



# SUNNINGDALE PARISH COUNCIL

The Pavilion, Broomhall Lane, Sunningdale, SL5 0QS

☎ 01344 874268 Fax 01344 874027

Email: [sunningdaleparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:sunningdaleparishcouncil@outlook.com)

[www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk](http://www.sunningdale-pc.org.uk)

Clerk: Ruth Davies

The Review Officer (Windsor and Maidenhead)  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP

Via email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

4<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Dear Sir / Madam

Sunningdale Parish Council has already registered their comments on the previous consultation and do not believe that any of these previously made comments should be altered. A copy of the original response is sent along with this letter.

However, to clarify the response considering the new invitation to respond, the council has the following points to make:

1. The council still disagree from a Community and Village identity aspect that the residential area called "South Ascot" is a logical addition to the village of Sunningdale
2. The two areas do not share any communal areas, nor shared services and are not locally identified as a cohesive area, in fact South Ascot clearly identifies with Ascot
3. We refer you to the Council Minutes for RBWM 24/4/2018 – point 261, copy attached, where Cllr Bateson clearly requested the proposed ward name is "Sunningdale and South Ascot" not the proposal where South Ascot is the first name. Cllr Bateson justifies this request due to Sunningdale being the largest village – we would highlight of the two, it is the **only village**
4. The council also refer you to the comments made by Cllr D Hilton supporting leaving the ward boundaries as they currently stand. His explanation clearly states that the current boundaries may well be outside the accepted deviation for boundaries, however after significant development which is to take place in the next year or so, this deviation will no longer exist
5. From a practical approach, it is worth highlighting that the proposed ward brings together two mainline train stations and leaves the ward of Ascot and Sunninghill, a considerable size ward with 4 councillors, without a train station
6. To highlight, the residential area of south ascot is not a village. It is an integral part of Ascot, and takes identity from Ascot high street
7. Referring to your own technical guidance, point 4.70 of the guide for Electoral Reviews states *Our preference is for names that are short rather than those which attempt to describe an area exhaustively, e.g. by reference to all or a number of parishes it encompasses. Excessively long electoral area names have the potential to cause confusion both to local residents and elected members, and not accurately reflect community identities.*

The council would therefore request the following:

1. Leave the boundaries as they stand due to the upcoming level of development

OR

2. If the new ward must be created, ensure the name is Sunningdale and South Ascot

Yours sincerely

Anne-Catherine Buxton  
Chairman of Sunningdale Parish Council

Kind regards



Ruth Davies  
Clerk to the Council



261. ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD ELECTORAL REVIEW -  
SUBMISSION ON DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

Members considered the Royal Borough's representation on the electoral review draft recommendations to be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). Councillor McWilliams explained the background to the report including the fact that the review was required as Oldfield would soon be over the 30% threshold and that the borough was in the bottom quartile in terms of elector representation. Stage 1 had been to determine the number of councillors needed in future, which had been proposed at 43. In the first draft proposals the LGBCE had reduced the figure to 42.

A series of Member briefings had been held on the second stage. The consultation was open to 7 May 2018 and Councillor McWilliams encouraged everyone to respond. The council's overall response would be an important part of the LGBCE machinations. If the recommendations in the report were not supported the LGBCE work would continue without the council's input. This would be a great shame as the Working Group had placed great focus on community identity. The Working Group had agreed that, particularly in the south of the borough, the electoral representation threshold should be breached to ensure community identity was maintained. Option 1 therefore proposed the Boltons be included in Clewer East. To ensure the LGBCE was aware the council had considered all options, it was proposed to include an option 2 (not preferred) that had an electorally balanced situation but the Boltons was split between Clewer East and Old Windsor.

Councillor S Rayner commented on the need to offer taxpayers value for money in terms of less elected representatives. The patterns proposed maintained community

---

COUNCIL - 24.04.18

identities as much as possible, The council had a duty to exercise its duties in the most efficient way possible.

Councillor Jones commented that the council approached the LGBCE to resolve an issue in Maidenhead. Whilst 43 councillors addressed this issue, it had proven not to work in Windsor and in the south of the borough because of geographical constraints. Councillor Jones thanked officers who had worked so hard to produce the warding patterns that put communities first. Councillor Jones had requested, and had now received, confirmation that the ward name of Old Windsor would remain and would not be proposed for amendment to Old Windsor and Great Park.

Councillor Hilton stated that he would confine his comments to the south of the Borough where he had local knowledge. At the December consultation the seven councillors in the south of the borough, supported by the two Parish Councils, proposed three 2-councillor wards which, based on local knowledge of major sites that would be coming forward for development, and using the same methodology as officers would have, had a maximum of 11% deviation, just 1% outside the desired

10% target. The proposals would have been coterminous with Parish boundaries with four councillors within Sunninghill and Ascot and two within Sunningdale. Sadly, the proposals were rejected by the LGBCE.

The latest proposals were for two wards in the south: Sunningdale and South Ascot and Ascot and Sunninghill. Aside of the addition of the whole of Windsor Great Park to Ascot and Sunninghill matched ward boundaries prior to the 2002 boundary changes. For about 18 months, prior to the 2002 boundary review, Councillor Hilton had represented Ascot and Sunninghill so it would not be too difficult to do so again. However he did not see the Great Park as part of Ascot. It was next to the ward but it was some miles from the centre of Ascot and the village, which was the only significant collection of homes in the Park, was much closer to Old Windsor than Ascot. He was sure that the affinity of the people who lived in the village was to the north and Old Windsor and Windsor, rather than the south.

Furthermore, in 2014 the Ascot Sunninghill and South Ascot Neighbourhood Plan was adopted by the council and it had been possible to draft policies that reflected all parts of what a cohesive area was. This would not have been the case had the Great Park, which was entirely within the Green Belt, been included. Members should be aware that just 276 electors lived within the Great Park and were proposed to be moved to Ascot on the grounds of balance. The fact that developers were already talking about more than 800 homes, with more to come, in the revised Ascot and Sunninghill ward indicated the Great Park should be left where it was to allow the community to remain together and allow time, as it surely would, to correct the imbalance. Councillor Hilton had written to the LGBCE in support of the two 3-councillor wards in the south but that the Great Park should be part of Old Windsor.

Councillor Bowden commented that if Clewer East was going to be 25% over with only two councillors, he would give in. Councillor Bicknell highlighted that the ward he represented would disappear by May 2019 under the proposals. In his view residents of the Boltons were not Old Windsorians.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that he understood that there was no way to reverse the process, which had not been made particularly clear to Members. The cure seemed worse than the disease.

---

COUNCIL - 24.04.18

---

Councillor Beer endorsed the comments made by Councillors Jones and Hilton. He felt the figure of 43 had been picked out of the air as it was the same number as West Berkshire. At the time he had pointed out that the Sunnings and old Windsor were a special case due to geographical constraints this had been ignored. Option A would suit the Old Windsor community, but not Windsor.

Councillor Rankin commented that there was a need for electoral equality and a reduction in the cost of politics. However it had been very difficult to balance the

figures. He welcomed a move to a submission with more focus on community identity. He personally felt that Eton should be in a separate ward to Windsor town centre.

Councillor E. Wilson highlighted two uncomfortable truths. The council as an administrative body rather than a self-preservation society. The council had to work smarter, rather than harder. The meeting had discussed a list of issues that it had no control over, such as admission policies. The LGBCCE aim of making every vote count had been achieved in their proposals, with two exceptions. The south was simply an over-represented part of the borough. The council's submission made it clear it did not make sense to add the urban area of the Boltons to semi-rural Old Windsor village. The exception was worth arguing.

Councillor Bateson commented that the parish council had requested the ward name be amended to Sunningdale and South Ascot, as Sunningdale was the largest village.

Councillor McWilliams commented that adding a third councillor to Clewer East would throw off the elector to councillor ratio across the whole borough and the process would have to start again. The decision was not to include it but he encouraged individual councillors to make submissions. The figure of 43 had not been picked from the air; officers and the Working Group had spent many hours debating the figure. If Eton was separated as a one-Member ward this would break the good governance rule to have the same number in all wards wherever possible. The Working Group decided it would not make proposals on ward names and encouraged all to put forward their ideas for ward names as individual submissions.

It was proposed by Councillor McWilliams, seconded by Councillor S Rayner and:

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council:**

**i) Agrees that the Royal Borough's representation on the electoral review draft recommendations be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.**



## Local Government Boundary Commission of England review of ward boundaries for Windsor and Maidenhead.

As the active, elected Parish Council representing the parish of Sunningdale, the council would be neglecting its parishioners if it failed to express an opinion at a time when significant decisions are being taken with the ward boundaries within their Borough.

Sunningdale has been a Parish Council since 1894 and are considered a key stakeholder in the process that is currently being followed.

The council acknowledges the boundary commissions proposals to recommend a reduction in a future council size for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead from 57 ward councillors to 43 and specifically in the Windsor boundary to follow a pattern of 21 members in 3 two-member wards and 5 three-member wards.

**We strongly oppose any change to Sunningdale's two-member ward.**

### The Parish of Sunningdale

Sunningdale is an aspirational area with leafy surroundings and a rich variety of housing types. It benefits from its proximity to Windsor Great Park and Chobham Common. The historic old village is clustered around the listed Holy Trinity Church and is predominantly a conservation area. At the heart of this area is the village hall and parish allotments.

The main commercial centre is located around the intersection between the A30 London Road and the Chobham Road. It offers a variety of small shops serving local needs together with specialist shops, coffee shops and restaurants. It is separated from the popular Waitrose supermarket, adjacent to the main line station, by a busy main road and level crossing. The character of the area along the A30 itself has changed significantly over recent years with the redevelopment of single dwelling plots into flats and apartments.

There is a strong sense of community in Sunningdale which residents are keen to retain with a desire to protect the character of the area. Both its leafy surroundings and its areas of green belt along with the design of its built environment are key to the identity of Sunningdale.

Located at the south of the borough adjoining Surrey and Runnymede councils and its neighbouring parish of Ascot and Sunninghill. Situated 24 miles west of central London with a main line train station to Waterloo and Reading serving an active commuting population.

Facilities which are easily found within Sunningdale:

- School
  - Holy Trinity C of E Primary School
  - Charters Secondary School

- Sunningdale School (Independent)
- Hurst Lodge School (Independent)
  
- Variety of pre-schools
- Churches
  - Holy Trinity Church C of E
  - Sunningdale Baptist Church
  - Sacred Heart Church
  - Rock of Salvation
- Kiln Lane Cemetery opened in 1974
- Magnolia House Surgery
- Dentist
  - Sunningdale Dental Practice
  - White Smiles
- Main line train station to Waterloo and Reading
- Buses connecting Sunningdale to:
  - Frimley Hospital
  - Windsor and Ascot
  - Staines
  - Egham
  - Camberley
  - Bracknell
- Mobile Library 2 days per week
- A discreet village centre radiating out from the intersection of the A30 and Chobham Road
- Public Houses
  - Royal Oak
  - Nags Head
  - Sunningdale Lounge
- Older people's developments and care homes
  - Ambassadors
  - Ben Lynwood village
  - Dormy House care home
  - Meridian Court
  - 2 additional developments with granted planning
- Hotels
  - Coworth Park part of the Dorchester Chain
  - Sunningdale Park
- Halls
  - Village Hall
  - Parish Hall
  - Women's Institute
- Parish Offices and Community hub
- Allotments
- Local Groups
  - Women's Institute
  - Scout
  - Sea Cadets
  - Carers Groups
  - Sports Clubs

- Special interest groups such as gardening and historical society

- Recreation Ground
  - Good sized private free car park for users
  - Refreshment chalet
  - Public Toilets
  - Children's playground
  - Teen scene
  - Adult fitness cardio vascular equipment
  - 3 all-weather lit tennis courts
  - Community Garden

Adding to the identity of Sunningdale as a community, the following events take place:

- Christmas event with traders and local school's involvement
- Remembrance Day service with residents with local brownies, scouts, guides, WI and others
- Village in Bloom participation
- Ben Lynwood vintage car rally
- Vicars garden tea party
- Sunningdale carnival
- Litter picking with residents and businesses
- Community engagement through petitions and questionnaires, most recently resulting in a reduction of weight limit on a local bridge for safety reasons

Most parishioners actively use the facilities of the village and there is a real sense of belonging to the community as is evidenced most recently in a Parish Council survey where the majority of responders recorded feeling part of the community.

### The Population of Sunningdale

The current population is 5467 (as of 2015) with an estimated rise to 5795 in 2023 according to the RBWM Statistics provided in the electoral review June 2017. In relation to the estimation of population figures for 2023, the stated development level of 196 new developments is likely to yield a higher increase than the RBWM figures suggest.

- Development for 2023 - 196 new developments
  - JSNA Ward profile for 2015 details 1000 households in Sunningdale
  - Average household size is 2.4 people with 2.11% needing one or more additional bedrooms

Therefore, the extrapolation of population growth is on the low side i.e. 196 new developments at 2.4 per household would increase the population by 470 additional residents as against the RBWM figures of 5467 to 5795 which is only 328 and is a **30% under estimation**.

- The stated number of electors per ward (as per the RBWM report 27<sup>th</sup> June 2017) is 1.79 adjusted and gives Sunningdale an electoral total of 4570.
- The additional development figures, again based upon the lower figure of 1.79 is 328
- Therefore, the overall elector number for 2023 for the parish would be 4908, which is a 11.22% deviation from the suggested 2764 electors per councillor.
- However, if you use the stated 2.4 per household (JSNA Ward Profile) this figure sits comfortably within the range

Appendix A JSNA Ward Profile

Appendix B [Official Guide of Sunningdale](#) – Follow the link to view as a large file



## Delivering electoral equality for local voters

As previously stated, the ward of Sunningdale falls outside the +/- 10% limit by 1.22%. It is being proposed by the ward councillors that this is a minor deviation and should therefore be mitigated by the benefit of retaining the benefits of a 2-councillor ward.

However, the parish council would like to propose the following actions to balance the ward numbers to within the level of tolerance.

- Move the parish boundaries of Sunningdale to include the entirety of streets and developments which are divided between the parish of Sunningdale and Sunninghill. This would not only provide the additional electoral numbers required to achieve the proposed councillor electorate, but would also remove the following issues:
  - Parish identity of residents, neighbours along the same streets having different communications; points of contact; services; charges; burial rights and associated charges
  - In-ability of the parish council and borough councillors to support the area fully due to division of roads
  - Planning representations at local levels
  - Ongoing division of Community Infrastructure Levy
  - S106 Legal agreements to mitigate the effects of development
- The proposed boundary movements are itemised on the map within the portal, however the streets affected are listed as:
  - All property to the south of London Road junction with Mill Lane along to B383, Buckhurst Road
  - Property to the east of Silwood Road from the junction with London Road to Larch Avenue
  - Property to the North and South of Larch Avenue from the junction with Silwood Road to Heathfield Avenue and to include the properties on Heathfield Avenue
  - Extend along Rise Road / Kings Road to include the entirety of the Ben Lynwood development and Lynwood Flats
  - Extend along Devenish Road A330 to the intersection with Bagshot Road B3020, with all properties to the south
  - From the junction of Bagshot Road and Devenish Road extend to meet the existing parish boundary which begins at Broadlands Drive and St Marys Road

This approach would allow Sunningdale to retain its 2 councillor wards, and as the properties included in the extension of boundaries are within the ward of Sunninghill and South Ascot, it does not have a detrimental effect on their ward figures as this ward is currently well within the levels of tolerance.

This outcome is supported by the Neighbourhood plan for Ascot and the Sunnings, adopted on the 29<sup>th</sup> April 2014, which not only identifies clearly 3 villages, but has clear policies to protect their individual identities.

**Therefore, Sunningdale Parish Council propose to the LGBC that the reduction in ward councillors is looked for by allocating the combined areas of Sunningdale, Sunninghill and Ascot into 3 two-member wards and retaining the two-member ward of Sunningdale.**