

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Personal Details:

Name:

E-mail:

Postcode:

Organisation Name: Ewell Village Residents' Association

Comment text:

Response from Ewell Village Residents' Association We have reviewed the commission's proposals and wish to reiterate our position and object to the suggested changes. We believe Ewell ward should continue to be represented by three councillors. Ewell ward has 4 schools, 4 public houses, a busy railway station, a high street with at least 10 cafes and restaurants and a number of other shops. There are also a number of offices and businesses, as well as a major public venue at Bourne Hall. This diverse mixture of local demands creates significant case work and activity for the three existing Ewell councillors, in addition to the support they provide to local residents. This evaluation does not include the significant numbers of new housing and development that is proposed by central government which undoubtedly will bring new residents into Ewell Ward increasing further pressures to the existing workloads of councillors. We feel that we made a robust case in our previous submission on the proposed changes to the ward boundary. We are therefore disappointed at the draft recommendations and still have concerns around the proposal to lose roads and electors to Nonsuch ward (Windmill Avenue, Park Hill Road, Langton Avenue, Hampton Grove, St James Avenue and Beech Walk), which we believe have an appropriate affinity with Ewell ward due to local councillors dealing with matters on their behalf for a significant number of years. We further feel this move could negatively impact voter participation for many reasons including polling station location and an identity of being part of the village community. We previously suggested that the new Sycamore Gardens development also be moved from Nonsuch Ward to Ewell ward as we indicated that these residents are closer to, and have more affinity with, Ewell Village centre rather than the wider mainly residential Nonsuch ward. Additionally, we would suggest that Ewell ward could include roads up to the A232 (Chatsfield, Conaways close, St Norman's Way and Station Approach). Further, we dispute the fact that the bypass is the only natural boundary and that the railway line is equally valid as a point of demarcation. Indeed it is a boundary that has a long historic tradition and further justifies the continued inclusion not only of those roads currently in Ewell that would be transferred to Nonsuch, but also other areas such as the Sycamore Gardens development being incorporated within a Ewell ward maintaining the railway as one of its key boundary lines. We would urge the commission to reconsider these draft recommendations and look at the option to make Ewell ward bigger and Nonsuch ward smaller, such that Ewell Ward retains 3 councillors to represent this busy and demanding village.

Uploaded Documents:

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1639319168_EVRA+response+to+boundary+review+draft+recommendations.docx

The Local Government Boundary Commission draft recommendations for the electoral review of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Response from Ewell Village Residents' Association

We have reviewed the commission's proposals and wish to reiterate our position and object to the suggested changes. We believe Ewell ward should continue to be represented by three councillors. Ewell ward has 4 schools, 4 public houses, a busy railway station, a high street with at least 10 cafes and restaurants and a number of other shops. There are also a number of offices and businesses, as well as a major public venue at Bourne Hall. This diverse mixture of local demands creates significant case work and activity for the three existing Ewell councillors, in addition to the support they provide to local residents.

This evaluation does not include the significant numbers of new housing and development that is proposed by central government which undoubtedly will bring new residents into Ewell Ward increasing further pressures to the existing workloads of councillors.

We feel that we made a robust case in our previous submission on the proposed changes to the ward boundary. We are therefore disappointed at the draft recommendations and still have concerns around the proposal to lose roads and electors to Nonsuch ward (Windmill Avenue, Park Hill Road, Langton Avenue, Hampton Grove, St James Avenue and Beech Walk), which we believe have an appropriate affinity with Ewell ward due to local councillors dealing with matters on their behalf for a significant number of years. We further feel this move could negatively impact voter participation for many reasons including polling station location and an identity of being part of the village community.

We previously suggested that the new Sycamore Gardens development also be moved from Nonsuch Ward to Ewell ward as we indicated that these residents are closer to, and have more affinity with, Ewell Village centre rather than the wider mainly residential Nonsuch ward. Additionally, we would suggest that Ewell ward could include roads up to the A232 (Chatsfield, Conaways close, St Norman's Way and Station Approach).

Further, we dispute the fact that the bypass is the only natural boundary and that the railway line is equally valid as a point of demarcation. Indeed it is a boundary that has a long historic tradition and further justifies the continued inclusion not only of those roads currently in Ewell that would be transferred to Nonsuch, but also other areas such as the Sycamore Gardens development being incorporated within a Ewell ward maintaining the railway as one of its key boundary lines.

We would urge you to reconsider your draft recommendations and look at the option to make Ewell ward bigger and Nonsuch ward smaller, such that Ewell Ward retains 3 councillors to represent this busy and demanding village.