewes and Brighton leg of that journey. It is one of the few profitable bus routes in the county, but the profitability comes from the link between Lewes and Brighton, going up to Ringmer and less so between Lewes and Uckfield. That route becomes profitable again between Uckfield, Crowborough and Tunbridge Wells. Looking

at how that route is profitable gives you also an indication of where the passenger transport is the heaviest and has the highest usage.

Lewes itself, whilst this is a connection with the wider Brighton area than just east Brighton itself, has a large number of commuters that commute both ways from Brighton to live and work in the respective towns. In fact, Sussex University has just rented out quite a number of hotel accommodations for its new students at the university. Lewes, more and more, is a town that is looking towards Brighton rather than looking towards Uckfield. Whilst that would not be wholly resolved by including Lewes in an east Brighton seat, the university itself would be in a North Brighton seat. It would allow a look towards Brighton, the wider politics of Brighton and the affairs that seem to be shared very much more between Lewes and Brighton than between, say, Lewes and Uckfield or Seaford and Lewes.

It is interesting that I was asking around my colleagues in Lewes and my colleagues in Queens Park and East Brighton about how many times they had visited Seaford in their lives. The response that they give is in single digits. It is a curiosity town, just as people would visit for tourism in other towns but, in terms of a regular connection, it is extremely low. Lewes to Brighton and Newhaven to Brighton are very regular connections.

It should of course be noted that my colleagues in Seaford that I have spoken to would equally see themselves as pulled towards Brighton and Eastbourne. I do not want to give the impression that Seaford members are saying, "No, we do not see any connection with Brighton at all". They do see a connection, but it is equal to Eastbourne and it is equal to Lewes. Seaford has always been a town, to some extent, that has been pulled in many directions from it being a cinque port linked to Hastings to the present day; whereas Newhaven and Peacehaven have much more looked to Brighton. In that sense, that part of the inclusion was both expected and not a surprise.

I have tried to cover the social aspects. Already, with things like the Brighton Festival as well, many of those activities have started to spill over into Lewes and Ringmer. The Charleston Festival, which is a literature festival, happens alongside the Brighton Festival in the Ringmer and Ouse Valley ward. Again, it is about that cultural element that Lewes, East Brighton and Brighton as a whole seem to share much more than Seaford.

Of course, there could be an argument to try and include Lewes in a north Brighton seat and then rejig all the other wards to match. What I am suggesting here is the least onerous of any changes in that respect. I hope that is what would be appreciated. I think also it is important that as few constituencies cross political boundaries as possible. The Kempton seat, which the East Brighton Park makes up, already crosses over the boundary. It would make no sense to have two constituencies crossing over a political boundary if one could arrange it that only one constituency crosses over the political boundary - i.e., to have north Brighton wholly within Brighton City Council and east Brighton to be the one that does wrap around.

I have a number of testimonies from young people who live in the area about what their feelings are. I will put those in writing to you rather than reading them out. I have a few maps and geographical mapping as well and I will put those in the written submission to you. I think that is broadly the final thing.

As I said, we can live with the results but, with that one tweak, we feel it would improve the coherent nature of the local connections, even if on a map it looks less desirable. It makes it more condensed in one area than a string constituency which is not particularly desirable in terms of cohesion. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Just so that I am clear about what is being proposed, you are suggesting that the five----

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: I can point it out if it is useful.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Let me tell you what I think I heard. The five Seaford wards would become part of what is currently called Lewes and Uckfield that would be called something else if Lewes then joined Brighton East and Newhaven. Which wards in Lewes would you be suggesting?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: I would suggest Ouse Valley/Ringmer, Bridge, Castle, which is not indicated on there but is a smaller one, and Kingston. It would make the numbers up if one does the calculation. It would be five wards so it would become a seat that physically wraps around eastern Brighton rather than a seat that flows from the tip of eastern Brighton along to Eastbourne effectively. It would, I assume, because something like East Brighton and Ouse Valley seat because it would effectively go up the Ouse Valley to Lewes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: In terms of the numbers, that works out?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: It does work out in terms of the thresholds. I have done those maths and our national office has done those maths. The national office is ambivalent to that particular change but it has confirmed with me that it works in terms of numbers on both sides of the constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I have one other question. You mentioned that Seaford looks to Eastbourne and to Brighton. What you did not say was Seaford looking north to the rest of this new constituency like Uckfield and beyond. Is there any connection between----?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: There is definitely a connection between Seaford and Polegate.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could you point out where Polegate is?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: Polegate is here (indicating). Polegate at the moment is the last town in the Lewes constituency and would remain in the Lewes and Uckfield constituency in the proposals. It is a medium-sized town that effectively has become a satellite town of Eastbourne. I am sure Polegate people would not like me saying that but that is where they tend to look. There is a good connection between Polegate and Seaford and to Alfriston.

I agree with you. Seaford all the way up to Uckfield would be less of a connection. There is a road but it is a rather rural road that runs, not via Lewes, but directly skirting Hailsham. No constituency is perfect. In terms of then bolstering Eastdene and Alfriston and Polegate, which become a bit of the dog leg of the constituency, you allow the constituency to be a real two centre constituency, so a Seaford and Polegate centre and then a more northern part of a centre; whereas at the moment you have a Lewes and Uckfield centre in that constituency. The danger is this bit gets completely forgotten. There is already that danger with Polegate. A load of candidates and my Conservative candidates have always worked very hard to make sure feel is included in that constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for that. Any other questions?

MR BEAMENT: (Green Party) There are numerous points I want to make in response to this.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: This is for clarification, remember.

MR BEAMENT: Can you clarify how your proposal stands to the national Labour Party and the South East region Labour Party proposal? I was there at the Guildford hearing and there was no mention of this.

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: I have tried to be very clear. The national party has remained agnostic about that particular change. Their feeling is that we can live with the three as proposed. This is a proposal of a number of the local constituencies who really know the local area and how local community links and they feel it would benefit from that. The national party, looking at the bigger picture, feels that it would not make much advantage one way or another from the party's perspective and therefore is not something that the party is going to push. I am here to try and talk about those local links and local connections which is what I think the Boundary Commission needs to be doing ahead of just looking at what the national parties are saying from their satellite overview.

I was trying to be very clear because I do not want to misrepresent the national party or the regional party to say that they are suddenly coming around to a different view than what was presented at the regional hearing. That is not the case.

MR BEAMENT: Is it okay to make a couple of other points of clarification?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: As long as they are questions of clarification.

MR BEAMENT: As far as I can tell, your argument for crossing the Downs, because geographically there is quite a separation between east Brighton and Lewes, a large, empty space, to put it another way; whereas, along the A259 as the Boundary Commission has proposed, there is almost continuous conurbation all the way along the coast there. You had health and education links and some justification in terms of transport but it seemed to me that there needed to be more to overcome the point which the Boundary Commission has, which is geography.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: What point are you asking to be clarified?

MR BEAMENT: The geography. What is the justification against the first of the four criteria?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: I think we can all see the geography. What I am trying to talk about is the way that human beings inhabit that geography. We can all look at geography on a map. The point surely of the hearing is for human beings to come along and say, "Yes, there might be a green space here and not much of a green space there", but actually the human interaction is much more this way or that way etc. That, to me, is the point of hearings, not just to be reiterating political points or what everyone can see on a map. Of course it is strong and that is why I have tried to be very clear that I am not in any way dismissing totally the Boundary Commission's current proposal, but saying there is an alternative that would, I think, have a stronger social connection, even if it does not have what looks on a map to be a stronger geographic connection. The geographic connection, in terms of transport links, is not bad either. I did mention the biosphere of the area that cuts off right here at this ward and goes up here and then across here, slightly up there and then down here. That is where the UNESCO biosphere region covers. To some extent, they make a distinction where that line is. I would counter that they are more expert in terms of how environmental geography fits together than I or maybe you. I could not possibly comment.

MR BEAMENT: I am no expert on plant life.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you have a last point of clarification?

MR BEAMENT: Yes. This is a very quick, personal point. I am a Ditchling resident and therefore I would really love to know what happens to Ditchling in this proposal because I do not know where it is going to be connected to, if you take Lewes out. You tell me.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Where is Ditchling in your proposal?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: Ditchling is, at the moment, just here. Ditchling is one of those villages that really looks to a town that is not in its constituency quite a fair bit, in terms of Burgess Hill.

MR BEAMENT: Brighton as well.

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: Yes. I am not proposing that suddenly it goes into Burgess Hill. If we were able to totally redraw the map with different parameters, yes, I think that would be the argument, that Ditchling should go into Burgess Hill. What I am trying to do is give a conservative element of change. Ditchling would be with Chailey, North Chailey and Newick, which is the rural, northern part of Lewes district. That rural part of Lewes district does have a very different economy to the southern Lewes town downwards. Of course, there is an inter-linkage but it would be linked with those wards that go up in lines because of the history of how the area was farmed. I am sure we can all talk about the history of the forestry and everything in that area, which is very different - and you can even physically see it in those wards - to the history of how wards have developed south of Lewes.

MR BEAMENT: If you are not crossing the West Sussex border, is Ditchling in the same constituency as Seaford? Is that what you are proposing?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: Yes, as Uckfield and Seaford. Ditchling would be part of that Uckfield part of the constituency, in my vision, and then Alfriston would have a centre into the seat. I do not think that constituency becomes perfect but I do not think it is very good at the moment either. The argument is: where do you want the centres of gravity to be and, equally, how do you make sure Eastdene does not just get completely cut off from being in a constituency where its centre of gravity is not either side? Some villages, I am afraid, are going to get lost in a proposal where we are not able to have more flexibility of numbers or are decreasing MPs rather than increasing them, which is what we should be doing, but that is a political argument that is not really for this room, is it?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: There is a question at the back.

MR WALDEN: The proposed East Brighton and Newhaven seat: you are proposing that Seaford should go from that proposed seat and be replaced by the Lewes wards and the Kingston West ward into an East Brighton and Lewes seat, including Newhaven?

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE: I would call it an East Brighton and Ouse Valley seat, but yes. Let us not get caught up in the names. That is effectively what I think would provide more of a focus of a seat that wraps around East Brighton than, as I see it at the moment, a seat that follows from the edge of East Brighton and effectively goes, barring one Ward, to Eastbourne, the next big conurbation. Whilst I note that those strip constituencies do exist in other proposals, I am not sure strip constituencies are particularly politically cohesive.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thanks very much. That is a very useful discussion of that proposal. Our next speaker is due at 4.50 and it is now 3.30, so we will adjourn until 4.30.

Time Noted: 3.30 pm

After a short break

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: All the proceedings are recorded and videoed for the public record so I would ask you to go up to the lectern and make your presentation. You need to start by saying your name and where you are from. Then you have ten minutes and, at the end of the ten minutes, there may be questions from the floor, purely for clarification of what you have said.

MR SIMISTER: My name is James Simister. I live at 42 Bates Road, BN1 6PG, which is just about in Withdean ward and currently in the Brighton Pavilion constituency. First of all, as a member of a long-term Brighton and Hove family, when Brighton and Hove were merged, it was promised that Hove would retain its separate identity and, as has been made clear in various controversies for example over the future of Hove Library, there has been a series of issues on which Hove has had to assert its right to retain that separate identity.

I think a key part of that is having a constituency which is called "Hove", not "Something and Hove", but "Hove". It is strange that the new Brighton Central and Hove constituency will not include Hove Park. I think it would be quite easy to draw up a Hove constituency including Hove Park which would be roughly equal. I notice the three proposed constituencies. One has 71,500, Brighton East and Newhaven; one has 75,000, Brighton North, and one has over 78,000 - that is to say, Brighton Central and Hove.

My second point is that I thought 78,000 was the limit for the new constituencies in terms of numbers of electors. Brighton Central and Hove, as well as having those 78,000 electors, also has a very large number of people who are not registered to vote. Working in the referendum, I was astonished at how many people told me they were not registered to vote, so I am absolutely certain that Brighton Central and Hove, with its large student population and transient worker population, is in fact much larger than that. I feel that perhaps Regency and/or St Peter's and North Laine should be put back into a Brighton East or Brighton North seat and that Hove should include Hove Park.

I am not a member of the Green Party. The document I brought with me is the Labour Party document. I have to say that there are many people in Brighton and Hove who believe that this whole proposal has been designed so as to winkle Caroline Lucas out of her seat. There are millions of people in this country who vote Green, rightly or wrongly, and currently they only have one Member of Parliament. If you wanted to draw up a set



of proposals to divide her supporters into two - and I am not a Green supporter myself - you could not do better than this set of proposals. They absolutely divide the wards which are most strongly Green voting and divide them between two constituencies. I think that is totally wrong. At a time when we are trying to convince the public that they should use their vote and that their vote does count, we need to respect not only the natural communities of Brighton and Hove and other places but also not to draw up proposals which seem almost designed to achieve a party political objective.

I would also add that the Brighton East and Newhaven seat is a very strange shape and includes a very wide range of very different communities. I do not know Brighton East and Newhaven and Seaford so well, so I am not going to comment further upon that, but I have many friends in that area who feel that this is a rather ungainly and unnatural construct of a seat.

To sum up, my objections are about the loss of a Hove seat, the rather strange selection of wards that have been put into different seats, about the very large size of the new Brighton Central and Hove seat where I am sure there are many unregistered electors, and about the appearance that has been given of gerrymandering to try and get the one Green MP in this country out of her seat. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Does anybody want to ask a question? I would just make the comment that the upper limit for the size is 78,507 and the lower is 71,031. The Boundary Commission's proposals which were drawn up by an independent body with no political affiliation obviously were within those limits. Based on the December data, all of our proposals are within the limits.

MR SIMISTER: Sure. Do you take my point about unregistered voters of whom I am convinced, from my work in the referendum, there are an awful lot in the central areas of both towns?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That may well be, but the Boundary Commission is restricted in what it does by a parliamentary order setting out the rules for carrying out this review. That order requires us to take the date in December 2015 as the date for using registration data. Next time round, it will be a different point in the calendar but, for this exercise, we have to use that particular date. There is no flexibility.

MR SIMISTER: Okay. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Our next speaker is Jonathan Hill. Because it is being recorded for the public record, you just need to say who you are and where you live.

MR HILL: I am Jonathan Hill from Hanover ward in Brighton Pavilion.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Now you have your ten minutes.

MR HILL: I will not need ten minutes. What I should say is I booked the slot for five o'clock. I did not think I would make it so I booked one for 5.20. I am not going to be here at 5.20. I am here now. On the creation of Brighton Central and Hove, if you knew the culture of Brighton and Hove, they are very different. We could talk about the demographics been different but I think the vibrancy of the centre of Brighton is very different to Hove. In Hove, obviously, there is an older demographic. I just think the two cultures are different and should not be mixed. I also think it is very strange that you are taking the Pavilion out of Pavilion and you are taking the railway station out of Pavilion as well, I believe.

It looks like the creation of Brighton North means we are going to lose our much beloved Green MP. I think she was parliamentarian of the year and nobody wants to lose her that I know, so that would be a great loss to us in Hanover and Pavilion. I do not think that Newhaven and Seaford have anything to do with Kemptown. They are not in the Brighton and Hove Unitary Authority. It has a knock-on effect. In Lewes, which is a very Liberal town, we have had LibDem MPs. Without Newhaven, that will never happen again. I think Lewes will be very upset about that. I think the culture of Seaford is very different to that of Kemptown.

I think that is pretty much it. I know lots of people who will not turn up who feel the same way I do about the changes to Pavilion. We love Pavilion and we want to keep Pavilion. The idea of losing 50 MPs seems to me wrong. We are decreasing democratic representation when the House of Lords is stuffed full of unelected people.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for that. Does anybody have a question? No. The Boundary Commission cannot comment on the number of MPs. That is what Parliament has decided and we act within that. However, if you and the people that you have spoken to wish to come up with a different arrangement or a different proposal, please do respond by 5 December with a proposal and they will genuinely all be considered against the criteria that we have to work to. We recognise that we do not have the knowledge about local ties that many local people do. If there is a better set of arrangements which reflects local ties and sticks within the constraints of the criteria within which we have to operate, then we are more than happy to consider them.

MR HILL: I think it is the Regency ward that is moving over to Hove. It seems to me like the whole thing is being shifted east, along the coast. If there was a way of the Hove constituency gaining more voters and more electorate by going north or west, I certainly think that would be something to think about because I think the people who live that way have more in common with the people of Hove than the people who live in the centre of Brighton.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Any counter-proposals will of course be considered. Thank you very much indeed. The next one is at 5.30, so we will have a short adjournment until 5.30 and then we will be on the home straight.

After a short break

CLLR WARES: I was second to speak this morning. I am grateful for the manner in which this hearing has been conducted by the speakers and yourselves. I suppose I do not really envy the task that you have ahead of you in trying to consider everything that you have been told today. I just wanted to summarise the Conservative proposal, without going through all the detail again of course, as it affects Hove and Pavilion and of course we do support East Brighton and Seahaven as it is proposed.

The Conservative proposal, we believe, delivers on what is actually possible. We believe that it respects all the parameters that the Commission has to work to. We also believe that it creates the least disruption to the Boundary Commission's proposals and, in particular, has no ripple effect beyond the boundaries of the council's unitary governance boundary. With respect to other submissions that you have had today, I sometimes think that there is probably a tsunami effect with the changes that others might have proposed that could wash all the way down to perhaps the Kent coast, down to Lands End and even as far north as Scotland. Who knows?

Further, we believe that it causes no disruption to local governance by altering ward boundaries and the councillor/residents ratios that currently exist. I am proud that Brighton and Hove are unique, but I do not think we are that unique that we deserve to be the only place in the entire country that has split wards.

Lastly, sir, we believe that what we have done is preserved the character of the towns of Brighton and Hove. As was articulated by my colleague, Councillor Tony Janio, earlier this afternoon and as you have heard numerous times today we believe that we maintain the atmosphere and underlying sense of belonging that people have in the two towns.

We have proposed, as you can see, a north/south boundary to try and keep the constituency links with the sea. Again, that is something we believe that you have heard many times today that people think is important.

We have recognised the saying, "Hove, actually". It is interesting that some of the speakers today read the same Wikipedia page as I did in finding that and I refrain from referring to Laurence Olivier and others, but I was minded to do so. We have noticed that that is really important. We propose that the name of what we think should be the Hove constituency should start with "Hove".

I hope that you have sensed the amount of passion that many of the speakers have brought here today in making that point, hopefully clearly.

We also propose that those landmarks that you would normally associate with Brighton remain in Brighton. For that reason, we would ask that you retain the name of the constituency as Brighton Pavilion.

Sir, that was my summing up. Again, thank you for this process today and for listening to me and everybody else. Good luck with your future endeavours on this very vast project. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Dare I ask whether anybody wants to clarify? I do not think I heard anything new.

MR BEAMENT: You said that your proposals caused the least disruption to the Boundary Commission's proposals in terms of ripple effects and that kind of thing, but that is not a criterion, as I understand it, that the Boundary Commission is working to. How would you say your proposal is in terms of least disruption to existing constituencies, which is indeed one of the criteria that the Boundary Commission is working to?

CLLR WARES: That is a fair comment. Thank you for that. In our proposal with regard to the existing two constituencies as they are today, we are proposing the movement of three wards to accommodate the movement of Moulsecomb and Bevendean and Woodingdean into what we all know currently as Brighton Pavilion.

In terms of the disruption elsewhere, again, I accept that that is not a criterion that the Commission has to work with, but what we tried to do with our proposal was not to put the Commission in a position where, to be able to make Brighton and Hove, as we believe, a better arrangement, it then moves constituency down the coast, in all directions.

I think you would accept that, if we take in something north of our unitary boundary, then we are into mid-Sussex and then from mid-Sussex we are into Crawley and so on and so forth.

MR BEAMENT: You also talked as if splitting wards was something that the Boundary Commission is prevented from doing. You have read the documentation, I am sure. You will know that, under particular circumstances, it is indeed allowable.

CLLR WARES: Yes. Again, I do acknowledge that the splitting of wards is permitted by the Commission. My comment is more in the spirit that, as things currently exist across the entire country, the Commission has worked on the basis that no wards have been split and I sense that the idea of splitting wards is almost something of a last resort when no other solutions that have been presented could work.

MR BEAMENT: I wanted to echo some of the comments that have been made about Hove having a very importantly separate identity. In terms of your own proposal, it seems

as though you are not respecting the Brighton and Hove boundary and you are drawing the boundaries in a slightly different way. Maybe you could just clarify how your proposal relates to what is the traditional Brighton and Hove boundary.

CLLR WARES: Another speaker earlier on who represented the Labour Group acknowledged that there can never be a perfect boundary or a perfect constituency. I think we all live within that world right now. To try and meet the numbers to bring that electoral weight to each constituency to a better position and meet the 50 MP reduction that is required by Parliament, what we have tried to do is retain that as much as possible. For example, as I believe one of your own speakers raised earlier, to keep Hove Park in Hove. We will perhaps have different opinions on what is the heart, the lung or the soul of the constituency, but I think we all agree that it is certainly the epicentre of what Hove will be.

We discussed earlier in my presentation Central Hove, which again might seem an anomaly, but just referring back briefly Central Hove was an arbitrarily named ward back in 2000/1, when we had local government boundary reviews. It was a makeup of Brunswick and Adelaide, Regency and the old Vallance ward. What we believe we have done here is to restore the old Brunswick Town set up that existed which, as it happens, brings what would have been Vallance back into Brighton. To some degree, what we have done is to preserve and bring back something that should have existed from day one.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Since we have no further speakers until seven o'clock, my suggestion is that we adjourn until 6.45. Then, if somebody has turned up, they will have a chance to speak.

After a short break

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Please say where you are from and just make your comments.

MR SIMMONS: My name is Jon Simmons. I am a member of the public living in Brighton and Hove. I do not represent anybody. I am not here representing any organisation or political party. I am just here as a member of the public. I think it is really important that Members of Parliament and their constituencies identify with a local area and a neighbourhood. To be honest, I am not against proportional representation. I might even favour it, but that is not the system we run. If we were running a system of proportional representation I think modelling population numbers with slightly larger boundary areas would make a lot of sense. In the system we run, with a Member of Parliament aiming to represent a local area and a constituency, I think it is quite important that the boundaries of their constituency are identifiable and people understand them.

I was rather shocked when I saw the Boundary Commission's proposals for my area which borders Brighton and the very large constituency that has been proposed that goes along the south coast, which is a ridiculously long, arbitrary constituency. You can see it there. It starts somewhere in the heart of Brighton and then stretches all the way to the east, including lots of other neighbouring towns.

I just happen to be in that part of the heart of Brighton, which is on the borders of that constituency. The constituency boundary runs straight down the middle of the road that is a few roads along from mine. That is ridiculous because it is cutting a community in half. It is cutting quite an active ward and neighbourhood in half. That feels completely ridiculous, to have two Members of Parliament representing essentially the same place.

My plea would be that you redesign the boundary so that we retain some kind of heart for the Members of Parliament, so that they represent the communities in which they are living as a whole, and not some arbitrary set of boundaries designed by essentially a mathematical model. That is it.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you live in Queens Park?

MR SIMMONS: I live in the Queens Park ward, yes. I am not on Queens Park Road.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Your point is that you would be represented by the Brighton East and Newhaven MP and, a few streets along, you would be represented by Brighton Central and Hove?

MR SIMMONS: Exactly. One of the streets that is just a few along from mine would literally be split down the middle by this plan. It is ridiculous. One group of people on one side of the street would be represented by one MP and, on the other side of the street, by the other. Occasionally, there could be a justification for that but this is a very small street in a relatively tightly knit neighbourhood and it is just one street amongst many, obviously.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Does anybody else have a point of clarification that they want to ask? No. Thank you for coming in. I appreciate you making the effort and I am glad we found a way for you to make your representation and of course you can write in as well.

MR SIMMONS: Thank you very much for taking the time to listen.

The hearing adjourned until 9 am on Tuesday 1 November 2016

**B**

MR BEAMENT, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 33, 35, 36, 46, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62

**D**

MS DEVAS, 48

**F**

MS FINCH, 29, 30, 31

**H**

MR HARRIS, 31, 33, 45, 46

MR HILL, 57, 58

MS HUGH-JONES, 26, 27, 29, 41, 42

**J**

CLLR JANIO, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48

**L**

MS CAROLINE LUCAS MP, 18, 23

**M**

MR MILLER, 5, 8, 16, 23, 30

**P**

MS POTTER, 9

**R**

CLLR RUSSELL-MOYLE, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56

**S**

MS SHANKS, 43, 44, 45

MR SHEPHERD, 23  
MR SIMISTER, 57, 58  
MR SIMMONS, 62, 63

## T

MR TESSIER, 2  
THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42,  
43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62

## U

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER, 9, 13, 27, 31, 36, 46, 48

## W

MR WALDEN, 12, 35, 36, 55  
CLLR WARES, 9, 12, 13, 36, 46, 48, 60, 61, 62  
MR WINTER, 45