

[REDACTED]

From: Fiona Cameron [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 December 2021 10:39
To: reviews; [REDACTED]
Cc: Louise Norie; Fiona Cameron
Subject: Waverley BC response on draft recommendations on new ward boundaries
Attachments: Waverley Borough Council response.docx; LGBCE Consultation Feedback v3.docx; HasEastfinal.zip; HasWestvfinal.zip; Fwards5_region.zip

Importance: High

Categories: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find attached Waverley Borough Council's submission in response to the draft recommendations on new ward boundaries across Waverley. This submission, including alternative recommendations on ward boundaries, was agreed by resolution of Waverley's Full Council on Tuesday 14 December 2021.

Attached are the following documents:

- The Waverley Borough Council Response (this includes annexes with maps of the proposed warding of the Borough plus ones for Haslemere and Farnham and the summary of the variances).
- The Feedback document which gives details of the Waverley Councillor feedback to the Working Group which informed the recommendations in the Council's response.
- 'Shape' files for Haslemere East and West (HasEastfinal.zip and HasWestvfinal.zip) and Farnham (Fwards5_region.zip) which are referred to in the Response document.

Please let me and Louise Norie know if there is anything further that you need from us.

Kind regards,

Fiona Cameron
Senior Governance Officer
Waverley Borough Council
[REDACTED]

This email, and any files attached to it, is confidential and solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed.

The opinions expressed in this email are not necessarily those of Waverley Borough Council.

The Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent. If you are not the intended recipient of this email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful.

Please visit our website at <http://www.waverley.gov.uk>

Waverley Borough Council response to the Draft Recommendations from the Local Government Boundary Commission on new electoral arrangements for Waverley Borough Council

This response reflects the views of Waverley Borough Council following resolution at the Council meeting on 14 December 2021. The response has been prepared following consultation with all council members and four meetings of the Boundary Review Member Working Group and their report to the Executive on 30 November and Full Council.

In considering each of the proposed new ward arrangements we have considered the need for

- improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents
- ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity and
- providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

Waverley is a rural borough, the largest in Surrey, and transport networks, including road and rail, predominantly run north south. To travel from one side of the borough to the other could take up to an hour. Waverley comprises four main settlements in Farnham, Godalming, Haslemere and Cranleigh and a large number of more rural communities. Many of the rural communities have a low level of services, shops and public transport and therefore look to larger neighbouring villages for these facilities. In preparing this response we have tried to reflect the natural alignment and allegiances between the villages and communities and have taken into consideration wherever possible the views of the parish councils.

A map of the Borough indicating the preferred warding scheme is attached at Annexe 1.

Cranleigh, Ewhurst and Ellens Green

Waverley endorse the BC proposals relating to Cranleigh East, Cranleigh West and Ellens Green.

Alfold, Dunsfold & Chiddingfold (and Hambledon)

The Commission's proposal creates a large ward stretching east west across four parish areas where the transport links run north south and therefore transport links between three of the villages is an issue. Whilst there are differing opinions about village links there has been unanimous opposition to combining these four parishes.

There are no links between Chiddingfold and Alfold either in community or transport terms and Chiddingfold Parish Council is not in favour of joining with Alfold. Hambledon has expressed a strong preference to remain with Witley and Milford and has important links with Milford for schools, shopping facilities and other services.

The new Dunsfold Park Village development straddles both Alfold and Dunsfold parishes with the new village development falling in Alfold with the remaining open green space being in the parish of Dunsfold. The forecast electorate numbers for Alfold (2934) make it too large for Alfold to stand alone as a one-Member ward. As the new village develops over the next few years it would make sense for local councillors to represent both Alfold and Dunsfold.

Hascombe, which under the draft proposals is included in the Bramley and Wonersh ward, has far more links with Dunsfold, sharing a priest for the two churches, a joint Horticultural Society and a number of shared social events. Hascombe is separated geographically from Bramley and Wonersh by a significant hilly area and road networks between the two areas are restricted to narrow minor roads that are challenging to drive on. This significantly reduces communication from east to west.

Taking all the feedback into account from councillors and parishes covering Alfold, Dunsfold, Chiddingfold, Hascombe and Hambledon, the following change to the Boundary Commission's proposal is recommended.

Recommendation:

- **1 councillor ward to be called Chiddingfold**
- **2 councillor ward for Alfold, Dunsfold and Hascombe, to be called Alfold, Dunsfold and Hascombe.**

Witley and Milford

We welcome the proposal to bring together the Witley parish wards and this is supported by the local borough councillors and the Parish Council. However, for reasons given above, there are also strong existing links between the parish of Hambledon with Witley and Milford. Hambledon residents look to Milford for schools, shops and other services and should remain with Witley Parish. We appreciate that the elector number variance would be higher than 10% but we regard the links as being strong enough to warrant this exception.

Recommendation:

A three councillor ward to include Hambledon PC with the Witley parish area. The ward name to be Witley, Milford and Hambledon.

Bramley and Wonersh

Whilst there is support for keeping Bramley, Wonersh, Shamley Green and Blackheath together in a three councillor ward, persuasive arguments were received from local councillors about the lack of connection between Hascombe and the rest of the proposed ward. There is a geographical divide in terms of a large hilly area between Bramley and Hascombe and the main road through Hascombe goes onto Dunsfold and Alfold and does not connect to the east except by very narrow roads to the Bramley area. There are no community links between these two areas. The retention of the parish of Busbridge with Bramley was also considered as by many it is regarded as being part of Godalming. However, the parish council has objected

strongly to the idea of being joined with Godalming as they feel they would be swallowed up by the town and lose their rural identity. The western side of Busbridge aligns closely with Milford and the southern and eastern part extends from Godalming into the more rural area of Munstead. The option which we favour would be to retain Busbridge with Bramley and Wonerish but to include Hascombe in a ward with Alfold and Dunsfold.

Recommendation:

The villages of Bramley, Wonerish, Shamley Green, Blackheath and Busbridge become 1 ward with 3 Councillors, to be called Bramley & Wonerish.

Godalming

Waverley broadly supports the Commission's proposals for the Borough wards in Godalming although there are reservations about the Binscombe and Charterhouse ward arrangement on the grounds of size and community identity. Ideally, the two distinct communities of Binscombe and the Frith Hill/Charterhouse area, which are separated by a steep hill and have distinct characteristics, would be warded individually. However, the elector numbers are not distributed in a way to enable this, being 3,215 and 3,179 respectively. For this reason it was resolved to accept the proposal for one ward with 3 councillors.

Waverley recommends that the prefix of Godalming is included in the ward names.

As far as the Commission's proposals for the Town wards are concerned there was unanimous disapproval both at Borough and Town Council level. The Town Council showed a rare unanimity across all parties that the borough and town wards should be coterminous as without this it would defeat the Commission's statutory criteria of providing effective and convenient local government. Both in Godalming and Farnham the problem seems to be the alignment with the County Divisions which have created, in Godalming's case, a very anomalous town Croft ward. To create sensible wards whilst aligning County Divisions is an impossible task and one that doesn't seem necessary bearing in mind that the Borough and Town electoral cycles are the same and the County elections are different. Not to have coterminous Borough and Town wards would be confusing for Godalming electors and could end up with residents attending a different polling station for each election on the same day.

As a consequence of the review of the Borough's electoral arrangements, i.e. reducing the Borough representation of Godalming to 9 councillors, the Town Council feels it is appropriate and logical to reduce their council number to 18. Our understanding is that the Commission's approach in interpreting the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, does not consider that varying the number of parish councillors to be a direct consequence of the borough warding arrangements. It considers this matter to be within the remit of a Community Governance Review. Both Waverley and Godalming Councils are extremely disappointed by this approach which ignores the unanimous wishes of both councils to align the borough and ward boundaries. It doesn't accord with the statutory criteria of 'community interests and identities' nor 'providing for effective

and convenient local government'. As a result, the town councils of both Godalming and Farnham have requested a Community Governance Review which will involve further work and resources which could have been contained within this one review.

Recommendation:

- **to accept the BC proposals for the borough wards but to reject the town wards configuration for the reasons given above**
- **town wards should be prefaced with 'Godalming'.**

Haslemere East, Haslemere West and Hindhead & Beacon Hill

Waverley welcomes the Hindhead & Beacon Hill proposal as it recognises the distinct community of Beacon Hill.

Waverley agrees with the principle of the proposed Haslemere East and West wards but considers that the configuration does not reflect the communities within Haslemere and we would wish to amend the boundary between the two as follows:

Haslemere West should comprise the settlements of Shottermill, Critchmere and Wey Hill which have a distinct character different from the Haslemere town area and environs. It should include the western end of Kings Road as well as Sickle Road and Sturt Road at the southern end of the town. There are well used paths across these areas and there are clearly defined shopping areas distinct from the town centre. The railway line is not an impervious boundary between Wey Hill and the area south of the line and residents here feel more allegiance to this western area than to the town centre area.

Haslemere East should include the whole of Farnham Lane as this area aligns with the central area of Haslemere. A map of the proposed boundaries is set out at Annexe 2 to this submission and is attached as a shape file for your convenience. The result of the recommended realignment produces the following elector number and variances:

Haslemere East 5,859 forecast electors -7% variance with 3 councillors

Haslemere West 4,108 electors -2% variance with 2 councillors.

Recommendation:

- **To accept the Hindhead & Beacon Hill proposed ward**
- **To amend the Haslemere East and West wards as set out in Annexe 2 to this submission.**

Churt & Frensham

Elstead & Peper Harow

Waverley supports the configuration of these wards although acknowledges that a one Member ward for Elstead and Peper Harow was not favoured by the Parish Council.

Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Churt & Frensham ward.

Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Elstead & Peper Harow ward.

Farnham

Waverley does not accept that the A31 needs to form a hard boundary for the full length of the town and that there is a better configuration to be achieved if one ward, Moor Park and Badshot Lea, were to straddle the A31 at its eastern end.

Both Waverley and Farnham Town Council object strongly to the fact that under the Commission's proposals the borough and town wards are no longer coterminous and that this should be a requirement. There are a number of distinct communities in the Farnham area which are reflected on the Ordnance Survey map. Every attempt has been made in drawing up the proposed new wards to reflect these communities. A map of these wards is attached at Annexe 3 to this submission and is also attached as a shape file for convenience.

In arriving at the proposed ward boundaries a small sub-group of twin hatted Farnham Councillors met to discuss and confirm the proposals being recommended by this Council.

In a similar way to the Godalming proposals, the County Divisions seem to be an enormous stumbling block in making sense of the Borough and Town wards such that they reflect the distinct communities that make up Farnham. The coterminosity of the Borough and Town wards are significant to electors who need to find some logic in their representatives' wards especially when the elections for Borough and Town councils are held at the same time.

Farnham Town Council feel that as a direct result of the change in number of Borough Councillors representing Farnham their council size should also be reduced from 18 to 16. Both Councils feel strongly that as there is support from the two councils for this amendment to the electoral arrangements it should be carried out as a part of this review. However, if the Boundary Commission are not minded to do this then Farnham Town Council have requested a Community Governance Review to change the size of their council. This request was accepted at the Full Council meeting of Waverley Borough Council on 14 December.

Waverley recommends the following wards for Farnham.

Recommendation: 8 wards of 2 councillors to be created with the following names

- **Farnham Bourne**
- **Farnham Castle**
- **Farnham Firgrove**
- **Farnham Hale & Heath End**
- **Farnham Moor Park and Badshot Lea**
- **Farnham North West Farnham**


- **Farnham Weybourne**
- **Farnham Wrecclesham and Rowledge**


The 2027 elector number and variances for the proposed wards are as follows:

Proposed Ward Name	Councillors per Ward	Electorate 2020	Variance 2020	Electorate 2027	Variance 2027
Farnham Bourne	2	4,330	15%	4,454	6%
Farnham Castle	2	3,422	-9%	4,247	1%
Farnham Firgrove	2	4,098	9%	4,263	1%
Farnham Hale & Heath End	2	4,227	12%	4,442	5%
Farnham Moor Park & Badshot Lea	2	3,907	4%	4,071	-3%
Farnham North West Farnham	2	2,870	-24%	3,983	-5%
Farnham Weybourne	2	3,616	-4%	4,146	-2%
Farnham Wrecclesham and Rowledge	2	4,287	14%	4,348	3%


A summary of the proposed wards including variances is set out in Annexe 4.

Proposed Ward Map of Waverley Borough Council



Proposed Map of Haslemere East and West Wards

Proposed Farnham Wards



LGBCE Boundary Review

Summary of Waverley's response to the Commission's recommendations on warding arrangements

LGBCE recommendations					Waverley recommendation, where different				
Ward name	No. of Councillors	Electorate 2027	Electors/ councillor	Variance From average	Ward name	No. of Councillors	Electorate 2027	Electors/ councillor	Variance From average
Alfold, Dunsfold & Chiddingfold <i>(including Hambledon)</i>	3	6778	2258	7%	Alfold, Dunsfold & Hascombe	2	4059	2029	-4%
					Chiddingfold	1	2336	2336	11%
Bramley & Wonersh <i>(including Busbridge, Hascombe)</i>	3	6243	2081	-1%	Bramley, Wonersh & Busbridge	3	5989	1996	-5%
Churt & Frensham <i>(including Dockenfield, Tilford & Thursley)</i>	2	3843	1922	-9%					
Cranleigh East	3	6744	2248	7%					
Cranleigh West	2	4619	2309	10%					
Elstead & Peper Harow	1	2271	2271	8%					
Ewhurst & Ellens Green	1	2031	2031	-4%					

LGBCE recommendations					Waverley recommendation, where different				
Ward name	No. of Councillors	Electorate 2027	Electors/ councillor	Variance From average	Ward name	No. of Councillors	Electorate 2027	Electors/ councillor	Variance From average
Farnham Bourne & Runfold	2	4037	2018	-4%	Farnham Bourne	2	4454	2227	6%
Farnham Castle	2	4229	2115	0%	North West Farnham	2	3983	1992	-5%
Farnham Firgrove & Shortheath	3	6959	2320	10%	Farnham Firgrove	2	4263	2132	1%
Farnham Hale & Heath End	3	6399	2133	1%	Farnham Hale & Heath End	2	4442	2221	5%
Farnham Upper Hale	2	3784	1892	10%	Farnham Weybourne	2	4146	2073	-2%
Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea	2	4052	2026	-4%	Farnham Moor Park & Badshot Lea	2	4071	2036	-3%
Farnham Wrecclesham & Rowledge	2	4494	2247	7%	Farnham Wrecclesham & Rowledge	2	4348	2174	3%
					Farnham Castle (<i>town area</i>)	2	4247	2124	1%
Godalming Binscombe & Charterhouse	3	6394	2131	1%					
Godalming Central & Ockford	2	3932	1966	-7%					
Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall	2	4028	2014	-4%					

LGBCE recommendations					Waverley recommendation, where different				
Ward name	No. of Councillors	Electorate 2027	Electors/ councillor	Variance From average	Ward name	No. of Councillors	Electorate 2027	Electors/ councillor	Variance From average
Godalming Holloway	2	4026	2013	-4%					
Haslemere East	2	4229	2114	0%	Haslemere East	3	5859	1953	-7%
Haslemere West	3	5740	1913	-9%	Haslemere West	2	4168	2054	-2%
Hindhead & Beacon Hill	2	3893	1946	-8%					
Milford & Witley	3	6557	2186	4%	Witley, Milford & Hambledon	3	7194	2398	14%

Boundary Commission Ward Pattern proposals – Councillor Feedback and Working Group Response:

The following table sets out the feedback from individual councillors following consultation on the Boundary Commission proposals. A cross party Working Group was formed to consider the proposals and feedback and have set out their recommendations in the final column of this report.

A map of the proposed wards is set out at Annexe A, map 1.

<u>Alfold, Dunsfold and Chiddingfold</u> (including Hambledon)		
Councillor(s)	Comments	Response & Recommendations
Kevin Deanus	Comments to the Working Group on 20 October are summarised as follows: The proposed ward for three members is too large. It would take 30-40 minutes to drive from one side to the other. It has three parish councils and no transport links from Alfold to Chiddingfold. There are no links to employment and shops and the three villages are very separate although there are some links between Alfold and Dunsfold there are none to Chiddingfold.	The proposed ward is very large and transport links run north south and not east west so transport links between the three of the villages is an issue. There are differing opinions about village links. The forecast electorate numbers for Alfold (2934) make it too large for Alfold to stand alone. The new Dunsfold Park village development straddles both Alfold and Dunsfold parishes with the new village development falling in Alfold. The remaining open green space is in the parish of Dunsfold so it would make sense to keep these two communities together in one ward. This would consequently create Chiddingfold as a one member ward. Hascombe and Dunsfold share a number of links including a shared priest and various community events. Hambledon Parish expressed a wish to remain with Witley and this makes sense geographically and there are strong links between the two communities.
John Gray	<p>This is a very large ward although there are 3 ward members the current plan does not afford with the local links and historic ties nor the potential changes that will arise from new housing.</p> <p>Alfold has been linked to Dunsfold historically and I am told that this did not work well. The current Alfold, Alfold crossways and Ellens Green works well and has logical links to Cranleigh being common road issues, the new garden village exits onto A281 and bus and local services. Dunsfold has no exits in its Parish and has some 25% of the airfield in the parish which is down to be the country park.</p> <p>Chiddingfold and Dunsfold have road links common parish boundaries and sharing of Doctors surgery with Local satellite in Dunsfold. There are strong ties with the Dunsfold Horticultural Society, Dunsfold Amateur Dramatic and Art club and Puddleduck nursery. Dunsfold supports the cinema in Chiddingfold</p> <p>Hascombe and Dunsfold share a number of links through a shared priest in charge of the two separate church buildings and an active role in managing the community shop in Dunsfold and a joint horticultural Society and on a number of shared social events.</p> <p>Hambledon, Hascombe, Chiddingfold and Dunsfold are similar rural villages with sharing transport road and sustainability issues as well as common concerns over the extension</p>	

	<p>of Surrey Hills AONB. Dunsfold Oil Drilling application and a potential one from IGAS will affect drilling underneath all 4 villages.</p> <p>A lot of historical development of Glass, Charcoal and Metal works and rural economy, equestrian and farming is shared.</p> <p>I have hopefully painted a picture of shared history and current common issues, The ward being Dunsfold, Hascombe, Hambledon and Chiddingfold seems to me to be most logical and whilst the ward is large two members should be able to cover it. Dunsfold Park does not fit well with this as it would be brought in through Alfold.</p>	<p>change to the Boundary Commission's proposal is recommended.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 councillor ward to be called Chiddingfold • 2 councillor ward for Alfold, Dunsfold and Hascombe, to be called Alfold, Dunsfold and Hascombe.
Anna James	<p>Cllr Gray and I have grave concerns about Chiddingfold and Dunsfold. Alfold is more Cranleigh, and should NOT include the new Garden City of the airport. It should be a two member ward as is but include Hambledon.</p>	
Bramley & Wonersh including Blackheath, Shamley Green, Hascombe and Busbridge)		
Richard Seaborne	<p>Bramley and Wonersh Ward</p> <p>Sadly, the proposal made by the Boundary Commissioners has produced a ward which satisfies numerical requirements but is rather less sensitive to geography and community synergies.</p> <p>Merging Bramley with Wonersh, Shamley Green and Blackheath makes considerable sense. The two parishes are geographically similar, being predominantly located in the north-south valley of Cranleigh Waters with less populated high ground to the east and west at Blackheath and Thorncombe Street. The four villages are in close proximity and share many facilities (schools, surgery, pharmacy, shops, churches, library, sports clubs, junior uniformed organisations, and a weekly care club for the aged). They are served by common bus routes.</p> <p>The parishes of Hascombe and Busbridge are geographically separated from Bramley and Wonersh by a significant, lowly-populated, hilly area. The main roads in the whole area run predominantly north to south. East to west communication is restricted to narrow minor roads that are challenging to drive on, particularly at night and in bad weather. This contributes to significantly reducing communication between east and west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The northern part of Busbridge parish is effectively the southern fringe of Godalming town. • In the southwest of Busbridge parish is the new Leithfield Park development next to Milford Hospital. It contains around 200 relatively new voters who live approximately 	<p>The argument put forward by Cllr Seaborne is persuasive and therefore a change to the BC proposal is recommended by aligning Hascombe with a new Alfold and Dunsfold ward as described above.</p> <p>The parishes of Hascombe and Busbridge are separated geographically from Bramley and Wonersh by a significant, lowly populated, hilly area. Again the roads predominantly run north/south and the east west road network is restricted to narrow very minor roads. Busbridge PC have expressed a preference to be aligned with Witley and Milford. However, this would mean a 4 councillor ward and it would also mean an increase in the Waverley council size to 51 which the Working Group considered unacceptable. Therefore the other option is to align Busbridge with a Hascombe, Dunsfold, Alfold configuration. The option to join with Godalming Town was unacceptable to Busbridge PC as they felt they would lose their identity as a parish</p>

20 minutes on foot from Milford and 20 minutes by car from Bramley and Wonersh. They use schools and shops in Milford and Godalming. A bus service which operates on only three days a week is about the only connectivity that they have with Bramley and Wonersh.

- Residents in the southeast of Busbridge parish have far greater affinity with Hascombe and Hambledon parishes.
- Hascombe residents do interact with the affluent residents of the southwest part of Bramley parish, living in the Thorncombe street area but they have far greater affinity with Dunsfold. The centres of the two villages are only 5 km apart. This compares with 12km to the centre of Bramley along the better roads. It is possible to get from Hascombe to Bramley via single lane roads with passing places and reduce the journey to just over 5 km but this is not a comfortable drive.
- Education. Bramley parish contains St Catherine's Junior and Senior schools, which are both private girls-only schools, together with Bramley Infant and Nursery School. The parish also contains several special schools typically serving special needs pupils from further afield. State junior education for Bramley residents is predominantly provided at Tillingbourne school in Chilworth and Shamley Green Primary School. Neither Busbridge, nor Hascombe offers educational facilities of any description though Busbridge Infant and Busbridge Junior schools, located in the Godalming suburb of the same name are only just to the north of the rural parish. Primary age children in Busbridge and Hascombe, for the most part, will use schools in Milford, Godalming and Cranleigh with few using the Bramley schools.

Given the size of the proposed new ward, successful representation at borough council level could, to a certain extent, be dependent on the political affinities and home locations of the three ward members. If they are all from the same party then allocation of responsibilities and attendance at, and interaction with the four parish councils in the new ward can be shared and is likely to be more successful than if the three members were from different parties. The distances involved and diversity of geography, coupled with the fact that there are four parish councils and five distinct villages to be covered make this a completely different proposition to having three councillors looking after a more concentrated area of population with only one town or parish council to interact with.

I recognise that balancing numbers is a challenge without changing parish boundaries but the existing proposal, if left as is, while satisfying numerical criteria is likely to result in a democratic deficit in parts of the new ward.

and as a rural parish they wished to remain with other rural parishes.

Cllr Howard's argument is persuasive and accords with Cllr Seaborne's view regarding the geography between Bramley and Busbridge and Hascombe.

It is proposed to make Bramley, Wonersh, Blackheath and Shamley Green into one ward with 3 councillors. Although the variance is -18%, and would be an exception to the normal tolerance allowed, it would make sense from a geographical and community identity point of view.

Recommendation:


The villages of Bramley, Wonersh, Shamley Green, Blackheath and Busbridge become 1 ward with 3 Councillors, to be called Bramley & Wonersh.

Chris Howard	<p>Whilst recognising that this is a numbers game, there is little else to commend the current recommendation on such a large rural ward taking in Wonersh, Shamley Green, Blackheath, Bramley, Thorncombe Street, Busbridge, Munstead, and Hascombe and Winkworth. All distinct communities/villages and I am not sure how we can cover these areas effectively.</p> <p>How will it work? If we have three different Councillors from three different parties then I suspect all three of us will need to attend each parish council or community meeting. How will our residents know who to contact? How can we get to know these much wider areas? At the moment I cover just Shamley Green and its hinterland and I know most of the residents and every path and issue and the residents know me. I find it rewarding working with my local community.</p> <p>I can see the logic in merging Bramley Parish and Wonersh Parish (Shamley Green, Wonersh & Blackheath villages) if we must increase our numbers, but there is no synergies at all with Busbridge, Munstead Hascombe. They look to Godalming or Milford for their transport and road networks, schools, churches, and general community groups.</p> <p>Wonersh/ Blackheath and Shamley Green look to Cranleigh rather than Godalming as their lead town and all work closely with the Cranleigh Councillors. I have not ever had to contact a Godalming Councillor to work with them on local issues. There is just not the synergies there. If we took over Busbridge and this bigger area, this would increase my workload even further as I would have to make new relationships with Councillors in that area and another MP to get anything done.</p> <p>I think this system is deeply discriminatory to rural areas, who already struggle to get heard in a system dominated by the towns. I have had several councillors tell me over the years when they have moved from town to rural wards how much more work they have to do and how much further they have to travel.</p> <p>It is hard enough to get local residents to understand how local councils work and this new system of having three Councillors serving one large area will further remove us from the natural community we serve. There is no logic to this recommendation other than it makes the numbers fit.</p>	
<u>Cranleigh East</u>		
Ruth Reed	Happy with the boundary as shown for the Cranleigh East Ward.	

Philip Townsend	In agreement with the proposals although the electorate numbers for the west ward for 2027 look very light with all the development going on.	The Working Group endorse the BC proposals relating to Cranleigh East. Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Cranleigh East ward.
<u>Cranleigh West</u>		
	See above.	Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Cranleigh West ward.
<u>Ewhurst & Ellens Green</u>		
Val Henry	In agreement with the proposal.	Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Ewhurst & Ellens Green ward.
<u>Elstead & Peper Harow</u>		
Jenny Else David Else	Prefer to remain with Thursley and Tilford.	The electoral numbers for Elstead and Peper Harow do make it possible to combine with the villages of Thursley, Frensham, Churt, Dockenfield, Tilford and Rushmoor if it became a 3 councillor ward. The variance would be -3%. The BC proposal has a variance of -9% for Churt and Frensham and +8% for Elstead and Peper Harow. However, it would be by far the largest ward in the Borough and for reasons given in other parts of the submission it would be difficult to represent such a large number of communities. Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Elstead & Peper Harow ward.
<u>Churt & Frensham</u> – includes Dockenfield, Tilford and Rushmoor		

Brian Adams	<p>Overall the parishes are happy with the outlines although I've not spoken to Mr Mendelssohn as he is away. Churt is discussing it at the same time as our Council meeting.</p> <p>However, expressed reservation about the size of the ward.</p>	<p>Due to the elector numbers involved it is very difficult to suggest an alternative proposal.</p> <p>Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Churt & Frensham ward.</p>
<u>Farnham Bourne & Runfold</u>		
Carole Cockburn	<p>I have been showing the proposals to residents' associations and local members to see if there is a general consensus and there does seem to be more or less total agreement. Basically, the proposals do not respect the geography or natural movement pattern of south Farnham.</p> <p>Our preliminary thoughts:</p> <p>Rowledge and Wrecclesham's eastern boundary should be Green Lane and Shortheath should be removed from the name of any ward. The small part labelled Shortheath should be incorporated into either Wrecclesham or The Bourne, using existing roads to create the boundary, probably Burnt Hill Road.</p> <p>Shortheath Road, the Ridgeway and Great Austins sit on top of the natural ridge and houses on both sides of these roads should be included in The Bourne, together with roads like Edward Road. There is no logic in the suggested boundary of Firgrove, which is not a community and did not exist until the last boundary review. Firgrove Hill goes down from the lights on the A287 and the ward should incorporate the roads that go down into town between Green Lane and Tilford road. There is also a direct link to Riverside.</p> <p>Moor Park should be maintained in the name of the ward and include Compton and Runfold.</p> <p>Menin Way should be the boundary of Moor Park ward.</p> <p>Firgrove could link with Riverside, as the A31 is not a barrier in that ward, as it is elsewhere. There is far more in common with Firgrove than with Hale and Heath End.</p> <p>We are trying to build on the existing communities of Rowledge, Wrecclesham, the Bourne and Moor Park and linking the natural east /west flow of people.</p>	<p>The A31 represents a hard boundary for most of the town except potentially at the eastern end. Given the population north of the A31 is larger than the south and new development is also greater in the north, it would not be possible to make an even split unless at least one ward (such as Moor Park at present) straddles the A31.</p> <p>Both the Working Group and Farnham Town Council objected strongly to the fact that under the BC proposals the borough and town wards were no longer coterminous and that this should be a requirement. There are a number of distinct communities in the Farnham town area which are reflected in the Ordnance Survey map. Every attempt has been made in drawing up the proposed new wards to reflect these communities. It was considered expedient to have slightly larger variances in some wards in order to satisfy the geographical boundaries of each area, often being bounded by major roads.</p> <p>A small sub-group of twin hatted Farnham Councillors met to confirm the following</p>

		<p>proposals being recommended by the Working Group.</p> <p>The BC have cited the County divisions as being an important consideration in drawing up the borough and town wards. However, the coterminosity of the borough and town boroughs are far more significant in terms of elections as their elections are on the same cycle whereas the County elections are held in different years.</p> <p>Farnham TC have requested a Community Governance Review as they feel, as a result of the reduction in size of the Borough Council and the consequent re-warding, that it would be logical for their council to reduce in size from 18 to 16. Whilst the timing of a CGR is not ideal it is <i>likely to be/has been accepted by</i> Waverley BC.</p> <p>Recommendation: 8 wards of 2 councillors to be created with the following names</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle • Firgrove • Bourne • North West Farnham • Moor Park and Badshot Lea • Weybourne • Hale & Heath End • Wrecclesham and Rowledge <p>A map of the proposed wards is set out in Annexe A, map 2.</p>
<u>Farnham Castle</u> – no change proposed		

	No comments	See above.
<u>Farnham Firgrove & Shortheath</u>		
John Neale	Favours an 8 ward (16 councillors) arrangement for both town and borough. Maps showing different options emailed separately to Working Group together with a spreadsheet showing the electoral equality.	See above.
<u>Farnham Hale & Heath End</u>		
Sally Dickson	<p>Suggestion regarding Town wards; One solution might be to merge Hale Village with Hale and Heath End, and keep all the other constituencies the same. (<i>This would combine Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea ward with Riverside.</i>)</p> <p>This makes geographic sense, and as a number of councillors are retiring at the next election will be a 'natural' way to reduce numbers of councillors in Farnham to 16, as well as making sense to residents.</p> 	See above.
Michaela Wicks	Verbal response – happy with extension to the Farnham Hale and Heath End Ward.	
<u>Farnham Upper Hale</u>		
Peter Marriott	In their scheme, the Farnham wards will reduce from 9 to 7, which is more than is warranted based on a 12% reduction in councillor numbers. In their plan, we will lose two wards, and two wards in the east will have three councillors so that in total Farnham will have 16 borough councillors (5 x 2 and 2 x 3) which matches the 12% reduction. All of the boundaries will change. Their rationale is to impose the A31 as a hard ward boundary right across the town. Keeping this constraint means it's very difficult to	See above.

configure the ward arrangement in a sensible way because of the population numbers to the north and south. Currently Moor Park extends north across the A31. My take on it that perhaps we can keep much of the existing ward locations, with a few tweaks to allow for population growth, but allow the 3 councillor Badshot Lea and the new Bourne and Runfold wards to split into three two councillor wards, reinstating Moor park perhaps as the middle one, but this goes across the A31. Actually, not much different to what it is now, so why the need for wholesale changes?

1. As a general comment, it is difficult to consider specific Boundary Commission revisions to the proposed WBC ward plans without detailed data on the population density in the region. These data are available in the electoral rolls that we used in our canvassing, but only in our specific wards where we stood for election. Even if we had all of the electoral roll data it would be just too big a task to put forward a detailed revised ward plan. Comments are therefore subjective, reflecting a largely personal view, but with input from discussion with others.
2. I note that the Boundary Commission has only undertaken virtual tours of the area to identify connectivity and community interests (what does this mean?) to justify where best to define ward boundaries. I don't believe a virtual tour would give much information on community aspects, other than identify areas of different socio-economic groups, presumably based on property values. They have also decided to define the A31 as a hard boundary between the wards, even though the existing Moor Park ward does extend to the north of the A31.
3. We are looking to redefine the ward map based on a reduced number of councillors from 57 to 50. This is almost a 1/8th reduction in size (about 12%), although there were a range of councillor numbers expressed when the proposed boundary review was first tabled.

Question – in the light of proposed changes in the WBC O&S and meeting structure, is the 50 councillor number still appropriate?

4. With the current 57 councillors, the ward maps are well suited to 2 councillors per ward, with just one or two anomalies (single and triple member wards). It is clear that with 50 Councillors the Boundary Commission has found it difficult to optimise the ward maps maintaining 2 councillors in each ward and also to keep the electorate numbers within the required limits.
5. I am opposed to single councillor wards, on the basis that it limits the electorates choice especially in the case where there is a strong sitting candidate. This also discourages effective opposition candidates from standing. I am also not in favour of 3 councillor wards, since as ward size increases, it become more difficult to represent all of the ward community on a personal basis. However, if there is an odd number of

councillors in the Council, as is the case currently, there will always be at least one ward with either a single or 3 councillors.

6. Looking at some specific issues in the BC proposal:

6.1 Farnham's currently has 18 WBC councillors. With a 12% reduction spread across the borough, Farnham should have 16 councillors, which is proposed. However, the current 9 ward map is reduced to 7 wards rather than 8, which on a simplistic approach is the number of wards in line with the percentage reduction in the number of councillors. This leads to problems with allocating councillor numbers to each ward, coupled with what is perceived to be an emphasis on a North-South divide across the A31, so that there would be two 3 councillor wards (and hence 7 wards in total).

6.2 If Farnham goes up to 8 wards, either one ward has to be lost elsewhere in the borough, or two of the wards in the Boundary Commission proposal would go from being 2 councillor to 3 councillor wards.

6.3 I and many others think that having two different ward arrangements for WBC and FTC is not sensible, confusing the electorate and making life much more difficult for two-hatted councillors. WBC and FTC ward maps should be the same, meaning that WBC should look to implement this at some point in the future. However, the Boundary Commission has proposed a 10 ward map for Farnham Town Council (FTC) in line with schedule 2 to the 2009 Act.
Question - On what basis has the law changed that justifies this proposal? If this cannot be challenged, then we will not be able to have corresponding WBC and FTC wards.

6.4 Using the 2027 electorate projections, there will be approximately 15400 electors in Farnham wards mostly to the north of the A31 (part of Moor Park ward extends north of the A31), and approximately 18600 to the south. These numbers fit nicely with a 4 ward – 5 ward Farnham north to Farnham south divide. The BC 7 ward proposal reverses this trend with a 4 ward – 3 ward north -south divide, but only by having two 3 councillor wards (one very large extending across much of the Farnham south area, accepting variances in elector numbers on the +/- 10% limits in two of the wards. and also making the A31 a boundary between all of the north-south wards.

6.5 It seems to me that an 8 ward plan could be drawn up quite easily if the A31 boundary is relaxed, particularly in Farnham east, allowing part of Weybourne and Badshot Lea to extend south of the A31, and reducing the Farnham South wards from 5, as is now, to 4 by modifying the existing ward boundaries. As a very minimal change to the Boundary Commission proposals, since the

	<p>Weybourne and Badshot Lea ward is adjacent to the new proposed Bourne and Runfold ward and both of these are to be 3 councillor wards, so dividing these into 3 sections should be relatively simple although the middle ward of this plan would probably lie across the A31. This middle ward could be seen as a replacement Moor Park ward which is lost in the Boundary Commission proposals. I believe this can be achieved by starting on the eastern Wrecclesham and Rowledge ward boundary, moving sequentially in an anticlockwise direction redefining the ward boundaries south of the A31 as far as a revised Moor Park ward. This ward extends into the area north of the A31, and the boundary revision then continues to the east. An 8 ward plan would also be consistent with reducing the number of FTC councillors from 18 to 16, with 2 councillors per ward (assuming the 10 ward proposal can be challenged).</p>	
<u>Farnham Weybourne & Badshot Lea</u>		
	No comments received.	See above.
<u>Farnham Wrecclesham & Rowledge</u>		
Peter Clark Brian Edmonds	<p>Wrecclesham and Rowledge Ward</p> <p>Councillor Brian Edmonds and I are content with the new Wrecclesham and Rowledge ward boundary. It has been increased by taking part of the old Shortheath and Boundstone ward, due to the requirement of increasing the resident numbers within the new ward arrangements. The new boundary runs the length of Sandrock Hill Road and along the length of Gardeners Hill Road. This is a more logical boundary than the previous artificial one.</p> <p>Farnham Wards</p> <p>If Farnham is to have 16 councillors rather than 18, then we should have 8 wards rather than the current 9. This would allow 2 councillors per ward which we know from our experience works well in Farnham.</p> <p>It makes no sense at all, indeed it creates confusion, to have ward boundaries for the Borough that are not in alignment with the Town wards. This will need rectifying between WBC and FTC so they coalesce.</p>	See above.

	<p>There seems to be a fixation about making the A31 a ward boundary. This thinking will probably need to be changed to allow for equal division of the population in 2 councillor wards.</p>	
<p>Andy MacLeod</p>	<p>Here are my comments on the Boundary Commission solution for Farnham which is based on 7 wards with 16 councillors</p> <p>Their solution has</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 wards with 9 councillors north of the bypass (three 2-councillor wards and one 3-councillor ward) • 3 wards with 7 councillors south of the bypass (two 2-councillor wards and one 3-councillor ward) <p>This solution has the advantage that no ward crosses the bypass. I represent, with Cllr Michaela Martin, the Moor Park Ward, which is the only current one which crosses the bypass. This ward has two distinct areas with little in common. The area north of the bypass is urban and is closely connected to the town centre. It has a much larger population than the area south of the bypass, which is physically much larger, but with a much more dispersed population.</p> <p>The possible disadvantage is the introduction of 3-councillor wards. I instinctively prefer 2-councillor wards, because that is what I am used to, and they seem to work well. However, I have no experience of a 3-councillor ward and it is quite possible that they can work just as well, particularly as the Boundary Commission is proposing them in this case.</p> <p>In terms of the 7 wards that they are suggesting, the three south of the bypass seem OK to me.</p> <p>However, I think that there is a much better arrangement for the 4 wards north of the bypass. The Upper Hale, Hale and Heath End and Weybourne and Badshot Lea wards should remain largely as they are at present, with only minor boundary changes as necessary to equalise the numbers of electors.</p> <p>The Castle Ward should become the 3-Councillor ward by including most of the part of the current Moor Park Ward, which is north of the bypass. The whole of this area would probably make Castle Ward have too many electors for even for a 3-councillor ward.</p>	

However, that could easily be resolved by putting some of the electors into Hale and Heath End and Weybourne and Badshot Lea.

The A31 represents a hard boundary for most of the town except potentially at the eastern end. Given the population north of the A31 is larger than the south and new development is also greater in the north, it would not be possible to make an even split unless at least one ward (such as Moor Park at present) straddles the A31.

I have thought a bit more about how the Waverley/Farnham Town Council Wards could be aligned with the 3 Surrey Divisions in Farnham under the proposed reductions in the number of councillors and wards.

This would be impossible with 7 or 8 wards but, as David Howell has suggested, it would be possible with 6, which is divisible by 3. This would align each Surrey division with 2 Waverley/Farnham Town Council Wards.

However, the current proposal for 16 Farnham Councillors would not work with this idea as 16 is not divisible by 3. However, it would work with 15 councillors in Farnham. This would be 5 in each Surrey Division, rather than the current 6.

Each Surrey Division would thus include a 3-councillor ward and a 2-councillor ward.

This would be a neat solution for Farnham, but it raises another problem. With 15 councillors out of the proposed 50 Farnham would be under-represented at Waverley.

This however could be resolved by reducing the total from 50 to 47, taking the Farnham number down from 16 to 15 and the rest of the Borough from 34 to 32.

It is a pity that the Boundary Commission did not think of this idea themselves as it would probably not now be easy to sell it to the rest of the Borough just to resolve a problem in Farnham.

Farnham is unique in Waverley in having this problem, as ward alignment with the Surrey Divisions is easy everywhere else. Haslemere, Cranleigh, Western and Eastern Villages have one Surrey Division and Godalming two.

There will be a two-year period between the 2023 Waverley elections and the 2025 Surrey elections where the Surrey Divisions and Waverley wards will be out of alignment but by thinking ahead now the Boundary Commission could make it possible to bring them back into alignment in 2025. If they don't the chance will be lost.

I also think that 47 councillors is more than enough for Waverley. Guildford with a similar sized area and a larger population has 48.

The wards suggested below are largely based in existing wards, but boundary adjustments would be necessary to accommodate the 3 councillor wards.

Farnham North Division

Hale/Hale and Heath End Ward (3 councillors)

	<p>Weybourne and Badshot Lea Ward (2 councillors)</p> <p>Farnham Central Division</p> <p>Castle Ward (3 councillors) - includes most of the East Street area previously in Moor Park Ward</p> <p>Firgrove Ward (2 councillors) -</p> <p>note - Castle Ward is north of the bypass, Firgrove Ward is south of the bypass</p> <p>Farnham South Division</p> <p>Wrecclesham, Rowledge and Shortheath Ward (3 councillors)</p> <p>The Bourne and Runfold Ward (2 councillors)</p> <p>The Boundary Commission solution with 16 ward councillors in Farnham has 9 councillors north of the bypass and 7 south to get the numbers right. This solution with 15 councillors has 8 north of the bypass and 7 south. Thus, it may be necessary to move a limited number of electors from Runfold into the Weybourne and Badshot Lea Ward. However, I have not looked at this at that level of detail as variances of up to 10% from the average ward size are allowed.</p>	
<u>Godalming Binscombe & Charterhouse</u>		
Nick Palmer	Like everyone I've spoken to, I see the huge Binscombe/Charterhouse ward as puzzling - there is very little joint boundary and the communities do not have very much similarity apart from both being in Godalming. I should prefer the council's suggestion of 3/3/3 ward divisions and hope that the working group can prepare a proposal on those lines.	<p>With the exception of the Binscombe and Charterhouse ward there was general agreement over the proposals for Godalming borough wards. There was reservation that the Binscombe and Charterhouse ward was large and did not reflect the two distinct communities separated by a steep hill. However the electoral numbers for the polling districts of Binscombe and Charterhouse are 3,215 and 3,179 respectively. It would not be possible to divide the ward in two along polling district lines as the electors per councillor need to be in the order of 2,106. For this reason it was resolved to accept the proposal for one ward with 3 councillors.</p> <p>However, the Working Group and Godalming Town Council objected strongly to the Town wards no longer being</p>
Paul Rivers	<p>Godalming Town Councillors (of which I am one) take the following view:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Although the boundaries between the existing Charterhouse and Binscombe wards are slightly untidy around the area of Elizabeth Road, and the lower end of Farncombe Hill, they do delineate areas of differing characteristics. The majority of Charterhouse ward is established upon Farncombe Hill, Charterhouse Hill and Frith Hill and their approaches, whereas Binscombe is predominantly based around the area of the 1930's onwards northern expansion of Farncombe. These two distinctive areas clearly have a differing majority of housing stock and characteristics. For these reasons Godalming Town Council considers that a case can be made for maintaining a five ward model for the Town Council elections. This model being based upon the proposed WBC Godalming Ockford & Central, Godalming Holloway and Godalming Farncombe & Catteshall wards with the addition two wards based on the existing Binscombe ward and Charterhouse ward. 2) For the boundaries of both Waverley Borough and Godalming Town Councils' electoral wards to remain coterminous for Farncombe & Catteshall, Holloway and 	

	<p>Central & Ockford with the proposed Godalming Binscombe & Charterhouse Ward remaining as two separate wards primarily based on the existing Town Council ward boundaries.</p> <p>3) For the number of Godalming Town Councillors to be reduced from 20 to 18 distributed as indicated in the table above.</p> <p>4) Godalming prefix to be retained for the names of the proposed new Waverley Borough Council electoral wards within the parish of Godalming.</p> <p>5) The word "Parish" to be removed from the names of the proposed Town Council Wards.</p> <p>6) At Borough level GTC would wish to see the Godalming Binscombe and Charterhouse ward split on the same line as proposed for the Town Council.</p> <p>So, I am strongly in favour of:</p> <p>1) At Borough level, the Godalming Binscombe and Charterhouse ward split on the same line as proposed by the Town Council, and strongly support the retention of two two-Councillor wards rather than the combined three-Councillor ward.</p> <p>2) The word "Parish" to be removed from the names of the proposed Town Council Wards.</p> <p>3) Godalming prefix to be retained for the names of the proposed new Waverley Borough Council electoral wards within the parish of Godalming.</p>	<p>coterminous. The Town Council have also requested a Community Governance Review on the basis of the change in number of Borough councillors having a direct bearing on the town ward configuration and therefore on the size of their council. They would like to reduce their size from 20 to 18.</p> <p>Recommendation: to accept the BC proposals for the borough wards but to reject the town wards configuration.</p>
<u>Godalming Central & Ockford</u>		
Paul Follows	<p><u>Ward-Specific Comments</u></p> <p>In regards to the ward that I represent at Borough level (Godalming Central and Ockford) I have no specific comments as this is one of the wards where the changes are extremely minor (which considering the stated population variance and the reality that it borders another borough on one side and another parish within Waverley on the other) - was about what I expected and as such I have no concerns.</p> <p>In my additional capacity as the Surrey Divisional Member for Godalming South, Milford and Witley I would just add that I support the amalgamation of the current wards within the Witley Parish area into that proposed single ward. I would however defer to any comments from Witley Parish Council in that regard.</p> <p><u>Wider Concerns re: Godalming Wards</u></p> <p>I have some wider concerns about the Godalming patterns more generally. As you will likely be aware, Cllr Williams, Cllr Cosser and I also hold roles within Godalming Town Council (as deputy leader, leader of the opposition and leader of the council</p>	See above

respectively). A more formal letter is heading to the committee from our Town Clerk following a formal session of that council that was held to discuss the boundary commission proposals.

I am sure those councillors, along with my Labour colleagues at GTC (Cllr Ashworth cc'd) can relay similar but I feel it worth pointing out this was one of the few areas where GTC didn't just express a majority view for the following comments - it had total, unanimous and all-party backing.

- At the borough level, the prefix 'Godalming' should be restored to ALL the ward names - both for standardisation across Waverley and because it helps residents identify the place. For example, what does 'Central' mean if not prefixed by 'Godalming'
- The amalgamation of Charterhouse and Binscombe wards essentially takes two distinct sub-communities of Godalming and merges them in a way many councillors and residents will not recognise. Elaboration on this point will be made in the GTC letter.
- We were all frankly disappointed in the way town/parish warding was almost an afterthought. This wasn't restricted to Godalming but certainly it is a good example of that issue.
- The 'Croft' ward (and this is me toning down my language) is frankly just strange. It would not be recognisable as a place in that way and having just 1 councillor for that tiny ward seems almost arbitrary and without a rational explanation.
- The fracturing of wards will make it even more confusing to residents (a resident could have 3, partially overlapping local authority boundaries) and as such GTC are proposing that the wards are co-terminus with WBC (with the exception of the re-splitting of Binscombe and Charterhouse wards at the parish level). Proposals for the councillor numbers and split are also made in the coming letter from GTC) and I support the patterns proposed and the numbers of councillors for GTC in that letter.

It is clear that the process for parish warding for Godalming (and probably elsewhere) needs to happen so that the new wards come into effect at the same time as Waverley wards. I would support that review happening ASAP and would ask the committee to confirm how we go about that, who runs it, what the costs are and which authority pays for it?

Godalming Farncombe and Catteshall

Steve Cosser

Agrees with GTC statement and Paul Follows comments above.

See above.

	I should also like to request that the members of the Working Group take careful note of the information supplied by the Town Clerk (see the GTC comments section below) about the previous action of the Commission to agree a reduction in the size of the Town Council and press them to use the powers available to them to enable the alternative proposals being put forward for the Town Council to be agreed.	
Steve Williams	<p>I would propose a change of name of Charterhouse Ward/ Binscombe and Charterhouse Ward. The area is known as Frith Hill and I would suggest a name change to Frith Hill Ward/ Binscombe and Frith Hill.</p> <p>I also agree with the proposal that Godalming Town Wards are prefixed by "Godalming", in line with practice in the other towns: ie Godalming Binscombe & Frith Hill, Godalming Central & Ockford, etc.</p>	
<u>Godalming Farncombe and Catteshall</u>		
Joan Heagin	<p>An increase in ward size was inevitable and the suggested way to achieve this makes sense as only one corner of the ward is changing. I am a little confused about the exact location of the boundary line in a couple of places.</p> <p>I don't understand the deep V that is carved out of the ward at the bottom of Holloway Hill. It's difficult to tell from the map what the significance might be in practical terms, but Flambard Way at that point should be in Ockford & Central (O&C), and everything south of it in</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Holloway. 2. Similarly there is an odd dink in line at the bottom of Brighton Road. I believe the line should be drawn so that all properties on Brighton road should be in Holloway ward, including the new senior living facility that recently received planning permission, to be built on the site of the old Mole Stores. <p>In addition there are properties at Busbridge Sidings (GU7 2JP) that can only be accessed from Portsmouth Road. It is therefore an anomaly for it to form part of Holloway ward. It should more logically form part of O&C.</p> <p>I still have concerns about several aspects of the warding proposal for GTC, but for the time being would just like to make a plea for the GTC ward to mirror the WBC ward in name and extent.</p>	See above.

Peter Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I agree with Joan re the kink at the foot (or northern end) of Brighton Road - I do not understand that. • Similarly with the v shaped kink at the northern end of Holloway. The ward currently includes Harvest Hill - it looks as if that has been moved ? It is marginal as to where it should be. Is it a road off Holloway or is it a road off Ockford Road ? I would be happy either way as to which ward Harvest Hill is in. • Again with this same kink - we need to ensure that all residents of Holloway Hill stay in the ward (the ward is named Holloway after all!). The proposed boundary appears to put St Hilary's School into Central Ward. That will take a residence with a Holloway Hill address with it - namely The Bungalow (with 2 voters) at postal code GU7 1RZ. The Bungalow needs to stay. • There is one anomaly that is not resolved. That concerns Grove Road. The Holloway ward currently has 2 houses in Grove Road within its boundaries. The rest of the road is in the Central ward. It would be sensible to change this. The two houses (with 10 voters) in question are The Eyrie and South Winds in postal code GU7 1RE. Without doubt these should be moved from Holloway to Central. <p>More generally I am also concerned re Godalming Town Council boundaries. GTC boundaries need to mirror those of Waverley - even if that means reducing GTC membership from 20 to 18.</p>	
<u>Haslemere East</u>		
Simon Dear Robert Knowles	<p>The LGBC proposals, completely splits communities in Haslemere. Haslemere is a ribbon development either side of the Portsmouth Railway line. The town is in two parts, Shottermill, based west of Weyhill and Haslemere Town being the older part of the town. Residents of the Sicklemill estate shop in Shottermill, their children go to Shottermill school. Likewise residents of Tanners Lane and High Lane, relate to Haslemere, with children going to St Barts School, and the closest shops being in the town centre.</p> <p>These proposals are actually based on north and south and splits both communities.</p> <p>We suggest that the stream running to the East of Weydown Road remains the boundary between Wards and follows its course along Kings road, but the Sicklemill estate should remain in West (Shottermill)</p> <p>Whilst we recognise that the Commission have taken the easy option, using the railway as the boundary, this is false and fails their own requirements as it falsely splits very separate communities</p>	<p>The Working Group felt that the Haslemere East and West proposed boundary, following the railway line, did not in any way reflect the distinct communities that make up Haslemere. On the western side of Haslemere are the settlements of Shottermill, Critchmere and Wey Hill. To the south of these areas is the Kings Road and Sickle Mill area which are also distinct from the town area contained in the east ward. For this reason the West ward should contain Shottermill, Critchmere, Sickle Road, Sturt Road and the western end of Kings Road. In drawing up the proposed amendments there may need to be a degree of flexibility as regards the variance</p>

	<p>Prior to 1999 the boundary between Haslemere and Shottermill was the stream at the bottom of Weyhill, and that changed caused anger with areas such as Farnham Lane being moved into Shottermill, the current proposals will not be welcome to the communities</p>	<p>as it was not possible to keep these communities together without slightly exceeding the 10% margin.</p> <p>Recommendation: To amend the Haslemere East and West wards as set out in map 3 in Annexe A to this submission report.</p>
<u>Haslemere West</u>		
	See comments above.	See above
<u>Hindhead and Beacon Hill</u>		
Peter Nicholson	<p>(a) I agree entirely (to the exact house) with the relatively smaller movement of the higher north west areas of Critchmere and Shottermill into the enlarged Hindhead and Beacon Hill ward</p> <p>(b) I can see that the railway line is a clear dividing line between the east and west areas of Haslemere but it ignores firstly an area which has strong links to shottermill which is the Kings road to sturt road area to the immediate south of the line whose residents easily cross into shottermill by two rail bridgelinks- one under and the other over. This area should transfer to Haslemere west.</p> <p>In addition the mid north area of the town ie Bunch Lane moving eastwards to the High Lane estate consider themselves to be part of Haslemere main Town and therefore ought to be part of Haslemere East</p> <p>Allowing for these two block transfers, I consider that modified wards be accepted and the larger of the two wards be given 3 councillors and that the smaller take the remaining 2.</p>	Recommend acceptance of the Boundary Commission's proposal for Hindhead and Beacon Hill ward.
<u>Milford & Witley</u>		
Maxine Gale	Happy with the option to change ward boundaries to encompass the whole of Witley Parish Council, being represented by 3 Councillors.	In response to feedback, the Working Group favoured the inclusion of Hambledon with Witley and Milford. The Parish Council also favoured this option. Whilst Busbridge would also prefer to be included in Witley
Jan Floyd-Douglass	Response on behalf of Cllr Sadler and Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass.	

We have now approached both Witley Parish Council and Hambledon Parish Council, and our views echo theirs.

Witley PC are comfortable with the recommendations.

Hambledon PC are very concerned with the facts that they would be within one of the largest geographical ward areas in the Borough, along with a much higher number of other villages. This would include Dunsfold with its likely considerable housing development growth. and that they might not be fully represented due to time and travel pressures on the Borough Councillors.

In addition, they feel that their village residents, in terms of schools, shops and other facilities, relate much more to Witley than to the other parishes with whom they would be grouped. They would therefore prefer to remain within the same ward as Witley.


Accordingly, Hambledon PC is not happy with the possibility of both moving out of the same ward as Witley, nor the recommended revised ward size, and oppose it. Therefore, in terms of our response relating to Hambledon parish, as the above points show, there is a definite YES in response to both of your questions.

and Milford as explained above, it would mean having 4 councillors and increasing the size of the council to 51 which was not acceptable to the Working Group.


Recommendation: To amend the Boundary Commission's proposal so as to include Hambledon PC with the Witley parish area.

The ward name to be Witley, Milford and Hambledon.

Map 1 – Proposed Borough Warding Pattern



Map 2 – Farnham Ward Proposals



Map 3 - East and West Haslemere wards

