

Surrey County Council

Electoral Review of Surrey County Council

Stage Three Response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England

October 2011

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In August 2010, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (“LGBCE” or “the Commission”) announced that it would be conducting an electoral review of Surrey County Council. The review was triggered by the fact that levels of electoral representation have changed since the last review was completed in 2000 and 26 divisions (33%) have an electoral variance greater than 10%.
- 1.2 The Review began in September 2010 with an initial consultation on the overall council size. The County Council initially proposed 80 members however, following consideration of councillor allocation across the Districts and Boroughs during Stage One, the County Council proposed a scheme of 81 single-member divisions. In reviewing all the submissions received during Stage One, the Commission agreed with the County Council’s proposal for 81 single-member divisions, distributed across the 11 District and Borough areas as follows:

District/Borough	Electorate (2016)	Distribution for 81	Proposed no of divisions
Elmbridge	98,555	8.98	9
Epsom & Ewell	60,022	5.47	5
Guildford	108,454	9.88	10
Mole Valley	69,809	6.36	6
Reigate & Banstead	109,401	9.96	10
Runnymede	62,950	5.73	6
Spelthorne	75,260	6.85	7
Surrey Heath	67,150	6.12	6
Tandridge	65,596	5.97	6
Waverley	96,117	8.75	9
Woking	76,087	6.93	7
	889,401	81	81

- 1.3 During Stage One of the Review, the County Council submitted a scheme of electoral divisions that it felt best met the Commission’s three statutory criteria:
- **Electoral equality.** Each councillor should represent as near as possible to the same number of electors.
 - **Community identity.** Division boundaries should recognise and support strong community links, such as parishes, shared facilities and transport links.
 - **Effective and convenient local government.** Divisions should be coherent with good internal communication links. For example, ensuring the Member can effectively travel to all parts of his/her division.
- 1.4 The County Council is pleased to note that having considered the submissions received during Stage One, the Commission developed proposals broadly based on the County Council’s scheme, having regard to evidence submitted by other interested parties (including District, Borough and Parish Councils.)

- 1.5 This report outlines the County Council's response to the Commission on its draft recommendations, focussing on the areas where the Commission has amended the County Council's proposed scheme and providing further evidence against the statutory criteria.

2 The Council's Approach

- 2.1 In September 2010, the Council set up a cross-party working group to lead on its response to the Electoral Review. This working group co-ordinated the Council's response on Council Size, endorsed formally by the County Council on 15 December 2010, as well as the response to Stage One of the Review.
- 2.2 The County Council's response to Stage One involved extensive consultation and discussion with local Members who, working within a 10% variance from the average electorate per division, were asked to put forward a pattern of divisions that would best support strong community identity with easily identifiable boundaries – such as parishes, major roads/railways and rivers. However, each local area is different and both the geography and pattern of communities can, in exceptional circumstances, make this 10% variance difficult to achieve. In such instances, local Members provided additional evidence to explain the detrimental impact of altering any proposed divisions to bring them within the tolerance range for electoral equality.
- 2.3 Where there was unanimous local agreement for a pattern of divisions that met the criteria, this was automatically adopted as the Council's response as it was felt that local Members are best placed to advise on this. Where local agreement did not prove possible, the task group looked at all the views put forward and recommended the pattern it felt best met the Commission's criteria.
- 2.4 Using this bottom-up approach, the proposals put forward by the County Council were locally drafted and moderated for consistency by the cross-party working group. The final draft was then put forward to the County Council for formal approval on 22 March 2011.
- 2.5 Following the County Council's approval, the response was published on the County Council's website and letters sent to District and Borough Councils, Parish Councils and Residents' Associations within Surrey to draw their attention to the proposals and inviting them to show their support by responding to the Review.
- 2.6 At the end of Stage Two, the Commission published its draft recommendations for a further period of consultation from 19 July– 11 October 2011. Members were made aware of the report and sent links to the Commission's website. Hard copies of the reports and maps were also made available to Members either providing personal copies where their local area was particularly affected by the proposals or through access to shared copies held at County Hall. All Members were given the opportunity to submit views on the Commission's proposals to the cross-party working group to consider when drafting a response based on the Council's original proposed scheme and the Commission's recommendations.
- 2.7 The County Council's views are outlined in the remainder of this report for the Commission to consider prior to developing its final scheme of electoral divisions.

3 Response to the Proposals by District and Borough Area

Elmbridge

- 3.1 The County Council notes that the Commission has decided to adopt the County Council's proposal in full as their draft recommendations for Elmbridge Borough. This is welcomed as the Council's original proposals are felt to be the best solution against the statutory criteria.

Epsom & Ewell

- 3.2 The County Council notes that the Commission has based its draft recommendations on the Council's scheme and welcomes this. However, two alterations to the Council's proposals are suggested:
- i. Move Windmill Avenue, Park Hill Road, Langdon Avenue and Hampton Grive from Ewell Division to the Epsom West Division.
 - ii. The field south of college road remains in Epsom Town & Downs Division rather than transferring to Ewell Division as suggested in the County Council proposal.
- 3.3 On the first point, while recognising the Commission's desire to improve electoral equality, these roads are seen to be an integral part of Ewell, not Epsom, and therefore realigning in this way would not support the community needs effectively. Ewell is an ancient settlement dating back to Saxon times whilst Epsom is a much newer, smaller area. The differences between the two are very marked and the people of Ewell very much associate themselves with the village, not the neighbouring town. The identifiable differences include the ecclesiastical parishes, postal addresses and area codes, the Residents' Associations and general physical appearance, with Ewell maintaining grass verges and Epsom taking on a much more urban feel.
- 3.4 On the second point regarding the field south of college road, although there are no voters affected by this change, it is linked to the farm situated in Ewell Division and therefore should be part of that division rather than the Epsom Town & Downs Division to the south. This ensures the farm and land are represented by one local Member, improving effective and convenient local government, and making it easier to deal with any longer term issues such as building or development in the area.
- 3.5 The County Council, therefore, commends the original proposal submitted during Stage One to the Commission.

Guildford

- 3.6 The Commission again adopted the County Council's proposal with two changes:
- i. Recommend the boundary between Ash and Shalford follow the district ward boundary along the railway and A323 until the ward moves north (where the division boundary continues along the A323.)
 - ii. Move Belmont Avenue, Byrefield Road, Clayton Drive and Ryde's Hill Road (near Stoughton) from proposed Guildford North to Guildford West Division.)
- 3.7 On the first change, the County Council's proposed scheme followed the A323 as a strong boundary between Ash and Shalford and to ensure the greatest possible level of electoral equality. However, as this created two parish wards, one of which is not felt to be viable as an

electoral unit, the County Council is content to accept the revised line suggested by the Commission.

- 3.8 On the second change, the County Council in its original submission did not feel that it was necessary to alter the boundary between Guildford North and Guildford West. However, it is noted that Guildford North as it stands is outside the 10% electoral variance and that the Commission's recommendation seeks to reduce this.
- 3.9 The Commission's recommendation supports community identity within Guildford West as it would move the entire length of Rydes Hill Road into the division and the roads running off it to Worplesdon Road are part of an existing community consisting of those roads together with Shepherds Lane and Sheepfold Road, which again link Rydes Hill Road and Worplesdon Road. The main community facilities for the area are Emmanuel Church and the church hall, which is used for community purposes. Both the church and the hall are in the current Guildford West Division.
- 3.10 However, in contrast, Guildford North would be adversely affected by this change. As mentioned above, following a previous boundary review the main community facilities for the area moved to the Guildford West division and this has had a significant negative impact on the sense of community in the local area. More boundary changes could exacerbate the lack of community identity and may lead to further confusion for residents and business owners in the Stoughton area who feel part of Guildford North rather than the Guildford West/Westborough Ward area.

Mole Valley

- 3.11 The Commission has proposed not to follow the new boundaries set out in the County Council submission for the parished areas of the District which had the support of all relevant local organisations and interested parties and, instead, has proposed an alternative configuration for the Dorking Hills Division so that it includes part of South Leatherhead, which is currently in the Leatherhead & Fetcham East Division, and the remainder of Abinger Parish, which is currently in the Dorking Rural Division.
- 3.12 The Council regrets the Commission's decision to overlook the carefully considered and consensus position of local organisations and asks the Commission to revisit carefully its decision not to support the proposal put forward by the County Council. It does not make sense to include in one division part of Leatherhead town with a rural area that stretches right down to the Sussex County boundary on the simplistic pretext that the part of Leatherhead town has similar rural characteristics to the rural area adjacent to it.
- 3.13 If the Commission is not prepared to reconsider the original proposals put forward by the County Council which much more clearly reflect the community boundaries of the area, it should at least revisit the proposed boundary between the Leatherhead and Fetcham East Division and the Dorking Hills Division as the ties of the "natural communities" outlined below far outweigh the perceived "hard boundary" of the A246 and the A24 proposed by the Commission.
- 3.14 The following evidence is provided in support of this statement:
- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area has always been part of Leatherhead town and not the rural area to the immediate south and east of this area. This is evidenced as the area is unparished with Residents' Associations as opposed to the area to the south and east being parished with formal parish councils (Headley Parish and Mickleham Parish).

- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area is basically an area of suburban Leatherhead town, there being no village shop, no village pub, and no village church in the area (all such facilities being in Leatherhead town itself). In contrast, in the rural area of Headley and Mickleham to the south and east, both villages have a village shop, a village church, and a village pub – and a village, as opposed to a suburban, way of life.
- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area looks to Therfield School in Leatherhead as the local secondary school whilst residents of Headley and Mickleham look to the Ashcombe School in Dorking as the local secondary school (an important distinction as one of the most significant roles of the County Council is education provision and the involvement of the County Councillor with local schools).
- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area has a Leatherhead postcode and letters are delivered from the Leatherhead Sorting Office. No other parts of the Dorking Hills Division have a Leatherhead postcode or are served by the Leatherhead Sorting Office i.e. only residents from the Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area of the proposed new division would go to Leatherhead town to collect parcels and letters not delivered by the Post Office clearly evidencing the separate ties of this area to Leatherhead.
- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area has no similarity with much of the Dorking Hills Division towards the Sussex border even if it can be substantiated that it has a similarity with the area to its immediate south and east (which the Council refutes). At least the area to the south and east (Headley and Mickleham) of this area has a village way of life with a parish council and local village facilities like the remaining villages in the Dorking Hills Division – a village way of life that the Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area does not have.
- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area looks to do their weekly shop at Sainsbury's Leatherhead or Tesco in North Leatherhead. The residents to the south and east either look to do their weekly shop at Sainsbury's or Waitrose in Dorking (in the case of Mickleham) or across the District Boundary at Asda in Burgh Heath in the case of Headley.
- The Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area principally cares about urban issues relating to Leatherhead. The remainder of the Dorking Hills Division cares about rural village issues and Dorking. As such, it makes much more sense for the area to be represented by a councillor who represents Leatherhead and is fully conversant with the issues that affect the town as opposed to a councillor whose division will principally cover Dorking town and the rural village areas and who will be extremely hard pressed to also be fully conversant with all the nuances of the issues that will affect Leatherhead town as well as all the issues that will affect the rest of the division.

3.15 Accordingly, if the Commission is to keep broadly to its own criteria, it is essential on clear community grounds that the Givons Grove, Leatherhead Downs, and Tyrrells Wood area is retained within the Leatherhead & Fetcham East Division.

3.16 In reviewing the County Council's Stage One submission against the Commission's recommendations, it has become clear that the proposal submitted for the boundary between Bookham & Fetcham West and Leatherhead & Fetcham East was incorrectly drawn. The County Council requests that the boundary between the two divisions be maintained as currently, following the ward boundaries.

3.17 Finally, the County Council notes that the Commission has not followed the County Council's new proposed boundary between Dorking Hills and Dorking South and the Holmwoods. Rather than following the current ward boundary, the County Council recommends that the boundary follows the main roads of the A25, Vincent Lane and Coldharbour Lane as this both improves electoral equality and uses distinct features for the boundary. Coldharbour Lane

also leads the boundary naturally back to the parish line of Holmwoods. This is more sensible from a community point of view, following the major roads in the area rather than the more arbitrary ward boundary. Should the Commission accept the current boundary between Leatherhead and Fetcham East as requested above, changing the boundary between Dorking Hills and Dorking South and the Holmwoods would still improve electoral equality in the rural areas.

- 3.18 The County Council rejects the Commission's proposals for Mole Valley and asks the Commission to revert to the Council's original proposals (with the amendment of keeping the current boundary between Bookham & Fetcham West and Leatherhead & Fetcham East.) If this is not acceptable, the County Council would accept the remainder of Abinger Parish only being transferred from the Dorking Rural Division to the Dorking Hills Division as the next best way to equalise the number of electors between these divisions notwithstanding that this creates a division with an extraordinary geographic area (a moon-shaped area with its geographic centre well outside the boundaries of the ward).

Reigate & Banstead

- 3.19 It is noted that given the electoral forecast, an additional division is needed in Reigate & Banstead, and therefore the changes in this area would be more significant and potentially more difficult to agree. In submitting its original scheme, the County Council looked to ensure the greatest level of electoral equality whilst trying to also respect the community lines.
- 3.20 The County Council is pleased to note that the Commission has accepted the Council's original proposal for the three northern Divisions with the amendment to retain the existing southern boundary for Nork & Tattenhams Division. The County Council proposal was submitted as a means of addressing the level of electoral equality in the area but is happy to accept the Commission's view that this is not necessary given the other adverse factors of reducing co-terminosity with ward boundaries and impacting on the community.
- 3.21 In the central area – principally covering the towns of Reigate and Redhill – the Commission has accepted the scheme put forward by Dr Hack, which proposes four divisions of Redhill East, Redhill West & Meadvale, Reigate and Earlswood & Reigate South. The County Council recognises that this scheme has some positive aspects, particularly in relation to keeping the community in Redhill East together by splitting the two into an east and west division. However, this in turn has a detrimental effect on the areas further south.
- 3.22 The boundaries proposed by Dr Hack would create a much longer, narrower Division in Redhill West meaning that the extremities of the Division are a very long way apart on the north/south axis, extending from the southernmost part of Reigate, through diverse parts of Central Reigate, Redhill and almost into South Merstham. The Division would contain disjointed sections of various areas with no single, cohesive centre or community.
- 3.23 In addition, the community of Meadvale would be split, with the area of former Local Authority (LA) housing known as "The Trees" estate separated from the rest of Meadvale and incorporated into South Park and Woodhatch which contains adjoining former LA estates. This could imply to residents that public and housing association housing estates are being removed from the areas which have more private housing to join other areas with a high proportion of public housing.
- 3.24 The original proposal would leave Central Redhill and Reigate as cohesive communities, and recognises Meadvale and St Johns as a distinct community together with the southern part of Reigate. The community of Meadvale is seen by most residents to be part of Reigate rather than Redhill. Most residents attend Reigate School as a Secondary School rather than the Warwick School in Redhill. In addition, crime and disorder issues are covered by either the

Reigate Police Panel or the Woodhatch Panel rather than the Redhill Panels. Reigate is also the nearest main shopping area.

- 3.25 The dividing line drawn in Reigate in the Council's original proposal makes sense as the southern part of Reigate naturally merges with Meadvale and is in many ways part of that community, in particular as many children would go to Reigate School which is a large secondary school on the Meadvale/ Woodhatch border and many pupils from St John's Primary School would also move to Reigate School. There are also 2 independent secondary schools Dunottar for Girls and Reigate Grammar, which is mixed, as well as a Junior Faith School (Reigate Parish) and a primary (St John's.)
- 3.26 The County Council's proposal provides for a stronger Division of South Reigate and Earlswood, using the parish boundary in the south, which would not affect the Whitebushes Estate. Woodhatch and South Park to the west is very much like a village, made up of four estates of mainly social housing which share facilities including a number of church communities, a youth centre, school and two shopping areas.
- 3.27 Moving further east, South Earlswood is another distinct area, much like a village, with a shared shopping area and one school providing a central focus. Crossing the A23, Whitebushes is the next clear community with one large estate of mostly social housing and a small shop in the centre.
- 3.28 Finally, to the north east of the Division is the community of Royal Earlswood – a gated community with some social housing and a YMCA. While diverse, the three communities within the proposed division are linked by Redhill Football Club.
- 3.29 In relation to North Earlswood, the County Council's proposal divides this area in half using St John's Road, a strong local boundary marker. Including Meadvale as part of South Park and Woodhatch is not seen to give any benefit because of the major roads involved. It is part of the Woodhatch Shopping parade but because of the major junction, the Commission's proposals would divide the village in half.
- 3.30 The County Council therefore urges the Commission to review its draft recommendations for Reigate & Banstead and revert to the County Council's original submission, accepting the Commission's suggested amendment to the boundary between Horley East and Horley West if this improves electoral equality.

Runnymede

- 3.31 In Runnymede, the Commission suggested a number of changes to the boundaries originally proposed by the County Council. The result of the Commission's changes is to amend the boundary between Addlestone and Woodham & New Haw to include Row Hill in Woodham & New Haw and amending the boundaries in the north of the Borough to divide Egham between two divisions rather than three, with Thorpe included in the Division of Foxhills & Virginia Water.
- 3.32 The County Council accepts the proposed alteration to improve electoral equality between Addlestone and Woodham & New Haw and is pleased to note the Commission's acceptance of the strong boundaries used for the Chertsey Division.
- 3.33 In relation to the north, while the County Council was happy with its original proposal, it notes the views expressed by Egham Residents' Association to keep Egham together and the Commission's attempts to reduce the number of divisions covering the town. With this in

mind, the County Council is willing to accept the Commission's proposals for Runnymede in full.

Spelthorne

3.34 The County Council notes that the Commission has decided to adopt the County Council's proposal in full as their draft recommendations for Spelthorne Borough. This is welcomed as the Council's original proposals are felt to be the best solution against the statutory criteria.

Surrey Heath

3.35 The County Council notes that the Commission has accepted the County Council's proposed scheme for the western divisions covering Camberley and Frimley areas and welcomes this.

3.36 In the more rural eastern area, the Commission has based its recommendations on an alternative scheme submitted by Windlesham Parish Council and supported by the Borough. This alternative scheme seeks to bring the village of Lightwater together in one division and provide greater co-terminosity between the division boundaries and those of the parish and borough ward boundaries. Given the evidence provided to support this alternative scheme against the criteria, the County Council is minded to agree this in principle.

3.37 However, the Commission has altered the Parish Council's original suggestion slightly by transferring part of Chobham Parish into the Lightwater, West End and Bisley Division. This is proposed in order to ensure that "Bisley Detached" which amounts to no more than 6 electors and views itself as part of the community of Chobham, having no road access to Bisley, can be retained in the Division with the rest of Bisley Parish.

3.38 In order to accommodate these few households and electors into a village which they have no community links with (i.e. Bisley and West End) the whole of the nearby lanes, households and electors amounting to 132 properties and 254 electors, which are an integral part of the Chobham community and Parish, will be transferred into a division with which they have no community connection and whose main interests are different. The County Council proposes that Bisley Detached be retained in the Bagshot, Windlesham & Chobham Division as this would be less disruptive to Chobham Village or indeed to Bisley Detached.

3.39 The County Council (and indeed the majority of local people consulted by the present County Councillor) have some sympathy with what the Commission is trying to achieve for Lightwater, but as it stands the proposal would have a detrimental impact on Chobham as a community. The areas of Pennypot and Castle Green, which include Grosvenor Road, Lovelands Lane, Scotts Grove Road and Close are an integral part of Chobham Village. Tenaker is the Chobham Farm Shop on Scotts Grove Road and is the main fresh food shop for the Village.

3.40 This area thinks of itself as Chobham and connects with the County Council(lor) on matters from roads, flooding and the Chobham Common (SSSI, SPA and internationally important heathland) as well as the local schools and preschool.

3.41 The transfer of residents living along the Bagshot Rd, (from Brook Lane – a hidden muddy track practically in the centre of Chobham) into the Lightwater, West End and Bisley Division, with which they have no connection, is also unwelcome. These residents have many connections with Chobham, as well as being within the ecclesiastical boundaries of Chobham Church. This change, if implemented, would go against the Commission's own criteria – the

need to reflect local communities and the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break local ties.

- 3.42 Furthermore, another criterion of the Commission is using easily identifiable boundaries. In order to achieve this between the villages of Chobham and West End, the division boundary between the two villages should be moved further west at least as far as Brook Place, a Jacobean House with a Chobham postal address and with historic Chobham connections. This lies on the southern side of the A319. Its lodge, Penny Cottage, on the northern side could also be included in the division. More logically, if the proposal to put Chobham, Windlesham & Bagshot in one division is to go ahead, it would be sensible to redraw the divisional boundary of Chobham Village up to Halebourne Lane on the northern side of the A319, and then to include the whole of the eastern side of this lane up to the Windlesham Road and Valley End. These are both already in the village and the present County Council division and include the Infant School and Church of Valley End, (also part of Chobham Division and Parish).
- 3.43 These variations in the Commission's proposal would satisfy all their criteria, supporting greater effective and convenient local government, whilst also satisfying the need to have equality of representation.

Tandridge

- 3.44 The Commission's recommendations for Tandridge adopt the County Council's scheme with two main changes:
- i. Opting to split Whyteleafe Parish (using the railway line) to improve electoral equality in the north rather than move Woldingham
 - ii. Including Crowhurst parish in Oxted Division rather than in Lingfield.
- 3.45 On the first of these points, splitting Whyteleafe into two parish wards was considered by the Working Group in the initial Stage One process. As this split a parish between divisions and the option to move Woldingham did not, the County Council opted to move Woldingham, a discrete village in its own right, rather than divide a parish unnecessarily. In addition, residents in Whyteleafe tend to gravitate along the valley and into Caterham for their main shopping and schools so have a closer affiliation with the Caterham Valley Division.
- 3.46 It is accepted that the railway lines would provide a strong division boundary but they also cause significant issues locally. Firstly, about 200 houses in Hillside lie to the east of the railway but are only accessible from Whyteleafe to the west, not supporting effective and convenient local government. Secondly, there are shared issues on both sides of the railway – e.g. parking issues – which would be better served by one councillor representing the area as a whole.
- 3.47 There are also concerns in splitting the section of Whyteleafe to the north of the roundabout, near Whyteleafe and Upper Warlingham stations, from the Village Centre and Godstone Road to the south. The A22 between the roundabout at the southern end of the ward and the northern district boundary, together with the roads leading to and from it, share a number of issues in relation to traffic congestion which would be better served by clear, single Member representation.
- 3.48 In relation to Crowhurst Parish, the County Council recognises that the Commission has put forward this recommendation to improve electoral equality within the District. However, as argued in the original submission at Stage One, Crowhurst Parish has strong ties to the south, relying on Lingfield for shopping and rail travel. It is linked by a bus service, and children from

Crowhurst Parish attend Lingfield Primary School. It has no social or economic links with the areas to the north and west with road access in both directions poor and in winter often impassable.

- 3.49 Recently the parishes of Burstow, Horne, Lingfield, Crowhurst, Dormansland and Felbridge have begun to collaborate in bidding as a Hub for the contract to undertake the highway horticulture in the Division. This has brought them together in a very useful way, and there are signs that, with localism and local planning forums, this base could be developed in a productive manner. Maintaining all six parishes within one County Division will support and enable this hub to continue therefore the County Council does not support the proposal to include Crowhurst in the Oxted Division.

Waverley

- 3.50 The Commission's proposed scheme recommends that the nine electoral divisions in Waverley remain as currently. The County Council had suggested a change to the boundary between Farnham Central and Farnham South to improve electoral equality and to simplify the boundary locally. The local Members still feel this change would be beneficial but accept the Commission's view that given the impact on the parish warding in the area, it is not necessary and will accept keeping the status quo as suggested.

Woking

- 3.51 The Commission has agreed with the County Council that the majority of the Divisions can maintain the status quo, with the exception of the current Woking Central and Horsell Divisions, given the level of electoral inequality. The Commission recommends that rather than adopting the County Council's proposed divisions of Goldsworth East & Horsell Village and Woking North, the current divisions be maintained with the area of Sheerwater transferring from Woking Central to Horsell.
- 3.52 The County Council does not agree with this solution and recommends its original submission to create the Divisions of Goldsworth East & Horsell Village and Woking North. These divisions ensure greater electoral equality at 0% and 1% respectively, compared to electoral variances of 10% and -5% under the Commission's proposals.
- 3.53 The Commission maintains that the proposed divisions support greater community identity but the County Council is satisfied that the alternative scheme put forward at Stage One does not adversely affect the area.
- 3.54 Goldsworth East & Horsell Village Division includes two distinct communities and is co-terminous with the district wards of Goldsworth East and Horsell West. These two wards share shops, doctors and other facilities and there is a natural affinity between the two. A significant section of Goldsworth East used to regard/regards itself as Horsell, and either has or until recently had a Horsell address. Goldsworth East and Horsell West also have strong ties in terms of schools, sharing both Sythwood and Goldsworth Primary Schools and with secondary pupils from both areas going to Woking High in Horsell. In contrast, the secondary school for Maybury, Sheerwater, and Woodham is Bishop David Brown.
- 3.55 The second division – Woking North – would again be co-terminous with the two district wards of Horsell East & Woodham and Maybury & Sheerwater. Whilst these wards incorporate three distinct communities, Horsell East and Woodham share some facilities in terms of schools. Overall, however, Horsell East is largely commuter housing and as such, has a less defined community centre and therefore it would not be significantly impacted by the proposed electoral separation from Horsell West. Maybury and Sheerwater in comparison has a

stronger, more unique community identity within Woking and separating the two areas would make it more difficult to deal effectively with their shared issues as the representation would be split between two councillors.

- 3.56 Given the high level of electoral equality, co-terminosity with district wards and support of strong community links, the County Council's original proposal is still seen to be the most appropriate scheme. In addition, the County Council would like to re-submit the following names changes to help residents better understand which divisions they fall within:
- Rename Knaphill "Knaphill and Goldsworth West"
 - Rename St Johns & Brookwood "Woking South West"
 - Rename Pyrford "Woking South East"

Key Points From Council Debate- 11 October 2011

GENERAL POINTS

COLIN TAYLOR	Matter of principle – need to go with the words, rather than the maps. The words describing the divisions for Epsom and Ewell in the Council's first submission were correct but the map from the Commission is slightly different – <i>please see Mr Taylor's submission direct to the consultation.</i>
SALLY MARKS	Localism Bill – people and communities at heart of what we do. LGBCE ignores community cohesion for a numbers games. End result delivers another councillor to the Council, at a time when we are reducing the number of MPs.
HAZEL WATSON	Cross-party working group worked well together. Thank the officers for providing excellent support to the task group.

ELMBRIDGE

PETER HICKMAN	Register objection to everything it says about the Dittons, against the 5 criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective Govt – no evidence that the proposal secures more effective government - Equality of Representation (10% rule) – left 9 divisions in County 10% or above. Dittons was going to be 12%, could have kept at this level. - Splits borough ward - Haven't crossed district boundary =- only criteria met - Local communities/easily identifiable boundary – proposing to change boundary from edge of farmland to middle of a road. It breaks local tie between Thames Ditton and Weston Green by splitting Weston Green in half.
---------------	---

EPSOM & EWELL

CHRIS FROST	Para 3.2 (ii) – field transferring. There is a possibility that this site might be developed in the future and therefore would like to keep all in one division. Support the proposal in the report to transfer the field.
COLIN TAYLOR	Para 3.2. (i) – moving number of roads from Ewell into Epsom. Additional support against this is that they are all side roads of a road called Epsom Road, <i>Ewell</i> . More importantly, the map is incorrect, the words from the Council's stage one response should be used to redraw the map – <i>see separate response from Mr Taylor.</i>

GUILDFORD

PAULINE SEARLE	The report is a good summary of what has been said in favour of Guildford West and Guildford North – the report sums up that the argument is on community grounds.
FIONA WHITE	There were a number of comments at the council meeting about communities. The situation in this part of Guildford is that the community in question is already divided because part of Rydes Hill Road and Worplesdon Road together with Shepherds Lane and Sheepfold Road have been moved into Guildford West when the change was made some years ago. In fact, the larger part of that community, taking in the area

	around Stoughton Rec and Emmanuel Church, is already was moved from Guildford North at that time. The changes proposed by the commission will bring the additional roads into line with the rest of the community.
--	--

MOLE VALLEY

HELYN CLACK	Recognise that the LGBCE wants to recognise natural boundaries – agree with that. It is important to have a parity of electors per division, as seeking to do under the parliamentary review. Intrigued by what want to do to own division (losing part of Dorking Rural to Dorking Hills). While this is part of my community, recognise that currently I have a larger number of electors than neighbouring colleague and this isn't fair to the voters or to politics and the county as a whole. Should be a parity of voting numbers.
-------------	---

REIGATE & BANSTEAD

ANGELA FRASER	<p>Happen to have largest division in County. Indeed, 3 northern divisions in R&B are 3 of the largest in Surrey and happen to believe all three are well represented by the current incumbents. I care what will happen to my area, it is being made a complete hotch-potch. We don't need another councillor, we could do with a half-dozen less. It is not going to promote more effective local government, don't need to play the numbers game.</p> <p>The proposal for the area crosses borough wards, divides parishes, divides local villages, no community cohesion whatsoever. Own village cut in half with the church being put in another community. It's a nonsense – all sorts of boundaries are broken. Every county councillor with have who knows how many borough councillors.</p> <p>Nonsense – trying to join one side of Reigate & Banstead with the far side, which is almost in Tandridge, and will be put in a different parliamentary constituency in the current review.</p> <p>Feel very sad about the whole thing.</p>
MICHAEL GOSLING	<p>Second largest division. It's a numbers game – and a numbers game only. Apart from the numbers, don't feel that the Commission understand the communities they are reviewing.</p> <p>What the Commission has essentially done is destroy hundreds of years of history because Lower Kingswood relates to the Deanery of Epsom and has done since the middle ages. And it is a community that lives along the A217. Schools, doctors, the library are up and down the A217 – escarpment divides it from Banstead.</p> <p>Going to join this area of 1,100 houses with Merstham. Merstham as far as Lower Kingswood is concerned could be as near as Waverley – there is no main road joining the two area, no buses, no trains. It gets joined with Merstham and it is a nonsense. No one will look at a map or get in the car and go for a drive to understand that this community shouldn't be put in a division with Merstham. Ignoring this because it is</p>

	inconvenient to the numbers.
LYNNE HACK	<p>Comments on paragraphs within the working group's report:</p> <p>P 3.20 - Whilst the Councils submission deals with electoral equality, it completely ignores the position of Lower Kingswood which has strong community ties with Kingswood, and none whatsoever with Netherne.</p> <p>The most bizarre aspect of this proposal is to call the division, containing Lower Kingswood, Hooley, Netherne and Merstham – 'Merstham and Banstead South'. Both Hooley and Netherne lie to the East of the Banstead East Division, and the Kingswood and Tadworth division is too the South of Banstead, between Banstead itself and the new 'Merstham and Banstead South Division'.</p> <p>P 3.22 - The officers comment that the Redhill West division extends 'almost into South Merstham' – This is the existing boundary.</p> <p>P 3.23 - The 'Trees Estate' is very much part of the Woodhatch community. This is demonstrated by the 'Woodhatch community project', which has been providing recreation facilities on the patch of green space on the corner of the Woodhatch shopping parades. The Boundary Commission's draft recommendation unites this community.</p> <p>P 3.24 - I disagree with the officer's notion that 'Meadvale is seen by most residents to be part of Reigate rather than Redhill'. Residents of Meadvale see themselves as residents of Meadvale.</p> <p>It is true that some residents attend Reigate School as this is situated between Reigate and Redhill. (the Warwick School being some distance away in Redhill East). Many, possibly more, children also attend St. Bede's School in Redhill West.</p> <p>Police panels are not co-terminus with the wards. (There is only one in Redhill – despite the officer's plural). Residents will continue to attend whichever panel they feel is most relevant.</p> <p>P 3.26 - The County Council's proposal (using the Parish Boundary) divides the Whitebushes community. The Boundary Commission's draft proposal does not and should be supported.</p> <p>P 3.29 - North Earlswood – Again, County Council's proposal (using the Parish Boundary) divides the North Earlswood community. The Boundary Commission's draft proposal does not and should be supported.</p>

	P 3.30 - The County Council should not ask the Boundary Commission to revert to the Council's original submission.
--	--

SPELTHORNE

IAN BEARDSMORE	<p>There were a number of problems with the original electorate numbers produced for Spelthorne during the initial stages of the Electoral Review which included a number of errors, reducing the electorate and implying the Spelthorne should reduce the number of councillors from 7 to 6.</p> <p>This meant that there was not time during Stage One to produce a detailed submission for Spelthorne and hence one has been provided during this stage instead – <i>see separate submission from Mr Beardsmore.</i></p>
----------------	---

SURREY HEATH

DAVID IVISON	<p>Happy to comment on the proposals. Four Divisions which will be unnecessarily affected by the Commission's proposals. In the case of two divisions – Frimley Green & Mytchett and Heatherside & Parkside – we are very marginally short of the desired electorate numbers (251 and 256 respectively.) The Commission proposal transfers 727 to Frimley Green & Mytchett and 799 to Heatherside & Parkside, strange Commission arithmetic, particularly as Surrey Heath has the highest economic growth in the country at 7% which will rapidly increase electorate numbers without any need for boundary changes.</p> <p>All 6 Surrey Heath County Councillors were in favour in March that we recommended the retention of the status quo – this local statement has been ignored by the county response.</p> <p>Reservations supported by the Borough Council, voters will have to use different polling stations for county and borough elections.</p> <p>Propose that we keep the status quo – have written personally to the Commission.</p>
BILL CHAPMAN	<p>Comment on the boundary between Heatherside & Parkside and Camberley East Divisions. 800 voters going from Camberley East to Heatherside & Parkside. Prefer it not to happen but there is no option to do nothing and therefore accept that it has to be done.</p>
CHRIS PITT	<p>Agree with Mr Ivison. Trying to work closer with Borough Councillors and huge wall along Sandringham Road with a river and park. Left hand side, known as Frimley with large church and also parish of Frimley and right hand side, known as Frimley Green with the school etc. There is a huge big divide. Don't mind taking on another 10,000 people but it doesn't make sense to the local people and it is the local population when we are talking about localism. Local people do not want to be change from Frimley into Frimley Green.</p>

	Frimley Green a proud village and don't want Frimley to come into them. Different types of populations. Frimley is mostly housing association which doesn't associate at all with Frimley Green.
LAVINIA SEALY	Submission for own part of Surrey Heath included in the report, this is of huge importance. Lightwater split and now being put back together which is fine but at the same time, the Commission has suggested pushing the West End boundary into the heart of Chobham, thus dividing a community in the same way as Lightwater. This is not acceptable, to divide the community in such a way.

TANDRIDGE

NICK SKELLETT	<p>Two strong messages:</p> <p>1 – All councillors in Tandridge agreed at the beginning and at the end of the process that they wanted no change.</p> <p>2 – Tandridge Village should remain in the Oxted Division.</p> <p>Electorate Numbers should not have been the driving force – the balance between numbers and the interests/integrities and loyalties of the communities is unbalanced in Tandridge. The community identity and needs should have been the priority. If the local committee does not want any change in an area, the County Council should not go against those wishes – we can make a political choice to focus on the community needs rather than follow central bureaucracy.</p> <p>Tandridge Village – have attended a number of local meetings and people are genuinely upset. Churches are united, the settlements are continuous. All the children go to Oxted primary and secondary schools and all transport is directed towards Oxted. The children's clubs are shared, there are voluntary groups covering both areas. District wards will be divided and all family and shopping links are across Tandridge Village to Oxted. All these points have been ignored by the working group and ask again that as representatives of local government, we think more locally in our approach. A better balance should have been found.</p>
SALLY MARKS	<p>Echo comments of Mr Skellett. Mr Hall in introducing the item said that no change is not an option, yet the Commission itself broke its own rules, therefore feel no change is an option.</p> <p>Own division is subject to a change which however you look at it, means existing communities will be split. I deplore the proposals and urge that the Commission leaves well alone.</p> <p>The Parish of Whyteleafe may be split into 2 halves. Woldingham also being subjected to a potential move which has no support from residents, the parish, borough or county councillor. Urge the Commission to respect historic boundaries rather than the numbers.</p> <p>I would amend paragraph 3.45 to add "as does Woldingham" to the end of the paragraph.</p>
DAVID HODGE	Speaking as Member for Warlingham. Agree with Mr Skellett

	<p>and Mrs Marks. As the communities and divisions in Tandridge are all quite distinct, there is no need to mess around with it. Proposal in the County's original submission that if have to move numbers, then Woldingham was the right size to move to Warlingham Division but clearly on an important note, cannot split villages.</p> <p>Whyteleafe has spent a lot of time and effort resurrecting the village and making it a community. Received grants, which Whyteleafe have done the fundraising for, to do substantial amount of work in Whyteleafe recreation ground. The Commission's proposal would move the recreation ground into Warlingham Division which already has a number of recreation grounds. No logical reason to split Whyteleafe. Recognise the problems with the numbers in the division and the potential need to move Woldingham. There is an argument for leaving as is but if a change must be made, moving Woldingham is the more logical one as it is another large rural area and would fit with the rest of the Division.</p> <p>Should try to keep the current Divisions together.</p>
--	--

WOKING

<p>LINDA KEMENY</p>	<p>It's extremely disappointing that the County Council has chosen to totally ignore the wishes of local residents and local organisations in the Horsell Division, by brushing aside the proposal of the Local Government Boundary Commission in its draft recommendations which took them into account and accepted the evidence presented to keep Horsell in one Division, preferring instead to press ahead with its poorly thought out Stage 1 response to split Horsell into two and join the two halves to other areas of Woking which are physically remote, have poorer communications and larger populations with few interests in common with Horsell. This will certainly have a detrimental affect on this historic and strong community and doesn't reflect the Council's aim of supporting Localism through strong and vibrant communities.</p> <p>The Horsells were mentioned in a 1720 map of the area and their distinct needs and interests would be submerged in the proposal to separate the Horsell Division and join the 2 parts to other quite different areas of Woking, as indicated in a letter from Horsell Residents Association to Mr. David McNulty, Chief Executive of Surrey County Council, dated 20th March, 2011.</p> <p>The Horsells share schools, a shopping area, recreational facilities and a cultural centre. At least two other local Trustee bodies, the Village Hall and the Horsell Sports Ground Association, would have to change their Trust documents as they are specifically for the benefit of the residents of the electoral Wards of Horsell West and Horsell East.</p> <p>The solution accepted by the Boundary Commission to keep the Horsells intact and add the Ward of Sheerwater to it to maintain the required level of electoral equality would be</p>
---------------------	---

	<p>exactly the same as the former Horsell Division in 2001 before the last boundary review. Many of the reasons given in the County Council's proposal to join Horsell West with Goldsworth East and Horsell East & Woodham with Maybury and Sheerwater do not appear to have anything to do with reality, and I repeat how disappointed local residents will be to find that the County Council has totally disregarded their wishes and concerns, all of which were posted on the Boundary Commission's website.</p> <p>Finally, I was elected to Surrey County Council on 19th May, 2011. I was therefore very surprised to find that the first notification I had of a proposed change of name of my Division from St. Johns & Brookwood to Woking South West was when I read about it in the Council's Stage 3 Response. My residents and I are very happy with the historic and familiar name of St. Johns & Brookwood and do not wish to be lumped into an amorphous mass of Woking South West.</p> <p>I hope that the Boundary Commission will once again take note of these strong objections to the proposals made by the County Council in Paragraphs 3.52-3.56 of their Stage 3 Response dated October 2011, and retain the recommendations in paragraph 138 of their Draft Recommendations published on 19th July, 2011, as well as retaining the name of the St. Johns & Brookwood Division of Woking.</p>
BEN CARASCO	<p>What was the Commission about? More effective representation with electoral parity and protecting local interest. Horsell lucky as has large, effective, representative Residents' Association (RA). RA wants to maintain its community identity and retain Horsell as one entity. The Commission listened to this and reinforced this, the County Council is trying to vandalise this by splitting it into two. Lucky that we had the voice of the residents telling the Commission what it wanted and the Commission listened. The Commission's submission has my support.</p>
DIANA SMITH	<p>Horsell is one community among a number in Woking. Goldsworth Park – also a large community although a much newer one. The County Council's proposals put forward to date have found a good balance between community identity and the electoral numbers. Residents in Goldsworth Park have not put forward proposals to date as they agreed with what the County Council was saying. Ideally, what residents in Goldsworth Park would like is to see Goldsworth Park as one division but know it won't work as it is too big.</p> <p>Currently, have one long sausage division – Woking Central – which has parts of Goldsworth Park at one end and Maybury & Sheerwater at the other, two very unrelated areas. What the Council proposal gives is something more cohesive with Goldsworth East in a Division with Horsell. There are a lot of links between Goldsworth East and Horsell, as many as between Horsell West and Woodham. Horsell is no more of a community than Goldsworth and already both are divided into</p>

	<p>different borough wards. Strong feeling among community in Goldsworth that it shouldn't be divided and feel that Horsell residents are stopping a proposal that would find a much better compromise for both communities.</p> <p>The County Council submission has much greater electoral equality, bringing the two divisions to almost perfect equality. The detail is in the report and should not be overthrown.</p>
WILL FORSTER	<p>Support the County Council submission on Woking, which has been gone through in great detail. It is unfortunate that it will divide Horsell but Goldsworth Park is divided, a lot of South Woking is divided, Knaphill is divided, it is the way communities in Woking have had to function. The same is true in Mole Valley – Leatherhead, Fetcham, Bookham all divided because of the nature of numbers.</p> <p>Horsell didn't want Sheerwater in its division, now the RA is saying they want it back. Have to take a wider view of things. Goldsworth and Horsell have a lot of links, schools, supermarkets and estates. Lots of Horsell West was built at same time as Goldsworth Park and have strong links. Woodham and Sheerwater share schools – there are links.</p> <p>There are borough councillors in the areas affected that support the county council proposal, there is a difference of opinion locally.</p> <p>Numbers in the submission from Cllr Kemeny and Carasco are further away from the electoral equality, raising a concern that a further review will be needed in the near future. Want the numbers as good as possible to ensure a long term solution.</p> <p>Maybury & Sheerwater is one borough ward which we would be looking to divide in the Commission's proposal. I don't want to do that for one simple reason. The area is very ethnically diverse and the most deprived part of Surrey. Do not want the most deprived part of Surrey to have a weak voice and dividing it will give it a weak voice. That part of Surrey deserves the strongest voice it can have. Putting it solely in one borough ward and one county division will do that and that's why I support the County submission.</p>

