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Dear Sir

I have little to add to letters that you have already received regarding the prospect of St George's Hill ward being renamed Weybridge. Brooklands.

If you arrive in Weybridge you will indeed see signs for Brooklands. These direct you to an industrial estate, business park and museum.

Brooklands is not an accepted residential district but St George's Hill is.

You should be aware that there is strong opposition within Elmbridge BC to a name change and that this was only pushed through by the Conservative majority block voting and flexing their muscles for political gain.

Their objective is to remove the credibility of St George's Hill Independents as a small political party.

This is not democracy and I am sure not quite what you were thinking of when reviewing our ward pattern.

I trust you will bear this in mind when finalising your decisions.

Yours

Brian Fairclough
Councillor
St George's Hill Ward
Hinds, Alex

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 31 March 2015 13:02
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Submission to LGBC - Elmbridge Borough Council Electoral Review

From: Christine Elmer
Sent: 31 March 2015 11:06
To: Reviews@
Cc: Christopher Elmer; Hawkins Stuart
Subject: Submission to LGBC - Elmbridge Borough Council Electoral Review

For the Attention of Mr Alex Hinds

Dear Mr. Hinds,

I attach as below a submission to the Commission for its current review of the boundaries for Elmbridge Borough Council.

I am one of the ward Councillors for the existing Walton South ward. I have been a Councillor for this ward since 2006. I have had a chance to discuss this new warding proposal with my local Conservative committee and these are our thoughts/suggestions on behalf of the 3 Councillors Cllr Christine Elmer, Cllr Chris Elmer, Cllr Stuart Hawkins.

The Proposed Warding Pattern as suggested by Elmbridge Borough Council and which was discussed at a Special Meeting of the Council on 16 March 2015 splits the existing Walton South ward into three separate areas.

This separation of Walton South would involve moving part of it to a new ward comprising of Walton Ashley area with Oatlands Park electors (ward #7); part to a new ward #6 comprising of existing Walton North and Walton Ambleside electors; part would remain as the core Rydens area of Walton-on-Thames, together with a part of Hersham including the Rydens Enterprise School (ward #16).

The new ward (#16) has been suggested could be called Rydens ward and this naming was accepted by the Special Council meeting which met on 16 March 2015.

This new Rydens ward as proposed comprises of roads in both Walton and Hersham (which are separate towns) but which contain the Rydens name, such as Rydens Road, Walton, Rydens Park, Walton, and Rydens Grove, Hersham. A large development of bungalows along Rydens Road in Walton is called Rydensdale.

Rydens area is indeed a community of its own. As a ward Councillor we have worked together with residents on many issues which affect them jointly, such as opposition to the Weylands Anaerobic Digestion facility close to Hersham Station, a plan to build 1000 homes at land adjacent to Fieldcommon/Rydens Road a local crossing point in Rydens Road at the junction with Meadowside, and an unwanted Office block on open green space/land at Severn Drive, Walton. Many of our residents have children who attend Rydens Enterprise School in Hersham.
When we saw this map on 16 March 2015 we noted with some concern that a road in the existing Walton South ward, called **Rydens Avenue** is not included in the proposed ward #16. **Rydens Avenue** is one of the defining roads of the area. If there is to a separation of communities, it would make no sense to create a ward artificially to then leave out a large part of that community.

We would strongly recommend that if this proposed separation is agreed that all roads within the Rydens Road/Rydens Avenue community should stay together in one ward. There are some small roads off Rydens Avenue that will need be included Brunswick Avenue, Beecott Lane, Gladesmuir Close.

I also note that in the line drawn along Rydens Road some roads/cul-de-sacs, have been separated out to ward #9 such as St Michael’s Close, The Spur and Foxhollow. These also need to be in ward #16 (Rydens ward). It is the feeling of my committee that ideally the two roads of Meadowside and The Furrows should be in ward #16 as these also form an integral part of the Rydens community.

Finally for your information I attach a link to the webcast of the Elmbridge Borough Council Special meeting of 16 March 2015 where I spoke on this matter.

[http://www.elmbridge.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/168816](http://www.elmbridge.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/168816)

Yours sincerely,

Christine Elmer

Cllr Christine Elmer
Councillor John O'Reilly

March 29th 2015

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

Dear Mr. Hinds,

Elmbridge Borough Council Electoral Review

Hersham

I write as a resident of and Borough Councillor for Hersham in strong support of the Council’s proposed new Hersham Village Ward within an authority comprising 48 members (which I also wholeheartedly endorse).

The inclusion in the ward of both Whiteley Village and the Burwood Park Estate, longstanding features of our Hersham ‘landscape’, is indispensable if the three rules established by the Commission and particularly that of "reflecting the interests and identities of local communities" are to be fulfilled. It is inconceivable that either should be transferred to another electoral area. Furthermore, the proposed Hersham Village ward would fully meet the other two criteria the Commission has set, namely electoral equality and promoting effective and convenient local government.

Elmbridge as a whole

Turning to the overall configuration of a 48 member Elmbridge Borough Council, I would again commend to the Commission the recommendations made by our professional officers which was approved by a large majority at the Full Council meeting on March 16th, along with the relatively minor amendments contained in the separate submission from the Esher and Walton Conservative Association.

In my judgement these faithfully reflect the Commission’s three principles and succeed in preserving the distinct identities of the communities in the Borough.
In the context of electoral equality, I would respectfully urge the Commission to reject proposals that include two member wards, not least because of the unfairness to residents who would be unable to vote in certain years because the Council has retained the election-by-thirds system.

When this matter was considered only last October, it was made abundantly clear to all Councillors that only if we moved to all-out elections every four years, could two or even single member wards be a credible option. Indeed, many Councillors changed their views to support change precisely because of the prospect of being better able to link community patterns with electoral boundaries. In the event the proponents of the status quo prevailed. But with that decision, I would contend that there are no exceptional circumstances anywhere in the Borough that would justify a departure from the stated norm of three member wards. If a derogation is conceded for, say Hinchley Wood or Long Ditton, why not for Hersham, Cobham, Weybridge or Molesey all of which arguably have just a strong an argument for being treated as ‘special cases’.

I hope these observations are helpful in your deliberations.
Councillor John Sheldon

Mr Alex Hinds,
Review Officer (Elbridge),
Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
Layden House,
76-86 Turnmill Street,
London EC1M 5LG

28th March 2015

Dear Mr. Hinds,

Electoral Review for Elmbridge Borough

A long cherished ambition of Elmbridge Borough councillors to reduce their numbers from 60 to 48 is now coming to fruition, with approval of officers’ recommendations for our 22 historical Wards to undergo a degree of amalgamation into 16, each for representation by 3 Members.

After close examination of the proposed boundary changes I conclude that they constitute the best and most appropriate response to the need for fewer, larger Wards, so I am concerned that special pleading is being expressed by a few Members who wish to modify the approved boundaries, creating some 2 Member Wards.

As a longstanding Member for the Hersham South Ward I would strongly oppose any move to detach Whiteley Village or Burwood Park from this administrative area, both deeply integrated with the settlement of Hersham, its church, shopping, Centre for the Community, Health Centre, et cetera, and supported by a history of strong and effective representation.

Whilst the objections to the approved proposals were listened to attentively in Council, it was obvious that all were based on the supposition that voting boundaries authoritatively define the communities they represent, so that changes could and would damage cohesiveness and residents’ sense of identity. For the Hinchley Wood and Weston Green Wards principally quoted, phraseology such as “torn apart”, “airbrushed out of existence”, and “carved up” revealed the depth of this misunderstanding.

In responses to those who entertain such fears I have pointed out that the several small townships which characterise Elmbridge are ancient settlements held together by common ties, rather than lines drawn on a map for administrative convenience. I have put it to the worried few that under the new arrangements the only difference of significance to voters is that their elected representatives will have larger areas of responsibility.

I believe therefore that the objections raised by those pleading for 2 Member Wards are groundless, and that such Wards are not only unnecessary but would be inconvenient and inconsistent. Consequently I earnestly request the Boundary Commissioners to reject requests for them and for any other modifications to the approved new boundary proposals as submitted.

Yours sincerely,

Elmbridge Councillor, Hersham South Ward
Hinds, Alex

From: Starkie, Emily
Sent: 23 February 2015 08:34
To: Hinds, Alex
Subject: FW: Elmbridge Boundary Changes

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Lewis
Sent: 19 February 2015 11:21
To: Reviews@
Subject: Elmbridge Boundary Changes

My comments relate to the Elmbridge Ward boundaries within and close to the Surrey County Council electoral Division of Cobham, for which I am the elected member.

Basic principle- please avoid for practical and PR purposes running boundaries along the middle of residential roads so that neighbours have different ward councillors and different polling stations. Currently this applies in Tilt Road Cobham, Knipp Hill Cobham and Fairmile Park Road Cobham.

I assume that there will be two electoral Wards rather than the current three within my Division. Existing are Cobham & Downside, Cobham Fairmile, Oxshott & Stoke D’Abernon The most logical way to end up with two would be to have Cobham and Oxshott & Stoke D’Abernon To achieve this I would suggest that the logical part of Cobham Fairmile to be included in Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon would be the area around Sandy Lane including Knipp Hill all, Miles Lane, Sandy Lane and roads off either side.

The following roads from the current Cobham and Downside Ward should also go with Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon: Tilt Road and the side roads off it, Stoke Road along to Piper's Close and the roads off it which back onto Tilt Road.

These areas naturally identify with Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon.

I will write in more detail when I see the draft recommendations.
Mary Lewis
Surrey County Councillor for Cobham Division e mail:*

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.
If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position.
Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.
Visit the Surrey County Council website - http://www.surreycc.gov.uk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
As an Elmbridge Councillor for this Ward I have no objection to any increase in electoral numbers, although I am concerned that the review of the ward boundaries in Elmbridge is unnecessary, will alienate the electorate and divide communities at a time when political manoeuvring is viewed with suspicion.

I do feel obliged to highlight that the recommendation submitted by Elmbridge Borough Council are the views of the Conservative Administration who hold a very small majority, and are views not shared by the remaining Council members. I do not consider it necessary to change the Ward name to Weybridge Brooklands, again a recommendation forced through by the Conservative Administration. I do however respect that in order to accommodate any possible increased Ward size the name Weybridge should be included and suggest Weybridge St George as an alternative.

The name St Georges Hill was included following a petition by constituents in 1921 and has survived to this day. While I fully respect both the name of Brooklands and the associated history should be celebrated, I do not consider this review is the platform to achieve this. Brooklands and the associated Business Park represent a fraction of the electorate with the majority residing in or around the perimeter of the hill.

I am also concerned the Conservative Administration of Elmbridge Borough Council could use the Boundary Commission review as a political tool in which to manipulate electoral numbers. While I am aware the commission are minded to reduce councillor numbers to 48, experience tells me there is more than enough work for 60 councillors for a borough of this size, if they wish to represent their wards effectively.
Yours sincerely, Cllr Peter Harman.

St Georges Hill Independents,

St Georges Hill Ward, Elmbridge Borough Council.

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir/Madam,

Ref. Elmbridge Boundary Commission Review

I write to comment on the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) review above. I intend to do this in several ways as follows:-

A. Bring to your attention the importance of community to people who live in Weston Green within Elmbridge Borough, the community that I am elected to represent as one of its two Borough Councillors.

B. Give views on the Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) proposal, narrowly agreed at a special meeting of the Council on 16th March 2015 and demonstrate how it does not meet all the main stated criteria of the LGBCE:-
   - to devise a pattern of three-member wards across the whole authority
   - to deliver electoral equality for voters
   - to reflect the interests and identities of local communities
   - to promote effective and convenient local government

C. Comment on the EBC Residents’ Association (RA) Group’s alternative proposal.

D. Comment on meeting the LGBCE’s criteria and the relevant legislation.

A. Bring to your attention the importance of community to people who live in Weston Green within Elmbridge Borough, the community that I am elected to represent as one of its two Borough Councillors.

I have lived in this community since 1993 and for a further thirty-four years close by, so I believe I am well qualified to comment on the special nature of the community of Weston Green. I have been one of its Borough councillors since 2012. I have also served on the Church Council, on and off, for nine years. Weston Green residents, me included, take huge pride in where they live and many play a very active part in the wider aspects of village life.

As recently as 2012, the LGBCE reviewed Weston Green and resoundingly supported its value as one settlement. The Chairman of the EBC Constitutional Review Working Group has said this is no longer significant as the legislation has changed. However nothing I can see in any of the advice offered by the Commission or in the 2009 Act itself indicates that communities are no longer a factor, in fact quite the opposite.

Nearly all the people in the public gallery at the special meeting of the Council to discuss this matter were from Weston Green. They remember the Commission review of 2012.
The following few comments should give a flavour of Weston Green and the strong community bonds:-

- We enjoy high voter turn-out in local elections, often the highest in Elmbridge.

- We enjoy good representation at public meeting regarding local planning issues. Interest and comment means that application often qualify for public speaking. People want to support sensitive and appropriate local development and are keen to shape and be part of the decisions that affect Weston Green.

- This passion extends to more than just buildings. The commons and green spaces are highly valued and there was much upset recently when a much loved Holm oak tree in the grounds of a local school had to be felled for sound safety reasons, after its partial collapse.

- We have an active and well represented Weston Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee which is regularly consulted by EBC with regard to relevant conservation area planning applications.

- Weston Green has two ponds and Pond Clear-up Days are always well attended by volunteers of all ages, as are Community Litter Picks on the Commons.

- At the heart of the community is the Church and Church Hall. Both are used by a wide cross section of the community for both secular and religious events. Indeed, the All Saints’ mission statement is “To be a blessing to our Community by weaving the stuff of life with the story of God”.

- A wide variety of groups regularly use the Church Hall – children’s activity classes, yoga, dancing, the Mother and Toddler Group in term time and even some local Morris Dancers to name but a few.

- A monthly drop-in meal and talk for senior citizens is a popular, recent, locally driven initiative.

- All the Weston Green uniformed organisations - Beavers, Cubs, Scouts, Rainbows, Brownies, Guides use the Church Hall and Church for their activities and meetings.

- In 2014, All Saints’ celebrated its 75th anniversary with an exhaustive list of events which were much enjoyed and well attended by all age groups. Highlights included ‘Weston’s War’ which remembered WWII in Weston Green and included personal testimonies from local residents who lived in Weston Green as children. Extra evening performances had to be added to accommodate the queues of disappointed local residents, around 1000 of whom eventually saw the show staged in the Church over several days. Other very popular events were the Anniversary Ball and the concert given by Kings College Cambridge. [http://www.allsaintsweston.com/](http://www.allsaintsweston.com/)

- A Trussell Trust Foodbank operates from Church premises on Tuesdays.

- Weston Green has three schools that accommodate LOCAL children who use the Church and the ponds to enhance their curricula.

- Weston Green residents enjoy an annual Summer Fete and Christmas Fair.
Weston Green is growing as a community, so much so, that a new mini supermarket is due to open its doors as soon as modifying building works have been completed.

All Saints’ Weston was the fastest growing Church community in Guildford Diocese in 2014. It publishes a regular bi-monthly A4 colour magazine that is distributed free to all parishioners.

There are two busy, thriving pubs – Marney’s Village Inn and The Greyhound, which not many communities can claim these days in a village of this size. Between them they offer regular live music and lunch and dinner every day.

There is a lively and pro-active Residents’ Association that holds bi-monthly Open Meetings including regular Police Panels and occasional guest speakers. It publishes a full colour A5 magazine every quarter which includes news updates and features on local history. It has recently re-launched its website http://residents-association.com

June 2015 will see the second ‘Secret Gardens of Weston Green’ event. The previous one was so well attended by the local community that £1000s were raised for local community projects.

I would like to invite any visitors from the LGBCE who care to come, as this is the best way to view the Weston Green community.

B. Give views on the Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) proposal, narrowly agreed at a special meeting of the Council on 16th March 2015.

LGBCE Commissioner Sir Tony Redmond said, during his 1st September 2014 briefing to Council members, equal weight would be given to the views of residents. As the residents in communities in certain places in the East of the Borough are already very unhappy with what is being proposed, even at this early stage, and I am very clear that my role it to represent residents’ views rather than my own, I am writing to explain the flaws in the proposal put forward by the narrow majority Conservative administration of EBC who were the only group to vote for it.

This proposal from the special Council meeting on Monday 16th March 2015 makes no sense in terms of respecting communities. The recommendation for a reduction by 12 councillors from 60 to 48 is also questionable in terms of effective governance. Sir Tony Redmond also made it clear at the 1st September 2014 briefing exactly what he saw as being relevant to the word community. These were facilities, social structures, schools, churches. This plan makes no attempt to respect these factors in the East of the Borough.

A key Commission criterion is to “reflect identities and interests of the local community”. The administration’s proposal is a lazy one. It is just about figures. No homework has been done to meet the other criteria in the 18 months that has been available to address these issues. The Commission has very much said it is interested in understanding a sense of community – its notice to residents asks for its views on where they live and where they access shops, leisure facilities. This has fallen on deaf ears at the Civic Centre in Esher as the current proposal makes no attempt to respect easily identifiable boundaries and is driven, especially in the North-East of the borough, purely by statistics surrounding electoral role numbers.

Ironically, community information is readily available. There has already been extensive and costly public consultation within communities to produce the EBC Local Plan and Core Strategy document in 2011 but this appears to have been ignored by the Conservative administration and local representation and resulting views, brushed aside. Eight distinctive settlements were
identified and the resulting plan was approved by the Planning Inspectorate. Now this is being undone for no good reason. This review process alone will probably cost EBC much more than it will potentially save by reducing councillor numbers. The £50,000 per annum saving equates to just 4p per month per elector, not even per resident. Its a completely false economy.

The administration demonstrated its focus on only one element of the LGBCE’s criteria long before the special Council meeting on 16th March. The agenda for the evening shows an already evident bias. Agenda item 9. for that evening reads, “The proposed warding pattern has been drawn up having regard to the Commissions’ criteria, for example, delivering electoral equality ……. The full criteria can be found on the LGBCE’s web site.” ‘Equality of representation’ appears to be the only real area of interest.

Even within this requirement the administration’s proposal appears to ‘cherry pick’ the parts of Schedule 2 of the 2009 Act that presumably suit their purpose as they appear to have disregarded the need to “minimise change from existing constituency boundaries”. The 16th March 2015 proposal unnecessarily disturbs somewhere in the region of 7000 electors. This adds weight to the view that the administration’s proposal is based on a statistical, and perhaps also political, exercise and not sensitive at all to local feeling and the basis of local communities.

The Commission is currently “minded” to accept a reduction to 48 councillors but there are clearly geographic areas in the East of the borough that just don’t work properly with a 16 x 3 councillor ward scheme. Molesey is one of them. Molesey’s borders are very distinct and bounded by rivers and reservoirs. Hinchley Wood, a very well established and settled community has been split in two and apportioned to other wards and there are major issues in Hersham. The working party members have had 18 months to come up with a workable plan that encompasses all of the Commission’s stated criteria.

It is in the North-East of Elmbridge where what is currently suggested also rides particularly roughshod over local ties. The long established settlement of Molesey is cobbled together with Thames Ditton, a completely different community, and Hinchley Wood, that produced the ‘Father of Elmbridge’, Edgar Royston Pike, is effectively obliterated by amalgamating half of it with Weston Green and half with Long Ditton.

The west half of Hinchley Wood has been randomly bolted onto and Weston Green. These are two very distinct communities and can’t, and shouldn’t, be just ‘lumped together’ to make the figures work elsewhere. Each has its own schools, shops, organisations and social groups, uniformed organisations, churches and Residents’ Group. The proposed new, larger ward is not in any sense one community and to even get to Hinchley Wood from the current Weston Green ward, one has to cross the main Woking to London railway line and negotiate the always very busy Portsmouth Road.

I have written about the community of Weston Green under ‘A’. In turn, Hinchley Wood is a distinct community that has no crossover with Weston Green whatsoever. Its location alone, in relation to Weston Green, precludes this as there are natural spaces between the two communities. Hinchley Wood therefore has its own shops and Church - St Christopher’s which has its own distinct clergy team as does All Saints’ Weston Green and St Mary’s Long Ditton. Hinchley Wood Junior and Senior Schools are always over-subscribed and so very much draw children from the immediately surrounding community. There is a railway station, a children’s playground that is literally miles, and a half an hour walk, away from Weston Green, its own annual events, associations, sports clubs, uniformed organisations and young people’s groups. It is a clearly defined geographic and physical area, being bounded by Green Belt, the Esher bypass and a main railway line. The focus of the community is The Memorial Gardens.

Technically the name for #14 ward, under the 16th March proposal, should be ‘Weston Green, Lower Green and Hinchley Wood West and Molesey South’. This would clearly be ridiculous but
the clue is there in the title as to just how much ‘community’ has been regarded. It covers four easily definably different areas.

In the Council chamber on Monday 16th March, we were told by members of the Conservative administration that people don’t care where they vote and in which ward they are grouped. It was said “People in Cobham will still live in Cobham . . . . “ Such views may find resonance in wards where councillors are not very in touch with their residents but what will be problematic in representational, governance and plain practical terms across the entire Borough is where the 16th March proposal creates a situation where a councillor living in one community will be representing residents in quite another and therefore not have any real knowledge and understanding of local issues, which after all is a principal function of a local councillor. This is the exact scenario proposed for Weston Green, Hinchley Wood, Thames Ditton, Molesey and Hersham.

I hope I have made clear that I do not support the 16 x three-member ward plan for the residents of Weston Green. However, if the Commission agrees to this ward pattern then the inclusion of the Lower Green area of the current Esher ward and the Emberside area of Molesey East’s with the current Weston Green make far more community sense than its annexing of huge chunks of Hinchley Wood. Lower Green has natural ties to Weston Green through its links with Cranmere School and All Saints’ Church. Paul Bryer, the Archdeacon of Dorking is in the process of applying to the Chancellor for a change of parish boundary, with the blessing of Christchurch Esher (into whose parish Lower Green currently falls). This will mean that Lower Green will then be within the parish of All Saints’ Weston Green and would match the new ward pattern. The soon-to-be-relocated Cranmere School will also be in Weston Green parish and with this in view, the vicar of Weston Green, Rev Phillip Johnson, is standing for Chair of Governors at Cranmere School. Lower Green Police boundaries would then also match the new ward.

C. Comment on the EBC Residents’ Association (RA) Group alternative proposal.

I would like to wholeheartedly support and endorse the EBC Residents’ Group alternative proposal submitted to the LGBCE on 30th March 2015.

This alternative proposal meets all the LGBCE’s stated and published criteria and moves only 1000 voters to new wards compared with the 7000 proposed in the 16th March 2015 plan.

It keeps communities in the East of the Borough intact and allows the possibility for councillors to live in the communities they represent. Residents in Elmbridge think this matters. So do I. It is important in terms of proper representation and electoral soundness.

In its 5th February press release the LGBCE clearly states its responsibility, set out in legislation, to devise a pattern of three-member wards where elections are to be held ‘in thirds’ ie local elections are held for three years out of every four and county/police/other elections on the other. However in the same paragraph is says “the Commission is able to move away from a uniform pattern of three-member wards - on a ward by ward basis – if it believes an alternative arrangement would better meet its other statutory criteria to deliver electoral equality for voters, to reflect the interests and identities of local communities and to promote effective and convenient local government”.

The 3 x two-member wards contained in the proposal retain the new figure of 48 councillors that the LGBCE are ‘minded to recommend’ and still has regard to the criteria regarding electoral equality in terms of electorate per councillor.

While no plan is ideal, the RA Group suggestion builds in clearly drawn and common sense boundaries which respect existing, well established communities and more closely respects the natural features and infrastructure created by rivers and railway lines.
In the RA Group proposal, governance is much better served in respect of alignment with County Council wards, the EBC Local Plan Core Strategy and therefore Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allocations and Planning Sub-Committees thereby achieving the need for “convenient local government”.

D. **Comment on the LGBCE’s criteria and the relevant legislation.**

I recognise the challenge faced by the LGBCE in taking on board all the strands of the 2009 statutory requirements and, where they conflict, seeking to strike a balance between the requirement for equality of representation and the need to respect community identities and wishes.

I do not take lightly residents’ democratic rights, indeed this was precisely why I voted for election by thirds not ‘all outs’ in November 2014 when The Council voted on this matter. I believe fervently that people need an opportunity to have as much say as possible, as often as possible, but not at the expense of disregarding absolutely all other matters which residents themselves value.

Even in these early days of consultation following the launch of EBC’s proposal, the residents to whom I have spoken have been very clear that they are very much more interested in what affects them than simply “whether their bins get emptied on time”, as was suggested by one or two councillors at the special Council meeting on 16th March 2015, or in saving 4p per member of the electorate per month as a result of a reduction in the number of Councillors to 48.

Paragraph 4.1 of the Commission’s technical guidance calls for a review of indicators which “identify and build up a map of communities”. It recognises that this should happen, not just in rural communities but even in a suburban landscape. The approach adopted by the current administration and the resultant proposal has been driven by a completely statistical agenda and does not take this on board.

Electoral equality is a key feature and important but ‘lumping’ communities together, in the manner of what the EBC administration has done in the case of Molesey with Thames Ditton and Weston Green with part of Hinchley Wood just to make the ‘numbers’ work is not respecting community identities and makes a mockery of the Commission, if allowed.

I very well understand that where a decision has been made to elect ‘by thirds’ the aim is to achieve three-member wards and that a similar pattern of wards is preferable. However the LGBCE’s criteria also clearly states that this will not be overridden by the need to respect local communities and that all criteria must be met and exceptions can be made on a ward by ward basis.

I have already been able to engage a good number of local people in the process so far and it is very evident that, in terms of opportunity to make feelings known versus keeping the community functioningmeaningfully, residents will choose community boundaries every time.

People would also rather have their community intact and be represented by a Councillor that lives in the same community that be able to vote ‘in thirds’.

Trusting all is clear and that you will add this to the submissions on the LGBCE website.

Yours faithfully,

Ruth M Bruce
EBC Councillor, Weston Green Ward
31st March, 2015
Dear Mr. Hinds,

I am writing to you as a long standing resident of Elmbridge and as a Borough Councillor for Hersham where I live.

I wholeheartedly support the Council's proposals for the new boundaries within an authority comprising 16 wards of three members.

In particular, I strongly support those for the new Hersham Village Ward. Both Whiteley Village and Burwood Park are very much part of the Hersham "community". (Frankly it is the Whiteley Villagers support for our infrequent bus service from Whiteley Village through to Hersham Village, with their daily trips to doctor, dentist, shops and of course the Hersham Centre for the Community, that keeps the bus on the road).

Finally, I would like to highlight that at Full Council in November last year we debated the issue of "all out" elections every four years versus keeping our current system of "thirds". At that time it was made very clear to all councillors that by keeping the present system it would, for various reasons, (not least fairness to voting residents), necessitate 3 member wards. A large majority voted to retain the status quo. I believe that the Council's submitted proposals uphold the Council's decision made at that time and that any suggestions of one or two member wards should be rejected.

I hope that you will consider these points when making your decision,

Yours Sincerely,

Ruth Mitchell

Councillor, Hersham South Ward
ELMBRIDGE BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW

THE RESIDENTS' GROUP SUBMISSION:

This document expresses the views of the 21 Residents Group Councillors on Elmbride Borough Council, who are the main opposition party to the Conservative-led Administration. Within the Group, individual Residents' Associations will be making their own submissions to the Boundary Commission.

INTRODUCTION

We were disappointed that we were unable to persuade the Boundary Commission to retain 60 councillors on Elmbride Borough Council through our submission of 3rd December 2014. However, we acknowledge that the Commission is now minded to recommend a Council of 48 members for elections in 2016.

The Boundary Commission's detailed technical guidance document, dated April 2014, is clear that the proposed wards should result in electoral equality, with a tolerance of + or - 10% from the Borough average, but also the need to reflect local community identities and interests, and provide for effective and convenient local government. Our submission will seek to address all these criteria.

Since the beginning of the Electoral Review, it has been recognised by everyone that, with elections by thirds, the delivery of 16 x 3-member wards would be extremely difficult to achieve in Elmbride, in order to satisfy ALL the Commission's criteria.

Over many months, examples of such a scheme have been put to councillors across the Borough, and many were considered unworkable because they would cut across present local authority identities and clear boundaries, particularly rivers and railway lines - e.g. parts of Hersham into Esher across the River Mole, and parts of Hinchley Wood into Weston Green. At the last working party meeting, Members were asked to put forward their ideas for suitable ward boundary changes. No individual member submission was put forward, but one from each of the political groups. The Residents' Group and the Liberals put forward their ideas for new ward boundaries across the whole Borough. The Conservative-led Administration did not put forward any suggestions for new ward boundaries in the north-east part of the Borough - which is the most difficult to reorganise - to comply with the Commission's criteria. It was left to the Officers to draw the lines on the map and they have worked extremely hard to find a solution. However, this has only been done by reference to
electoral numbers, and does NOT take into account the potential break-up of local communities. It is only Ward Councillors who have this knowledge of their local communities and identities, and the most efficient way that they should be governed.

Through this document we seek to highlight that by accepting the Administrations proposals for new ward boundaries, key Commission criteria will not be achieved. We have taken soundings across the Borough - and it is quite apparent that residents have an identity, and identify themselves with certain geographical communities. We believe that, once the Commission publishes its suggested ward boundaries for public consultation in the summer, this strength of feeling will become apparent.

The Council's own Local Plan Core Strategy highlights the physical composition of the Borough as having eight settlements, all of which have their own distinctive character and clear boundaries. This strategy was the result of detailed public consultation, and has been approved by the Planning Inspectorate. The proposed ward boundary changes by the Council will cut across many of these distinctive communities.

A perfect submission is not feasible, but we believe that our submission produces the best possible solution. It achieves the Commission's prime objective of electoral equality within the stated parameters, but it is with the other two statutory criteria, namely to reflect the interests and identities of local communities and to promote effective and convenient local government, that we fundamentally disagree with the Council's submission.

In order to comply with ALL the Commission's criteria, it is necessary to propose three two-member wards in the north-east part of the Borough. We have vigorously looked at a 16 x 3-member ward structure, but are unable to suggest suitable ward boundaries which fit with local community identities, and provide effective governance in Elmbridge. We therefore suggest that in the north-east of the Borough, there should be 3 x 2-member wards, all adjoined, covering Hinchley Wood, Long Ditton and Weston Green. This proposal is instead of the 2 x 3-member wards, as set out in the Council's submission.

We also submit that our proposals for the Borough will result in a significant reduction in the number of unnecessary movements of electors between wards - we estimate there would be about 1000 such movements as a result of our proposals compared with probably over 7,000 under the Council's proposals - and we consider that such large scale movements would hinder the provision of effective local government.

We believe that the significant electoral movements that permeate the Council's submission, have been driven by political aspirations, rather than reflecting community identities and interests. This is clearly demonstrated in their proposals to eradicate Hinchley Wood as a Ward, by cutting across historic and natural boundaries and dividing it between the wards of Weston Green and Long Ditton.

We submit that our proposals better promote effective and convenient local government in that our proposals for wards align ward boundaries with the County Council divisions as far as possible, whereas the Council's proposals cut across these
arrangements, for example the Council's proposed Weston Green and Hinchley Wood ward would be covered by three County Councillors - the Dittons, Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott and East Molesey and Esher. This would cause confusion if a resident had a problem with education or highways which county councillor should he contact? Similarly the proposed ward for Thames Ditton includes a significant number of electors from East Molesey (again involving county councillors from the Dittons and East Molesey and Esher).

The greater amount of shuffling of electors between the eight settlements set out in the Council's Local Plan Core Strategy would also lead to more problems in the allocation of Community Infrastructure Fund monies, as these have been set up with local Spending Boards that match the eight settlement areas, and more generally Local Plan Core Strategy policies and the administration of planning decision making through the 3 Area Planning Sub Committees have been tailored to the eight settlement pattern. For example, the Council's proposed Thames Ditton Ward, most of which falls into the East Area would contain significant amounts of Molesey East ward- including the sensitive Jolly Boatman / Hampton Court Station site-, currently part of North Area. The Council's proposed Weston Green and Hinchley Wood ward would straddle three settlement areas, Esher, the Dittons and East and West Molesey.

As indicated above, it is not possible to avoid movements between settlements entirely, but the scale of unnecessary changes envisaged in the Council's plans is surely unacceptable when we have demonstrated that an alternative that would be far less disruptive is available.

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Selleck,
Councillor for Molesey North Ward,
Elmbridge Borough Council,
and Leader of the Residents' Associations' group of Councillors,

30th March 2015.
March 2015 Submission to Local Government Boundary Commission for England

This document supplements the map with our proposed boundaries drawn in, so as to explain in greater depth why we have drawn the boundaries we have, and why we believe this provides a better solution to the task set than the boundaries proposed by the Conservative administration of Elmbridge Borough Council. It is noteworthy in our view that following the lengthy debate at the Special Council Meeting on 16th March, there were no supporters for the Administration proposals except members of the Conservative Group.

Our starting point was the Commission’s Technical Guidance Document dated April 2014 which sets out the statutory criteria the LGBCE works to, namely :-

the need to secure equality of representation

the need to reflect the identities and interests of local community, and

the need to secure effective and convenient local government.”

Included in the community identities and interests criterion is the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable and which will not break localities. We also noted that the Technical Guidance states that the Commission needs to take account of all the strands of its statutory criteria and where those strands may be in conflict with one another, seek to strike what in our judgement is the right balance, having regard to the evidence provided to us.

In addition, there is the issue of the presumption of having all 3-member wards if an authority has – as Elmbridge has – a system of elections by thirds. We took note of the fact that the Technical Guidance – at Paragraph 4.50 -states: “In each review of local authorities that elect by thirds or by halves, we will aim to deliver such patterns of multi-member wards. However, in all cases, this consideration will not take precedence over our other statutory criteria, and we will not recommend uniform patterns in the numbers of councillors per wards if, in our view or as is shown in evidence provided to us, it results in unacceptable levels of electoral inequality, does not reflect communities or hinders the provision of effective and convenient local government.”

Our starting point was an overview of the Borough based on the analysis in our Core Strategy document, adopted by the Council in July 2011 after extensive public consultation and examination in public by a Planning Inspector, which sees the Borough as consisting of 8 settlements: Claygate, Cobham, The Dittons, Esher, Hersham, Molesey, Walton and Weybridge. Some of these settlements have electorates which fit fairly closely to the size of an average new 3-member ward, which is roughly 6,200 electors, or 2 or 3 such wards, others do not.

We took the view that we should keep to the existing settlement boundaries as far as possible, as these clearly have been recognised in the past and have stood the test of time, largely unchanged and unchallenged for some 40 years.

At this “macro” level, we concluded that Claygate should stay as it is.
Walton has almost 18,600 electors, which equates to 3 new wards almost exactly, and so does not need adjustments that cross settlement boundaries.

Cobham has almost 13,000 electors, and similarly does not need adjustments with electors moving in or out of the settlement.

Weybridge and The Dittons are each about 2,000 electors short of what would be the average for 3 new wards.

Esher is about 1,000 votes short of electors to stand as a single average-sized ward.

Molesey is more difficult still, with an electorate around 15000, almost halfway between two and three average-sized wards.

Hersham is arguably even more difficult with an electorate of around 9600, just over halfway between one and two average-sized wards.

A further key problem is that The Dittons’ settlement area comprises a number of smaller villages with distinct identities and histories, and their individual sizes do not correspond with the size of the new 3 member ward.

This broad analysis, alongside the need to reduce the number of wards from 22 to around 16, has informed all the various attempts to come up with a new warding pattern for the Borough. On the broad-scale settlement basis, we come up with similar solutions; namely a single ward for Claygate, 2 wards for Cobham, 3 wards for Weybridge, 3 wards for Walton, 1 ward for Hersham, 2 wards for Molesey and 1 ward for Esher. As to the Dittons, The Elmbridge Borough Council Administration proposal has the area divided into 3 wards of 3 members each, which in our view cuts across community identities, whilst our solution has one 3-member ward and 3 2-member wards, and boundaries which have been discussed with and have the support of all the local Ward Councillors.

Our main objections to the warding pattern set out in the Council’s proposal are that it does not respect the community identities of Hinchley Wood, Long Ditton, and Weston Green, and seeks to impose a 3-member ward pattern that just does not work. It is clearly evident that something is wrong when a new boundary is created on the map and it goes straight through the name of one of the long-established communities of the Borough, and when both the local Hinchley Wood Primary and Secondary Schools find themselves on the Long Ditton side of the new boundary. The other half of Hinchley Wood is then lumped in with Weston Green and Lower Green which would result in its electors being spread across 3 County Council Divisions, hardly a good example of the co-terminosity between County Council and Borough boundaries that the Commission aims to achieve. Our proposal keeps Thames Ditton intact as a new 3 – member ward and increased by taking in those voters in Long Ditton closest to the River Thames. Long Ditton reduces slightly to a 2-member ward following that transfer. Hinchley Wood ward remains as a two member ward with its existing boundaries. Weston Green
ward takes in those electors in the southern most part of the current Molesey East ward, mainly those south of the River Mole, plus those located between Bridge Road / Creek Road and the River Mole on its Northern side.

Molesey – as mentioned above – is a difficult size to fit into a new warding pattern and we have chosen to keep the two new Molesey wards at the upper end of the size considered still to preserve electoral equality so as to keep as much of the Molesey community together and represented by Councillors clearly identified with Molesey. We do not consider that it is acceptable to the long term interest of the community to split off significant parts of Molesey, especially around the Hampton Court Station / Jolly Boatman site, with which Molesey Councillors have been so involved in recent years.

Hersham also presents a difficult problem. The conclusion reached both by the Administration and ourselves, is that in future there should be a single Hersham Ward, which results in a significant number of voters needing to be transferred out of the settlement area. It has to be done one way or another but it seems fundamentally wrong to include among those transferred out across the River Mole to Esher ward the residents who live south of the Esher Road and in some cases are less than a quarter of a mile from the centre of Hersham Village and its conservation area, while leaving in the new ward residents living in Burwood Park who are as close to the shops in Oatlands and Walton as they are to the shops in Hersham. We believe it is more logical to move voters across from Burwood Park and its environs into the Oatlands Ward. There is a precedent for joining the electors across the Queens Road in that Polling District UC, part of Oatlands Ward is included in the Hersham County Council Division. We would also suggest that the southernmost part of Hersham South ward (mainly Whiteley Village) joins St Georges Hill Ward on the other side of the Seven Hills Road. This also means that fewer electors have to be transferred from the eastern side of Hersham North into Esher Ward, and the new Hersham Village is more centred on the village centre and conservation area than it is under the Council Administration proposal.

Esher ward retains its current boundaries and takes in those voters from across the River Mole in Hersham as set out above.

Cobham settlement, currently three wards, can become two new wards with a new boundary line going through the existing Cobham Fairmile ward, as is proposed in the Council Administration proposal, although we see no reason or justification for moving the historic boundary between Cobham and Hersham from following the River Mole to making a detour around the Burhill Golf Course (New Course).

Weybridge settlement’s need to draw in electors to justify three new wards can be satisfied by these movements of the electors in Burwood Park and its environs into Oatlands ward, and the Whiteley Village / southern end of Hersham South into St Georges Hill. We would suggest that the current Weybridge South and Weybridge North wards are merged to form a unified Weybridge ward, with a part of Weybridge South’s Polling District TB – that part of it bounded by the Queens Road, Hanger Hill and the main railway line be moved into St Georges Hill.

Finally, the proposals for Walton seem bizarre in the extreme, and wholly unacceptable. As mentioned earlier, the settlement of Walton is one of those that - fortuitously - does
not need to draw in any electors from other settlement areas nor does its electorate need to be reduced in size. Its electorate of approximately 18600 matches the average size of three new wards. It shares this characteristic with the settlements of Claygate and Cobham, both of which have been left without any material change to their external boundaries. So why treat Walton differently? Why move hundreds of electors from Hersham North into Walton South, while at the same time moving all of Walton’s residents south and west of the centre line of New Zealand Avenue, the High Street and the Hersham Road into Oatlands. Walton’s long-established Ashley Cof E Primary School finds itself in Oatlands, while the church that it is closely linked with it remains in Walton Central. And Walton’s War Memorial that will celebrate its centenary 5 years after these boundaries changes come into effect will likewise find itself in Oatlands. What kind of respect for community identity is that? It really makes one wonder what the Agenda is here. The ward boundaries for Walton that we have proposed here create simple coherent areas based on the existing wards of Walton Central, Walton North and Walton South, names which date back to at least 1933, minimising inconvenience and disruption to the electorate.
Key data and Draft Ward Names for consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Number</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Divergence from Average size of 6204*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Claygate</td>
<td>5509</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Oxshott &amp; Stoke D’Abernon</td>
<td>6538</td>
<td>+ 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Cobham and Downside</td>
<td>6451</td>
<td>+ 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>St Georges Hill</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>- 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Weybridge</td>
<td>5827</td>
<td>- 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Hersham Village</td>
<td>6620</td>
<td>+ 6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Oatlands &amp; Burwood Park</td>
<td>6077</td>
<td>- 2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Walton Central</td>
<td>6024</td>
<td>- 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>Walton North</td>
<td>6550</td>
<td>+ 5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>Molesey North</td>
<td>6762</td>
<td>+ 9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>Molesey South</td>
<td>6715</td>
<td>+ 8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>Thames Ditton</td>
<td>5676</td>
<td>- 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>Long Ditton (2 Cllrs)</td>
<td>3854</td>
<td>- 6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>Hinchley Wood (2 Cllrs)</td>
<td>3948</td>
<td>- 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>Esher &amp; Hersham Riverside</td>
<td>6259</td>
<td>+ 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>Walton South</td>
<td>5993</td>
<td>- 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>Weston Green &amp; Mole Riverside (2 Cllrs)</td>
<td>4462</td>
<td>+ 7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 99268

Electorate numbers are provisional and based on the data available as at 13 February 2015, apart from Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon and Cobham and Downside where we have taken the numbers used by the Council Administration which are as at 23 February 2015.
DETAILED COMMENTARY ON NEW WARD BOUNDARIES

#1 Claygate – Parished. As currently drawn. 5509 electors 11.2% below average.

#2 Oxshott and Stoke D’Abernon absorbs roughly half of Cobham Fairmile, along a boundary already marked in the “Third Model” map. Estimated number of electors per Council Administration proposal 6538 electors.

#3 Cobham and Downside absorbs the other approximately half of Cobham Fairmile ward. Estimated number of electors 6451.

#4 St Georges Hill. Electorate now 4547. Add 880 from the new merged Weybridge Ward, (see below) and approx 644 from Hersham South, around Whiteley Village, ie, those to the south of Burwood Road as far east as the Cemetery. (644 is the difference between the total electorate for Polling District RB of 1200 and the number in Burwood Park transferred into Oatlands Ward, 556). Makes 6071, approx 2.1% below average.

#5 Weybridge ward, from merging Weybridge North (electorate 3347) and Weybridge South (electorate 3360) would be 6707 voters. Transfer approx 880 voters in the triangle bounded by the railway line, Hanger Hill and Queens Road (but not including addresses on those roads) to St Georges Hill ward leaves 5827 voters, some 6.1% below average.

The roads and their electors moved across are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Lane</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daneswood Close</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden Way</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir Grange Ave.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Place</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Close</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavesden Road</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Grove</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Court, Pine Grove</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Grove Mews</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwood Ct. Pine Grove</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princes Road</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington Lodge, Princes Road</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket View, Princes Road</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathgrove, Princes Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princes Court</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranmore Place</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s Court</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount House</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pycroft Lane</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pycroft House, Pycroft Lane</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakfield Court</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woodview Court 22
Wentworth Dene 15
Windsor Walk 55
Chestnut Place 5
York Road (south west of Queens Rd) say 50
Norwood Lodge York Road 13.

#6 Hersham Village. Currently Hersham North and South have 9616 electors. From a merged ward, they lose 1194 in and around Burwood Park to Oatlands, and 644 (mainly Whiteley Village) to St. Georges Hill. From the East they lose approx 1158 electors to Esher from the QA Polling District to the west of (but excluding voters living on) Molesey Road, (mainly the Longmore Estate) broadly as suggested in the Third Model map produced by officers. This leaves 6620, 6.7% above average.

Roads and electors moved to Esher
Abbotts Tilt 18
Assher Road 25
Molesey Close 193
Claremont Avenue 86
Warren House, Claremont Avenue 2
Pembroke Ave 67
Riverside Road 82
Longmore Road 121
Celandine Road 114
Mead Road 48
Grange Road 39
Southdown Road 123
Heathfield Road 30
Wayneflete Mews, Heathfield Road 4
Newlands Close 70
Chailey Place 30
Meadow Close 2
Ramormie Close 11
The Leys 33
Esher Road 60

#7 Oatlands Park ward is 4883. Transfer into it from Hersham South the Burwood Park residents, 556, in Polling District RB, and from Polling District RA those in Onslow Road and on the periphery of Burwood Park (The Heronry, Eastwick Road, Kenwood Drive) 468, plus those in Westcar Lane, Frith Knowle, and Groombridge Close, 170. This results in an electorate of 6077, 2.0% below average. Probably it would also make sense to add in those living on Burwood Road and Queens Road who back on to Burwood Park and its environs.

Roads and electors in Burwood Park in Polling District RB:
Albury Road 58
Broadwater Close 35
Broadwater Road North 26
Broadwater Road South 23
Burwood Road 3
Chargate Close 31
Cranley Road 89
Eriswell Crescent 34
Eriswell Road 33
Farmleigh Grove 25
Kilruke Lane 8
Kelvedon Avenue 37
Ince Road 85
Manor House Drive 8
Patmore Lane 11
Pond Close 21
The Quillot 29

#8 Walton Central. It makes sense to extend Walton Central slightly to the south and slightly to the east. Currently electorate 5258, add in Stompond Lane, 45 voters, Grange Place, 5 voters, The Links, 15 voters, and Crutchfield Lane, 112 voters, i.e. 177 electors in aggregate, from Walton South, and Cottimore Avenue, 253 voters, Stuart Avenue, 115 voters, Fairfax Close, 28 voters, Monks Crescent, 28 voters and Cromwell Close, 26 voters, i.e. in aggregate 450 electors from Walton Ambleside, plus another approx 54 electors from Sidney Road (from the existing boundary with Walton Central down to the junction with Bowes Road and Cromwell Road), and from Walton North, Lancaster Court, 61 voters and Cottimore Terrace, 19 voters, i.e. in aggregate 85 electors. Walton Central ends up with a consistent southern boundary of Stompond Lane, across to Crutchfield Lane across to Stuart Avenue, and to the east it picks up all the roads to the west of Cottimore Lane, without including anyone from Cottimore Lane itself. Total electorate becomes 6024, 2.9% below average.

#9 Walton North - currently 5021, less 85 to Walton Central, see above, equals 4936. Add in the northern part of Walton Ambleside, 1614 electors, makes electorate 6550, 5.6% above average. Given the “community nature” of the St Johns Estate it is probably not realistic to reduce this number.

Roads and electors transferred in:
Ambleside Avenue, Blakenden Court 5
Ambleside Ave, Etheridge Court 5
Ambleside Avenue, Langport Court 56
Ambleside Avenue, Peppin Court 7
Ambleside Avenue, Shelley Court 8
Braycourt Avenue 195
Cheriton Court 47
Clements Road 22
Clements Road Dunbar Court 41
Clements Road, Naseby Court 32
Cottimore Crescent 99
Cottimore Lane 227
Cromwell Road 7
Cromwell Road, Egmont House 4
Crown Close 6
Hillary Crescent 68
Lansdown Close, Marston Court 34
Lansdown Close, Preston Court 64
Lansdown Close, Selwyn Court 33
Mistys Field 113
Newark Court 55
Regency Gardens 166
Rodney Close, Edgehill Court 23
Rodney Close, Worcester Court 63
Rodney Green 16
Rodney Road 139
Rodney Road, Inwood Court 46
St Johns Drive 27
St Johns Drive, Lodge House 6

#10 Molesey North Currently 4846 electorate. Suggest it should expand to the east, taking in the northern part of polling Districts GB and GC, (roads north of Walton Road) say approx 1053 electors plus the northern part of polling district GA, all those living north of the River Mole and then the centre line of Bridge Road / Creek Road, 1614 electors. Also move Weston Avenue, Apps Meadow Close, the Bishop Fox Estate and the Boleyn Drive / The Crescent / Berkeley Drive cul-de-sac, into Molesey South, reduces numbers by 542 and 209 electors respectively. Total electorate then 6762, 9.0% above average.

Roads and electors in Polling Districts GB and GC moved across:
Challoners Close 22
Church Road 43
Harrow Gardens 6
Hurst Lane 6
Kent Road 80
Kings Chase 226
Manor Road 66
Palace Road 16
Park Road 108
Park Mews, Park Road 6
Parsons Mead 44
Pemberton Road 58
Aragon Court, Pemberton Road 16
School Road 71
Vine Road 62
Dennis Road 116
Hurst Lane 35
Pemberton Road 49
Willow Lodge, Pemberton Road 5
Vine Road 18

Roads and electors in Polling District GA moved across:
Arnison Road 131
Wheatleys Mews, Arnison Rd. 4
Barge Walk 2  
Molesley Lock, Barge Walk 1  
Bridge Gardens 39  
Bridge Road (50%) 90  
Boleyn Court, Bridge Road 17  
Palace View, Bridge Road 15  
Sovereign House, Bridge Road 7  
Westlands Court, Bridge Road 21  
Wolsey Court, Bridge Road 11  
Creek Road 18  
Feltham Avenue 102  
Hampton Court Mews, Feltham Ave 10  
Hampton Court Crescent, Graburn Way 59  
Riverside, Graburn Way 30  
Grove Road 48  
Hansler Grove 47  
Sandra House, Hansler Grove 14  
Hardy’s Mews 4  
Hurst Road 143  
Palace Road 210  
The Firs, Palace Road 6  
Motcombe, Palace Road 10  
River Bank 25  
The Old Boat House, River Bank 5  
St Johns Road 18  
Wolsey Road 174  
Cardinal Court, Wolsey Road 9  
Bell Road 80  
Matham Road 143  
Croft House, Matham Road 2  
New Inn Court, Matham Road 16  
St Marys Road 23  
Walton Road 44  
Gallery Court, Walton Road 4  
Styles Court, Walton Road 6  
Grove Court, Walton Road 26  

#11 Molesey South, currently 5221. Suggest it also expands to the east to take in approx 743 electors from polling districts GB and GC, those living on Walton Road or to the south of it. Also take in from Molesey North electors in Weston Avenue, Apps Meadow Close and the Bishop Fox estate, 542 electors and those in the Boleyn Drive / The Crescent / Berkeley Drive cul-de sac, 209 electors. Total electorate then 6715, 8.2% above average.

Roads and electors in Polling Districts GB and GC moved across:
Beauchamp Road 90
18 Beauchamp Road 11
Beauchamp House, Beauchamp Road 5
Clinton Avenue 61
Molesey Park Close 36
Molesey Park Road 42
Spencer Park, Molesey Park Road 20
Seymour Close 15
Seymour Road 30
Spencer Road 73
The Wilderness 50
Walton Road 181
Pemberton Terrace, Walton Road 7
Hidden Close 22
Langton Road 5
Seymour Road 41
Walton Road 42
Candle Mews, Walton Road 12

#12 Thames Ditton, Currently 4795. Add in the 881 voters in the northern part of the Long Ditton Polling District BA, effectively those living to the north of Long Ditton Recreation Ground, and on the Portsmouth Road or those roads leading off it. Total electorate 5676, 8.5% below average.
Roads and electors to move across from Long Ditton BA Polling District to Thames Ditton:

Alston Close 44
Cholmley Road 15
Diton Reach 49
City Wharf House 56
Clearwater Place 81
Ferry Road 25
Ferry Yacht Station 2
Houston Road 127
Imworth Cottages 8
Ferry Road, Thames Court 6
Ferry Road, Old Police Station 5
Howard Street 17
Portsmouth Road 18
Portsmouth Rd. Cholmly Terrace 12
Portsmouth Rd. Cholmly Villas 18
Portsmouth Rd. Claremont Terrace 25
Portsmouth Rd. Riverside Villas 7
Portsmouth Rd. Thames Cottages 13
Portsmouth Rd. Thames Ditton Marina 5
Prospect Road 80
Southbank 61
Thorkhill Road 29
Vallings Place 30
Vaughan Road 72
Windmill Lane 52
Winters Road 24

#13 Long Ditton (currently 4735 voters) would lose 881 electors in the northern half of Polling District BA to Thames Ditton, as set out above. In aggregate, 3854 voters, 6.8% below average.

#14 Hinchley Wood would stay exactly as it is now with 3948 voters, 4.5% below average

#15 Esher and Hersham Riverside. Currently 5101, takes in 1158 from Hersham North, see above. Total electorate 6259, 0.9% above the average.

#16 Walton South. Currently 5039, less 177 to Walton Central equals 4862. Add in the new developments on the former Swansmere and Ambleside Junior Schools, and the parts of Walton Ambleside to the south of there, - Ambleside Avenue, Rydens Road, Holly Avenue, Cardinal Drive, Wolsey Drive etc, Normanhurst Road, Molesey Road, approx 1131 electors, gives 5993 electors approx 3.4% below average.
Roads and electors added:
Ambleside Avenue 98 (But would suggest Nos 40
and 42 go to Walton North
Ambleside Coniston Terrace 18
Ambleside Avenue, Hawthorne Court 10
Ambleside Avenue, Langdale Terrace 17
Ambleside Avenue, Thirlmere Terrace 5
Ambleside Avenue, Windermere Terrace 6
Branksome Close 23
Cardinal Drive 61
Holly Avenue 122
King George Avenue 92
Molesey Road 57
Molesey Road, Weylands Old Treatment Works Nil
Normanhurst Road, 153
Rydens Road 146
Scholars Place 53
Swansmere Close 74
Wilton Gardens 37
Windsor Walk 15
Wolsey Drive 144

#17 Weston Green (2901 voters) would take in those voters in Molesey East’s Polling District GA who live south of the River Mole, some 1202 voters, and those who live to the south and west of the centre line of Bridge Road / Creek Road and north of the River Mole, some 359 electors. Total electorate becomes 4462, 7.9% above average. 2 member ward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alders Grove</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadfields</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ember Farm Avenue</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ember Farm Way</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ember Lane</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esher Road</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Court Avenue</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine Way</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molembert Road</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molembert Court, Molembert Road</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Lane</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newstead House, Orchard, Lane</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Avenue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southfields</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Avenue</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Gardens</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Road</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Place, Summer Road</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Mead, Summer Road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those living south and west of the centre line of Bridge Road / Creek Road and north of the River Mole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Road,(50%)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Court Mews, Bridge Road</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingfisher Court, Bridge Road</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Close</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Road</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Court Parade</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Court Way</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterside Hampton Court Way</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oarsman Place</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Boleyn Court, Queens Reach</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne of Cleves House, Queens Reach</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Howard House, Queens Reach</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine of Aragon House, Queens Reach</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Parr House, Queens Reach</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Seymour House, Queens Reach</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This minimises unnecessary shuffling of electors, i.e. where a ward takes in voters and also loses voters to another ward.
Mr Alex Hinds
Review Officer (Elmbridge)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Laydon House
76-78 Turnmill Street
LONDON
EC1M 5LG
31 March 2015

Dear Mr Hinds,

I am writing to you as a resident of Weybridge and Borough Councillor, since May 2014, for the current St George’s Hill Ward within Elmbridge Borough Council to support the reduction from 60 to 48 Councillors, endorse the recommendations of the Council, support the naming of the new enlarged Ward (number 4 in the submission) as Weybridge Brooklands and outline that Waverley Road is intimately coupled with Heath Road.

**Elmbridge as a Whole**

Having served also as a Councillor for Surrey Heath Borough Council (2007-2011 – St Michael’s Ward), which had 40 Councillors for an electorate of 64,283 (in 2011), I strongly support the reduction to 48 Councillors. The 40 councillors in Surrey Heath were, in my opinion, sufficient to provide good Governance and Scrutiny of the Council and excellent representation of our electorate. I also believe that elections every year forces Candidates to listen to our voters and accepted, when voting in Council, that this would commit the Council to three member Wards, but allowing all the electorate to vote every year and accepting that redrawing some of the Boundaries may be difficult. In the interests of electoral equality I would respectfully ask that the Commission only consider 2 members Wards if they can see exceptional reasons to do this in Elmbridge. With my limited time as an Elmbridge Councillor I cannot see those exceptional reasons.

I therefore support the recommendations made by our professional officers, which were approved by a large majority at the special Council meeting on Monday 16 March 2015, with the relatively minor amendments contained in the Esher and Walton Conservative Organisation.
Ward Number 4

The current St George’s Hill Ward, which makes a significant portion of the new Ward number 4, is very much part of Weybridge; a significant portion is bounded to the South West by the Borough boundary, to the South by the large A3 dual carriageway and to the East by the straight, long and distinctive Seven Hills Road.

Moving the boundaries of the Ward across either of these very distinguishing Roads would lead to residents which were detached from, and with no community identification with, the majority of the Ward. Moving any part of Burwood Park or Whitley Village would be contrary to the rules established by the Commission of “reflecting the interests and identities of local communities”.

The proposal to move parts of the current Weybridge South and Oatlands Ward, which are adjacent to St George’s Hill, is the natural solution joining areas which are very much associated with “greater” Weybridge. Heath Road and the London railway line, as North-eastern and Northern boundaries, would provide clear natural new Ward borders.

The name for this new Ward will be contentious: however it cannot be right for it to remain as St George’s Hill since that name reflects only a small part of the new Ward.

In May 2014 there were 1073 electors in VA polling district and only 777 of these can be considered to live in St George’s Hill (having removed Byfleet Road, Portsmouth Road, Redhill Road, Seven Hills Road and Seven Hills Close electors); this will be less than 13% (777/6123) of the new Ward.

Even if one added a significant proportion of those electors in VB polling area, to the North of VA polling area up to Egerton Road and St George’s Avenue (but not including those areas with their own distinct identity of Cobbetts Hill, Firfields, and Northern roads off St George’s Avenue – I would include North Field Place, Cross Field Place and South Field Place as having a distinct identity but these Roads are in Polling area VC) this would add another 1021 electors who might consider they reside in St George’s Hill. This total of 1798 electors would be less than 30% of the new Ward.

There were 1710 electors in polling area VC in May 2014 most of whom live in the area of Brooklands to the West of and including Brooklands Road; of these voters 194 are East of Brooklands Road. Added to this number are those residents, 797, in the former Weybridge South living in the shadow of Brooklands College, a total of 2507 and 41% of the new Ward.

There are of course a further 707 electors formerly in Oatlands Ward who will now be electors in this new Ward.

I would content that this new Ward needs a new name, one that should reflect that it is very much part of the community of Weybridge. It cannot be right to name it after a select part of the area, the gated community of St George’s Hill, and that the name of “Weybridge Brooklands” would reflect the heritage of Weybridge. Brooklands is nationally known and associated with Weybridge; it is home of the famous former racing circuit and a significant aero factory, during the early part of the twentieth century, with a thriving museum keeping that history very much alive.
Waverley Road

Waverley Road is a Victorian terraced street running parallel and anchored to Heath Road. The cottages were originally built for workers for the Locke King estate, situated in the area now named Brooklands, and the funder for Brooklands racetrack. There are more recent additions to the nearby residential area with Melrose Road, Molyneux Road and St Charles Place but these all join at the Northern tip of Waverley Road. House numbers (odd) on the Western side of Waverley Road run from the public house, The British Volunteer, in ascending order South to the other exit onto Heath Road with even numbered houses only starting south of the junction of Melrose Road and Waverley Road. This small community of Waverley Road has an annual street party, annual carol singers ending at the British Volunteer, occasional skittles evenings and it’s own Neighbourhood Watch which includes properties in the immediate vicinity on Heath Road. There are no houses on the Northern side at the entrance of Waverley Road (from Heath Road) which then leads into Melrose Road.

I content that Waverley Road is therefore wedded to Heath Road and its electors should remain in the Ward which includes Heath Road preferably the new Ward 4; I would accept that Molyneux and Melrose Roads and St Charles Place could be considered part of either Ward 4 or Ward 5 depending on the view one took about access to them.

I trust that you will take these submissions into account when making you decision on the future Warding patterns for Elmbridge Borough Council.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Sir/Madam

Elmbridge Borough Council
Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England

I strongly oppose the Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) proposal submitted following the Special Council Meeting held on 16th March 2015. I believe that Cllr Stuart Selleck’s Amendment, put forward on behalf of 21 Residents’ Group councillors, deserves serious consideration as a more sensible solution.

Background: The Weston Green Ward.

The Borough of Elmbridge is rather unique in that it consists of 3 main towns and 10 villages. The Ward of Weston Green is one such village. I have been privileged to represent this ward for 16 years, know its residents well, and understand how the community interacts. Weston Green is the smallest ward in Elmbridge. It is an extremely close-knit community centred around its local church of All Saints, Weston. The church has a lively and rapidly-growing congregation and is at the heart of the community. Weston Green is proud of its environment and history. The residents are active in preserving their much-loved Weston Green Conservation Area and there is an active Conservation Area Advisory Committee consisting of local volunteers who give up their time and expertise because they value and care for the built environment and heritage. The residents treasure their two village ponds and are active in their maintenance through organised community days. Recent fundraising by the community has also provided funds for a bore-hole to be installed to provide top-up water for one of the ponds. Residents value the beautiful and open Green Belt and common land that encircles Weston Green; they value their listed buildings and have supported a local Blue Plaque initiative organised by the Residents’ Association. The Ward has excellent schools – they are truly local and many children can be seen walking or cycling to school each day. There are extremely active PTAs who organise all manner of events within the community.

The number of Sports Clubs is impressive; Ember Sports Club in Grove Way (where not only can you play tennis and bowls, but it also houses a thriving theatre group); The Old Cranleighans Sporting Club; Foley Boxing Club, and the Ditton’s Velos.

Colets Sports Club, The Old Paulines, Thames Ditton Tennis Club, Thames Ditton Cricket Club and the Dittons Skiff and Punting Club, although not based in Weston Green, are mostly within walking distance and are well supported by Weston Green residents.
The community spirit here is palpable. It is worth noting that, in 2011, the voting turnout was 54% - the highest in the Borough. Again in 2012 we achieved a high turnout of 42%. This is a community that cares, is responsible, active, and plays its part in local government.

In May 2002 the community unveiled the Weston Green Village Sign - a beautiful piece of public art, commemorating the Queen’s Jubilee. It is situated opposite Jubilee Villas – a quaint row of cottages built to commemorate Queen Victoria’s Jubilee. This community is proud of its heritage.

A thriving Residents’ Association was founded in 1934. The Thames Ditton and Weston Green Resident’s Association hold regular public meetings in order to interact with the community and discuss local issues. The R.A. also distributes a quarterly magazine to all residents and has an excellent website.

You will be aware that, in 2012, Surrey County Council were involved in a Boundary Commission Review. The initial recommendation was that the Weston Green Ward be severed along Ember Lane and a large portion of the electorate moved into the Esher Division. There was much concern, and indeed anger, in the community. Weston Green residents, schools, churches, and various organisations made representations to the LGBCE. As a result, the recommendation was modified and I quote Paragraph 33 of the BC’s report:

“We found the evidence relating to community identity and interests compelling and are persuaded that dividing the area of Weston Green would be detrimental to a community that has demonstrated strong links with Thames Ditton. We have therefore decided to modify our draft recommendations accordingly”

With the aforementioned details in mind, I am pleased that the EBC proposal of 16\textsuperscript{th} March does not result in the Weston Green Ward being divided in any way.

However, the 16\textsuperscript{th} March proposal does have major disadvantages which is why I support the alternative recommendation of keeping Weston Green as a two-member ward as outlined in the Residents’ Group submission.

**The Council’s Recommendations of 16\textsuperscript{th} March 2015.**

I am opposed to the recommendations for the following reasons:

1. **In an attempt to fulfil the statutory criteria of electoral equality, the 16\textsuperscript{th} March proposal severs the Hinchley Wood Ward and ‘tacks’ it on to Weston Green. This will decimate the close-knit community of Hinchley Wood and will also result in the Weston Green ward losing its sense of identity.**

There is no identifiable interaction between Weston Green and Hinchley Wood. In the LGBCE ‘Guide for Councillors’ it is stated that;

“constructions such as major roads, railway lines or commercial developments can also form well known and effective barriers between communities”

These ‘effective barriers’ already exist between the Weston Green and Hinchley Wood wards – namely the A309 and an arterial railway line. They form the well-known boundaries between the two existing wards. Should the EBC 16\textsuperscript{th} March proposal be adopted, the elected members of the combined wards would need to negotiate the notorious Scilly Isles, drive along an extremely busy dual-carriageway (A309), and over the railway bridge to reach the other part of the ward. This would be a logistical nightmare and make a complete nonsense of the statutory criteria of providing “effective convenient local government”.

Combining these two wards, both of whom have their own distinctive community identity, and who do not interact in any way, would result in a large, incohesive, and disjointed community. This community would
also be severed by the barriers mentioned in the previous paragraph. The 16th March proposal rides roughshod over the communities of both Hinchley Wood and Weston Green in favour of electorate equality and this is clearly not acceptable and, further, it fails to meet LGBCE’s own criteria.

2. The recommendation fails to meet the criteria of ensuring secure and convenient local government.

At present the Weston Green Ward, together with Thames Ditton and Long Ditton, share one local Surrey County Councillor. He lives in the community, is extremely active and very well-known in the electorate. The Administration’s proposal of 16th March would result in a ward that would have three different County Councillors – two of whom would probably not live within the community.

The 2009 Act Schedule 2 is quite clear about the need to provide “secure and convenient local government” and having three different County Councillors flies in the face of this requirement.

In summary, the proposal fails to meet the two most important criteria. Vital considerations regarding the preservation of community identities and the need to have well-defined boundaries have been swept aside in order to achieve electoral equality. This is clearly wrong.

A Working Group was set up some 18 months to produce a scheme, and map, that would show how the number of councillors could be reduced to 48. The scheme was obviously required to meet all three LGBCE criteria of

1. delivering electoral equality;
2. reflecting the interests and identities of local communities; and
3. promoting effective and convenient local government.

In 18 months the Working Group failed to produce a map that ‘worked’. Several maps were produced but none met all three criteria. Consultation meetings were arranged with Ward Councillors. Unfortunately, although our particular area meeting was very well attended, others were not. In a couple of meetings only 1 or 2 members attended out of a possible 8-10. These consultation meetings also failed to produce a ‘workable’ map although several maps were proposed.

The mere fact that, eventually, officers had to be asked to draw up the map is an indication as to just how difficult this exercise has been. It also explains why, in the Conservative Administration’s proposal, close-knit and cohesive communities have been severed. With the best will in the world officers cannot be expected to understand or have any knowledge regarding community identities and how communities interact.

The proposal is completely flawed and should be disregarded. You cannot break up communities in this way.

We are told that, because the Council elected to stay with the status quo of electing ‘by thirds’ (having also gone out to consultation on the matter) we have to accept the imposition of three-member wards.

This is not the case and the guidelines on this are clear. Throughout the 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act it is stated that, when making the order, the Secretary of State must have regard to the need –

(a) To reflect the identities and interests of local communities, and
(b) To secure effective and convenient local government
It is therefore clear, that these two criteria are **crucial** and that every effort must be made to meet them. Should the imposition of three-member wards not meet the criteria it is obviously necessary to consider including some two-member wards. Furthermore, the following two statements are pertinent;

**Boundary Commission News Release for Elmbridge 3 February 2015**

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

**The Technical Guidance – at Paragraph 4.50 also states:**

“In each review of local authorities that elect by thirds or by halves, we will aim to deliver such patterns of multi-member wards. However, in all cases, this consideration will not take precedence over our other statutory criteria, and we will not recommend uniform patterns in the number of councillors per wards if, in our view or as is shown in evidence provided to us, it results in unacceptable levels of electoral inequality, does not reflect communities or hinders the provision of effective and convenient local government”

The alternative recommendation put forward by Cllr Stuart Selleck on the 16th March should therefore be given serious consideration as it fulfils ALL the necessary criteria and provides minimum disruption and movements between settlements. It recommends 14 three-member wards and 3 two-member wards - a total of 48 councillors. The recommendation would support the strong community identity of the 3 two-member wards of Hinchley Wood, Long Ditton and Weston Green whilst also providing electoral equality. The proposal conforms with the +/- 10% tolerance on electoral equality both currently and as projected for 2020. More importantly, it reflects the interests and identities of local communities and promotes effective and convenient local government. It does all this with minimum disruption for local people.

For the reasons stated above I oppose the 16th March proposal, and fully support the alternative amendment and subsequent submission to the LGBCE by Councillor Stuart Selleck, on behalf of the 21 Residents’ Group Councillors. I respectfully request that you give the latter serious consideration.

Yours sincerely

Tannia Shipley
Cllr: Weston Green Ward
Elmbridge Borough Council
Dear Mr Hinds,

I support the view of my fellow ward Cllr as stated below.

Cllr Stuart Hawkins (Walton South Ward)

---Original message---
From: W HAWKINS
Date: 31/03/2015 - 11:06 (GMTST)
To: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Cc: Cllr Christine Elmer, Cllr Chris Elmer
Subject: Submission to LGBC - Elmbridge Borough Council Electoral Review

For the Attention of Mr Alex Hinds

Dear Mr. Hinds,

I attach as below a submission to the Commission for its current review of the boundaries for Elmbridge Borough Council.

I am one of the ward Councillors for the existing Walton South ward. I have been a Councillor for this ward since 2006. I have had a chance to discuss this new warding proposal with my local Conservative committee and these are our thoughts/suggestions on behalf of the 3 Councillors Cllr Christine Elmer, Cllr Chris Elmer, Cllr Stuart Hawkins.

The Proposed Warding Pattern as suggested by Elmbridge Borough Council and which was discussed at a Special Meeting of the Council on 16 March 2015 splits the existing Walton South ward into three separate areas.

This separation of Walton South would involve moving part of it to a new ward comprising of Walton Ashley area with Oatlands Park electors (ward #7); part to a new ward #6 comprising of existing Walton North and Walton Ambleside electors; part would remain as the core Rydens area of Walton-on-Thames, together with a part of Hersham including the Rydens Enterprise School (ward #16).

The new ward (#16) has been suggested could be called Rydens ward and this naming was accepted by the Special Council meeting which met on 16 March 2015.

This new Rydens ward as proposed comprises of roads in both Walton and Hersham (which are separate towns) but which contain the Rydens name, such as Rydens Road, Walton, Rydens Park, Walton, and Rydens Grove, Hersham. A large development of bungalows along Rydens Road in Walton is called Rydensdale.
Rydens area is indeed a community of its own. As a ward Councillor we have worked together with residents on many issues which affect them jointly, such as opposition to the Weylands Anaerobic Digestion facility close to Hersham Station, a plan to build 1000 homes at land adjacent to Fieldcommon/Rydens Road a local crossing point in Rydens Road at the junction with Meadowside, and an unwanted Office block on open green space/land at Severn Drive, Walton. Many of our residents have children who attend Rydens Enterprise School in Hersham.

When we saw this map on 16 March 2015 we noted with some concern that a road in the existing Walton South ward, called Rydens Avenue is not included in the proposed ward #16. Rydens Avenue is one of the defining roads of the area. If there is to a separation of communities, it would make no sense to create a ward artificially to then leave out a large part of that community.

We would strongly recommend that if this proposed separation is agreed that all roads within the Rydens Road/Rydens Avenue community should stay together in one ward. There are some small roads off Rydens Avenue that will need be included Brunswick Avenue, Beecott Lane, Gladesmuir Close.

I also note that in the line drawn along Rydens Road some roads/cul-de-sacs, have been separated out to ward #9 such as St Michael’s Close, The Spur and Foxhollow. These also need to be in ward #16 (Rydens ward). It is the feeling of my committee that ideally the two roads of Meadowside and The Furrows should be in ward #16 as these also form an integral part of the Rydens community.

Finally for your information I attach a link to the webcast of the Elmbridge Borough Council Special meeting of 16 March 2015 where I spoke on this matter.

http://www.elmbridge.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/168816

Yours sincerely,

Christine Elmer

Cllr Christine Elmer