

Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
Layden House,
76 – 86 Turnmill Street,
LONDON EC1 5LG

ELMBRIDGE BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW

THE RESIDENTS' GROUP SUBMISSION :

This document expresses the views of the 21 Residents Group Councillors on Elmbridge 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 Elmbridge 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 Elmbridge, 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 local ties. 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

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

Chestnut Lane	19
Daneswood Close	60
Dresden Way	32
Fir Grange Ave.	19
Grove Place	9
Heathside	74
Jason Close	21
Leavesden Road	38
New Road	63
Pine Grove	66
Pine Court, Pine Grove	12
Pine Grove Mews	19
Southwood Ct. Pine Grove	18
Princes Road	110
Barrington Lodge, Princes Road	26
Cricket View, Princes Road	14
Heathgrove, Princes Road	2
Princes Court	25
Ranmore Place	10
St Michael's Court	25
Viscount House	10
Pycroft Lane	29
Pycroft House, Pycroft Lane	9
Oakfield Court	10

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	
Waynefleete Mews, Heathfield Road	4	
Newlands Close	70	
Chailey Place	30	
Meadow Close	2	
Ramornie 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
Kilrue 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
Molesey 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
Ditton 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

Roads and electors moved across :

Alders Grove	12
Broadfields	88
Ember Farm Avenue	34
Ember Farm Way	144
Ember Lane	91
Esher Road	164
Hampton Court Avenue	103
Jasmine Way	2
Molember Road	100
Molember Court, Molember Road	9
Orchard Lane	64
Newstead House, Orchard, Lane	8
Riverside Avenue	41
Southfields	97
Summer Avenue	51
Summer Gardens	48
Summer Road	118
Gladstone Place, Summer Road	21
Willow Mead, Summer Road	7

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

Bridge Road,(50%)	90
Kings Court Mews, Bridge Road	10
Kingfisher Court, Bridge Road	78
Cedar Close	17
Cedar Road	18
Hampton Court Parade	41
Hampton Court Way	7
Waterside Hampton Court Way	6
Oarsman Place	9
Anne Boleyn Court, Queens Reach	23
Anne of Cleves House, Queens Reach	15
Catherine Howard House, Queens Reach	9
Catherine of Aragon House, Queens Reach	15
Catherine Parr House, Queens Reach	6
Jane Seymour House, Queens Reach	15

This minimises unnecessary shuffling of electors, i.e. where a ward takes in voters and also loses voters to another ward.