

## Appendix 1b – electoral review information

Table prepared by the LGBCE demonstrating their calculations calculations (based on December 2016 electorate data.

Ward Name	Electorate	Councillors	District Voter Ratio	Ward Voter Ratio	% Variance
Brunswick & Adelaide	7,567	2	3,672	3,784	3.03%
Central Hove	7,139	2	3,672	3,570	-2.80%
East Brighton	10,330	3	3,672	3,443	-6.24%
Goldsmid	11,939	3	3,672	3,980	8.37%
Hangleton & Knoll	11,019	3	3,672	3,673	0.02%
Hanover & Elm Grove	10,755	3	3,672	3,585	-2.38%
Hollingdean & Stanmer	9,065	3	3,672	3,022	-17.72%
Hove Park	8,254	2	3,672	4,127	12.38%
Moulsecoomb & Bevendean	10,285	3	3,672	3,428	-6.65%
North Portslade	7,605	2	3,672	3,803	3.54%
Patcham	11,119	3	3,672	3,706	0.92%
Preston Park	10,949	3	3,672	3,650	-0.62%
Queen`s Park	11,164	3	3,672	3,721	1.33%
Regency	7,401	2	3,672	3,701	0.77%
Rottingdean Coastal	10,956	3	3,672	3,652	-0.56%
South Portslade	7,163	2	3,672	3,582	-2.47%
St.Peter`s & North Laine	12,310	3	3,672	4,103	11.73%
Westbourne	7,320	2	3,672	3,660	-0.34%
Wish	7,190	2	3,672	3,595	-2.11%
Withdean	11,229	3	3,672	3,743	1.92%
Woodingdean	7,550	2	3,672	3,775	2.79%

**Electoral Forecasts – A Guide for Practitioners: extract taken from page 2:**

“When variances in representation become significant, we consider the need for an electoral review. We regard variances as significant when more than 30% of an authority’s wards/divisions have an electoral imbalance of more than 10% from the average for that authority; and/or it has one ward/division with an electoral imbalance of more than 30%; and the imbalance is unlikely to be corrected by population change within a reasonable period.”