

From: Caroline Salmon <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 30 May 2022 14:38
To: reviews
Subject: Mole Valley Boundary Commission Review 2022

Categories: Submissions, Simon

Dear Sirs

I write as a Cllr for Beare Green and as a member of the working group for the Boundary Commission, who have tried to get a consensus of the cross party working group but only achieved a partial success.

Further to my previous comment when this Consultation was first introduced, where I stated that Coldharbour had no links to Beare Green and should not be treated as a rounding up number, whereas although I know the links are tenuous I have spoken to Holmwoods Councillors and as they are likely to be with Beare Green on this 3 Cllr ward, they have no strong objection to Coldharbour being included.

The Rural areas South of Dorking need further consideration in respect of what goes where and if 3 Cllr wards work in the rural areas, which are also heavily perished.

I have also spoken with the Capel Parish Council (currently covering Capel, Coldharbour and Beare Green) and encouraged them to make a response.

Their previous view was it made no difference to them what District Cllrs ward area were, so long as they all worked with them.

I sincerely hope that Capel Parish Council will send in comments themselves, but in general they seemed to feel that Beare Green and Coldharbour would look after themselves within whatever ward you put them, but were less happy to have Charlwood and Hookwood, joined to the Capel Leigh and Newdigate ward, as they felt that they might get less time from the Cllrs if they have a larger area to cover. Hookwood is also scheduled to have 500 houses in the next few years if the Local Plan is agreed as submitted.

I back up the Capel Parish's concept that the current CLN ward and the Charlwood ones really would be best kept as they are - one 2 Cllr ward and one 1 Cllr ward.

A similar situation exists with the old Boxhill and Headley and the 3 Bs (Brockham, Betchworth and Buckland), they are hard to make into a 3 Cllr ward and the current 2 and 1 works much better.

In respect of "Leith Hill" this is a stupidly large area for ask Cllrs to cover or even stand in. I would ask the Boundary Commission to seriously look at it and perhaps split it into 2 or 3 wards, although the Parish Council boundaries and lie off the land make any "Leith Hill" ward area difficult to get balances electorate numbers.

2 of the current Cllrs have stated that there is no effective solution, and they expect to need to work across the huge distance as a 3 Cllr ward.

This probably means that no party will dominate after the all out..

There is a slight solution to this but it splits off Mickleham,

which Leatherhead Cllrs dont want.

Plus Mickleham and Westhumble state they don't want to be split although they effectively only really share a church,

But they feel that they are linked despite their being split apart by the A24 itself.

This desire by Parish Councils is in effect impacting on the entire ability of the District to operate effectively and fairly in respect of Electorate Split, and distance across proposed wards.

If Mickleham was put into Leatherhead

- it just about makes a workable electorate split in Leatherhead, heading to 10% of balance and moving the North and South areas to be split nearer to where they now are.

So if we go back to "Leith Hill"and think about taking Mickleham out and how to split this hard to work area.

start at Oakwood ward (Ockley and Forest Green)

- add in one of Abinger PCs internal wards and perhaps Coldharbour (both of which have direct road links) and you get about a balance number with just 2 or 3 Parish Council meetings for the Cllr to attend.

That leaves a large area of the rest of Leith Hill

- Abinger and Wooton PCs, perhaps a Coldharbour ward of Capel PC,

Plus Westcott Residents Assn and a rather tentative link by land to Westhumble.

If that area is a 2 man ward it might work....

- retaining Mickleham (which is basically all the land to the East of the A24)- could be in or out -

But it would still make this a very large patch to cover, however, better than it being a 3 Cllr ward!

I cant find a way to split the proposed Leith Hill into 3 without splitting Westcott area into 2.

With regard to names - there was no real concensus of that,

but the land to the west of Mole Valley is part of 'The Surrey Hills', although that goes a lot further to the right and left than the proposed ward.

the rural area to the East is flatter.

The SCC seat from Boxhill to Ockley, including Abinger is their Dorking Rural and that is useful to note.

Im not sure if just having Dorking or Rural N S E W is useful in naming the wards.

I would suggest that Holmwoods and Beare Green is about right (with Coldharbour not mentioned - we already have bits of Newdigate addresses Iready within Beare Green!) - so its wasy to keep it simple.

If you split "Leith Hill" into 3 - its Denbies (that hill is North), Leith Hill and Oakwood (albeit expanded to be a bit larger)

Into 2 It can be Dorking Hills North and South?

With CLN and Charlwood - probably is best as Dorking Rural if it is to stay as 3 Cllrs together - albeit the SCC Dorking rural ward is that area, but a lot more!

I wish you all the best sorting this out!

Kind regards Caroline

Caroline Salmon

MVDC Cllr for Beare Green