

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council

Electoral review

January 2012

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 020 7664 8534

Email: publications@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2012

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final 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	9
Guildford Borough	10
Mole Valley District	11
Reigate & Banstead Borough	12
Runnymede Borough	14
Spelthorne Borough	14
Surrey Heath Borough	15
Tandridge District	17
Waverley Borough	18
Woking Borough	19
Conclusions	19
Parish electoral arrangements	20
3 What happens next?	23
4 Mapping	25
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	27
B Code of practice on written consultation	29
C Table C1: Final recommendations for Surrey County Council	33

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 September 2010.

This review was conducted as follows:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
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

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 81 members, with 81 single-member divisions. Our proposals were largely based on the County Council's scheme received at Stage One. We also had regard to schemes proposed by individual county councillors for particular areas. We accepted or proposed modifications to the county-wide scheme to better adhere to our statutory criteria.

Submissions received

During Stage Three, we received 465 representations. Many of these were in connection with our proposed boundary between East Molesey & Esher and The Dittons divisions in Elmbridge Borough. We also received a large number of representations in relation to our proposals in Reigate & Banstead, Tandridge and Surrey Heath. We received a smaller number of submissions for other areas. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final 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 4.5% over this period. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these as the basis of our final recommendations.

General analysis

We confirm our draft recommendations as final, with the exception of boundary changes in the following boroughs: Elmbridge; Epsom & Ewell; Runnymede; Spelthorne; Surrey Heath; Tandridge; and Woking

We carefully considered all evidence received during Stages One and Three. We received considerable evidence in relation to community identity and interests in the areas mentioned above, and this informed our final recommendations. We have sought to provide the best divisional patterns whilst adhering to the statutory criteria. We believe that our proposals will ensure good electoral equality whilst reflecting community identities and providing for effective and convenient local government.

Consequently, we have modified our boundaries in Elmbridge between East Molesey & Esher and The Dittons divisions, to include Weston Green in its entirety in The Dittons division; we departed from our draft recommendations in Surrey Heath in the Bisley area in order to keep Chobham parish in one division and we modified our draft recommendations in the southern part of Tandridge District to include Crowhurst in the Lingfield division and Tandridge in the Oxted division.

We confirm our recommendation for 81 single-member divisions. Nine divisions will have an electoral variance greater than 10% by 2016.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council. The changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings our recommendations into force – will be laid in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Surrey County Council, in 2013.

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

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 proposals first on the council size and then on division arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council*, which were published on 19 July 2011. We reconsidered the draft recommendations in light of the further evidence received during Stage Three and decided whether or not to make any modifications.

What is an electoral review?

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

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

Why are we conducting a review in Surrey?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2009 electorate figures, 33% 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?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the 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 town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim in 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 2009,² 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

10 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 the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

11 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.

12 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.

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

Submissions received

13 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, 40 submissions during Stage One and 465 during Stage Three, 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

14 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have also been assisted by officers at Surrey County Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

Electorate figures

15 As part of this review, Surrey County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2016, projecting an increase in electorate of 4.5% over the period 2010 to 2016. We are content to accept these forecast electorate figures as the basis for our final recommendations.

Council size

16 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. Proposals on council size ranged from 38 to 80 members.

17 The County Council proposed a council size of 81 members to improve the allocation of councillors between the districts and achieve good electoral equality. Having regard to the evidence received, we based our draft recommendations on a council size of 81 members and on the County Council's scheme, with some modifications in particular areas to best reflect the statutory criteria.

Electoral fairness

18 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 will provide for electoral fairness, whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

19 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out 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 889,202 by 2016) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 81 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 10,493 in 2010 and 10,978 by 2016.

20 Under the final recommendations, only nine 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 final recommendations for Surrey.

General analysis

21 Our draft recommendations were largely based on the County Council's scheme received at Stage One. We also considered proposals from individual county councillors, parishes, residents associations and individuals in particular areas. In some areas, we accepted or proposed modifications to the county-wide scheme to better adhere to our statutory criteria.

22 Our draft recommendations were based on a council size of 81 members and we proposed a pattern of 81 single-member divisions. The allocation of councillors across the districts was as follows:

- Elmbridge Borough – nine members
- Epsom & Ewell Borough – five members
- Guildford Borough – 10 members
- Mole Valley District – six members
- Reigate & Banstead Borough – 10 members
- Runnymede Borough – six members
- Spelthorne Borough – seven members
- Surrey Heath Borough – six members
- Tandridge District – six members
- Waverley Borough – nine members
- Woking Borough – seven members

23 At Stage Three, the County Council responded to our draft recommendations, stating it was pleased to note that we had broadly based our division patterns on its proposals during Stage One, but also proposed a number of modifications.

24 The majority of other submissions received focused on specific areas. In particular, the area of Weston Green in Elmbridge Borough; Crowhurst in Tandridge District; Chobham in Surrey Heath Borough; Givons Grove and Tyrells Wood in Mole Valley District; and Lower Kingswood in the Reigate & Banstead Borough. Councillors Beardsmore and Strong both proposed amendments to the draft recommendations in Spelthorne Borough.

25 We also received smaller numbers of submissions relating to other specific parts of the county.

26 Our final recommendations for Surrey are for 81 single-member divisions. Nine divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2016.

27 We consider our proposals will ensure good electoral equality while providing an accurate reflection of community identities and interests where we have received and considered evidence during Stages One and Three.

28 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on pages 33 – 40) and Map 1.

Electoral arrangements

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

- Elmbridge Borough (page 8)
- Epsom & Ewell Borough (page 9)
- Guildford Borough (page 10)
- Mole Valley District (page 11)
- Reigate & Banstead Borough (page 12)
- Runnymede Borough (page 14)
- Spelthorne Borough (page 14)
- Surrey Heath Borough (page 15)
- Tandridge District (page 17)
- Waverley Borough (page 18)
- Woking Borough (page 19)

Elmbridge Borough

30 Elmbridge Borough lies to the north of the county and currently comprises nine single-member electoral divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would continue to have nine divisions.

31 In our draft recommendations for Elmbridge Borough, we adopted the scheme submitted by the County Council. The Island Barn Reservoir stretches east to west across the current East Molesey & Esher division, preventing communication or transport links north and south within the division. In accordance with our policy of providing clear communication links within each division, we recommended that the boundary followed Station Road to allow access between the north and the south of the East Molesey & Esher division. As a consequence, the boundary divided the area of Weston Green, currently located wholly within The Dittons division.

32 We received 131 submissions opposing this scheme, citing strong community interests between Weston Green and Thames Ditton. Submissions referred to shared facilities such as the Thames Ditton Library, local schools, churches, children and youth activity centres and various sports clubs. We were informed that the Thames Ditton Day Centre is used by retired residents and draws volunteers from both areas. Respondents also stated that there is an active Conservation Area Advisory Committee attended by residents in both Weston Green and Thames Ditton. It was stated that to divide Weston Green would sever all ties within the community.

33 We found the evidence relating to community identity and interests compelling and are persuaded that dividing the area of Weston Green would be detrimental to a community that has demonstrated strong links with Thames Ditton. We have therefore decided to modify our draft recommendations accordingly.

34 We also received submissions in favour of incorporating an area south of The Dittons in the Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott division, arguing that it has better links with the Hinchley Wood area. Although this worsens the variance in Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott to 11%, it improves the variance in The Dittons division from 11% to 7% more electors than the county average by 2016. In light of the evidence received, we have decided to depart from our draft recommendations in this area and adopt the revised proposal.

35 We received one submission from Molesey Residents Association during Stage Three, suggesting that Molesey Heath Nature Reserve should be incorporated into the West Molesey division as the only access to the nature reserve is from West Molesey division.

36 Having considered this submission, we are in agreement that the nature reserve would be better suited in the West Molesey division and have decided to modify our draft recommendations accordingly.

37 We did not receive any representations on the rest of the divisions in Elmbridge. We have therefore decided that the remainder of our draft recommendations in Elmbridge should be confirmed as final.

Epsom & Ewell Borough

38 Epsom & Ewell Borough lies in the north of the county and is the smallest district geographically. It currently comprises five single-member electoral divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would continue to have five divisions.

39 At the draft recommendations stage, we adopted the scheme put forward by the County Council with a slight modification, transferring some roads from Ewell division into Epsom West division to improve the electoral equality.

40 During Stage Three, we received three submissions, from Epsom & Ewell Residents Association; Epsom & Ewell Borough Council; and Surrey County Council, all opposing the draft recommendations in relation to the boundary between Ewell and Epsom West divisions. They all stated that the residents in Windmill Avenue, Park Hill Road, Langton Avenue and Hampton Grove are associated with Ewell and, as such, the roads should remain in the Ewell division. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council stated that Ewell is a distinct settlement in its own right with the residents in the vicinity of Ewell associating with the village, its retail centre and primary schools. We consider that sufficient evidence had been received to demonstrate that the area has more in common with Ewell than Epsom. We have therefore decided to modify our draft recommendations to include the roads in the Ewell division. This would increase the variance in Ewell division to 12% more electors than the county average by 2016 and improve the variance in Epsom West from 7% to 5% more electors.

41 Surrey County Council re-iterated its original proposal submitted during Stage One. However, Councillor Taylor noted that in the County Council's original submission the accompanying maps did not accurately locate the boundary between Ewell West & Epsom and Epsom West divisions. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council also noted the discrepancy between the description contained within the County's

proposal and the accompanying maps. The draft recommendations reflected the boundary illustrated in the County Council's map. We consider that the evidence supplied by Councillor Taylor in favour of locating the whole of Hook Road and Briane Road in the same division, as the residents form part of the same estate and community, is compelling. Accordingly, we propose that the whole of Hook Road and Briane Road are included in Epsom West division. Due to the small number of electors affected, this has minimal effect on electoral equality.

42 Surrey County Council commented that the field south of College Road should be included in Ewell division. It suggested that although no voters are affected by the change, the field is linked to the farm in Ewell division and should therefore be part of that division. We consider that sufficient evidence has been supplied to warrant including the field to the Ewell division and we have decided to modify the draft recommendations accordingly.

43 Councillor Taylor further proposed that the names of the divisions put forward by Surrey County Council in Stage One, and adopted by the draft recommendations, should be changed to Epsom West, Epsom, Ewell, Ewell West and Cuddington. The Borough Council had no strong views on the names, apart from suggesting that the proposed division of Ewell West & Epsom be renamed West Ewell & Epsom to reflect the recognised local settlement and postal address.

44 We have considered both proposals and have decided to rename the divisions to reflect the changes to the Epsom West division. Therefore, Ewell West & Epsom division will be renamed West Ewell.

45 We propose that the remainder of the draft recommendations in Epsom and Ewell should be confirmed as final.

Guildford Borough

46 Guildford Borough lies in the west of the county and is the second largest borough geographically. It currently comprises 10 single-member electoral divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would continue to have 10 divisions.

47 At draft recommendations stage, we adopted the County Council's scheme with some slight modifications to the parish of Ash, to avoid creating an unviable parish ward with less than 100 electors. We also proposed a modification in the Stoughton area of Guildford town to improve the electoral equality in the Guildford North division.

48 During Stage Three, the County Council was content to accept the draft recommendations for the boundary between Ash division and Shalford division. However, Ash Parish Council opposed the boundary change, voicing concern that the consequential new parish ward would be under-represented with one councillor, causing confusion amongst the electorate as they are accustomed to, and familiar with, the current boundaries. We do not consider we have received sufficient supporting evidence to depart from the draft recommendations in Ash.

49 The County Council opposed the draft recommendations for the boundary between Guildford North and Guildford West divisions in the Stoughton area. It

suggested that residents in Guildford North division would be adversely affected as the main community facilities for the area are located in the Guildford West division. Conversely, Councillor White commented that the changes proposed in the draft recommendations would bring the additional roads into line with the rest of the community. We did not receive any other comments on these divisions and on balance, have decided against any modifications in this area.

50 During Stage Three, the Guildford West Labour Party stated that an area known as Dennisville should be included in the Guildford South West division rather than the Guildford West division as proposed under the draft recommendations. It stated that the A3 would create a more easily identifiable boundary, forming a significant barrier to the north. It added that the residents of Dennisville use the community facilities and shops in the Guildford Park and Onslow area in the Guildford South West division. In view of this further information, we have decided to depart from the draft recommendations in this area and to include the Dennisville area with the Guildford South West division as part of the final recommendations. This would improve the variance in Guildford West to 5% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2016, and in Guildford South West to equal to the county average.

51 We did not receive any other comments on the division boundaries in the remainder of the borough and confirm the draft recommendations as final.

Mole Valley District

52 Mole Valley District is located in the centre of the county and spans the southern to the northern county boundary. It currently comprises six single-member electoral divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would continue to have six divisions.

53 Our draft recommendations were based upon the County Council's proposal with some modifications to the Leatherhead & Fetcham East division to secure electoral equality.

54 During Stage Three, we received 35 submissions, all of which commented on the Givons Grove and Tyrells Wood area which under the draft recommendations would be located in the Dorking Hills division. Due to the strong boundaries to the north, east and west of Leatherhead, we were constrained in our division patterns for this particular area. Thirty of the submissions opposed the draft recommendations and five agreed with them. Surrey County Council also opposed the draft recommendations. Evidence was provided in relation to good community links between this area and Leatherhead compared to the lack of community interests with Dorking. The five respondents who agreed with the draft recommendations stated they had more in common with the rural area, with two residents stating that they had turned to the adjacent parish councils in the Dorking area for advice about planning issues.

55 We have carefully considered all the submissions received and acknowledge the rationale for including Givons Grove and Tyrells Wood area with Leatherhead. However, this would result in a variance of 15% more electors in Leatherhead & Fetcham East than the county average by 2016. We consider that a 15% variance in an urban area such as Leatherhead would be unacceptably high. Consequently, we

have decided that, on balance, the draft recommendations for Leatherhead & Fetcham East should be confirmed as final.

56 Under the draft recommendations, based on Surrey County Council's proposal at Stage One, the boundary between Leatherhead & Fetcham East and Bookham & Fetcham West followed the back of the properties on the west of Cobham Road. The Council had requested that the boundary between the two divisions be retained, as it was coterminous with the district ward boundaries. During Stage Three, the County Council informed us that its original proposal was incorrectly mapped in this area. Having reconsidered the submission, we note that implementing this change would adversely affect electoral equality in Bookham & Fetcham West, increasing it to 16%. We consider that insufficient evidence has been received to warrant such a high electoral imbalance and we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Bookham & Fetcham West as final.

57 Surrey County Council and Councillor Watson proposed that the boundary between Dorking Hills and Dorking South & the Holmwoods divisions should follow Coldharbour Lane and Vincent Lane. This was suggested to improve the electoral equality in Dorking Hills division and as an alternative to the draft recommendations which improved the electoral equality, by including the Givons Grove area and the whole of Abinger parish in the Dorking Hills division. Councillor Watson opposed the transfer of the whole of Abinger parish, suggesting that this would increase the geographical size of the division making electoral representation difficult. Surrey County Council, however, stated it was willing to support the inclusion of Abinger parish. Councillor Clack also supported the draft recommendations.

58 We do not consider that the boundary suggested by Councillor Watson would improve the community links in Dorking and therefore confirm the draft recommendations for Dorking Hills, Dorking Rural and Dorking South & The Holmwoods as final.

Reigate & Banstead Borough

59 Reigate & Banstead is located in the east of the county and spans the southern to the northern county boundary. It currently comprises nine single-member divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would have 10 divisions.

60 We based our draft recommendations in the north of the borough on Surrey County Council's proposal and, in Reigate and Redhill, on a proposal from Councillor Hack.

61 During Stage Three, we received 138 submissions in relation to the divisions in Reigate & Banstead, with the majority of these opposing the draft recommendations for the Merstham & Banstead South division in the north of the borough.

62 In the draft recommendations, the area of Lower Kingswood was included with Merstham in one division in order to improve electoral equality. To locate Lower Kingswood with the Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood division would result in 22% more electors than the average in the Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood division and 25% less electors in the Merstham division. During Stage Three, we received 125 standard letters supplied by the Lower Kingswood Residents' Association and signed

by residents. We also received eight other submissions opposing the draft recommendations in this area. Councillors Fraser, Gosling and Hack all submitted comments to Surrey County Council opposing the draft recommendations. Reigate & Banstead Borough Council also opposed the draft recommendations but conceded that given the statutory criteria, it would be difficult to provide an alternative proposal which would achieve better electoral equality.

63 A submission from the Banstead Village Residents Association provided an alternative proposal for the four divisions in the north of the borough. Whilst achieving good electoral equality, this proposal would split the Lower Kingswood community, with the eastern side of the A217 being included in a Merstham division and the western side included in a Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood division. This proposal would address the community links between half of Lower Kingswood and Kingswood.

64 The majority of the submissions related to the area between Lower Kingswood and Kingswood, saying there were no links between Lower Kingswood and Merstham. We note the strength of opposition to the draft recommendations in this area and having toured the borough, we accept that the links between Lower Kingswood and Merstham are not strong. However, while the proposal from the Banstead Village Residents Association would in part resolve the issue, we were not persuaded that dividing the Lower Kingswood community would be an acceptable solution for residents of that area. In the absence of any alternative arrangement that would achieve acceptable levels of electoral equality and better reflect community identity and interests, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

65 In Reigate and Redhill, the draft recommendations were based on Councillor Hack's proposal which, in our view, reflected community identity, keeping the community in Earlswood together in one division. We recommended using the district ward boundary rather than the parish boundary to the south of the Earlswood & Reigate South division which include Whitebushes wholly within the division.

66 During Stage Three, Surrey County Council maintained that its Stage One proposal should be adopted. It stated that the draft recommendations created a longer, narrower division in Redhill West with disjointed sections of various areas with no single, cohesive centre or community. The Council also stated that under the draft recommendations, 'the community of Meadvale would be split' from the area known as 'The Trees' estate. It added that 'the community of Meadvale is seen by most residents to be part of Reigate rather than Redhill'. Councillor Hack refuted both statements. She said that the Woodhatch community project unites The Trees estate with Woodhatch, providing strong community interests and that the residents of Meadvale 'see themselves as residents of Meadvale'. She added her full support of the draft recommendations which she stated 'unites this community'.

67 We noted that the County Council did not provide any new evidence in support of its proposal. We also noted the additional evidence supplied by Councillor Hack and, on balance, we have decided that the divisions in Reigate and Redhill should be confirmed as final.

68 In Horley, we based the draft recommendations on the County Council's proposal with a slight amendment in the town centre to improve electoral equality. During Stage Three, the County Council accepted this amendment to the boundary. Horley Town Council commented that they had no objections in response to the draft recommendations. We therefore recommend that the draft recommendations for Horley are confirmed as final.

Runnymede Borough

69 Runnymede Borough lies to the west of the county and currently comprises six single-member divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would still comprise six divisions.

70 We based the draft recommendations on the proposals from Surrey County Council, with some modifications to better reflect community identity and improve electoral equality.

71 During Stage Three, we received three submissions in relation to the divisions in Runnymede.

72 Surrey County Council's proposed scheme for Egham split the town into three separate divisions. We sought to avoid dividing the town by proposing two divisions in the draft recommendations, incorporating part of Thorpe ward with Foxhills and Virginia Water. During Stage Three, the County Council said it was 'willing to accept' the draft recommendations. We received a submission from Thorpe Ward Residents' Association explaining that it would like the whole of the ward included in the Egham division. However, this proposal would result in a variance of 19% fewer electors than the county average in Foxhills, Thorpe & Virginia Water division for which we feel we have received insufficient justification.

73 In our draft recommendations we adopted Surrey County Council's proposed Woodham and New Haw and Addlestone divisions, albeit with a modification. During Stage Three, the County Council accepted this change and supported the draft recommendations. However, we received a submission from a resident explaining that the roads around Liberty Lane look towards, and are part of Addlestone, separated geographically from New Haw by an area of 'green strip with the River Bourne through its middle'. We considered this new evidence and agreed that the area would be better suited in the Addlestone division. This would change the variance in Woodham & New Haw to 9% fewer electors than the county average by 2016 and 2% more in Addlestone. We have therefore decided to depart from the draft recommendations in this area of Runnymede.

74 We did not receive representations for the rest of the divisions in Runnymede. We have therefore decided that the remainder of our draft recommendations in Runnymede should be confirmed as final.

Spelthorne Borough

75 Spelthorne Borough is located on the northern boundary of the county and currently comprises seven single-member divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would continue to have seven divisions.

76 Our draft recommendations were based entirely on the County Council's Stage One proposal which linked Stanwell to Stanwell Moor in a single-member division.

77 During Stage Three, we received a joint submission from Councillors Strong and Beardsmore providing an alternative scheme to slightly modify a number of divisions to better reflect community identity. We considered each of the proposed changes in turn.

78 The first modification related to an area known as 'Crooked Billet', which under our draft recommendations is included in the Stanwell & Stanwell Moor division. The councillors stated that Crooked Billet is adjacent to, and looks towards, Staines and should not be linked to Stanwell, particularly as the reservoir creates a strong barrier between Crooked Billet and the rest of the division. We agree that the reservoir would indeed create a barrier between Crooked Billet and Stanwell.

79 The councillors suggested that an area south of the A30 would be better suited in the Stanwell & Stanwell Moor division as it has better links with the Desford Way roads. They also suggested that the boundary between Sunbury Common & Ashford Common and Ashford should be altered to create a more identifiable boundary by locating the whole of Junction Road and Ashgrove Road in one division and that Charlton Village (currently in Sunbury Common & Ashford Common division) should be located in the same division as Shepperton Green as they both share common interests.

80 The councillors further opined that the boundary between Laleham & Shepperton and Staines South & Ashford West should be altered so that it follows the district ward boundary along Ashford Road (B377) and the brook. They indicated that this would provide for more effective and convenient local government by using the ward boundary, in addition to the area having more in common with Staines than Laleham, which they argued, is a separate community. We have decided that sufficient evidence of community interests have been provided to depart from the draft recommendations in this area.

81 This would result in 4% fewer electors than the county average in Laleham & Shepperton and 6% fewer in Staines South & Ashford West.

82 The councillors were in support of the draft recommendations for Lower Sunbury & Halliford division. We did not receive any further representations and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Lower Sunbury & Halliford division as final.

Surrey Heath Borough

83 Surrey Heath Borough is in the west of the county and is largely rural. The M3 motorway traverses the borough from east to west. It currently comprises six single-member divisions. Under our final recommendations, it would continue to have six divisions.

84 We based the draft recommendations on Surrey County Council's proposal in Camberley and Frimley and on Windlesham Parish Council's proposal in the rural area. However, we modified the proposal in the rural area to avoid creating a

detached part of the Lightwater, West End & Bisley division. We recognised that the draft recommendations in this area would be controversial but, in the absence of sufficient evidence relating to community interests in the Chobham area, we decided that to create a detached part of the division would not lend itself to effective and convenient local government.

85 In response to our recommendation during Stage Three, we received 65 submissions in relation to divisions in Surrey Heath. The vast majority of these submissions focused on the parish of Chobham.

86 We received substantial opposition to our draft recommendations which involved dividing the parish of Chobham. A significant amount of evidence was received from residents in the area, all relating to community interests within Chobham. Responses indicated that this was a 'tight-knit community' with strong links and good community interests, such as the shared use of facilities including schools, churches, shops and clubs. By dividing the parish of Chobham, residents stated that the community would be fragmented and ties severed. Residents further argued that creating a new Castle Green Parish ward in Chobham – as a result of dividing Chobham parish – would be confusing and disruptive for the community. Further comments questioned the need for this proposal which respondents stated resulted in order to address the issue of a detached area. Respondents stated that our approach was disproportionate. We have carefully considered all representations and note the strength of feeling against dividing Chobham Parish. We consider that the evidence of community identity is compelling. Consequently we are persuaded, in this rather exceptional case, to depart from our policy of not creating detached divisions, due to the overwhelming evidence received. We propose incorporating the whole of Chobham parish in the Bagshot, Windlesham & Cobham division.

87 However, we consider that the existence of a detached parish area, and the consequent need to create a detached district ward and county division, is not conducive to effective and convenient local government. We believe it is in the interests of all concerned for Surrey Heath Borough Council to carry out a Community Governance Review to address this anomaly.

88 The County Council supported the draft recommendations in the urban part of the borough including Camberley and Frimley. Councillor Bates re-affirmed his Stage One proposal that Camberley should be divided into a north and south division rather than east and west as we have proposed in our draft recommendations. He asserted that the evidence supplied by Surrey County Council to link St Paul's ward with Old Dean due to their school links was not factual. He provided further evidence to support his view that the road links between Old Dean and St Paul's are poor. He further stated that Brackendale Road is not a strong boundary as stated by the council. Additionally, he proposed that Ansell Estate should be included in the same division as Frimley as it has no links with Frimley Green and all the residents in the estate use the facilities in Frimley. He maintained that by dividing Camberley into north and south divisions, good electoral equality could still be achieved. We considered that the points put forward by Councillor Bates were persuasive, but in weighing up the evidence received relating to this area, we consider that there is insufficient additional evidence to depart from the draft recommendations in Camberley.

89 Surrey Heath Borough Council supported our recommendations for Heatherside & Parkside and Camberley East, but opposed the boundary between Camberley West and Frimley Green & Mytchett. It stated that the boundary would split a borough ward and divide a residential estate. The Borough Council had initially raised this concern during Stage One, which we duly considered. To include the Ansell Estate in the Camberley West division would result in 14% more electors than the county average by 2016 in Camberley West and 11% fewer in Frimley Green & Mytchett. We determined that sufficient evidence has not been received to warrant such a high variance and propose that the draft recommendations in the urban area are confirmed as final.

Tandridge District Council

90 Tandridge District Council lies on the eastern border of Surrey and is rural in nature with no major towns. It currently comprises six single-member divisions. Under our final recommendations, Tandridge will continue to have six divisions.

91 In the southern part of the district, we based our draft recommendations on Surrey County Council's scheme, with a modification in the proposed Lingfield division to improve electoral equality. In the north of the district, we based our draft recommendations on local evidence received during Stage One, which stated that Woldingham should be included in a division with Caterham.

92 During Stage Three, we received 69 submissions in relation to the divisions in Tandridge. The majority of these submissions focused on the parish of Crowhurst.

93 In our draft recommendations, we included the parish of Crowhurst in the Oxted division to improve the electoral equality in the Council's proposed Lingfield division. The submissions received during Stage Three provided persuasive evidence of community links between Crowhurst and Lingfield, stating that the churches shared a vicar and that the Crowhurst residents shared facilities such as a doctor's surgery, the main post office, the bank and other facilities in Lingfield. In addition, submissions were received stating that St Peter & St Paul's church in Lingfield is the sister church of St George's in Crowhurst and are both overseen by the same Reverend. To include Crowhurst in the Lingfield division would increase the variance to 13% more electors than the county average by 2016. We recognise that this variance is slightly higher than is normally acceptable, but having carefully weighed up the statutory criteria, we consider that adequate evidence of community identity has been received to warrant departing from our draft recommendations.

94 During Stage Three, 10 submissions were received regarding the parish of Tandridge. In the draft recommendations, the parish was included in the Godstone division as proposed by the County Council during Stage One. We received evidence during Stage Three indicating significant links between Tandridge and Oxted rather than with Godstone, including good transport links and shared sporting facilities. To include Tandridge parish in the Oxted division, along with the change to Crowhurst as mentioned above, would result in 12% more electors in Oxted and 12% fewer electors in Godstone. We acknowledge that this worsens the electoral equality in both divisions. However, having considered the statutory criteria, we feel that the evidence received in relation to community identity has been sufficient to propose departing from the draft recommendations in this area.

95 In the northern part of the district, we based our draft recommendations on local submissions received, namely that Woldingham would be better suited with Caterham, rather than with Warlingham as proposed by the County Council. To maintain Warlingham in a division without Woldingham would result in a variance of 19% fewer electors than the county average. We considered the option of dividing the parish of Whyteleafe along the railway line, placing half of Whyteleafe parish in the Warlingham division and the other half in the Caterham Valley division. This would result in Warlingham division containing 8% fewer electors than the county average and we therefore incorporated this into our draft recommendations.

96 During Stage Three, we received five submissions opposing the splitting up of Whyteleafe parish into two different divisions. Seven submissions suggested Woldingham should be joined with Warlingham; some respondents mentioned the similarity in the geographically rural nature of both areas. One submission supported the draft recommendations.

97 We carefully considered the evidence in relation to Whyteleafe parish. Respondents explained that in recent years the village council has worked well to unite the parish and encourage joint working with businesses. On reflection, we decided that splitting the parish into two different divisions would be detrimental to the community of Whyteleafe. During Stage One, submissions were received to suggest Woldingham had community links with Caterham. During Stage Three, many of the submissions refuted this evidence and suggested instead that there were far greater connections between Woldingham and Warlingham. To include Woldingham in the Warlingham division and the whole of Whyteleafe in the Caterham Valley division would result in 4% fewer electors than the average in Warlingham division and 13% fewer electors in Caterham Valley. We were concerned over the high variance in Caterham Valley and considered the option of transferring some electors from Caterham Hill into Caterham Valley, but having studied the topography of the area, we have decided it would be unfeasible to incorporate any part of Caterham Hill into Caterham Valley. We have therefore decided to depart from the draft recommendations in this area of Tandridge with three divisions in the northern part of the district: Warlingham, Caterham Valley and Caterham Hill.

Waverley Borough

98 Waverley Borough lies to the south of the county and is predominantly rural. It currently comprises nine single-member divisions. Under our final recommendations, Waverley will continue to have nine divisions.

99 We based our draft recommendations on Surrey County Council's scheme with a slight modification in Farnham to prevent creating a small unviable parish ward.

100 Surrey County Council supported the draft recommendations, whilst commenting it would have preferred the boundary between Farnham South and Farnham Central to follow the Ridgway Road rather than go behind the properties to the south of Ridgway. However, it understood that this would create an unviable parish ward and was therefore willing to accept the draft recommendations. We therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final in the whole of Waverley Borough.

Woking Borough

101 Woking Borough lies in the centre of the county. It currently contains seven single-member divisions. Under our draft recommendations, Woking will continue to have seven divisions.

102 We based our draft recommendations on the scheme provided by Woking Constituency Conservative Association, following submissions opposing Surrey County Council's scheme which divided Horsell into two different divisions.

103 During Stage Three, we received nine submissions, four of which supported the draft recommendations with the remainder opposing them. Those in support of the draft recommendations stated that linking Goldsworth West to Knaphill and Goldsworth East with Horsell Village best met community interests as these divisions shared many facilities. Respondents stated that Goldsworth East and Horsell have strong ties in terms of schools, particularly Sythwood and Goldsworth Primary schools. A submission from the Goldsworth Park Community Association stated that the proposals put forward by the County Council made the divisions contiguous and that the Horsell community shared recreational and shopping facilities offered by Goldsworth Park. Those opposing the draft recommendations also provided evidence of community identity and supported Surrey County Council's proposal for the area, stating that the two areas share shops, schools, doctors' surgeries and other facilities.

104 Having carefully considered all the evidence provided, we consider that on balance, adopting the County Council's proposal for this area better reflects community identity and provides for better electoral equality. The Goldsworth East & Horsell Village and Knaphill & Goldsworth West divisions would both have only 2% more electors than the county average.

Conclusions

105 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 33 – 40 and illustrated on a number of large maps we have produced. The outline map which accompanies this report shows our final recommendations for the whole authority. It also shows a number of boxes for which we have produced more detailed maps. These maps are also available to be viewed on our website.

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final 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	12	9
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	2	0

Final 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

107 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.

108 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.

109 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Ash and Horley.

110 Ash parish is presently represented by 12 councillors, 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.

Final 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 2b.

111 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.

Final 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 7b.

3. What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Surrey County Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Surrey County Council in 2013.

Equalities

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

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Surrey

113 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 the south east of Guildford borough.
- **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 the town of Godalming.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7a** illustrates the proposed divisions in central Reigate and Banstead borough.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7b** 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 www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or 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 www.nalc.gov.uk
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 county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or county 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

Criteria	Compliance/departure
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 Final recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.

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: Final 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 %	
Divisions in Elmbridge Borough								
1	Cobham	1	10,072	10,072	-4%	10,541	10,541	-4%
2	East Molesey & Esher	1	9,261	9,261	-12%	9,940	9,940	-9%
3	Hersham	1	9,697	9,697	-8%	10,228	10,228	-7%
4	Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott	1	11,625	11,625	11%	12,145	12,145	11%
5	The Dittons	1	11,483	11,483	9%	11,761	11,761	7%
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.): Final 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 %	
Divisions in Epsom and Ewell Borough								
10	Epsom Town & Downs	1	11,084	11,084	6%	11,998	11,998	9%
11	Epsom West	1	10,377	10,377	-1%	11,506	11,506	5%
12	Ewell	1	11,953	11,953	14%	12,308	12,308	12%
13	Ewell Court, Auriol & Cuddington	1	11,865	11,865	13%	12,233	12,233	11%
14	West Ewell	1	10,946	10,946	4%	11,977	11,977	9%
Divisions in Guildford Borough								
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%
19	Guildford South West	1	10,634	10,634	1%	10,939	10,939	0%
20	Guildford West	1	11,024	11,024	5%	11,479	11,479	5%

Table C1 (cont.): Final 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 %
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%	11,376	11,376	4%
Divisions in Mole Valley District								
25	Ashted	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	10,731	10,731	2%	11,063	11,063	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%
30	Leatherhead & Fetcham East	1	11,630	11,630	11%	12,248	12,248	12%
Divisions in Reigate & Banstead Borough								
31	Banstead, Woodmansterne & Chipstead	1	11,345	11,345	8%	11,858	11,858	8%

Table C1 (cont.): Final 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 %
32	Earlswood & Reigate South	1	10,303	10,303	-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	9,360	9,360	-11%	10,874	10,874	-1%
38	Redhill West & Meadvale	1	9,907	9,907	-6%	10,674	10,674	-3%
39	Reigate	1	10,501	10,501	0%	11,063	11,063	1%
40	Tadworth, Walton & Kingswood	1	10,569	10,569	1%	11,103	11,103	1%
Divisions in Runnymede Borough								
41	Addlestone	1	10,369	10,369	-1%	11,218	11,218	2%
42	Chertsey	1	9,925	9,925	-5%	10,414	10,414	-5%

Table C1 (cont.): Final 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 %
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	-2%	10,669	10,669	-3%
46	Woodham & New Haw	1	9,590	9,590	-9%	10,030	10,030	-9%

Divisions in Spelthorne Borough

47	Ashford	1	10,464	10,464	0%	10,813	10,813	-2%
48	Laleham & Shepperton	1	10,245	10,245	-2%	10,508	10,508	-4%
49	Lower Sunbury & Halliford	1	10,061	10,061	-4%	10,503	10,503	-4%
50	Staines	1	11,074	11,074	6%	11,660	11,660	6%
51	Staines South & Ashford West	1	9,846	9,846	-6%	10,306	10,308	-6%
52	Stanwell & Stanwell Moor	1	9,633	9,633	-8%	10,109	10,109	-8%
53	Sunbury Common & Ashford Common	1	11,045	11,045	5%	11,361	11,361	3%

Table C1 (cont.): Final 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 %	
Divisions in Surrey Heath Borough								
54	Bagshot, Windlesham & Chobham	1	10,708	10,708	2%	11,430	11,430	4%
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%
58	Heatherside & Parkside	1	10,111	10,111	-4%	10,439	10,439	-5%
59	Lightwater, West End & Bisley	1	11,574	11,574	10%	11,897	11,897	8%
Divisions in Tandridge District								
60	Caterham Hill	1	10,613	10,613	1%	11,059	11,059	1%
61	Caterham Valley	1	8,780	8,780	-16%	9,565	9,565	-13%
62	Godstone	1	9,360	9,360	-11%	9,711	9,711	-12%
63	Lingfield	1	11,986	11,986	14%	12,447	12,447	13%
64	Oxted	1	11,784	11,784	12%	12,280	12,280	12%

Table C1 (cont.): Final 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 %
65	Warlingham	1	10,201	10,201	-3%	10,534	10,534	-4%
Divisions in Waverley Borough								
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%
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%

Table C1 (cont.): Final 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 %	
Divisions in Woking Borough								
75	Goldsworth East & Horsell Village	1	11,040	11,040	5%	11,251	11,251	2%
76	Knaphill & Goldsworth West	1	11,108	11,108	6%	11,241	11,241	2%
77	The Byfleets	1	9,894	9,894	-6%	10,092	10,092	-8%
78	Woking North	1	10,972	10,972	5%	11,185	11,185	2%
79	Woking South	1	10,483	10,483	0%	11,777	11,777	7%
80	Woking South East	1	10,144	10,144	-3%	10,517	10,517	-4%
81	Woking South West	1	9,580	9,580	-9%	10,026	10,026	-9%
Totals		81	849,927	-	-	889,202	-	-
Averages		-	-	10,493	-	-	10,978	-

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.

