

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	6
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Elmbridge Borough	8
Epsom & Ewell Borough	10
Guildford Borough	10
Mole Valley District	12
Reigate & Banstead Borough	13
Runnymede Borough	15
Spelthorne Borough	17
Surrey Heath Borough	17
Tandridge District	19
Waverley Borough	21
Woking Borough	22
Conclusions	24
Parish electoral arrangements	24
3 What happens next?	27
4 Mapping	29
<b>Appendices</b>	
A Glossary and abbreviations	31
B Code of practice on written consultation	35
C Table C1: Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council	37



# Summary

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

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in October 2010.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
Council Size	12 October 2010	Submission of proposals for council size to the LGBCE
One	11 January 2011	Submission of proposals of warding arrangements to the LGBCE
Two	4 April 2011	LGBCE's analysis and deliberation
Three	19 July 2011	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	10 October 2011	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Submissions received

The Commission received 24 submissions during its initial consultation on council size. During Stage One, we received a total of 41 submissions, including one scheme covering the whole county and a number of others covering specific districts and boroughs. The Commission also received localised evidence of community identity from parish councils, residents' associations and local residents in the county. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and draft recommendations

### Electorate figures

Surrey County Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2016. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in electorate of 4.6% over this period. The Commission is content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time.

## Council size

Surrey County Council currently has a council size of 80 councillors. During the council size consultation the Commission received proposals for council sizes ranging from 38 to 80 members. The County Council initially proposed 80 members but, during Stage One, following the consideration of councillor allocation, the County Council proposed a scheme for 81 members.

Having considered all the evidence received, we have decided to propose a council size of 81 as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that this is the most appropriate council size for Surrey based on the available evidence.

## General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during Stage One, we have developed proposals which are broadly based on the County Council's scheme. We have also had regard to evidence submitted by political groups, county and district councillors and parish councils. We have sought to reflect communication links, geographic factors and evidence of community identity received during Stage One.

## What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which time we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council contained in the report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **10 October 2011**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

**Review Officer**  
**Surrey Review**  
**The Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**Layden House**  
**76–86 Turnmill Street**  
**London EC1M 5LG**  
[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

# 1 Introduction

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

2 We wrote to Surrey County Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals first on the council size and, subsequently, on division arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council at the beginning of 2012.

## What is an electoral review?

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

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Surrey?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2009 electorate figures, 31% of divisions in the county have electoral variances of over 10% from the average. Most notably, the existing Banstead East division has 24% more electors than the county average and Horley West has 25% fewer electors than the county average.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the county council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish or town council wards you vote in. Your division name may change, as may the names of parish or

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we therefore stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will accept comments and views until 10 October 2011. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish at the beginning of 2012. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 27 and more information can be found on our website, [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed division boundaries, division names and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Surrey is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- have regard to the boundaries of district and borough wards in drawing boundaries for county divisions
- ensure that proposed county divisions do not cross external district and borough boundaries
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

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

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

14 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Surrey County Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Surrey County Council and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 24 submissions at council size stage and 41 submissions during Stage One, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

16 As part of this review, Surrey County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2016, projecting an increase in electorate of 4.6% over the period from 2010 to 2016.

17 The County Council provided us with a detailed methodology for their electorate forecasts, which included analysis of population change, changing household composition and the location and level of future house building. We are satisfied that the methodology used was rigorous and so are content to accept these forecast electorate figures as the basis for our draft recommendations.

## Council size

18 Surrey County Council currently has 80 councillors elected from 80 county divisions. At the beginning of the electoral review, we consulted locally on the most appropriate number of councillors (council size) for the authority and received 24 submissions. The council size proposals received ranged from 38 to 80 members.

19 The County Council proposed to retain the existing council size of 80. It cited evidence relating to the existing political management structure of the council and the workloads of members in support of an unchanged council size.

20 In the absence of any robust evidence for an alternative council size, we recommended that the council size should remain unchanged at 80. Accordingly, during Stage One we invited proposals for division patterns based on a council size of 80.

21 During Stage One, the County Council submitted division arrangements for the county based on an 81-member council. They provided evidence that the allocation throughout the county would be improved with an 81-member council and result in improved electoral equality. In light of the evidence received we have decided to change our original conclusions on council size.

22 Based on the evidence received, we have decided to adopt the proposed council size of 81 members as the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Electoral fairness

23 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental

democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

24 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The county average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (849,927 in 2010 and 889,201 by 2016) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 81 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 10,493 in 2010 and 10,978 by 2016.

25 Under the draft recommendations, only four of our proposed 81 divisions will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the county by 2016. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our draft recommendations for Surrey.

## General analysis

26 We received 41 submissions during Stage One. These included one scheme covering the whole county from the County Council.

27 The County Council proposed a pattern of 81 single-member divisions. The proposal allocated councillors across the districts as follows:

- Elmbridge – nine members
- Epsom & Ewell – five members
- Guildford – ten members
- Mole Valley – six members
- Reigate & Banstead – ten members
- Runnymede – six members
- Spelthorne – seven members
- Surrey Heath – six members
- Tandridge – six members
- Waverley – nine members
- Woking – seven members

28 Our draft recommendations are also based on this allocation of councillors to districts.

29 The County Council developed its scheme with a cross-party working group. The scheme submitted to us was formally endorsed at a full council meeting. Following the County Council's approval, the proposal was published on its website and letters sent to district and borough councils, parish councils and residents' associations within Surrey. As a consequence of the County Council's consultation, the Commission received a number of submissions either supporting or opposing elements of the County Council's own scheme. The scheme submitted by the County Council improved electoral equality to the extent that only 11 out of its proposed 81 divisions had a variance greater than 10% from the county average by 2016.

30 All the submissions that we received can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

31 We have based our draft recommendations on elements of the County Council's scheme, incorporating suggestions from parish councils, councillors and residents. We have adopted in full the County Council's proposals in Spelthorne and Elmbridge.

32 We have proposed modifications in some areas to improve electoral equality, reflect communication and transport links within divisions and to avoid creating unviable parish wards.

33 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on pages 37–45) and Map 1.

34 During Stage Three, we welcome comments on these draft recommendations.

## Electoral arrangements

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

- Elmbridge Borough (page 8)
- Epsom & Ewell Borough (page 10)
- Guildford Borough (page 10)
- Mole Valley District (page 12)
- Reigate & Banstead Borough (page 13)
- Runnymede Borough (page 15)
- Spelthorne Borough (page 17)
- Surrey Heath Borough (page 17)
- Tandridge District (page 19)
- Waverley Borough (page 21)
- Woking Borough (page 22)

36 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 37–45 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### Elmbridge Borough

37 Elmbridge Borough lies in the north of the county. It comprises the towns of Esher, Weybridge and Walton-on-Thames with neighbouring smaller towns and villages. Notable elements of its geography are the large reservoirs in the north of the district which act to separate the area of Molesey from the towns further south. Elmbridge currently has nine single-member electoral divisions. Under a council size of 81, the district is allocated nine members.

38 As well as the county-wide scheme, we also received three submissions from Councillors Hickman and Dennis and a local resident, all opposing some aspects of the County Council's proposals.

39 The County Council proposed nine single-member divisions for Elmbridge Borough. In the west of the borough they proposed five single-member divisions: West Molesey division including the western part of Molesey; Walton division including the northern part of Walton; Walton South & Oatlands division including the southern part of Walton and the area known as Oatlands Park; Weybridge division including the majority of Weybridge and St George's Hill; and Hersham division including the area south of the railway of Hersham, Burwood Park and Whitely Village. These proposed divisions would have a variance of 8% fewer, 4% more, 1% more, 4% more and 7% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

40 We did not receive any submissions for the west of the borough and we considered the County Council's proposal provided for strong boundaries and good electoral equality and we have therefore decided to adopt them without modification as part of our draft recommendations.

41 In the east of the borough, the County Council proposed four single-member divisions. Its proposed East Molesey & Esher division included East Molesey in the north and Esher in the south with Island Barn Reservoir and part of Weston Green in the centre. Its proposed The Dittons division included Thames Ditton, Long Ditton and part of Weston Green. The County Council's proposed Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott division stretched from Hinchley Wood in the north to Oxshott in the south with Claygate in the centre; its proposed Cobham division in the south of the borough comprised Cobham and Stoke D'Abernon. These proposed divisions would have 2% fewer, 4% more, 6% more and 4% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

42 Councillors Hickman and Dennis and a local resident all opposed the County Council's proposed East Molesey & Esher division. They argued that the community of Weston Green should not be split between two divisions and should be wholly located in the same division as Thames Ditton. Councillor Hickman proposed an alternative option to provide for good electoral equality.

43 We considered the submissions in depth; in particular the evidence of community identity between Weston Green and Thames Ditton. It is often the case that the evidence we receive as part of a review raises tensions between different strands of our statutory criteria. This is a case in point.

44 Including the total area of Weston Green with Thames Ditton would prevent any direct link between the north and south of the East Molesey & Esher division, raising questions over the extent to which the division would be regarded as cohesive, and as a result, whether it could be regarded as facilitating effective and convenient local government. The fact that the existing division has no north/south links is not, in our view, a material fact in this review. Whilst we accept that we received good evidence of community identity, the proposal from Surrey County Council provides for good communication links within the East Molesey & Esher division as the proposed boundary follows Station Road and Ember Lane, enabling easy access within the division. We considered the evidence received against the requirement for good communication links in a division and, on balance, decided to adopt Surrey County Council's proposal. Nevertheless, we welcome any further representations from residents in this area in the next stage of the review.

45 We have therefore decided to adopt Surrey County Council's proposal in full as part of our draft recommendations for Elmbridge Borough. Our draft recommendations would result in nine single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 11% coterminosity with district wards.

## Epsom & Ewell Borough

46 Epsom & Ewell Borough, in the north of the county is geographically the smallest. It comprises the adjoining towns of Epsom and Ewell and it currently has five electoral divisions. Under a council size of 81, the borough is allocated five members. This allocation results in a slight under-representation for the borough in comparison with other districts and boroughs in Surrey.

47 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received submissions from Cuddington Residents' Association and Ewell Court Residents' Association, both in support of Surrey County Council's proposal for the Ewell Court, Auriol & Cuddington division.

48 The County Council proposed a scheme of five single-member divisions. The proposed Ewell Court, Auriol & Cuddington division is located at the northern tip of the district with its boundaries being the district boundary, the railway line and Hogsmill River; Ewell West & Epsom division included West Ewell and a small part of Epsom; Epsom West included the area of Epsom west of the railway line; Epsom Town & Downs comprised the area at the southern tip of the district; and Ewell included the area of Ewell east of the railway line. These proposed divisions would have 11% more, 9% more, 6% more, 9% more and 12% more electors than the county average respectively by 2016.

49 The County Council's submission provided for strong boundaries and provided some evidence of community identity. We have therefore decided to base our draft recommendations on the Council's scheme. However, in order to improve electoral equality we recommend some slight changes to the proposed boundaries.

50 We considered that the electoral equality could be improved in the Ewell division by including the roads Windmill Avenue, Park Hill Road, Langton Avenue and Hampton Grove into the Epsom West division. This improves the electoral equality in Ewell to 10% more electors than the average by 2016 and changes the electoral equality in Epsom West to 7% more electors than the average by 2016.

51 Our draft recommendations would result in five single-member divisions with only one of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 20% coterminosity with district wards.

## Guildford Borough

52 Guildford Borough lies in the west of the county and is the second largest district geographically in Surrey. Guildford itself is located in the centre of the borough with rural areas in the east and west. Guildford Borough currently has 10 single-member electoral divisions. Under a council size of 81 members the borough is allocated 10 members.

53 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received submissions in relation to the Horsleys division from Ripley Parish Council and West Horsley Parish Council.

54 The County Council proposed a scheme of ten single-member divisions. These were largely based on the existing boundaries with some amendments to improve electoral equality.

55 In Guildford and its immediate surrounding area, the County Council proposed five single-member divisions: Guildford East; Guildford South East; Guildford North; Guildford West; and Guildford South West. The proposed divisions would have 3% fewer, 2% fewer, 11% more, 3% more and 4% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016. All of the proposed divisions were the same as the existing divisions apart from a small section of the boundary between Guildford West and Guildford South West.

56 We considered whether electoral equality could be improved in the County Council's proposed Guildford North division. We recommend that Belmont Avenue, Byrefield Road, Clayton Drive and Ryde's Hill Road, near Stoughton be included in the Guildford West division which improves electoral variance in Guildford North to 6% more electors than the county average by 2016 and in Guildford West to 8% more electors. We have decided to adopt the other divisions in the County Council's scheme without modification as part of our draft recommendations.

57 In the rural areas to the east and west of the borough, the County Council proposed five single-member divisions: Horsleys and Shere in the east and Shalford, Worplesdon and Ash in the west. The proposed divisions would have 8% fewer, 9% fewer, 1% fewer, 4% more and 3% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

58 Under the County Council's scheme, the boundary between Ash and Shalford diverges from the district ward boundary in two places. This area is located in Ash Parish and therefore would involve creating two parish wards, one of which would have a small number of electors and therefore be unviable as an electoral unit. We recommend that the boundary follows the district ward boundary along the railway line and the A323, until the ward boundary moves north, where at this point the division boundary will carry along the A323 to the edge of the district boundary. This will consequently create one additional parish ward with a sufficient number of electors and strong identifiable boundaries. Under our recommendations Shalford division will have a variance of 0% electors than the county average by 2016 and Ash division will have 4% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

59 The two submissions received in relation to the Horsleys division suggested that the existing division of Horsleys should be maintained, and provided evidence that the parishes share facilities such as a medical centre and youth club. Under the County Council's scheme, the proposed division maintains the connection between the parishes in Horsleys. However, to improve electoral equality the Council proposed including the parish of East Clandon. We consider that this satisfies both the criterion of community identity and good electoral equality, while reflecting the views of Ripley and West Horsley Parish Council.

60 We have decided to adopt the County Council's proposals without modification as part of our draft recommendations, apart from the changes to the divisions of Ash, Shalford, Guildford North and Guildford West as detailed above.

61 Our draft recommendations would result in 10 single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 30% coterminosity with district wards.

## Mole Valley District

62 Mole Valley District is located in the centre of the county and spans the southern to northern county boundary. The towns of Leatherhead and Fetcham are located in the north of the district, separated from the town of Dorking in the centre by the Surrey Hills. Mole Valley currently has six single-member electoral divisions. Under a council size of 81 members the district is allocated six members.

63 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received submissions from Capel Parish Council, County Councillor Watson and the Mole Valley Liberal Democrats.

64 The County Council proposed six single-member divisions: Bookham & Fetcham West, Leatherhead & Fetcham East and Ashtead in the north of the district and Dorking Hills, Dorking South & The Holmwoods and Dorking Rural in the south of the district. The proposed divisions would have 13% more, 15% more, 7% more, 4% fewer, 8% fewer and 12% more electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

65 We considered whether the electoral equality could be improved in the County Council's proposed divisions. The proposed Bookham & Fetcham West, Leatherhead & Fetcham East and Dorking Rural divisions are all under-represented. The County Council maintained that the boundaries of Bookham & Fetcham West and Leatherhead & Fetcham East could not be changed as they are strong boundaries. The boundary to the east of the proposed Leatherhead & Fetcham East division follows the M25 which is a significant barrier separating Ashtead from the rest of the district. The boundary to the north of both of the divisions follows the district boundary. The boundary to the west of the Bookham & Fetcham West division also follows the district boundary and to the south of the divisions are the Surrey Hills which also act as a significant barrier.

66 We considered the County Council's scheme and agree that the Ashtead division boundary should remain unchanged, as the M25 is a strong barrier. The southern boundary to Bookham & Fetcham West division should also remain unchanged due to the barrier formed by the Surrey Hills. However, having visited the area, we recommend that the southern boundary to the Leatherhead & Fetcham East division be amended to improve electoral equality. We recommend that the area directly south of the A246, comprising Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs and Tyrrell's be included in the Dorking Hills division. The areas are more rural in nature and the A24 and A246 make a strong boundary dividing this area from Leatherhead itself. This would improve the electoral equality in Leatherhead & Fetcham East to 12% more electors than the county average by 2016.

67 To improve the electoral equality in the County Council's proposed Dorking Rural division we recommend including the whole of Abinger parish into the Dorking Hills division. This improves the electoral variance in Dorking Rural from 12% more to 4% more electors than the county average by 2016.

68 The submission from Councillor Watson suggested that by including the rural areas into Dorking Hills division to improve electoral equality would cause the division to be too large geographically. Following a visit to the area and travelling from north to south of the division we are satisfied that including Abinger Parish in Dorking Hills would not prevent effective representation due to its increased size.

69 Under our recommendations, Ashted would have 7% more electors than the county average by 2016; Leatherhead & Fetcham East would have 12% more; Bookham & Fetcham West would have 13% more; Dorking Hills would have 1% more; Dorking Rural would have 4% more; and Dorking South & The Holmwoods would have 1% fewer.

70 Our draft recommendations would result in six single-member divisions with two of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 33% coterminosity with district wards.

## Reigate & Banstead Borough

71 Reigate & Banstead Borough is located in the centre of the county and spans the southern to the northern county boundary. The town of Banstead is located in the north of the borough, along with the villages of Tadworth and Kingswood, separated from the southern part of the borough by the M25 motorway. The adjoining towns of Reigate and Redhill are located south of the motorway and the town of Horley is located in the southern tip of the borough. Reigate & Banstead currently has nine single-member electoral divisions. Under a council size of 81 members the borough is allocated 10 members.

72 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received four submissions, three from residents' associations and one from a county councillor. The three from the residents' associations opposed parts of the County Council's scheme in the northern part of the borough, whilst the submission from County Councillor Hack provided an alternative scheme for the whole of the district.

73 The County Council proposed a scheme of 10 single-member divisions. North of the M25 the County Council proposed four single-member divisions: Nork & Tattenhams; Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead; Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood; and Merstham & Banstead South. The proposed divisions would have 7% more, 5% more, 5% more and 4% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

74 The submissions from both Nork and Tattenhams Residents' Associations' opposed the County Council's proposal to move 292 electors out of the proposed Nork & Tattenhams division and into Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood division. Whilst they recognised the County Council's proposals as a means of addressing electoral equality, they felt any change would unnecessarily disrupt community identity. The proposal would also affect coterminosity with the borough ward boundaries. We

considered the options and decided that as electoral equality would still be reasonable without the County Council's proposed change, the existing boundary should be retained, as it achieves coterminosity with the district ward boundary and does not split the community in Tattenham.

75 The submission from Lower Kingswood Residents' Association opposed the County Council's proposal to include Lower Kingswood in the Merstham & Banstead South division. They suggest that they are linked with Kingswood and should therefore be included in the same division. Under the County Council's proposal Kingswood would be in a separate division. We considered whether Lower Kingswood could be included in the Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood division. However, there is a large number of electors in Lower Kingswood and it would not be viable to include it in the division and still achieve good electoral equality. Councillor Hack agreed with the Residents' Association that Lower Kingswood should be in the same division as Kingswood and stated that there are shared community groups which link them. An alternative scheme was provided by Councillor Hack which included Lower Kingswood in the same division as Kingswood.

76 We considered the options and decided that although the scheme by Councillor Hack provided evidence of community identity and incorporated Lower Kingswood with Kingswood, it also included the ward of Preston in a division with Banstead. We saw no evidence of community links or direct roads linking the two places. On balance, we have decided to adopt the County Council's scheme as it provides for good electoral equality and good road links within all the divisions. It also incorporates the other suggestions made by Councillor Hack such as including Park Road, north of Woodmansterne, in the same division as Banstead; including Banstead Wood in a division with Banstead rather than Kingswood; and includes Merstham in a division with the villages further north rather than a division with the more urban areas of Redhill and Reigate.

77 Under our recommendations Nork & Tattenhams would have 10% more electors than the county average by 2016; Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead would have 8% more; Merstham & Banstead South would have 5% fewer; and Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood would have 1% more.

78 In the towns of Redhill and Reigate and immediate surrounding areas, the County Council proposed four single-member electoral divisions: Earlswood & Reigate South, Meadvale & St John's, Redhill, and Reigate. The proposed divisions would have 3% more, 6% fewer, 4% more and 8% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

79 Councillor Hack provided an alternative scheme for the urban area of Reigate and Redhill. It comprised four single-member divisions: Redhill East, Redhill West & Meadvale, Earlswood & Reigate South, and Reigate. These proposed divisions would have 1% fewer, 3% fewer, 4% fewer and 1% more electors than the county average respectively by 2016.

80 We carefully considered both schemes and decided that the submission from Councillor Hack provided persuasive arguments in terms of community identity for the divisions in the towns of Redhill and Reigate. Most notably, the concept of keeping the communities in Redhill together by splitting the town into an east and

west division. In comparison, the scheme from the County Council split Redhill into a north and south division, with the division in the south incorporating areas of Reigate. The County Council's scheme also divided the community of Earlswood into two different divisions, which under the Councillor's scheme would be wholly located in one division.

81 We have therefore decided to adopt the scheme from Councillor Hack, albeit with an amendment to the Earlswood & Reigate South division. The Councillor recommends using the parish boundary as the southern boundary of the division. However, having visited the area, we considered that this divided the community of Whitebushes which is a continuous area of housing adjacent to the A23. We therefore recommend using the district ward boundary which is further south.

82 Under our recommendations, Earlswood & Reigate South would have a variance of 0%, Redhill East would have 1% fewer, Redhill West & Meadvale would have 3% fewer and Reigate would have 1% more electors than the county average by 2016.

83 In the town of Horley, in the southern tip of the borough, the County Council proposed two divisions: Horley East, including the eastern side of the town, and Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow, including the western side of the town and the rural areas to the north. The proposed divisions would have a variance of 2% more and 12% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

84 Councillor Hack agreed with the County Council's proposals in this area and did not provide an alternative scheme.

85 The northern boundary of the County Council's proposed Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow division followed the parish boundary and, as discussed above, we recommend that it follows the district ward boundary. As this change adversely affects electoral equality we recommend altering the proposed boundary between Horley East and Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow in the town. The County Council's proposed boundary at this point follows the railway line and then the A23. We recommend the boundary follows the railway line and then goes around the town centre to rejoin the A23.

86 Under our recommendations, Horley East would have 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2016 and Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow would have 8% fewer.

87 Our draft recommendations would result in 10 single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 10% coterminosity with district wards.

## Runnymede Borough

88 Runnymede Borough lies to the west of the county. It comprises the town of Egham in the north and the towns of Chertsey and Addlestone in the south east, separated from the more rural western side of the borough by the M25 which runs north to south through the borough. Runnymede Borough currently has six single-member electoral divisions. Under a council size of 81 members the borough is allocated six members.

89 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received a submission from Egham Residents' Association relating to the town of Egham.

90 The County Council proposed a scheme of six single-member divisions: Addlestone, Chertsey, Egham & Thorpe, Englefield Green, Foxhills, & Virginia Water; and Woodham & New Haw. The proposed divisions would have 4% more, 5% fewer, 2% more, 7% fewer, 10% fewer and 11% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

91 Egham Residents' Association expressed strong views that the whole of Egham town should be in one division. We considered this option; however, the size of the electorate in Egham is too large to lend itself to be in one single-member division.

92 Under the County Council's scheme the town of Egham would be divided between three divisions, with a small part included in the Foxhills & Virginia Water division. To mitigate having to divide Egham into three divisions we recommend the division of Englefield Green incorporates Englefield Green and the western side of Egham town, using the M3 motorway and the railway line as the boundary, and the division of Egham incorporates the eastern side of Egham town and Egham Hythe. This improves community identity as Egham town would be divided into two divisions rather than three under the County Council's proposal. These divisions would have 7% fewer and 5% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

93 To improve the electoral equality in Foxhills & Virginia Water division and to reflect the changes discussed above, we recommend including the area of Thorpe in the division. Although Thorpe is on the other side of the motorway, the borough ward traverses the motorway and the B389 runs underneath, acting as a link between Virginia Water and Thorpe. This improves the electoral equality to 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2016 and to reflect the incorporation of Thorpe in the division, we recommend naming it Foxhills, Thorpe & Virginia Water.

94 We considered the County Council's proposal for the divisions of Chertsey; Addlestone; and Woodham & New Haw. The proposals were similar to the existing divisions with an amendment to the boundary between Woodham & New Haw and Addlestone to improve electoral equality. We recommend that this boundary be altered to further improve electoral equality, by including Rowhill in the Woodham & New Haw division. We consider the proposed Chertsey division uses strong boundaries and achieves good electoral equality and we have decided to adopt it without modification as part of our draft recommendations.

95 Under our recommendations Chertsey would have 5% fewer electors; Addlestone would have 7% fewer electors; and Woodham & New Haw would have 1% more electors than the county average by 2016.

96 Our draft recommendations would result in six single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 0% coterminosity with district wards.

## Spelthorne Borough

97 Spelthorne Borough is located on the northern boundary of the county and is urban in nature compared to the districts in the south. It comprises the towns of Staines, Ashford and Sunbury. It is geographically the second smallest in size in the county, although it has a sizable electorate. The main geographic features are three large reservoirs: two in the north-east and one in the centre of the borough. The M3 motorway crosses the borough, although it does not act as a significant barrier due to several roads crossing it in Shepperton and Sunbury. Under a council size of 81 members the borough is allocated seven members.

98 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received a submission from Shepperton Residents' Association stating that the divisions should remain as they are.

99 The County Council proposed a scheme of seven single-member divisions: Ashford; Laleham & Shepperton; Lower Sunbury & Halliford; Staines; Staines South & Ashford West; Stanwell & Stanwell Moor; and Sunbury Common & Ashford Common. The proposed divisions would have 2% more, 3% fewer, 4% fewer, 5% fewer, 2% fewer, 9% fewer and 7% more electors respectively than the county average by 2016. The proposed divisions were identical to the existing divisions with one minor adjustment to the boundary between the divisions of Stanwell & Stanwell Moor and Staines to improve electoral equality.

100 We consider the existing divisions best meet all the statutory criteria in a district that has several strong barriers, such as the reservoirs. Options for changing any boundaries are therefore limited. The team agrees with the County Council's proposed change to the Stanwell & Stanwell Moor division which improves the electoral equality and also provides for a more identifiable boundary along the A30.

101 We recommend that the County Council's proposal for Spelthorne Borough be adopted without modification as part of our draft recommendations.

102 Our draft recommendations would result in seven single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 14% coterminosity with district wards.

## Surrey Heath Borough

103 Surrey Heath Borough is in the west of the county and comprises rural and military land in the east of the district and the towns of Camberley and Frimley in the west. The M3 motorway crosses the borough from east to west. Under a council size of 81 members the borough is allocated six members.

104 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received four submissions. One from Windlesham Parish Council providing an alternative scheme for the rural area; one non-specific submission from a resident; one from Surrey Heath Borough Council agreeing with the submission from the Parish Council and opposing the County Council's proposal in the area of Frimley Green; and one from Councillor Bates providing an alternative scheme to the County Council's for the divisions in the towns of Camberley and Frimley.

105 The County Council proposed a scheme of six single-member divisions. These were based on the existing divisions with three amendments to improve electoral equality.

106 In the eastern rural area of the borough, the County Council proposed two single-member divisions: Bisley, Chobham & West End and Windlesham. The proposed divisions would have 2% and 10% more electors respectively than the county average by 2016 and were broadly the same as the existing divisions with a slight alteration to the boundary in Lightwater to improve electoral equality.

107 Windlesham Parish Council provided an alternative scheme for the rural area which would locate the village of Lightwater wholly within one division and allow for coterminosity between the division boundaries and those of the parish and borough ward boundaries. It suggested incorporating the borough wards of Bagshot, Windlesham and Chobham in one division and Lightwater, West End and Bisley in another division. The submission provided evidence opposing the County Council's proposal to split Lightwater, stating that 'Lightwater West is currently subsumed by another division to which it has no apparent connection'. It further stated that the grouping of wards it proposed had a natural coalescence and would also be coterminous with the ward boundaries. Surrey Heath Borough Council said it was minded to support the proposal.

108 We considered that the Parish Council provided good evidence of community identity, especially in relation to dividing Lightwater under the County Council's proposal. We have therefore decided to adopt the Parish Council's scheme with a slight modification to the boundary near Chobham. Bisley parish currently contains a detached area and the district ward boundary follows the parish boundary and therefore also contains a detached area of the ward. Adopting the Parish Council's proposal and following the borough ward boundaries would result in a small area geographically detached from the division. We considered this would not result in effective and convenient local government or create clear and identifiable boundaries. Therefore, to mitigate this we recommend the division takes in part of Chobham Parish including the areas of Pennypot and Castle Green in the Lightwater, West End and Bisley division. This would result in a parish ward of 213 electors being created in Chobham, which is explained in more detail on page 25.

109 Under our recommendations Bagshot, Windlesham & Chobham would have 2% more electors and Lightwater, West End & Bisley would have 10% more electors than the county average by 2016.

110 In the west of the district the County Council proposed four single-member divisions: Camberley East; Camberley West; Heatherside & Parkside; and Frimley Green & Mytchett. The proposed divisions would have 1% more, 7% more, 5% fewer and 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. They were largely based on the existing divisions with some amendments to improve electoral equality. These included an amendment to the boundary between Camberley East and Heatherside & Parkside to improve electoral equality by incorporating an area north of the motorway in the Heatherside & Parkside division. It also proposed a change to the boundary between Camberley West and Frimley Green & Mytchett, to improve electoral equality, by incorporating part of Frimley into the Frimley Green & Mytchett division.

111 Surrey Heath Borough Council opposed the proposed amendment to the boundary between Frimley Green & Mytchett and Camberley West. It suggested that by moving these properties it would split the borough ward of Frimley West between two divisions and would divide a residential estate. It considered that keeping communities in the same division without splitting the building blocks of borough wards should be the overriding consideration above electoral equality.

112 Under a council size of 81, the existing divisions of Camberley West and Frimley Green & Mytchett would have 14% more and 11% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016. We consider it important to improve the electoral equality in these divisions and the County Council has provided an option which will do this by incorporating the whole of the Anstell Estate into the Frimley Green & Mytchett division. The B3411, Frimley Green Road, provides good access from the estate to Frimley Green.

113 The submission from Councillor Bates provided an alternative scheme for the town of Camberley. Under the Councillor's scheme, Camberley would be split into a North and a South division, with the area south of the motorway included in a separate division. In comparison the County Council's scheme, splits Camberley into an East and a West division and, similar to the Councillor's scheme, the area south of the motorway would be in another division.

114 We examined the merits of the scheme provided by Councillor Bates and compared it to that of the County Council. The justification for Councillor Bates' scheme was primarily in connection with the comparison of two borough wards, St Pauls and Old Dean, the former being very affluent and the latter very deprived. Councillor Bates suggested that as Old Dean ward is more deprived than St Pauls ward, there is no community connection; thus it should be in a division with St Michael's with which it has a similar demographic profile. Whilst reference to these two social communities accords with the County Council's assertion, the Council states that the primary and junior schools in St Pauls ward have a significant catchment area from Old Dean and the whole division is served by a single secondary school. We are persuaded by the County Council's argument rather than Councillor Bates'.

115 Accordingly, we have decided to adopt the County Council's proposal for the west of the borough as part of our draft recommendations, as it provides for better electoral equality and community identity than the other submissions.

116 Our draft recommendations would result in six single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 0% coterminosity with district wards.

## Tandridge District

117 Tandridge District is on the eastern boundary of Surrey and is rural in nature, with no major towns. It is entirely parished with the main villages being Caterham and Warlingham in the north and Oxted further south. The M25 motorway crosses the district from east to west and acts as a significant barrier between the villages in the north and those in the south. Under a council size of 81 members, the district is allocated six members.

118 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received 12 submissions. Six of these submissions opposed the County Council's proposal to move Woldingham into the Warlingham division; one was in agreement with the County Council's scheme in relation to Woldingham; two opposed the County Council's proposal in relation to the parish of Tandridge; two submissions were in relation to the division of Lingfield; and one submission from Titsey Parish Council.

119 The County Council proposed a scheme of six single-member divisions. North of the M25 the County Council proposed three single-member divisions: Caterham Hill, Caterham Valley and Warlingham. The proposed divisions would have 1% more, 13% fewer and 4% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

120 The majority of submissions opposed the County Council's proposed Warlingham division, which would include the parishes of Tatsfield, Titsey, Chelsham & Farleigh, Woldingham and Warlingham. The main argument presented against the proposed division was that the residents of Woldingham do not use the facilities in Warlingham and a large valley separates the villages. The submission from Woldingham Association stated that Warlingham is largely an urban area, contiguous with the London conurbation and quite different to Woldingham.

121 Under the existing arrangements, Woldingham is in the same division as Caterham and the consensus between the submissions is that this should remain unchanged. Under a council size of 81, the existing Warlingham division would have a variance of 20% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. We do not believe that we have received sufficient evidence to justify such a high electoral imbalance.

122 One option considered was to amalgamate the existing divisions of Warlingham and Caterham Valley into a two-member division. This would result in the division having 8% more electors than the county average by 2016 and keep Woldingham in the same division with Caterham. However, we received limited evidence to suggest that this would reflect community identity and provide for effective and convenient local government.

123 We recommend that the existing division boundaries of Warlingham and Caterham Valley are retained with a modification to include half of Whyteleafe parish in Warlingham division and half in Caterham Valley. The boundary follows the railway line through the parish and creates two parish wards in Whyteleafe. Given the evidence received, we considered this the best compromise, as it provides for better electoral equality than the County Council's scheme and takes into account the views expressed in the submissions. Under our draft recommendations Warlingham would have 8% fewer and Caterham Valley would have 9% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

124 South of the M25 the County Council proposed three single-member divisions: Oxted, Godstone and Lingfield. The proposed divisions would have 7% more, 7% fewer and 13% more electors respectively than the county average by 2016. They are similar to the existing divisions with the amendment of including the parish of Tandridge in the Godstone division to improve electoral equality.

125 We received two submissions opposing the County Council's proposal to include the parish of Tandridge in the Godstone division. Tandridge Parish Council

suggested that the residents of Tandridge have always considered themselves to be part of Oxted and use the facilities in the village. The submission from a resident in Tandridge echoed the views of the Parish Council.

126 We considered whether Tandridge parish could be included in the Oxted division. The only viable option results in a variance of 12% more electors in Oxted and 12% fewer electors in Godstone than the county average by 2016. On balance we decided to adopt the County Council's proposal as part of our draft recommendations as it provides for better electoral equality.

127 The other submissions received regarding Lingfield suggested Smallfield could be transferred to another division to improve the electoral equality in the Lingfield division. Under the County Council's scheme, the division would have 13% more electors than the county average by 2016. However, the electorate in Smallfield is comparatively large and removing it from Lingfield adversely affects electoral equality. Instead, we recommend including the parish of Crowhurst in the Oxted division which improves the electoral equality in Lingfield to 11% more electors than the county average by 2016 and changes Oxted to 9% more electors than the county average by 2016.

128 Our draft recommendations would result in six single-member divisions with only one of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 17% coterminosity with district wards

## Waverley Borough

129 Waverley Borough lies to the south of the county. It is largely rural and includes the towns of Farnham, Godalming and Haslemere with small villages throughout the rest of the borough. Under a council size of 81 the borough is allocated nine members. This allocation results in a slight over-representation for the borough by comparison with other districts in Surrey.

130 As well as the county-wide submission, we received four submissions. One from a parish council and a resident in relation to the parish of Churt and two from residents' associations suggesting that there should be no change to the existing divisions.

131 The County Council proposed a scheme of nine single-member divisions, all of them identical to the existing divisions with the exception of a small change to the boundary between Farnham Central and Farnham South to improve electoral equality. Overall, the existing divisions in the borough have reasonable electoral equality.

132 We consider that the existing divisions best reflect the statutory criteria. We considered the modification proposed by the County Council to the boundary between Farnham South and Farnham Central divisions. Although this improves the electoral equality in Farnham South from 9% fewer to 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2016, given that such a minor change in electoral equality would require us to depart from the district ward boundary and create additional parish warding in Farnham, we are not minded to adopt it as part of our draft recommendations at this point.

133 We recommend that the existing division boundaries be adopted as part of our draft recommendations. This results in nine single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 56% coterminosity with district wards.

## Woking Borough

134 Woking Borough lies in the centre of the county and comprises Woking town. The most notable geographic feature is a railway line which crosses the district from the north-east to the south-west boundary. Under a council size of 81 the borough is allocated seven members.

135 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received four submissions. A joint submission from former and current borough and county councillors, Horsell Residents' Association and the Woking Constituency Conservative Association all opposed the County Council's scheme in relation to the Horsell area. A submission from a County Councillor also opposed the County Council's proposed Pyrford Division.

136 The County Council proposed a scheme of seven single-member divisions: Woking South; The Byfleets; Woking South East; Woking South West; Knaphill & Goldsworth West; Goldsworth East & Horsell Village; and Woking North. The proposed divisions would have 11% more, 7% fewer, 6% fewer, 9% fewer, 3% more, 0% and 1% more electors respectively than the county average by 2016.

137 Three of the submissions received objected to the County Council's proposed Goldsworth East & Horsell Village division and Woking North division, as these divisions divide Horsell. Evidence was received to suggest that Horsell is one community with facilities such as a village hall, scouts and guides groups, recreational facilities, a cultural centre and a sports ground.

138 We considered the evidence and recommend keeping the area of Horsell in one division. The submission from the Woking Constituency Conservative Association suggested that the existing division boundaries be retained with a modification to include the area of Sheerwater in the Horsell division, as it has closer links with Horsell East and Woodham than with Maybury. This would improve electoral equality in the existing divisions of Horsell and Woking Central to 10% more electors and 5% fewer electors respectively than the county average by 2016. We consider the proposal from Woking Constituency Conservative Association better reflects the statutory criteria than the proposal from the County Council and have therefore decided to adopt it as part of our draft recommendations.

139 Under the County Council's proposal, the boundary of Woking South East division runs along the railway line. This creates a strong identifiable boundary. However, Councillor Bowes provided evidence to suggest that the existing Pyrford division boundary, which does not run along the railway line, but instead projects south in what appears an unusual division boundary, should be retained. In the submission Councillor Bowes suggests that although the current boundary looks unusual, it encompasses the entire Maybury Estate which traverses the railway line. Both sides of the railway line are well integrated via a playground between Arnold Road and Alpha Road which serves as a strong focal point. We found this evidence persuasive and have decided to retain the existing boundary at this point.

140 Under our recommendations, St Johns & Brookwood has a variance of 9% fewer electors than the county average by 2016; Knaphill has 2% more; Horsell has 10% more; Woking Central has 5% fewer; Woking South has 7% more; Pyrford has 4% fewer; and The Byfleets has 8% fewer.

141 Our draft recommendations would result in seven single-member divisions with none of the divisions having a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2016. Our proposals achieve 71% coterminosity with district wards.

142 Table C1 (on pages 37–45) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## Conclusions

143 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2010 and 2016 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements – draft recommendations**

	Draft recommendations	
	2010	2016
Number of councillors	81	81
Number of electoral divisions	81	81
Average number of electors per councillor	10,493	10,978
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	9	4
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

### **Draft recommendation**

Surrey County Council should comprise 81 councillors serving 81 divisions, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

145 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, Surrey County Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

146 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Ash, Chobham, Horley and Whyteleafe. We would particularly welcome comments on these proposals from the Ash, Chobham, Horley and Whyteleafe parish councils and local residents during this consultation stage.

147 Ash parish is presently divided into three wards: Ash South (four parish councillors), Ash Vale (four parish councillors) and Ash Wharf (four parish councillors). As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Ash parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Ash Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Ash South (returning three members), Ash Vale (returning four members), Ash Wharf (returning four members) and Rowan Field (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2c.

148 Horley Town Council is presently represented by 18 councillors, divided into six wards: Horley North (four parish councillors), Horley North Central (three parish councillors), Horley North East (two parish councillors), Horley North West (four parish councillors), Horley South Central (three parish councillors) and Horley South East (two parish councillors). As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Horley Town Council to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Horley Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Horley North (returning four members), Horley North Central (returning two members), Horley North East (returning two members), Horley North West (returning four members), Horley South Central (returning four members) and Horley South East (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7c.

149 Chobham parish is presently unwarded and is represented by nine parish councillors. As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Chobham parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Chobham parish should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chobham (returning eight members) and Castle Green (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2b.

150 Whyteleafe Village is presently unwarded and is represented by seven parish councillors. As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Whyteleafe parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Whyteleafe Village should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Whyteleafe West (returning four members) and Whyteleafe East (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7a.

### 3 What happens next?

151 There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 10 October 2011. Any submissions received after this date may not be taken into account.

152 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Surrey and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed division boundaries, number of councillors and division names. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during Stage Three. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

153 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer  
Surrey Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG**

**[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)**

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

154 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all Stage Three representations will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of Surrey County Council and at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

155 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, irrespective of whom they are from.

156 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

157 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which

brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Surrey County Council in 2013.

## 4 Mapping

### Draft recommendations for Surrey

158 The following maps illustrate our proposed division boundaries for Surrey County Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed division boundaries for Surrey.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Camberley town.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2b** illustrates the proposed divisions in the south east of Surrey Heath borough.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2c** illustrates the proposed divisions in the west of Guildford borough.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2d** illustrates the proposed divisions in Guildford town.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3** illustrates the proposed divisions in the towns of Ashford, Egham, Staines and Sunbury.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4a** illustrates the proposed divisions in the south east of Runnymede borough.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4b** illustrates the proposed divisions in the north west of Elmbridge borough.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4c** illustrates the proposed divisions in the north east of Elmbridge borough.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5** illustrates the proposed divisions in the towns of Leatherhead and Oxshott.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Epsom and Ewell borough.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6b** illustrates the proposed divisions in the north of Reigate and Banstead borough.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6c** illustrates the proposed divisions in Woking town.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7a** illustrates the proposed divisions in the north of Tandridge district.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7b** illustrates the proposed divisions in central Reigate and Banstead borough.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7c** illustrates the proposed divisions in Horley town.



# Appendix A

## Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

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



## Appendix B

### Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Consultation* (2008) (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 November 2008, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

**Table B1: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England's compliance with Code criteria**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Compliance/departure</b>
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations.
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.	We comply with this requirement.
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.	We comply with this requirement.



## Appendix C

**Table C1: Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2016)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	
<b>Divisions in Elmbridge Borough</b>								
1	Cobham	1	10,072	10,072	-4%	10,541	10,541	-4%
2	East Molesey & Esher	1	10,056	10,056	-4%	10,735	10,735	-2%
3	Hersham	1	9,697	9,697	-8%	10,228	10,228	-7%
4	Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	1	11,151	11,151	6%	11,671	11,671	6%
5	The Dittons	1	11,162	11,162	6%	11,440	11,440	4%
6	Walton	1	10,685	10,685	2%	11,371	11,371	4%
7	Walton South & Oatlands	1	10,662	10,662	2%	11,051	11,051	1%
8	West Molesey	1	9,856	9,856	-6%	10,097	10,097	-8%
9	Weybridge	1	10,791	10,791	3%	11,421	11,421	4%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
<b>Divisions in Epsom &amp; Ewell Borough</b>								
10	Epsom Town & Downs	1	11,084	11,084	6%	11,998	11,998	9%
11	Epsom West	1	10,618	10,618	1%	11,747	11,747	7%
12	Ewell	1	11,670	11,670	11%	12,025	12,025	10%
13	Ewell Court, Auriol & Cuddington	1	11,865	11,865	13%	12,233	12,233	11%
14	Ewell West & Epsom	1	10,988	10,988	5%	12,019	12,019	9%
<b>Divisions in Guildford Borough</b>								
15	Ash	1	9,992	9,992	-5%	10,520	10,520	-4%
16	Guildford East	1	10,347	10,347	-1%	10,701	10,701	-3%
17	Guildford North	1	11,422	11,422	9%	11,661	11,661	6%
18	Guildford South East	1	10,015	10,015	-5%	10,730	10,730	-2%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
19	Guildford South West	1	10,276	10,276	-2%	10,581	10,581	-4%
20	Guildford West	1	11,382	11,382	8%	11,837	11,837	8%
21	Horsleys	1	9,836	9,836	-6%	10,074	10,074	-8%
22	Shalford	1	10,703	10,703	2%	10,981	10,981	0%
23	Shere	1	9,602	9,602	-8%	9,993	9,993	-9%
24	Worplesdon	1	11,060	11,060	5%	11376	11,376	4%
<b>Divisions in Mole Valley District</b>								
25	Ashtead	1	11,182	11,182	7%	11,797	11,797	7%
26	Bookham & Fetcham West	1	12,005	12,005	14%	12,425	12,425	13%
27	Dorking Hills	1	10,738	10,738	2%	11,070	11,070	1%
28	Dorking Rural	1	11,066	11,066	5%	11,455	11,455	4%
29	Dorking South & The Holmwoods	1	10,442	10,442	0%	10,821	10,821	-1%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
30	Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	11,623	11,623	11%	12,241	12,241	12%
<b>Divisions in Reigate &amp; Banstead Borough</b>								
31	Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead	1	11,345	11,345	8%	11,858	11,858	8%
32	Earlswood & Reigate South	1	10,253	10,253	-2%	10,970	10,970	0%
33	Horley East	1	9,018	9,018	-14%	10,282	10,282	-6%
34	Horley West, Salfords & Sidlow	1	9,587	9,587	-9%	10,096	10,096	-8%
35	Merstham & Banstead South	1	9,950	9,950	-5%	10,437	10,437	-5%
36	Nork & Tattenhams	1	11,518	11,518	10%	12,044	12,044	10%
37	Redhill East	1	9,410	9,410	-10%	10,874	10,874	-1%
38	Redhill West & Meadvale	1	9,953	9,953	-5%	10,674	10,674	-3%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
39	Reigate	1	10,455	10,455	0%	11,063	11,063	1%
40	Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood	1	10,569	10,569	1%	11,103	11,103	1%
<b>Divisions in Runnymede Borough</b>								
41	Addlestone	1	9,398	9,398	-10%	10,212	10,212	-7%
42	Chertsey	1	9,925	9,925	-5%	10,414	10,414	-5%
43	Egham	1	9,875	9,875	-6%	10,391	10,391	-5%
44	Englefield Green	1	9,825	9,825	-6%	10,228	10,228	-7%
45	Foxhills, Thorpe & Virginia Water	1	10,306	10,306	-1%	10,669	10,669	-3%
46	Woodham & New Haw	1	10,561	10,561	1%	11,036	11,036	1%
<b>Divisions in Spelthorne Borough</b>								
47	Ashford	1	10,886	10,886	4%	11,234	11,234	2%
48	Laleham & Shepperton	1	10,320	10,320	-2%	10,607	10,607	-3%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
49	Lower Sunbury & Halliford	1	10,061	10,061	-4%	10,503	10,503	-4%
50	Staines	1	9,923	9,923	-5%	10,455	10,455	-5%
51	Staines South & Ashford West	1	10,317	10,317	-2%	10,777	10,777	-2%
52	Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	1	9,466	9,466	-10%	9,974	9,974	-9%
53	Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	1	11,395	11,395	9%	11,712	11,712	7%
<b>Divisions in Surrey Heath Borough</b>								
54	Bagshot, Windlesham & Chobham	1	10,491	10,491	0%	11,213	11,213	2%
55	Camberley East	1	10,569	10,569	1%	11,059	11,059	1%
56	Camberley West	1	11,078	11,078	6%	11,730	11,730	7%
57	Frimley Green & Mytchett	1	10,321	10,321	-2%	10,595	10,595	-3%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
58	Heatherside & Parkside	1	10,111	10,111	-4%	10,439	10,439	-5%
59	Lightwater, West End & Bisley	1	11,791	11,791	12%	12,114	12,114	10%
<b>Divisions in Tandridge District</b>								
60	Caterham Hill	1	10,613	10,613	1%	11,059	11,059	1%
61	Caterham Valley	1	9,360	9,360	-11%	9,990	9,990	-9%
62	Godstone	1	9,878	9,878	-6%	10,258	10,258	-7%
63	Lingfield	1	11,756	11,756	12%	12,205	12,205	11%
64	Oxted	1	11,496	11,496	10%	11,975	11,975	9%
65	Warlingham	1	9,621	9,621	-8%	10,109	10,109	-8%
<b>Divisions in Waverley Borough</b>								
66	Cranleigh & Ewhurst	1	10,906	10,906	4%	11,148	11,148	2%
67	Farnham Central	1	10,261	10,261	-2%	10,834	10,834	-1%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
68	Farnham North	1	10,030	10,030	-4%	10,258	10,258	-7%
69	Farnham South	1	9,710	9,710	-7%	9,978	9,978	-9%
70	Godalming North	1	11,324	11,324	8%	11,596	11,596	6%
71	Godalming South, Milford & Witley	1	10,983	10,983	5%	11,255	11,255	3%
72	Haslemere	1	9,678	9,678	-8%	10,035	10,035	-9%
73	Waverley Eastern Villages	1	10,715	10,715	2%	10,952	10,952	0%
74	Waverley Western Villages	1	9,650	9,650	-8%	9,858	9,858	-10%
<b>Divisions in Woking Borough</b>								
75	Horsell	1	11,828	11,828	13%	12,050	12,050	10%
76	Knaphill	1	11,108	11,108	6%	11,241	11,241	2%
77	Pyrford	1	10,144	10,144	-3%	10,517	10,517	-4%
78	St Johns & Brookwood	1	9,580	9,580	-9%	10,026	10,026	-9%

**Table C1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Surrey County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2016)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
79 The Byfleets	1	9,894	9,894	-6%	10,092	10,092	-8%
80 Woking Central	1	10,184	10,184	-3%	10,385	10,385	-5%
81 Woking South	1	10,483	10,483	0% 11,777		11,777	7%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>849,927</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>889,201</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,493</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,978</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Surrey County Council.

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