

## Surrey County Councillors (Cons) District ward boundary representation

### Summary of proposals:

- 17 Wards
- 9 three-councillor wards, 4 two-councillor wards and 4 single councillors wards

### Limpsfield and Tatsfield

2 Councillor ward Limpsfield 1 Councillor ward Tatsfield

We are proposing retaining the two-Councillor ward for Limpsfield and the one councillor wards for Tatsfield and Titsey. These areas are visibly separated by the North downs, with Tatsfield sitting on top of the North downs and Limpsfield below to the south. The neighbouring boundary for Limpsfield east is with Kent, which is a rural area, while Tatsfield mostly borders with the London borough of Bromley and more significantly, the town of Biggin Hill. We believe that residents of Tatsfield and Titsey will lose their voice locally as the population of Limpsfield is larger and voters in Tatsfield and Titsey will always be outnumbered by voters in Limpsfield. Although they are both rural villages, Tatsfield and Titsey are isolated, surrounded by other rural communities. In comparison, Limpsfield adjoins Oxted which is one of the largest towns in the Tandridge district. As a result, there is a split in access to services (with residents in Limpsfield naturally travelling into Oxted to town centre while those in Tatsfield and Titsey travelling to neighbouring Biggin Hill for similar reasons). Although it was noted by the Boundary Commission that there are suitable road links, in reality there are only 2 roads that connect these areas, one of those consisting of a single-track road unsuitable for modern-day traffic. Therefore, we believe there are poor transport connections between these areas.

We believe this proposal means there is a good ward pattern which will provide suitable electoral equality in both areas within the 10% (up or down). It will also give voters an equal voice across the wards and reflect community interests and identities of the varying community groups. For instance, this would also reflect the differences in Parish boundaries and seek to protect the resident groups/associations that currently exist in both areas. We also believe that the North Downs in itself provides a natural, physical boundary between both communities.

### Oxted North

3 Councillor ward

We are proposing to keep the ward as it currently stands by adding back Tandridge village to the Oxted North ward (reducing the -8% variance) that would otherwise be created by removing Tandridge Village. This ward is already a well-known 3 Councillor ward that currently does not need to be changed, the changes will in fact lead to over representation of this area.

We believe this proposal means there is a good ward pattern which provides good electoral equality, these areas are within the 10% (up or down). It also reflects the community interests and identities, as these areas have different community groups but share a common identity. For example, Tandrige Village is conveniently nestled between Oxted North and Oxted South, with many residents in the village choosing to access services in Oxted town centre (Doctors, Library, leisure facilities and shops etc)

### Oxted South

No changes to the proposal made by the electoral commission.

### Warlingham East, Chelsham and Farleigh

No changes to the proposal made by the electoral commission.

### Woldingham

No changes to the proposal made by the electoral commission.

### Warlingham west

3 councillor ward

We are proposing that the ward does not take the small section of the current Whyteleafe Ward. This being the A22 Godstone Road, Maple Road, Maple Close, Hill View and Downsway. We believe that the railway line for Upper Warlingham station should be used as the natural boundary. This area visibly sits in Whyteleafe and, for many years, has been much a part of the wider village of Whyteleafe than anywhere else. There are many physical identifiers when coming into this part of Whyteleafe. For instance, when traveling from London (Croydon) into Surrey (Tandrige) there is a clear village gateway sign saying, "welcome to Whyteleafe". These are not natural communities and share very little in common with each other. Further, there are not many local issues that bind these two communities together, and by breaking this section off from the current Whyteleafe area will lead to confusion and division amongst residents.

We believe this proposal means there is a good ward pattern which provides good electoral equality, these areas are within the 10% (up or down). It also reflects the community interests and identities as Warlingham is seen as going up and on top of the hill, where Whyteleafe is characterised as the valley area. It also will deliver effective and convenient local government as it will make the boundary cleaner compared to the current boundary suggestion which is confusing.

### Bletchingley and Nutfield

No changes to the proposal made by the electoral commission.

## Godstone

No changes to the proposal made by the electoral commission.

## Burstow, Horne and Outwood

No changes to the proposal made by the electoral commission.

## Dormansland and Felbridge

1 Councillor ward Felbridge 2 Councillor ward Dormansland

We are proposing that these wards do not change from their current ward pattern of one, 2 councillor wards and one, 1 councillor ward. Felbridge is positioned at the edge of the district, and it is more closely connected to towns outside of the Tandridge/Surrey area. Residents access services from towns such as East Grinstead and Crawley. It's also worth noting that Dormansland is predominantly rural and has 'no affinity' with the mainly urban Felbridge, which sits much more closely to neighbouring west Sussex. We also believe that residents of Felbridge will lose their voice locally as the population of Dormansland is larger and voters in Felbridge will always be outnumbered by voters in Dormansland. This could lead to a feeling of isolation for residents in Felbridge.

We believe this proposal reflects the community interests and identities of Both Dormansland and Felbridge.

## Lingfield and Crowhurst

2 Councillor ward.

We are proposing that these wards do not change from their current ward pattern of one, 2 councillor wards. **This will allow of one councillor to be moved from the South Tandridge into North Tandridge namely Caterham to help create a better Variance.** We selected this ward as Tandridge Village would fit back in Oxted North and Lingfield and Crowhurst would be able to stay the same and stay within the variance as both wards were -8%, compared to Caterham Valley that was 11%. We also believe that residents of Tandridge Village will lose their voice locally as the population of Lingfield and Crowhurst is larger and voters in Tandridge Village will always be outnumbered by voters in Lingfield and Crowhurst. This could lead to a feeling of isolation for residents in Tandridge Village.

We believe this proposal reflects community interests and identities.

## Caterham on the Hill

(Westway and Chaldon, Queens Park and Portley)

We are proposing the creation of Caterham on the Hill (East and West wards) which would fall within the Caterham on the Hill parish boundary, avoiding the need for Parish changes at a later stage. Westway would remain as the current Westway ward with part of the current Queens Park ward added. The second ward will be Portley & Queens Park ward which will be the entirety of the current

Portley ward along with the remaining part of the current Queens Park ward. There is a clear difference between Caterham Valley and Caterham on the Hill, both within the geography of the area along with the issues faced by both communities. Services are often split between both communities such as the libraries, where both areas have separate library services/hubs. We are also proposing that Chaldon stays as a one 1 councillor ward. This is a rural village compared to the urban area of Westway and the wider Caterham on the Hill area. This will also allow for 12 councillors to cover the Caterham area, which will in turn will ensure the valley ward is not 11% over.

We believe this proposal means there is a good ward pattern which provides good electoral equality, these areas are within the 10% (up or down). It also reflects the community interests and identities between Caterham on the Hill and Caterham Valley. It will make the boundary cleaner compared to the planned boundary which is very confusing as it includes Whyteleafe and parts of Caterham Valley.

#### [Caterham Valley](#)

[\(Whyteleafe, Valley and Harestone\)](#)

We are proposing that the creation of a Whyteleafe Valley ward and Harestone Valley ward. The northern half of the current Valley ward going to Whyteleafe and the southern half going to Harestone. Creating two, 3 councillor wards of Whyteleafe Valley and Harestone Valley. These areas have issues that bind them together, unlike Whyteleafe being located within Portley ward. They also have good Transport connection such as trains, buses (notably the 407) and road connections between all 3 current ward areas, which supports the argument to break them into two, 3 councillor wards. This will also reduce the 11% variance, creating a much more equal split of representation, while also keeping the wards within the two parish council boundaries. It will also mean that parts of the valley and Whyteleafe will no longer be part of Caterham on the Hill, wards which are connected by the County division of Caterham Valley, leading to less confusion amongst residents.

We believe this proposal means there is a good ward pattern which provides good electoral equality, these areas are within the 10% (up or down). It also reflects the community interests and identities between Whyteleafe and Caterham Valley. It will make the boundary cleaner compared to the planned boundary Change, which is confusing as it includes Caterham on the hill within both Whyteleafe and Caterham Valley.

These are the views of the Conservatives County Councillors for Tandridge

Cllr Cameron McIntosh  
Cllr Lesley Steeds  
Cllr Becky Rush  
Cllr Jeremy Webster

# Tandridge

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Fodi Foti

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Postcode:** [REDACTED]

**Organisation Name:** Tandridge Conservatives County Councillors (Representative of a local organisation)

## Comment text:

To whom it may concern,

I have attached the views of the Conservatives County Councillors of Tandridge. On the proposed wards in the Tandridge district as part of the Boundary Commission report 2023.

These are the views of

Cllr Cameron McIntosh

Cllr Lesley Steeds

Cllr Becky Rush

Cllr Jeremy Webster

Kind regards

Fodi Foti

Support officer to the Tandridge Conservatives County Councillors East Surrey Conservatives Party

6 Godstone Road, Lingfield, Surrey RH7 6BW

## **Attached Documents:**

- Boundary changes. Tandridge ward suggestions. Cons 2023.docx