Local Residents submissions to the Elmbridge Borough Council electoral review

This PDF document contains submissions from surnames of residents U to Z

Some versions of Adobe allow the viewer to move quickly between bookmarks.
Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 04 August 2015 09:51
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge - objection to Thames Ditton proposal

From: Su Underwood [staff@elmbc.org.uk]
Sent: 03 August 2015 17:41
To: reviews <reviews@elmbc.org.uk>
Subject: Elmbridge - objection to Thames Ditton proposal

Dear Sir or Madam,

I live in [redacted], one of the many roads included within the proposals that would be 'moved' to Long Ditton should it go ahead. Allegedly, one of the Boundary Commission's main considerations is "to reflect community identity". I moved to Thames Ditton because I loved it and I still do. I love the sense of community and the fact that it's remained a village within a city. If someone loses something or a dog runs away, we are all on Facebook straight away to try and help. People chat on street corners. I can watch cricket matches; kids playing soccer; thin people at their several days a week bootcamp; dogs being walked; teenagers flirting on their way home from school and toddlers learning to toddler on Giggs Hill Green. I can walk easily to my library, my high street, my doctor, the Vera Fletcher Hall and my railway station. I live in Thames Ditton. I feel like a Thames Ditton person and I am proud to tell people that.

I do not live in Long Ditton. Long Ditton is the other side of the railway line. I do not know any of their community hubs but any shops that I do know of are a car drive away from where I live. I do not know anyone who lives in Long Ditton. Long Ditton is of no interest to me whatsoever.

And yet it has been proposed that - for no valid reason that I can find - I should be moved into Long Ditton. How can two sides of Giggs Hill Green be in Thames Ditton and yet the other side be in Long Ditton? Madness.

I would be divorced from the Thames Ditton ward and parish and from a community that this land has been part of since 1100 AD. Giggs Hill Green is Thames Ditton's Village Green. The Thames Ditton Cricket Club has played there since 1833. The land that my property stands on, along with all properties that stand around the three edges of Giggs Hill Green, have always been in Thames Ditton and yet the one side of the green that I live on is now being threatened with a moved boundary line. It does not make sense.

The Thames Ditton ward's boundary has included them since the first local council was established in 1895. To remove 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward based organisation that represents us, the Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents' Association, would break our community involvement in the democratic process. I wouldn't know who to appeal to if I had any problems.

I really and truly hope that sense will prevail and that the feelings of all of the Thames Ditton residents who, like me, are horrified with this proposal will be taken into full consideration. We may appear to just be numbers in some great plan but we are really human beings whose identities are being threatened.
Please do not go ahead with this.

Yours faithfully,

Su Underwood
From: Eero Vanaale
Sent: 23 August 2015 22:40
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Fw: Boundary Commission proposal

I have received an information brochure regarding the proposed changes to remove Lower Green from Esher Ward.

As a resident of [REDACTED], I fully support the Esher Residents Associations position that the area has natural, geographic and social cohesion with rest of Esher.

We go to Church, do our grocery shopping and visit restaurants in Esher and spend many weekends with family in Claremont Landscape Gardens and Garsons Farm - so Esher all the way. I have never really been in Hinchley Wood and extremely rarely happen to be in Hersham - thus its not clear where does the logic for such proposals is coming from.

It is also disappointing to learn of such initiatives/proposals/changes in retrospective.

Kind regards,
Eero Vanaale
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Alison Van Der Hoven
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

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 is separated from us by a railway line, has an entirely different community, and has entirely different ward issues.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Review Officer,

I am emailing to register our objection to the proposed boundary changes placing Burwood Park to Oatlands. Our objection is due to a number of issues some of which we have identified below:

- Physically separated by a railway.
- The present orientation shared with Hersham Village is a symbiotic relationship in that both Burwood Park and Hersham Village are more rural in nature and share physicians, churches, libraries, shopping and other daily facilities. The proposed new Ward does not support that same relationship.
- Oatlands is more residential in design and layout than the pastoral setting of Burwood Park. As such, planning issues for Burwood Park are more effectively considered within the context particular to its rural setting than the residential requirements of Oatlands.
- Politically the proposed Ward would create a disadvantage for residents to make an effort to get behind and gather support local issues endemic to our area. 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.

We kindly request 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.

Sincerely,

Sara Venter
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: margaret wakefield
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

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 is separated from us by a railway line, has an entirely different community, and has entirely different ward issues.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Fuller, Heather  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 04:08 PM  
To: Hinds, Alex  
Subject: FW: Proposed Boundary changes  

From: Geoffrey Walker  
Sent: 18 August 2015  
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
Subject: Proposed Boundary changes  

From G Walker  
I do not support proposed changes to the Esher parish boundary.  
I support your proposal  

Geoffrey Walker.
13th August 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in response to your letter regarding the Local Government Boundary Commission to Elmbridge Borough Council.

It would be an absolute tragedy for Wester Green to be separated from Thames Ditton as the two are entwined and part of each other and share the same values. Besides, what is the point? We have nothing in common with Hinchley Wood. For better surery to combine, Thames Ditton, Wester Green and Lower Green...
Into one land and thickly wooded
with Claygate, since both are on the
other side of the A307.

My address is Thames Ditton and
I want it to stay that way. It would
be keen elevatus for the schools, churches
etc. Too. Far better surely than being
broken up. Keep this bit of Old England
intact, it is much valued!!

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]
I would like to object to the proposal to remove all residents on the GB register on roads which includes Southville road and others east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton ward which would separate them from Thames Ditton ward parish and community of which they have been a part of since 1100 AD. The Thames Ditton wards boundary has included them since the 1st local council the Esher and Ditton’s Urban District Council was established in 1895.

There is an active Residents Association for the whole of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. We have been very well represented by our Councillors in particular Karen Randolph who has represented us with our objections to various planning applications that would affect our lives in Southville Road, to remove 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward based organisation that represents them our Residents Association, would diminish community involvement in the democratic process. Our community magazine Thames Ditton Today and website serves the whole of the existing Borough wards of Thames Ditton and Weston Green, this proposal would confuse local residents as to whom to lobby re planning, shops and parking etc.

Regards,

Mrs Chris Wall
I would like to object to the proposal to remove all residents on the GB register on roads which includes Southville road and others east of the Portsmouth Road to Long Ditton ward which would separate them from Thames Ditton ward parish and community of which they have been a part of since 1100 AD. The Thames Ditton wards boundary has included them since the 1st local council the Esher and Ditton’s Urban District Council was established in 1895. There is an active Residents Association for the whole of Thames Ditton and Weston Green. We have been very well represented by our Councillors in particular Karen Randolph who has represented us with our objections to various planning applications that would affect our lives in Southville Road, to remove 940 electors from the Thames Ditton ward based organisation that represents them our Residents Association, would diminish community involvement in the democratic process. Our community magazine Thames Ditton Today and website serves the whole of the existing Borough wards of Thames Ditton and Weston Green, this proposal would confuse local residents as to whom to lobby re planning, shops and parking etc.

Regards,

Peter Wall.
It has come to our notice that if the above proposal goes ahead we will in a position where we will not have the choice to vote for an dependant candidate to represent us in the local elections as the Long Ditton Ward does not offer the electorate a Resident Association candidate and therefore, there would not be any independent Councillor to represent the voters living in these roads.

Mr and Mrs P Wall

Sent from my iPad
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Christine Ward
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

I have looked at your proposals for the new Hinchley Wood and Weston Green ward and consider it a great shame that the housing developments and amenities off Lynwood Road should now fall within the Long Ditton ward. The Lynwood Road area contains allotments which are used in the main by Hinchley Wood residents and also the local brownie and guide hut. These would all fall in Long Ditton which has its own similar facilities already. Additionally, as there is a pedestrian way running parallel to the railway track, the residents of the housing development live within a 3 minute walk of the shopping facilities in Hinchley Wood. The Community Hub in Claygate Lane is similarly only a 5 minute walk away as there is a pedestrian bridge over the railway line bringing the pedestrian into Manor Road North. These residents are therefore so much closer to the Hinchley Wood facilities than those in Long Ditton ward. Hinchley Wood is a thriving community and the current boundary proposal would see some of the amenities which we value so highly falling to another ward.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Tony Watson
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

Hersham is a small but vibrant community with its own identity & could not be more remote from Esher. The new proposal excludes some local amenities, (Molesey Road) & even Hersham Library. I feel those of us who care about our local government would feel disenfranchised by these changes as we would have no interest in voting for would would be a very "Esher" candidate or, with respect, they with Hersham matters. I feel that the following would go a long way to resolving this matter: That the new boundary be redrawn down Esher Road (A244) so that the Longmore Estate & Molesey Road remain in Hersham Village Ward. Although I appreciate that the new boundaries are for political purposes only, I feel that such a measure would help to preserve the identity of "Hersham Village"

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Robert Welford

Dear Sir

I am writing on behalf of my family as residents of Hersham, Hertsam.

I have recently been informed that the Boundary Commission is considering moving the borough council ward (Hersham South Ward) into the Oatlands Park Ward as part of the exercise to reduce the number of councillor seats in the Borough.

In my opinion this proposal is counter-intuitive and not desirable. Instead I think it would make much more sense for Hersham South to be folded into a new “Hersham Village” ward. My reasons are

1. as you will see from our address, my family lives in Hersham and not in Oatlands or Weybridge (although close, of course)
2. given our location, and although Hersham/Walton is by no means perfect, it does represent where we live, shop and access services. As its residents we have nothing per se to do with Oatlands
3. my MP represents a constituency for Esher and Walton (Mr Dominic Raab) which includes Hersham but does not include Oatlands or Weybridge
4. the railway line (London-Woking and beyond) has been the historical divide between Hersham and Weybridge for electoral administrative purposes – why alter that precedent?

For these reasons, I would like the current Hersham South Ward to be part of the new Hersham Village Ward when the boundary changes are implemented, as recommended by our Councillors.

Should you have any questions on this matter, I would be pleased to discuss them. My contact details are as given below.

Yours sincerely

Robert Welford

Robert Welford
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: tony west
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Organisation Name: [Redacted]

Comment text:

My view is that the merging of Hinchley Wood and Weston Green Wards is justifiable in terms of criteria 1 & 3 but moving Lynwood Road into Long Ditton Ward is significantly counter to criteria 2. Placing Lynwood Road in the Long Ditton Ward would cut across the local interests, community identity and use of facilities of people on the estate which are focused on Hinchley Wood rather than Long Ditton.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
24th August 2015

The Review Officer
The Local Government Boundary commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
London SW1 4PQ

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: Elmbridge Borough Council Boundary Review**
**Hinchley Wood and Weston Green Ward**

Having considered all the evidence and looked at the proposal maps I fully support the recommendation to relocate Arran Way and the eastern section of Douglas Road (from the junction of Arran Way) to the newly-formed Hinchley Wood and Weston Green Ward.

Furthermore I would also support the relocation of the entire area known as Lower Green, north of the railway line, to the newly-formed Hinchley Wood and Weston Green Ward.

Yours faithfully

Emma-Claire Whicheloe (Mrs)
I 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. This is because the community has strong ties both pastorally and socially with Weston Green.

Yours

Ian Whitley
Parish Missioner
To whom it may concern

I am emailing to strongly object to the proposal for the reasons below:

I have lived and taken part in the village life of Thames Ditton for past 26 years. We had our wedding banns read at St Nicholas Church and would be horrified after all this time to be side slipped into Long Ditton parish.

I live in runs of the Portsmouth Road and I consider Giggs Hill Green the heart of my village, I watch the cricket, walk the dogs and drink at the Angel. The scouts who meet in Claygate Lane(also under the new proposal), hold their annual fete and Remembrance Parade on the Green of Thames Ditton, not Long Ditton and we would not want them to hold it elsewhere as they are very much part of the community.

How can the new boundaries run along one side of that Green. ~This I feel would divorce me and them for the parish and community of which we have been a part of since 1100 AD. The wards boundary has included us since the first local council was established in 1895.

I am part of the Thames Ditton community, I have worked at Bachmann’s Patisserie and am involved at the Vera Fletcher Hall. I enjoy receiving the Thames Ditton today magazine which I help to deliver and their Website. I enjoy being protected by Thames Ditton conservation area committee, and the Residents Association and the security and protection this gives me.

I would feel cut off and isolated from a very friendly, appealing historic village and community that we love and care for, and have done personally as mentioned before for the last 26 years, that being the parish of Thames Ditton.

Kind regards

Allison Whittle
ELMBRIDGE - OBJECTION TO THAMES DITTON PROPOSAL

Having lived in [REDACTED] for over 45 years as "Thames Ditton" residents, we strongly object to the proposal that we now become "Thames Ditton" for the following reasons:-

1. We regard Thames Ditton as our village and we both support the local shops, restaurants and functions at the village hall,

2. Both our sons were christened at St Nicholas Church which, at present, is our parish church, rather than St Mary's in Long Ditton.

3. There is a sense of community in being part of Thames Ditton and this is encouraged by an active Residents' Association and our local R.A. Councillors who diligently look after village interests.

4. Finally, why change a community that has been in existence for over 900 years purely for the sake of bureaucracy.

Yours
David and Jane Wildash
To Whom It May Concern,

I have lived in Thames Ditton Village for a number of years firstly on [redacted] and now on [redacted]. I would like to put my views that the recent boundary review should not take out those roads by Giggs Hill Green and place them in the Long Ditton ward.

Whilst I lived in [redacted] I used the Sure Start Centre where I attended anti and post natal care, had my midwifery appointments at Giggs Hill Surgery, used the Thames Ditton library and supported the local parade of shops not to mention Christmas fairs and school fetes. I know these residents in those roads affected by this feel, and will always be "Thames Dittoners" and their views should be represented by Thames Ditton residents association as they are Thames Ditton residents.

Regards
Charlotte Wilkes

Sent from my iPhone
I wish to express some dismay at the proposed changes particular relating to the current Lower Green Ward. I am a long serving governor at Cranmere Primary School which is shortly moving to an adjacent site where it will no longer be part of Weston Green. The school and governing body has been well served by our local councillors and I would like to suggest that Cranmere Primary is still in the area designated as Weston Green.

Yours

Joanna Willey
I would like to state my support for the proposed Walton South ward boundary as shown on the June 2015 draft recommendation and in particular the railway line being the south boundary and the area between Molesey Road (the section north of the railway line) and Hersham Road to the west being all in one ward. As regard the eastern part of Ashley Park, I generally feel that this should also be part of the ward but do not have strong views on this.
Starkie, Emily

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 28 August 2015 16:23
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Representation on the draft Elmbridge B C boundary review

-----Original Message-----
From: Jackie Williams
Sent: 28 August 2015 16:22
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Representation on the draft Elmbridge B C boundary review

Dear Sir/Madam

We wish to make representation on your proposals as follows;

We support the general principle of the number of three member wards and the various dispositions but there are a number of the proposals that appear driven more by trying to achieve some electoral equality than having regard to community identity , physical linkages ,natural barriers (railway lines ,major roads etc) ,history (parish boundaries and the original estates that formed this part of the County) and postal notations. For the most part a reasonable outcome has been achieved.

As a former Returning and Electoral Registration Officer elsewhere in Surrey one of us is only too acutely aware of the challenges such a re-warding exercise presents. However your proposals to annex Burwood Park from its longstanding linkage to Hersham and Walton on Thames seems extreme and goes against many of your guiding principles. It has few if any community of interest with Oatlands and has more to do with Ashley Park and crucially Walton train station. Whilst the acreage occupied by Burwood Park is substantial its population is relatively modest (even more so with the large number of foreign nationals often ineligible to vote).On balance it should remain in the the Hersham Ward.

Closer to home the boundary between Oatlands Park and Weybridge Riverside is very contrived and not consistent with the principles you enunciate. Commencing the boundary at the beginning of Oatlands Drive surely reflects better the identity and interests of the Oatlands community and is readily recognised as such by most in Oatlands Drive and the cul de sacs off it (e.g. Park lawn Road, Latymer Close, Vaillant Road, Southerland Close). They also formed part of the historic Finnart Meadow estate and its Oatlands Park ( now the nearby Hotel site).The roads immediately to the south of these (Finnart Close, Marlborough Drive, Mulberry Close, Grotto Road etc ) feed into Thames Street and the Town centre and are naturally part of your proposed Weybridge Riverside Ward.

On naming of Wards many have sought to achieve some identity in ordinary residents’ minds. Frankly the Oatlands Park and Burwood Park is somewhat pretentious and for the reasons outlined above it should be called "Weybridge - Oatlands" so reinforcing the primacy of the Town. As to "Weybridge- Riverside" the unfortunate connotation with river and the very serious flooding last year is surely undesirable as much of the Ward is a distant away from the river. A better ,more neutral, name would be "Weybridge Town" or "Central Weybridge" which again reinforces the focus of the Town.

We hope these comments will be considered carefully and hopefully taken on board in your final announcement.

Regards,

T and J Williams -

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of [redacted], I am in favour of these proposed changes to return Avern Road to East Molesey from many moons ago.

Yours faithfully,

Mr D J Willingale
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Ian Willsmer
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name: [REDACTED]

Comment text:

HI, WE LIVE IN THE WESTON GREEN WARD AND ARE VERY HAPPY BY THE REPRESENTATION WE HAVE AS OUR COUNCILLORS ARE VERY AWARE OF THE AREA. TO BE PART OF HINCHLEY WOOD DOES NOT MAKE SENSE AS IT WILL BE TAKING A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF LOCAL KNOWLEDGE AWAY. IF ANYTHING WE SHOULD BE PART OF THE ESHER WARD. I KNOW IT HAS TO DO WITH NUMBERS ETC. SURELY TO JOIN WESTON GREEN AND HINCHLEY WOOD TOGETHER IS A LITTLE LACKING IN LOCAL THINKING. CRANMERE SCHOOL I BELIEVE HAS ALWAYS BEEN LOOKED AFTER BY WESTON GREEN AND MAY BE SHOULD BE WITHIN THE WESTON GREEN WARD? THE COST SAVING IN CUTTING DOWN WARD REPRESENTATIVES IS NOT THAT SUBSTANTIAL AND DOES NOT OUTWAY THE LOCAL KNOWLEDGE THAT MIGHT GO MISSING. REGARDS THE WILLSMER CLAN [REDACTED]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
From: Erin Willson
Sent: 18 August 2015
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Subject: Objection to LGBCE proposals for Thames Ditton

Please find below our objection to the proposed changes to the Thames Ditton Ward.

The proposal to remove all residents on the roads east of the Portsmouth Road from the current CB register will divorce those families from the Thames Ditton ward, community and parish - breaking up a community which has been together for many hundreds of years.

Residents of the roads which will be effected consider Thames Ditton to be the centre of the community, which is centred around the High Street, Children’s Centre, Community Centre, Library, Doctors office and Giggs Hill Green. Forcing them to join an alternative ward, which they do not feel an association to or engage as strongly with seems entirely unnecessary and is contrary to your aim to reflect community identity.

In addition, breaking up the ward will not provide more effective and convenient local government as you suggest. The effected residents are part of the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents Association and are adequately served by the current elected officials. If residents are using services and amenities in Thames Ditton, but voting and lobbying in another ward, it will lead to confusion.

As a result of the objections above, like many Thames Ditton residents, we feel strongly that the proposed ward changes will not have a positive effect on our community.

Kind regards
Andrew and Erin Willson
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 04:09 PM
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Boundary commission proposal

-----Original Message-----
From: Chris Wilson
Sent: 17 August 2015
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary commission proposal

Good evening,

Please keep Lower Green remaining in the Esher ward.

Many thanks
Mr & Mrs Wilson

Sent from my iPhone
---Original Message---

From: Anthony Winckley
Sent: 23 August 2015 22:18
To: reviews <reviews@lbce.org.uk>
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection: Proposals for Thames Ditton

FAO: the Review Officer

Dear Sir / Madam,

As a resident of [redacted] the proposals put forward would result in our property to falling under the Long Ditton ward instead of Thames Ditton. I would like to register my very strong objection to this proposal. This is something which appears to be foisted upon us without due consideration and at relatively short notice, presumably in an attempt to force it through.

My objections are based principally on the following:

1) Contrary to the Boundary Commission's main considerations "to reflect community identity":

We moved to Thames Ditton 5 years ago having lived in the area for around 3 years prior to that. We were particularly drawn to the village and its community and since moving here, have very much become involved in the village. Our children were christened at St Nicholas Church, they have both attended Colets Nursery, we go the Fair on Gigg's Hill Green and other community events (remember the 2012 Road Race passing down Portsmouth Road?) and have made many friends in and around the village. In short, our social lives revolve around the village. This proposal would effectively evict us from that community against our will. A community which, I might add, has existed for more than 100 years.

2) Contrary to the Boundary Commission's main consideration "to provide for effective and convenient local government".

If this proposal goes through we will no longer have the right to vote in local elections for Thames Ditton Residents' Association. This association has been active in supporting local residents' issues and if we are no longer covered by that association we will feel substantially less well represented. Long Ditton's association is much less active, and in fact does not put forward a candidate at local elections, thereby removing at a stroke our opportunity for representation by a candidate not aligned with one of the main political parties. This move is deeply undemocratic and thoroughly contrary to our interests.

I would like to summarise by saying we did not ask for this change; it is being forced upon us. We feel part of this community, we are involved in it, and our social lives revolve around it. My sense is this change is politically motivated and we are deeply concerned about what may lie around the corner for us if it goes ahead. I would ask that this proposal is rejected outright. Thank you in anticipation.

Yours faithfully,
Anthony Winckley

Sent from my iPad
Starkie, Emily

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 24 August 2015 16:48
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection: Proposals for Thames Ditton Ward

From: vicky west
Sent: 23 August 2015 15:32
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Cc: 
Subject: Elmbridge Electoral Review - Objection: Proposals for Thames Ditton Ward

F/A/O the Review Officer

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of [redacted], I am directly affected by your proposal to re-draw the council's ward boundaries and move us into the Long Ditton Ward. I wish to object to these proposals in the strongest terms: it is a shocking attack on my democratic rights to representation in the Thames Ditton Ward.

1) I believe that your proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commission's main consideration "to reflect community identity"

My husband and I have been Thames Ditton residents for five years and my children are members by birth. My area has been part of the Thames Ditton ward since 1895 and hence since [redacted] was built within this ward, circa 1908.

Your proposal undermines my identity as a member of Thames Ditton community and removes my democratic right to influence local character, amenities and services provided within the community (such as parking), through my participation in local council elections. It clearly detracts from the community identity of Thames Ditton village.

My family and I consider ourselves firmly to be part of the Thames Ditton community:
Both of our children were born here and christened at the the local parish church, St Nicholas;
We patronise the village shops and businesses, including pottery at Thames Ditton Cricket Club;
We attend the village fairs on Giggis Hill Green;

We are regular patrons the Thames Ditton Children's Centre, the Library in Mercer Close and have also used the pre-natal services at the Emberbrook Clinic on Raphael Drive;
We are able to take an active interest in community matters through the provision of the excellent residents association magazine "Thames Ditton Today" and through membership of the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents' Association;
We look to the Thames Ditton High Street and Giggis Hill Green as the centre of our community.

2) I believe that your proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commission's main consideration "to provide for effective and convenient local government"
The existing boundary position supports effective and clear local government for me as a Thames Ditton resident and the proposed change would have a negative impact on this effectiveness by confusing the responsibilities for services in my area and removing my right elect local Thames Ditton representatives.

I emphatically wish to remain an elector for the Thames Ditton and Weston Green Residents Association, who represent my interests as a Thames Ditton resident.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Victoria Winckley (Mrs)

Sent from my iPad
From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 21 July 2015 11:51
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Save Hersham library!

From: Natalie Wisedale
Sent: 21 July 2015 11:30
To: reviews
Subject: Save Hersham library!

Please could you save Hersham library. As a family we use it all the time and the children just love it! We would be extremely upset if it closed. Pleeeeeease help save it!!

Regards,
Natalie Wisedale
Review Officer (Elmbridge)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
LONDON
SW1P 4QP

22nd July 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARY CHANGES IN ELMBRIDGE

We wish to object to the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposal to move [Redacted] the Oatlands Park Ward into the Walton Central Ward.

As the road name suggests, Oatlands Drive logically and rightly belongs in the Oatlands Park Ward. Oatlands Drive, which at its mid point runs through Oatlands Village, is a main arterial route connecting the towns of Walton and Weybridge at either end. The proposed new boundary, to the Weybridge side of The Mount, is ill-judged, totally arbitrary and not supported by any logical rationale. No one would expect to find the boundary for the ward of Walton Central over a quarter of a mile down Oatlands Drive, half way along the road leading to Oatlands Village. This is neither a strong nor easily identifiable boundary.

Further, if the proposal goes ahead we feel we will have been effectively disenfranchised by the change. We would not expect Walton Central's councillors' remit or principal concerns to extend to including a few hundred voters somewhere half way along Oatlands Drive. This is particularly so because Walton Central's three councillors are currently all from The Walton Society, a local amenity group, and there are no obvious community links between this section of Oatlands Drive and The Walton Society.

Having lived on Oatlands Drive for over 50 years, issues which regularly arise concern support for the the local village community, availability of places in Oatlands and Cleves schools and speed restrictions, traffic calming measures, cycle routes and safe pedestrian crossing points on Oatlands Drive. With the majority of the mile and a half of Oatlands Drive remaining in the Oatlands Park Ward it would be totally disproportionate and unreasonable to expect Walton Central councillors to be able to provide effective representation for a minority number of Oatlands Drive residents annexed to their ward. To this extent they could not provide those Oatlands Drive residents with very effective or convenient local government.
The Oatlands Park Ward does not comprise just a recreational park or residential housing estates. It has, at its heart, a vulnerable local community centered around Oatlands Village. This village together with its local church, St. Mary's Oatlands, needs the support of the local residents in the immediate vicinity to ensure its survival and preserve its interests for future generations. Two generations of our family have lived and attended both of the schools in Oatlands. We have supported the local independent shops and businesses and taken part in community activities, including the annual Oatlands Village Fair. We identify with the Oatlands Park Ward and strongly object to being made a convenient "add on" to Walton Central purely for the sake of making up voter numbers. This may be a way of providing electoral equality but it is not good electoral equality.

Finally we have serious concerns about the impact this ward boundary change would have on constituency boundaries and voting in general elections. Currently Oatlands Park is part of the Runnymede and Weybridge constituency while Walton Central Ward residents vote in general elections as part of Walton and Esher. The proposal would create obvious conflicts and tensions for the small number of Oatlands Drive residents who would be required to vote in one ward for local elections and another for general elections. Further it would be impractical and discriminatory to expect these residents to attend at two different polling stations, especially if national and local elections were held on the same day. This proposal would end up not providing effective or convenient local or, indeed, national government.

We strongly urge you to reject the proposal to move our property into the Walton Central Ward.

Yours faithfully

[Blank]

cc

Oatlands Park Councillors - Barry Cheyne, Lorraine Samuels and Lewis Brown

Member of Parliament – Rt.Hon.Philip Hammond MP
To whom it may concern

I strongly object to the Boundary Commission proposal recommending that some roads in Hersham be merged with Oatlands Ward in Elmbridge Borough Council. These roads, including [redacted] where I am an owner undoubtedly are in Hersham and should be included with the proposed Hersham Village Ward.

I live in Hersham and it is my postal address. All the many facilities in Hersham (shops, doctor, dentist, church, community facilities etc) are used by these roads and are in a very short walking distance. There is absolutely no synergy with Oatlands Ward and geographically there is no reason whatsoever to feel connected. I live in KT12, not KT13.

Hersham is completely separated from Oatlands, with established boundaries such as main roads and a railway line.

I cannot think of one positive reason that supports the proposal.

Yours faithfully

James Woodburn
Amendment of Boundary Commission proposal for Hinchley Wood and Weston Green ward

We would like to make the following comments in support of the inclusion of Lower Green Esher. The community of Lower Green lies north of the railway line and so has many geographical links with the other two communities. Any facilities situated in Esher town itself requires a long uphill walk for access with an infrequent bus service.

Cranmere school serves the Weston Green community as well as Lower Green as does All Saints church Weston Green.

The food bank at Weston Green serves Lower Green. Other projects such as youth work involve the two communities together.

We hope you will consider these points in making a decision.

Patricia and David Worthy.
Hinds, Alex

From: Mayers, Mishka on behalf of reviews
Sent: 11 August 2015 17:00
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Boundary Changes

-----Original Message-----
From: kenneth yale
Sent: 10 August 2015 20:01
To: reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>
Subject: Boundary Changes

I am very concerned about the proposed changes to our boundaries. Why can’t you live well alone? The village of Thames Ditton has existed quite happily for many years based on St.Nicholas Church and there is no reason (except political!!) as far as I can see, for any changes. We have lived here for 48 years without Long Ditton and I feel it should remain that way!! Yours, Ken Yale.
Elmbridge District

Personal Details:

Name: Alison Zacharia

E-mail:

Postcode:

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

We are residents on [redacted] Esher. We have a three and a half year old daughter who will start school in September 2016. Since living in the area (2011) we've always liked the idea of her attending Cranmere School. It is local and highly regarded. Therefore, with the proposed boundary changes, we're upset to see that the school will no longer fall under our ward. So we’d like to propose a change and request that the boundary is extended to include Lower Green. There are several other factors to support our reason for wanting to extend the proposed boundary. But for us, personally, we feel most strongly about the local community and families that attend the school or consider it as a first choice school for their children.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
To whom it may concern,

My husband and I have lived in Thames Ditton since 2006 and have enjoyed being part of the local community and village life. We moved to [redacted] in 2009 and very much feel part of the historic Thames Ditton village community.

We strongly object against the plans to redrawing the council ward boundaries, and becoming part of Long Ditton Ward, when our local identity is being part of Thames ward.

Making these changes is resulting in Thames Ditton being carved up for bureaucratic convenience, and I am not convinced that my personal local interests will be sufficiently represented going forward. We feel that the Thames Ditton & Weston Green Residents Association has been representing our interests and we wish to continue to belong to Thames Ditton for this reason.

We don't think there is a need to change a community, which has been closely tied since 11AD.

We moved to Thames Ditton to be part of this community, with local shops, Giggs Hill Green close by, and we do not want to be split. We also believe it is important to continue protecting the conservation areas, which until today has been effectively done by the Thames Ditton Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

Best regards
Larissa & Michael Zell