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Surnames H
To the Review Officer (Woking)

Re: Boundary Changes to Woodham -

Dear Sir

I have studied the proposed Local Authority Boundary changes for my address and am dismayed to find that you are proposing to change the boundary lines to lump the Woodham ward in with the Sheerwater ward and divorce it from the Horsell Ward.

I consider this proposal to be undesirable, unnecessary and ill-considered and wish to register my OBJECTION.

- there is no reasonable justification to sever historic community links and relationships with existing councillors

- there is little social, community or physical connection between Sheerwater and Woodham wards - indeed the wards are physically disconnected by the canal. There is only one vehicle/pedestrian crossing of the Basingstoke canal in the ward at Sheerwater Road.

- Woodham Lane running east - west into Woking is the artery which connects Horsell and Woodham Wards together and into Woking town centre

- the proposed significant expansion of the population of the Sheerwater area justifies its own autonomous ward

- the Horsell and Woodham wards are primarily low-density residential areas, whereas the Sheerwater ward is and will become a high-density, urban, commercial and industrial area

- it will inevitably cost money to change the boundaries and I would sooner see this go into community benefits - libraries etc

For these reasons I strongly OBJECT to the boundary rearrangement and urge you to maintain the current boundaries

yours faithfully

Christopher R Hacking
Peter D.S. Hadfield

Review Officer (Woking)
LGBCE
Layden House
London EC1M 5LG

Dear Sir,

I understand that the Boundary Commission has decided that part of the ward of Horsell West in Surrey should become part of a new Sheerwater ward.

The village of Horsell and its surrounding area are currently divided into two wards: Horsell East and West, on the latter of which I am on the voting register. The village has been around for some time, as can be seen from the parish church of St Mary’s in the village, which dates back to the 12th century. Horsell is an attractive and active village and an entity in its own right, with its own character; its residents have a clear link to it and identify themselves with Horsell. There is a clear and logical demarcation line between it and Woking, in the form of the Basingstoke Canal, which currently forms the southern boundary of the Horsell West ward.

I understand that Woking Council have proposed that all of the present Horsell wards should be included in a proposed enlarged Horsell ward, which would have the advantage of treating the whole of present day Horsell as a unit. I have been told that there was: “general agreement that this arrangement would provide a cohesive locality and that there were many broad similarities, both demographic and geographic, in the combined wards”, which is a statement I would support.

Despite this proposal from our locally elected representatives, I understand that the Boundary Commission has decided to overrule them, by taking a small area of Horsell on the north side of the canal near the Chobham Road, in an area in which I live, from Horsell and putting it in a new Sheerwater ward. It is pretty widely accepted that Sheerwater has no historical connection with Horsell or this part of Horsell and there is no evident affinity between the two areas, which are quite different. It thus looks as if this was a purely arbitrary decision.

I believe that The Boundary Commission should explain why it has decided to ignore Woking Council’s recommendation and why it has decided to turn this part of Horsell into a Sheerwater “enclave” across the canal. It should also explain what alternatives it looked at besides the route it has chosen in order to achieve whatever its objective was and why these were turned down.

Peter Hadfield

1st August 2014
Peter Hadfield

Review Officer (Woking)  
LGBCE  
Layden House  
London EC1M 5LG

6th August 2014

Boundary changes affecting Horsell

Dear Sir,

I refer to my letter of 1st August, in which I stated my objections to the Boundary Commission’s proposal to make an area of present Horsell by the Chobham Road bridge over the Basingstoke Canal, which is where I live, part of the ward of Sheerwater. Since then, I have received a document issued by you dated July 2014 entitled “draft Recommendations”. Amongst other things, this states that:

a) The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Woking which delivers: “Community Identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities”.

b) “A good pattern of wards should”, amongst other things: “Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links” and “be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries”.

c) Community Identity: Transport Links, Community Groups (parish council and residents association), Facilities, Interests and Identifiable boundaries, with natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals”.

Applying your criteria, the bit of Horsell which you are proposing to make part of Sheerwater clearly should remain part of the proposed Horsell ward, and, if you were proceed with your proposal concerning this “bit” of Horsell, you would not be following the criteria you have laid down. You would just be laying down a purely arbitrary boundary, which has no justification or sense, which I do not believe is the mission of the Boundary Commission or is correct behaviour.

It is moreover very odd that, having stressed the importance of: “strong, easily identifiable boundaries” and “natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries”, you then ignore the present very evident and “strong” southern boundary (namely the canal) of the area you are sticking into Sheerwater and draw a new boundary on the north bank in a zig zag and arbitrary manner, so that this area becomes part of Sheerwater.

Your document also states that: “In general we have based our draft recommendations ….. to reflect the evidence received relating to community identities”. I do not know whose evidence you obtained, but I find it hard to believe that anyone in Horsell would have told you that there were any community identity/links between Horsell, or any parts of it, and Sheerwater. I bet the people of Sheerwater would feel the same about Horsell.

Your own criteria clearly indicate that this area of Horsell should remain part of Horsell; your proposal should thus be amended accordingly.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]

Peter Hadfield
The Review Officer (Woking)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Layden House
76-786 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

Re: Borough Boundary Review Consultation
In particular for Boundary Changes to Horsell West in October 2014

From Jane Hadfield

Address:____________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

The Boundary Commission for England are proposing to re-align the Boundaries to existing Wards with for the purposes set out in the Boundary Commission Policy Doc.

As one of the home owners of Horsell (for forty years), who you are proposing to kick out of Horsell and dump in Sheerwater, I wish to strongly reaffirm my objection to your proposal to change the longstanding ward boundary lines in the Broomhall area, so that this area will thereafter become a new and totally artificial appendage of Sheerwater, imposed on an area which for years has been an integral part of Horsell and will for practical purposes remain so. It’s a daft idea both from the point of view Horsell and also Sheerwater.

The Proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commissions intentions as set out in their policy document.

Here is a summary of some of the reasons for my objection:-

- Our area is of little significance in terms of electoral numbers BUT would make a vast difference to us who have lived in the area for generations as part of the local Horsell Village, it would destroy the sense of Village Community in the area, which I would have thought would be something which the Boundary Commission should seek to enhance rather than destroy.
- We would loose the Village cohesion that is part of the Heritage and Heritage of Horsell eg. children & parents attending the same school or Church for generations.
- In this area we help with organising Horsell Village Events and use the facilities within area above as part of the Horsell.
- Residents use local Horsell Shops and other local services in Horsell
- Our sense of character of the area has evolved with generations living for over 150 years & belonging to Horsell Village.
- In this area we help organise Horsell Community Events eg. Safari Gardens, Fund Raising for Horsell Village Hall, Scout & Girl Guide organisations, the annual Horsell Village Fair etc..
- We meet together at Horsell Schools, Doctors, Dentist, Churches & services - all central to our sense of Village Community.
- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Geographical, Social, Economic or Political backgrounds.
- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Heritage.
- Horsell is separated geographically and economically by the Light Industrial Units of Maybury & Sheerwater along the Canal.
- The number of residents in the Broomhall & part Brewery Road area is INSIGNIFICANT with regards to the overall numbers required for the proposed Ward
- There are no Community Associations with Sheerwater or the proposed Canal Side Ward.

Signed____________________________________________________________________

Date: 29th Sept 2014

Name printed:_____________________________________________________________
Dear Sir/Madam,

With regard to the Boundary Commission’s proposal that Woodham should be joined with Sheerwater. I strongly object to this proposal and would request that Woodham should remain with the Horsell Ward. The Basingstoke Canal forms a natural barrier between Sheerwater and Woodham, and should remain so. Furthermore, there seems to be little communality of interest or sense of neighbourhood between Woodham and Sheerwater.

I understand the preferred solution from Woking Borough Council is that Woodham should join with Horsell to form a three councillor ward. These arrangements would provide a cohesive locality and there are many similarities, both of a demographic and geographic nature in the combined wards.

When I moved to the area from Chertsey some twelve years ago, being part of Woodham and Horsell was a key factor in my decision to move to the area.

My wife and two of my children that live with us are of the same opinion, and would endorse this letter of objection. Therefore I hope you will note the strong reluctance from my family and neighbours to this proposal.

Yours Sincerely

AW Hallett
PD Hallett
LA Hallett
SG Hallett

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sir,

I am opposed to the proposed boundary change to take Woodham out of Horsell ward and to instead join it Sheerwater Ward. The Basingstoke Canal separates Sheerwater from Woodham and has nothing to do with Woodham, there is no sense of communal interest. Although our actual address is Woking.

The A245 road, which links Sheerwater to Woodham, is always traffic jammed, and travel between these roads difficult, and understand this is under route management study.

I consider the proposals submitted to you by Woking Borough Council to maintain the link between Horsell and Woodham.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Harding
Porter, Johanna

From: Fuller, Heather
Sent: 23 September 2014 09:17
To: Porter, Johanna
Subject: FW: Boundary change woodham

-----Original Message-----
From: Suzanne Harding
Sent: 19 September 2014 20:16
To: Reviews@
Subject: Boundary change woodham

Dear Sir,
I am opposed to the proposed boundary change to take Woodham out of Horsell ward and to instead join it Sheerwater Ward The Basingstoke Canal separates Sheerwater from Woodham and has nothing to do with Woodham, there is no sense of communal interest.

The A245 the road which links Sheerwater to Woodham is always traffic jammed, and travel between these roads difficult, and understand this is under route management study.

I consider the proposals submitted to you by Woking Borough Council to maintain the link between Horsell and Woodham.
Yours sincerely

Adam Harding
Hi,
As a resident of Hollies Avenue, West Byfleet, I feel very strongly about the boundary changes. Our road is in the centre of West Byfleet; the children in our road attend West Byfleet schools, not Sheerwater ones, and we have a strong local community that doesn't extend into Sheerwater. The natural divide falls on Sheerwater road, and to include us in a community the other side of a busy dividing road makes no sense. Please reconsider the proposal and listen to the people who actually live in the wards.

Kind regards,
Rhiannon Hardyman
Hi

Hollies Avenue, West Byfleet and I object to the proposed join with Sheerwater ward. We live in the heart of West Byfleet, we shop there, I catch the train from the station every day, our doctors are there, we eat out there, I went to school there, we vote there and we have many friends we meet in the village.

I have no links with Sheerwater. The closest I go to Sheerwater is when I cycle along the canal towpath to Woking. I feel that we have no "community identity" that is shared with Sheerwater.

I also consider the A245, Sheerwater Road as a "Strong easily identifiable boundary" between Sheerwater and West Byfleet. This road splits the KT14 postcode of West Byfleet from the GU21 postcode of Sheerwater and Woking.

I hope you reconsider the proposals and align us with the "Byfleet and West Byfleet Ward" where we belong.

Kind regards,

Tim Hardyman
2 September 2014

Review Officer (Woking),
Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
Layden House,
76-78 Turnmill Street,
London
EC1M 5LG

Dear Sir or Madam,

Proposed boundary changes affecting West Byfleet

I am writing to express my opposition to the current proposals to alter the ward boundaries and, in particular, the proposal that Hollies Avenue, Woodlands Road and Old Avenue should form part of the new Sheerwater ward.

When moving here in 1997, my wife, children and I moved to West Byfleet, not Sheerwater, and feel that, by these proposals, the identity of West Byfleet is being wholly undermined. Residents of the abovementioned roads gravitate for all their needs to the West Byfleet village centre, be that for retail or other services. That is where we shop and use the Post Office. That is where the Library is located. My bank, solicitor and accountant are all based in West Byfleet. For those of the necessary persuasion, their places of worship are in West Byfleet (and, as I understand, the parish boundaries include the three roads). Residents of these roads do not gravitate to Sheerwater for these purposes.

I imagine that the counter argument might be that these ward boundaries are simply for electoral administrative purposes and that these other facilities will all continue to be there for our needs and pleasure. That is only true to a point. The fact is that we would prefer the councillors representing these roads on Woking Borough Council to be those whose focus is on the needs of our gravitational centre. The councillors working for the interests of Sheerwater will, quite rightly, have their minds on the excellent plans for the regeneration of Sheerwater - a scheme that will have no practical relevance to the residents of the three roads.
I appreciate that the railway line presents a convenient boundary. That said, there are all manner of lumps and bumps in the map of proposed wards and I cannot imagine any reason why the three roads could not be accommodated within the Byfleet and West Byfleet ward, enabling us to obtain representation aligned to our community. I also understand that there is a desire broadly to balance the numbers of electors in each proposed new ward. If, as a result of the amendment I am advocating, Sheerwater were temporarily to be slightly depleted in numbers, I believe this will be more than made up when the Sheerwater regeneration is completed and further building stock added.

Neighbours have made a variety of additional points relating to the inclusion of these roads in the Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Association and the Safer Neighbourhood Policing Team. Neither of these are affiliations from which we would want to be distanced and fear that would be the result if these roads were ‘transferred’ to the proposed Sheerwater ward. We agree with all these points.

In closing, I attach a copy of the proposed redrawing of the boundaries contained on your web site. I would suggest that the hatched area should be retained within the Byfleet and West Byfleet ward. Personally, I would also include the area immediately to the other side of the railway line, containing my golf club, down to the Old Woking Road, using that as the ‘easily identifiable boundary’, rather than the railway line. This outcome would, I believe, be much more in line with retaining the ‘community identity’ of West Byfleet.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Yours faithfully

D M Hardy
To the Review Officer (Woking).

The idea that certain roads in Horsell should be taken under the wing of Sheerwater councillors seems, to me, foolish. From what I have read it would seem that Sheerwater has a larger electorate than Horsell, and the same number of councillors so how will making Sheerwater still larger and Horsell smaller solve anything? Also there is so much going on in Sheerwater, with all the talk of redevelopment, that I should think Sheerwater councillors have more than enough on their plate without taking on any worries of Horsell residents.

Ann Harington,
I have been a resident in Woodham (Woking) for the past 35 years and it was with considerable delight that I discovered that Woking Council in its submission to the Boundary Commission had recommended that Woodham be no longer attached to Sheerwater but should join Horsell to form a three councillor ward. There is absolutely no communality of interest with the Woodham area and Sheerwater which geographically is separated by the Basingstoke Canal and demographically has no affinity.

It was therefore with exterme amazement and disapointment that I now have been given to understand that the Boundary Commissions response is to keep Woodham appended to Sheerwater. Why? I cannot understand the thinking if the areas were known. I very seldom go into the area I know as Sheerwater and when I do the difference in all aspects is apparent, whereas going into Horsell is like being in the same area with the same aspirations and needs.

I hope the Boundary Commission after its 'consultation' will take Woking Councils recommendation that Woodham be coupled with Horsell.

Otherwise I will continue to be "represented" by councillors (of any political persuasion) who have no understanding or sympathy with the views of the people in my area and I will continue to feel as an outsider with no interest in local affairs.

Regards, John Harri,
Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in objection to the proposed boundary changes with specific respect to Hollies Avenue & Woodlands Avenue (both in West Byfleet) being included within the proposed Sheerwater ward.

I, and my family, are residence of West Byfleet and I am also a School Governor of West Byfleet Infant School. The proposed move of my road into Sheerwater will have a significant impact in the following key areas:

- My family and I are part of West Byfleet town community, using shops, library, schools, recreation ground etc. We need to be heard in the context of West Byfleet interests and issues and have no association with the Sheerwater Community
- The is a natural boundary between West Byfleet and Sheerwater (namely the Sheerwater Road) which would seem a much more sensible boundary line.
- The current proposal separates our family from the community and our local councillor would be more interested in dealing with Sheerwater issues that will not affect me/my family.

I understand the need to balance electoral numbers, boundaries etc. but the current proposal does not reflect the community identity.

I would propose that the boundary for Byfleet & West Byfleet be extended to the Sheerwater road and include Woodlands and Hollies Avenue which will ensure local people are able to be represented by councillors with common community interest.

Regards
Mr Grant Harrison and family.
I would like to make an objection to a proposed change to the ward boundary for the Horsell / Goldsworth Park wards. I live in Merrivale Gardens which is currently in the Horsell West ward but is proposed to be moved to Goldsworth Park, along with the adjacent cul-de-sac of Hedgerley Court.

While I understand the requirement to balance the numbers in each ward, I feel the decision to annex us from Horsell has been taken only to move headcount and has taken no account of our local links and identity and will result in us being poorly represented at Council.

I feel we are a firm part of the Horsell community for the following reasons;

- My children have gone to Horsell schools from pre-school through to current primary / secondary school,
- They go to Horsell Brownies and Scouts and so we are part of community events such as the May Fayre on Wheatsheaf Common and the annual Remembrance Day service at the Horsell war memorial,
- We take part in local Horsell community events such as the Jubilation, the annual Village Show and the Christmas tree festival. As well as attending these events, we support them by entering exhibits and helping run stalls.
- We are part of Horsell based sports clubs - the Woking and Horsell Cricket Club on Horsell Moor and at the squash club, also in Horsell.
- We have much used local pathways from Merrivale Gardens that join us through to the centre of Horsell and the town centre. These make Horsell our "local" community much more than Goldsworth Park, which we are separated from by busy roads.
- The local shops and facilities we use are those in Horsell; i.e. supermarket, newsagent, post office, hairdressers, coffeeshop, doctors etc.

In fact, it is a rare day that I am not on Horsell High Street at least once, sometimes many times in a day.

If we become part of Goldsworth Park I do not believe that my new councillor will be able to effectively represent me. Any local issues that I may to speak to a councillor about will be those in the Horsell area and so will be outside the remit of a Goldsworth Park councillor. Likewise, I have no opinion on issues effecting the main part of Goldsworth Park as that's not my community.

I would ask that the boundary be returned to either its original position or pass along the alleyway to Sythwood (as it originally did) and then along Lockfield Drive, as these provide the natural barriers between our estate and Goldsworth Park.

Also, while I hope I have provided an acceptable case for why we should stay in Horsell I would like to add that the Council's final proposal to annex us into St Johns would be even more unrepresentative of our identity. I have no links with and rarely (twice in ten years!) have used a shop in that area.

Finally, I would like to point out that many people on our estate may be unaware of the Commission's changes to the plans originally put forward by the Council, in which we stayed in Horsell (the move to St
John's came later). So, if there has been a lack of objection from local people, please don't assume that this is acceptance: I believe many people may still be unaware. There has been no local publicity on this change.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mrs V Harris
We are opposed to the amendment made by the local Government Boundary Commission to take Woodham out of the Horsell Ward and instead adjoin it with Sheerwater to form a three councillor Sheerwater Ward. We are also against the removal of the name of Woodham from the proposed names of the new ward.

The Basingstoke Canal separates Woodham from Sheerwater which is crossed only by the extreme ends of the ward and as a result there is little or no community of interests and no sense of neighbourhood between the two areas.

There are many community affinities between Woodham and Horsell as both are predominantly prosperous, residential leafy suburbs containing mostly detached housing and many private roads,

I consider the proposals submitted to you by Woking Borough Council to be sensible, particularly as they make a real attempt to retain the natural cohesion between the historic areas of Horsell and Woodham.

Kind regards

Ken and Ann Harris
To whom it may concern

I am writing to inform you of my opposition to the amendment made by the Local Government Boundary Commission to take Woodham out of the Horsell Ward and instead adjoin it with Sheerwater to form a three councillor Sheerwater Ward.

I am also against the removal of the name Woodham from the proposed names of the new wards.

The Basingstoke Canal separates Woodham from Sheerwater which is crossed only at the extreme ends of the ward and as a result there is little or no communality of interests and no sense of neighbourhood between the two areas.

The A245 between Woodham and Sheerwater is a major route which suffers from heavy traffic particularly at peak times and is one of the roads that is a part of a route management study. Travel between the two areas is therefore difficult.

There are many community affinities between Woodham and Horsell as both are predominantly prosperous, residential leafy suburbs containing mostly detached housing with many private roads.

I consider the proposals submitted to you by Woking Borough Council to be sensible, particularly as they make a real attempt to retain the natural cohesion between the historic areas of Horsell and Woodham.

Sheila Hatch
To: The Review Officer (Woking)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76-786 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG  

Re: Borough Boundary Review Consultation  
In particular for Boundary Changes to Horsell West in October 2014  

From: [Redacted]  
Address: [Redacted]  

The Boundary Commission for England are proposing to re-align the Boundaries to existing Wards with for the purposes set out in the Boundary Commission Policy Doc.  

I/we wish to strongly object to the proposal to remove the part Locally Listed and Conservation Area of the Broomhalls and part Brewery Road area from the existing Local Horsell West Ward and include the area into the proposed Sheerwater (Canal Side) Ward. The area requested currently lies within the existing boundary to Horsell West.  

The Proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commissions intentions as set out in their policy document.  

Here is a summary of some of the reasons for my/our objection:-  

- Our area is of little significance in terms of electoral numbers BUT would make a vast difference to us who have lived in the area for generations as part of the local Horsell Village, it would destroy the sense of Village Community in the area.  
- We would loose the Village cohesion that is part of the Heritage and Heritage of Horsell e.g. children & parents attending the same school or Church for generations.  
- In this area we help with organising Horsell Village Events and use the facilities within area above as part of the Horsell.  
- Residents use local Horsell Shops and other local services in Horsell  
- Our sense of character of the area has evolved with generations living for over 150 years & belonging to Horsell Village.  
- In this area we help organise Horsell Community Events e.g. Safari Gardens, Fund Raising for Horsell Village Hall, Scout & Girl Guide organisations, the annual Horsell Village Fair etc..  
- We meet together at Horsell Schools, Doctors, Dentist, Churches & services - all central to our sense of Village Community  

- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Geographical, Social, Economic or Political backgrounds.  
- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Heritage.  
- Horsell is separated geographically and economically by the Light Industrial Units of Maybury & Sheerwater along the Canal.  
- The number of residents in the Broomhall & part Brewery Road area is INSIGNIFICANT with regards to the overall numbers required for the proposed Ward  
- There are no Community Associations with Sheerwater or the proposed Canal Side Ward.  

Signed: [Redacted] Date: 29-9-20  
Name printed: [Redacted]  

PTO
Our letters of objection do matter. The letters of objection need to be received by The Boundary Commission before the

6 October 2014.

Please urgently complete the above and either/or:-

1. Scan and sign this letter and email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

or

2. Use the context of this letter and adjust for your own objection letter & submit.

or

3. Sign this letter & hand deliver to: [redacted]

or

4. Post direct to The Boundary Commission at the above address.

Let's TRY & keep Us in Horsell!

Kathy McCloskey & John Bingham.

tel: [redacted]

email: [redacted]
Sir

As you can see from my address that I am part of woodham and east horsell ward.

If Woodham was stuck on to Sheerwater, I would find it useless to do a local vote. I suspect that the majority of Sheerwater people would be represented by a different party, because our lifestyle are completely at odds

If you want a real contest, you should have a more evenly balanced population.

People say the canal separates us, well the railway separates Sheerwater and Pyrford, and Pyrford is not to join Sheerwater, so Woodham should not have to join Sheerwater.

L.E. Haworth
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Michael and Judith Hawtin
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

We are writing to register our objections to the inclusion of Old Avenue, Woodlands Avenue and Hollies Avenue in your proposed new Sheerwater Ward and to ask you to reconsider this aspect of your proposals. As residents of Old Avenue for 40 years, we regard ourselves as very much part of the West Byfleet community: our address is West Byfleet and we are constant users of its shops and services. All our community and social links are with West Byfleet and Pyrford (where we attend church and sometimes shop); we have virtually no links with Sheerwater. We are members of the Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association and want to be represented locally by councillors who have the interests of these three villages at heart, rather than tacked on to a ward with a different focus and interests. Referring to your draft recommendations, and in the light of the comments above: - we feel strongly that the inclusion of Old Avenue, Woodlands Avenue and Hollies Avenue in your proposed Sheerwater Ward is not consistent with the requirement in the 2009 Act to "reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular.......the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties" (para.12). -we do not believe the use of the main railway line to define ward boundaries (on which you appear to place a good deal of emphasis - paras.41 and 59) reflects the real direction of our community and transport links which are most definitely with West Byfleet and Pyrford. Our preferred option is to include Old Avenue, Woodlands Avenue and Hollies Avenue in the proposed Byfleet and West Byfleet Ward. Our understanding is that this would still leave the number of electors in the Ward within the 10% variance. But if the size of the electorate still remains a matter of concern for you, we very much hope you will be prepared to revert to the proposal in Woking Borough Council's submission to you that that all three roads should be included in Pyrford Ward.

Uploaded Documents: 

None Uploaded
The Review Officer [Woking]
Local Government Boundary Commission or England
Lynden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

30 September 2014

Dear Sir,

Re: Review of the Ward Boundary Changes for Woking Borough Council

I am writing to oppose the proposals to the new ward boundaries for West Byfleet Ward, in particular the proposed inclusion of Old Avenue, Hollies Avenue and Woodlands Avenue into the Sheerwater Ward. I ask that consideration is made to include this area into the Byfleet and West Byfleet Ward.

My main reason to object is that I feel, very strongly, that these streets have long and strong local connections to the West Byfleet Community, not the Sheerwater area. Our community links and connections have always been with the West Byfleet village, the shops, churches, Doctors, and the library are all within our local community of West Byfleet.

The Sheerwater community is currently involved in a huge regeneration scheme and all energies in this ward are involved in the project. I understand the need for electoral equality, however the Sheerwater regeneration scheme proposes to build an additional 500 houses which would, I believe, once again create an imbalance to local electorate numbers if our roads are included into Sheerwater. In addition I believe that the elected Sheerwater Ward councillors would have no time to take interest in a community historically from West Byfleet, never having had dealings or interest in this area and therefore I believe that our interests would not be fairly reflected or considered.

I therefore ask for due consideration to my objections. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Nicola Hayes-Holgate (Mrs)
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Pauline Hedges
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

Pauline Hedges The Review Officer (Woking) LGBCE 76-78 Turnmill Street London EC1M 5LG October 3rd 2014 Dear Sir Ward Boundary re-organisation – West Byfleet, Surrey I write in my personal capacity as a resident of West Byfleet for 24 years, regarding the proposed re-allocation of wards within the 3 villages of Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford. These 3 villages have been separate entities with their own councillors for many years and together form a flourishing Resident’s Association. Additionally, all three separate villages have their own individual Neighbourhood Forum. Our local borough council, guided by the mandarins in London, opted to change the make-up of the council and the net result, so far, is that, despite our protestations earlier this year, we are being split into 3 separate wards but parts of each village are being merged with other parts of other villages. The worst part of this arbitrary merger is that a small part of West Byfleet village is being taken away from West Byfleet and merged with another part of the Borough altogether – Sheerwater. (Hollies Avenue, Woodlands Avenue and Old avenue plus surrounding closes.) Well, it is just NOT right and I know that many residents are planning to withhold their vote at the next election. Which is damaging to the council, who do not want this split either? Please re-evaluate this ill-considered and arbitrary decision, made without any acknowledgement to the democratic process in this country. I also refer you to my letter as joint Chair of the West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum. This is OUR neighbourhood, these are OUR councillors, and this is OUR wish. Respect that. Yours sincerely Pauline Hedges

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Linda Heffron
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

We are writing to make know our preference that the area of Woodham remains in the Horsell Ward as preferred by Woking Borough Council and NOT be joined with Sheerwater as currently being considered. From: Mr MJ & Mrs LK Heffron, [REDACTED]

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
I am writing to express my concern about the proposed boundary changes in West Byfleet.

I live in Woodlands Avenue, one of the roads which it is proposed will now become part of the Sheerwater Ward. This change seems very peculiar to me. My family has very little to do with Sheerwater. We have lived here for 19 years and in that time we have always used the West Byfleet centre. My children went to school at the Junior School. We have always regularly used the banks, Post Office, Library, Health centre and St John's Church in West Byfleet. We attend events at the St John's Cornerstone centre. When I walk my dog, it is in the West Byfleet recreation grounds. I have rarely been to Sheerwater.

I am concerned that the Sheerwater Ward will rightly be concerned with Sheerwater issues. Will the tail end of West Byfleet .... us, Hollies Avenue and Old Avenue really be represented? Are we relevant to Sheerwater and is Sheerwater really relevant to us?

I am disabled and have mobility problems. I walk with a wheeled walker. I manage to access the centre of West Byfleet easily through the tunnel under the railway at West Byfleet Station. My husband frequently works away from home and when it comes time to vote in any sort of election I often have to walk to the polling station. This has always been at the St John's Cornerstone Centre in West Byfleet. I can manage to walk there under my own steam. I presume that if these changes go through, our new polling station will be in Sheerwater. I cannot walk to Sheerwater, therefore I will be unable to vote, something which concerns me greatly.

I would like you to reconsider these boundary changes and keep Woodlands Avenue, Hollies Avenue and Old Avenue a part of the West Byfleet Ward. It does not make sense to attach us to Sheerwater.

Sarah Helmy
Re: Borough Boundary Review Consultation: Boundary changes to Horsell West, Oct. 2014

Mr & Mrs Henrich

The Boundary Commission for England are proposing to re-align the Boundaries to existing Wards with for the purposes set out in the Boundary Commission Policy Doc.

We wish to strongly object to the proposal to remove the part Locally Listed and Conservation Area of the Broomhalls and part Brewery Road area from the existing Local Horsell West Ward and include the area into the proposed Sheerwater (Canal Side) Ward. The area requested currently lies within the existing boundary to Horsell West.

The Proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commissions intentions as set out in their policy document.

Here is a summary of some of the reasons for our objection:

- Our area is of little significance in terms of electoral numbers BUT would make a vast difference to us who have lived in the area for generations as part of the local Horsell Village, destroying the sense of Village Community in the area.
- We would loose the Village cohesion that is part of the Heritage and Heritage of Horsell eg. children & parents attending the same school or Church for generations.
- Residents use local Horsell Shops and other local services in Horsell
- Our sense of character of the area has evolved with generations living for over 150 years & belonging to Horsell Village.
- In this area we help organise Horsell Community Events eg. Safari Gardens, Fund Raising for Horsell Village Hall, Scout & Girl Guide organisations, the annual Horsell Village Fair etc..
- We meet together at Horsell Schools, Doctors, Dentist, Churches & services - all central to our sense of Village Community.
- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Geographical, Social, Economic or Political backgrounds.
- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Heritage.
- Horsell is separated geographically and economically by the Light Industrial Units of Maybury & Sheerwater along the Canal.
- The number of residents in the Broomhall & part Brewery Road area is INSIGNIFICANT with regards to the overall numbers required for the proposed Ward
- There are no Community Associations with Sheerwater or the proposed Canal Side Ward.

Mr D A Henrich
28 September 2014

Mrs M E Henrich
28 September 2014
The Review Officer (Woking)
Local Government Boundary C
Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London EC1M 5LG

29th September 2014

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref: Current Stage of the Review consultation on Ward pattern for Woking Borough Council

We write to object to the revised boundary proposals for Woking Borough Council specifically in regard to the transfer of Hollies Avenue, Woodlands Avenue and particularly Old Avenue to the Sheerwater Ward.
Needless to say we had no objection to the Woking Borough Council proposals which reflected the wishes and needs of the residents of the area who for the greater part consider themselves West Byfleet residents with close ties to the village its interests and ethos which would be missing in Sheerwater.

General review
Currently all of our normal day to day needs are provided by West Byfleet which include extensive transport by train, local travel by bus, petrol stations, health care, professional services, a wide range of retail and leisure activities including many restaurants, our banking, library, veterinary care, religious needs and car parking. These services are readily available and can be reached easily either by foot or ear. The same range or choice of facility are not available in Sheerwater, are not reasonably walkable to and are little used by West Byfleet residents.

Character
There is very little similarity in character between the two areas under consideration, Sheerwater being a fairly heavily populated suburban area and the three avenues being a more residential area with in particular Old Avenue having a local conservation order from Woking Borough Council and described as an area of special residential character
Regrettably Sheerwater is numbered amongst the 10% most deprived areas in Surrey and is currently in the early stages of a long term regeneration programme which includes a further 500 homes. This we believe can only be advantageous to the residents of Sheerwater and good for Woking and which we support.
In light of the above it is difficult however to see that with a mix of this nature that there would be no long term conflict of interests for our councillors or reduction in property values.
Boundaries
We believe that the boundary between Sheerwater and West Byfleet has been in place since Sheerwater was developed in the mid 1950s and for many years has been understood and effectively operated without difficulty or confusion. This is evidenced by the events of 2013 when the Sheerwater regeneration boundary was considered by others for extension into Old Avenue but following action by the residents and their West Byfleet Councillors, the existing boundary was retained. We also see no reason why along this short section of the railway line that with the modern road bridge on Sheerwater road and an effective pedestrian underpass at West Byfleet Station, why the boundary needs changing at all.

Electorate
We are currently unaware whether any provision has been made in the Sheerwater figures for all or part of the proposed regeneration scheme’s 500 new homes. If no provision has been made then on the basis of an 8 year building programme starting in 2015 it is probable that at least 250 homes could be completed by 2019. Hence in the event that the ward boundary is relocated as proposed on the attached drawing and as there are some 276 existing homes within the three avenue area the electoral equality for Sheerwater could be maintained. Irrespective of this if the boundary is relocated there will still be a need to adjust the boundaries to Byfleet and West Byfleet and/or Pyrford to maintain an acceptable electoral equality even if need be the three avenues are split into two parts and each part allocated to one of the two wards.

Conclusion
In view of the disparity in the numbers of residents in the distinct areas of the Sheerwater ward and the potential for differences in interests and requirements there is great concern that the interests of the three avenues would become less significant to our councillors and become lost in the general business of the ward. We would therefore request that you review your proposals and return the three avenues area to the Byfleet and West Byfleet and or Pyrford wards and adjust the adjacent boundaries accordingly to maintain acceptable elector equality.

Yours Faithfully AG & PA Hepden

Enc: Map showing proposed modifications to the Sheerwater boundary
Proposed area to be removed from the Sheerwater Ward.

View this map online and draw your own boundaries: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Follow the review on Twitter: @LGBCE

If you are viewing this page online, click on the map to go straight to our interactive consultation area

Boundary Modifications
for letter from AG & PA
Hepper dated 29/3/14
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Hewitt
E-mail: [ obscured ]
Postcode: [ obscured ]
Organisation Name: N/A

Comment text:

I have lived in Ferndale Road, Horsell for 36 years. The Basingstoke canal is I understand the current boundary separating Horsell from Woking. Over the years a number of hotly contested disputes relating to Woking and Horsell relating to this boundary have taken place. Notably the creation of the Lockfield Drive into the Victoria Way bypass which was originally planned by the 'powers that be' to cross the Basingstoke canal and invade Horsell Moor. A particular group registered as The Grove Group was formed and was instrumental in successfully opposing the proposals resulting in the current Lockfield Drive/Victoria Way arrangement - thus preserving the integrity of Horsell Moor and Ferndale Road/The Grove as residential areas. The consolidation of Horsell West with Horsell East to become a Horsell ward is welcomed and, in my view, long overdue. I am advised by my local councillors that a section of Horsell including Ferndale Road and The Grove is proposed to be taken out of Horsell Ward and joined instead with Sheerwater, an area we respect but have absolutely nothing to do with as we have no issues in common. This seems to me to be an arbitrary proposal in order to get the 'right' number of people on the electoral roll in each constituency. Please be so kind as to be inclined to Horsell residents who wish to remain so for quite sound reasons. Yours sincerely Richard JB Hewitt

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Woking District

Personal Details:
Name: John Hill
E-mail: 
Postcode: 
Organisation Name: 

Feature Annotations

Map Features:

Annotation 1: Boundary using the basingstoke canal

Comment text:
I am opposed to the amendment made by the Local Government Boundary Commission to take Woodham out of the HorSELL Ward and instead adjoin it with Sheerwater to form a three councillor Sheerwater Ward. I am also against the removal of the name Woodham from the proposed names of the newwards. The Basingstoke Canal separates Woodham from Sheerwater which is crossed only at the extreme ends of the ward and has meant that there is little or no communality of interests and no sense of neighbourhood between the two areas. The proposals submitted to you by Woking Borough Council in April reflect the real needs of the area, particularly as they make a attempt to retain the natural cohesion between the historic areas of HorSELL and Woodham.

Uploaded Documents:
None Uploaded
To: The Review Officer (Woking), Local Boundary Commission for England

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to raise a strong objection to the proposed ward boundary changes for Woking as published in your draft recommendations.

The stated aim of the review is "to ensure that each Woking councillor represents roughly the same number of voters and that ward boundaries reflect the interests and identities of local communities".

I accept that the proposals do meet the objective of equalising the number of electors in wards and I do support the reduction in the number of Councillors. However, in the case of West Byfleet, the proposals singularly fail to provide the requirement for "community representation". West Byfleet is the only recognised community in the Woking Borough Council area that would not have its own ward under these proposals. Indeed it is recognised at the most significant community outside of Woking Town centre yet it has been seen fit to divide its current ward between 3 of the proposed new wards. West Byfleet, Byfleet and Pyrford have long been recognised as three distinct villages each with their own separate identity. They have long been represented by a single Residents Association, who also have, on behalf of the residents, raised objection to the lack of "community representation" for West Byfleet in the Woking ward proposals.

I have raised my objections before with the Woking Council, Councillor Gary Elson (represents West Byfleet) and with the Woking MP, the Right Honourable Jonathan Lord. Jonathan Lord stated in his email to me that: "I agree with you that it is most regrettable that West Byfleet will likely end up being split between two neighbouring wards - the only community in the whole of the Borough affected in this way". The Commissions own proposal document acknowledges that the Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford ward arrangements drew many comments against the 2 ward arrangement of "Byfleet & West Byfleet" and "Pyrford".

Comments to me from local councillors have indicated that the 10 ward arrangement each with 3 councillors is rigid and cannot be varied. This inflexible approach cannot allow the aim of the review to be satisfactorily met in the case of Woking. There seems to me to be a simple solution that would satisfy the residents. That is to create 3 wards, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford from the current proposed 2 wards, each with 2 councillors. This would give the same number of voters per councillor as all other wards. It would also enable the Boundary Commission to meet its stated aims.

Unless there is flexibility in the application of the 10 ward system each with the 3 councillors, West Byfleet and probably Woking as a whole would be better to stay with the current system of wards. It is more important to voters to have a proper community representation through a ward structure that recognises all local communities rather than to worry about the a slightly unequal number of voters.
Comment text:

My comment is on the boundary between the proposed Horsell and Sheerwater wards towards the centre of the town. Generally, the approach has been to use natural boundaries between wards - for example large roads or other features such as the Basingstoke canal. Yet there is a small area towards the centre of Woking where that approach has not been taken, namely Broomhall Road and The Grove which, though north of the Basingstoke canal find themselves in Sheerwater. It would be more logical to include this area in Horsell, using the Basingstoke canal as a natural boundary.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Simon Hiscocks
E-mail: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I find it entirely reasonable and sensible to merge the many Horsell wards into one but am unable to divine why the ward boundaries are being redrawn such that Ferndale Road, The Grove and Broomhall Road would be annexed and lumped into the Sheerwater. Patently, the residents of Ferndale Road and The Grove have considerable interest in the goings on in the Wheatsheaf Common and the Horsell community as do the other bounding communities on Chobham Road and Wheatsheaf Close. Much more so than the community in Sheerwater, with whom we share less common local interaction; not in shopping precinct, culture or geography. The redrawn ward boundary appears to go against the geographical boundaries of both Victoria Road and the Basingstoke Canal, both of which define the edge of our community and the town centre. Interestingly, in point 70 of the draft recommendations document, Victoria Way is sited as a clear delineating boundary. In conclusion, I am absolutely against the suggested southern boundary of the new Horsell ward, which I believe should follow the Victoria Road as this would include the communities around Horsell Moor and Wheatsheaf Common with the Horsell community with whom they share more cultural, community, geographic and social concerns.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Review Officer

Please, please, please can our area remain a three councillor ward with Horsell.

We feel very affiliated with Horsell Village. It is walking distance from our home. My husband and I often walk to Horsell and attend the many activities of village life which take place there.

Conversely we feel little/no connection with the Sheerwater area.

Our address has been [Redacted] for the 25 years we have lived here and we do not want that to change!!!

Regards
Jane and Richard Hockley
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Richard Hockley
E-mail: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Organisation Name: Richard Hockley

Comment text:

I live in Ferndale Road Woking. It has been announced that the Boundary commission has decided - against local council recommendations- to remove our road & The Grove from Horsell ward & join it with Sheerwater. This makes no sense, Sheerwater is seperated by distance, culture & demographics from us. We belong with Horsell, not an area we don't know or go to. The Basingstoke canal is a good geographical boundary, lets keep it like that. Richard Hockley

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
**Woking District**

**Personal Details:**

**Name:** Matt Hogben  
**E-mail:**  
**Postcode:**  
**Organisation Name:**

**Comment text:**

I do not wish to be part of the 'Sheerwater Ward', We are COMPLETELY separate from Sheerwater in every way. If we were to be joined, house prices on our part in Horsell would certainly be negatively affected. There is no need to change what is already in place. Matt Hogben

**Uploaded Documents:**

None Uploaded
To: The Review Officer (Woking)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England 
Layden House  
76-786 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG

Re: Borough Boundary Review Consultation  
In particular for Boundary Changes to Horsell West in October 2014

From: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]

The Boundary Commission for England are proposing to re-align the Boundaries to existing Wards with for the purposes set out in the Boundary Commission Policy Doc.

I/we wish to strongly object to the proposal to remove the part Locally Listed and Conservation Area of the Broomhalls and part Brewery Road area from the existing Local Horsell West Ward and include the area into the proposed Sheerwater (Canal Side) Ward. The area requested currently lies within the existing boundary to Horsell West.

The Proposal is contrary to the Boundary Commissions intentions as set out in their policy document.

Here is a summary of some of the reasons for my/our objection:-

- Our area is of little significance in terms of electoral numbers BUT would make a vast difference to us who have lived in the area for generations as part of the local Horsell Village, it would destroy the sense of Village Community in the area.
- We would loose the Village cohesion that is part of the Heritage and Heritage of Horsell eg. children & parents attending the same school or Church for generations.
- In this area we help with organising Horsell Village Events and use the facilities within area above as part of the Horsell.
- Residents use local Horsell Shops and other local services in Horsell
- Our sense of character of the area has evolved with generations living for over 150 years & belonging to Horsell Village.
- In this area we help organise Horsell Community Events eg. Safari Gardens, Fund Raising for Horsell Village Hall, Scout & Girl Guide organisations, the annual Horsell Village Fair etc..
- We meet together at Horsell Schools, Doctors, Dentist, Churches & services - all central to our sense of Village Community

- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Geographical, Social, Economic or Political backgrounds.
- Horsell Village area and Sheerwater area do not share the same Heritage.
- Horsell is separated geographically and economically by the Light Industrial Units of Maybury & Sheerwater along the Canal.
- The number of residents in the Broomhall & part Brewery Road area is INSIGNIFICANT with regards to the overall numbers required for the proposed Ward
- There are no Community Associations with Sheerwater or the proposed Canal Side Ward.

Signed: [Redacted]  
Date: 27/9/2014

Name printed: [Redacted]
Our letters of objection do matter. The letters of objection need to be received by The Boundary Commission before the

6 October 2014.

Please urgently complete the above and either/or:-

1. Scan and sign this letter and email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
2. Use the context of this letter and adjust for your own objection letter & submit.
3. Sign this letter & hand deliver to [redacted]
4. Post direct to The Boundary Commission at the above address.

Let's TRY & keep Us in Horsell!

Kathy McCloskey & John Bingham.

tel: [redacted]
email: [redacted]
20 August 2014

Review Officer,
Woking Review,
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England,
Layden House,
76-86 Turnmill Street,
LONDON. EC1M 5LG

Dear Sirs,

Review and Proposed Changes to the the Number Of Councillors and Electoral Equality for Woking Borough Council

My wife and I have lived in Woking for the last 30 years, initially is St Johns and latterly in Horsell.at the above address.

We note that there has been considerable discussion and observation dealing with many of the proposed ward areas and you have expressed opinions on the majority of the proposed changes. However we note that very little observation has been made about the boundry of the Horsell Ward.

We note it is proposed that the main A320 road be the Southern Boundry of the Horsell Ward. This is a logical boundry and there is a good deal of merit in that decision. However it is noted that it is proposed that a small area on the north side of the A320 road is to be transferred out of Horsell into Sheerwater Ward. This is the area where we reside and we very strongly object to this proposal.

Our links are much based within Horsell. We do not travel to, visit or have any links with the Sheerwater area. We live in Horsell, we live in the parish of Horsell, our grand children attended Horsell schools and we attend Horsell Parish Church of St. Marys. Our friends live in Horsell and if we are trasferred to the Sheerwater Ward it will feel that we are being cut off from our neighbouring community.

Please leave the existing Ward Boundry as it is at present and do not move this small community away from Horsell to an area that is totally foreign.

Yours faithfully

William Hogg

Lindsey Hogg
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Jill Holland
E-mail: [removed]
Postcode: [removed]

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

As a resident of Woodlands Ave, West Byfleet I strongly object to the inclusion of this road and Hollies Ave in the proposed Sheerwater Ward. West Byfleet is a clearly defined community both geographically and socially and should remain so for the following reasons. 1. The existing borough boundary is the Old Rive Ditch which runs adjacent to the Basingstoke canal, north of Woodlands and Hollies Ave, this is a well established boundary formed by a geographical barrier. whereas the railway line is no barrier as West Byfleet exists on both side. 2. Services for residents of Woodlands ave and Hollies ave are provided by West Byfleet, not Sheerwater. They are within walking distance - for shopping, health care, education, library etc. Residents in these two roads rarely if ever travel to Sheerwater, so as a community Woodlands and Hollies are West Byfleet and should be represented by the councillor for that ward. 3. As for the numbers, Sheerwater is subject to a proposed large scale development over the next 10 years, in which time the size of the proposed Sheerwater ward will increase significantly - If Woodlands and Hollies are included in this new ward this seems to defeat the idea of evening up ward sizes. A more logical solution would be to include theses avenues in the Byfleet, West Byfleet area which more closely represents the needs of the resident and given the opposition expressed by local residents, would be a more democratic decision.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Patricia Hollinshead &lt;t&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>19 September 2014 21:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Reviews@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Woking council boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I am happy with the new draft election boundaries for Mount Hermon, in woking, thank you for taking my previous comments into account and removing the town centre ward.

Patricia Hollinshead
Dear Sirs,

I am pleased that my concerns regarding the boundaries relating to Goldsworth Park and Knaphill have been addressed in the current plan.

However, I would ask that you reconsider the proposed boundaries in the Pyrford, Sheerwater and Byfleet and West Byfleet area. Can I suggest that the Old Woking Road and Sheerwater Roads form natural boundaries, and that the following changes be considered:

Move the Madiera Road and Brantwood areas from Pyrford to the Byfleet & West Byfleet ward. These areas are clearly linked to West Byfleet Station and the local school.

Move Hollies Avenue and Woodlands Avenue from Sheerwater to Byfleet & West Byfleet ward. This is not so easy to justify as the railway does form a boundary between this area and West Byfleet but the area has absolutely no connection with the large Sheerwater estate - the Sheerwater Road is also a natural boundary which the current plans ignore.

I appreciate that this would increase the variance from average % in Byfleet & West Byfleet but it would probably be no higher than the 7% variance in Knaphill.

I trust that you will give my recommendations serious consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Hopgood
The Review Officer (Woking)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
Lynden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London  EC1M 5LG

Dear Sir/Madam

Current Stage of the Review Consultation on Ward Pattern for Woking Borough Council

We are writing to explain why we are strongly opposed to some aspects of the new ward boundaries and names proposed in July 2014; also to propose some sensible changes.

SUMMARY

West Byfleet is a village with a strong identity and nearly all services and facilities for daily living. To split the village between three new wards is bad for local democracy. We and many people we speak to in Woodlands Avenue, Hollies Avenue and Old Avenue do not want to be in the proposed Sheerwater Ward, which should at least be renamed. The case is made for the three Avenues to be part of the Byfleet and West Byfleet Ward or, failing that, some or all of us be put into the Pyrford Ward, so at least we are part of Three Villages. If numbers of electors are still a problem, then an option is set out for changes to Mount Hermon and Heathlands Wards but we hope these will not be necessary.

REASONS AND DETAILS

Since 1997 we have lived in Woodlands Avenue in the parish of West Byfleet. We have lived in the borough for over 30 years with strong local connections going back another 20 years. West Byfleet is a village with its own strong identity. It has many shops, including Waitrose, over a dozen restaurants and cafes, large health centre, banks, post office, library, offices, mainline railway station with fast service to Waterloo, well attended Anglican and Roman Catholic churches, schools, recreation ground and many other services and amenities.
Our Connection to West Byfleet

We use many of West Byfleet’s facilities in our day-to-day lives. We walk to the village most days via the railway station’s pedestrian underpass used by many hundreds of people each day. Many people with prams, shopping trollies or electric buggies and cyclists use the underpass too. We can walk to most facilities in West Byfleet in ten to fifteen minutes from our home. There is a pleasant alternative walk via Madeira Road. Our polling station is in the hall of the parish church. For people in Woodlands Avenue the railway line is no barrier to our belonging to West Byfleet. It is surely the case that we have a strong connection to West Byfleet. The canal north of Woodlands Avenue would be a suitable ward boundary instead or, more accurately, The Old Rive Ditch which is the borough boundary here.

Our Connection to Sheerwater

We may visit Sheerwater’s few shops once a year, if that. They are 25 minutes or so walk away. Occasionally we go by bus into Woking and the bus goes through Sheerwater, but we have no reason to stop there. Our connection to Sheerwater is almost non-existent compared to our connection to West Byfleet. It is reasonable to suppose that the same is true for most of our neighbours.

Representation

In view of our strong connection, we want to be represented by Borough Councillors who have a major interest in West Byfleet or whose main focus is on Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford, often known as the Three Villages, which often link together in significant ways (eg The Residents Association and Churches Together in Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford).

We are extremely dismayed by the July 2014 proposals, which split West Byfleet between three wards and to find that Woodlands Avenue, Hollies Avenue and Old Avenue are an appendage to a new Sheerwater Ward. As we have almost no connection with Sheerwater, we cannot imagine that Sheerwater councillors would have but little interest in West Byfleet. We want effective representation when issues come up about our village. If the July 2014 proposals go ahead as they stand, we would probably cease to vote in Borough Council elections.

Name of Ward

Sadly the Sheerwater Estate is an area of high deprivation. We would support moves to improve the lives of many of its residents. But by proposing the name Sheerwater as the ward name, as the LGBCE now have done, you are associating those in more prosperous neighbourhoods with an area of high deprivation. If a vote on the name was taken in the new ward amongst those outside the Sheerwater Estate, we are certain the majority of those who care would favour an alternative name. Please would you change the name to
one of more general application. The name Woking Canalside would be a good compromise since people in the various neighbourhoods now within the ward relate to the Basingstoke Canal in their different ways, generally with some affection in our experience.

Changes in Ward Boundaries and Numbers of Electors

Because we and our neighbours have a strong connection to West Byfleet please would you consider changing the proposals in one of the following ways, which we note below, including approximate effect on numbers of electors:

(A) Transferring Woodlands Avenue, Hollies Avenue and Old Avenue into the Byfleet and West Byfleet Ward; involving we estimate a transfer of about 500 electors, changing the Sheerwater Ward 2019 electorate to 7494 and that of Byfleet and West Byfleet to 8473, variances from average changing to -4% and 8.6% respectively; or

(B) if, due to numbers of electors in Byfleet and West Byfleet being judged by you too high, proposal (A) is not acceptable, then put, say, about 360 electors from Woodlands and Hollies Avenues into Byfleet and West Byfleet Ward and about 140 electors from Old Avenue into Pyrford Ward so that variances from average would change to about 7% and 2% respectively. Sheerwater would remain at -4%, but with proposed development over the next ten years or so, we understand that numbers of electors there will increase substantially anyway; or

(C) We strongly hope that one of Proposals (A) or (B) are acceptable to you but, if they are not, then we propose all the above three avenues be transferred into Pyrford Ward. This was proposed in WBC’s Warding Pattern Submission but has now been changed. Such a transfer of (we guess) about 500 electors into Pyrford Ward, would increase numbers of electors to about 8300, the variance becoming 6.4%. If even this is unacceptable to you, then we propose the following changes to the wider Pattern for the Wards detailed under (D) and (E) below:

(D) Add into Mount Hermon Ward some or all of the area southwest of West Byfleet Golf Course bounded by Balmoral Drive, Princess Road and Alpha Road and adjoining sites with, say, about 800 electors. This area has little or no existing connection with Pyrford. It includes the Maybury Estate and is surely part of Maybury which is in the proposed Mount Hermon Ward already. Mount Hermon Ward would increase up to 8654 electors and Pyrford Ward decrease to 7500, the variances becoming 11% and -4% respectively.

(E) As this makes Mount Hermon Ward too large, then all or most of its western appendage bounded by York Road, Guildford Road and Wych Hill Lane could be added to the proposed Heathlands
Ward, which could take more electors anyway. Assuming about 800 electors transferring to Heathlands Ward, Mount Hermon Ward would revert back to 7854 and Heathlands increase to 8155, the variances becoming 1% and 4.6% respectively. This is in line with WBC’s original proposals for the new wards, which had this area in a ‘South Woking’ ward (which has now become Heathlands). Of course, an objection is Mount Hermon Ward would lose Mount Hermon Road. But WBC’s January 2014 Ward Proposals did not contain the Mount Hermon name. There is possibly historic attachment in some quarters to the Mount Hermon name. But it is not a community or a village. There seems little to justify keeping this name. Mount Hermon Ward could be renamed perhaps South Central or, better perhaps, Woking Heathside since it contains Heathside Road (linking to Maybury), Heathside Crescent, Heathside Park Road, Heathside Gardens and Heathfield Road, besides being a name of general application. Even better perhaps would be the name Maybury Heathside Ward reflecting the two main areas of the ward.

We enclose a map marked up as a reference to the several changes we propose.

Please would you give full consideration to these proposals.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Anthony and Myrtle Hopkins

cc  The Rt. Hon. Jonathan Lord MP
     Mr Gary Elson
     Mr Richard Wilson
     Mr Frank Jeffrey
Summary of our recommendations
We have considered all of the submissions we received during the previous phase of consultation.

The Commission has developed proposals for 10 three-member wards based on a combination of submissions received during consultation. In general, we have based our draft recommendations on warding patterns proposed by the Council subject to a number of modifications to provide for improved levels of electoral equality and to reflect the evidence received relating to community identities. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the borough.

You can read the full report on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk.

Overview of draft recommendations for Woking Borough Council
Hopefully not needed but it may make sense to Move as much as necessary of area bounded by York Rd, Wyhill Lane & Guildford Road into Heathlands Ward

Move Woodlands, Hollies & Old Avenues either all into Byfleet & W. Byfleet Ward or part into Byl & W. Byl Ward and part into Pyrford or all into Pyrford

Contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown copyright and database rights 2014

Have your say at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk:
- view the map of our recommendations down to street level,
- draw your own boundaries online,
- zoom into the areas that interest you most,
- find more guidance on how to have your say,
- read the full report of our recommendations,
- send us your views directly.

View this map online and draw your own boundaries:
www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Follow the review on Twitter: @LGBCE

If you are viewing this page online, click on the map to go straight to our interactive consultation area
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: tim hopkins
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I have reviewed the proposal to remove Woodham from the Horsell Ward and include in Sheerwater. Effectively, the identity of Woodham which has been is use for many years. would be lost. The boundary with Sheerwater has been through the Basingstoke Canal providing a natural boundary. There is no relationship between Woodham and Sheerwater and so I reject your proposal. Please re-consider this proposal.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Evelyn Hopkins
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I am Evelyn Hopkins and I have lived for the past 40 years at 1, The Gateway, off Woodham Lane, which has been within the ward of Horsell East and Woodham but is possibly to be included in the Sheerwater ward. I object to the proposed ward change on the grounds that there is no common community identity between Sheerwater and our part of Woodham, separated as we are by the Basingtoke Canal. We do not share transport links across the proposed new ward. Our area of Woodham has its own parish council and residents association, which have nothing to do with Sheerwater. People from our part of Horsell East and Woodham do not shop in Sheerwater. Children from here do not attend Sheerwater schools. Socially and culturally the wards are extremely different. To be subsumed into the Sheerwater ward would mean that the residents of the Woodham Lane end of Horsell East would be outnumbered and ultimately unrepresented within the council. Since being built as a GLC housing estate, Sheerwater has developed a healthy identity of its own. The long estate has one main road feeding from Sheerwater Road into Maybury and this layout has effectively directed its development. The estate has its own schools, shops, recreation grounds, medical and community centres and its own industrial estate. It is sufficient unto itself. It is very different socially and culturally from Horsell East and Woodham and has more in common with Maybury. You have chosen the railway line as the new southern division between Sheerwater and Mount Hermon. To maintain electoral equality in numbers of voters, Sheerwater should extend past the railway to include the Maybury estate. On the north, the boundary between Sheerwater and Horsell East should remain at the Basingtoke Canal. In fact, now that I have done a direct comparison between what we have now and what is proposed; the current ward boundaries reflect the two communities interests and identities in a way that the proposal does not. The proposed boundary change should not be made. On another note, since the Shah Jehan Mosque is very much a community focus for many of the residents of Sheerwater and Maybury, should that not also be included in the Sheerwater ward?

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Paul Hopper
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I wish to express reservations over the proposal to remove the area of Woodham from the Horsell Ward and instead combine it with Sheerwater to for the Sheerwater Road. Woodham and Sheerwater are separated by a physical boundary, namely the Basingstoke Canal, crossed only at the extreme ends of the proposed ward. I cannot see any community of interest at play and would suggest that a ward based on such a lack of interest must be regarded as illogical, whatever other reasons are advanced for the change.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
1st October 2014.

The Review Officer [Woking] LGBCE, 76 – 78 Turnmill Street. London. EC1M 5LG

Dear Sir

Ward Boundary West Byfleet. Surrey.

I have lived in West Byfleet for many years, my present home is within a 2 minutes’ walk into the centre of our village i.e. Barclay Bank corner. But I now find myself in a proposed Pyrford Ward!

Pyrford ward is mainly a rural community with just 8 shops; a school and church were as West Byfleet is a busy commercial centre, two very different communities. For voting I would have to go by car into Pyrford were as I can easily walk into West Byfleet.

You talk of keeping a Community Identity but I have no identity with Pyrford. All my shopping, banking, post office, medical services, leisure facilities, railway station are all with in West Byfleet, none of these facilities are in Pyrford village.

I also lived in Hollies Avenue for 15 years, again an easy walk into West Byfleet village with all its amenities and an area that is very much part of the West Byfleet community and has been since the 1930s when most of the houses in Hollies, Woodlands Avenue were built many of the house in Old Avenue are older. It is breaking up a community by taking these roads into another ward. If you set standards by which the public must adhere to, the Commission should do the same.

I strongly object to West Byfleet been split into two wards, but to divide it further into three will not produce effective local government and our community identity with a possible nine councillors who will have other centres to look after, will be lost.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Mrs Penny Hoskyn.
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Robin Hoyle
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: Horsell Residents Association

Comment text:

From Robin Hoyle, Chair - Horsell Residents Association. On behalf of the committee of Horsell Residents Association I wish to strongly object to the proposal to exclude The Broomhalls, The Grove, Ferndale Road, Kingswood Court and parts of Brewery Road and Chobham Road and Trinity Methodist Church from the proposed new local ward of Horsell. The areas referenced currently lie within the existing boundaries of the local wards of Horsell West and Horsell East and Woodham and lie north of the Basingstoke Canal that forms the natural southern boundary of the village of Horsell. Horsell Village is an entity with a strong identity and a cohesive and active community. There are many initiatives and community events and activities that are curated by the many locally active residents of Horsell village. The wide ranging local events include a summer show that has been running for 150 years, christmas fair in the High Street, Garden Safari with over 30 Horsell gardens across the village and Scout and Guide May Fair.

Residents from all areas of Horsell take part in these events. Local community volunteer organisations and initiatives including Horsell Care and Horsell Snow Angels draw upon residents in all parts of Horsell village to support and care for less able residents in the village. Horsell Snow Angels for example has over 120 registered volunteers. The strong village core with its active High Street, fine infant, junior and high schools and churches is enjoyed by all residents in Horsell including those in the area identified for exclusion. Many residents in the areas identified to be excluded from the new local ward of Horsell enjoy the events and volunteer in the community. Losing these areas would negatively impact on Horsell as a whole and would affect the entity, identity and community of Horsell. Therefore I register the objection to the exclusion of the The Broomhalls, The Grove, Ferndale Road, Kingswood Court and parts of Brewery Road and Chobham Road from the proposed new local ward of Horsell. Yours, Robin Hoyle -Chair, Horsell Residents Association

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Adrian Hughes
E-mail: 
Postcode: 

Organisation Name: 

Comment text:

I would like to comment on the proposed boundary change from West Byfleet to Sheerwater which affects my household at [redacted]. On the attached map, I have shown the proximity of our house to West Byfleet town centre, yet we are being proposed to move into the Sheerwater ward whose centre is some way away. The key point for me is that our community is clearly West Byfleet, my children go to West Byfleet School, we use West Byfleet library and West Byfleet park and amenities, therefore it seems logical that we should have a vote that affects our services. Recently there are large development proposals for West Byfleet which affect our lives, yet the housing proposals for Sheerwater which I know are controversial have no effect on us and therefore it seems that the line is slightly too close to west byfleet in trying to balance up numbers for these wards.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Dear Sirs,

I would like to object to the proposed boundary changes.

Woodham ward has little similarity to Sheerwater with different housing, different crime rate, and different feeling of community. Sheerwater is highly industrialised with high density housing. Woodham has no industry and has mainly large houses, many of which are on private roads. The two areas are cut off from each other by the Basingstoke Canal and are as different as chalk and cheese.

There is no sense at all in joining these two wards together and I ask you to reconsider.

John Humphreys,
Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to register my concerns about the planned changes to the Horsell West boundaries that are due to take place in the near future. I have particular concerns about the Broomhalls and Brewery Road area, which is due to be moved from Horsell West to the Sheerwater boundary. As a resident of this area for the last 5 years, I have no connections at all to Sheerwater, but strong social and cultural ties to Horsell, as I am sure many in this area have. There is a strong community link between the Broomhalls area and Horsell, and virtually no links between this area and Sheerwater. Indeed, there are stronger links between Broomhalls and Woking town centre than this proposed adjustment. Such a shift in the boundaries would be detrimental to local life.

As a historian, I find it particularly concerning that a decision to adjust these boundaries may not take these cultural and social ties into consideration. There are many families in this area that have had strong connections to Horsell for many generations; something that is would be a great shame to remove.

I request that you take these issues into consideration when making this decision, and I am sure that you will receive many other comments along these lines from other residents in this area.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Mark Hurst
Associate Lecturer in History
School of History, Rutherford College
Boundary changes affecting Horsell

Dear Sir,

I refer to my letter of 1st August, in which I stated my objections to the Boundary Commission’s proposal to make an area of present Horsell by the Chobham Road bridge over the Basingstoke Canal, which is where I live, part of the ward of Sheerwater.

Since then, I have received a document issued by you dated July 2014 entitled “draft Recommendations”. Amongst other things, this states that:

a) The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Woking which delivers: “Community Identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities”.

b) “A good pattern of wards should”, amongst other things: “Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links” and “be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries”.

c) Community Identity: Transport Links, Community Groups (parish council and residents association), Facilities, Interests and Identifiable boundaries, with natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals”.

Applying your criteria, the bit of Horsell which you are proposing to make part of Sheerwater clearly should remain part of the proposed Horsell ward, and, if you were proceed with your proposal concerning this “bit” of Horsell, you would not be following the criteria you have laid down. You would just be laying down a purely arbitrary boundary, which has no justification or sense, which I do not believe is the mission of the Boundary Commission or is correct behaviour.

It is moreover very odd that, having stressed the importance of: “strong, easily identifiable boundaries” and “natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries”, you then ignore the present very evident and “strong” southern boundary (namely the canal) of the area you are sticking into Sheerwater and draw a new boundary on the north bank in a zig zag and arbitrary manner, so that this area becomes part of Sheerwater.

Your document also states that: “In general we have based our draft recommendations ….. to reflect the evidence received relating to community identities”. I do not know whose evidence you obtained, but I find it hard to believe that anyone in Horsell would have told you that there were any community identity/links between Horsell, or any parts of it, and Sheerwater. I bet the people of Sheerwater would feel the same about Horsell.

Your own criteria clearly indicate that this area of Horsell should remain part of Horsell; your proposal should thus be amended accordingly.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]

Peter Hadfield

6th August 2014