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Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents’ Association

c/o Byfleet Village Hall, 54 High Road, Byfleet, KT14 7QL

The Review Officer (Woking)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE),
Layden House,
76-86 Turnmill Street,
London,
EC1M 5LG

Date: 29 March 2014

Woking Borough Council - Consultation on Warding Arrangements

Dear sir/madam,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents’ Association. We are an active community organisation that represents the interests of all those who live and work in these three villages. Our association has been in existence for over 80 years and currently has 2500+ members drawn from both residents and local businesses.

Each of our villages has a strong and distinct historical character, with a growing sense of community spirit most recently demonstrated by the formation of individual Neighbourhood Forums. The Residents’ Association has actively encouraged this initiative and believes that it will further strengthen the voice of local people in this area of Woking Borough.

Currently, the villages enjoy the practical benefits of each having their own ward – an arrangement that closely reflects the ‘natural extent’ of each village. This ensures that our elected councillors each have a clear village focus and can better serve the interests of voters in these wards. Our new neighbourhood forum areas have largely adopted the same boundaries as they too believe that this also provides the best definition of community interests and identity.

We believe that wherever possible a close alignment of neighbourhood and ward areas will make for more efficient working between our three communities, councillors and local businesses. As such we would hope that any adjustments to ward boundaries are kept to a minimum so that we can preserve these relationships into the future.

We fully recognise the importance of having a reasonable balance of electors per councillor but we do not believe that this should be at the expense of community interests. Your own guidelines provide for electorate variations across wards and we believe that this will be an important factor when considering this eastern area of the borough.

We understand that the decision has already been taken to reduce the number of councillors in Woking Borough Council (WBC) from 36 to 30. This is a significant change and is likely to have a substantial effect on the governance of the borough. It would therefore seem important to minimise the resulting ward boundary changes and avoid any fragmentation of existing communities - if at all possible.
A number of our members provided feedback to the consultation exercise undertaken by WBC over the last few months. This has highlighted the strength of feeling that local residents have on this issue.

WBC have done a very efficient job in redrawing the ward boundaries to minimise the variance in voting numbers across the borough; however their proposal to the LGBCE seems more concerned with equalising the vote between wards rather than avoiding disruption to existing communities. We believe that if ward variances had been relaxed more in their thinking, in line with your own guidelines, then greater flexibility would have been possible when deciding on any changes to Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford wards.

The final WBC recommendations have a particularly harmful effect on West Byfleet, which is officially designated by WBC as the only “District Centre” in Woking. Effectively the West Byfleet centre and its surrounding community identity no longer forms the nucleus of a ward area. We believe that this will have a detrimental effect on the long term governance of West Byfleet and its relationship with our other two villages, Byfleet and Pyrford. Under the WBC proposals, West Byfleet centre would be represented by councillors from the completely different and separate community in Byfleet (they are physically separated by the Wey Navigation and the M25!). Many current West Byfleet residents would have no influence even though they are the regular users of the centre while Byfleet residents have their own centre over a mile away with its own shops, restaurants, schools, churches, library, village hall, park, sports fields and railway station.

So in summary, we recognise that ward reviews and adjustments are necessary from time to time, but that our three distinct communities covered by the existing ward pattern should be preserved to the greatest extent possible. Any changes should ensure that whole communities are kept together and not split as is the case with the proposals submitted by WBC.

We trust that our views will be taken into consideration and look forward to participating in the LGBCE public consultation exercise planned for the summer. Should you require clarification on any of the points made above then please do get in contact.

Yours Sincerely,

[Signature]

Godfrey Chapples
Chairman
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: PHILIP STUBBS

Organisation Name: KNAPHILL RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

---

Map Features:

Comment text:

Dear Sir, In relation to the review of boundaries in the borough of Woking I wish to comment on the specific Ward of Knaphill. The Knaphill Residents' Association has been working with Woking Borough Council as they developed their preferred option and we fully support the Council’s proposed boundaries as it affects Knaphill. In resetting the boundaries it is important that communities are kept intact. This not only means the houses but also the open spaces that go to strengthen a community. The above is why it is important to have the southern boundary the Basingstoke Canal. I know this open space is named Brookwood Country Park but it is named after the hospital that stood on the site and this has always been Knaphill. Many of the boundaries for Knaphill are also Borough boundaries with Surrey Heath. It was important to include the houses to the west of the A322. The final estimated electorate is higher than the average but we believe that this is manageable. We believe that given the objective of achieving Wards of equivalent size the proposals for Knaphill as agreed by Woking Borough Council are probably the best to achieve this objective whilst retaining the community known as Knaphill.
**Woking District**

**Personal Details:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ian Whittle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Name</td>
<td>Prford Neighbourhood Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment text:**

Although I appreciate why there has been an emphasis on population numbers when creating the proposed ward boundaries, I wish to express my dismay at the way the proposals will undermine the strong community spirit and historic identity of the Pyford district. The Commission indicates that physical barriers such as roads, canals and railways should be used where possible to create ward boundaries. In the case of The Heath proposal, this has not been adhered to. There is a proposed split between two council wards – particularly the northern boundary where the railway line could be used as far east as Shearwater Road. The inclusion of a part of Maybury around East Hill and the Princess Estate is inappropriate. I do hope the Council will take on board the objections and aspirations of the residents and business community of the various districts with respect to this matter. The Commission has emphasised the need to maintain communities. Pyford should be maintained together as a single community within one ward if natural justice is addressed in accordance with the guidelines of the Commission. The Pyford Neighbourhood Forum is an existing entity whether or not it is yet to be fully recognised by the council. Consultations with the forum should be undertaken as a priority in settling any disputes over the ward boundaries.
Submission to the Boundary Commission – Pyrford Ward

The Woking Borough Council’s most recent revision to the Pyrford ward boundary has met most but not all the requirements that will satisfy the aspirations of the Pyrford Community. However, further thought should be given to the proposed south-western boundary with a view to following the eastern boundary of the Hoebridge Golf Course as per the Pyrford Neighbourhood Boundary. The tiny number of voters that would accrue to the Pyrford ward, should this be undertaken, would have no significant effect on the required number covered by the nominated councillors. The few residents that would be embraced by the ward consider themselves a part of the Pyrford neighbourhood. To maintain the cohesiveness of the community they should be included within the Pyrford ward.

I hope you will take this point into consideration when the matter comes under further review this coming week.

Yours faithfully

Ian Whittle
Vice-chairman – Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum
From: Martin Doyle
Sent: 01 April 2014 15:11
To: Reviews@
Subject: Woking Borough Ward Boundaries

I am writing to inform you of my general satisfaction at the Woking Borough Council ward proposal, which recognises that the community of Pyrford should not be divided between two council wards. However, I am mystified as to why the south-western boundary does not follow that of the recently designated Pyrford Neighbourhood Area. Boundary Commission guidelines require that ward boundary lines should reflect the identities and interests of local communities and in particular:

(i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
(ii) the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties.

You will note from the partial map reproduced below that the council has chosen an arbitrary 45° line (shown in brown on the map) running SE from Old Woking Road to the borough boundary line. Despite the fact that this area is very sparsely populated, so that it will affect very few voters, I question the justification for this arbitrary straight line, versus the PNF boundary which basically follows the natural boundary of the Hoebridge Golf Course.
I would suggest a slight movement of the western boundary to that used for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Area line (shown in red on the map). This means that the new Pyrford Ward would incorporate the entirety of Pyrford Common, The Rough and Shey Copse.

If this minor alteration were to be made, I would be fully in favour of the Woking Borough Council boundary proposals.

sincerely,

Martin Doyle

Chairman of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum
A332 Bagshot Road and Herm tage Road is considered locally by residents to be in Knaphill
Dear Sir /Madam,

Please see the attached letter which has been sent to you by the Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association.

I am writing to you on behalf of the newly formed West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum.

The Forum would like you to know that we endorse everything that has been said in this letter.

We are very disappointed that Woking BC have seen fit to divide our village between two wards, that of Pyrford and Byfleet. We do not feel this follows the criteria as set down by your commission that communities should be kept together.

Yours faithfully,

Penny Hoskyn
Joint Chair West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum
Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents’ Association

c/o Byfleet Village Hall, 54 High Road, Byfleet, KT14 7QL

The Review Officer (Woking)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE),
Layden House,
76-86 Turnmill Street,
London,
EC1M 5LG

Woking Borough Council - Consultation on Warding Arrangements

Date: 29 March 2014

Dear sir/madam,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents’ Association. We are an active community organisation that represents the interests of all those who live and work in these three villages. Our association has been in existence for over 80 years and currently has 2500+ members drawn from both residents and local businesses.

Each of our villages has a strong and distinct historical character, with a growing sense of community spirit most recently demonstrated by the formation of individual Neighbourhood Forums. The Residents’ Association has actively encouraged this initiative and believes that it will further strengthen the voice of local people in this area of Woking Borough.

Currently, the villages enjoy the practical benefits of each having their own ward – an arrangement that closely reflects the ‘natural extent’ of each village. This ensures that our elected councillors each have a clear village focus and can better serve the interests of voters in these wards. Our new neighbourhood forum areas have largely adopted the same boundaries as they too believe that this also provides the best definition of community interests and identity.

We believe that wherever possible a close alignment of neighbourhood and ward areas will make for more efficient working between our three communities, councillors and local businesses. As such we would hope that any adjustments to ward boundaries are kept to a minimum so that we can preserve these relationships into the future.

We fully recognise the importance of having a reasonable balance of electors per councillor but we do not believe that this should be at the expense of community interests. Your own guidelines provide for electorate variations across wards and we believe that this will be an important factor when considering this eastern area of the borough.

We understand that the decision has already been taken to reduce the number of councillors in Woking Borough Council (WBC) from 36 to 30. This is a significant change and is likely to have a substantial effect on the governance of the borough. It would therefore seem important to minimise the resulting ward boundary changes and avoid any fragmentation of existing communities - if at all possible.
A number of our members provided feedback to the consultation exercise undertaken by WBC over the last few months. This has highlighted the strength of feeling that local residents have on this issue.

WBC have done a very efficient job in redrawing the ward boundaries to minimise the variance in voting numbers across the borough, however their proposal to the LGBCE seems more concerned with equalising the vote between wards rather than avoiding disruption to existing communities. We believe that if ward variances had been relaxed more in their thinking, in line with your own guidelines, then greater flexibility would have been possible when deciding on any changes to Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford wards.

The final WBC recommendations have a particularly harmful effect on West Byfleet, which is officially designated by WBC as the only "District Centre" in Woking. Effectively the West Byfleet centre and its surrounding community identity no longer forms the nucleus of a ward area. We believe that this will have a detrimental effect on the long term governance of West Byfleet and its relationship with our other two villages, Byfleet and Pyrford. Under the WBC proposals, West Byfleet centre would be represented by councillors from the completely different and separate community in Byfleet (they are physically separated by the Wey Navigation and the M25!). Many current West Byfleet residents would have no influence even though they are the regular users of the centre while Byfleet residents have their own centre over a mile away with its own shops, restaurants, schools, churches, library, village hall, park, sports fields and railway station.

So in summary, we recognise that ward reviews and adjustments are necessary from time to time, but that our three distinct communities covered by the existing ward pattern should be preserved to the greatest extent possible. Any changes should ensure that whole communities are kept together and not split as is the case with the proposals submitted by WBC.

We trust that our views will be taken into consideration and look forward to participating in the LGBCE public consultation exercise planned for the summer. Should you require clarification on any of the points made above then please do get in contact.

Yours Sincerely,

Godfrey Chapples
Chairman
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Bill Corney

Organisation Name: Westfield Common Residents Association

This area constitutes Westfield Common, a registered common and a clear physical landscape feature. Under the new warding arrangement this community is arbitrarily divided between two different wards.

Suggested alternative warding boundaries for the new ward with the proposed name of How Valley that preserves the cohesion of existing communities and is made up of linear settlement of Westfield, Kingfield & Old Woking aka Historical Royal Woking.
Submission to Local Government Boundary Commission – Consultation on warding arrangements, Woking Borough Council FER

1. Woking Constituency Labour Party (“WCLP”) welcomes the opportunity to make submissions on the warding arrangements for the electoral review currently underway

2. WCLP has had the benefit of considering the Council’s warding proposal, presented to the meeting of its Executive on 20 March 2014, and to the full council meeting on 27 March 2014.

3. WCLP agrees that the revised proposals recommended by the Executive on 20 March represents a significant improvement on the proposals originally consulted upon, and notes in particular the many comments from residents of West Byfleet and Pyrford with regard to the desirability of drawing wards that encompass discrete communities with historic, geographic and topographic identities. WCLP considers that the proposed “Woodlands” and “The Heath” wards in the original proposal for consultation sought to unify sections of existing communities that lacked a common interest and internal connectivity, in the name of trying to achieve ward sizes as close to the average figure as possible. WCLP agrees that as important as it is to devise warding proposals where each ward has the same number of electors, this aim should not be achieved at the expense of dividing established communities with arbitrary boundaries.

4. As such, WCLP endorses the drawing of boundaries that as far as possible seek to maintain a unity of representation for the Borough’s established communities, and believes that the Council’s new proposal goes some way to achieving that aim.

5. Nonetheless, WCLP considers that there are a number of minor adjustments to the Council’s own submission that could be made, and which, if accepted, would achieve more evenly sized wards and wards which encompassed communities of substantial common interest and identity.

Byfleet and West Byfleet; Pyrford
6. WCLP agrees with the Council’s proposed Byfleet and West Byfleet ward. Both communities have a strong individual identity and village centre, but the exercise of drawing boundaries constrained by the need to achieve 10 electoral wards of equal size is inevitably going to pose a challenge when approaching the community around West Byfleet, given its geographical position in the borough and the position of Byfleet at the extreme east end of the borough.

7. West Byfleet does nonetheless share a geographic, topographical, suburban/semi-rural identity with neighbouring Pyrford, and there are extensive transport links between the two communities. As such it seems right that those parts of West Byfleet that cannot be enclosed in a ward centred on Byfleet and the east of West Byfleet village should be brought in to the proposed Pyrford ward. WCLP also endorses the principle of the proposed Pyrford ward, which encompasses the historic, rural village of Pyrford, and the more suburban part of the village around Ridgway and along the Old Woking Road, together with those parts of West Byfleet to the west of the village centre that have a high level of connectivity and shared identity with Pyrford.

8. WCLP does not however agree with the proposed inclusion of the Maybury Estate in the Council’s proposed Pyrford ward, for the reasons set out further below (see under Woking Central).

Horsell

9. WCLP agrees with the Council’s proposed Horsell ward. The Horsell community has a strong individual identity and busy commercial centre. There is a strong civic identity also with an active resident’s association. The inclusion of the community south of Woodham Lane and at Anthonys in the proposed ward is also endorsed. While the Woodham Lane area appears distinct from the community focussed on Horsell, the two communities share a suburban/semi-rural outlook and identity. The Woodham Lane is also currently linked to the east of Horsell in the current Horsell East and Woodham borough ward, and in the Woking North county council division. The proposed boundary also follows the boundaries of the neighbouring parishes of St Peter’s, Horsell and All Saint’s, Woodham.

Goldsworth Park

10. WCLP agrees with the Council’s proposed Goldsworth Park ward. The community in Goldsworth Park has a strong individual identity and busy commercial centre. There is a strong civic identity also with an active residents association. The area encompassed by the proposed ward shares the same suburban identity, having been developed at roughly the same time in the 1970s and 1980s.

Knaphill

11. WCLP agrees with the principle of a ward centred on the historic village of Knaphill, which has a strong identity and busy commercial centre. It has a
strong civic identity with an active residents association. However, the area has seen significant growth and development in recent years, particularly with the development of the former Brookwood hospital site. There is a geographical and topographical diversity in the ward, which comprises areas of older, denser housing, suburban areas and areas with a more semi-rural feel and outlook.

12. WCLP notes that the proposed Heathlands ward, which borders the proposed Knaphill ward, at present has fewer electors than the average, whereas the proposed Knaphill ward has more electors than the average. One solution to create a more even distribution of electors would be to include the residential area to the west of the A322 (around Oak Tree Road) currently in the proposed Knaphill ward in the proposed Heathlands ward. This area, while suburban in character and close in proximity to the Knaphill centre of population, is separated from Knaphill by a busy “A” road and arguably has a semi-rural identity (being on the edge of the main population centre, close to Brookwood village centre and Smart’s Heath), that means it has much in common with the community encompassed by the proposed Heathlands ward. It has good links to the other population centres in the proposed ward, the villages of Brookwood, Mayford and Sutton Green, via the A322 and the roads linking the A322 and the A320 Guildford Road). Further, the incorporation of the large proposed development site to the west of this area means that any housing growth here can be more comfortably incorporated into the relatively smaller (in terms of elector numbers) Heathlands ward, which would otherwise result in Knaphill gaining a significant number of new electors and thus creating a disparity with other wards.

Heathlands

13. WCLP endorses the approach taken by the Council in creating a ward encompassing the more rural communities to south and west of the borough. The inclusion of Hook Heath is also endorsed, as while that community has a suburban character and is close in proximity to the centre of the urban area of Woking, it has a distinct semi-rural character also and has many connections to, and much in common with, the more rural area that surrounds it. The area is also enclosed by a significant boundary, namely the railway lines to Guildford/Portsmouth and Basingstoke, which accentuate its separation from the neighbouring urban/suburban communities in St John’s and central Woking.

14. WCLP also agrees that it makes sense to include in the ward the residential areas along the Egley Road, to the south of the Wych Hill roundabout. These have a suburban/semi-rural identity and aspect and are close in proximity to neighbouring Mayford.

15. More problematic is the drawing of the boundary to the north east of the proposed ward, and the inclusion of the Barnsbury estate. The inclusion of the Barnsbury estate in the proposed Heathlands ward is anomalous. The estate was developed by the local authority in the mid 1900s and has a common identity of its own that is quite distinct from the neighbouring residential areas
to the west, being of a relatively higher density. It also faces in on itself, with only two access roads linking it to Egley Road.

16. At present, Barnsbury estate forms part of the existing Kingfield and Westfield ward (which is broadly encompassed in the proposed Hoe Valley ward). WCLP considers that it makes more sense for the Barnsbury estate to be added to the proposed Hoe Valley ward. While there is no direct road link within the proposed ward form Barnsbury estate to Kingfield or Westfield, and the Hoe stream represents a natural barrier, there is a footpath link, and the area is very close in proximity to neighbouring Westfield. The Hoe stream valley is a natural link for all the communities that are encompassed by the proposed Hoe valley ward, and as such this natural feature arguably unifies, rather than separates, these communities. The Barnsbury estate is already linked to the Kingfield and Westfield communities as a result of being in the same borough council ward at present, so its inclusion in the proposed Hoe Valley would represent a degree of continuity.

17. WCLP also considers that the inclusion in the proposed Heathlands ward of the “triangle” formed by the north side of Wych Hill Lane, east side of Guildford road and the rear boundaries of the properties on the west side of Claremont Avenue, is problematic. It is apparent that this area has been included in the proposed Heathlands ward to “make up numbers” and because the proposed Mount Hermon ward (into which this area would be more sensibly incorporated) is very close to the required average. This “triangle” plainly has a more common identity with the surrounding Mount Hermon area, being of a more suburban character very close to the town centre. Further, Salisbury Road, a cul-de-sac, has no connectivity to Heathlands except by its junction with Guildford Road, which itself forms a boundary with the proposed Mount Herman ward. The area is much better connected, and more closely identified with Mount Hermon. WCLP proposes redrawing the boundary to include this “triangle” in the proposed Mount Hermon ward. Being a relatively small area, taken on its own this change this is likely to have a negligible impact on the number of voters in the proposed Mount Hermon ward, which is at present 0.4% under the average number of electors.

18. When these changes are considered together with WCLP’s proposal to incorporate the residential area to the west of the A322 (around Oak Tree Road), currently in the proposed Knaphill ward, into Heathlands ward, then the removal of Barnsbury estate and the Salisbury Road “triangle” are likely to have a neutral (if not positive effect overall) impact on the distribution of electors across the wards in this part of the borough.

**Hoe Valley, Mount Hermon**

19. WCLP endorses the principle of a ward centred on the communities of Kingfield, Westfield and Old Woking. These are communities with their own distinct identity but unified by good transport links and close connections, proximity, geography and their suburban topography. Further, the proposal essentially represents the unification of the existing Old Woking borough
council ward with most of the existing Kingfield and Westfield borough council ward; both wards form part of the Woking South county council division. As such, their inclusion in a single borough council ward would represent a degree of consistency and continuity.

20. WCLP also endorses the principle of a ward in the centre of the borough, centred on the area to the south of the railway line, the area known as Mount Hermon, and the Maybury area around Maybury Hill. While these areas may lack a certain identity of their own, owing to their proximity to the commercial centre of Woking, they do share a suburban character and a high level of connectivity with one another. The proposed ward also incorporates most of the existing borough council wards of Mount Hermon East and Mount Hermon West, so uniting these areas in a single borough council ward would represent a degree of consistency and continuity.

21. However, as set out above, WCLP proposes that the Barnsbury estate be incorporate into the proposed Hoe Valley ward. It also proposes that the northern boundary of the proposed Hoe Valley ward be redrawn so that the area north and west of the Hoe stream is incorporated into the proposed Mount Hermon Ward. The area around Constitution Hill and Claremont Avenue is of a markedly different character than nearby Kingfield, being comprised of much higher density development characteristic of a close to the town centre location, whereas Kingfield is of a much more suburban character with significant amounts of open space. The Hoe stream also represents a natural feature along which to draw a sensible boundary.

22. These changes are likely to have a relatively neutral impact on the numbers of electors in the proposed Hoe Valley, if taken together with the incorporation of the Barnsbury estate. There will inevitably be an increase in the number of electors in the proposed Mount Hermon ward, taken together with the proposed inclusion of the Salisbury Road “triangle” as proposed at paragraph 17 above. However, as stated above, the proposed Mount Hermon ward has slightly fewer electors than the average, and could absorb the relatively small number of electors without a disproportionate impact on the distribution of electors across the borough.

St John’s, Woking Central

23. WCLP recognises that the centre of Woking and the “corridor” bounded by the Basingstoke Canal to the north and railway line to the south represents a particular challenge. It is accepted that these two barriers form natural boundaries, and separate communities which in all other respects might share similar identities and characteristics.

24. In broad terms WCLP endorses the Council’s approach in creating two wards in this central “corridor”. The proposed St John’s ward has the advantage on being mainly centred on the historic village of St John’s, with the nearby area west of Amstel Way and the Hermitage Woods estate with which it is closely linked. This area has a strong community and civic identity and is well interconnected.
25. The inclusion of the area along the Goldsworth Road and Kingsway in the proposed ward is more problematic. This area is very close to the town centre and parts of it have a very high density, urban character, whereas other parts have a slightly more suburban character that is itself distinct from the town centre and the nearby Goldsworth Park and St John’s areas. Having said that, the Goldsworth Road/St John’s Road and the Basingstoke canal path are busy transport arteries that represent a meaningful link to the area centred on St John’s.

26. In the proposed Woking Central ward, WCLP agrees that the Council’s proposal to link the Sheerwater estate to nearby Maybury and the town centre is the best solution. The original proposal for the “Woodlands” ward which incorporated Sheerwater and parts of Woodham, West Byfleet and Pyrford was not a proposal WCLP would have been able to endorse. Sheerwater is linked to the Walton Road area of Maybury via Albert Drive and the new road link to Monument Road, and it has existing and historic civic associations with Maybury and at present forms part of the existing Maybury and Sheerwater borough council ward. As such, uniting these areas in a single borough council ward would represent a degree of consistency and continuity.

27. WCLP also agrees that in terms of proximity, transport links and shared characteristics, the Walton Road area of Maybury has strong associations with the commercial centre of town. Walton Road/Boundary Road/Monument Road is itself home to a commercial centre, with shops and light industry. Both areas have high density housing and a distinctly urban character.

28. WCLP also acknowledges that it is justified to have a smaller ward centred on the centre of Woking, in terms of electoral numbers, owing to projected housing growth in the town centre area.

29. Nonetheless, for reasons relating to close cultural, community and other links, and owing to the anomaly of including the Maybury estate in a ward centred on the village of Pyrford (as described above), WCLP supports the inclusion of the Maybury estate in the proposed Woking Central ward, with a readjustment of the western boundary to add an additional area of the town centre to the proposed St John’s ward and a readjustment of the boundary between the proposed Mount Hermon and Pyrford wards.

30. The Maybury estate, and the area east of College Road/Maybury Hill, is very self-contained and looks in on itself. It has few links to neighbouring areas. It turns its back to the otherwise proximate residential area to the north of Old Woking Road, and as such has no sense of belonging to the Pyrford area. As such its inclusion in a ward centred on Pyrford is nonsensical.

31. While the Maybury estate is relatively well connected to East Hill/College Road and the area comprising the proposed Mount Hermon ward, the Maybury estate has particular cultural and socioeconomic characteristics that have much more in common with the Sheerwater estate and Walton Road area of Maybury. The existing borough council ward of Maybury and
Sheerwater has a significant Pakistani community (34.3% of the ward’s population compared to just under 6% in the borough as a whole), centred on the community around Walton Road and the Maybury Estate. The ward is also home to other BAME communities, in greater proportions than the borough as a whole.

32. There exist in the community centred on Maybury extensive family connections, and cultural and religious associations. There is a strong argument therefore that the interests of this community are best represented by unifying the geographical focal point of the community in a single council ward.

33. The Maybury and Sheerwater communities also have common interests when considering their socioeconomic profiles. The area has higher than average levels of deprivation as compared to borough and the county, and have a similar topography. The communities therefore have shared interests around economic development, regeneration, access to housing and housing conditions, which can best be represented (and their profile raised within the political structures of the council) by uniting these areas of interest within a single council ward.

34. The centre of Woking has a significant focal point for the Muslim community, in the form of the Shah Jahan mosque in Oriental Road. This site, and the adjacent Lion Retail Park, are sited in the proposed Mount Hermon ward. The site does however share characteristics with the retail parks in the centre of Woking and Sheerwater. In addition to the inclusion of the Maybury Estate in the proposed Woking Central ward, WCLP also proposes the redrawing of the northern Mount Hermon proposed boundary to include the Shah Jahan mosque and Lion retail park in Woking Central, to better integrate this significant historic, religious and cultural landmark into the community.

35. WCLP agrees that while the Mayhurst Avenue/Crescent area is enveloped by the Maybury estate on three sides, this area has no connectivity to the estate and is more sensibly included in the proposed Mount Hermon ward (the area forms part of the existing Mount Hermon East ward). WCLP would also redraw the boundary to the east of Mayhurst Avenue/Crescent between the proposed Mount Hermon and Pyrford wards so that the properties on East Hill are incorporated into Mount Hermon ward, and not Pyrford.

36. While this proposal represents a potentially radical change to the Council’s proposal for the Woking Central ward, WCLP would endorse retaining the name “Woking Central” for this ward. While the proposed ward is very similar to the existing Maybury and Sheerwater, it does encompass a large area of the town centre that cannot be said to be in Maybury. A large area of the proposed Mount Hermon ward can also lay claim to being in Maybury. The name Woking Central better describes a ward that encompasses the main commercial and shopping centre of the town.

37. WCLP would however support a change of to the name of the proposed St John’s ward. Even if the proposed ward is not extended to Victoria Way, as
we propose, the area around Goldsworth Road and Kingsway cannot be said to share a name or identity with the historic village of St John’s to the west of the proposed ward. The historic name “Goldsworth” lends its name to the main road passing through the area, and to the primary school. We would support either a name that represented all the communities in the area, such as “Goldsworth and St John’s”, or a neutral name that did not attach to a specific place, such as “Canalside”. 