

Tandridge

Personal Details:

Name: Jeremy Pursehouse

Email: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: Warlingham district councillors (District or county councillor)

Comment text:

Please see the attached submission from the five Warlingham district councillors and a copy of the submission from Warlingham Parish Council referred to in our letter. The PC document is just for ease of reference, the PC has sent its submission in separately.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Regards

Cllr Jeremy Pursehouse
07831 755980

Attached Documents:

- Response of WPC to Boundary Commisssion recoms 050723.docx
- WDC submission.docx

The Boundary Commission

Clerk to Warlingham Parish Council

Tandridge District Council Review

Warlingham Library,

Shelton Avenue,

Warlingham.

5 July 2023

Dear Sir,

Response to draft recommendations for Tandridge District Council ward boundaries from the Boundary Commission

Warlingham Parish Council has reviewed the draft recommendations on ward boundaries and its response is as set out below.

Principles

The Council notes that wards should reflect community identity, support effective and convenient local government and have strong, clearly identifiable boundaries and supports these principles.

It does not believe that the Commission's proposals sufficiently respect these principles as outlined below.

Proposed new Warlingham West ward

The Council is wholly opposed to the inclusion of the area west of the railway line and north of the Godstone/Hillbury Road roundabout in Warlingham West. This area is indisputably part of Whyteleafe and residents there in no way consider themselves to be part of Warlingham. In addition the type of housing, demography and topography are consistent with the rest of Whyteleafe and very different to the hilly topography and large houses of Warlingham West. Also the railway line forms a very strong, identifiable boundary.

The proposal to move the bottom parts of Hillbury and Westhall Roads and other houses east of the railway line into Warlingham West is acceptable however, as community identity there is blurred and it is the Council's view that the majority in that area identify with Warlingham rather than Whyteleafe. And as above the natural boundary is the railway line, which is why the ecclesiastical parish boundary uses it. If this move is made, then Stuart Road, the bottom of Westview and all other houses east of the railway line in that area that are currently in Whyteleafe ward should logically also be moved into Warlingham West.

In the interests of "effective and convenient local government", and to avoid much confusion, the areas that are moved into West should also be moved into Warlingham Parish as soon as possible.

Proposed new Warlingham East, Chelsham and Farleigh ward

The Council is opposed to the move of roads to the east of Limpsfield Road and north of Warlingham Green into West ward. The strong, identifiable boundary in this area is the Limpsfield Road, and the proposed new boundary, which wiggles around at the end of various roads and divides Crewes Lane, is very weak and artificial.

The area proposed to be moved has a similar flat topography and demography to the rest of East, composed as it is of small houses and flats. This is in contrast to West's generally hilly terrain and large houses. The proposal would also separate All Saints Church, Warlingham Sports Club and Hamsey Green Recreation Ground from all the houses next to them, contrary to the principle of effective local government.

Warlingham East, Chelsham and Farleigh ward should remain as it is, as we proposed in our original submission.

Other Points

It is the Council's view that the recommendations for Warlingham have been compromised by the proposals for changes in other areas and the surprise proposal to keep Woldingham separate, which is contrary to previous advice and inconsistent with what is proposed for the rest of the District. Whilst the Council is not opposed to Woldingham remaining a separate ward, it believes that the same logic that has been applied for Woldingham also applies to Tatsfield and Chaldon, which are similarly distinct. Keeping them as one member wards would address the Commission's difficulties with Caterham and Whyteleafe allowing six two member wards to become four three member wards.

The Council also notes with concern that the overall proposal results in the underrepresentation of the whole of the North of the District and the overrepresentation of the South, moving one (and effectively two because of the impact of uniting Limpsfield and Tatsfield) councillor from North to South. This would have unfortunate consequences for the balance between the two parts of the District, which is especially important given the current pressure on the North for more housing. Again this could be resolved by keeping Chaldon and Tatsfield separate.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Bold,

Clerk to Warlingham Parish Council.

The Boundary Commission
Tandridge District Council Review

Current Tandridge District Councillors
Warlingham East, Chelsham &
Farleigh
Warlingham West

28 July 2023

Dear Sir/Madam

We, the five district councillors for the whole of Warlingham, Chelsham & Farleigh, wish to register our opposition to all but one of your proposals for our two wards under the new electoral arrangements for Tandridge District Council. In doing so, we direct you to the excellent response from Warlingham Parish Council, which we wholeheartedly support in all respects (see attached).

We would underline that we make this representation as a united cross-party group of councillors, seeking to make no party-political gain, but only wanting the best for those we represent.

We fully understand your decision to leave Woldingham as a single-member ward, albeit against your initial advice that all wards should be three-member, but in trying to find a balancing two-member ward, and your attempts to sort out other issues in Whyteleafe and Caterham Valley, you have ended up with an unnecessarily messy solution for Warlingham, which goes against your stated aim to: "Create boundaries that are appropriate, and reflect community ties and identities." See the Warlingham Parish Council submission on this.

Our contention is that the best way to achieve this is to leave the current ward boundaries where they are, with the few exceptions stated by Warlingham PC, which improve the appropriateness of the boundary. In consequence of this, we would also contend that the numbers of councillors for each ward remain as they are now, with two for West and three for East, Chelsham & Farleigh, and the parish council arrangements also remain unaltered.

Even the movement of roads from East to West Wards goes against your aim to "reflect community ties and identities", as the terms are not arbitrary names for two halves of the village. The two current wards are very different in layout, type of homes, outlook, community type and even topography. At the moment, West generally features larger homes, more detached and semi-detached houses, private roads and steep hills, while East features smaller homes, terraced house, maisonettes and a generally flatter landscape.

Finally, we fully support the parish council's contention that all the proposed changes will move two councillors seats from the north of the district to the south, despite the

north having the much larger population and the highest number of planned large developments.

Yours faithfully

Cllr Jeremy Pursehouse
Cllr Robin Bloore
Cllr Keith Prew

Cllr Perry Chotai
Cllr Anna Patel