

Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
For England  
Report No. 34

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 34

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins, MP  
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
BOROUGH OF GUILDFORD IN THE COUNTY OF SURREY

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the borough of Guildford in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that borough.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 13 May 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Guildford Borough Council, copies of which were circulated to the Surrey County Council, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings in the Borough, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and to the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. Guildford Borough Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council had exercised an option for whole council elections.

5. On 30 October 1974 the Guildford Borough Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area into 20 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a Council of 44, two more than at present.

6. Following the publication by the Borough Council of their draft scheme we received letters from a local political association, two local councillors and a group of local residents in which various proposals affecting the Merrow and Burpham, Stoke and Holy Trinity and Christchurch wards proposed by the Borough Council were submitted for our consideration.

7. We considered the draft scheme together with the comments we had received and those of the comments received by the Borough Council, both before and after the publication of their draft scheme, which they had not felt able to adopt and incorporate in their draft scheme. We noted that the proposed Merrow and Burpham, Stoke and Holy Trinity and Christchurch wards would all have a relatively high elector/councillor ratio. Having studied the composition of these three wards and the comments made to us about them we decided that the proposed Merrow and Burpham ward should be divided into two district wards, Burpham ward returning 1 councillor and Merrow ward returning 2 councillors. We also decided that the proposed Stoke and Holy Trinity & Christchurch wards should be reorganised into 3 wards to be called Stoke, Holy Trinity and Christchurch. The new Christchurch ward would return 2 members and the Holy Trinity and Stoke wards 2 members and 3 members respectively. The three new wards would thus return a total of 7 councillors instead of the 6 proposed by the Borough Council. This would increase the size of the council to 45 members.

8. We considered whether the draft scheme could be further modified to strengthen the electorates of the proposed Onslow and Stoughton wards both of which would enjoy a relatively generous standard of representation. A number of possibilities were examined but, having regard to the location of the wards and the nature of their boundaries, we concluded that there were no sensible changes which could be made.

9. Turning our attention to the rural parts of the Borough we decided, in the interests of greater equality of representation, that the proposed Shalford ward should be strengthened by the addition of the parishes of Compton and Artington from the neighbouring The Pilgrims ward. The proposed Shalford ward would then return 2 councillors instead of one as the Borough Council had proposed, while The Pilgrims ward would be represented by one councillor instead of 2.

10. On the recommendation of the Ordnance Survey we adopted a number of minor modifications to ward boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more identifiable on the ground.

11. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 7, 9 and 10 above we decided that the Borough Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements of the Borough in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines, and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

12. On 6 December 1974, we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals, and the accompanying maps which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from

other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 31 January 1975.

13. Surrey County Council informed us that they had no observations to make on our draft proposals and we received a letter of support from a local political party. In addition, we received letters expressing approval of our proposal to create separate wards for Burpham and Merrow and of the proposals to reorganise the proposed Stoke and Holy Trinity and Christchurch wards so as to establish a separate Christchurch ward.

14. However, our draft proposals attracted opposition from the Borough Council who requested that their draft scheme should be adopted without modification. A local political party opposed our proposal to create separate wards for Merrow and Burpham and criticised the proposed Christchurch ward on the grounds that the two areas comprising the new ward had little in common. The same political party expressed concern at the proposal of the Borough Council which we had adopted to divide the parish of Seale and Tongham between two district wards. They also objected to our proposed Shalford and The Pilgrims wards. The last mentioned wards were opposed also by 4 parish councils, including those of the parishes of Compton, Artington and Shalford. Finally there was a suggestion from a district councillor that the proposed Friary and St Nicolas ward should be divided into two district wards.

15. In view of these comments we considered that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with Section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, you appointed Mr Thomas Foord as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and to report to us.

16. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at Guildford on 20 May 1975. A copy of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

17. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that the proposed Burpham and Merrow wards should form a single ward returning 3 councillors and that the parishes of Compton and Artington should be included in the proposed The Pilgrims ward which would return two councillors, leaving the proposed Shalford ward to return one member. Both these recommendations involved a return to the proposals comprised in the Borough Council's draft scheme.

18. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's report. We resolved that both the alterations recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be adopted and, subject to these amendments, we decided to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

19. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached maps. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the maps.

#### PUBLICATION

20. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the maps are being sent to Guildford Borough Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the maps, is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (Chairman)  
JOHN M RANKIN (Deputy Chairman)  
DIANA ALBEMARLE  
T C BENFIELD  
MICHAEL GHISHOLM  
ANDREW WHEATLEY  
F B YOUNG

DAVID R SMITH ( Secretary)

3 July 1975

THOMAS FOORD  
(HONS.), F.C.I., L.M.A.T.P.I.  
 SOLICITOR

19th June 1975.

Your ref: LGBC/D/36/7

D.R. Smith Esq.,  
 Secretary,  
 Local Government Boundary  
 Commission for England,  
 20 Albert Embankment,  
 London, SE1 7TJ.

Dear Sir,

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
BOROUGH OF GUILDFORD

I have to report on the local meeting held at the Council Offices, Millmead House, Guildford on the 20th May 1975 to consider the future electoral arrangements for the Borough of Guildford, following representations which had been made on the draft proposals published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. A list of the persons who attended the meeting and the interests they represent is attached.

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals provide for the future warding of the Borough, as follows:

<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>Name of Ward</u>	<u>Councillors</u>
ASH	3	ONSLOW	3
ASH VALE	2	PIRBRIGHT	1
BURPHAM	1	SEND	2
CLANDON and HORSLEY	3	SHALFORD	2
CHRISTCHURCH	2	STOKE	3
EFFINGHAM	1	STOUGHTON	3
FRIARY & ST NICOLAS	3	THE PILGRIMS	1
HOLY TRINITY	2	TILLINGBOURNE	2
LOVELACE	1	TONGHAM	1
MERROW	2	WORPLESDON	3
NORMANDY	1	WESTBOROUGH	3

The representations made at the meeting related to the following matters, which are considered separately and in detail below.

- (a) The Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of the wards of Burpham, Merrow, Stoke, Christchurch and Holy Trinity.
- (b) The Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of The Pilgrims, Shalford and Tongham wards.
- (c) A proposal to divide the proposed Friary and St. Nicholas Ward into two wards.

At the conclusion of the meeting I visited the areas concerned to consider in situ the several points which had been made in support of or against the proposals advanced at the meeting. With the agreement of those present at the meeting I was accompanied on my inspection by the Chief Executive and the Clerk and Solicitor of Guildford Borough Council and by Councillor R.G. Burgess. In making my recommendations I have also taken into consideration the written representations made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and to the Guildford Borough Council. I am grateful to all those individuals, associations and other bodies who, in the interests of the new Borough of Guildford, have taken so much trouble and care to present their views.

BURPHAM, MERROW, STOKE, CHRISTCHURCH AND HOLY TRINITY

Guildford Borough Council in its draft scheme for this area provided for (i) a three member Merrow and Burpham Ward, (ii) a three member Holy Trinity and Christchurch Ward, and (iii) a three member Stoke Ward.

The draft proposals of the Local Government Boundary Commission are substantially different from the Borough Council's draft scheme and provide for:

- (a) The proposed three member Merrow and Burpham Ward to be divided into a two member Merrow Ward and a single member Burpham Ward.
- (b) A new two member Christchurch Ward consisting of parts of the Borough Council's proposed Stoke, Holy Trinity and Christchurch wards.
- (c) The remainder of the Borough Council's proposed Holy Trinity and Christchurch Ward to form a new two member Holy Trinity Ward.
- (d) The reduced Stoke Ward to retain its three councillors.

At the meeting the proposal to divide the Merrow and Burpham Ward into two wards was opposed by the Borough Council. The Council felt that there was a strong community of interest between the two areas and the physical division by the railway line was more apparent than real. The Wards looked to each other and not away. In making their proposal for a three member Merrow and Burpham Ward they had taken into account this community interest and felt strongly that the ward should not be changed unless there was an over-riding reason. Reference was made to impending development in the area and the need to spread the workload in a ward over more than one councillor. The existing ward councillors were united in their view that the ward should not be divided. Mr. Twyford emphasised the educational and other links between the two areas, and pointed out that the George Abbot School served Merrow as well as Burpham.

The Council's views were supported by Mr. Stewart, who was in favour of maintaining the links between Merrow and Burpham.

Mrs. Oldfield, on behalf of the Burpham Community Association, took the opposite view. The Association felt that Burpham had no strong historic ties with Merrow. They were two distinct communities, with their own shopping areas and other facilities. The Association welcomed the proposal for a separate Burpham Ward, which they felt would be more in keeping with the village community which they were.

Councillor Marks referred to his written representations to the Boundary Commission and invited me to visit the area to consider the points which had been made.

The Boundary Commission's proposal for the new two member Christchurch Ward, with its consequent effect on the Borough Council's draft scheme for the Stoke, and Holy Trinity and Christchurch Wards, was opposed by the Borough Council. The Council felt that to create a separate Christchurch Ward, as proposed by the Commission, would unnecessarily disturb the existing Stoke Ward, which has functioned well as a ward for many years with the present boundaries. In the Council's view Polling District H had more community of interest with Holy Trinity Ward

rather than with Polling District P, with which it was proposed to be joined in the new Christchurch Ward. Mr. Watts, for the Council, accepted that the Councillors for Stoke Ward did not agree with the Borough Council and supported the Boundary Commission's proposals. The Borough Council's scheme was for three wards represented by three councillors each, whereas the Commission's proposals envisage five wards with varying representation of one to three councillors per ward.

Mr. Stewart, Secretary and Agent for the Guildford Conservative Association, expressed his Association's concern about the proposed new Christchurch Ward. He emphasised the geographical features of the area and that the railway line effectively divided Polling Districts H and P.

Councillor Burgess, on behalf of the three councillors of Stoke Ward, supported the Boundary Commission's proposals for the new Christchurch Ward. There was a greater geographical affinity and stronger local ties between the electorate of Polling Districts P and H than existed between Polling District P and the remainder of the Stoke Ward as at present constituted. He suggested that I should visit the area.

#### Recommendation A

After considering all the arguments and having visited the area I recommend that Merrow and Burpham should form a single ward, represented by three councillors. There are existing cultural, educational and social links between the two communities. There are two adequate and well used routes across the railway line, and while I appreciate the submissions put forward by the Burpham Community Association I do not consider there are sufficiently convincing reasons for the separation of the area into two wards.

#### Recommendation B

I recommend that the Boundary Commission's draft proposals for the creation of the new two member Christchurch Ward, the three member Stoke Ward and the two member Holy Trinity Ward be adopted. It is understandable that the Borough Council would wish to preserve the status quo, but this is a major review of the electoral

arrangements for the Borough, and the opportunity should be taken to remove anomalies and rationalise the ward boundaries so far as possible. Polling District P is basically a private residential area, and it is separated by open spaces, the by-pass and the river from the remainder of Stoke Ward. It is an area similar to and having a community of interest with the adjoining Polling District H. It is not felt that the existence of the railway line presents any real barrier to the association together of these two polling districts into a new Christchurch Ward.

#### THE PILGRIMS, SHALFORD AND TONGHAM WARDS

The Borough Council's draft scheme for this area provided for a single member Tongham Ward, a single member Shalford Ward and a two member The Pilgrims Ward. In the Borough Council's scheme the parishes of Compton and Artington were included in The Pilgrims Ward.

The Boundary Commission's draft proposals differ from those of the Borough Council in that the parishes of Compton and Artington were transferred from the proposed The Pilgrims Ward to be added to Shalford Ward. Consequent upon this transfer it was proposed that the representation of The Pilgrims Ward should be reduced from two to one councillor, and that of the Shalford Ward increased from one to two councillors.

At the local meeting there was virtual unanimity that the parishes of Compton and Artington should form part of The Pilgrims Ward and not be grouped with Shalford Ward. It was generally felt that the Borough Council's draft scheme for the Tongham, Shalford and The Pilgrims Wards was right.

Mr. Oliver, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Cross and Mr. Taylor, representing Seale and Tongham Parish Council, supported the Borough Council's proposals. Reference was made to the geographical position of Tongham and the anticipated development in that area, and it was felt that Tongham should form a separate ward and have separate representation, as proposed by the Boundary Commission and the Borough Council.

Mr. Olver, Clerk to the Artington Parish Council, and Mrs. Bond, representing Compton Parish Council, made strong representations that Compton and Artington should

be included in The Pilgrims Ward and not with Shalford. Their views were supported by Mr. Thatcher of Wanborough Parish Council and Mr. May of the Compton and Artington Branch of the Conservative Association.

Mr. Stewart, who also represented his wife who is the councillor for Shalford Ward, emphasised that all these representations had been made from a genuine community interest. No such interest existed between Compton and Artington and the existing Shalford Parish. The two areas were separated by a wide band of agricultural land, and the River Wey. Shalford was urban and residential in character compared with the more rural aspect of Compton and Artington, and they had no common purpose or common problems. Compton and Artington should remain with their neighbouring rural villages in The Pilgrims Ward.

Mr. Gould, Clerk to the Shalford Parish Council, did not agree that Shalford was wholly urban in nature, but he conceded that Shalford had no affinity with Compton and Artington. They welcomed the Boundary Commission's draft proposal for Shalford to be a two member ward.

Mr. Watts, for the Borough Council, said that the 1979 forecast electorate for the Tongham Ward is 1,761. The Council felt that Tongham should be a single member ward, that Compton and Artington should be included in The Pilgrims two member ward, and that Shalford Ward should be represented by one member. If you are to have a one member ward you should have a ward which is compact and the Borough Council's proposals for Tongham Ward and Shalford Ward met this criteria.

#### Recommendation C

I recommend that the proposals in the Borough Council's draft scheme for this area be adopted and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals be varied accordingly to provide for (i) A single member Tongham Ward (ii) The parishes of Compton and Artington to be included in a two member The Pilgrims Ward and (iii) a single member Shalford Ward.

I was impressed by the strong local support for the Borough Council's scheme, and while the Commission's draft proposals have the merit of more equal arithmetical representation, I am satisfied that the local ties, community of interest and geographical factors outweigh this consideration.

FRIARY AND ST NICOLAS WARD

The Borough Council's draft scheme proposed that Friary and St. Nicolas should be a single ward electing three councillors, and this was accepted by the Boundary Commission and included in the Commission's draft proposals. Councillor Marks, who is a councillor for the Friary and St. Nicolas Ward, wrote to the Commission on the 24th January 1975 proposing that the ward should be divided into a one member Friary Ward and a separate two member St. Nicolas Ward. He felt that although at present linked together and in the town centre, they are really split by the town centre and have little in common.

At the meeting Councillor Marks re-iterated his suggestion and drew an analogy with the Boundary Commission's proposal to divide Merrow and Burpham into two wards. Miss Claydon, representing the Friary and St. Nicolas Branch of the Conservative Association, also felt that there was no community of interest between Friary and St. Nicolas. The clubs were not the same, the schools were not the same, and there was no geographical affinity between the two communities.

Mr. Watts stated that the Borough Council felt that Friary and St. Nicolas was a compact ward with a community of interest. The proposals for the combined ward under local government reorganisation were logical and sensible, and there were no grounds for dividing the area into two wards. He pointed out that the estimated 1979 electorate for the combined ward was 6,694 and that if the ward was divided as proposed it would result in an electorate for St. Nicolas of 3,613, represented by two council members, and an electorate for Friary of 3,081 with one council member.

Recommendation D

I recommend that the Boundary Commission's draft proposals for a three member Friary and St. Nicolas Ward should be confirmed. I accept the Borough Council's arguments in favour of the combined ward, and whilst I attach some weight to the contrary views expressed, I do not feel that they constitute sufficient justification for dividing the ward into two.

Yours faithfully,

*Thomas Ford*

---

ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
Mr. B.E. Twyford	Chief Executive, Guildford Borough Council	Millmead House, Guildford.
Mr. D.T. Watts	Clerk and Solicitor, Guildford Borough Council	" " "
Mr. R.N. Olver	Clerk to the Artington Parish Council	10 Woodlands Road, Guildford.
Mrs. D.M. Bond	Compton Parish Council	The Dykeries, Compton.
Mr. M.R. Whybrow	Surrey County Council	County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames.
Mr. R.K. Burgess	Borough Councillor for Stoke Ward and representing the three Councillors of Stoke Ward	Friary, 49 Pewley Hill, Guildford.
Mr. R.T. Oliver	Chairman of the Seale & Tongham Parish Council	22 North Side, The Cardinals, Tongham.
Mr. W.J. Taylor	Seale and Tongham Parish Council	56 North Side, The Cardinals, Tongham.
Mr. C. Stagg	Seale and Tongham Parish Council	10 Bower Road, Boundstone, Farnham.
Mr. A.P. Cross	Seale and Tongham Parish Council	32 Poyle Road, Tongham.
Miss M.C. Claydon	Friary and St Nicholas Branch of the Guildford Conservative Association	6 The Court, Buryfields, Guildford.
Mrs. M.J. Theobald	Burpham Community Association	35 Burpham Lane, Burpham.
Mrs. G. Oldfield	Burpham Community Association	296 London Road, Burpham.
Mr. R.G. Marks	Borough Councillor for Friary and St Nicholas Ward	9 Blackwell Avenue, Guildford.
Mr. A.C. Thatcher	Wanborough Parish Council	Little Hay, Flexford Road, Normandy.
Mr. S. Pinn	Surrey Daily Advertiser	Martyr Road, Guildford.
Mr. D.J. Stewart	Agent for Guildford Conservative Association & also representing his wife Mrs. E. Stewart, Councillor for the Shalford Ward	9 High Street, Guildford.
Mr. A.C. May	Compton and Artington Branch of the Guildford Conservative Association	Sandyknowe, Compton.
Mr. J.D. Gould	Clerk to the Shalford Parish Council	8 Highfield, Summersbury, Shalford.

## BOROUGH OF GUILDFORD : NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBERS OF COUNCILLORS

NAME OF WARD	NO OF COUNCILLORS
ASH	3
ASH VALE	2 5
CLANDON AND HORSLEY	3 8
CHRISTCHURCH	2 10
EFFINGHAM	1 11
FRIARY AND ST NICOLAS	3 14
HOLY TRINITY	2 16
LOVELACE	1 17
MERROW AND BURPHAM	3 20
NORMANDY	1 21
ONslow	3 22
PIRBRIGHT	1 24
SEND	2 27
SHALFORD	1 28
STOKE	3 31
STOUGHTON	3 34
THE PILGRIMS	2 36
TILLINGBOURNE	2 38
TONGHAM	1 39
WESTBOROUGH	3
WORPLESDON	3 45

## BOROUGH OF GUILDFORD: DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

## STOUGHTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP meets the Woking to Guildford railway thence southwards along the said railway to the railway bridge at the southeastern end of Woodbridge Hill thence north westwards along the said bridge and Woodbridge Hill to Worplesdon Road thence northwestwards along the said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of the property No 1 Worplesdon Road thence southwestwards along the said boundary to the rear boundaries of the properties No's 8 to 38 Aldershot Road, thence northwestwards along the said boundaries and northwards along the rear boundaries of the properties No's 6 to 8 Wendy Crescent to the southern boundary of Stoughton Recreation Ground, thence westwards and northwestwards along the southern and western boundaries of the said recreation ground to the southwestern boundary of the property No 46 Fentum Road, thence northwestwards along the said boundary to its end thence northwestwards in a straight line to the northwestern boundary of the property No 53 Fentum Road thence northeastwards along the said boundary to the rear boundaries of the properties No's 45 and 43 Northway thence northwestwards along the said boundaries and eastwards along the southern boundary of the property No 41 Northway to the rear boundaries of the properties No's 41 to 3 Northway thence northwestwards along the said boundaries to the eastern boundary of the property No 23 Shepherd's Lane, thence northwestwards along the said boundary to Shepherd's Lane, thence generally westwards along the said lane and continuing in a straight line to the southern boundary of the property No 53 Rydes Hill Road thence northwestwards along the said boundary and the southern boundary of the property No 36 Rydes Avenue to a point where it meets the eastern

boundary of Worplesdon CP thence northeastwards and following the said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### STOKE WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP meets the River Wey; thence southwards and southwestwards along said river and the River Wey Navigation to Stoke Road; thence southwards along the said road to the Kingston upon Thames to Guildford Railway; thence northwestwards and following the said railway to the Guildford to Woking railway; thence northwards along said railway to the eastern boundary of Stoughton Ward; thence northwards along said boundary to the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### CHRISTCHURCH WARD

Commencing at the point where the Kingston upon Thames to Guildford Railway meets the eastern boundary of Stoke Ward; thence northwards along said ward boundary to a point opposite the northeastern boundary of Parcel No 6900 as shown on 1:2500 Ordnance Survey Plan TQ 0051-0151 Edition 1965; thence southeastwards to and along the said boundary and continuing along the northeastern boundary of Parcel No 7179 to a point opposite Grass Road; thence northeastwards and southeastwards to and along the said road, and continuing along the road that is adjacent to the southwestern boundaries of Parcel Nos 0074 and 1858 to London Road; thence southwestwards along said road to a point opposite the southwestern boundaries of the George Abbot School for Boys and the George Abbot Girls School; thence southeastwards to and along said boundaries to the Kingston upon Thames to Guildford Railway; thence southwestwards and following said railway to a point opposite the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 27 to 1 Merrow Woods; thence southeastwards to and along the said boundaries to Merrow Copse; thence southeastwards along Merrow Copse to

Boxgrove Lane; thence southwestwards along said lane to a point opposite the main entrance to Boxgrove County Primary School; thence southeastwards to and along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of said school to the western boundary of the property known as Langley, Horseshoe Lane West; thence southeastwards along said boundary to a point being the prolongation northeastwards of the northern boundary of the property No 10 Greencroft; thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 21 to 43 Meads Road; thence southeastwards along the said boundaries and continuing along the eastern boundary of the property No 143 Epsom Road to Epsom Road; thence southwestwards along the said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the property No 128 Epsom Road; thence southeastwards and southwestwards to and along the eastern and southern boundaries of the said property to the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 2 to 88 Down Road; thence southeastwards along the said boundaries and continuing in a straight line to the western boundary of the property No 23 Downside Road; thence southwestwards and following the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 21 to 1 Downside Road and in prolongation thereof to a point opposite the western boundary of Merrow Downs; thence northwestwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundaries of the properties Browning's Down to No 31 Warren Road; thence southwestwards and following the said boundaries to Tangier Road; thence northwestwards along said road to a point opposite the rear boundaries of the properties No 27 to 15 Warren Road; thence southwestwards and following said boundaries, the northern boundary of the property No 15 Albury Road, across said road and continuing along the northern boundary of the property No 14 Albury Road and the rear boundary of the property No 13 Warren Road to Cross Lanes; thence northwestwards along Cross Lanes to Cranley Road; thence northeastwards along said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the property No 13 Cranley Road; thence northwestwards to and along said boundary and continuing along the rear boundaries of Nos 10 to 22 Hilgay and in prolongation thereof to the Kingston upon Thames to Guildford Railway; thence southwestwards and following said railway to the point of commencement.

MERROW AND BURPHAM WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP meets the northern boundary of the district, thence southeastwards and following the said northern boundary to the western boundary of Send CP, thence southeastwards along the said boundary to the western boundary of West Clandon CP, thence southwards and following the said boundary to the northern boundary of Albury CP, thence southwestwards along the said northern boundary and the northern boundary of St Martha CP to the western boundary of Merrow Down, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of the property No 23 Downside Road, thence northwestwards in a straight line to the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 88 to 2 Down Road, thence northwestwards along the said boundaries to the southeastern boundary of the property No 128 Epsom Road, thence northeastwards and northwestwards along the said southeastern and the eastern boundary of the said property to Epsom Road, thence northeastwards along the said road to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the property No 143 Epsom Road, thence northwestwards to and along the said boundary and continuing along the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 43 to 21 Meads Road to the northern boundary of the property No 10 Greencroft, thence northeastwards along the said property and in prolongation thereof to the western boundary of the property known as Langley, Horseshoe Lane West, thence northwestwards along the said boundary to the southern boundary of the Boxgrove County Primary School, thence northeastwards, northwestwards and southwestwards along the southern, eastern and northern boundaries of the said school to the school's main entrance, thence northwestwards to Boxgrove Lane, thence northeastwards to Merrow Copse, thence northwestwards along Merrow Copse to a point opposite the rear boundaries of the properties Nos 1 to 27 Merrow Woods, thence northwestwards along the said boundaries and continuing to the eastern boundary of Christchurch ward, thence northeastwards and following the said boundary to the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP, thence northeastwards and following the said boundary to the point of commencement.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200

201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300

#### WESTBOROUGH WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP meets the southern boundary of Stoughton Ward thence southeastwards and following the said southern boundary to the western boundary of Stoke Ward; thence southwards along the said boundary to the Guildford to Aldershot railway thence generally northwestwards and westwards along the said railway to the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP thence northwestwards and following the said boundary to the point of commencement.

#### ONSLow WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Worplesdon CP meets the southern boundary of Westborough Ward thence eastwards and following the said southern boundary to the Woking to Guildford railway thence southeastwards along the said railway to a point opposite the rear boundaries of the properties No's 31 to 1 Rupert Road thence southwestwards to and along the said boundaries and the western boundary of the Guildford Park Evangelical Church, to Guildford Park Road; thence northwestwards along the said road to Madrid Road thence southwestwards along the said road to Agraria Road thence southeastwards along the said road to Farnham Road thence southwestwards along the said road to the access road leading to Sunnydown School, thence southeastwards along the said road to the eastern boundary of Compton CP thence southwestwards and following the said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Worplesdon CP, thence northeastwards and following the southern and eastern boundaries of the said parish to the point of commencement.

FRIARY AND ST NICOLAS WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Compton CP meets the southern boundary of Onslow Ward, thence northeastwards and following the southern and eastern boundaries of the said ward to the southern boundary of Stoke Ward thence northeastwards and following the said boundary and the southern boundary of Christchurch Ward to London Road thence southwestwards along the said road to Alexandra Terrace thence northwestwards along the said terrace to a point opposite the southern boundary of Alexandra House thence southwestwards to and along the said boundary and in continuation thereof to the eastern boundary of the property No 11 Eastgate Gardens, thence southeastwards and southwestwards along the eastern and southern boundaries of the said property, and thence northwestwards in a straight line to the southern boundary of Guildford Royal Grammar School thence southwestwards and following the said boundary to the High Street, thence southwestwards along the said street to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the property No 193 High Street; thence northwestwards and southwestwards to and along the eastern and northern boundaries of the said property and in prolongation thereof to Pannells Court; thence southeastwards and southwestwards along Pannells Court to North Street; thence northwestwards and southwestwards along the said street to Onslow Street; thence northwestwards along the said street to Bridge Street; thence southwestwards along the said street to the River Wey; thence southeastwards and southwestwards along the said river to the northern boundary of Artington CP; thence northwestwards and following the said boundary and the eastern boundary of Compton CP to the point of commencement.

HOLY TRINITY WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Artington CP meets the eastern boundary of Friary and St Nicolas Ward; thence northeastwards and following the said eastern boundary to the southern boundary of Christchurch Ward; thence northeastwards and following the said southern boundary to the southern boundary of Merrow Ward; thence eastwards and following said southern boundary to the northern boundary of St Martha CP; thence southwestwards and following the said boundary to the northern boundary of Shalford CP; thence southwestwards and following the said boundary to the eastern boundary of Artington CP; thence northwestwards and following the said boundary to the point of commencement.

TILLINGBOURNE WARD

Comprises the Parishes of Albury, St Martha and Shere.

CLANDON AND HORSLEY WARD

Comprises the Parishes of East Clandon, East Horsley, West Clandon and West Horsley.

EFFINGHAM WARD

Comprises the Parish of Effingham.

LOVELACE WARD

Comprises the Parishes of Ockham, Ripley and Wisley.

SHALFORD WARD

Comprises the Parish of Shalford

THE PILGRIMS WARD

Comprises the Parishes of Puttenham, Shackleford, Artington, Compton, Wanborough and the Seale and Sands Ward of the Parish of Seale and Tongham.

TONGHAM WARD

Comprises the Tongham Ward of the Parish of Seale and Tongham.

ASH WARD

Comprises the South East and South West Wards of the Parish of Ash.

ASH VALE WARD

Comprises the North Ward of the Parish of Ash.

NORMANDY WARD

Comprises the Parish of Normandy.

PIRBRIGHT WARD

Comprises the Parish of Pirbright.

WORPLESDON WARD

Comprises the Parish of Worplesdon.