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Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposal to alter the ward boundaries for Thames Ditton. As a resident in the area which the Boundary Commission wishes to join to the ward of Long Ditton, I am dismayed to find that the ancient historic ties to Thames Ditton will be severed and any changes will have a negative effect on local identities. It is not in the interests of the local community to make these changes. People living in the affected area will feel alienated and will feel that they have an inferior standing in the community if their postal addresses and wards conflict. Residents may also be confused about which councillors to contact on issues.

Furthermore, I have established relationships with the current local councillors and have communicated with them many times. In contrast, I do not even know the names of the Long Ditton councillors and do not want to have to go through the whole process of explaining ongoing issues again to a new set of people.

It is also a great concern to me that these proposals have been issued when many residents will be on holiday. Many residents will not be aware of the situation, particularly when the date set for end of the consultation period is in, arguably, the most popular week for holidays. It would have been more courteous to extend the period into September. Such a restricted consultation period will no doubt lend itself to bias to the detriment of the community.

Yours faithfully
Sarah Kaikini
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Sam Kavanaugh
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: Man

Comment text:

I think the whole of beauchamp road should be east molesey. The current plans mean some of the road is east and some west

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 07 August 2015 15:36
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection to Thames Ditton Proposal

---

From: Tom Kelly
Sent: 07 August 2015 15:33
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection to Thames Ditton Proposal

Dear Sir/Madam,
I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the Thames Ditton ward.

I look to Thames Ditton as the centre of my community in which I have lived for 31 years. I am an active member of the Thames Ditton and Western Green Residents Association (TDWGA) and I have supported them in their attempts to protect the unique character of the neighbourhood.

It will not improve my representation to have my neighbourhood join Long Ditton. I am currently well represented by a TDWGA councillor and I am also part of the Giggis Hill Green conservation area.

I consider myself part of the Thames Ditton community and I do not wish to leave it.

Yours sincerely,
Mr TM Kelly
The Review Officer (Elmbridge)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor,
Millbank Tower,
London
SW1P 4QP

19 August 2015

I live at [redacted] and am unhappy about the proposed boundary changes which would place my home in Oatlands Park Ward.

My postal address includes the line Hersham as that is the community in which the house resides.

I appreciate the need to reduce the number of councillors but the proposed boundaries do not seem to take account of the local community.

Currently there is a Hersham North and Hersham South Ward and under the new proposals these have been reduced to a single Hersham Village Ward excluding many Hersham homes from the Hersham Ward.

Hersham is a vibrant community with shops, post office, doctors, dentist, library etc that my neighbours and I use regularly. I consider myself to live in and to be part of the Hersham village community. I have no association with Oatlands.

The railway and main road form a natural boundary separating Hersham and Oatlands and certainly from my perspective I have no affiliation or connection with Oatlands.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that Oatlands is in a different Parliamentary constituency from Hersham to that of Walton and Esher and there are currently no Elmbridge Borough wards which cross Parliamentary boundaries.

I feel very strongly that Westcar Lane and the roads running off it should be part of the Hersham Ward and I wish to add my support to the Council's recommendations for an enlarged Hersham Village Ward which includes these roads.

Many thanks

Maggie Kent
From: Nick Kent
Sent: 30 July 2015 16:51
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary changes

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary changes for my area. I am currently part of the Hersham area (my address is [redacted] and the proposal is to move my area to be part of Oatlands.

I think this will be very negative for my area which is quite rural and even agricultural and group it into an area which is very different in character – primarily residential. Over many years the local councillors have understood our community well and made thoughtful decisions which reflect the nature of the area and the needs of its constituents. I do not feel that this would be the case if we were to be part of such a dissimilar area as Oatlands.

I hope my objection is clear. Please contact me if you require any further information.

Yours faithfully

Nick Kent

[Redacted]

[Redacted] with it are confidential and for the intended recipient only. If you have received this e-mail in error you should destroy it without copying, distributing or otherwise disclosing its content. Please notify the sender immediately.
Dear Sirs

I am concerned that the review for the Hersham Village Ward is misguided.

It seems to me that the guideline for wards to be such that each councillor represents roughly the same number of voters as elected members elsewhere in the authority has been given undue weight against the other prime criteria.

The proposed boundary runs through Hersham Village, splitting the Longmore Estate away from the rest of the village.

Clearly this boundary proposal does not reflect common community interests or identities. Furthermore it does not reflect the requirement for convenient local government.

I hope that the Commission will see fit to move the ward boundary further east to the River Mole.

Yours faithfully

Tim Kerr
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Fay Khan
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I feel very strongly that the Longmore Estate in Hersham and especially Hersham Library should be in the Hersham Village Ward. This area can not be considered to be part of Esher. The children who live in these roads are in the catchment for Hersham Schools. The people who use the library are Hersham residents. The residents of the Longmore Estate commute from Hersham Railway Station. They cannot be represented by Esher. The River Mole creates a natural boundary and Esher starts once you have crossed the river by the Hospice.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Kilpatrick, Thomas
Sent: 14 August 2015 13:
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>

Dear Sir or Madam,

In November 2014 my family and I moved to Thames Ditton and live at ______. I am writing to register my objection to the proposed boundary changes which would mean our home and about would be shifted to Long Ditton. We are regular church attendees at St Nicholas church – particularly now there is a new vicar - and are trying to get to know the Thames Ditton community through the church, the various sports clubs (tennis, cricket and Colets) and our children’s nursery schools. We feel we have made great strides in the past 9 or so months but are very dismayed to now learn we may well be part of Long Ditton.

I know this will have little effect on our day to day lives but the reason we moved to the area from central London is because of the community spirit within Thames Ditton. St Nicholas is a magical church and we deeply want to remain part of the parish. We definitely look to Thames Ditton as the centre of our community and to start to break up this historic and beautiful part of the world through boundaries seems very regrettable from our perspective. I therefore implore you to rethink your actions – if the community atmosphere of the area is damaged it may mean that families like us looking to establish themselves and raise their children to be part of the community look past Thames Ditton.

Living within an anonymous street lacking community focal point and environment was exactly the reason we moved away from town and we would be most upset and disappointed if this were to be undone. Please don’t break-up Thames Ditton.

Yours faithfully,

Tom Kilpatrick
Director
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 13 August 2015 16:58
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection: Proposals for Thames Ditton Ward

-----Original Message-----
From: Vicky Kilpatrick
Sent: 11 August 2015 19:58
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 
Subject: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection: Proposals for Thames Ditton Ward

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am emailing to object to the proposed plans to move residents from Thames ditton electoral role to Long Ditton.

I live on and enjoy being part of the Thames ditton community and I have very strong views against being removed from this community and my voting writes that go with it. I believe the proposal to remove all residents on the CB register on the roads east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton ward will divorce us from the Thames Ditton ward, parish and community of which we have been a part since 1100 AD.

I very much view Thames Ditton as the centre of my community for all of my local activities from shops, collets, doctors, village hall (now Vera Fletcher Hall), St. Nicholas Church, village green (Giggs Hill Green) Thames Ditton Centre for the Community, Girl Guides etc.

The Thames Ditton ward councillors respond to local residents and look after these areas and I want to remain part of their decision making.

I strongly object to these plans and wish my view to be seriously considered before a decision was made.

Kind Regards
Vicky Kilpatrick
To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to oppose the changes to the Boundary Commission. I do not feel this is the right way to go and object to being lumped into wards which dictate my future. We are a Village with our own library which we have fought to save many times, a River which at the moment dictates the Boundary and local councillors. I feel very strongly to the proposed changes and object to them.

Yours sincerely,
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Roger & J. Veronica King
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I am a long-term Esher resident & support the Boundary Commission proposals but NOT those of the Esher Council: removal of the Lower Green area is wrong. It is an important part of Esher Parish & is unrelated to that of Weston Green. Esher church & residents have devoted time, money & effort to the development of this area of Esher & it has strong cultural, social, religious & communication links with Esher.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
3. 8. 15

Dear Sir,

I am not at all happy re the boundary change. I have lived in my present house since 1970, my children all went to school round here. I attend a local church and also use the Day Centre and Village Hall regularly. I regard this area as my home, am now a widow and would hate any change.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Sir/Madam

I was concerned to read that the Local Government boundary commission has proposed that Burwood Park be removed from Hersham Village and combined with Oatlands Park. The existing arrangement has worked well, and residents have been well served by their councillors.

The problems with the new proposal, apart from potentially losing good councillors, are the new ward crossing two Parliamentary constituencies, blurring representation, and the crossing of a physical boundary (the railway line). Burwood Park belongs more naturally to the Hersham community.

Regards, Nick Kirk
From: KNIGHT JENNIFER
Sent: 19 August 2015 12:
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Change

Dear Concerned,

Just heard that the Boundary Commission had recommended my road was to stay within the Esher Ward....hooray!

Then only to find out that the Conservative Administration of Elmbridge Borough Council wish to go against this - this is wrong. Questions need to be asked and answered:

1. How much more is this costing the residence?
2. I don't remember seeing anything explaining how they have made the decision and why?
3. They obviously knew about this in the May Election why did the residence not get asked to vote on this?

I have been an Esher resident all my life (+44 years).

This stinks....seems to me Conservative are trying to make Esher more elite and obviously the people/residents in the lower part of Esher are not worthy.

Shame on you!!

A very unhappy Esher resident.

Marie Knight
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am emailing to record my, and my wife's, strong objection to the current proposal to move our street (Westville Road) and surrounding roads out of the Thames Ditton ward.

- We purchased our current property in 1988, in part because it was part of Thames Ditton ward, with a wonderful village, village green and amenities, and a good reputation (schools, etc.). Since then we have always felt a part of the Thames Ditton community and feel a deep affinity with the village, Giggs Hill green and the ward - but not with Long Ditton. If the proposal is "to reflect community identity" then you have got that wrong.
- We have always supported the Thames Ditton Resident Association, who we believe very fairly and proactively represent the wishes of the community of which we are part (note, we have had dealings the local council re planning applications, etc. in the past, and have been always been impressed with the TDRA - and not so much with some others). The current boundary change will, we believe, reduce our democratic representation...definitely against our wishes.
- We also see, from viewing the plans, that there is a proposal to include part of East Molesey within the Thames Ditton ward whilst removing our area....this doesn't seem to make much sense to us.

We are also surprised (appalled) in the manner in which these proposals have been brought to our attention (or not in our case). It does affect our sense of local identity...and we have been here for a few decades and been part of the community.

In summary, we don't see the value in the proposed change, very strongly object to them ,and feel that our democratic rights are being affected.

Regards

Bob and Margaret Laidler
The Review Office (Elmbridge)  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14th Floor Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP  

6 August 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

**Elmbridge Electoral Review- Objection: Proposals for Thames Ditton Ward**

I have lived in Thames Ditton since 2000. One of the reasons I moved to this area was because of Thames Ditton village and the community. Our house overlooks Giggs Hill Green and is in a conservation area with the rest of the houses around Giggs Hill Green. I’m objecting to the proposals to joining Long Ditton ward because:

1) The Boundary commission’s own criteria states that the wards should reflect the interests and identifies of local communities. Being in a conservation area and overlooking the village green – it is better if one Ward tackles these issues rather than two.

2) The Boundary commission’s own criteria also states that “the electoral arrangements should provide effective and convenient local government”. Just on the conservation issues – the work will be increased since 2 Wards will have to tackle things or sadly it’ll be ignored.

3) I use the facilities in Thames Ditton e.g. Giggs Hill Green, the shops, events at Vera Fletcher Hall, The Community Centre, the Library and I would like my own Councilors to continue to improve and campaign for the theses things e.g. the High Street shops, Giggs Hill Green etc.

4) The Thames Ditton ward boundary has included Portsmouth Road since the first local council was established in 1895. 

5) Our house overlooks Giggs Hill Green and should continue to have a historic cohesiveness with the rest of the houses overlooking Giggs Hill Green. This historic and special view may be lost if the houses (on Porstmouth Road) overlooking Giggs Hill Green are moved to another Ward.

In summary it appears that the historic community of Thames Ditton is being carved up for the sake of bureaucratic convenience. I would like to stay within the Thames Ditton Ward. Please confirm that my objection has been noted.

Yours sincerely
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: PAT LAMBOURN
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:
I can see a need for maybe reducing the number of councillors in Elmbridge. Taking the boundary in front of Hersham Library is not a good idea. I feel very strongly that the boundary should be behind the library, thereby ensuring the library will be kept safe within Hersham. I have used the library for almost all the 38 years my family have lived here, and it would be a massive loss if we were to lose it.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: John Lancashire
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

We live on the edge of Burwood Park and have a greater affinity with Weybridge and Oatlands than Hersham. We have much more in common with the needs and issues of the households in this area. The draft proposals for the new Oatlands Park and Burwood Park Ward reflect this and would be better for us than the extension to Hersham South Ward proposed by Hersham South councillors.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Starkie, Emily

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 24 August 2015 16:49
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Boundary Commission: electoral review of Elmbridge - Weston Green

From: Jeremy Lancaster
Sent: 23 August 2015 12:43
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Commission: electoral review of Elmbridge - Weston Green

Dear Sir/ Madam
My family have been residents of Weston Green for 20 plus years.
Having reviewed the information and map on the LGBCE website, we believe that the new Hinchley Wood & Weston Green ward should be extended beyond that proposed by the Commission on 30th June to include the area known as Lower Green, to the north of the railway line.
Consequently, we strongly support the Elmbridge Borough Council's submission ratified at Full Council of 22nd July 2015

Yours faithfully,

Jeremy, Helen, Alexandra and Freya Lancaster
Hello
Just to say that while I recognise the need for change I am very concerned about the inclusion of Hersham Library in the Esher ward in the proposed plans. Considering how often the closure of our library has been mooted over the years I can’t help but feel that this move will provide the final excuse that’s needed – we don’t need two libraries in one ward. Yet there is nowhere else in walking distance where people can access reading material without buying it. Libraries are a huge opportunity for social inclusion and Hersham library is situated close to areas where there is a need. It also plays a major role in the life of the community. Moreover, with the growing recognition that we are faced with an ageing population, a local library where people who are not hugely tech-savvy can access printed books and newspapers is a forward-thinking facility. Promise that the library will remain and I’ll be content with the boundary changes. Make no promise and I will continue to object.

Regards
Kathy Lawrence
I object to the new proposed boundary changes which directly impact us.

It appears that the changes are simply a “bureaucratic” change which will be time consuming and expensive to implement, and seems to have immeasurable benefits to residents. We will lose our current community identity, which we have benefited from over several years, under the protection of the local residents association and councillors who work hard to ensure that all Thames Ditton residents are supported and local issues are addressed. We live in Thames Ditton (not Long Ditton) and should be supported locally and believe there is currently limited Long Ditton support. We are already part of this community and use services extensively within this ward.

The changes simply appear to reduce ward residents in one area and increase in another, which seems to be a boundary shifting exercise with no benefit to the community insofar as reduced financial responsibility or an improvement in local services. This maybe more convenient for local government but what cost savings there may be, will then be spent communicating and delivering this unnecessary change. We are currently well supported by the local Community of Thames Ditton & Weston Green and any break up will mean that we are no longer part of this strong community which is well supported and keeps the local community intact, effective and working together.

I wouldn’t object to joining or merging areas to make larger areas, but to remove a number of houses out of one part and then increase these elsewhere seems a futile exercise, as this I the case for my property. From a resident’s viewpoint I do not believe these changes will provide any improvements in the effectiveness of local government. I believe it would be better to simply reduce the councillors to 48, let the residents take a hit on any changes this may result in, and then make ward changes based on actual practical and funding experience and identified priorities. Maybe each ward should not have an equal number of councillors to voters (proposed 3), it should be based on the ward activities and local support already in place - taking into account strong residents associations which differ from one area to the next.

With future similar proposals, it would be beneficial for local residents to be informed of the cost of these proposals so that there is some kind of meaningful measurement to approve/object to. Its all very well reducing the number of councillors to 48, but does the cost of this overall administrative change, cost more to implement with little benefit to local residents? If this is the case, which I suspect it is in this case, it should be a non-starter.

I look forward to receiving further information.

Dena Lawson
I object to the new review separating Burwood Park from Hersham. All our activities are centred on Hersham and we should not be separated! V. Leach
Re your proposals to incorporate certain roads at present in Hersham South ward with Oatlands Park Ward I am writing to protest against this on the following grounds.

Hersham Village has a real village atmosphere, a sense of belonging which is vital and dear to those who live there. We centre around the village green, the community hall and church, the doctor’s surgery, the post office, the library and the shopping centre. Groups meet here and there is a real feeling of community.

We ask “Where is Oatlands Park?”. It’s a vaguely known housing area with no real centre, separated from us by the railway line and a busy main road. Unless you know someone who lives there no one living in Hersham would have any need to go there. It is in a different Parliamentary Constituency from us and if the proposes boundary change go through I believe we would be the only Borough ward to cross Parliamentary boundaries. This just doesn’t make sense.

I understand Elmbridge Borough Council proposed those roads affected be incorporated into an enlarged Hersham South Ward to be named Hersham Village Ward. Our local councillors know us, are known buy us and they live in the community. I feel they best represent the interests of their constituents and they be listened to.
We are writing to express our concerns about the proposals being mooted for the current Esher ward.
Our concerns are as follows:
1. It is tortured local geopolitics to remove the Lower Green area from its natural and longstanding Esher home and then to try and "balance the books" by going over the river and grabbing a random piece of Hersham.
2. Hersham has never been considered to be part of Esher - its natural affinity is with Walton on Thames.
3. As for the long name; we have gone from a succinct 'Esher' to the convoluted 'Esher and Hersham Riverside' which wags will doubtless change to either Esher and Ersham or Hesher and Hersham - they are doing so already!
If it ain't broke, don't fix it is a good rule of thumb so we urge you to leave Esher alone. We are a robust and vibrant community. We are not Hersham Riverside!
Yours faithfully,
Mr and Mrs Simon and Joan LEIFER
From: Fuller, Heather  
Sent: 13 August 2015 16:58  
To: Hinds, Alex  
Subject: FW: Elmbridge - objection to Thames Ditton proposal (I want to stay in Thames Ditton!)

From: Karen Llewellyn  
Sent: 11 August 2015 19:20  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Elmbridge - objection to Thames Ditton proposal (I want to stay in Thames Ditton!)

11/08/2015

Dear Sir/Madam

I have lived in Thames Ditton all my life and can’t believe you are considering revisiting the boundaries that have existed since 1100 AD. I understand that the Thames Ditton ward’s boundary has included the CB register since the first local council (the Esher & the Dittons Urban District Council) was established in 1895.

Contrary to the Boundary Commission's main consideration "to provide for effective and convenient local government", to remove 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward based organisation that represents them, Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents' Association, diminishes community involvement in the democratic process. It also confuses local residents as to whom to lobby re: parking, shops, services etc. I have had to deal with parking issues in the village when I lived in Harvest Lane and it was easy to know who to approach.

There is an active Residents' Association for the whole of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. The community magazine “Thames Ditton Today” and website serves the wards of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. I would really miss this.

Above all I have no idea why you would consider making this change. What about the old adage, ‘if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it’?

Please note my objections, to which I would appreciate an acknowledgment. I don’t, however, expect you to send a full reply.

Karen Llewellyn
For the Attention of the Review Officer

I am writing to object to the Boundary Commission’s proposal to re-set the boundary for the Thames Ditton ward.

I have lived in Thames Ditton for the past 11 years. I have a huge association Thames Ditton; I work and run a fitness studio in the heart of Thames Ditton and our children are Thames Ditton Ajax Sea Scout, both are currently/were at both Thames Ditton Infants and Thames Ditton Junior Schools, we belong to the doctors, library, tennis club - all in Thames Ditton. I have supported the local businesses and events within the village, and are very much involved within the community.

Giggs Hill Green is Thames Ditton’s village green and all the houses surrounding it feel part of the Thames Ditton community, including those roads now affected by the Boundary Commission’s proposal. The conservation area runs alongside the Green into Angel Road and this is protected by the Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee. There is no such committee in Long Ditton that could take over this responsibility.

I have supported the re-election of the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents Association since moving into the area as they are proactive, effective and very much part of the Thames Ditton culture. In fact it was one of the deciding factors in our choice of location. We do not have the same affinity with Long Ditton as it has never been considered 'our village'.

We urge you to listen to the voices of the Thames Ditton residents and to reconsider your proposal.

Yours sincerely,
Sally Lloyd-Jones
The Review Officer (Elmbridge)  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England

1. If Burwood Park were to be merged with Oatlands Village our planning issues would not receive the same consideration as they receive today because our local Hersham orientated councillors share our more rural environment as opposed to the more urban environment of Oatlands Village.

2. Most of the residents of Burwood Park shop in Hersham Village which has a large Waitrose supermarket with ample free car parking, a petrol filling station, a post office, a medical centre, a community centre for the elderly and many other facilities including a library, three Pubs and several cafés. The Church recognises that Burwood Park is part of Hersham as the Park is included in the Parish of St. Peter’s Hersham not St. Mary’s Oatlands for good reasons, one being the railway cutting which physically separates them. Some of these facilities are not available in Oatlands Village.

3. Burwood Park residents use facilities which are available in Esher and Walton–on–Thames, we share the railway stations of Walton and Hersham and I would think very few ever use Weybridge station. We prefer it that our ward remains part of the constituency of Esher and Walton–on–Thames with which we have much in common rather than become part of Weybridge and Runnymede with which we have little in common.

John and Stella Lodge
Dear Sirs,

We have been residents of a property in [redacted] since 1981 and consider ourselves to be a part of the Thames Ditton Community. Throughout the years we have looked to Thames Ditton as the community in which we live not least for the Thames Ditton ward councillors response to local residents regarding planning/improving and campaigning for the area. We have always considered that the village green and the Thames Ditton Cricket Club as part of our area and indeed they are at the moment. We wish to be represented by the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents' Association. We are objecting strongly to the proposed removal of the 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward and wish to continue to be Thames Ditton Residents and Voters.

Yours faithfully,

Shirley and Richard Long

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam,

We are writing to object to the Boundary Commission’s current proposal to re-draw the Council’s ward boundary in Thames Ditton.

Our objections to the proposals are as follows:

1) By moving us in to Long Ditton Ward this would direct contradict the Boundary Commission’s own idea that the ward should ‘reflect community identity’.

Having lived in [redacted], Thames Ditton (one of the roads directly affected by the proposals) for 11 years, we are part of the Thames Ditton community. Our children have attended Thames Ditton Infant and Thames Ditton Junior schools (our daughter still attends the latter). We use Giggs Hill Surgery, the Dittons library, the shops, the local eateries, Colets Health Club and other amenities within the village. Consequently we have a deep affinity with Thames Ditton Ward, an affinity which we do not share with Long Ditton.

2) The proposal also contradicts the Boundary Commission’s own idea that ‘a pattern of wards should...provide for effective and convenient local government’.

The local councillors who represent our village have campaigned and represented us on a number of local issues that affect our village directly. By moving us in to Long Ditton Ward we would lose the choice to vote for Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents’ Association who we have repeatedly voted for to represent us at a local council level.

It does not seem at all logical to us that we, as part of Thames Ditton, should be forced to vote for, and be represented by, councillors from Long Ditton Ward whose loyalties and interests would lie primarily within Long Ditton.

3) Furthermore we understand from looking at the plans for the new proposed boundaries that part of East Molesey would be pulled in to Thames Ditton Ward. It makes no logical sense to pull Thames Ditton and Molesey apart for the sake of bureaucratic ease.

On an administrative note, we would very much like to know why local residents received no official notification of the proposed boundary changes. We found out about it by chance due to a local Facebook post!

To conclude we are deeply dismayed by the Boundary Commission’s proposal and we are simply not prepared to lose our rights to preserving our local identity.

Yours faithfully,

Linda and Gary Lucas
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 07 August 2015 16:34
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Boundary Commissions proposals re Thames Ditton ward boundaries.

From: Ruth Lyon
Sent: 07 August 2015 16:18
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Boundary Commissions proposals re Thames Ditton ward boundaries.

To the Review Officer (Elmbridge)

As a resident of Thames Ditton since 1963 I write to protest in the strongest terms against the proposal to hive off a large part of Thames Ditton ward to Long Ditton. The Commission’s rules allow for 2 member wards in some cases, which could apply in Hinchley Wood, Long Ditton and Weston Green and thus avoid this dismemberment, and this is surely one such case where the ward has a strong community sentiment and where it appears that you wrongly took at face value the statement by a political party that there was only one unit called “Ditton”, which was wholly incorrect.

John Lyon
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: John MacColl
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I understand that in your proposals for the reduction of Elmbridge Borough Councillors you have suggested moving my local ward from Weybridge South to Weybridge St. Georges. I want to register my opposition to that change. It seems obvious to me that our interests are much closer aligned to Weybridge town itself and the new Weybridge Riverside ward. St. Georges on the other hand, has an entirely different community, and has entirely different ward issues. is separated from us by a railway line.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Starkie, Emily

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 24 August 2015 16:47
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge - objection to Thames Ditton proposal

From: libby MacIntyre
Sent: 23 August 2015 18:43
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 
Subject: Elmbridge - objection to Thames Ditton proposal

I want to object to the proposals for changes to the Thames Ditton Ward.

I do not understand the Boundary Commission’s failure to recognise its own criteria regarding community identity in the proposals for Thames Ditton. I have previously been Chairman of the Thames Ditton and Weston Green residents association (RA) established in 1934, and am currently editor of Thames Ditton Today, a local magazine that serves all residents in these wards, published since 1970. Both are active in promoting community identity and involvement for everyone within the Thames Ditton ward. We were a Big Society before the phrase was coined!

The proposal to move all residents on the register on the roads east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton ward ignores the years of community-building. These residents see themselves as part of Thames Ditton. Their local amenities include the Thames Ditton Centre, the Thames Ditton Cricket club, Tennis club, High Street shops and more. If their community focus is Thames Ditton then their local government representation should also be Thames Ditton.

We work hard to make sure residents know their local councillors and who to turn to for help. The RA actively seeks to involve people in local government by holding regular Open Meetings to discuss issues and ideas and how to respond to them. Our Conservation Area Advisory Committee protects the Conservation Area on both sides of the Portsmouth Road. People expect to have a coherent ‘Thames Ditton’ voice.

Two of the main considerations of the Boundary Commission are not served by this current proposal, namely: ‘to reflect community identity’ and to ‘provide effective and convenient local government’. What looks efficient when wielding a pencil from afar does not translate to efficient representation or a big society on the ground. Please reconsider and keep the historic community of Thames Ditton intact.

Yours Sincerely

Libby MacIntyre
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Craig Mackenzie
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I have noted your proposals to move my local ward from Weybridge South to Weybridge St George's and object most strongly. Apart from the train line naturally dividing the wards, voters in Weybridge South have no empathy or care for the goings on at St George's which has its own little world. In our ward we care about the town not the size of our house. This note is to register my opposition to the change. If the Boundary Commission would care to visit Weybridge they would understand my argument.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

Contrary to the LGBCE's main consideration to reflect community unity and identity, the proposal to split the Thames Ditton community (integral since 1100 AD and last formalised in 1895 under the Esher & The Dittons Urban District Council) by removing all residents on the CB Register east of the A307 Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton, will do exactly the opposite.

I reside in Ditton Lawn, which would be moved out of Thames Ditton under your proposals. Located opposite our village green, Giggs Hill Green, we very much enjoy watching the cricket and attending the Fete during the summer months and have done so over many years. The Angel, George & Dragon, Old Swan and Albany (on the river Thames) public houses form part of our lives as regular venues for meals, quiz nights and jazz sessions. The High Street is one example of the rapidly disappearing scenes of rural England and plays a central part of the community with its shops, good restaurants and annual festivals. Vera Fletcher Hall events are regularly attended. The community magazine has a large and dedicated readership. These are integral parts of the precious village identity.

LONG DITTON DOES NOT HAVE AS MANY OF THESE COMMUNITY JEWELS and our household does not want to be separated from the Thames Ditton community feel.

Our Residents' Association play a very active part in protecting the interests of the Thames Ditton and Weston Green communities. One example was the successful campaign to prevent Tesco opening a large store on the ex-Milk Marketing Board site. The RA also enjoys regular and significant support in local government elections for their effective actions in protecting the interests of the Thames Ditton residents.

In summary, who would want to be separated from an ancient village community, situated on the banks of the river Thames with views across to Hampton Court, incorporating a true village High Street, St Nicholas Church, an active and pretty village green famous for its long cricketing tradition over 182 years, with well established hostelries and a thriving schools and library environment?

I know that my views are shared by all the residents of the Thames Ditton community and I trust that the LGBCE will take due note of these important concerns.

Yours sincerely,

William Macpherson
Dear Sir,

I have lived in [redacted] for over 20 years and always considered our family to be a part of The Thames Ditton local community. We use the shops in Thames Ditton, Had our children christened at St Nicholas Church. Played all manner of sports on the village green and regularly watch Thames Ditton playing cricket. Eat and Drink in Thames Ditton at the local pubs and restaurants.

I have always looked to Thames Ditton as the centre of the community in which I live and have many friends and work colleagues that I meet regularly in Thames Ditton.

Thames Ditton is a very historic community and I can see no benefit in the community being carved up for what I understand is no benefit to us residents - I for one would be very unhappy if the Boundary Commission went ahead and carved up the community and moved me from Thames Ditton to Long Ditton.

All of my social hours when at home are spent in the Thames Ditton community for one reason or another, I have no affinity to Long Ditton whatsoever.

Kind regards

Bob
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: ROGER MANNING
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Boundary Changes I have no objection to a reduction in the number of Borough Councillors, with the associated adjustments to ward boundaries. In practice, I would have supported a reduction to 36 Councillors, but a reduction from 60 to 48 is a step in the right direction. I regret my reason for this support is primarily a negative one. Normally, when deciding what “establishment” one needs to perform a certain task, one firstly defines the size and nature of the overall task, and then defines the numbers and skills of the people required to perform that overall task. Recently, I had a pacemaker fitted, and in the operating theatre was a team of people performing a range of individual tasks, in harmony with each other, led by the consultant surgeon. The overall task and the procedure to perform it were obviously well defined, as were the “job descriptions” of everyone involved. [One could take a simpler example, such as moving a grand piano out of a house and into a lorry, but the same applies.] Sadly (and oddly) the raison d’être for having Councillors appears very poorly defined, and their required skill levels totally undefined; ridiculously, they are often selected on their political affiliation, which is largely irrelevant to the performance of a task at local level. I’m sorry to say that, looking back over nearly 20 years living here, I can think of no example of any Ward Councillor taking a worthwhile initiative for our benefit, no example of a constructive and successful reaction to any suggestion from anyone in our road, and no example of our being kept informed of what is happening and why. Worse, I can think of things which have been poorly done. If I want something done, I now go direct to the permanent staff at the Council, who generally do respond professionally. In addition to identifying clearly what rôle Councillors should fill, and therefore what capabilities any candidate for office should display, I think three actions would be beneficial: 1. Establish a 3-person local EBC office, for example at the Weybridge Hall, manned on a rotating basis by temporarily detached EBC staff. 2. At the same location, have a room available where elected representatives (MEP, MP, County and Borough) would schedule “surgeries”. 3. Formalise and develop the type of system pioneered by Cllr. Andrew Davis to gather, and respond to, the wishes and suggestions from local residents.
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Boundary Changes

I have no objection to a reduction in the number of Borough Councillors, with the associated adjustments to ward boundaries.

In practice, I would have supported a reduction to 36 Councillors, but a reduction from 60 to 48 is a step in the right direction.

I regret my reason for this support is primarily a negative one. Normally, when deciding what “establishment” one needs to perform a certain task, one firstly defines the size and nature of the overall task, and then defines the numbers and skills of the people required to perform that overall task. Recently, I had a pacemaker fitted, and in the operating theatre was a team of people performing a range of individual tasks, in harmony with each other, led by the consultant surgeon. The overall task and the procedure to perform it were obviously well defined, as were the “job descriptions” of everyone involved. [One could take a simpler example, such as moving a grand piano out of a house and into a lorry, but the same applies.]

Sadly (and oddly) the raison d’être for having Councillors appears very poorly defined, and their required skill levels totally undefined; ridiculously, they are often selected on their political affiliation, which is largely irrelevant to the performance of a task at local level.

I’m sorry to say that, looking back over nearly 20 years living here, I can think of no example of any Ward Councillor taking a worthwhile initiative for our benefit, no example of a constructive and successful reaction to any suggestion from anyone in our road, and no example of our being kept informed of what is happening and why. Worse, I can think of things which have been poorly done.

If I want something done, I now go direct to the permanent staff at the Council, who generally do respond professionally.

In addition to identifying clearly what rôle Councillors should fill, and therefore what capabilities any candidate for office should display, I think three actions would be beneficial:

1. Establish a 3-person local EBC office, for example at the Weybridge Hall, manned on a rotating basis by temporarily detached EBC staff.
2. At the same location, have a room available where elected representatives (MEP, MP, County and Borough) would schedule “surgeries”.
3. Formalise and develop the type of system pioneered by Cllr. Andrew Davis to gather, and respond to, the wishes and suggestions from local residents.
Dear Sir/ Madam

My understanding is that one of the Boundary Commission’s principal aims is to reflect community identity.

I live at [Redacted] - less than 50 yards away from Giggs Hill Green, widely considered to be at the heart of Thames Ditton community and village life. My garden borders the Giggs Hill Green Conservation Area. My local pub is 5 minutes’ walk away in the heart of Thames Ditton Village. My son attended school in Thames Ditton. I am a member of Thames Ditton Tennis Club. We shop in Thames Ditton and we are active members in many varied Thames Ditton community events and activities. I have always voted for the Thames Ditton Residents Association.

Under these new proposals I will no longer be a part of the Thames Ditton community? For obvious reasons I wish to register my objection to these plans.

Yours sincerely

Simon Marjoram
Managing Director
Hello,

I am writing to object to the proposed boundary changes to Thames Ditton Ward. I live at [redacted] and have always considered myself part of Thames Ditton Village and community. Our local pub The Angel is hundreds of years old and has always been part of Thames Ditton and would be ridiculous to suggest it and Angel Road now forms part of Long Ditton.

I have absolutely no affinity to Long Ditton whereas I have attended weddings, births and funerals at St Nicholas’ Church, my son went to Thames Ditton Infants school, I shop in Thames Ditton village, use the library, Colets and have a wide local network of friends who I regularly meet at village pubs and restaurants. I consider Giggs Hill Green to be the central to Thames Ditton and our house is 50m away. I have always voted for Thames Ditton Residents Association in local elections.

I strongly object to this proposal.

Yours faithfully

Mrs S Marjoram
To: The Review Officer (Elmbridge), Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 14th Floor Millbank Tower, London SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

The proposal to exclude an historic and important part of Thames Ditton Ward and incorporate it into Long Ditton makes no sense at all. It does the opposite of “reflecting community identity”. It cuts off and confuses a section of the community that has existed for hundred of years and which relies on local services and the ability to be represented and involved in local democratic processes.

Please reconsider this flawed, disruptive proposal and leave things as they are.

Yours sincerely.

David Marshall
Review Officer (Elmbridge)
LGBCE
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

1st August 2015

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the Commission’s draft recommendations for Elmbridge, in particular the proposals for the existing Hersham North and Hersham South wards.

The Commission’s recommendation that parts of the existing Hersham wards are added to the new Esher ward ignores community identity and, I believe, will not be conducive to effective and convenient local government in this part of the borough. Specifically:

- The proposed ward boundaries do not ‘reflect community interests and identities’.
- Having lived here for 36 years (and in Esher for five years before that) I believe there is little ‘evidence of community links’ other than those which are common to all parts of Elmbridge District.
  - While Hersham and Esher do not have parish councils, they are in separate ecclesiastical parishes.
  - Hersham and Esher have their own established community groups such as residents’ associations and scout and guide groups.
- Prior to the local government reorganisation of 1974, which created Elmbridge District, Hersham was part of Walton and Weybridge Urban District and, until 1933, Walton Urban District. Hersham was granted Parochial status in 1851, having previously been part of Walton-on-Thames Parish. So, while there is a long history of Hersham being a distinct administrative entity with links to Walton-on-Thames, there is no such history of links to Esher.
- Hersham and Esher have their own shopping centres, doctors’ surgeries and libraries. These further promote the feeling of separate communities as there is little cross-boundary use of these facilities.
- Unlike the existing wards, the new wards are not ‘based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries’. This is particularly true for the proposed boundary to the north of the Longmore Estate which follows a little used public foot path.
- The River Mole and its floodplain form a belt of undeveloped land which is a natural barrier between Hersham and Esher, contributing to the limited links between the two communities.
- Elmbridge is peculiar in tending to elect a large group of Residents Association councillors. Both Hersham North and Esher have a history of being represented by members of the RA group and the group formed the administration until recently. RA councillors are proud advocates of their local communities and the concern is that the part of the new Esher ward to the west of the River Mole, being part of Hersham, would be the neglected junior partner.
This would not ‘help the council deliver effective and convenient local government’ to those Hersham residents in the Esher ward.

In conclusion I believe that the Commissions’ recommendations do not reflect community feeling, are not based on strong boundaries and would be bad for the representation of that part of Hersham which would join the new Esher ward. I therefore urge the Commission to pursue these proposals no further and to make new recommendations which allow Hersham to be represented as a distinct community.

Yours faithfully,

Mr A C Marsh.
-----Original Message-----
From: wayne mason
Sent: 17 July 2015 19:42
To: reviews
Subject: Keep Hersham Library in Hersham

I am opposed to Hersham Library being part of an Esher Ward. Hersham Library should stay in Hersham and belongs in the Hersham Village Ward. It will not affect the number of voters. Councillors in Esher are too far away from Hersham Library and they have their own library to support. Please reconsider the new boundaries and keep Hersham Library where it belongs.

Anna and Wayne Mason

Sent from my iPad
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2015 04:05 PM
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Hersham Library to stay

From: jorden matthews 
Sent: 20 August 2015 19: 
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Hersham Library to stay

I am opposed to Hersham Library being part of an Esher Ward. It should stay in the Hersham Ward, this will not affect the number of voters. Please reconsider the new boundaries and keep Hersham Library where it belongs.

Yours,
Jorden Matthews
I am opposed to Hersham Library being part of an Esher Ward. It should stay in the Hersham Ward, this will not affect the number of voters. Please reconsider the new boundaries and keep Hersham Library where it belongs.

Yours,

Sophie Matthews
Year Group Leader Year 6
From: Toby Mayers
Sent: 23 August 2015 12:05
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 
Subject: Objection to LGBCE proposals for Thames Ditton (Elmbridge Council)

To the Review Officer for Elmbridge,

I'm writing with my objection to the Government's Boundary Commission's proposal for moving the TD boundary line.

I have lived in TD at two addresses over 4 years and have been very happy as part of the TD community. I've enjoyed the benefits that have come with being part of this community and do feel that moving the boundary to exclude will cause our road to no longer have a sense of community. I am registered at the doctor at Giggs Hill Green. I consider the shops/pubs/restaurants on the TD High Street and Winter's Bridge Parade to be our local shops and use them regularly.

I am a small business owner and have built up my business through my local contacts and the community I feel part of. Some of these contacts have come from meeting people at the Thames Ditton Lawn Tennis club where I am a member. Others have come through shopping or in sourcing local services for the home or my business. A change of boundary line would severely disrupt my business plans through a sense of loss of community for those living to the north of Portsmouth road.

I do hope the plans to move the boundary line will be reconsidered as I feel strongly that is a part of the TD community which I wish to to remain a part of.

Regards
Toby Mayers
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the Thames Ditton boundary. I feel this is not in the best interests of the Thames Ditton community in spite of the protestations made by those proposing these changes. There is an active Residents' Association for the whole of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. The community magazine "Thames Ditton Today" and website serve the whole of the existing Borough wards of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. My main objections to the proposals are as follows.

a) Contrary to one of Boundary Commission’s main considerations "to reflect community identity", the proposal to remove all residents on the CB register on the roads east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton ward would divorce them from the Thames Ditton ward, parish and community of which they have been a part since 1100 AD.

b) Residents in these roads look to Thames Ditton as the centre of their community for shops, doctors, schools, village hall (now Vera Fletcher Hall), St. Nicholas Church, village green (Giggs Hill Green) Thames Ditton Centre for the Community, Girl Guides etc. Thames Ditton ward councillors respond to local residents re: improving/campaigning for High Street shops, doctors' services, leisure services eg. at Giggs Hill Green.

c) Giggs Hill Green is Thames Ditton's village green, Thames Ditton Cricket Club has played on the green since 1833 and the houses round the Green have always formed part of Thames Ditton. It is now proposed to move all those on one side of the Green into Long Ditton. Giggs Hill Green is Thames Ditton's village green and all the houses round it as well as those in Angel Road feel part of the Thames Ditton community. Giggs Hill Green Conservation Area runs along the Portsmouth Road side of the Green and extends into Angel Road. Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee covers the area and there is no Long Ditton Conservation area or Advisory Committee that could take this on which could provide the protection residents enjoy at present.

d) Contrary to the Boundary Commission’s main consideration "to provide for effective and convenient local government", to remove 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward based organisation that represents them, Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents' Association, diminishes community involvement in the democratic process. It will confuse local residents as to whom to lobby re: parking, shops, services etc.

I would respectfully ask those who are suggesting these changes to reconsider and put the community at the heart of the decision making as opposed to being at the bottom of their list.

Yours faithfully

Amanda

Amanda J Manzoni
Vice President Human Resources Global Retail
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Steve McCarthy
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

I do not think the names of the wards. Weybridge St Georges Hill and Weybridge Riverside, are appropriate. They do not sound at all representative of the different areas in Weybridge Firstly Weybridge St Georges Hill partly covers an area that is not in Weybridge, that is Whiteley Village and surroundings. The Weybridge boundary is all along the Seven Hills Road, not eastwards over it. Secondly St Georges Hill is generally only referred as as the specific and exclusive private estate of St Georges Hill, which must only represent a very small part of the population of the ward. The area does include most of what these days is known as Brooklands. At the very least the ward could be called Brooklands and St Georges Hill. Weybridge Riverside as a ward name gives the impression that Weybridge literally sits on a riverside, which sound nice but in reality Weybridge has never been regarded as a riverside town in the way that other places on the Thames are regarded. It sits on the Wey Navigation which which is more of a canal. In reality the area of the ward more relates to names like Weybridge Town or Weybridge Central.
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None Uploaded
Weybridge - the boundary down Hanger Hill and along Queens Road putting this area into the St Georges Hill Ward makes no sense at all. This area is regarded by everyone as part of central Weybridge and in particular includes the War Memorial and the cricket ground. It is obvious that the boundary should be the railway line. If the insistence to equalise number of electors overrules everything then a better compromise proposal would be to put the boundary all along Pine Grove.
The Review Officer (ELMBRIDGE)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London SW1 4QP.

Dear Review Officer,

We agree with the plan to reduce the number of councillors. However we object strongly to the proposal for Burwood Park to be merged with Oatlands Park Ward.

Our main objections are briefly as follows:-

We moved to Burwood Park in 1978 from Hinchley Wood. We were attracted by the park like environment and the rural landscape of the area. The covenants managed by Burhill Estates Limited endorsed the maintenance of these features. There is a risk that future planning issues involving Burwood Park will be considered and decided in a residential / urban context rather than the special rural context which exists presently.

Much effort has been made to forge the identity of Hersham Village KT12 over the past years. Current Hersham local councillors understand, appreciate and fully support the interests of Burwood Park residents. Burwood Park has this close affinity with Hersham Village. It lies within the parish of old St Peters Church.

A main railway line physically divides Burwood Park with Oatlands. No physical separation exists with KT12.
Please rethink the boundary changes and retain Burwood Park in the Hersham Ward as proposed by Elmbridge Borough Council.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

John and Sylvia McDermott

July 22nd 2015.
i am a resident of Burwood Park in Walton on Thames. and i would like to express my objection over the Hersham Ward boundary changes.

Reasons for objection

1. The proposed boundary changes move Burwood Park from an orientation to Hersham Village, to which it shares a postcode, to Oatlands, from which it is physically separated by a railway line.

   2. Burwood Park has an affinity with Hersham Village due to the rural nature of the community compared to Oatlands, which is a residential area with no natural centre. Residents of Burwood Park use the facilities of Hersham Village for shopping, the library, the doctor's surgery and the Park lies within the parish of St Peter's Church. The proposed new Wards are therefore not orientated correctly.

   3. There is a risk that future Burwood Park planning issues will be considered in a residential context rather than the rural environment, which exists today. The current Hersham orientated local councillors understand and fully support the interests of Burwood Park residents.

   4. The proposed boundary change to move Burwood Park into the Oatlands Ward, results in a change in parliamentary boundary - from Esher and Walton to Weybridge and Runnymede. There are currently no Elmbridge Borough Wards across Parliamentary boundaries. This is a mis-match, which other Wards do not suffer and will add complexity for residents to navigate and gain support for specific local issues.

It is recommended that the Review Officer re-considers the boundary changes and retains Burwood Park and the surrounding roads in the Hersham Ward as proposed by Elmbridge Borough Council.

Thank you for your support on this matter

Kathleen & Andrew McDougall
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: jackie mcginty

E-mail: [redacted]

Postcode: [redacted]

Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I object to the electoral wards being changed from Hersham to Esher. The two communities have totally different issues and therefore we need Hersham councillors to represent Hersham residents on the council not Esher ones.
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Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Ian McKechnie
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I see from the map above that as part of your scheme to reduce the number of Elmbridge borough councillors you have proposed moving my local ward from Weybridge South to Weybridge St Georges. I am writing to register my opposition to that change. The interests of residents in [redacted] are much more closely aligned to Weybridge town and the new Riverside ward. St Georges on the other hand is separated from us by a railway line and has an entirely different community, and entirely different ward issues. I propose that the boundary of St Georges is redrawn to remain south of the railway and the triangle containing Daneswood Close becomes part of Weybridge Riverside.

Uploaded Documents:
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Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Penny McKechnie
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I understand that the proposed ward changes in Elmbridge will move my local ward from Weybridge South to Weybridge St George’s Hill and I would like to register my opposition to this change. I feel that my interests and issues relate more to the town and the area covered by the new Weybridge Riverside ward. It seems to me that becoming part of St George’s Hill ward would cause it to be a detached ward (as set out in the guide), as the railway is an obvious dividing line. The communities on either side of the railway are very different and have very different issues to be considered.
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TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Proposals for Thames Ditton Ward – Objection

I have lived with my family at [redacted] since 1999 and we are very upset by the proposal to remove us from the Thames Ditton ward for many reasons.

We moved to the area as we were attracted to its village community and the heritage around the village. Angel Road has been part of the Thames Ditton ward for centuries. Both my children were christened at St Nicholas Church, Thames Ditton and we were married there as well.

We have a long standing interest and involvement in many aspects of village life including the church, the village hall, Thames Ditton cricket club where my son was a member of the Junior section, and Thames Ditton tennis club. We have also been members of the village’s only health club, Colets, for over 20 years.

We have consistently voted for the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents Association and use the community print and social media to interact with fellow villagers and village life.

The village green, Giggs Hill Green, is at the top of our road and plays an important part in both the adult and children’s lives as an area of beauty and recreation including dog walking.

We are residents of Thames Ditton and don’t wish this to change as the proposed new ward does not reflect the same community values as Thames Ditton.

Amanda Baiden and Adrian McKeon
I have recently received notice from Ruth Mitchell, John Sheldon and John O'Reilly that the Hersham South Ward is soon to be reorganised. As residents at [redacted], my wife and I hope that we shall continue to be part of the Hersham village community and wish to support the three Hersham councillors in their sensible proposals to achieve any necessary changes.

With our best wishes for an acceptable outcome of your discussions,

Dr and Mrs S C R Meacock.
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: David Mealor
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

If the wards go forward in the proposed form please draw the boundary for Hersham village such that it includes Hersham library. Hersham councillors have been very supportive of this and it is not likely to receive such support from the Esher councillors. I notice that Hersham village is the only ward where you have not been able to say that it properly reflects the community. I seems to me that surrounding wards have been formed at the expense of Hersham. I think that the main problem is the 3 member ward system which I regard as undemocratic as it denied representation to the smaller communities and gives the smaller parties less chance of winning seats. It also means too many elections. I would have liked to see the council reduced to 40 single seat wards which would have made the many small towns in Elmbridge easier.
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Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Susan Mealor
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Submission to the Boundary commission Regarding the unfair treatment of Hersham village and its environs Introduction I am a member of the public who has lived in Hersham for nearly 40 years. I am socially and politically alert, and am a member of a variety of local groups, including Friends of Hersham Library. I support the campaign to keep Hersham Library in Hersham; it is not and should never be part of Esher. I was unaware of the boundary changes until after the closure of the consultation period. Had there been a public consultation then I am sure that there would have been a big response. The Hersham community is massively affected by the reorganisation as it goes from 6 local councillors to three. I emphatically do not agree with the suggestions made that boundaries do not affect the decision making or community coherence (3). If this were so, then there would be no need for the LGBCE. I am shocked that many political submissions were more interested in keeping Whiteley Village and Burwood Park in Hersham Ward, than in preventing the incision into the heart of the village, which moves parts of the village which are a mere 0 to 2 minutes walk from the centre to Esher Ward which is 30 - 45 minute walk away. It is even more inappropriate to campaign to keep those areas as opposed to Longmore Estate, which is much closer geographically. Although you have moved a few voters back into Hersham, the centre of the village is still dissected.

Outcome of your deliberations You state (1, 2) that a good pattern of wards should show: electoral equality community interests and identity strong identifiable boundaries convenient and effective local government It may be pertinent to note that even the lgbce appears to know that it is treating Hersham unfairly as you state: “While we accept that the village is a cohesive community, we have to deliver a warding pattern for Hersham which provides for the best balance of the statutory criteria and follows the presumption in legislation that the authority should have a uniform pattern of 3-member wards”. This cannot be so. You have to provide a solution for the whole of Elmbridge; if Hersham does not fit then the scheme fails, and must be corrected. A quick look at the suggested warding plan (para 7 of (1)) shows: 15 of 16 wards show electoral equality (not Claygate for obvious reasons) only one has no comments on community coherence, i.e. Hersham only one has no mention of identifiable boundaries, i.e. Hersham So Hersham has only electoral equality as the basis for its new ward! You cannot impose a system where this one factor trumps the other criteria; especially since this is the ONLY ward in the whole scheme that is in this situation. My Conclusions There are three possibilities: 1. The Hersham Library can easily be moved back into the Hersham community and ward by putting the boundary behind the site, such that the green also is kept in Hersham. This has no electoral cost. 2. The Old Esher Road area can be kept in Hersham Village within the variance required. 3. All of Hersham including Whiteley Village, Burwood Park and Longmore Estate would be kept within a 2 ward/3 councillor Hersham (as now) if the parish of Hersham was used as boundary to the west.** Only the third is acceptable, because: There is no community cohesion with Esher, nor is there geographic linkage. If Hersham is not kept as a discrete entity by community or boundary, then the plans should be withdrawn and the process started again, maybe even rethinking whether 48 is best, possibly more or fewer councillors could be better. If you cannot find a fair solution for Hersham then a rethink is needed: Go back to Elmbridge for further consultation on 48, more or fewer. or Keep the 60 until a fair system is found. ** In the Elmbridge submission to LGBCE, two communities were suggested for splitting: Hinchley Wood and Hersham; there were suggestions that boundaries do not
damage community cohesion (3). Therefore there cannot be any compunction about splitting other areas if it makes the outcome fairer. In elections every resident gets one vote which counts equally, none are more equal than others, so if it is OK to suggest to dissect an ex-social housing estate and an area that does not vote for the incumbent party, then it is equally OK to split an estate composed of mansions! Not my opinion, as it happens, but it follows logically from the council submission. References Elmbridge-draft-recommendations-2015-06-30-to-publish Elmbridge-draft-recommendations-summary 3. current-reviews/south-east/surrey/elmbridge; submission from J Sheldon

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
Dear Sir,

Please note observations as follows:

I am concerned that the proposal to create a new ward called Hinchley Wood and Weston Green would:

1) Exclude Lower Green which would become part of Esher Ward. Weston Green has always had strong links with Cranmere School which is located in Lower Green. Additionally All Saints Weston Church (in Weston Green) has for a long time (many decades) collaborated with that school for the benefit of the pupils which a boundary change could alter

2) Apart from the above issue which spans both educational and faith aspects, strong social and community service ties would most likely be compromised.

Yours faithfully,

David and Cheryl Meggitt
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Catherine Mehta
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

The proposed new Esher/Hersham boundary runs along Molesey Road to the Barley Mow roundabout, and then towards Esher along the Esher Road. This proposed boundary directly affects Hersham library. Hersham Library is a great resource for Hersham, well used by all the local schools, and adults from all over the Hersham area. It is a great introduction to information gathering and reading for the youngsters and adults alike, and the availability of computers is very useful if these are not available at home. If Hersham Library goes to Esher Ward, it would be in a more vulnerable situation to closure, as there is already a library in Esher. There have been several attempts to close Hersham Library, and successful campaigns to keep it open. These have been well supported by local councillors. It makes sense to keep Hersham Library in Hersham Village Ward, as it will then come under the auspices and support of the three proposed local councillors that will be elected to Hersham Village Ward, rather than the more distant Esher Ward councillors. If the proposed boundary could be amended to run around the back of the library, the library can be saved. If these small changes are made to the proposed new boundaries between Esher and Hersham Village Wards, there will be no change in the number of voters in the newly proposed Hersham Village Ward or Esher Ward, as no-one lives in the Library. Thank you for your consideration.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sir /Madam

I write to object to the proposed changes to the Thames Ditton boundary. One side of Portsmouth Road is to be moved to Long Ditton Ward.

My house on [removed] looks towards Thames Ditton and my families local community life is centred around Thames Ditton and not Long Ditton including schooling, local shops, community services. It would even put a strange situation whereby the shops on the opposite side of the road would be in a different area. The proposed changes would put an artificial divorce from the Thames Ditton ward, parish and community which has served my area since the first local council was established in 1895.

We live minute from Giggs Hill Green where my son plays at the currently local Thames Ditton Cricket Club and the green like the houses and facilities around it are very much part of Thames Ditton community. We currently have a clear representation by the Residents Association serving Thames Ditton and Weston Green and to change this would be to put in a disconnect from those who represent the community.

I urge you to reconsider to not cut-off part off an existing community.

Regards

David and Beverley Merchant
Dear sirs,

I have just realised that I am a day late in submitting my comments on your proposals, I had it in mind that the consultation finished on 26th August which is why I have today been finalising my thoughts which I hope you will take into consideration in arriving at your final determination.

Firstly, I should like to thank you for taking into account my previous observations on the Elmbridge Borough Council’s proposal and that you have placed the centre of Hersham back towards the centre of Hersham and not right on the edge of the electoral boundary. In addition, thank you for putting Hersham Golf Club back into Hersham along with the Rydens area.

I have two main schools of thought on these proposed boundary changes:

A. Attached to this email is a map of the Hersham Boundary from 1851 to 1933, since then the Hersham boundaries have been squeezed and squeezed to achieve the correct population for the number of councillors etc. This proposal is to ask you to reinstate the original Hersham Boundaries and to perhaps expand them slightly in order that Hersham can retain two electoral wards, Hersham North and Hersham South.

Whilst I understand that even with these expanded boundaries we are tight on the electoral population for two wards, since Elmbridge Borough Council has already proposed that the Burhill Estate on the other side of the River Mole be included within the Hersham Village ward that was formally in Cobham and that as this area, Northwood Farm etc, is served by two bridges over the river Mole it seems logical that this area be included in Hersham.

By adopting this proposal you will be alleviating the serious heartache and distress to those Hersham residents in Whiteley Village, Burwood Park, Burhill Estate, Burhill golf course, Longmore Estate, Felton Fleet School, Painshill Park, Notre-dame Convent & schools, Seven Hills Road area, Westcar Lane area, Kenwick Drive area, Eastwick Road area, The Heronry area, Goombridge Close area, Frith Knowle area, and sections of both Burwood Road and Queen’s Road areas along with others.
B. If your current proposal is to remain as the core boundary of Hersham Village, I ask that for a very small increase in the electoral population that you reinstate:

1. Hersham Library into Hersham by re-drawing the proposed boundary from the Molesey Road in front of the library to follow the rear boundary of the library and perhaps too the adjoining VW garage to make the line look neater on paper.

2. Burhill Estate, Burhill (old) Golf Course, Burvale farm and Burvale Cemetery areas into Hersham with your proposed boundary moved from Turners Lane to The Kings Drive

3. Burhill Estate, Burhill (new) Golf Course and Northwood farm which are to the south of the river Mole but are mainly accessed via the two bridges over the river Mole into the main part of the estate that is located to the north of the river Mole which is currently in Hersham. I am not sure of the exact estate boundaries so have not shown this on the attached map.

4. Westcar Lane into Hersham with the boundary down the centre of the road so reinstating the properties to the east back into Hersham.

See attached PDF file titled ‘Boundary Commission Draft map 2015_06 rev_a.pdf’ where I have added the suggested revised boundaries in light blue.

I close in hoping that you will take these two suggestions into consideration and will hopefully reinstate Hersham back to two council wards to follow the original Hersham Boundaries.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Edward Meryon

From: Fuller, Heather [mailto:heather.fuller@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 30 June 2015 14:54
To: of Elmbridge: Draft recommendations

30 June 2015

Dear Mr Meryon,

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF ELMBRIDGE: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has published draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Elmbridge Borough Council. Today is the start of an eight week public consultation on the Commission's draft recommendations on new ward boundaries across Elmbridge. The consultation closes on 24 August 2015.
View the draft recommendations

You can view the Commission’s draft recommendations at https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/4438 where you can find interactive maps, a report and guidance on how to have your say. The Commission has not finalised its conclusions and now invites representations on the draft recommendations.

A summary outlining the Commission’s draft recommendations, an interactive map of the Commission’s recommendations for Elmbridge, electorate figures and guidance on how to propose new wards is available on the consultation area at: https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/4438. Further information about the review and the Commission’s work is also published on our website at: http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/surrey/elmbridge.

Have your say

We encourage everyone who has a view on the draft recommendations to contact us whether you support them or whether you wish to propose alternative arrangements.

Before finalising the recommendations, the Commission will consider every representation received during consultation whether it is submitted by an individual, a local group or an organisation. We will weigh each submission against the criteria the Commission must follow when drawing up electoral arrangements:

- To deliver electoral equality where each councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the borough.
- 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.

Elmbridge Borough Council currently holds elections by thirds. Where a council elects by thirds, Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 provides that the Commission should have regard to the desirability of recommending that each ward returns three councillors, subject to its other statutory criteria of achieving electoral equality, reflecting community identity and providing for effective and convenient local government. This reflects Parliament’s view that each elector in a local authority should have the same opportunity to vote in local elections, irrespective of that authority’s cycle of elections.

It is important that you take account of the criteria if you are suggesting an alternative pattern of wards. You can find additional guidance and information about previous electoral reviews on our website to help you or your organisation make a submission.

Get in touch

The Commission welcomes comments on the recommendations report by 24 August 2015. Representations should be made:

- Through our interactive consultation portal where you can explore the maps of the recommendations, draw your own boundaries and supply comments at: https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/4438.

- By email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk.
Or in writing to:
Review Officer (Elmbridge)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

The Commission aims to publish every response it receives during phases of consultation. If you do not want all or any part of your response or name to be made public, you must state this clearly in the response. Any such request should explain why confidentiality is necessary. All responses may be subject to publication or disclosure as required by law (in particular under the Freedom of Information Act 2000).

This is the last opportunity to influence the Commission’s recommendations before they are finalised. We therefore encourage local people to get in touch with us and have their say.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]
Alex Hinds
Review Officer
Starkie, Emily

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 24 August 2015 16:47
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge Borough Council- objection to Thames Ditton proposal

From: Gregory Michalczyk
Sent: 23 August 2015 19:03
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 
Subject: Elmbridge Borough Council- objection to Thames Ditton proposal

Dear Sir,
Having reviewed your proposals for Thames Ditton and the surrounding area I am writing to object to them on the following grounds:

Your proposal does not make sense to me for the following reasons

- By joining Weston Green with Hinchley Wood you are taking no account of the long standing link between Thames Ditton and Weston Green. Our Residents Association is based on the two areas and to join Weston Green with Hinchley Wood does not meet your criteria 'to reflect community identity'. It would appear to me to make more sense to join Thames Ditton and Weston Green rather than follow your proposed idea.
- You are proposing to move part of the area currently defined as Thames Ditton into Long Ditton.
  - This area, which borders Giggs Hill Green, is part of Thames Ditton and it makes no sense to me to move it into Long Ditton.
  - This means that the area would no longer reflect the historic Thames Ditton parish boundary and again this does not, in my opinion, reflect make up of the local area and your wish 'to reflect community identity'.
  - This change would also impact on the area currently monitored by the Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee. It would be very confusing for this group to operate across two wards as your proposal would have them do.

I trust you will consider my opinions when making your final recommendation.
Regards,
Gregory Michalczyk

Dear Sirs,

With regard to the Elmbridge Borough Council boundary changes.

I live in Hersham, which is currently in Hersham South. I under proposal is to move this road, along with others, to Oatlands Park Ward.

I wish to protest against this move as I live in Hersham, our postal address is Hersham, I use Hersham for my shopping, post office, vets and dentist. I do not use Oatlands for any services. I walk into Hersham, it is physically close where as Oatlands is a car drive away.

The railway line is a natural boundary and together with the main Queens Road separates Hersham from Oatlands. I currently walk to my polling station in Herham and would be unable to do this if it were moved to Oatlands.

I feel that we would be better served by remaining in the new Hersham Village Ward.

Yours A Miller
From: Eileen Miller
Sent: 11 August 2015 13:31
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary changes Hersham - Surrey

Dear Sir

I note that the proposed boundary changes in Elmbridge currently suggest moving Hersham Library into Esher as the new boundary will pass in front of the Library. I cannot see any point in this as the library has no connection with Esher and is used mostly by the people of Hersham. If the boundary change takes place I can see that the first thing Esher will do is to try and close the Library. This has been tried before but has always been fought strenuously by the local people. I would ask you to reconsider and move the boundary behind the library so it retains it’s presence in Hersham and can continue to meet the needs of the community.

Yours faithfully

Eileen Miller
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Christopher Mitchell
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

Please not attached document.

Uploaded Documents:

Download
Response to proposed Elmbridge Ward Boundaries

Whiteley Village
The move of Whiteley Village to Weybridge and St Georges hill does not reflect Community interests and identities and boundaries.

The residents of Whiteley village are largely elderly people of limited means. Their social and shopping facilities are in Hersham Center and have very limited commonality of interests with St Georges Hill and Weybridge, where the residents are most standards wealthy (in the case of St Georges Hill very wealthy by any standards) and whose social centre is Weybridge. Although the Seven Hills Road may just appear on a map as any other road, it presents not only a clear geographic boundary but it is a very busy route, with no controlled pedestrian crossings. It presents an almost impassable barrier to anybody with limited mobility. Whiteley village is also in a different Parliamentary Constituency to the remainder of the proposed council ward.

Thus the proposed ward does not meet two of your criteria and would sacrifice these solely to the aim of numerical equality.

I therefore propose that it should remain in a Hersham Ward.

Oatlands Park & Burwood Park
This is divided by two factors. It is in two Parliamentary Constituencies and is divided by the railway line. This can only be crossed at two places on the boundaries. It has a very strange outline and an uniformed observe might well gain the opinion that it was the results of 'Gerrymandering'. The Northern section and the triangular section south of the railway could be incorporated into the St Georges Hill ward to compensate for the loss of electors from Whiteley Village. These are also in the same Parliamentary constituency.

This leaves the Burwood Park area. If this is included along with Whiteley Village into the Hersham Village ward, the number of electors would be excessive but not large enough for two wards. However the proposed Esher ward is 5% above target and includes an area to the west of the River Mole. This river forms a natural boundary between Esher and Hersham and so this area could be included into 2 new Hersham wards West and East with approximately equal numbers.

I fully appreciate the desire for equality of representation, but as you know perfect equality in numbers is never achievable, but I believe that my proposal better meets your other two, equally important criteria but am not able to determine the variance from average without more detailed data.

Mr C Mitchell
Hersham Library should remain in Hersham.

My daughter Daisy who is 10 years old says "Hersham Library is a very nice place to spend time in because the ladies who work there are very kind and helpful".

Every Tuesday after school, we visit our local library in Hersham so that our children can return their library books and with the help of the lovely Librarian ladies, they look for new books to take out. Each time we visit, there is a definite sense of stability and community spirit. Hersham library has helped my children to engage with reading. They both get quite cross if for some unforeseen event prohibits us from making our Tuesday evening visit!

Separately, Hersham’s local school (Burhill) is extending and so logic suggests that there is now even a greater need for our Library to remain in the village.

From Claire, Paul, Daisy and Johnny Montgomery

Sent from my iPad
Just had a paper delivered regarding the number of wards being reduced from 22 to 16. I live at [redacted] and very pleased to hear that the HERONRY will return to it's status when the house was both built and I later purchased my home. I have never understood the right of people to change the address, I was told to raise the profile of HERSHAM. How totally stupid to add a locality to the address, a meaning line which has caused me no end of problems.

The Royal Mail sent me a letter after the many letters I sent out to say I could leave HERSHAM off my address and I have always done so.

GREAT TO SEE HERSHAM LEAVE MY ADDRESS.

Graham Moody
I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the Boundary Commission proposal to change the boundary for the Thames Ditton ward effectively removing a considerable section of our village & making it Long Ditton.

Giggs Hill Green is the beating heart of the village and for centuries the houses surrounding it ~ on both sides of the Portsmouth Rd ~ have been considered part of Thames Ditton village. This includes the Conservation area which runs across the Green & past Angel Road ~ is this historical & hitherto protected area now to be excluded from Thames Ditton Conservation Cttee protection?

Having lived in [REDACTED] for ten years and made many friends in the proposed area of change, I feel to remove a section of the village (some of which is a short walk from my home within the existing village boundary) is counter productive as many of those affected contribute extensively to village life & the local Thames Ditton community in numerous ways. We enjoy a unique & inclusive sense of community here, and I feel to needlessly remove an active section of this is not only unfair on those who have given, in some cases a lifelong, contribution to village life but through sending their children to local schools, clubs & supporting Resident Associations, local events etc consider themselves very much part of Thames Ditton village.

Please re consider your Boundary change proposals & take into account the views of local residents ~ if implemented these changes will have many negative effects.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours Cathryn Moore
Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection to the proposals for Thames Ditton Ward

I am concerned that the grounds of this proposal are contrary to two of the Boundary Commission’s main considerations.

i. "To provide for effective and convenient local government" and "to reflect community identity"

a. The Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents’ Association is active and represents 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward who would be removed by the proposals. This diminishes community involvement in the democratic process. It confuses local residents as to whom to lobby regarding shops, parking, services and so on. The community magazine "Thames Ditton Today" and website serves the whole of the existing Borough wards of Thames Ditton and Weston Green.

b. The proposal ignores the history that Giggs Hill Green is Thames Ditton’s village green and all the houses round it as well as those in Angel Road feel part of the Thames Ditton community. Thames Ditton Cricket Club has played on the green since 1833 and the houses round the Green have always formed part of Thames Ditton. It is now proposed to move all those on one side of the Green into Long Ditton. Giggs Hill Green Conservation Area runs along the Portsmouth Road...
side of the Green and extends into Angel Road. Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee covers the area and there is no Long Ditton Conservation area or Advisory Committee that could take this on which could provide the protection residents enjoy at present.

c. The proposal ignores the fact that residents on the CB register on the roads east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton ward would be removed, divorcing them from the Thames Ditton ward, parish and community of which they have been a part since 1100 AD. The Thames Ditton ward’s boundary has included them since the first local council (the Esher & the Dittons Urban District Council) was established in 1895. Residents in these roads look to Thames Ditton as the centre of their community for shops, doctors, schools, village hall (now Vera Fletcher Hall), St. Nicholas Church, village green (Giggs Hill Green) Thames Ditton Centre for the Community, Girl Guides and much more besides. Thames Ditton ward councillors respond to local residents for improving/campaigning for High Street shops, doctors' services, leisure services like those at Giggs Hill Green

I trust you will look again at the proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Phil Moore
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Pauline Morozgalska
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

At last! We bought our house in [redacted] East Molesey in 1988. Without any consultation, we were notified that this was changed in due course to a West Molesey address. We bought the property because it WAS in East Molesey for family sentimental reasons with the traditional boundary being the marked stone just beyond the Library in Walton Road. We have lobbied about this matter and believe that the present proposals put Spring Gardens back into the area in which it had always belonged. The fact that newer houses have been built for example the Hurst Park Estate should never have affected the Post Code status of this small road. We therefore, full support the proposal that Spring Gardens should be included in the Molesey East Ward and assume that the postal address will be amended appropriately. Pauline & Feliks Morozgalski

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: LAURA MORRISON
E-mail: [redacted]
Postcode: [redacted]
Organisation Name: [redacted]

Comment text:

I believe that as a resident of Esher that the roads which form the specific area of Lower Green should remain in the Esher ward. To my knowledge, the councillors of Esher have not consulted with the electorate of their wish to move this part of Esher from the ward of Esher. It is unreasonable to remove this part of Esher without consultation. I do not support the proposed new name for this ward to Esher and Hersham Riverside. I strongly object to this counter proposal. Esher should remain under its current name of Esher. I support the draft recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
For The Review Officer (Elmbridge)

Dear Sir

We have been away and on our return are dismayed to learn of plans to "shift" us across from Thames Ditton to Long Ditton! We can see no benefits at all for residents should this plan go ahead and strongly reject the idea.

We believe community identity would be lost and more especially active council representation from Thames Ditton ward councillors with their ability to respond to residents fears and concerns thus diminishing community involvement in the democratic process.

Please be sure to register our strong objection.

Yours faithfully
Graham and Lynda Mortimer - residents for 41 years
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 17 July 2015 15:19
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Hersham - proposed boundary changes

-----Original Message-----
From: Rebecca Mosby
Sent: 17 July 2015 15:19
To: reviews
Subject: Hersham - proposed boundary changes

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to express my concern and upset at the proposed boundary changes in Hersham, Elmbridge. We live a 10 minute walk from the heart of Hersham village and our children attend a school in Hersham, however, under the proposed changes we will no longer feel we have any say in what actually happens in Hersham. We live in Hersham and want to feel part of the local community and we want the opportunity to vote for Hersham councillors. We want to be able to vote for someone who has a true interest in Hersham and do not feel we would be fairly represented if our road were to become part of the Esher Ward.

It is also upsetting to discover that Hersham library will also become part of the Esher ward as this is such a valuable Hersham resource.

I feel strongly that local electoral boundaries should reflect local communities and splitting the village of Hersham up would not be fair to local residents and seems to make little sense.

Kind regards

Rebecca Mosby

[...]

my iPad
Dear Alex Hinds

Thank you for listening to the views of the people of Hinchley Wood regarding proposed boundary changes. The new proposals are much better.

I have just one query and that is the inclusion of the [redacted] area in Long Ditton. All the residents that I know there consider themselves to be part of Hinchley Wood, would shop, socialise and travel in/from Hinchley Wood.

I realise that this may be arranged because of voting numbers, but it really would make more sense locally for this area to be part of Hinchley Wood/Weston Green rather than Long Ditton.

Kind regards
Caroline Mullins
Dear Review officer,

I have been away and only found out about this major even on Sunday so our view are somewhat charged with a little emotion but are our feeling and also carry view of some of our friends whom also didn’t know about this event.

We would like to make a few comments regards your proposed ward and boundary change in regards Weston Green and Thames Ditton and it Hinchley Wood renaming.

I find your lack of proper consultation alarming as No resident in any of the proposed areas were informed by Letter as to what might taking place. I noted that Mr Markus Bowell had said that you didn’t have the funding to carry out such sending letters to residents and I will be talking to the Speaker MHP about this matter.

This approach is not normal Government practice or true governance for government to behave. It is poor management of such an important change to local government for whom we rely on. I will write to the Speaker of the House of Commands and copies to major news papers.

The two areas known as Thames Ditton and Weston (Green) are explicable tied (linked) together by location, over 1000 Years of history, Tudor King and other modern relevant infrastructure but also for the modern history but also for design of electronic in Speaker design Robotic, Computer control systems (Autonomous vehicles UAV) Car design and manufacturing, and inventors of other famous devices and mathematics in computer and nano technology.

The TD WG areas of schools working environments and Ethos of the areas happy and close knit society, by NOT reviewing this in a logical and taking in to consideration local status and village ethos, you would break the society and back bone of a well sorted parish.

It is well represented by our current resident’s independent councillors (non-line political) whom do caring and focused job in looking after this busy area. They look after:- Command land, schools, shops, transport rail and road /buses services, industry, along with building planning all in line with local residents need.

This would indeed be BROKEN in the reshuffle and I take a very dim view in your approach and methods which I have discussed with Ms Heather Fallen and Markus Bowell today. By cutting and removing the Weston Green ward and renaming it Hinchley Wood and Weston is an insult and it would destroy the very fabric of our well run village community.
Comments On proposed Change to Wards concerning Weston Green and Thames Ditton

People move here because of the local community spirit and being part of a TD WG areas known for not only famous history, the village spirit formed by the closeness of the current two wards.

Answers
Thames Ditton and Weston Green gave land to form the parish of Hinchley Wood circa 1920/5 and Esher council agreed to form the ward so *Weston Green should be parts of Thames Ditton Ward and should extend to cover to Esher station the commons and natural boundaries. It could run along the A307 north side it would also take the north area you have already marked.*

A warring on wards sizes and local councillors workloads its make no sense in making the wards larger to reduce the amount of councillors they are already struggling with amount of local requirements so the local residents would get a poor service or a damaging service. This is comes for my experiences working with Elmbridge council having being involved in the Weston Green conservation Group for more 10 years.

You’re sincerely

Robert C Mullins      Kay Mullins
FRSA MIET
Dear Sirs,

The proposal to remove all residents on the CB register on the roads east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton would divorce us from the Thames Ditton ward, parish community of which we have been part since 1100AD.

I live on the east side of Portsmouth Road overlooking Giggs Hill Green. Giggs Hill Green is Thames Ditton’s village green and all the houses round it feel part of the Thames Ditton community. Giggs Hill Green Conservation Area runs along the Portsmouth Road side of the Green and extends into Angel Road. Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee covers the area and there is no Long Ditton Conservation Area or Advisory Committee that could take this on to provide the protection residents enjoy at present.

The residents in these roads look to Thames Ditton as the centre of our community for shops, doctors, schools etc. and we have an active Residents’ Association for the whole of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. The community magazine “Thames Ditton Today” and website serves the whole of the existing borough wards of Thames Ditton and Weston Green.

I feel very strongly about this and sincerely hope you will think again before removing 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward without good reason. It would diminish community involvement in the democratic process and confuse us as to whom to lobby re parking, shops, services etc.

Kind regards
Anne-Catherine Murray
For the attention of The Review Officer (Elmbridge)

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object to the LGBCE’s proposal for the Thames Ditton Ward (Elmbridge Council), specifically the removal of c. 940 residents from the Thames Ditton Ward and incorporating them into the Long Ditton Ward.

From speaking to other residents recently it is clear that a number of people feel very strongly about this matter. In my opinion this proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commissions main considerations of reflecting community identity and providing for effective and convenient local government.

My reasons for objection are as follows:

The roads and residents affected by the proposal have been part of the Thames Ditton ward since the late 1800’s and part of the ancient parish of St. Nicholas, Thames Ditton for many years prior to that. Having lived on the hill for just a fraction of that time, I am already acutely aware of the sense of community and inclusion in the area. We see Thames Ditton as the centre of our community and remove us will adversely impact community involvement for the whole of Thames Ditton.

The houses that run around the perimeter of Giggs Hill Green have always formed part of Thames Ditton and Giggs Hill Green itself is the Village Green for the whole of Thames Ditton. To move the houses on one side of the Green into Long Ditton ward will change the identity of the Thames Ditton community as we know it – a community that has been created over hundreds of years.

In addition, Thames Ditton Ward councillors have been excellent at responding to issues raised by local residents and improving local services. Removing us from the Thames Ditton ward based organisation that represents us (TDWGRA) will make it unclear whom to speak to in relation to issues that need raising.

The Giggs Hill Green conservation area extends into Long Ditton and as such is covered by the Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee. There is no such committee for Long Ditton and so the protection enjoyed by the residents at the moment would discontinue.

I am sure you will receive a number of objections to this proposal and I urge you to consider carefully the impact of this proposal.

Kind regards

Des Murray
AV Lomas, SA Pearson, PD Copley, R Downs and JG Parr, (together “the Joint Administrators”) were appointed as Joint Administrators of Lehman Brothers International (Europe) to manage its affairs, business and property as agents without personal liability.

The Joint Administrators are licensed in the United Kingdom to act as insolvency practitioners by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales and are Data Controllers of personal data as defined by the Data Protection Act 1998. PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP will act as Data Processor on their instructions. Personal data will be kept secure and processed only for matters relating to the administration.

If this e-mail relates to another Lehman Brothers entity where the Administrators or Liquidators are from PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, please click below and select the relevant company in the list provided.

http://www.pwc.co.uk/business-recovery/administrations/lehman/lehmans-stakeholder-companies-in-administration.jhtml

This message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited.

This communication is for information purposes only and should not be regarded as an offer to sell or as a solicitation of an offer to buy any financial product, an official confirmation of any transaction, or as an official statement of the Lehman company in administration or liquidation, as the case may be. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free. No representation is made in relation to this information, including, without limitation, whether it is complete or accurate and nor should it be relied upon as such. All information is subject to change without notice.

You should make your own independent decision whether or not to enter into any arrangement referred to in this message based upon independent legal, financial and other advice and your own judgement. Accordingly, you should not rely on any communication (written or oral) of the Lehman company in administration or liquidation, as the case may be, its administrators or liquidators, as the case may be or any of their respective affiliates, agents, employees, directors, officers, partners or advisers as a recommendation or advice to enter into any arrangement referred to in this message.