

Guildford Borough Council

Personal Details:

Name: Derek Payne



Organisation Name: Boxgrove Park Residents' Association

Comment text:

Sir/Madam, The attached is taken from an email sent to Tony Rooth, and cc'd to Joss Bigmore and Dennis Booth on 22nd November after a number of email exchanges. The full exchange is available, but emails could not be uploaded. For context, Tony sent me the spreadsheet for the latest/updated "Final Copy of the Electoral Forecasting Proforma 003", and the email is based on these updated final numbers. It seems the numbers were "corrected" after errors were found in the earlier version that I was sent, but I had to chase to get the latest document. To summarize, the recommended wholesale changes feel very much like an exercise to try to justify the time, effort and public money that has been ploughed into this exercise. There is also no explanation of any benefits of such changes. It would be helpful if someone could outline these benefits publicly, rather than just pay lip service to a public review and then just push through the changes with no accountability. I've also not been informed of, or invited to, any meetings on the subject, and will raise this as high as necessary if this continues to be the case. I'm very happy to discuss. Derek Payne, Chair of Boxgrove Park Residents' Association, 

Uploaded Documents:

https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/download_document?file=draft%2F1641375800_Temp+2.xlsx

My immediate suggestion would be to consider leaving all Wards in place, but realigning numbers from:

- Friary & St Nicholas -> Holy Trinity (moving 19% leaves both at +8%)
- o Or Shalford could also take 8% to get all 3 to +4%
- Ash South & Tongham -> Pilgrims (moving 16% leaves 0% and +1%)
- Lovelace -> Send (moving 25% leaves both at +11%)
- o An alternative option here would be for Lovelace to move 34% to Send; then Send to move 17% to Merrow. Net outcome would be Lovelace +2%; Send +3%; Merrow +3%

Whilst this might be a somewhat simplistic approach, the benefits are that all 3 "movements/realignments" are between adjacent Wards, there is no need to realign the number of councillors to any Ward, the Councillors know their Wards/constituents, and it completely removes the need for the heavy duty changes that are proposed.

I would also add that all your proposals are based on 2026 projections, which may or may not happen as projected (i.e. what is the level of confidence ...), and could therefore mean further wholesale changes based on what actually evolves over the next 5 years.

In simple terms, if it ain't broke, don't mend it ☹️ (or at least, tweak rather than disrupt).

Please do add me to the list of those to be informed. I would be happy to attend any meeting/forum to make such suggestions, and also very happy to be corrected if I've misunderstood or misinterpreted anything, or my suggestions can be reasonably argued against.

Regards, Derek.