

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

E-mail:

Postcode:

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am pleased that Mint Road Banstead is now in Banstead Village

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

██████████

E-mail:

██

Postcode:

██████████

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I welcome that you have now enlarged the ward to include the whole of Meadvale that we are part of ██████████, but I object to you dropping the name Meadvale from the new ward of Earlswood Common. Can it not be called EARLSWOOD & MEADVALE to give us a feeling of belonging to this new enlarged ward? We are a village and not a bit of somewhere.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

The proposed changes appear sensible and overcome some of the previous odd boundaries. I welcome the change to Reigate Central that previously extended well into Redhill. The new titles of the wards are nicely descriptive of the areas concerned.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am pleased that Meadvale has not been split in two. However I strongly object to the loss of the Meadvale name as it is a village in its own right. I would like the name to be Meadvale and Earlswood Common.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Blackborough Road has historically been in Reigate Central and is a few minutes walk from Reigate town which is our nearest central shopping and recreational area. It makes no sense to move this Road to the area called St Mary's and Redhill Common. St Mary's is not a know and talked about area today. Redhill Common has little in common with St Mary's. There is a church at St Mary's but attendances are falling which tells it's own story. There is no merit in the proposed change and Blackborough Road should be left in the Reigate section.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Living close to Tattenham Corner the shops , parade, library, Doctors and Church are all affiliated together. Nork is isolated from this area having major roads to cross to get to the hub of it and is an entirely separate area from Tattenhams. It has an entirely different atmosphere and we cannot see any reason for the two areas to be affiliated.

[REDACTED]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I live in Horley [REDACTED]. This is Horley. My postal address is Horley. I want my local ward Councillor to be thinking about Horley. I do not want to be part of Salfords. I did not purchase a house in Salfords. I am therefore objecting to the proposals to remove Horley East. A house that is currently in Horley should remain in Horley.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am concerned that the 7,000 of Reigate will share an equal voice with the over 8,400 of Merstham. How is that equitable? It is blatantly biased toward a wealthier, whiter, more middle class electorate. It is immoral. The number of councillors should be balanced proportionally with the number of voters. As most proposed Wards are populated by about 7,500 voters, this should be reflected across all the boundaries. The Wards should be redrafted to fit as close to the 7,500 target as possible - the same for ALL Wards if at all possible. I do not have the time, knowledge nor skill to redraft the boundaries to reflect this so I trust it to more capable, skilful and knowledgeable people. The proposed gap of over 1,400 voters between Reigate and Merstham is inexcusable and must be changed.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

You seem to have changed the draft proposals and added Preston to tattenham. Surely once all the building is complete on the Preston ward it will be big enough on its own considering it's varied requirements and issues. You be not given any details of constituency size and forecast for the current ward and the proposed size after the building work. Were not able to have the full information. Therefore I cannot agree with the proposal.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Proposed Boundary Changes affecting the village of Meadvale and the ward of Meadvale and St. John's. Meadvale had, at one time, around 15 retail businesses and whilst most of these have now gone, it has always been a village a very strong sense of community spirit. 10 years ago, primarily to add a focus to village life, we launched the very successful Meadvale Village Fete which is organised by the 34th Reigate (Meadvale) Scout Group and held every year on Swing Common. The letter sent from The Local Government Boundary Commission to Mr. John Jory states that three key criteria / legal factors must be considered: 1. To deliver electoral equality where each borough councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the borough. According to the latest Census data that is available (2011), the population of Meadvale and St. John's is close to the average for the three wards affected. Both the other wards border each other, therefore a more straightforward solution to meet this requirement would be to move the border of South Park & Woodhatch north to include Sandhills Road and East to Woodhatch Road. Alternatively, instead of dividing Whitebushes in two, move the eastern border of South Park & Woodhatch to the A23 and keep the southern border of Earlswood & Whitebushes as it is. Even accounting for recent new builds these minor adjustments would appear be close to equalising the population of all three wards. 2. That the pattern of wards should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities. Meadvale has a heritage that has evolved from the 19th century brickworks, tannery and potteries. It still has a Village Hall which is used by community groups and The Old Oak is now a family-friendly pub that has become a major enhancement to the local area. I have spoken with a number of friends and neighbours about the proposed changes and not one of them is happy with the loss of Meadvale from the name of our ward. As residents, we all want to keep the identity of Meadvale alive. The proposed new boundary changes not only divide the village but run up the middle of Arbutus Road and Copse Road, further segregating communities. Even the land where Meadvale Brickmakers was situated would be outside the ward. The distinct hamlet of St. John's also has a history that dates to the mid-1800s. To lose the names of both Meadvale and St. Johns and replace them with Earlswood Common (common land with few inhabitants) is not a reflection of the area in which we live. 3. That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government. Currently the ward of Meadvale & St. John's is clearly defined and almost entirely bordered by main roads (A23, A217 and Pendleton Road and B3034). The proposals appear to have no logical approach to the application of the boundaries and these main roads now criss-cross the ward and divide historically and geographically defined local communities. As a consequence, a wider spread of communities and interests will be encompassed within them and it would be more difficult to be "effective and convenient" represent local government and deal with the issues of the residents.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name: ?

Comment text:

Move tattenham corner and Preston into epsom and Ewell. We shop there are affected by the derby held there. Our MP is there. Reigate is a long way away and we are a forgotten corner. Still too many wards and councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I disagree with this as the following makes more sense with three less wards but the number of seats maintained, New area called Horley West, replacing Meath Green & Sidlow plus the western part of Horley Town, to consist of Meath Green, Court Lodge, town Centre, land west of railway line and the new Westvale Development, Losing Sidlow to Woodhatch and Sidlow New area call Horley East, replacing Eastern part of Horley town and Langshott & Salford's, covering Langshot, The Arces, Balcombe Road area (East of railway line) but losing Salford Earlswood Common to include Salford's and the Earlswood part of St Mary's & Redhill Common but renamed Earlswood & Salfords Woodhatch and South Park to gain both Sidlow and the South Western part of St Mary's & Redhill Common St Mary's & Redhill Common plus colesmead & Wray Common to be merged into one area with outlying areas handed over to neighbouring wards (Sw to Woodhatch and South Park) SE to Earlswood Common and Salfords. New combined area to be renamed Wray Common. The areas in the North of the Borough are well aligned, I would also ask that all council elections would be coordinated with Borough posts all up for re-election at the same time as I believe this would reduce voter fatigue.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Why wouldn't you use the M25 as the boundary between Merstham and Chipstead and Kingswood.... I live in Hooley which is a five minute walk to Chipstead but 30 minute walk to Merstham crossing the M25... These boundary changes are not for cost saving but political

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Hooley and Chipstead belong together because the communities are interknitted - even the parish church of Chipstead will now fall outside of the boundary. The boundary should come down Star lane and meet the A23 at the bottom or include the houses along the A24 to the railway bridge. Chipstead and Hooley feel integrated. There is no connection emotionally with Merstham. It is, in fact, impossible to even walk there as there is no footpath that allows it along the road. Far better to leave Hooley in Chipstead where there is an established connection and identification. The number of residents is not significant enough to make the division necessary.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded

Reigate and Banstead District

Personal Details:

Name:

[REDACTED]

E-mail:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Hooley and Chipstead are "joined at the hip" by the parish church, St Margarets, which is in Hooley, it seems silly to split them just to suit some "jobsworths" plan. In addition Merstham is already quite a large ward and change could spread the ward councillors work thinly.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded