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Elmbridge Borough Council has drawn up a warding pattern which it believes takes into account the objectives of the Electoral Review, achieving a balance between recognition of community links and the need to achieve a balanced electorate across sixteen wards.

The Borough of Elmbridge has some significant 'barriers to movement' including the Queen Elizabeth II Reservoir and Island Barn Reservoir; rivers; railway lines; major roads and geographical natural boundaries including Esher, Arbrook and West End Commons and Oxshott Heath. The Council has taken these into account in defining ward boundaries as far as possible, acknowledging the difficulty of crossing the features in parts of the Borough.

The Council constituted a cross party Electoral Review Member Working Group in order to consider the development of the Council’s submission on future Council Size and Warding Pattern. The Working Group was constituted with 7 Members (4 Conservative, 2 Residents’ Associations and 1 Liberal Democrat.) The Working Group has met to consider and inform the different stages of the Electoral Review and made recommendations to the Cabinet and Council. Copies of the minutes of the meetings of the Working Group are set out in Appendix I. The minutes record the considerations of the Working Group and give an indication of the extent to which the Council’s submission has evolved over the past 18 months.

A series of area based Member meetings were held during March and April 2014, in order to engage all Members in the Electoral Review and, specifically, seek early views as to key aspects of importance in the drawing up of a future warding pattern. Notes of these meetings were made, attached at Appendix II, and contributed to the development of the warding pattern.

The Council reviewed its electoral cycle in light of the Electoral Review and the implications of maintaining its policy of elections-by-thirds. As part of the electoral cycle review, the Council undertook a public consultation to determine whether there was a desire to change to all-out elections. A report on the proposals was considered by the Council on 17 November 2014. The Report and Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 17 November 2014 are attached at Appendix III.

The Council chose not to change the current arrangements of elections-by-thirds. In doing so, the Council was aware that retaining elections-by-thirds would limit the available options to a warding pattern of wards of an equal size in terms of electorate, with each ward represented by three Councillors.

A proposed warding pattern was considered by the Working Group on 4 March 2015. Following some amendments made by the Working Group, the revised warding pattern was considered by a Special Meeting of the Council on 16 March 2015. Again, following some amendments, the Council’s preferred warding pattern was agreed for formal submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and is attached at Appendices IV -VII.
The report and Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 16 March 2015 are attached as Appendix VIII.

This document summarises the approach adopted by the Council for the Boundary Review of Elmbridge and sets out the basis on which the Council's final submission has been drawn up. All supporting evidence is included with this submission.
2. Review of Electoral Cycle

The Council currently has 60 councillors who represent 22 wards across the Borough (population 131,500). Each ward is represented by either two or three councillors and each councillor is elected for a four year term of office. Borough Elections are by thirds, whereby every three out of four years a third of councillors stand for election / re-election.

The Council considered a possible move to whole council elections whereby all seats on the Council would be elected at the same time once every four years. A public consultation was undertaken during October 2014 seeking views in this regard. The Council took the opportunity to consider a possible move to whole council elections, which would enable greater flexibility of ward configuration in the future. If approved, the earliest date to hold whole council elections would be May 2016.

At the Special Meeting of the Council on Monday 17 November 2014, the motion to adopt an electoral cycle of whole council elections every four years was not carried and accordingly, the Council agreed to retain the current arrangements of Borough Elections by thirds. In accordance with the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s guidance that Electoral Reviews would start with a presumption in favour of delivering a uniform pattern of three Member wards where authorities had elections by thirds, the Council’s size submission proposed 48 councillors, being a figure divisible by three.

The Council agreed not to change the current arrangements of elections-by-thirds. In doing so, the Council was aware that retaining elections-by-thirds would limit the available options to a warding pattern of wards of an equal size in terms of electorate, with each ward represented by three Councillors.

The report and Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council held on 17 November 2014 are attached as Appendix III.
The Council size business case submission was drawn up by the cross-party Electoral Review Member Working Group before being presented to the Council in December 2014. The submission was agreed by the Council and submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England and is published on its website as part of the related Electoral Review documentation.

The Council agreed a proposal to seek a reduction in the number of Borough Councillors for Elmbridge from 60 to 48, representing a reduction of some 20%. In reaching this conclusion, the Council took into account a number of factors, including the workload of Councillors, the changing way in which people could access information and the governance arrangements of the Council. The Council considered that such a reduction would be appropriate whilst maintaining a robust approach to effectively discharging its responsibilities and retaining democratic representation and accountability.

In February 2015, the Boundary Commission recommended that it was minded to support a reduction in the number of Members from 60 to 48 and accordingly launched its public consultation on warding patterns.
4. Electoral Projections

As part of the Electoral Review of the Borough of Elmbridge, the Council has been requested to submit current electorate figures and a projection of the electorate in 2020. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England, in considering the changes to the existing ward boundaries, must have regard to the likely increase, decrease or movement in electorate over a five year period from the making of its final recommendations. The Commission has confirmed that, for the purposes of this review, the population projections should extend to the year 2020.

In drawing up this report, the Council has followed the guidance set out in the Commission’s publication “Electorate Forecasts – A Guide for Practitioners”. The Council has therefore sought to achieve an accurate forecast through the use of different sources of evidence, including the electoral register, planning data on future residential developments within the Borough and data available through the Office for National Statistics.

To calculate the anticipated increase in electorate, the Council has analysed the number of dwellings expected to be completed between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2020 as established by the Council’s Land Availability Assessment 2014. The anticipated electorate increase arising from new developments has been added to the figures for the Borough electorate in May 2013 together with a factor to take into account an underlying increase in population levels, calculated using data available from the Office for National Statistics.

The Council’s Electorate Predictions proforma was submitted to the Boundary Commission in January 2015 and is published on its website with related Electoral Review documentation.

The Council has used the predicted electorate figures (updated as at 30 March 2015) in conjunction with GIS mapping to provide accurate population figures for the wards, enabling the Council to develop a warding pattern based on 16 three-Member wards. The Council sought to draw up a warding pattern which achieved ward electorate sizes as close as possible to the average size for a single ward (6,173 - the earlier figure of 6,240 as set out in the Electoral Projection documentation previously submitted to the Boundary Commission, has since been updated and reflects the position as at 30 March 2015) and thereby ensuring each Councillor represented a similar number of electors, appropriate for both the individual Councillor’s workload and for access opportunity for the elector to their elected representative.
5. Proposed Warding Pattern

The Boundary Commission's consultation on the warding pattern, inviting proposals and comments, started on 3 February to 31 March 2015. The Boundary Commission provided the Council with posters promoting the consultation, which were then sent to local libraries and centres, residents groups and other local bodies (Appendices IX-XI). Once the Council received confirmation that the Boundary Commission had adopted a Council size of 48 Councillors for the consultation, it started drafting a warding pattern proposal in line with the requirements set out in the Local Government Boundary Commission for England guidance.

Proposals for a future warding pattern were considered by the Electoral Review Member Working Group and by the full Council. Amendments were made by both the Electoral Review Member Working Group and by the Council. In addition, consideration was given to the name of each of the sixteen wards.

A report on the warding pattern proposal was submitted to a meeting of Council on 16 March 2015. The report to the Council and the Minutes of the Meeting are attached at Appendix VIII. In addition, a webcast of the Council Meeting is available to view: http://www.elmbridge.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/168816

The Council's preferred Warding Pattern submission includes:

- the Warding Pattern map, Appendix IV;
- the names of each of the sixteen wards, Appendix V;
- the polling district / road list for each of the sixteen wards, Appendix VI;
- explanation of the rationale for the proposed ward boundaries on a ward by ward basis, Appendix VII;
- the supporting evidence contained in this document that has informed the development of the Council’s preferred Warding Pattern submission.

The Ward Boundary proposals contained herein set out information supporting the proposed Wards. To meet the Boundary Commission objectives, each Ward needs to have a forecast Electorate within 10% of the average electorate of 6,173 (the earlier figure of 6,240 as set out in the Electoral Projection documentation previously submitted to the Boundary Commission has since been updated and reflects the position as at 30 March 2015). A GIS format Borough Ward map has been included with this submission.

The table on the following page summarises the proposed new Borough Wards and reports on the variance of Electors in each Ward from the average of 6,173 electors. As already outlined, future population growth and future development have been taken into account, as set out in the Electorate Projection information previously submitted to the Boundary Commission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Number</th>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1</td>
<td>Claygate</td>
<td>5,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2</td>
<td>Oxshott and Stoke D’Abermon</td>
<td>6,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>Cobham and Downside</td>
<td>5,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>Weybridge Brooklands</td>
<td>5,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>Weybridge Riverside</td>
<td>6,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6</td>
<td>Hersham Village</td>
<td>6,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7</td>
<td>Oatlands &amp; Ashley Park</td>
<td>6,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8</td>
<td>Walton Central</td>
<td>6,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 9</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
<td>6,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 10</td>
<td>Molesey Riverside</td>
<td>6,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 11</td>
<td>Molesey South</td>
<td>6,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12</td>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
<td>6,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 13</td>
<td>Long Ditton</td>
<td>6,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 14</td>
<td>Weston Green and Hinchley Wood</td>
<td>6,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 15</td>
<td>Esher and Hersham Riverside</td>
<td>6,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 16</td>
<td>Rydens</td>
<td>5,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisional Total Electorate (as at 30 March 2015) 98,770
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Election Review Member Working Group

REPORT of a meeting held on 14 October 2013

Members of Working Group:

* A.C. Kelly (Chairman)
* B.J.F. Cheyne
* C.J. Elmer
* C.R. Sadler
* A. Davis
* J. O’Reilly
* Mrs. J.R. Turner

* Denotes attendance

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference, as set out in the agenda, were noted by the Working Group.

2. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2013/14

The Working Group appointed A.C. Kelly as Chairman for the Municipal Year 2013/14.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. TECHNICAL GUIDANCE FOR ELECTORAL REVIEW – PREPARING A BUSINESS CASE

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s Technical Guidance for Electoral Reviews was noted by the Working Group.

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE COUNCIL’S FORMAL DECISION MAKING STRUCTURE

It was acknowledged that the business case would need to demonstrate a fit for purpose formal decision making structure.

The Working Group discussed the Council’s current formal decision making structure as well as principles for a future structure on the basis of 48 elected Members of the Council.

RESOLVED that, notwithstanding the separate Overview & Scrutiny Committee review currently being undertaken in respect of considering returning to the Committee system, it was acknowledged that the Council’s current formal decision making structure was fit for purpose on the basis of 48 elected Members of the Council, subject to the following:
(i) the membership of all committees etc would be proportionately reduced and similarly, the Cabinet be comprised of a proportionately reduced number of Portfolio Holders; and

(ii) possible alternative arrangements for development management, specifically in respect of alternative arrangements for an East, North and West Area Planning Sub-Committee, be further explored to provide a more inclusive and flexible approach for the future, having regard to 48 elected Members of the Council.

6. DISCUSSION ON ELECTORAL WARDS FOR THE FUTURE

The Working Group discussed Electoral Wards for the future, being mindful of the Boundary Commission’s guidance and also having regard to the following principles:

(a) Council’s decision in April 2013 not to move to all out Elections means each Ward would need to be comprised of three elected Members;

(b) any Warded Parishes, i.e. Claygate, would need to be retained;

(c) electoral variances in each Ward should not be greater or less than 10% of the average for that Local Authority area;

(d) take into account future projected electorate for each Ward whilst satisfying (c) above; and

(e) whilst not within the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s guidance, the preferred approach of having regard to the Parliamentary Constituency boundary when determining electoral wards, would be preferable. This was to enable the electorate in a specific Ward to vote for one and the same Member of Parliament, and to reflect the current arrangements for the two Parliamentary constituencies within the Borough of Elmbridge.

The Working Group were provided with a First Draft proposed 16 Ward configuration, on the basis of 48 elected Members of the Council as a starting point for consideration.

RESOLVED that

(a) proposals be worked up on the basis of 48 elected Members of the Council;

(b) Members of the Working Group be invited to submit initial comments to officers on the First Draft proposed 16 Ward map, to be considered at the next meeting of the Working Group, prior to wider circulation and consultation of all Members; and

(c) information be circulated to the Members of the Working Group regarding the total electorate and number of elected Members for each Surrey Borough/District.
The meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. and concluded at 7.12 p.m.

A.C. KELLY
Chairman

Officers in attendance

R. Moran - Chief Executive
Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Ms. A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Electoral Review Member Working Group

REPORT of a meeting held on 19 December 2013

Members of Working Group:

* A.C. Kelly (Chairman)
* B.J.F. Cheyne
* C.J. Elmer
* C.R. Sadler
* A. Davis
* J. O’Reilly
* Mrs. J.R. Turner

(Mrs. C. Elmer was also in attendance.)

* Denotes attendance

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES

Whilst one Member raised a query about the Minutes, no amendments were proposed and the Minutes of the meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group (ERMWG) held on 14 October 2013 were agreed as a correct record, and signed by the Chairman.

3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND – CONFIRMATION OF ELECTORAL REVIEW TIMETABLE

The Working Group received a letter from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England confirming the Electoral Review timetable for Elmbridge, which was noted.

4. FURTHER DISCUSSION ON ELECTORAL WARDS FOR THE FUTURE

Further to the last meeting of the Working Group and comments received from Working Group Members on future arrangements, a revised map of proposed Electoral Wards was considered at this meeting.

A couple of further suggestions were put forward, including that Wheatley’s Eyot together with the areas the Spelthorne side of the River Thames be incorporated into the same Ward.

Members acknowledged that the Council was currently undertaking the Annual Canvass of Electors and electoral figures would not be confirmed until February. In addition, Members were updated that Planning Officers had been requested to provide electorate forecast figures for a five year period in respect of proposed future Wards. This information was expected to be available in January.
considered appropriate to have the next meeting of the Working Group in January, when these figures could be updated and to ensure that required electorate variations would be met. Members then felt that arrangements to consult all other Members of the Council on proposed Electoral Wards for the future should be undertaken at the next meeting.

**AGREED** that the next meeting of the Working Group be scheduled for January 2014 to consider (i) proposed Electoral Wards for the future in relation to updated Canvass figures, together with electorate forecast figures; and (ii) establish the process for consulting all other Members of the Council on proposed Electoral Wards for the future.

---

The meeting commenced at 4.00 p.m. and concluded at 5.15 p.m.

A.C. KELLY
Chairman

**Officers in attendance**

Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Ms. A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Electoral Review Member Working Group

REPORT of a meeting held on 29 January 2014

Members of Working Group:

* A.C. Kelly (Chairman)
* B.J.F. Cheyne
* C.J. Elmer
* C.R. Sadler
* A. Davis
* J. O'Reilly
* Mrs. J.R. Turner

* Denotes attendance

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group held on 19 December 2013 were agreed as a correct record, and signed by the Chairman.

3. FURTHER DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED ELECTORALWARDS FOR THE FUTURE AND CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS WITH MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ON PROPOSED ELECTORALWARDS FOR THE FUTURE

Further to the last meeting of the Working Group and comments received from Working Group Members on future arrangements, a revised map of proposed Electoral Wards was considered at this meeting.

Some further suggestions were put forward. Councillor Sadler specifically requested that St. John’s should be included in Ward #10 rather than Ward #11 and that the Willowhayne Drive area should be included in Ward #11 rather than in Ward #10 and asked that this be acknowledged in the Minutes. A further suggestion was for Weylands to be included in Ward #10 rather than Ward #6. Councillor Mrs. Turner advised that she had received a considerable number of calls from residents relating to future wards.

Members acknowledged that the Council was currently undertaking the Annual Canvass of Electors and electoral figures would not be confirmed until February. Members noted the electorate forecast figures, provided by the Planning Team, in respect of proposed future Wards.

Further to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s Electoral Review timetable, that was submitted to the last meeting of the Working Group, Members noted that a preliminary meeting for the Boundary Commission to meet Group Leaders and the Council as a whole, would be arranged for June/July 2014.
Members considered it appropriate for initial meetings with other Members of the Council to be progressed on an area basis to enable smaller groups. Councillor Cheyne was also keen for the Council as a whole to meet, to look at proposals in the round and this was envisaged to happen at a later stage in the process.

AGREED that

(a) following completion of the current Annual Canvass, electorate figures for each Ward, together with electorate figures by street, be circulated to the Members of the Working Group;

(b) the Chairman and Officers hold meetings in March with Members by way of the following area groups, in order to update Members on the considerations to date of the Working Group, within the context of Council decisions and the Boundary Commission Guidance and Review Timetable:

Cobham / Oxshott / Stoke D’Abernnon
Hersham / Esher / Claygate
Hinchley Wood and the Dittons
Molesey
Walton
Weybridge and Oatlands;

with comments being reported back to a subsequent meeting of the Working Group.

- - - - - - -

The meeting commenced at 6.30 p.m. and concluded at 8.15 p.m.

A.C. KELLY
Chairman

Officers in attendance

Ms. B. Greenstein  -  Head of Executive and Member Services
Ms. A. Mammous  -  Electoral Services Manager
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
Electoral Review Member Working Group

REPORT of a meeting held on 29 July 2014

Members of Working Group:

* A. Kelly (Chairman)
* B.J.F. Cheyne
* C.J. Elmer
* C.R. Sadler

δ A. Davis
* J. O’Reilly
* Mrs. J.R. Turner

* Denotes attendance
δ Denotes Substitution

(Mrs. S. R. Kapadia was present as a temporary substitute for A. Davis.)

(Mrs. C.J. Cross and Mrs. C. Elmer were also present.)

1. APPPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2014/15

The Member Working Group appointed A. Kelly as Chairman for the Municipal Year 2014/15.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29 JANUARY 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. CONSULTATION WARD MEETING NOTES

The Member Working Group received the notes from the consultation meetings held with all Ward Groups below, in March 2014:

- Weybridge, Oatlands and St. George’s Hill Wards;
- Hersham, Esher and Claygate Wards;
- Walton Wards;
- Cobham, Stoke D’Abernon and Oxshott Wards;
- Hinchley Wood, The Dittons and Weston Green Wards; and
- Molesey Wards.

In respect of the notes of the Hinchley Wood, The Dittons and Weston Green Wards meeting, and in particular the third bullet point on page 10 of the agenda, a Member indicated that stronger representations had been given in respect of retaining the centre of Long Ditton, including Fleece Road shops, within the same ward.
RESOLVED that the reports of the Consultation Ward meetings be received and noted.

5. MEETING WITH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND – VERBAL UPDATE

The Working Group noted that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England had allocated Monday 1 September 2014 as the date the Lead Commissioner would visit the Council to address all Members of the Council as to the Electoral Review process.

The Boundary Commission had further confirmed that Sir Tony Redmond would be the Lead Commissioner for the Elmbridge Electoral Review. Sir Tony Redmond would meet all Group Leaders prior to the session with all Members of the Council. He would be happy to answer any questions that Members might have.

RESOLVED that the update be noted.

6. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS GOING FORWARD IN RESPECT OF THE COUNCIL SIZE SUBMISSION

In terms of development of the Council’s submission, it was recognised that the future Ward configuration would not necessarily be coterminous with the Parliamentary Boundary to the West of the Borough.

Members also discussed the appropriate size of the Council going forward. Whilst there was not unanimous agreement by the Members present, together with acknowledging that all Political Groups would have differing views, it was confirmed that for the basis of the submission, the future number of councillors should be 48. It was recognised that the Boundary Commission would ultimately determine the future Council size as part of the Electoral Review process. The majority of Members present felt that a Council size of 48 Members would be an appropriate reduction in number from the current 60 councillors, on the basis that it was a sufficient number to maintain delivery of the Council’s functions and that, as the Working Group had previously considered, the Council’s formal decision making structure was fit for purpose. Members were aware that in authorities that have elections by thirds, the LGBCE was required to start Electoral Reviews of authorities with a presumption in favour of delivering a uniform pattern of three Member wards. Any departure from such a pattern would need to be justified on a ward by ward basis, having regard to statutory criteria. As the Council currently had six two Member wards, an alternative option should the Council wish to retain a mixed pattern of wards, would be to move to a cycle of whole council elections.

Representatives from each of the Political Groups present at the meeting indicated that they supported that the Council should again explore a public consultation exercise in respect of reconsidering, at a Special Meeting of the Council, a possible move to whole council elections. Accordingly, Officers were requested to establish the required process and progress arrangements in this regard.
The meeting commenced at 5.30 p.m. and concluded at 6.57 p.m.

A. KELLY
Chairman

Officers in attendance

Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
Electoral Review Member Working Group
REPORT of a meeting held on 4 November 2014

Members of Working Group:

* A. Kelly (Chairman)
* B.J.F. Cheyne
* C.J. Elmer
* C.R. Sadler
* A. Davis
δ J. O’Reilly
* Mrs. J.R. Turner

* Denotes attendance
δ Denotes Substitution

(δ Mrs. C. Elmer was present as a temporary substitute for J. O’Reilly.)
(M. Bennison, Mrs. C.J. Cross and Mrs. D.M. Mitchell were also present.)

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29 JULY 2014

The Minutes of the meeting of the Member Working Group held on 29 July 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. ELECTORAL REVIEW – COUNCIL SIZE SUBMISSION TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (LGBCE)

The Member Working Group considered the draft Council Size Submission that had been drafted having taken account of the steer from Members through previous meetings of this Working Group; previous Cabinet and Meetings of the Council; together with the LGBCE’s Technical Guidance that the Member Working Group had considered at their meeting held on 14 October 2013.

Following a full discussion, the following amendments were agreed:

- Page 5 – include the addition of gambling licensing to the Council’s service responsibilities;
- Page 5 – clarification that all three of the FTE comparator figures do not include fixed term contracts;
- Page 6 – remove the reference to Members not needing to attend a meeting to observe proceedings when the webcasting facility is introduced, as some Members considered they would still prefer to attend in person to observe;
- Page 9 – similarly to the point above, remove reference to Members not necessarily needing to travel to observe meetings that are webcast and thereby freeing up their time;
• Page 11- with regard to the table of benchmarking information with other Surrey Districts, remove the column with population figures and instead insert a column showing the electorate per councillor for each authority;
• Page 12 – in the sixth bullet point, add the words ‘of need’ immediately after the words ‘there are pockets’;
• Page 14 – add commas to the list of figures showing age structure;
• Pages 14 & 15 – the figures indicating the types of household tenure did not total the figure given for total households in the Borough, so the figures would be checked and clarified;
• Page 17 – with regard to the table illustrating how Elmbridge compares to the rest of England, it was noted that the key referred to two ** which did not appear in the table, so this would be checked and clarified;
• Page 26 – with reference to the paragraph relating to Officer Delegation, the last sentence referring to there being scope to further extend delegation arrangements, be deleted.

Members were reminded of the Electoral Review timetable as updated by the Boundary Commission on 1 September 2014 at their session open to all Members of the Council. It was anticipated that the next meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group would be held in the New Year, once the view of the Boundary Commission had been received as to Council size.

For Members’ interest, and following the recent public consultation exercise on the Council’s Electoral Cycle, the Head of Executive & Member Services updated the headline figure results. Further details and analysis would be submitted to the Special Meeting of the Council on 17 November 2014.

RESOLVED that subject to the inclusion of the Working Group’s amendments listed above, the draft Council Size Submission be submitted to the meeting of the Cabinet on 19 November 2014 for consideration.

The meeting commenced at 4.00 p.m. and concluded at 5.13 p.m.

A. KELLY
Chairman

Officers in attendance

Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Miss A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
Electoral Review Member Working Group
REPORT of a meeting held on 11 February 2015

Members of Working Group:
* A. Kelly (Chairman)
  * B.J.F. Cheyne
  * C.J. Elmer
  * C.R. Sadler
  * A. Davis
  * J. O’Reilly
  * Mrs. J.R. Turner

* Denotes attendance
(Mrs. R.M. Bruce, Mrs. C.J. Cross, Rachael.I. Lake, Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon, S.J. Selleck, Mrs. M. Sheldon and Mrs. T. Shipley were also present.)

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES OF THE ELECTORAL REVIEW MEMBER WORKING GROUP MEETING HELD ON 4 NOVEMBER 2014

The Minutes of the meeting of the Member Working Group held on 4 November 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. ELECTORAL REVIEW – LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (LGBCE) - COUNCIL SIZE AND CONSULTATION ON NEW PATTERN OF ELECTORAL WARDS FOR ELMBRIDGE.

The Head of Executive and Member Services referred to the LGBCE being minded to recommend that 48 Councillors should be elected to Elmbridge Borough Council in future. The Commission was now inviting proposals from the Council, interested parties and members of the public on a pattern of electoral wards to accommodate those Councillors. The consultation runs from 3 February 2015 until 31 March 2015.

The following documents from the LGBCE were attached to the Agenda for ease of reference and had already been circulated to all Members of the Council:
- Letter to the Chief Executive;
- A copy of the new release;
- Elmbridge poster.

Accordingly the Working Group were invited to consider the approach to developing a preferred pattern of electoral wards.
A Member of the Working Group referred to the LGBCE press release (previously circulated to all Members) and it was requested that further clarification be sought from the Commission on the matter of a presumption of a uniform pattern of 3-Member Wards and where Borough Elections were held by thirds and any scope for special circumstances. The Head of Executive and Member Services undertook to ascertain the view of the LGBCE and update all Members accordingly.

The LGBCE consultation period runs from 3 February and concludes on 31 March 2015. The Working Group were keen to engage all Members of the Council in the process and particularly to be invited to make initial comments on future warding patterns. Accordingly the following time table was agreed:

- Up to end of 22 February – all Members of the Council be invited to make initial comments on future warding patterns;
- 23 – 27 February – as far as possible taking account of initial comments, draw up proposed future warding pattern of 16 x three-Member Wards;
- 4 March meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group to consider warding pattern;
- Period for any further adjustments. A further meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group may be required during this period;
- A Special Meeting of the Council be arranged (date to be confirmed) to consider future warding patterns for Elmbridge;
- The Council’s preferred option of warding patterns to be submitted to the Commission by the close of the consultation period on 31 March.

Members will recall that the Working Group previously requested that meetings be arranged to engage all Members of the Council in early deliberations on the Electoral Review and possible future warding patterns. These Ward Member Meetings were held last March in area groupings to facilitate smaller discussion groups, which were led by the Chairman of the Electoral Review Member Working Group, together with the Chief Executive and relevant officers. The notes of those meetings would be resent to all Members for ease of reference.

RESOLVED that:

a) the Head of Executive and Member Services seek further clarification from the Commission on the matter of a uniform pattern of 3-Member Wards and where Borough Elections were held by thirds and that all Members be updated accordingly;

b) the Head of Executive and Member Services communicates the timescales for the opportunity to comment together with proposed further meetings within the consultation period to all Members of the Council;

c) the Head of Executive and Member Services re-circulate the notes of the ward based Member meetings held in March 2014 to all Members of the Council for ease of reference; and
d) The Head of Executive and Member Services circulate the most up to date Borough street list indicating the number of electors and properties in each street, to all Members of the Council.

The meeting commenced at 5.00 p.m. and concluded at 5.54 p.m.

A. KELLY
Chairman

Officers in attendance

Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Miss A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
Electoral Review Member Working Group

REPORT of a meeting held on 4 March 2015

Members of Working Group:

* A. Kelly (Chairman)

δ B.J.F. Cheyne  * A. Davis
δ C.J. Elmer  * J. O’Reilly
* C.R. Sadler  * Mrs. J.R. Turner

* Denotes attendance
δ Denotes substitution

(δ Rachael I. Lake and J.G. Sheldon were present as temporary substitutes for C.J. Elmer and B.J.F. Cheyne respectively.)

(Ms. R. Ahmed, Mrs. R.M. Bruce, N.C. Cooper, Mrs. E. Cooper, G.P. Dearlove, S.J. Foale, R. Green, P.M. Harman, Mrs. S.R. Kapadia, Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon, S.J. Selleck, Mrs. M.C. Sheldon and Mrs. T. Shipley were also present.)

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES OF THE ELECTORAL REVIEW MEMBER WORKING GROUP MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2015

The Minutes of the meeting of the Member Working Group held on 11 February 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. ELECTORAL REVIEW – LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (LGBCE) - CONSULTATION ON NEW PATTERN OF ELECTORAL WARDS FOR ELMBRIDGE.

Members were asked to consider the development of the Council’s preferred option of a new pattern of electoral wards for Elmbridge.

The Head of Democratic Services outlined the progress to date in respect of the Electoral Review. This included the Council’s decision on its Electoral cycle and Council size submission.

Following the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) confirmation of being minded to recommend that Elmbridge Borough Council has 48 Councillors going forward, a proposed warding pattern had been drawn up. The proposed warding pattern had been informed by the Boundary Commission’s guidance, the Council’s decision on Electoral cycle and as far as possible, Members’ views and suggestions.
Initial comments and maps that had been received from Members since the last meeting of the Working Group were circulated with the Working Group Agenda papers.

At the request of the Working Group at their last meeting, the Head of Democratic Services had sought further clarification from the LGBCE on the presumption of a uniform pattern of 3-Member Wards where Borough Elections were held by thirds. The Head of Democratic Services informed Members that the Boundary Commission had reaffirmed their position in this regard. Accordingly, this had been immediately updated to all Members of the Council.

The Head of Democratic Services explained to Members that the proposed new pattern of electoral wards for Elmbridge had reflected as far as possible, the ward based meetings and the technical guidance from the LGBCE.

The Chairman invited comments from the Electoral Review Member Working Group. Members expressed concerns with regard to the proposals for Hinchley Wood, due to being unable to get from one part of the Ward to the other, and Walton-on-Thames, with regards to the electorate of Ward #8 considering the projected future development.

The following amendments were proposed by Councillor A. Kelly:

(a) Move from Ward #8 to Ward #9: Dunsmore Road, Franklyn Road (part), Cambridge Road and River Walk.

(b) Move from Ward #13 to Ward #14: Greenways and Manor Road South.

(c) Move from Ward #14 to Ward #13: Claygate Lane, Severn Drive and Hill Rise.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor A. Davis:

(a) Move from Ward #12 to Ward #11: Island Barn Reservoir.

Councillor J. O’Reilly then proposed a vote on the amendments proposed by Councillor A. Kelly and Councillor A. Davis. Councillor C.R. Sadler requested a recorded vote, whereupon there voted:

In support of the amendments:


Against the amendments:

A. Davis, C.R. Sadler and Mrs. J.R. Turner

A vote was then taken on the draft proposals as amended. Councillor C.R. Sadler requested a recorded vote, whereupon there voted:
In support of the draft proposals as amended:


Against the draft proposals as amended:

A. Davis, C.R. Sadler and Mrs. J.R. Turner

The Chairman declared the draft proposals, as amended, to be agreed.

Councillor J. O'Reilly expressed his support for the draft proposal and acknowledged the difficult task Officers had undertaken on behalf of the Electoral Review Member Working Group.

Members discussed names for the proposed Wards with some suggestions being received. It was agreed that the Special Meeting of the Council on 16 March 2015 should decide on Ward names.

The Chairman informed Members that the current consultation on Ward arrangements concludes on 31 March 2015. The LGBCE would publish draft recommendations for a future Warding pattern for Elmbridge in June 2015, whereby a second period of public consultation would run during the Summer. It was agreed that a further meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group would be held as soon as possible after the draft proposals are published.

AGREED that

(a) The proposed future Warding pattern for Elmbridge Borough Council, as amended, be submitted to the Special Meeting of the Council to be held on 16 March 2015 for consideration.

(b) The proposed Ward names be considered at the Special Meeting of the Council to be held on 16 March 2015.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 p.m. and concluded at 7:28 p.m.

A. KELLY
Chairman

Officers in attendance

Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Democratic Services
Miss A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
Mrs. P. Phillips - Committee and Member Services Officer
Electoral Review - Initial Consultation Meetings with Members

Weybridge, Oatlands and St George’s Hill Wards

18 March 2014

Members Present: A.C. Kelly (Chairman of the Electoral Review Member Working Group), B.J.F. Cheyne and G.P. Dearlove

CONSIDERATIONS RAISED

1. Context Provided

The meeting was provided with background context, including the Council’s formal decisions to date in respect of the Electoral Review; the requirements of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and their timescales, as well as future Ward number considerations including Claygate Parish Ward and Ward electoral averages.

2. Number of Councillors for the Future

The meeting was supportive of 48 Councillors.

3. Procedural Considerations

The meeting acknowledged that the formal process would be undertaken by the LGBCE going forward. The review for a proportionate reduction of Members across all Committees was acknowledged. The meeting also felt that the current Area Planning Sub-Committee arrangements were appropriate.

4. Future Ward Map Considerations

- Claygate / +/- 10% / Parliamentary considerations were acknowledged;
- Members were happy with the three Member Ward Model, thereby not taking account of Parliamentary Constituencies;
- Weybridge Members were keen to observe the natural boundary of the railway line in Weybridge as a Ward Boundary, if possible;
- The relationship between TB and UC and the potential swap to counter balance numbers, and recognise natural communities, was highlighted;
- Members accepted there was a need to be flexible around the margins of Oatlands Park Ward;
- The top of Monument Hill could potentially be included in Oatlands Park Ward; and
- Members felt that the Town Centre in Weybridge needed to be maintained as its own community identity.

The meeting commenced at 4.00 p.m. and concluded at 4.45 p.m.
**Officers Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Moran</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. B. Greenstein</td>
<td>Head of Executive and Member Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss. A. Mammous</td>
<td>Electoral Services Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electoral Review - Initial Consultation Meetings with Members

Hersham, Esher and Claygate Wards

24 March 2014


CONSIDERATIONS RAISED

1. **Context Provided**
   
   The meeting was provided with background context, including the Council’s formal decisions to date in respect of the Electoral Review; the requirements of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and their timescales, as well as future Ward number considerations including Claygate Parish Ward and Ward electoral averages.

2. **Number of Councillors for the Future**
   
   The meeting was supportive of 48 Councillors.

3. **Procedural Considerations**
   
   The meeting acknowledged that the formal process would be undertaken by the LGBCE going forward. The review for a proportionate reduction of Members across all Committees was acknowledged. The meeting also felt that the current Area Planning Sub-Committee arrangements were appropriate.

3. **Ward Map Considerations**
   
   - Claygate / +/- 10% / Parliamentary considerations were acknowledged;
   - Potential Walton/Hersham Ward name changes were not considered by Members to be of key importance;
   - No concerns were raised about crossing the Parliamentary Boundary;
   - Hersham Members raised no concerns regarding whether Painshill Park was included in another Ward;
   - Hersham Members were strongly in favour of Whiteley Village remaining in Hersham; and
   - The possibility of the whole of Burhill Golf Course being maintained in one Ward was acknowledged.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 p.m. and concluded at 3.07 p.m.

**Officers Present**

R. Moran - Chief Executive
Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Miss. A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
Electoral Review - Initial Consultation Meetings with Members
Cobham, Stoke D’Abernon and Oxshott Wards

28 March 2014

Members Present: A.C. Kelly (Chairman of the Electoral Review Member Working Group) and Mrs. J. Fuller.

CONSIDERATIONS RAISED

1. Context Provided
   The meeting was provided with background context, including the Council’s formal decisions to date in respect of the Electoral Review; the requirements of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and their timescales, as well as future Ward number considerations including Claygate Parish Ward and Ward electoral averages.

2. Number of Councillors for the Future
   The meeting was supportive of either 48 or 45 Councillors.

3. Procedural Considerations
   The meeting acknowledged that the formal process would be undertaken by the LGBCE going forward. The review for a proportionate reduction of Members across all Committees was acknowledged. The meeting also felt that the current Area Planning Sub-Committee arrangements were appropriate.

4. Ward Map Considerations
   - Claygate / +/- 10% / Parliamentary considerations were acknowledged;
   - Fairmile Lane should be maintained within one Ward, and any potential boundary amendment should be taken south into Stoke Road to facilitate the whole of Fairmile Lane in the same Ward – it was commented that there was no issue with splitting Stoke Road;
   - Sandy Lane should also be maintained within one Ward;
   - Due consideration should be given to any Ward name amendments, especially with regard to the ‘Fairmile’ name; and
   - It was considered that residents of Cobham Fairmile tended to gravitate toward Oxshott.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 p.m. and concluded at 2.27 p.m.

Officers Present

R. Moran - Chief Executive
Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Miss. A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
Ms. J. Bolton - Committee and Member Services Officer
Electoral Review - Initial Consultation Meetings with Members

Hinchley Wood, The Dittons and Weston Green Wards

28 March 2014

Members Present: A.C. Kelly (Chairman of the Electoral Review Member Working Group), Mrs. R.M. Bruce, B. Fairbank, Mrs. S.R. Kapadia, Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon, Mrs. T. Shipley and Mrs. J.R. Turner.

CONSIDERATIONS RAISED

1. **Context Provided**

   The meeting was provided with background context, including the Council’s formal decisions to date in respect of the Electoral Review; the requirements of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and their timescales, as well as future Ward number considerations including Claygate Parish Ward and Ward electoral averages.

2. **Number of Councillors for the Future**

   Members raised a concern that a reduction in Councillor numbers could increase the case work load for Members, especially as the population of the Borough continued to grow. There was strong support for core community identities which the meeting did not want to see diminished. One Member raised a concern that any reduction in the number of Councillors may reduce the opportunity for a cross-section of the community to be represented on the Council. Accordingly, the meeting did not support a reduction in the overall number of Councillors. It was acknowledged by that the Electoral Review Member Working Group was minded for 48 Councillors.

3. **Procedural Considerations**

   The meeting acknowledged that the formal process would be undertaken by the LGBCE going forward. The review for a proportionate reduction of Members across all Committees was acknowledged. The meeting also felt that the current Area Planning Sub-Committee arrangements were appropriate.

4. **Ward Map Considerations**

   - Claygate / +/- 10% / Parliamentary considerations were acknowledged;
   - Concern was raised over the potential reduction of Wards in the Borough, from 22 to 16;
   - Reference was made by the meeting to historic gerrymandering in other areas of the country, although it was noted that the LGBCE would be undertaking the review;
   - Loss of identity of communities was commented on, especially as Elmbridge was made up of many small towns and had no single, dominant centre;
- Members discussed the recorded vote of the decision to seek an electoral review at the Council meeting held on 10 April 2013, and felt that it would be useful if the LGBCE was updated about the result of the recorded vote;
- Members did not support any demise of the current Hinchley Wood Ward and wished to retain, as far as possible, existing communities to ensure community identity and cohesion; and
- The centre of Long Ditton was supported, including Fleece Road shops, with these areas remaining in the same Ward.

Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon wished it to be noted that her comments were made on behalf of her fellow Thames Ditton Members, and Mrs. J.R. Turner wished it to be noted that her comments were made on behalf of her fellow Hinchley Wood Residents’ Association Member.

The meeting commenced at 3.30 p.m. and concluded at 4.50 p.m.

**Officers Present**

- R. Moran - Chief Executive
- Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
- Miss. A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
- Ms. J. Bolton - Committee and Member Services Officer
Electoral Review - Initial Consultation Meetings with Members

Walton Wards

28 March 2014

Members Present: A.C. Kelly (Chairman of the Electoral Review Member Working Group), Ms. B.A. Cowin, Mrs. C. Cross, C.J. Elmer, N.J. Luxton and C.R. Sadler.

CONSIDERATIONS RAISED

1. **Context Provided**

   The meeting was provided with background context, including the Council’s formal decisions to date in respect of the Electoral Review; the requirements of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and their timescales, as well as future Ward number considerations including Claygate Parish Ward and Ward electoral averages.

2. **Number of Councillors for the Future**

   The meeting acknowledged population growth in the Borough, and that some services responsibilities had been lost whilst other services responsibilities had been gained, for example Licensing. The meeting was provided with comparative information on other Surrey authorities, including electorate and total number of Members. Furthermore, the meeting acknowledged the public expectation to reduce the number of Councillors, as it had been raised by a former councillor at the Let’s Talk Elmbridge: Prospects and Priorities meeting in January 2014. The Residents’ Association Group commented that they did not wish to reduce the overall number of Councillors. Some Members, however, were supportive of 48 Councillors going forward.

3. **Procedural Considerations**

   The meeting acknowledged that the formal process would be undertaken by the LGBCE going forward. The review for a proportionate reduction of Members across all Committees was acknowledged. The meeting also felt that the current Area Planning Sub-Committee arrangements were appropriate.

4. **Ward Map Considerations**

   - Claygate / +/- 10% / Parliamentary considerations were acknowledged;
   - Members were keen for the Willowhayne Drive area to remain part of Walton Central Ward;
   - There was strong opposition to Field Common becoming part of a Molesey Ward;
   - There was a preference to keep St John’s Estate in one Ward;
   - Members maintained a preference for Walton North Ward and Walton Ambleside Ward to be joined together and include Field Common;
• The schooling arrangements for Fieldcommon were noted, as the children of the area attended both Walton Oak and Grovelands schools which were in Walton Wards; and
• Members felt it was important to avoid splitting roads between different Ward boundaries.

The meeting requested that a list displaying the average number of electorate per Councillor for each Surrey district be circulated to all Members.

The meeting commenced at 11.30 a.m. and concluded at 12.27 p.m.

Officers Present

R. Moran - Chief Executive
Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Executive and Member Services
Miss. A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
Ms. J. Bolton - Committee and Member Services Officer
Electoral Review - Initial Consultation Meetings with Members

Molesey Wards

31 March 2014


CONSIDERATIONS RAISED

1. Context Provided

The meeting was provided with background context, including the Council’s formal decisions to date in respect of the Electoral Review; the requirements of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and their timescales, as well as future Ward number considerations including Claygate Parish Ward and Ward electoral averages.

2. Number of Councillors for the Future

Members raised a concern that a reduction in Councillor numbers could increase the case work load for Members, especially as the population of the Borough was increasing. Members already had a number of increased responsibilities, for example through the upcoming CIL meetings. Accordingly, the meeting did not support a reduction in the overall number of Councillors. It was acknowledged that the Electoral Review Member Working Group was minded for 48 Councillors.

3. Procedural Considerations

The meeting acknowledged that the formal process would be undertaken by the LGBCE going forward. The review for a proportionate reduction of Members across all Committees was acknowledged. The meeting also felt that the current Area Planning Sub-Committee arrangements were appropriate. One Member commented that Government legislation, for example the new Permitted Development rights, could reduce the number of planning applications to be determined by the Area Planning Sub-Committees. The meeting acknowledged that the Constitutional Review Member Working Group was the appropriate route for this discussion, and it was further noted that the electoral review being undertaken by the LGBCE was not a cost-saving exercise.

4. Ward Map Considerations

- Claygate / +/- 10% / Parliamentary considerations were acknowledged;
- There was strong opposition to Field Common becoming part of a Molesey Ward;
- Geographical boundaries should determine Ward boundaries as far as possible, for example Molesey Heath, which was the natural geographic boundary located at the South of Molesey
- Natural boundaries, for example the railway line, river, and Seven Hills
Road, should be maintained; and

- The next map model should not include the polling districts as it was felt this information had less relevance to Ward boundaries, and would unclutter the map.

Given the consequence of elections by thirds or all-out elections and the implications on the electorate-Member ratio / number of Members per Ward, some Members considered it appropriate for the Council to reconsider its decision in April 2013 whereby it was agreed to retain elections by thirds.

An all-out election that would follow an electoral review would have negligible cost implications, and should the Council be minded to move to all out elections going forward, significant savings could be achieved, as set out in the report that went to Council on 10 April 2013, and would enable more flexibility with regard to two Member Wards.

The meeting commenced at 3.00 p.m. and concluded at 4.00 p.m.

**Officers Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Moran</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. B. Greenstein</td>
<td>Head of Executive and Member Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss. A. Mammous</td>
<td>Electoral Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. J. Bolton</td>
<td>Committee and Member Services Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Members are asked to review and determine the Borough Electoral Cycle, having regard to the recent public consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections. In considering the matter, the Council may, by special resolution of a Meeting of the Council and by two-thirds of the Members voting on it, resolve to move from the current scheme of elections by thirds, to whole Council elections.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT

THE COUNCIL DETERMINE, HAVING CONSULTED INTERESTED PERSONS, WHETHER TO MOVE TO AN ELECTORAL CYCLE OF WHOLE COUNCIL ELECTIONS EVERY FOUR YEARS, WITH THE EARLIEST EFFECTIVE DATE BEING MAY 2016.

REPORT:

1. Background

At the Meeting of the Council held on 10 April 2013, Members considered whether to review the current Electoral Cycle with a view to undertaking consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections. It was highlighted that following consultation and consideration of the results, the Council may, by special resolution of a Meeting of the Council and by two-thirds of the Members voting on it, resolve to move from the current scheme of elections by thirds, to whole Council elections. At that time, the Council agreed to retain the status quo.

The full report submitted to that Meeting of the Council is reproduced at Appendix A to this report for ease of reference. Paragraph 6 of that report sets out the implications in respect of Electoral Review. A separate report on the Electoral Review was submitted to the same Council Meeting where it was agreed that the Council’s request for an electoral review to be undertaken by the Local...
Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), be confirmed, in order to consider reducing the number of Members of the Council.

As Members will be aware, the LGBCE have since confirmed that the Council has been included in the 2014/15 Electoral Review programme.

As the early stages of the Electoral Review have progressed and specifically following the LGBCE’s presentation to all Members at the Civic Centre on 1 September 2014 to outline the Commission’s Review process, a number of Members considered it timely for the Council to again look at the Council’s Electoral Cycle.

It is pertinent to highlight that in authorities that have elections by thirds and following recent changes to legislation, the LGBCE is required to start Electoral Reviews of authorities with a presumption in favour of delivering a uniform pattern of three Member wards. Any departure from such a pattern would need to be justified on a ward by ward basis, having regard to statutory criteria. As the Council currently has six two-Member wards, an alternative option should the Council wish to retain a mixed pattern of wards, would be to move to a cycle of whole council elections.

Sir Tony Redmond, the Lead Commissioner for the Elmbridge Electoral Review, confirmed to Members at the presentation that the LGBCE will start with a presumption of three-Member wards based on the Council’s current Electoral Cycle of elections by thirds.

At the Meeting of the Council held on 1 October 2014, Members further considered the matter. The Council agreed to undertake a public consultation exercise regarding whether the Council move from the current electoral cycle by thirds, to full Borough Council Elections every four years, which would enable greater flexibility of Ward configuration for the future.

The report submitted to the Meeting of the Council on 1 October 2014 is also attached at Appendix ‘A’ for the sake of completeness. The two Council reports attached at Appendix ‘A’ contain all the previously documented considerations as to any change of Electoral cycle, together with financial implications etc.

2. Public Consultation Exercise

In accordance with the decision of the Council at its Meeting held on 1 October to undertake a public consultation exercise, the wording of the consultation material was agreed in consultation with Group Leaders. The public consultation ran from 7 October to 2 November 2014.

Residents of the Borough were encouraged to respond to the consultation via:

- The Council’s website together with front page headline advert banner;
- Council’s Face Book Page and Twitter accounts;
- Leaflets available at the Civic Centre, Centres and Libraries across the Borough;
- Council Noticeboards across the Borough;
via the resident’s panel group; and
through Councillors encouraging their ward residents; and
through the local media.

In addition, consultation was undertaken directly with the following:

- Members of Parliament;
- Surrey County Council;
- Runnymede Borough Council;
- Members of the Council;
- Claygate Parish Council;
- Local political parties.

The leaflet used in the consultation, as referred to above, is attached at Appendix ‘B’.

3. Results of the Public Consultation Exercise

A total of 601 responses to the public consultation were received either by way of website or returned leaflet.

308 supported (A) retaining the existing system of Borough Elections by thirds; and
282 supported (B) change to whole council elections once every four years.
11 responses had not indicated a preference.

The literal comments received to the public consultation are attached at Appendix ‘C’.

In addition, a letter and two e-mails via the Council’s ‘contact us’ facility were received in response to the consultation and are attached (with personal details redacted) at Appendix ‘D’.

Out of the 601 responses received either by way of website or returned leaflet, the following breakdown was received:

509 via the website; and
92 by returned leaflet.

4. Decision-Making Process

This is a specially convened Council Meeting called pursuant to Section 33(3) Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The meeting follows consultation with interested persons, in accordance with Section 33(2). The Council may only resolve to move to ‘Whole Council’ elections if there is a two-thirds majority of Members voting on it. For the purposes of calculating a two-thirds majority, the total votes cast will be the sum of votes for and against a proposal to move to ‘Whole Council’ elections. An abstention is to abstain from voting and is not a vote on the resolution for the purposes of the calculation.
Financial implications:
As referred to in the report and detailed in Appendix ‘A’.

Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Legal implications:
To comply with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, as amended in Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011.

The legal process to effect change to the electoral cycle (including consultation and special resolution) is set out in this and the earlier reports attached at Appendix ‘A’.

Equality Implications:
The Returning Officer has responsibility to run fair, open, effective and transparent Elections.

Risk Implications:
Risks associated with the running of elections are captured in the Risk Register regularly submitted to the Electoral Commission and are referred to in the report.

Community Safety Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Principal Consultees:
Chief Executive and Returning Officer and Head of Legal Services.

Background papers:
None

Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix A – Previous Council reports on Review of Borough Electoral Cycle;
Appendix B – Consultation Leaflet;
Appendix C – List of literal comments received in response to consultation;
Appendix D – Letters / Contact Us replies received in response to consultation;
Appendix E – Consultation responses by Ward and Polling District.

Contact details:
Head of Executive and Member Services – 01372 474174
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Members are asked to re-consider whether to review the current Electoral Cycle with a view to undertaking public consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections. In the event of such consultation and consideration of the results, the Council may, by special resolution of a Meeting of the Council and by two-thirds of the Members voting on it, resolve to move from the current scheme of elections by thirds, to whole Council elections.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT

(A) IN VIEW OF CONSIDERATION OF THE COUNCIL’S FUTURE WARD CONFIGURATIONS, MEMBERS DETERMINE WHETHER TO UNDERTAKE A PUBLIC CONSULTATION EXERCISE REGARDING THE COUNCIL BEING MINDED TO MOVE FROM THE CURRENT ELECTORAL CYCLE BY THIRDS TO FULL BOROUGH COUNCIL ELECTIONS EVERY FOUR YEARS; AND

(B) SUBJECT TO (A) ABOVE, THE PRE-NOTIFIED SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL BE HELD ON MONDAY 17 NOVEMBER AT 7.15 P.M. TO CONSIDER THE RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION AND FORMALLY DETERMINE THE COUNCIL’S ELECTORAL CYCLE.

REPORT:

1. Electoral Review Implications

At the Meeting of the Council held on 10 April 2013, Members considered whether to review the current Electoral Cycle with a view to undertaking consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections. It was highlighted that following consultation and consideration of the results, the Council may, by special resolution of a Meeting of the Council and by two-thirds of the Members voting on it, resolve to move from the current scheme of elections by thirds, to whole Council elections. At that time, the Council agreed to retain the status quo.
The full report submitted to that Meeting of the Council is reproduced at Appendix 1 to this report for ease of reference. Paragraph 6 of that report set out the implications of any Electoral Review. A separate report on the Electoral Review was submitted to the same Council Meeting where it was agreed that the Council’s request for an electoral review to be undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), be confirmed, in order to consider reducing the number of Members of the Council.

As Members will be aware, the LGBCE have since confirmed that the Council has been included in the 2014/15 Electoral Review programme.

As the early stages of the Electoral Review have progressed and specifically following the LGBCE’s presentation to all Members at the Civic Centre on 1 September 2014 to outline the Commission’s Review process, a number of Members considered it timely for the Council to again look at the Council’s Electoral Cycle.

It is pertinent to highlight that in authorities that have elections by thirds and following recent changes to legislation, the LGBCE is required to start Electoral Reviews of authorities with a presumption in favour of delivering a uniform pattern of three Member wards. Any departure from such a pattern would need to be justified on a ward by ward basis, having regard to statutory criteria. As the Council currently has six two-Member wards, an alternative option should the Council wish to retain a mixed pattern of wards, would be to move to a cycle of whole council elections.

Sir Tony Redmond, the Lead Commissioner for the Elmbridge Electoral Review, confirmed to Members at the presentation that the LGBCE will start with a presumption of three-Member wards based on the Council’s current Electoral Cycle of elections by thirds.

The Review can proceed on the basis of current arrangements, or alternatively, Members may prefer to give further consideration to the matter of potentially moving to whole council elections every four years, which would enable greater flexibility of Ward configuration for the future.

2. Financial Implications

The previous report to Council, reproduced at Appendix 1 to this report, sets out in detail at paragraph 3, the financial implications and cost savings of moving from the current Electoral cycle by thirds to full council elections.

The following table provides an indicative summary of costs, taking account of any contributions from external parties. It should also be noted that the occurrence of Borough By-Elections would be greater in a cycle of full Council Elections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Out Elections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBC total</strong></td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£345,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Thirds Elections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£7,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBC total</strong></td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£154,000</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£95,000</td>
<td>£594,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into account the opportunity to share fixed costs in combined elections, the table shows that over a 6 year period all out elections will cost Elmbridge Borough Council approximately £345,000 (an average of £58,000 p.a.) while elections by thirds will cost approximately £594,000 (an average of £99,000 p.a.). This gives an average annual difference of £42,000 p.a. If the table is extrapolated over a ten year period the difference rises to £50,000 p.a.

3. **Public consultation**

Should Members be minded to undertake a public consultation exercise, the consultation would take place during the month of October through the Council’s website and other interested parties such as Surrey County Council and Claygate Parish Council would be advised. A Special Meeting of the Council would be held on Monday 17 November 2014 at 7.15pm in the Council Chamber, to receive the results of any public consultation and to formally determine any change to the Council’s electoral arrangements. This would enable any resultant decision to be included into the Electoral Review timetable.

**Financial implications:**

As set out in the body of the report.
Environmental/Sustainability Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Legal implications:
To comply with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, as amended in Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011.

The legal process to effect change to the electoral cycle (including consultation and special resolution) is set out in this and the earlier report.

Equality Implications:
The Returning Officer has responsibility to run fair, open, effective and transparent Elections.

Risk Implications:
Risks associated with the running of elections are captured in the Risk Register regularly submitted to the Electoral Commission and are referred to in the report.

Community Safety Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Principal Consultees:
Chief Executive and Returning Officer and Head of Legal Services.

Background papers:
None

Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix 1 - Review of Borough Electoral Cycle – Council Report, 10 April 2013

Contact details:
Head of Executive and Member Services – 01372 474174
Committee: COUNCIL

Date of meeting: 10 April 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Review of Borough Electoral Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Officer:</td>
<td>Chief Executive and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Executive &amp; Member Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Holder:</td>
<td>Leader – Councillor John O’Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to Council Priorities:</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt information:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated status:</td>
<td>For Resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Members are asked to consider whether to review the current Electoral Cycle with a view to undertaking consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections. Following consultation, the Council may, by special resolution of a Meeting of the Council and by two-thirds of the Members voting on it, resolve to move from the current scheme of elections by thirds, to whole Council elections.

**RECOMMENDED:** THAT

(A) THE COUNCIL CONSIDER WHETHER IT IS MINDED TO MOVE TO WHOLE BOROUGH COUNCIL ELECTIONS ONCE EVERY FOUR YEARS AND IF SO, THAT THE RELEVANT CONSULTATION BE UNDERTAKEN, WITH A REPORT BACK TO AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL; AND

(B) ANY MOVE TO WHOLE BOROUGH COUNCIL ELECTIONS BE IMPLEMENTED TO EITHER COINCIDE WITH THE SAME YEAR AS ANY ELECTORAL REVIEW OUTCOMES OR, IN THE ABSENCE OF SUCH A REVIEW, AT A DATE TO BE DETERMINED FOLLOWING THE CONSULTATION.

**REPORT:**

Legislative Context

Elmbridge Borough Council has operated under a system of elections by thirds since its formation in the Municipal Year 1973/74. Currently, each Member serves a term of four years, producing a four yearly cycle of elections, allowing for Borough Council elections to be held in three out of four years and Surrey County Council elections to be held every fourth year. Ward boundary changes took place for the 2000 Borough Elections, leading to the whole Council being elected that year but no full Council Elections have been held since that time.

A move to whole council elections would mean that Borough Council elections would be held once every four years, rather than in three out of every four years.
Legislation introduced by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enables the Council to resolve to change its electoral cycle. Prior to this, the process of changing the electoral cycle involved seeking approval from the Secretary of State. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (s.33(5)(b)) gave Councils the opportunity to decide this issue themselves, subject to certain restrictions as to the years the whole Council Elections could be held in. However, the Localism Act 2011 has now amended the provisions of the 2007 Act so that Councils have the opportunity to determine their electoral cycle and when the whole Council elections would first be held.

If a Council wishes to move from thirds to whole Council elections, it must:

- Consult such persons as it thinks appropriate on the proposed change;
- Convene a special meeting of the Council;
- Pass a Council resolution to change by a two thirds majority of those voting;
- Publish an explanatory document on the decision and make this available for public inspection; and
- Give notice to the Electoral Commission.

2. Parish Councils

A move to 4 yearly elections will affect any parish councils, which within Elmbridge, specifically applies to Claygate Parish Council. The Parish Council would be consulted as part of the consultation process.

At present parish councils elect every 4 years and elections are generally combined with the Borough Election in that year. The next scheduled Claygate Parish Council Election will be held in 2015.

If the Council resolve to move to whole council elections every four years, any parishes with elections that fall in the years in the cycle when there will no longer be Borough elections would have to meet the whole of the cost of their individual elections in the same way they would at a by-election.

The 2007 Act enables the Council to make an Order to alter the years of the ordinary election of parishes so that they can coincide with a move by a Council to elections by whole Council. The Order can make transitional provision for the retirement of parish councillors at different times than would otherwise apply during that transitional period.

3. Financial Savings

A move to whole Council elections would lead to a financial saving for the Council in the three years where there was no Borough election. As there is no Borough election in 2013/14, there is currently only budgetary provision for two by-elections and therefore the budget strategy for 2014/15 includes budgetary provision for a one third Borough election. Should the Council move to whole Council elections the budget provision required would be £178,000 every 4 years, rather than an annual cost in 3 out of 4 years of £151,000. As currently, where the Borough
Elections coincide with other elections, any fixed costs incurred would be reduced by the level of contributions from external parties such as Central Government and the County Council.

A move to whole Council elections would also better utilise current resources to deal with the increase in the number of other elections e.g. Police & Crime Commissioner Elections, by phasing peak periods. In addition to the undertaking of elections, the three permanent FTE election staff would be required as currently established to carry out electoral registration, particularly Individual Electoral Registration which is to be introduced in 2014 and will impact heavily on the electoral registration function.

By-Elections are more likely to occur under a 4 year system because vacancies would need to be filled at the time they occur, rather than where for example a resignation is generally dealt with in the more frequent May Borough Elections, as currently. There are of course occasions when By-elections are held at other times of the year, depending on when the vacancy occurs. The estimated cost for a stand alone By-election is £10,000. An annual budgetary provision should be provided to allow for two By-Elections. In the year of whole Borough Elections, it would only be necessary to provide for one By-election.

Over a four year period, the cost of running the Borough elections would, excluding any contributions from external parties, reduce from £473,000 for three annual one third elections to £248,000 for one annual whole Borough election (taking account of budgetary provision for By-elections), producing an estimated saving over the three year period of up to £225,000.

4. The Electoral Commission

The Electoral Commission undertook a review of electoral cycles in 2003 with the report entitled “The cycle of local government elections in England”.

The Electoral Commission, having taken into account the evidence and arguments presented during the consultation process, concluded that a pattern of whole council elections for all local authorities in England would provide a clear, equitable and easy to understand electoral process that would best serve the interests of local government electors. The Electoral Commission therefore recommends that each local authority in England should hold whole council elections, with all councillors elected simultaneously, once every four years. However, this is currently a matter for local choice.
5. **Election Cycles Across Surrey**

At present, there are a variety of election cycles throughout the County and the summary position is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>District or Borough</th>
<th>How elected</th>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>No. of Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmbridge</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Thirds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>All out</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>All out</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23 plus one parish meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>All out</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate and Banstead</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Thirds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnymede</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Thirds</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelthorne</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>All out</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>All out</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Thirds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>All out</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Thirds</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Implications for any Electoral Review**

Elsewhere on this Council agenda is a report for consideration regarding an Electoral Review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), specifically reviewing the number of Borough Councillors. The Minister for Local Government, Brandon Lewis, has agreed an approach with the LGBCE for shortening the timetable for implementing electoral reviews whereby any changes resulting from an electoral review can be implemented on the first practicable local election day (i.e. the first Thursday in May) following the Commission completing their review and their making the necessary Order, irrespective of when the Council would normally hold elections. To achieve this, the Secretary of State intends, as necessary, to use his powers under the Local Government Act 2000 to bring forward by Order the year in which a Council holds its elections. Once any review is undertaken, the Commission will liaise closely with the Council and with the Department about the timetable for implementation.

It is important to highlight that in authorities that have elections by thirds, following recent changes to legislation, the LGBCE is required to start Electoral Reviews of authorities with a presumption in favour of delivering a uniform pattern of three member wards. Any departure from such a pattern would need to be justified on a ward by ward basis, having regard to statutory criteria. An alternative option should the Council wish to retain a mixed pattern of wards, would be to move to a cycle of whole council elections.
7. Programme of Forthcoming Elections

The current election cycle is as follows:

European parliamentary – every 5 years
UK Parliamentary General – every 5 years (legislation passed in 2011 for 5 year fixed term Parliaments)
Police & Crime Commissioner – every 4 years
Surrey County Council – every 4 years
Elmbridge Borough – every 3 out of 4 years
Claygate Parish – every 4 years.

In addition, the Localism Act allows for local referenda to be held and there is always the possibility of a Government referendum, as was the case in 2011.

In terms of calendar years, the current cycle is as follows:

2013 – Surrey County Council Elections
Borough By-Election for the Claygate Ward

2014 – European Parliamentary Elections
Borough Elections

2015 – UK Parliamentary General Election
Borough Elections
Claygate Parish Council Elections

2016 – Borough Elections
Police & Crime Commissioner Election

A move to full Council Elections could be undertaken at any time. Should the Council wish to undertake an Electoral Review, it would be appropriate to coincide commencement of full Borough Elections with the implementation of Electoral Review outcomes, where a full Borough election would be required. In terms of complexity, practicalities and managing risk as well as resources, it would be preferable to programme an initial full Borough election on a year without a Parliamentary General Election and specifically the implementation of Individual Electoral Registration.

8. Advantages of Elections by thirds and whole Council Elections

Arguably, primary advantages for Borough Elections by thirds include the following:

- Encourages electorate into the habit of voting in May every year.
- A Council is judged on its performance annually, rather than every 4 years.
- The electorate can react more quickly to local circumstances and Council decisions.
- The Council better reflects public opinion locally.
- There are more frequent opportunities for potential candidates to stand.
- Less likely for local situation to be influenced by national situation politically.
Arguably, primary advantages for Borough Elections by whole Borough Elections include the following:

- A Council has a clear mandate from the electorate for 4 years.
- An elector can vote for the whole Council, as well as a Councillor.
- Creates greater stability over the 4 year period with little chance, subject to by-elections, of a change in political control.
- Improves the strategic political management by enabling longer term planning as Elections by thirds encourages shorter term focus and planning.
- Increased continuity and certainty enabling stronger leadership as a result of four year terms.
- Avoids situation where political control of Council can change in election by thirds when some electors in two member wards have no opportunity to vote.
- Evidence suggests (according to Electoral Commission) that there is slightly higher turnout in whole Council elections.
- Evidence suggests (according to Electoral Commission) that the electorate associates more clearly with whole Council elections.
- Reduced expenditure for the Council because of fewer Borough elections.
- Reduced expenditure by political parties because of fewer elections.
- Given the increased type of elections eg Police and Crime Commissioner Elections and statutory referenda together with the resultant increased frequency and complexity of combined elections, all out Borough elections would allow for better phasing and efficient use of resources.
- Less campaigning needed by parties.

9. Summary and Next Steps

The recent legislative changes encourage local authorities to move towards whole council elections. If the Council is minded to move to whole council elections, there would need to be a consultation process undertaken, specifically the taking of ‘reasonable steps to consult such persons as (the Council) thinks appropriate on the proposed change’ (s.33(2) of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, as amended in Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011. Whilst consultation is prescribed, the Council maintains discretion as to consultees. A light touch consultation is permissible, provided it is fair and explanatory of proposals.
Consultation on such a proposal could be undertaken with the public by way of the Council’s website and directly with the following:

- Members of Parliament;
- Surrey County Council;
- All Members of the Council;
- Claygate Parish Council;
- Other Council partners and stakeholders;
- Local political parties; and
- any other parties expressing an interest.

Following the consultation, an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council would need to be scheduled during the autumn, to consider the results of the consultation and determine whether the Council supports a resolution for the introduction of whole council elections in Elmbridge, possibly with effect from 2016. Should whole council elections be implemented with effect from May 2016, the Council would be tied to that electoral cycle of having whole council elections every four years thereafter. There is a requirement that two-thirds of the Members voting on the resolution at the Council Meeting must vote in favour for any such resolution to be approved.

Any decision on the part of the Council would in practice require the electoral arrangements of the Parish Council to change to bring their individual years of election into line with that of the Borough. Depending upon the transitional arrangements that the Council included in the Order, this could mean either a shorter or longer period of office for the councillors affected. Similarly for some elected Borough Councillors, their term of Office would not be the full four term during the transition period.

If, at the Extraordinary Council Meeting referred to above, Members decide in favour of moving to whole council elections, the following would apply:

- Election of all Councillors will be held every four years;
- On the fourth day after the Borough elections, newly elected councillors would come into office and sitting councillors would retire, as is the case currently;
- If such a resolution is passed, the Council must produce an explanatory document setting out the details of the new scheme and make it available for inspection (s.35(1)-(3)) - and generally publicise the new arrangements.

**Financial implications:**

Estimated savings of up to £225,000 over a three year period (£75,000 per annum) could be achieved by changing the electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections, as detailed in the report. Where combined elections take place, the core costs are shared with other bodies and therefore the identified saving to Elmbridge Borough Council would be less.
Environmental/Sustainability implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Legal implications:
Many of the legal implications are referred to in the report. The Council's power to change its electoral cycle is set out in Sections 31 to 36 and 53 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, as amended in Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011.

Equality Implications:
The Returning Officer has responsibility to run fair, open, effective and transparent Elections.

Risk Implications:
Risks associated with the running of elections are captured in the Risk Register regularly submitted to the Electoral Commission and are referred to in the report.

Community Safety Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Principal Consultees:
Corporate Management Board and Head of Legal Services.

Background papers:
None.

Enclosures/Appendices:
None.

Contact details
Head of Executive and Member Services – 01372 474174
We are interested in your views on whether we should change to whole council elections every four years starting in May 2016 or retain the existing system of elections by thirds. A Special Meeting of the Full Council will be held on 17 November 2014 to consider the issue further and the results of this consultation exercise will form part of these discussions.

Please have your say by placing a tick (✓) in the appropriate box to indicate your preferred option:

(A) retain the existing system of Borough Elections by thirds, with Borough Elections every three out of four years whereby a third of Councilors stand for election/re-election;

(B) change to whole council elections once every four years, starting in May 2016, where all seats on the Council will be elected at the same time.

Question: Please indicate whether you think Elmbridge Borough Council should

[ ] (A) retain the existing system of Borough Elections by thirds.
[ ] (B) change to whole council elections once every four years.

If you have any comments or reasons for your choice please let us know.

Please complete your postcode:

You can respond to this survey online at www.elmbridge.gov.uk/consultation. Alternatively please drop in or send this hard copy response to:

Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre, High Street
Esher, Surrey KT10 9SD

01372 474 474 elmbridge.gov.uk
@ElmbridgeBC
We want your views on how often you vote to elect Borough Councillors

Elbridge Borough Council is consulting on how often residents should vote to elect our councillors.

This consultation will close on Sunday, 2 November 2014 so we welcome your views before then.

You can do this online via the Council’s website (elbridge.gov.uk) or by completing and returning this leaflet to the Council at the Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey KT10 9SD.

The Council currently has 60 councillors who represent 22 wards across the Borough (population 131,500).

Each ward is represented by either two or three councillors and each councillor is elected for a four-year term of office.

Currently, every three out of four years a third of councillors stand for election/re-election, this is called ‘elections by thirds’.

Under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the Borough Council has the power to change its electoral arrangements to ‘whole council elections’ which would mean all seats on the Council would be elected at the same time once every four years.

An Electoral Review of Elbridge Borough Council is currently being undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in order to consider reducing the number of councillors.

In authorities that have elections by thirds, the Commission is required to start reviews with a presumption of delivering a uniform pattern of three Councillor Wards.

The Council is considering a possible move to whole council elections to enable changes in Ward configuration and a reduction in the number of Councillors.

If approved, the earliest date to hold whole council elections would be May 2016.

Advantages of the current system of electing by thirds include:

- More opportunity for electors to vote and participate in local democracy;
- Over 18 year olds and incoming residents have the opportunity to vote within 12 months, instead of 4 years;
- More opportunities for people to stand for election;
- Fewer candidates required for nominations, thereby reducing the chance of non-contested seats;
- A potentially greater mix of new and experienced councillors;
- Greater consistency of councillors by reducing the potential for large scale change at the same time;
- Political make-up of the Council is potentially more reflective of the changing views of the electorate;
- Greater accountability as Councillors are required to engage and defend decisions on a more regular basis.

Moving to all out elections could provide the following benefits:

- Wards of different sizes namely 3, 2 (or even single member Wards) could be maintained, which might better reflect the diversity of communities that make up the Borough;
- Greater political stability and ability to take a longer term view of policy implementation and decision making;
- Financial savings in the cost of administering elections;
- Reduction on time spent each year on election related activities such as canvassing in order to avoid interruption to Council business;
- Improved corporate and strategic planning over a four year period;
- Greater likelihood of contested elections and reduced likelihood of voter fatigue;
- Less confusion resulting from combinations of elections for different organisations e.g. Parliamentary, European Parliament, County Council and Borough Council.
Review of Borough Electoral Cycle – Public Consultation

Literal comments received to the public consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections:

- If a four-year cycle is introduced, the Council will be unaccountable for that period and be able to bulldoze through even more unacceptable planning applications. Voters need to be heard and listened to every year.

- Get rid of all the unwanted immediately, so to start with sufficient new people to instantly control E.B.C. employees; plus it is the system for general elections (and EU elections).

- Current arrangement - It is more democratic.

- Councillors could more easily be replaced if not satisfactory, rather than waiting 4 years.

- Leave it as it is. A very expensive project. Will affect Long Ditton and other villages as may lose their identity. Boundaries changing will affect school places. Good to have elections as they stand now, as transient community. Have a wonderful service from our present councillors. Don’t change it.

- DON’T WANT TO LOOSE VILLAGE I.D. WITH BOUNDARY CHANGES - TRANSCENT COMMUNITY - WORKS WELL

- BRING EVERYTHING IN LINE - BIT OUT OF DATE

- To save the council money and allow the resource released to be spent on service provision, rather than maintaining an overly complicated and anachronistic system. If the House of Commons can run on all-out elections every five years without democracy and the state crumbling, then I am sure that EBC can manage.

- Please please please reduce the total number too

- A cheaper and simpler system which should encourage more people to vote. At a time of financial stringency, substantial justification would be needed for the much greater cost of the existing system and the case has not been made.

- Please retain the existing system which not only keeps Councillors fresh and responsive to the electorate, but retains a greater degree of consistency and experience on the Council.

- Agree it makes more sense and better value for money.

- I would like to know who the absolute shower of councillors were that abstained on the crucial Morrisons supermarket vote. Their names have never been made public. The lives of Weybridge residents have been disrupted and the heart of the town has been torn out over the past year with still more Misery with a capital 'M' to follow.
There are pros and cons in each proposal but on balance elections in thirds is preferable. Surrey County Council has used their 4 years without elections as a reason for pushing through contentious issues. More frequent elections with parties campaigning means local issues can be raised more frequently and the ruling party cannot sit back until the year before their election to act. Local democracy would be damaged with option 2.

The current version provides a certainty of continuity.

I believe that a '4 year whole council' would be a more effective governing body than the current system provides. In view of the probability of more 'devolution' to local authorities the extra experience and commitment that a, more or less guaranteed full term would mean will be a clear advantage. It obviously follows that I think the cost and time saving of the 'new proposal' would be another improvement.

Why limit the choices to just these two? Why not offer the 'whole council' option on a THREE-year cycle? Or even better, why not an enhanced combination of both - viz: a 'HALF-council' on a FOUR-year cycle?

I am concerned that whole council elections can result in a complete change of council with no continuity, and also no ability to express dissatisfaction with the council interim. The costs of keeping the existing system is not significant.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Main reasons: Mix of experienced + new councillors; Voting more often; Gradual change of personnel.

I believe the current system helps prevent people confusing central government inadequacies with local politics.

By electing councillors by thirds will ensure that the administration works effectively for the community at ALL times instead of only at election year.

A Frequency of option to 'have a say' and so more accountability. The 'SCC model' does NOT deliver this and produces complacency.

The removal of yearly elections is a significant undermining of democracy. It encourages corruption and gerrymandering by the incumbent party of control as the electorate would have no opportunity to vote them out of office for up to four years. New voters to the Borough would similarly be prevented from having any say for up to four years. THIS CANNOT BE ACCEPTABLE IN A 'DEMOCRATIC' SOCIETY

Four year plans can be made together as a council,

Save money - everyone still serves for 4 years!
• In my opinion it is much better to have a mix of experienced and new councillors. This is particularly important in Planning Committees. If there were large numbers of inexperienced councillors, there is more likelihood of unwise decisions.

• Greater flexibility in number of councillors per ward, enabling local identity of wards to be better reflected.

• Voting more frequently increases the accountability of councillors.

• System A provides for continuity and stability at this time of unpredictability.

• Save Money; more important get bigger turnout and thus more representation.

• Option A is preferably as it allows for greater continuity and a mix of new blood and the voice of experience. Option B would lead to greater instability and uncertainty in the longer term.

• This way provides some continuity.

• Election by thirds retains some of the councillor's experience from year-to-year. It also avoids too violent swings resulting from transient changes in public opinion.

• This cost cutting exercise should have been introduced immediately following the all out election in 2000!

• Gives better indication of accountability.

• The space provided for comments is inadequate. They will be sent separately.

• Administrative saving – hopefully.

• Let all the tax payers know this is going on by posting through everyone's letter box notice of intent, not just this web site, you officers of the council have a duty to the local people for whom you work for. Please remember you work for the people.

• Neither, every three years, as we have 3 councillors. Fourth year could be Parliamentary elections.

• By maintaining the present system it is less party driven, but driven by individuals who would give good service to the borough. If elections were every four years, then if a party has said something detrimental before an election it could have an effect on who was elected, which people may come to regret soon after. The present system, although more expensive negates this problem to a certain extent.

• IT WILL SAVE MONEY.

• Current system is costly and leads to voting fatigue. Purdah periods every year are damaging to effectiveness of the council.
Elections every 4 yrs result may lead to undesirable step change rather than gradual change. This is not good b'cos there is potentially large-scale loss of 'corporate memory' & resultant time-wasting. 4 year cycles means that someone interested in being a Councillor would have only 1 chance every 4 yrs rather than in 3 out of 4 years. Finally, I feel it is very important to feel involved in the Council more, rather than less; every election results in involvement & info about local issues.

- Cost savings.
- More cost efficient.
- It will be simpler. And I think the number of councillors should be GREATLY reduced at the same time. We do not need so many.
- Saves money and allows greater long term planning.
- Option B would save a lot of money presumably.
- Definitely support whole council elections. This will save the Council money so it must be the most sensible option.
- Electorate is utterly bored and disinterested in annual elections. Introduction of all-out elections every four years would create a new momentum and would give peoples' votes much higher relevance. In addition it would save money.
- Long term decisions can be made and also saves money.
- Electing all councillors at the same time leaves local councillors far more dependent on national politics, particularly in a General Election year. Election by thirds allows the political complexion of a council to change more gradually.
- The possibility of a wholesale change in councillors to protest votes against the existing national Government leaving us with an entire council with no experience at all should concern us all.
- Allows opportunity for residents to take into account changed local issues/concerns on a more regular basis.
- Have indicated (A) for the very reasons listed as advantages of the current system.
- The advantages of the current system outway the disadvantages, particularly regular participation in the democratic process, the ability to influence the make up the council, lack of temptation to work to one date every four years.
- Would ensure a mix of more experienced councillors with new ones. Councillors would be more accountable.
• Electoral voting system is fine as it is and gives a more balanced representation of views.

• Why change - the election of councillors works ... we don’t want to lose our identity and be blended with our wards!!!!

• I believe this will offer longer term strategy and more focus.

• An all out approach is cheaper and provides for a consistent government (barring by-elections) for the tenure of the council as a whole.

• Yearly change means that plans often don’t get time to come to fruition.

• Logical and more democratic.

• A Frequency of option to ‘have a say’ and so more accountability. The 'SCC model' does NOT deliver this and produces complacency.

• Electing only a third of the Councillors each year is vital so that the Administrative Party in power can maintain continuity.

• The present system allows residents to make their views on their ward’s Councillors felt at short intervals, keeping Councillors accountable and less likely to lose the perspective of their job being to represent their voters, not a party.

• It is well known throughout the County that other boroughs wish they did as we already do - keep as is more efficient and democratic.

• I favour a regular involvement in the democratic process and prefer the gradual changes in composition resulting from elections by thirds.

• Retaining the current system is in the interests of democracy as the new system would seem to reduce the number of councillors we have, thereby reducing the chance of us having a truly local councillor. There is also talk of the boundaries being moved which could result in Long Ditton being merged with Hinchley Wood or Thames Ditton: I am strongly opposed to this expensive exercise. It's bad enough that the Post Office do not recognise Long Ditton without our local council following suit.

• Councillor renewal on a regular basis allows greater flexibility and ability to change with the changing times. Please retain the existing system.

• My councillors work at the local level and represent the local community. Moving to fewer councillors will reduce the intimacy we enjoy today. Additionally, we do not wish to lose our local identity. RETAIN EXISTING SYSTEM.

• Only if this does not preclude the reduction in the number of councillors.

• Council business would continue without a break otherwise it could become officer lead!
• Maintains continuity of knowledge of council business - at least two thirds of councillors at any time would know background when voting in Council.

• Saves money and stops councillors being in constant “election-mode” - which should in turn improve decision-making.

• Saves cost of having an election every year.

• Keeping local affairs in continuous focus and saving new voters from waiting up to 4 years.

• For sake of simplicity which might increase voter engagement. Maybe personal invitations/info to Rising 18 year olds remind/introduce them to work local councils do ‘meet your local councillor’ or some such.

• Worried that e.g. UKIP might hold the balance of power for 4 years.

• (B) would have a bigger impact, interest more of the electorate and most likely get a larger vote.

• Difficult to bring about change with existing system and inefficient use of resources.

• Whichever is more financially sound.

• More democratic.

• Inadequate notice has been given of the proposals. Apart from the web-site, which is visited by a small proportion of residents, you appear to have relied on local organisations to give notice of the consultation. 2. The period of notice of notice has been too short-compare the ten and twelve week notice periods required for consultations by the Local Government Boundary Commission. 3. Option B would almost certainly cost more as it would surely require more staff in a different role than

• Inadequate notice has been given for adequate consultation. Apart from the web-site, which I believe is only visited by a small proportion of Elmbridge residents, it seems that you have relied on local organisations to bring the proposals to notice.

• Brings the borough in line with parliamentary & EU elections. Provides stability.

• I think that gradual changes of councillors, should voters’ preferences change, would be less costly than a sudden one, when council policies could be overturned suddenly at great expense. Also, a certain number of councillors with expertise would continue in office. As someone who reached the voting age at 21, but had no general election until I was 25, I think making young voters wait until they are potentially 22 is a bad thing.

• A group that commences unpopular policies can be more swiftly removed.
Elections by thirds offer more opportunity for participation in local democracy and require greater accountability from councillors. It is disappointing that this consultation has not been better publicised.

I believe elections by thirds provides the opportunity for change within the council more regularly, yet also provides stability, in that the whole council is not changed at once which could result in more upheaval and policy stagnation.

The greater frequency of elections the less likelihood that the council will become stale.

In Brief:- Elections by thirds provides at all times a core of experienced councillors and thereby greater decision consistency - a rolling programme of election which is more manageable and provides for greater participation of localised electors.

Less cost, more dedication of incumbent.

Flexibility for voters who, under the current thirds system, can express their pleasure or disgust over a Councillor's political activities more frequently, which is a good approach.

The existing system is much more democratic. Stick with it.

Option A provides continuity and partial change, rather than all-out change, which could be disruptive.

It will be more cost effective

I live in Molesey and I think it is important to retain the integrity of the Molesey wards and not be merged with neighbouring towns or non-Molesey communities.

This enables the electorate to cast their vote every year in local democratic elections. It also enables new councillors to be introduced to their responsibilities by existing ones, rather than having a lot of new councillors all at one time. We only get to vote once every 5 years nationally - this is an essential opportunity to exercise democracy on a frequent and local basis.

I do not wish to have to wait 4 years between elections, running the risk that a majority party could make decisions in the early years after an election with impunity. Councillors should be required to defend decisions to the electorate frequently and run the risk of not being re-elected if they are party to decisions which are unpopular/not in accordance with the electorate's wishes.

Whilst clumbersom the existing system provides more uniformity to council business. The positives you mention for the existing system (A) far outweigh the advantages of the suggested alternative (B).
I am concerned about the possibility of reduced number of councillors & proposed boundary change number of councillors. If the population has increased, we surely need more rather than less councillors working for us.

It will save on the heavy cost of elections & Councillor expenses.

Save wasting even more money.

I feel this would make it more likely that Moleseys community identity would be preserved.

Neither of above - both are poor options. Prefer half of seats every 2 years. For 3 councillors then have 2 seats at one election and the other seat 2 years later.

Local Government cannot be truly accountable if only a small part changes - like Central Government local councillors should be truly accountable to the electorate for what they have or have not done.

B is easier to cope with.

The current system requires councillors to account for their decisions annually and listen to voters on a regular basis, rather than allowing them to ignore what voters want for years until the next election approaches.

Although I appreciate that the current system may be more costly to administrate and have other disadvantages, I feel that 4 years is too long a period between elections for Borough Councillors. I would think that the 'elections by thirds' procedure has evolved for valid reasons and therefore it should be retained but I would be happy to hear the counter arguments.

The current system, with more frequent elections, allows better representation of the views of a changing population as people move into and out of the borough.

I do not think the system should change to accommodate changes the Boundary Commission may or may not make. Current system ensures no one group is completely in control so ensures accountability and current system enables Councillors to actively engage with electorate every year - financial savings minimal seems more like a way for Conservatives to.

The present system is too complicated - a straightforward change of all the Councillors is preferable.

I like the idea of improved efficiency and it should be easier for the council to work harder at increasing turnout.

More diverse options of voters and councillors.

I strongly favour option B for the following reason: It avoids disruption to the Council's business activities every year when the 'one-third election' takes place; further it avoids the situation whereby the newly elected 1/3rd of councillors - who
may well arrive with the intent of effectively addressing a current concern of some importance to Residents - may have difficulty in achieving understanding and support from the large majority of existing Councillors.

- Less "voter fatigue"; would cost less than the current system.

- I applaud the money-saving idea, but I think that the benefits of a) a mix of experienced and new councillors and less of a wholesale change, b) more frequent opportunities to have our say and not to be stuck with poor councillors for 4 years, outweigh this. I would be interested in the council exploring a 'middle ground' with e.g. half the council changing every two years.

- I think that election by thirds is likely to result in a short term view which will hamper the councils ability to take a more long term strategic view.

- A is disruptive to Council services and fewer councillors being elected at the same time would be more efficient and effective.

- Same as E-Mail sent 5 minutes ago --post code corrected.

- No change for 4 years, I do not think so. Less councillors, more bully boys forcing their views through. Changes

- I think it is good to have a mix of new and experienced councillors also gives young people more say.

- Having everyone new at the same time would mean less "old hands" would be around to help newly elected councillors to find their feet.

- I think continuity is important, and also that living in such strange times politically, we should not allow the vagaries of party politics to derail fair and responsible local politics if we can help it!

- Annually opportunity to vote keeps you in the habit of voting and keeps you more involved in local democracy. However, we need to increase voter numbers and I believe this would happen if more people had a postal vote and/or opportunity to vote on line.

- A potential change of control of a Council every year is not good for implementation of Council decisions, and can lead to lack of decision making.

- Knowledge on ongoing matters is important, this would be at risk if all councillors were to stand down every years. Also a c

- Enables long term strategy planning, more immediate effectuation of voting trends, lifts burden of political campaigning, significant cost saving.

- Financial and time savings to all concerned - especially for the voters
• Better mix of new and experienced councillors; more engagement by councillors with local people.

• I think we should regular elections every year and I welcome a vote on this it would have been nice to be consulted.

• This will supply continuity.

• What comparisons are there between voter numbers for annual elections as opposed to elections every four years for the whole council? Can we have this information please?

• Current system prevents snap decisions being made based on current national situation that could have a dramatic effect on the make up/control of the council

• Better continuity & less disruption.

• All out elections assist political stability and allow the majority party to implement their manifesto commitments over the lifetime of the administration.

• I feel more involved - if I had to vote every 4 years, I wouldn’t bother!! Should not use schools to vote in - there have to be alternatives.

• The public cannot understand the ‘By Thirds’ and are always left wondering why other councillors are not standing--i fact they think the other councillors must have resigned or their term of office has expired. Further, ‘By Thirds’ is intrusive on time and expensive, both individually to organisations as well as to the general taxpayer. Further, there is a tendency on the ‘One-third’ system for the other ‘Two-Thirds’ of councillors to rarely disengaged from the election process.

• Less confusing.

• Councillors should be committed to saving money when it relates to them!

• This is not a second vote by the same person, my husband and I share this computer!

• Anything which makes financial savings is a good thing. I think people are more likely to vote once every 4 years than on an annual basis.

• A chance for the electorate to have a real impact every 4 years if they believe the incumbents have not met expectations and makes the whole council more accountable for its performance.

• Whole council will mean no continuity and possibility of 100% change of councillors.

• Ability to change things, more continuity, councillors are closer to voters than MPs, I don’t like the cabinet system - all councillors should be equal, EBC is not a Parliament!
• Councils need continuity - if the whole council changes in one go, it will take about a year to get back on course and decisions will be delayed.

• A/ option ensures that there are people in place who have experience in running the system, a total crop of fresh members each would be a total disaster.

• So balance is preserved.

• Saving money if elections are held only every four years.

• I think the continuation of some experienced councillors alongside new councillors when elected is beneficial. An ‘all new’ group could be prone to errors through lack of experience.

• I believe we should reduce the overall number of councillors.

• Simplicity, increased probability of clearer outcomes and I get tired of all the frequent voting correspondence I currently receive and feel I have to action.

• To reduce the number of councillors and save money.

• Benefits as described in the consultation document.

• Option A: people have democratic vote every year rather than once every 3 years. Less likelihood of complete change of councillors - so new can benefit from experienced and there's more continuity.

• I think the current arrangement makes for a more stable administration.

• The existing system makes the council more democratically accountable, it gives a good mix of new and experienced councillors, more frequent elections get people into the habit of voting and it is encouraging for young people to be able to join the register and exercise their right to vote soon after they are eligible. It is a much better system than waiting four years to replace the whole council.

• Why change something that isn't broken?????

• It is about consistency, efficiency and stability (from a policy implementation perspective) from where I see it and hence my preference for (B) above.

• I don't believe a 100percent new council would be efficient.

• We should reduce the number of Councillors by a Third. 2. We should reduce the cost of holding elections - however I believe the Council should outline what savings can be made by moving to Option B. Its also not clear to me who will make the decision to reduce the number of Councillors ? It seems perverse that the outcome would be determined by our councillors.
• It will save energy, money & time. Regrettably Councillors have little authority since the Thatcher days, budgetary constraints also limit their ability to do anything - so they are now just supervisors of staff action.

• Maintaining the "by thirds" system ensures that there is some continuity in the council and an on-going responsibility to the electorate.

• Less time/money spent on dealing with election matters.

• Cost; continuity; upheaval if no-one knows the job.

• Less expense and potential confusion: leads to better longer-term planning.

• Item A is fairest because if a valuable councillor loses his/her seat through an idiosyncracy one year - they can stand again the following year for a different ward.

• Provides a degree of continuity - always assuming that is a good thing, of course!

• Gradual change works better in local government than big changes every 4 years.

• It is our opinion that the eight reasons you list as advantages of the current system greatly outweigh the seven reasons for moving to all out elections. In short it is more democratic to maintain the current system.

• I THINK IT SHOULD PROVIDE MORE CONSISTENCY AND THEREFORE BETTER PLANNING.

• Councillors need to be accountable and when mistakes are made the electorate should have the opportunity to instigate a complete change. Additionally this system will save considerable expense in organising elections.

• Councillors tend to react more democratically when they realise their actions can have immediate repercussions even if outside their own ward. Just look what happens in the years without elections. Four years is too long to wait for a democratic process. Also, just imagine a single issue party being elected on the strength of national opinion - if it were no good at local politics, there would be four years before the electorate could deliver their verdict anywhere in the council.

• Cost saving.

• Makes more sense, try to line up with general election.

• I agree with your list of advantages for thirds. And councillors would be re-elected by their performances.

• Having read your benefits of both approaches and considering national practice I was persuaded to the every 4 years approach.
• Retain existing system please - otherwise you could get a council that is totally inexperienced - I belong to a couple of Committees and changing a third each time works well.

• I would feel much more engaged with less frequent elections, and also surely it must be a cost saving?

• We would have a better-spread-out debate, more community involvement, better chance for local politics [infrequent elections more likely to be contested on national politics] - all really important LOCAL stuff.

• Who are the Councillors? Why do we see one or two of them ONLY at election time?

• Surely a single Full Ward Election every 4 years would be less cost?

• Allows more immediate and direct responses from electorate, thereby judging the council on its ongoing merits - as opposed to the 4 year mandate which in inevitably going to focus on the bigger picture political aspect.

• It would have been helpful to know how much financial savings would be made.

• Whole 4 yearly council elections with multiple, but reduced numbers, councillors is a bad idea. Reduction of councillors means that each will be responsible for handling the concerns of a greater number of residents. If there are multiple ward councillors then it is democratically preferable that their term should not be identical to enable reflection of residents current views. This comment section is inadequate.

• Ward boundaries need to continue to reflect the distinctive natures of the villages of the East Elmbridge area, i.e., Esher, Claygate, Hinchley Wood, Oxshott, Cobham….

• Cost.

• It makes economic sense.

• A 4 year period would give the incoming Council time to push through new ideas/policies instead of always wondering if they might lose a third of their Members at the next local election. It would also save the Council (therefore the electorate) a great deal of money if elections were only held once every four years.

• Whole council elections mean councillors have to deal with the council as elected for four years not prevaricate on decisions hoping the balance may change in a year.

• Would B be cheaper?

• I and my family in Hinchley Wood consider the four-year 'whole council' elections proposal to be almost ANTI-democratic. As one who lived and voted in another
country (the US) the importance of frequent involvement in local politics is vital. Once every four years is far too infrequent, as is FIVE years for national elections. There is little enough authority in Elmbridge as it is, and it certainly does not need decreasing in representation or changed boundaries.

- This will reduce costs, particularly the high costs of elections. It will also facilitate reducing the number of councillors.

- With the existing system, for one third of councillors re-election is imminent (less than one year away). I think this helps them focus on the electorate. It means that electors may see councillors or prospective councillor one per year and literature explaining their current views on local issues.

- Not sure how (b) would work as most wards have three councillors so you would be electing three councillors per ward in one year???? - This is not clear so cannot comment other than to say the system seems to work so no need to change it.

- Proposal B it sermonizes with other elections and it as stated saves money.

- More likely to encourage residents to stay involved.

- Every 4 years would give a stable council for a sensible period of time. This would allow decisions to be implemented properly, rather than piecemeal or abandoned as a consequence of constantly changing councillors.

- I feel this has been rushed through by the council at a time of Austerity and also a bid to reduce the number of councillors. The current way of voting is much fairer and means no over all party can take it for granted they have a four year mandate to do as they please.

- I feel this system helps continuity. If all councillors new at the same time might be rather chaotic!

- In favour of changing all seats at the same time. I'm NOT in favour of the local Councillors being reduced in number by more than a small amount. 60 to 48 seems too much too quickly, it favours the large national parties and makes it harder for independents and resident's association councillors to be elected.

- I feel that the current system prevents dramatic changes due to "one-off" matters, or popular fads, that might happen by chance to be close to election time, thereby giving a more accurate reflection of residents wishes over the long term.

- I would like the boundary commission to consider reducing the number of councillors in Elmbridge.

- A simpler process which is easier to administer.

- IT WOULD BE MADNESS TO HAVE THE POSSIBILITY OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL OR EVEN A MAJORITY BEING CHANGED AT ONE TIME. STICK TO
THE WELL TRIED SYSTEM WE HAVE AT PRESENT TO PREVENT A POSSIBLE EXPENSIVE PERIOD OF CHAOS !!

- Election by thirds means annual democratic review of the Council's work and is a better way of keeping the Council responsive to local needs. Note that it would be uneconomic to apply the same method to Parish Council elections. However I have some concerns about the way in which an all 3 member Ward system will be arrived at. I hope there will be full public consultation on this, as the present exercise is to limited and too short notice.

- We need need to reduce costs incl reducing number of councillors. Need less constant change.

- Circumstances change as do the views that voters have about the council.

- I approve of the current electoral pattern as it allows for frequent reassessment of the elected parties. I will be very concerned if the Claygate ward is joined with any neighbouring ward - if the number of councillors representing Claygate is to be reduced (which I would be against) then I would reluctantly support a four-yearly election.

- Better and more immediately representative Council make-up. Greater mix of new and existing councillors. Greater consistency of councillors with less wholesale change.

- The present system works very well, and best serves the needs of the residents. a 4 year gap in local elections is too long. Surprised by the need only for a postcode - where is the security against potential fraud in this system?

- The present system works extremely well, whereby new councillors are integrated with experienced councillors, thus being less disruptive to the work of the council. However, this consultation process has been appalling, and I only came across the opportunity to express my view by chance. Why were not all households provided with a leaflet? Giving postcode only for I.D. could also be subject to fraud. Very unsatisfactory.

- Having local issues visited regularly, on a near annual basis rather than once every four years, encourages all Councillors to become more aware of the current local concerns and ensures they have to be in touch with the feelings of the local electorate on a more frequent basis.

- The current system should be retained because the elected councilors have to address local issues every year. It also provides a degree of continuity while giving a portion of the electorate the opportunity to remove councilors they are unhappy with.

- The current system ensures a degree of continuity while allows some residents to express their displeasure with elected officers without having to wait for up to 4 years.
- Option B - saves money.
- Better continuity. Retaining experience.
- Reduction in admin costs and continuity of councillors.
- I do not wish for the number of councillors to be reduced.
- Whole council elections too infrequent and it will be difficult to get candidates. Engagement would reduce further.
- More stability in terms of experienced councillors.
- Any changes that cut down on bureaucracy and make monetary savings are very welcome.
- Unnecessary local elections are a total waste of public money and leads to disillusionment with the electoral system and embarrassingly low turn-outs. Furthermore, 60 councillors for the Borough is far too many and another waste of money.
- I also strongly support a reduction in the number of councillors. I saw a figure quoted of 48.
- The advantages of the current system of election by thirds far outweigh any benefits of moving to all out elections. Please stay with the present system.
- Tidier and less confusing system. Less costly than more frequent elections. Enables retention of the 2-or 3-councillor wards. Current "villages" would better retain their separate identities.
- There are reasons to believe that keeping the electoral machine rolling evenly is more efficient than stop-and-start in 4-year gaps.
- I believe the current system is better than electing a whole council every four years. I would like this kind of rolling election to be used for parliamentary elections - it is more sensitive to the wishes of the electorate and therefore more democratic.
- I don’t agree with either option - annually is too often, no change to achieve anything. Every 4 years is too long. An 18 year old may not vote till they are 22. Why not every 2 Years?
- Increase public interest and reduce costs.
- The website is hopeless. nothing about the survey is on it.
- It will save taxpayers money and is plain common sense.
• Present system is more democratic... and it works! We need more councillors not fewer. I'd like to see the rationale behind reduction.

• Why change a system that works?! Voting every year allows for more stability with a good mix of new & experienced councillors. It's more democratic way of voting - every year.

• You shouldn't tamper with a system that has worked for many years. It's more democratic than 'all out' elections.

• This ‘Survey’ is open to abuse.

• Keeps councillors in touch with electors.

• I feel this is the better system. I don’t like the idea of less councillors and all out.

• A= mix new & experienced councillors. A less likely result dominance of 1 party

• Council will reflect electorates changing views.

• Absolutely not - I have lived here for 52 years and existing system has served the borough well. How could 60 new councillors ever compete with the experience of office.

• It is essential to have continuity. A completely new set of councillors would have no idea of what had gone on before.

• It is better to keep at least one person in place who knows what issues have arisen. Then having 4 new people in place who have to start all over again.

• Current system allows continuity and works well.

• Considering Elmbridge has the 2nd highest Council Tax in the UK, a reduction in the number of councillors is overdue. 60 councillors is far too many people to cover 22 wards.
Dear Mr Moran

The Residents Associations of Long Ditton, Hinchley Wood and Thames Ditton & Weston Green have responded to the consultation making the following points:-

ELECTION OF ELMBRIDGE COUNCILLORS - VOTING FREQUENCY CONSULTATION

VIEWS OF THE LONG DITTON, HINCHLEY WOOD, THAMES DITTON & WESTON GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS

1. We feel that at this time of austerity and ever increasing cuts to budgets it is not terribly sensible to embark on an expensive change to the voting pattern of the Borough.

2. Should changes be necessary perhaps consultation should have taken place before the Council approached the Boundary Commission.

3. Any changes to the number of Councillors it seems will need a re-balancing of the number of Councillors from each ward, that will necessitate the re-drawing of some boundaries, and perhaps the disappearance of some wards all together. We feel that at this time when Localism is one of Central Government’s watchwords, wholesale changes that could adversely affect the identity of villages within the Borough is not in the interests of the residents of the borough.

4. We are not over-represented by councillors in Elmbridge compared with other Surrey boroughs and are in the middle tier. The redrawing of village boundaries will be expensive, a fact which the Administration has not taken into account and the Council should cease all activity down this road until it has first consulted the residents of the Borough. Any alleged savings claimed by the Administration would be minimal on an annual basis, and would almost certainly lead to councillors claiming larger allowances to compensate for increased work-loads.

5. Notwithstanding the views expressed about this whole exercise being undertaken and consultation being too late, we prefer election by thirds because it means there is more opportunity for electors to vote and participate in the local democracy on a regular basis allowing for the gradual change of the make up of the council. However we would wish to ensure that a clear message is sent to the Electoral Commission that residents would want to retain 'community identities'.

FRANK RENTON – Chairman Long Ditton Residents Assoc

FRANK DABELL – Chairman Hinchley Wood Residents Assoc

RHODRI RICHARDS – Chairman Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents Assoc

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

Vice Chairman, Long Ditton Residents Association
Contact the Council

We will endeavour to respond to your comments or queries as soon as possible.

Contact Details

Title*
Forename*
Surname*
How would you like us to contact you?*
Email

By email

Your address

Do you know your postcode?*
Address Line1
Address Line2
Address Line3
Town
County
Post Code*
Council Tax Band
Your comments or questions*

I have just completed the voting/election cycle survey and found the space for comments inadequate. Whilst definitely being against going to a 4 year voting cycle with reduced number of councillors I can understand the desire to make economies by going to a reduced frequency of elections. Might I suggest that a compromise might be achieved by opting for 2 councillors per ward, each serving for a 4 year term but with elections being held on a 2 year cycle. This would ensure continuity, with a minimum of 50% of councillors having at least 2 years experience, and at the same time enabling reflection of residents current views at twice the frequency of a 4 year cycle. Consideration also needs to be given to the size of electoral wards to minimise any increase in the number of constituents represented by councillors. It must be remembered that they are not full time paid politicians but volunteers who have to fit in the demands of their constituents and council role with their own employment/domestic routine. Electoral Registration

Which area is best suited to your enquiry? *

Date/Time Created 13:47:06 28 Oct 2014

® Note: On Line Requests : your query or request maybe covered by a specific service request form we would suggest you use a specific form where appropriate to speed up your enquiry.

If you wish to upload any supporting information then please use the facility below. Please note that attachments can be up to 2048 kb or 2 mega bytes in size.
Contact the Council

We will endeavour to respond to your comments or queries as soon as possible.

Contact Details

Title*
Forename*
Surname*
How would you like us to contact you?*
Email

Your address

Do you know your postcode?*
Address Line1
Address Line2
Address Line3
Town
County
Post Code*
Council Tax Band
Your comments or questions*

Which area is best suited to your enquiry? *

Date/Time Created 17:52:56 31 Oct 2014

Note: On Line Requests : your query or request maybe covered by a specific service request form we would suggest you use a specific form where appropriate to speed up your enquiry.

If you wish to upload any supporting information then please use the facility below. Please note that attachments can be up to 2048 kb or 2 mega bytes in size.

Your personal data will be used in accordance with our Privacy Policy

Mandatory fields are marked with red asterisk.

Is your comment a Complaint: 

Date submitted
## APPENDIX ‘E’

**Review of Borough Electoral Cycle**

**Consultation Responses by Ward and Polling District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Polling District</th>
<th>Response (%)</th>
<th>Ward total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG DITTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THAMES DITTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTON GREEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HINCHLEY WOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLAYGATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOLESEY EAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOLESEY NORTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOLESEY SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COBHAM AND DOWNSIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COBHAM FAIRMILE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OXSHOTT AND STOKE D’ABERNON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTON AMBLESIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTON CENTRAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>3.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTON NORTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTON SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HERSHAM NORTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QB</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HERSHAM SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEYBRIDGE NORTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEYBRIDGE SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OATLANDS PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST. GEORGE’S HILL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VB</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. REVIEW OF BOROUGH ELECTORAL CYCLE

Members were asked to review and determine the Borough Electoral Cycle, having regard to the recent public consultation on the option of changing the Council’s electoral cycle from elections by thirds to whole Council elections. In considering the matter, the Council could, by special resolution of a Meeting of the Council and by two-thirds of the Members voting on it, resolve to move from the current scheme of elections by thirds, to whole council elections.

The Council’s 60 Borough Councillors represented 22 wards across the Borough. Each ward was represented by either two or three councillors and each councillor was elected for a four year term of office. Currently, every three out of four years a third of councillors stood for election / re-election, known as elections by thirds.

The Council had regard to the previous reports submitted to the Council on 10 April 2013 and 1 October 2014, that had set out advantages of elections by thirds and whole council elections; financial implications and implications in respect of Electoral Review. These reports were reproduced with the Council agenda for Members’ ease of reference. Members also referred to the guidance from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, and specifically from Sir Tony Redmond, the Lead Commissioner for the Elmbridge Electoral Review, as confirmed at the presentation to Members on 1 September 2014, that the Commission would start Electoral Reviews with a presumption in favour of delivering a uniform pattern of three Member wards where authorities had elections by thirds.

Members also considered the results of the recent public consultation where residents had been invited to indicate whether they would prefer to retain the existing system of Borough Elections by thirds or change to whole council elections once every four years.

It was noted that a total of 601 responses to the public consultation were received either by way of website or returned leaflet, as follows:

308 supported retaining the existing system of Borough Elections by thirds; 282 supported a change to whole council elections once every four years; and 11 responses had not indicated a preference.

In addition, a letter and two e-mails via the Council’s ‘contact us’ facility were received in response to the consultation and were detailed in the report, together with all the literal comments received.

Members expressed their thanks to the Officers for conducting an efficient public consultation together with the analysis of the outcome. Members further expressed their thanks to all the residents who had engaged in the consultation.
The Leader moved the statutory notice of object to enable Members to consider the matter. Having had a full debate on the matter, it was

RESOLVED that the motion to adopt an electoral cycle of Whole Council Elections every 4 years was not carried.
NB: Both GIS and PDF versions have been sent to the Boundary Commission for England
Elmbridge Borough Council’s Proposed Names for each of the 16 Wards as agreed at a Special Meeting of the Council on 16 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Number</th>
<th>Ward Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1</td>
<td>Claygate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2</td>
<td>Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>Cobham and Downside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>Weybridge Brooklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>Weybridge Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6</td>
<td>Hersham Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7</td>
<td>Oatlands &amp; Ashley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8</td>
<td>Walton Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 9</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 10</td>
<td>Molesey Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 11</td>
<td>Molesey South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12</td>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 13</td>
<td>Long Ditton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 14</td>
<td>Weston Green and Hinchley Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 15</td>
<td>Esher and Hersham Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 16</td>
<td>Rydens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elmbridge Borough Council’s Preferred Warding Pattern
- Ward Composition

Ward #1 : Claygate  - Total electorate for Ward = 5,527

Polling District: F

All the Roads in Polling District F = 5,527
Ward #2: Oxshott and Stoke D'Abernon - Total electorate for Ward = 6,652

Polling Districts: JA (part of), K (part of), LA, LB, LC

Roads in Polling District JA (part of) = 157
Brookfield Place
Brooklands Close
Fairmile Lane
Gainsborough Place
Knighton Place
Stoke Road (Part of)

Roads in Polling District K (part of) = 1,703
Amblecote
Ashcroft Park
Ashlyns Park
Beech Close
Beech Close Court
Beechmeads, Leigh Hill Road
Benfleet Close
Blue Cedars Place
Burleigh Park
Burstead Close
Courtney Place
Earleswood
Eaton Park
Eaton Park Road
Fairacres
Fairbourne
Fairmeads
Fairmile Avenue
Fairmile Court
Fairmile Lane
Fairmile Park Copse
Fairmile Park Road
Fernlea Place
Fouracres
Green Lane
Grenville Close
Hawksview
Heatherbank Close
Hill Close
Icklingham Road
Icklingham Gate
Knipp Hill
Leigh Hill Road
Lytton Park
Miles Lane
Milner Drive
Nightingale Close
Portsmouth Road (part of South Side)
Queensgate, Fairmile Lane
Sandringham Park
Sandy Lane
Spring Place
The Barton
The Drive
The Garth
The Knoll
Towngate
Waterford Close
Wellington Place
Woodland Drive
Woodpecker Close

All the Roads in Polling District LA = 2,450

All the Roads in Polling District LB = 1,007

All the Roads in Polling District LC = 1,335
Ward #3: Cobham and Downside - Total electorate for Ward = 5,994

Polling Districts: JA (part of), JB, K (part of), RB (part of)

Roads in Polling District JA (part of) = 4,111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anyards Road</td>
<td>Hogs Hill Lane</td>
<td>Pendenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford Gardens</td>
<td>Hollyhedge Road</td>
<td>Pine Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Road</td>
<td>Lambourne Drive</td>
<td>Pipers Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Streets</td>
<td>Leigh Corner</td>
<td>Portsmouth Road (part of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Grove</td>
<td>Leigh Court Close</td>
<td>Ravenswood Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramble Rise</td>
<td>Leigh Hill Road</td>
<td>River Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Highway</td>
<td>Leigh Place</td>
<td>Ross Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Farm Road</td>
<td>Leigh Road</td>
<td>Spencer Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick Grove</td>
<td>Litchfield Gardens</td>
<td>Spinnaker Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Road</td>
<td>Lockhart Road</td>
<td>St Andrews Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>Loriners Close</td>
<td>St Andrews Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Road</td>
<td>Lushington Drive</td>
<td>Stoke Road (Part of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Lyster Mews</td>
<td>Summerhays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleves Close</td>
<td>Matthew Arnold Close</td>
<td>Tartar Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copse Road</td>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>The Bowsprit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downside Bridge Road</td>
<td>Mill Hedge Close</td>
<td>Tilt Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Grove Road</td>
<td>Mizen Close</td>
<td>Tilt Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Park</td>
<td>Mizen Way</td>
<td>Virginia Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmview</td>
<td>Oak Road</td>
<td>White Lion Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndown Gardens</td>
<td>Oakdene Road</td>
<td>Winstanley Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Wents</td>
<td>Oakfield Road</td>
<td>Winstanley Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemans Road</td>
<td>Old Oak Close</td>
<td>Woodend Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Gardens</td>
<td>Old Rectory Gardens</td>
<td>Woodgate Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haleswood</td>
<td>Oxshott Rise</td>
<td>Worlds End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harebell Hill</td>
<td>Oxshott Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Paddocks Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the Roads in Polling District JB = 547

Roads in Polling District K (part of) = 1,326

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Close</td>
<td>Meadowlands</td>
<td>Portsmouth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coveham Crescent</td>
<td>Molesworth Road</td>
<td>Queens Court Ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denby Road</td>
<td>Mossfield</td>
<td>Riverview Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elveden Road</td>
<td>Northfield Farm Mews</td>
<td>Trafalgar Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavell Road</td>
<td>Northfield Road</td>
<td>Wedgewood Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Avenue</td>
<td>Old Common Road</td>
<td>Wyndham Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Court</td>
<td>Old Nursery Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkefield</td>
<td>Pennyfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roads in Polling District RB (part of) = 10

Painshill Park
Portsmouth Road (part of)
Polling Districts: TA (part of), UC, VA, VB, VC

Roads in Polling District TA (part of) = 534
Belvedere Close
Bridgeham Close
Brooklands Lane
Caenwood Close
Fortescue Road
Heath Road
Lockestone
Lockestone Close
March Road
Mayfield Road
Old Heath Road
Wey Meadows

All the Roads in Polling District UC = 709

All the Roads in Polling District VA = 1,041

All the Roads in Polling District VB = 1,780

All the Roads in Polling District VC = 1,759
Polling Districts: SA, SB, TA (part of), TB, UA (part of)

All the Roads in Polling District SA = 1,684

All the Roads in Polling District SB = 1,678
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Baker Street  High Point  Parkside Court
Balfour Road  High Street  Park Drive
Bridge Road  Hillcrest  Portmore Quays
Brumana Close  Limes Road  Springfield Lane
Church Street  Manor Chase  Springfield Meadows
Churchfield Road  Manor Walk  St Charles Place
Churchfield Avenue  Melrose Road  St James Mews
Curzon Close  Molyneux Road  Trelawney Grove
Curzon Road  Monument Green  Waverley Road
Elgin Road  Monument Hill  Weybridge Park

All the Roads in Polling District TB = 1,356
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Cedar Grove
Churchill Drive
Grotto Road
High Pine Close
Lakeside Grange
Marlborough Drive
Oatlands Drive (part of)
Polling Districts: QB (part of), RA, RB (part of)

Roads in Polling District QB (part of) = 1,456
Beech Close               Garrick Close
Belgrave Close            Mayfield Close
Burwood Park Road        Mayfield Gardens
Charlton Avenue           Mayfield Road
Clarence Close           Queens Road
Clarence Road            Westdene
Cowley Crescent         West Grove
Fisher Close            Woodside Avenue

All the Roads in Polling District RA = 3,710

Roads in Polling District RB (part of) = 1,190
Albury Road              Farmleigh Grove
Broadwater Close         Fox Wood
Broadwater Road North    Heather Walk Whiteley Village
Broadwater Road South    Hornbeam Walk Whiteley Village
Burhill                  Ince Road
Burwood Road             Kelvedon Avenue
Byfleet Road             Kilrue Lane
Chargate Close           Kings Drive
Chargate Road            Manor House Drive
Chesnut Avenue Whiteley Village North Avenue Whitely Village
Chesnut Crescent Whiteley Village Octogon Road Whitely Village
Chesnut Walk Whiteley Village Patmore Lane
Circle Road Whitely Village Pond Close
Coach House Mews Whiteley Village Portsmouth Road (part of)
Convent Lane             Rabbit Lane
Coombe Lane Whiteley Village Seven Hills Road
Cranley Road             South Avenue Whitely Village
Drapers Crescent Whiteley Village The Green Whiteley Village
East Avenue Whiteley Village The Quillot
Eriswill Crescent        West Avenue Whiteley Village
Eriswill Road

Ward #6 : Hersham Village - Total electorate for Ward = 6,356
Ward #7: Oatlands & Ashley Park - Total electorate for Ward = 6,141

Polling Districts: NB (part of), PB (part of), UA (part of), UB

Roads in Polling District NB (part of) = 910
Alexandra Close  Hersham Road (part of)  Park Close
Ashley Close  Ireton Avenue  Red House Lane
Ashley Park Avenue  Linden Grove  Sandy House Lane
Ashley Park Crescent  New Zealand Avenue  Silverdale
Ashley Road  (part of)  
Grange Court  Oatlands Drive
Avenue

Roads in Polling District PB (part of) = 1,498
Adelaide Road  Gainsborough Court  Silver Tree Close
Ashley Drive  Grange Place  St Vincent Road
Ashley Park Road  Hersham Road (part of)  Station Avenue
Ashley Rise  Oakdene Court  Stompond Lane
Ashley Road  Priory Close  The Links
Cleveland Close  Priory Place  Trafalgar Drive
Copenhagen Way  Rushmon Gardens  Wynton Grove

Roads in Polling District UA (part of) = 2,844
Adelaide Place  Haddon Close  Rowan Green
Admiral Close  Hanover Walk  Ryelands Place
Anderson Road  Holly Green  St Marys Road
Aspen Square  Hungerford Square  Shewens Road
Barham Close  Kemble Close  Stafford Square
Beech Road  Lakeside  Templemere
Beechcroft Manor  Mallards Reach  The Laurels
Berkeley Court  Mere Road  The Mount
Beverley Close  Oatlands Avenue  Tower Grove
Boundary Park  Oatlands Chase  Vale Close
Broadwater Place  Oatlands Close  Vale Court
Brockley Combe  Oatlands Drive (part of)  Vale Road
Castle Green  Oatlands Green  Victoria Close
Castle Mews  Oatlands Mere  Victoria Road
Castle Road  Old School Mews  Victoria Way
Charlton Kings  Orchard End  Village Close
Cricket Way  Pantile Road  Westdene Way
Cross Road  Parkway  Woodland Close
Dove House Green  Ridgemount  Woodland Grove
Drynham Park  Ronnieby Close  Woodland Way
Duchess Court  Rosslyn Park

All the Roads in Polling District UB = 889
Ward #8: Walton Central - Total electorate for Ward = 6,217

Polling Districts: NA, NB (part of), OB (part of), PA (part of),

All the Roads in Polling District NA = 3,288

Roads in Polling District NB (part of) = 986
Hepworth Way
Hersham Road (part of)
High Street
Hurst Grove
Kings Close
Kings Gardens
Kings Road
New Zealand Avenue (part of)
Oakfields
Sidney Road
The Chestnuts
The Heart

Roads in Polling District OB (part of) = 1,292
Armstrong Close
Cottimore Lane
Cottimore Terrace
Felix Road
Grove Crescent
Little Halliards
Russell Road
Sunbury Close
Sunbury Lane
Terrace Road (part of)
Thamesmead
The Grove
The Halliards
Tumbling Bay
Weir Road

Roads in Polling District PA (part of) = 651
Bowes Road
Crossway
Crutchfield Lane
Hersham Road
Hurley Close
Midway
Rembrandt Way
Sidney Road
Ward #9: Walton Ambleside - Total electorate for Ward = 6,287

Polling Districts: M (part of), OB (part of), PA (part of),

Roods in Polling District M (part of) = 2,846
Ambleside Avenue  Fairfax Close  Rodney Road
Braycourt Avenue  Hillary Crescent  Rydens Road (part of)
Cardinall Drive  Holly Avenue  St Johns Drive
Cheriton Court  King Georges Avenue  Scholars Place
Clements Road  Lansdown Close  Sidney Road
Cottimore Avenue  Mistys Field  Stuart Avenue
Cottimore Crescent  Monks Crescent  Swansmere Close
Cottimore Lane  Newark Court  Windsor Walk
Cromwell Close  Regency Gardens  Wolsey Drive
Cromwell Road  Rodney Close
Crown Close  Rodney Green

Roads in Polling District OB (part of) = 2,697
Cambridge Road  Kirby Way  Sunnyside
Carlcott Close  Nightingale Road  Tanners Close
Carlton Road  Orchard Close  Telford Drive
Dunsmore Road  Pankhurst Road  Terrace Road (part of)
First Avenue  Paxton Close  Tithe Close
Florence Close  River Walk  Thorneycroft Close
Florence Road  Rivernook Close  Vanbrugh Drive
Fox Grove  Sandy Lane  Vicarage Fields
Garden Road  Second Avenue  Viner Close
Hurst Road  Shaw Drive  Waterside Drive
Kilsha Road  Spicer Close

Roads in Polling District PA (part of) = 744
Ambleside Avenue
Beecot Lane
Brunswick Close
Clements Road
Foxhollow Close
Gladsmuir Close
Holwood Close
Meadowside
Newhall Gardens
Rydens Avenue
St Michaels Close
The Furrows
The Spur
Polling Districts: GA (part of), GB (part of), GC, HA, HB (part of),

Roads in Polling District GA (part of) = 1,120
Arnison Road  Hansler Grove
Barge Walk     Hardys Mews
Bridge Gardens Hurst Road
Feltham Avenue Palace Road
Graburn Way    River Bank
Grove Road     St Johns Road
Hampton Court Way Wolsey Road

Roads in Polling District GB (part of) = 1,027
Challoners Close Palace Road
Church Road     Park Road
Harrow Gardens  Parsons Mead
Hurst Lane      Pemberton Road
Kent Road       School Road
Kings Chase     Vine Road
Manor Road      Walton Road

All the Roads in Polling District GC = 348

All the Roads in Polling District HA = 1,532

Roads in Polling District HB (part of) = 2,489
Abbey Walk       Molesham Close
Adecroft Way     Molesham Way
Balmoral Crescent Monaveen Gardens
Berkeley Drive   Mountwood
Boleyn Drive     New Road
Cherimoya Gardens Park Way
Churchfields     Rosemary Avenue
Dennis Road      St Peters Road
Dundas Gardens   Sandringham Gardens
Dunstall Way     Second Close
First Close      Spurfield
Hurst Lane       The Crescent
Hurst Road       The Fairway
Kelvinbrook      The Forum
Lavender Court   Third Close
Linkfield        Wilton Gardens
Merton Way       Windsor Avenue
Mole Abbey Gardens
Polling Districts: GB (Part of), GD, HB (Part of), I, OC

**Roads in Polling District GB (part of) = 436**
Beauchamp Road
Clinton Avenue
Molesey Park Close
Molesey Park Road
Seymour Close
Seymour Road
Spencer Road
The Wilderness

**Roads in Polling District HB (part of) = 776**
Apps Meadow Close
Augusta Close
Bishop Fox Way
Cambridge Road
Freeman Drive
Grafton Way
Hollingworth Close
Hurst Road
Lytcott Drive
Weldon Drive
Weston Avenue

**All the Roads in Polling District I = 5,247**
Polling Districts: CA, CB, GA (Part of),

All the Roads in Polling District CA = 3,869

All the Roads in Polling District CB = 958

Roads in Polling District GA (part of) = 1,672
Alders Grove
Bell Road
Bridge Road
Cedar Close
Cedar Road
Creek Road
Ember Farm Avenue
Ember Farm Way
Ember Lane (part of)
Esher Road (Part of)
Hampton Court Avenue
Hampton Court Parade
Hampton Court Way
Jasmine Way
Matham Road
Molember Road
Oarsmans Place
Queens Reach
Riverside Avenue
St Marys Road
Summer Avenue
Summer Gardens
Summer Road
Walton Road
Polling Districts: BA, BB, BC, EA (Part of), EB (Part of),

All the Roads in Polling District BA = 1,875

All the Roads in Polling District BB = 2,390

All the Roads in Polling District BC = 493

R*oads in Polling District EA (part of) = 234
Claygate Lane
Hill Rise
Severn Drive

R*oads in Polling District EB (part of) = 1,309
Avondale Avenue
Claygate Lane
Fairway Close
Greenways
Hengest Avenue
Hillcrest Gardens
Hinchley Close
Hinchley Drive
Manor Road South
Poplar Road
Soprano Way
Southwood Gardens
Woodstock Lane South
Ward #14 : Weston Green and Hinchley Wood - Total electorate for Ward = 6,231

Polling Districts: AC (Part of), DA, DB, EA (Part of), EB (Part of), GA (Part of)

Roads in Polling District AC (part of) = 807
Arran Way
Blair Avenue
Douglas Road
Farm Road
Joseph Locke Way
Mill Road
Sheriff Close
The Drive

All the Roads in Polling District DA = 1,439

All the Roads in Polling District DB = 1,489

Roads in Polling District EA (part of) = 1,866
Bourne Close Hillmont Road Paget Place
Brooklands Road Hinchley Way Portsmouth Road
Chesterfield Drive Lynwood Road Southmont Road
Cotswold Close Macauley Avenue Station Approach
Couchmore Avenue Manor Drive Wessex Close
Cumberland Drive Manor Road North Westmont Road
Dorchester Road Meadow Close Woodfield Road
Eastmont Road Montgomery Avenue

Roads in Polling District EB (part of) = 379
Hampton Court Way
Harefield
Heathside
Heathside Close
Littleworth Road
Medina Avenue
Portsmouth Road (part of)

Roads in Polling District GA (part of) = 251
Broadfields
Orchard Lane
Southfields
Polling Districts: AA, AB, AC (Part of), QA (Part of)

All the Roads in Polling District AA = 2,237

All the Roads in Polling District AB = 1,786

Roads in Polling Districts AC (Part of) = 295
Lower Green Road
More Lane
Oak Tree Place
Orleans Close
Spinney Gardens
The Furlongs
The Gallops
Thomas More Gardens
Waynefleet Place

Roads in Polling Districts QA (Part of) = 1,707
Abbotts Tilt
Assher Road
Brittain Road
Celandine Road
Chailey Place
Claremont Avenue
Dukes Road
Esher Road
Grange Road
Heathfield Road
Kingfisher Close
Longmore Road
Mead Road
Meadow Close
Mole Road
Molesey Close
Molesey Road (part of)
Newlands Close
Old Esher Close
Old Esher Road
Pembroke Avenue
Profumo Road
Ramornie Close
Riverside Road
Southdown Road
Polling Districts: M (Part of), OA, PA (Part of), QA (Part of), QB (Part of)

**Polling Districts M (Part of) = 367**
- Branksome Close
- Molesey Road
- Normanhurst Road
- Rydens Road (part of)
- Wilton Gardens

**Polling Districts OA = 982**

**Polling Districts PA (Part of) = 2,225**
- Betley Court
- Carrow Road
- Colne Drive
- Crofton Avenue
- Danesfield Close
- Denton Grove
- Devoke Way
- Elland Road
- Home Farm Gardens
- Hersham Road
- Holwood Close
- Kenilworth Drive
- Lindley Road
- Long Lodge Drive
- Maitland Close
- Milton Road
- Molesey Road
- Normanhurst Road
- Saxon Road
- Severn Drive
- Shaldon Way
- Sidney Road (part of)
- St Martins Drive
- Stamford Road
- Stoke Road
- Walton Park
- Walton Park Lane
- Winslow Way
- York Gardens

**Polling Districts QA (Part of) = 625**
- Arch Road
- Broad Close
- Claremont Avenue (Part of)
- Greenwood Place
- Marlborough Close
- Molesey Road (part of)
- Russet Close
- Rydens Grove

**Polling Districts QB (Part of) = 1,002**
- Albany Road
- Audley Firs
- Devon Road
- Falmouth Road
- Felcott Close
- Felcott Road
- Hersham Road
- Hersham Gardens
- Millers Close
- Molesey Road
- Pratts Lane
- Queensway North
- Robinsway
- Thistlecroft Road
**Explanation of the Proposed Ward Boundaries on a Ward by Ward Basis**

### Ward #1: Claygate

The current Claygate Ward is a Parished Ward and the only one within the Borough of Elmbridge. The village of Claygate is a more isolated settlement, predominantly surrounded by open land and Common land, with the Borough boundary to the East, whereby one road to the North and one road to the West links to adjacent settlements. Claygate has a strong identified community and has a long established geographical identity.

Whilst the electorate for Claygate Ward is slightly less than the – 10% variance to average electorate, it is proposed to retain the current boundary of Claygate Ward, being coterminous with Claygate Parish, in order to deliver convenient and effective local government.

### Ward #2: Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon

The established Oxshott & Stoke D’Abernon Ward is retained in its entirety and, to ensure that it has an adequate number of electors, a proportion of the neighbouring residential roads of Cobham Fairmile has been included in the new Ward. Members requested that Fairmile Lane and Sandy Lane be retained within one Ward, rather than split between Wards as was previously the case. Both Wards of Oxshott & Stoke D’Abernon and Cobham & Downside have the Borough boundary to the South, East and West and predominantly Painshill Park; Burhill Golf Course; Esher Common; Oxshott Heath and Prince’s Coverts providing a natural geographical boundary to the North.

### Ward #3: Cobham and Downside

The established Cobham and Downside Ward is predominantly retained in the proposed new Ward but will also include Painshill Park which has a strong Cobham identity, address and access route within the Cobham Settlement. Part of Burhill Golf Course has been moved to the adjacent Ward in order for the Golf Course to be situated within the same Ward. Both Wards of Oxshott & Stoke D’Abernon and Cobham & Downside have the Borough boundary to the South, East and West and predominantly Painshill Park; Burhill Golf Course; Esher Common; Oxshott Heath and Prince’s Coverts providing a natural geographical boundary to the North.

The A3 road is a strong boundary but this proposal crosses it since the properties to the north have access routes from the Cobham side and have an affinity in the Cobham area.
Weybridge Brooklands reinforces the identity of the historic motor and aviation heritage of the Borough with Brooklands Museum located within the Ward, together with Brooklands College. St. George’s Hill estate and Silvermere Golf Course are also included, with the Seven Hills Road providing a natural boundary to the East. A proportion of neighbouring roads of Weybridge to the North of Brooklands College have also been included in the new Ward to ensure that it has an adequate number of electors. There are links across the railway line at this point and these communities have a low density suburban character, distinct from Weybridge Town Centre.

Weybridge Riverside incorporates the core business areas of the Borough, both the Town Centre of Weybridge and the Queens Road retail area, where there are strong identified commercial, retail and employment uses. The River Thames flows to the North of the Ward along with the adjacent flood meadows, which the Ward name reflects. The railway forms the natural boundary to the South and road corridors influence the movement in and out of Weybridge Town Centre.

Hersham Village Ward incorporates substantially the existing Ward of Hersham South with minor changes at the Northern boundary to include some residential roads and also reflects the fact that Painshill Park is considered to be better located within the adjacent Ward to the South. The Hersham Centre is located within this Ward, with some retail and commercial provision. Whiteley Village retirement area is also retained as part of this Ward along with the adjacent Burwood Park low density residential area that lies to the West of Hersham Village Centre.
Ward #7: Oatlands & Ashley Park

Oatlands and Ashley Park incorporates the clearly identifiable communities of Oatlands Village and Ashley Park, situated between the adjacent Town Centres of Weybridge to the West and Walton to the North. The railway forms the natural boundary to the South of the Ward and the Broadwater Lake to the North West. In the North East the boundary runs up to the Southern edge of Walton Town Centre but largely includes suburban residential areas of a low density and broadly consistent character.

Ward #8: Walton Central

Walton Central incorporates one of the main commercial areas of the Borough which are located in the Heart Retail Centre and adjacent linked High Street of Walton Town Centre, where there are strong identified commercial, retail and employment uses. The River Thames and Borough Boundary form the Ward boundary to the North West and road corridors influence the layout and movement within these areas. All areas within the Ward are well connected in a relatively dense mix of commercial and residential uses identifiable as a cohesive town centre environment.

Ward #9: Walton Ambleside

Walton Ambleside is substantially the existing Borough Ward of Walton Ambleside but incorporating a large portion of the former Borough Ward of Walton North and a small portion of Walton South, to reflect and respect adjoining areas. The St. John’s Estate has been included in its entirety to the South of the Ward, maintaining the geographical cohesion of the community. The River Thames and Borough Boundary form the Ward boundary to the North, with the Queen Elizabeth II Reservoir forming a natural boundary to the East.

Ward #10: Molesey Riverside

The Molesey Riverside Ward incorporates predominantly the existing Borough Ward of Molesey North and part of Molesey East. The Borough Boundary and the River Thames form the long Northern boundary which is reflected the Ward name. A large section of the existing Ward boundary forms the Southern boundary. The Ward extends to the East to include Riverbank, whilst enabling Hampton Court Way, a main road into the Borough from the River Thames Crossing at Hampton Court, to be located in the adjacent Ward of Thames Ditton, maintaining the access and travel corridors accordingly.
Ward #11: Molesey South

The Molesey South Ward incorporates predominantly the existing Borough Ward of Molesey South with some adjustments to include a proportion of neighbouring roads of Molesey East and Molesey North to ensure that it has an adequate number of electors. Reservoirs form the natural boundary to the South and West. Coherence is provided by the inclusion of key public facilities including schools, hospital, employment area and football club.

Ward #12: Thames Ditton

The Thames Ditton Ward incorporates the existing Borough Ward of Thames Ditton in its entirety where there is a strong and long established community, while also incorporating the Eastern portion of Molesey East to ensure it has an adequate number of electors. The Borough Boundary and River Thames form the Ward boundary to the North, together with the existing Ward boundary, reflecting the community links and identity. The Ward includes all the main community facilities and areas like Giggs Hill Green. Although crossing the Portsmouth Road the Ward retains a coherence for the area recognised as Thames Ditton.

Ward #13: Long Ditton

The Long Ditton Ward incorporates the existing Ward of Long Ditton in its entirety and incorporates residential roads formerly within the Hinchley Wood Ward but that are separated by the Kingston By Pass. It is possible to transverse from one end of the Ward to the other, whilst remaining within the Ward, via Claygate Lane. There are good connections to local schools and the Ward is well connected whether by foot, bicycle, bus or car.

Ward #14: Weston Green and Hinchley Wood

The Weston Green and Hinchley Wood Ward incorporates two small identifiable communities and is reflected in the proposed Ward name. Each community has a small cluster of shops located along the roads running through the Ward. The existing Borough Ward of Hinchley Wood has had a section included with the adjacent Long Ditton Ward. There are good connections to local schools and the Ward is well connected whether by foot, bicycle or car. The railway lines, Hampton Court Way and Portsmouth Road all criss-cross the Ward and in some cases provide a clear Ward boundary. Nevertheless there is an identifiable character to this area despite having two distinct small centres.
## Ward #15: Esher and Hersham Riverside

Esher and Hersham Riverside Ward incorporates one of the main commercial areas of the Borough which is located in Esher High Street, where there is a strong identified retail centre, along with Sandown Park Racecourse. The Esher and Hersham Riverside Ward incorporates predominantly the existing Borough Ward of Esher where there is a strong identified community, whilst also incorporating the western portion of Hersham alongside the River Mole, reflected in the Ward name. The Lower Green Estate, formerly within the Ward of Esher, has been located in the adjacent Ward of Weston Green and Hinchley Wood to better reflect community identity and access routes to and from Weston Green, rather than Esher, given its location the other side to Sandown Race Course and the railway line.

## Ward #16: Rydens

Rydens Ward incorporates parts of Hersham and Walton-on-Thames. It includes the Fieldcommon Estate which is accessed from the Molesey Road, which is more logical than the existing Ward boundary. The Rydens Ward contains Rydens School which is the subject of a major planning application where 300 new properties are planned for completion prior to 2020 and are taken account of in the electorate growth for this Ward.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Having regard to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s (LGBCE) Electoral Review of Elmbridge, as the next stage in the process, Members are asked to consider the Borough’s future Warding patterns. The proposed Warding pattern takes account of the Commission being minded to recommend that the Council should have 48 Councillors in future. For Councils that hold Borough Elections in three out of every four years, the Commission works on the presumption of devising a uniform pattern of 3-Member Wards across the Borough. Members are also asked to give consideration to the names of the proposed new Wards.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT

(A) THE PROPOSED NEW WARDING PATTERN FOR THE WHOLE OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL, AS ATTACHED AS APPENDIX A, COMPRISING 16 THREE-MEMBER WARDS FOR 48 COUNCILLORS, WITH ALL PROPOSED WARDS CONFORMING TO THE +/- 10% TOLERANCE ON ELECTORAL EQUALITY BOTH CURRENTLY AND DURING THE FIVE YEAR PROJECTION, BE APPROVED; AND

(B) HAVING REGARD TO (A) ABOVE, THE PROPOSED NAMES FOR EACH NEW WARD BE AGREED


REPORT:

Background

1. The Council made a formal application for an Electoral Review to be undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England within the Electoral Review Programme for 2014/15, in order to consider reducing the number of Members of the Council. This formal request was agreed at a Meeting of the Council on 10 April 2013. The related Minute extract is set out below:
'RESOLVED that the Council’s request for an electoral review to be undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be confirmed, in order to consider reducing the number of Members of the Council; and

(a) a formal application be made to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for inclusion in the Electoral Review Programme for 2014/15, and that a business case be developed for submission, detailing the number of councillors that the Council considered to be appropriate;

(b) it be noted that whilst the Local Government Boundary Commission for England had not yet formalised the Electoral Review Timetable for 2014/15, should the Council be accepted within this Programme, it would be likely that any outcomes would be implemented by way of the Council elections in May 2016; and

(c) an Electoral Review Member Working Group be constituted with 7 Members (4 Conservative, 2 Residents’ Associations and 1 Liberal Democrat), in order to consider the development of the Council’s business case, for approval by the Cabinet prior to formal submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.’

2. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) subsequently confirmed that the Council had been formally included in its Electoral Review Programme for 2014/15. The stages involved in this review have been previously documented in earlier reports to full Council.

3. Representatives from the LGBCE met all Group Leaders and gave a presentation that was open to all Members of the Council on Monday 1 September 2014 at the Civic Centre to outline the review process and answer any questions from Members.

Council Size and Electoral Cycle

4. The initial stage of an Electoral Review is to determine a preferred Council size. This is the number of Councillors required to deliver effective and convenient local government. In consultation with the cross party Electoral Review Member Working Group, a Council-size submission was drawn up on the basis of 48 Members and took account of evidence available to the Council, including relevant consultations and surveys. The submission was formally approved by the Council on 3 December 2014.

5. The Council also took the opportunity during this process to reconsider its electoral cycle. For Councils that hold elections in three out of every four years, the Commission has a responsibility, set out in legislation, to devise a pattern of three-Member wards across the whole authority. The rationale is that such a ward pattern means that every elector would have the same opportunity to vote in local elections each time they are held. As the Council currently has six two-Member wards, an alternative option, should the Council wish to retain a mixed pattern of wards, would be to move to a cycle of whole-Council elections. The Commission is able to move
away from a uniform pattern of three-Member wards – on a ward by ward basis – if it believes an alternative arrangement would better meet its other statutory criteria: to deliver electoral equality for voters; to reflect the interests and identities of local communities; and to promote effective and convenient local government.

6. Following a public consultation, the Council determined that the current arrangements for Borough Elections by thirds would be continued and not changed to whole-Council Elections at a Special Council meeting on 17 November 2014.

7. On 3 February 2015, the Boundary Commission confirmed that it is minded to recommend 48 Councillors for the Borough of Elmbridge.

Warding Patterns

8. Following the Commission publishing its proposal of Council size and thereby commencing the first period of public consultation on Warding patterns until 31 March 2015, the Electoral Review Working Group sought all Members’ views to develop a potential new Warding pattern for the Borough. In view of the Council’s decision to retain Borough Elections by thirds, the Warding pattern has been developed on the basis of a uniform pattern of 16 three-Member Wards.

9. The Warding pattern has been drawn up having regard to the Commission’s criteria, for example, delivering electoral equality for local voters, whereby each local Councillor represents roughly the same number of people. The full criteria can be found on the LGBCE’s website.

10. The proposed Warding pattern takes account of the projected electorate for the whole district in 2020. The Elmbridge Electoral Data is published on the LGBCE website.

11. At the meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group on 4 March 2015, consideration was given to the proposed new Warding pattern. Following some amendments by the Working Group, the proposed Warding pattern for the Borough is attached at Appendix A (a large scale map has been provided to each Member of the Council separately, for ease of reference), for Members’ consideration.

Proposed New Ward Names

12. Furthermore, at the meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group on 4 March 2015, it was agreed that proposed names be considered at the Special Council Meeting on 16 March, 2015, alongside the proposed Warding pattern.

13. Some proposed Ward names were put forward by the Working Group to be included on the Special Council Agenda for Members’ consideration, together with other suggestions received prior to the Council Agenda despatch. Accordingly, Members are asked to determine proposed Ward names, having regard to those already included on the agenda paper, together with any proposed at the meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Number</th>
<th>Proposed Ward Names Received to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1</td>
<td>Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cobham East and Oxshott;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxshott and Cobham East;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxshott and Fairmile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2</td>
<td>Cobham West;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>St. George’s Hill;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. George’s Hill and Weybridge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weybridge West;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weybridge South;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elmbridge West;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklands;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weybridge Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>Weybridge Central;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weybridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>Hersham Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6</td>
<td>Oatlands &amp; Walton Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7</td>
<td>Walton Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 9</td>
<td>Molesey North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 10</td>
<td>Molesey South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 11</td>
<td># 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12</td>
<td># 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 13</td>
<td># 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 14</td>
<td># 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esher and Hersham Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 15</td>
<td>Rydens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Stages of the Electoral Review**

14. The current consultation on Ward arrangements concludes on 31 March 2015. The Commission will publish draft recommendations for a future Warding pattern for Elmbridge in June 2015, whereby a second period of public consultation will run until August 2015. It is anticipated that the Commission will make its final recommendations in September 2015. A draft Order setting out the Commission’s final recommendations will be placed before Parliament, with the expectation that the Order will be confirmed later this year. Subject to Parliament approval, the new arrangements will come into force in May 2016 when an all-out Borough election will be held.

**Financial implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.

**Environmental/Sustainability Implications:**
None for the purpose of this report.
Legal implications:

Equality Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Risk Implications:
This is a response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s Consultation.

Community Safety Implications:
None for the purpose of this report.

Principal Consultees:
Chief Executive and Head of Legal Services.

Background papers:
None

Enclosures/Appendices:
Appendix A - Proposed New Warding Pattern

Contact details:
Head of Democratic Services –
1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

2. ELECTORAL REVIEW – PROPOSED WARDING PATTERNS FOR ELMBRIDGE

Having regard to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s (LGBCE) Electoral Review of Elmbridge, as the next stage in the process, Members were asked to consider the Borough’s future Warding patterns. The proposed Warding pattern took account of the Commission being minded to recommend that the Council should have 48 Councillors in future. For Councils that held Borough Elections in three out of every four years, the Commission worked on the presumption of devising a uniform pattern of 3-Member Wards across the Borough. Members were also asked to give consideration to the names of the proposed new Wards.

At a meeting of the Electoral Review Member Working Group on 4 March 2015, consideration had been given to the proposed new Warding pattern. Following
some amendments by the Working Group, the proposed Warding pattern for the Borough, attached as Appendix A to the report, was presented for Members’ consideration.

Mrs. K. Randolph, seconded by Mrs. R.J.M. Lyon, moved the following amendments to the proposed Warding pattern map:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#12 Thames Ditton (6,260)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Comment/explanation</th>
<th>Amended Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add 634</td>
<td>From #13</td>
<td>To accord with existing ward boundary in Thorkhill Road area ie. The whole of CB register to be in #12</td>
<td>6,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract 185</td>
<td>To #14</td>
<td>Southfields (97) + Broadfields (88) to transfer from #12 to #14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract 156</td>
<td>To #14</td>
<td>Ember Lane odd numbers between Embercourt Road and Esher Road (31) Ember Lane even numbers between Embercourt Road and Esher Road (60) Orchard Lane (65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #13 (Long Ditton) (6,524) | Subtract 634 | To #12 TD | To accord with existing ward boundary in Thorkhill Road area ie. The whole of CB register | 6302 |
| Add 412                    | From #14 | Manor Road South (218) and Greenways (194) to transfer from #14 to #13 | |

| #14 (Weston Green) (6,561) | Add 156 | From #12 | Ember Lane odd numbers between Embercourt Road and Esher Road (31) Ember Lane even numbers between Embercourt Road and Esher Road (60) Orchard Lane (65) | 6,490 |
| Subtract 412               | From #14 | Manor Road South (218) and Greenways (194) to transfer from #14 to #13 | |
| Add 185                    | From #12 | Southfields (97) + Broadfields (88) to transfer from TD to WG | |

By affirmation of the meeting, the Mayor declared the amendment to be CARRIED.

S.J. Selleck, seconded by C.R. Sadler moved the following amendment:
‘That Recommendation A of the report be amended to read:

A) That the proposed new Warding pattern for the whole of Elmbridge Borough Council, as tabled, comprising 14 three-Member Wards and 3 two-Member Wards for
48 Councillors, with all proposed Wards conforming to the +/- 10% tolerance on electoral equality both currently and as projected for the year 2020, be approved.’

In addition to circulating a map showing an alternative proposed Warding pattern, the following information was also circulated to Members in support of the amendment:

‘Key data and Draft Ward Names for consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Divergence from Average size of 6204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claygate</td>
<td>5509</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oxshott &amp; Stoke D’Abernion</td>
<td>6551</td>
<td>+ 5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>6364</td>
<td>+ 2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>St Georges Hill</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>- 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Weybridge</td>
<td>5827</td>
<td>- 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hersham Village</td>
<td>6620</td>
<td>+ 6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oatlands &amp; Burwood Park</td>
<td>6077</td>
<td>- 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Walton Central</td>
<td>6024</td>
<td>- 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Walton North</td>
<td>6550</td>
<td>+ 5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Molesey North</td>
<td>6703</td>
<td>+ 8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Molesey South</td>
<td>6786</td>
<td>+ 9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
<td>5676</td>
<td>- 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Long Ditton ( 2 Cllrs )</td>
<td>3854</td>
<td>- 6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hinchley Wood (2 Cllrs)</td>
<td>3948</td>
<td>- 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Esher &amp; Hersham Riverside</td>
<td>6259</td>
<td>+ 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Walton South</td>
<td>5993</td>
<td>- 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Weston Green &amp; Mole Riverside (2 Cllrs)</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>+ 7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 99268

Electorate numbers are provisional and based on the data available as at 13 February 2015.’

R. Green requested a recorded vote, whereupon there voted:

In support of the amendment:


Against the amendment:

Abstain:
A. Coomes, A. Davis, B. Fairbank, Mrs. J. Fuller, A.J. Hopkins and Mrs. M. Marshall. (6)

The Mayor declared the amendment to be LOST.

At the Electoral Review Member Working Group meeting on 4 March 2015, it had also been agreed that proposed Ward names should be considered at the Special Council Meeting, alongside the proposed Warding pattern.

Members were invited to determine the proposed Ward names, having regard to those already received together with those subsequently proposed at the meeting, as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Number</th>
<th>Proposed Ward Names Considered by Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 1</td>
<td>Claygate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 2</td>
<td>Oxshott and Stoke D'Abernon; Cobham East and Oxshott; Oxshott and Cobham East; and Oxshott and Fairmile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>Cobham West; Cobham West and Downside; Cobham and Downside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 4</td>
<td>St. George’s Hill; St. George's Hill and Weybridge; Weybridge West; Weybridge South; Elmbridge West; Brooklands; Weybridge Park; Weybridge Brooklands; Weybridge St. George’s; Weybridge St. George’s Hill; and Brooklands St. George’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 5</td>
<td>Weybridge Central; Weybridge; and Weybridge Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 6</td>
<td>Hersham Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 7</td>
<td>Oatlands &amp; Walton Ashley; and Oatlands and Ashley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 8</td>
<td>Walton Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 9</td>
<td>Walton Ambleside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 10</td>
<td>Molesey North; and Molesey Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 11</td>
<td>Molesey South; and Molesey Beecham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 12</td>
<td>Thames Ditton; and Hampton Court and Thames Ditton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 13</td>
<td>Long Ditton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 14</td>
<td>Rythe; Weston Green and Hinchley Wood West; and Weston Green and Hinchley Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 15</td>
<td>Esher and Hersham Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 16</td>
<td>Rydens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After detailed discussion and debate it was RESOLVED that

(a) the proposed new Warding pattern for the whole of Elmbridge Borough Council, as attached as Appendix A to the report, as amended, comprising 16 three-Member Wards for 48 Councillors, with all proposed Wards conforming to the +/- 10% tolerance on electoral equality both currently and during the five year projection, be approved as the Council’s preferred Warding pattern;

(b) having regard to (a) above, the Council’s preferred names for each new Ward be agreed as follows:
Ward  Ward Name
Number

# 1 Claygate
# 2 Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon
# 3 Cobham and Downside
# 4 Weybridge Brooklands
# 5 Weybridge Riverside
# 6 Hersham Village
# 7 Oatlands & Ashley Park
# 8 Walton Central
# 9 Walton Ambleside
# 10 Molesey Riverside
# 11 Molesey South
# 12 Thames Ditton
# 13 Long Ditton
# 14 Weston Green and Hinchley Wood
# 15 Esher and Hersham Riverside
# 16 Rydens; and

(c) the Council’s preferred Warding pattern and Ward names be submitted as the formal response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s consultation, by 31 March 2015.

The meeting commenced at 8.00 p.m. and concluded at 10.48 p.m.

B. FAIRBANK
Mayor

Democratic Services Officer
Ms. M. Hayes - Committee and Member Services Manager

Other Officers in attendance
R. Moran - Chief Executive
Mrs. S. Selvanathan - Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive
R. Lee - Strategic Director
Ms. B. Greenstein - Head of Democratic Services
A. Harrison - Head of Legal Services
Miss A. Mammous - Electoral Services Manager
Miss. C. Tidy - Graduate Management Trainee
Mr Robert Moran  
Chief Executive  
Elmbridge Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
High Street  
Esher  
Surrey  
KT10 9SD  

03 February 2015

Dear Mr Moran,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

I am writing to inform you that the Commission has, today, opened its consultation inviting proposals for a new pattern of electoral wards for Elmbridge.

The Commission is minded to recommend that 48 councillors should be elected to Elmbridge Borough Council in future. The Commission now invites proposals from the council, interested parties and members of the public on a pattern of electoral wards to accommodate those councillors.

The consultation begins today and will end on 31 March 2015.

Publicising the review

I would be grateful if you could bring the consultation to the attention of elected members. Furthermore, a copy of the Commission’s press release and posters advertising this stage of the review are being sent to your Council. It would be much appreciated if you could publicise the consultation by arranging for copies to be placed on display at local information points, and by taking such other steps as you consider appropriate to bring the review to the attention of the public and other interested parties. In particular, we would appreciate it if you could promote the consultation online, via social media and any other channels you would normally use to engage residents.

Further details about the review are available on our website at www.lgbcce.org.uk where there is information about how to get involved and the kind of evidence the Commission is seeking in support of any proposed division patterns.

In addition, the Commission’s consultation portal allows visitors to interact with online maps of the current electoral wards, draw their own boundaries and feed views into the consultation process directly. The portal is available at www.consultation.lgbcce.org.uk.

Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 3rd Floor Layard House, 76-86 Tymrell Street, London EC1M 5LD  
Tel: 0207 564 8534; reviews@lgbcce.org.uk; www.lgbcce.org.uk
Submissions can also be made by email to reviews@lgbce.org.uk and by post to the address at the end of this letter.

Review timetable

This phase of consultation closes on 31 March 2015.

Once the Commission has considered all the proposals received during this phase of consultation, it plans to publish draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements in June 2015. Public consultation on the draft recommendations is scheduled to take place between June 2015 and August 2015. Once the Commission has considered the representations and evidence as part of that consultation, it intends to publish final recommendations in December 2015.

New electoral arrangements for the council are scheduled to come into effect at the council elections in 2016.

Creating a pattern of wards

In drawing up a pattern of electoral wards, the Commission must balance its three statutory criteria, namely:

- To deliver electoral equality where each councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the wards.
- That the pattern of wards should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities.
- That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.

The Commission will test proposals against the criteria before drawing up draft recommendations. Accordingly, all proposals should demonstrate how they meet the three requirements. The Commission will take decisions based on the strength of the evidence presented to it and not merely on assertion. For example, details of community interests such as the location and use made of local facilities, services and local organisations demonstrating how a community manifests itself will carry greater weight than submissions that simply assert the that an area has community identity.

The Commission will consider all submissions on their merit. A well-evidenced submission from an individual which addresses the three statutory criteria will be more persuasive than one which does not, even if the latter is from an elected individual or body.

Further information on drawing up a pattern of electoral wards is available in our guidance document: Electoral reviews: technical guidance which can be found at www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/guidance. We also publish a practical guide for putting forward submissions called How to propose a pattern of wards which is available at www.lgbce.org.uk/documents/lgbce/guidance-policy-and-publications/guidance/proposing-new-wards-guidance.pdf.
Our website includes information about previous electoral reviews of councils where you can see how the Commission came to its conclusions and how other counties, districts and parishes built their own pattern of wards.

Please feel free to contact us at any time should you have any questions. Officers at the Commission will be happy to assist with technical aspects of your division scheme either in person or via email or telephone.

Correspondence and enquiries

Correspondence relating to this review should be addressed to:

Review Officer (Elmbridge)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Or direct to your main contacts at the Commission who will be:

- Alex Hinds, Review Officer, with specific responsibility for the day-to-day running of the review
  Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk; Tel: 020 7664 8517;
- Richard Buck, Review Manager, who leads the team dealing with this and other reviews
  Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk; Tel: 020 7664 8511.

I am copying this letter to the organisations and individuals listed below.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Jolyon Jackson
Chief Executive
Reviews@lgbce.org.uk
020 7664 8537

cc MPs and MEPs with constituency interests in Elmbridge
Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey
Surrey Downs Clinical Commissioning Group
NHS England
Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
News Release

Embargoed until: 00.01, 3 February 2015

Have your say on new ward boundaries for Elmbridge

The independent Local Government Boundary Commission for England is asking local people for their help to draw up a new pattern of council wards for Elmbridge Borough Council.

The Commission has also announced that it is minded to recommend that the council should have 48 councillors in future: twelve fewer than the current arrangements.

The Commission now needs information from people and groups across Elmbridge to help it to produce a new pattern of wards to accommodate 48 councillors.

In drawing up new boundaries, the Commission aims to deliver electoral equality for voters in council elections so that each councillor represents roughly the same number of voters. The review also aims to ensure that the new council wards reflect, as far as possible, the interests and identities of communities across Elmbridge.

Max Caller, Chair of the Commission, said: “The starting point of an electoral review is for the Commission to take a view on the number of councillors that should represent the authority in future. On the evidence presented to the Commission, we are minded to recommend that Elmbridge should have 48 councillors in future: twelve fewer than the current arrangements.

“We are now asking local people and organisations to help us draw up new wards for Elmbridge. As we develop the recommendations, we will take into account local community identities as well as ensuring electoral equality for voters.

“Your views will make a difference.

“We will carefully consider all evidence that is provided during this phase of the review whoever it is from and whether it applies to the whole of Elmbridge or just a small part of the borough.

“We will publish all the submissions on our website so that local people can see all the various proposals we receive. Residents will then have a further chance to have their say after we publish our draft recommendations in June.”

Local people have until 31 March 2015 to submit their views. Further information on the review and interactive maps of the existing wards can be found at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk and www.lgbce.org.uk.

ends
Notes to editors:
1. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for reviewing local authority electoral arrangements, defining boundaries for local elections and the number of councillors to be elected, as well as conducting reviews of local government external boundaries and structures.

2. The aim of an electoral review is to provide for ‘electoral equality’; that means each councillor representing approximately the same number of electors. The Commission must also have regard to community identity and interests and providing effective and convenient local government.

3. The types of questions the Commission is asking residents at this stage are:
   - Do you have suggestions about where your ward boundaries should be?
   - Which areas do you identify as your local community?
   - Where do people in your area go to access local facilities such as shops and leisure activities?

4. Residents have from 3 February 2015 to 31 March 2015 to have their say about where ward boundaries for Elmbridge’s 48 councillors should be drawn. The Commission will then publish its draft recommendations in June 2015 and open a further phase of consultation with local people. New wards are scheduled to come into effect at the 2016 local elections.

5. The Commission’s decision on council size means it is ‘minded’ to recommend 48 councillors for Elmbridge but is not legally bound by that number in its final recommendations and depending on the evidence submitted to it during consultation.

6. For councils, like Elmbridge, that hold elections in three years out of every four, the Commission has a responsibility, set out in legislation, to devise a pattern of three-member wards across the whole authority. Such a ward pattern means that every elector would have the same opportunity to vote in local elections each time they are held. However, the Commission is able to move away from a uniform pattern of three-member wards – on a ward by ward basis - if it believes an alternative arrangement would better meet its other statutory criteria: to deliver electoral equality for voters, to reflect the interests and identities of local communities and to promote effective and convenient local government.

7. Members of the public can have their say on the new ward arrangements by writing to:
   The Review Officer (Elmbridge)
   Layden House
   76-86 Turnmill Street
   London EC1M 5LG
   Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

   Follow the Commission on Twitter: @LGBCE

   Go directly to the Commission’s consultation portal at: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk

   Link to dedicated web page for the Elmbridge electoral review at: https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/surrey/elmbridge

   For further information contact the Commission’s press office on: 0207 664 8530/8534 or email: press@lgbce.org.uk
Electoral Review of Elmbridge

The independent Local Government Boundary Commission for England is carrying out an electoral review of Elmbridge Borough Council.

The review will draw new council ward boundaries across Elmbridge.

The Commission has also announced that 48 councillors should be elected to the council in future: 12 fewer than the current arrangements.

Now we are asking for evidence about your local area to help us decide a new pattern of wards for Elmbridge Borough Council.

Your views will make a difference

Local people know their area best. That’s why we are asking you for evidence on a range of issues:

- Do you have suggestions about where your ward boundaries should be?
- Which areas do you identify as your local community?
- Where do people in your area go to access local facilities such as shops and leisure activities?

For more details and interactive maps, visit:

www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk or www.lgbce.org.uk

Have your say

Send your views to:

The Review Officer (Elmbridge)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Follow us on Twitter: @LGBCE

The consultation closes on 31 March 2015

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
THE COUNCIL’S PREFERRED WARDING PATTERN FOR THE BOROUGH OF ELMBRIDGE
AGREED AT A SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING ON 16 MARCH 2015

Elektorate Figures as at 30/3/15

Total Electorate = 98,770
Average Electorate per ward = 6,173
+ 10% variance = 6,790
- 10% variance = 5,556
(N.B. Electorate numbers indicated in brackets are provisional)