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Surnames M - R
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you as the Boundary Commission to express general satisfaction at the WBC ward proposal, which recognises that the community of Pyrford should not be divided between two council wards.

However, we are mystified as to why the south-western boundary does not follow that of the recently designated Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum (PNF) 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
(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 would like to question the basis for this arbitrary straight line, versus the PNF boundary which basically follows the boundary of the Hoebridge Golf Course.
I look forward to your comments

Yours faithfully

Ian Makowski
Woking District

**Personal Details:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Gerard &amp; Margaret Mandeville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Name:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment text:**

We do not agree with the new proposals to split Pyrfold as proposed. To join us with Sheenwater seem ridiculous as it is the other side of the railway and not close to our area like the part of Pyrfold you are proposing to hive off. Also the village shops are part of the local community as is the village hall. Also what about the local medical centre, will that all change later? Splitting the communities is a backward step and should be taken into consideration!!
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Gerard & Margaret Mandeville

Organisation Name: N/A

Map Features:

Comment text:
This is a better idea that will leave the Pyrford community intact. We would only question the 45 degree brown line on the map.
Dear Sirs

I wish to comment on the draft proposals sent to you by Woking Borough Council for changes to its warding pattern.

I have lived in West Byfleet for 28 years and find it to be a thriving centre with its own strong identity. I am, therefore, most unhappy that the proposals put forward by Woking Borough Council would cut right through the heart of our community and would split the village between two wards. One of Woking BC's key considerations for drawing up its draft warding patterns was that "There remains a sense of community within each ward, and local centres are not divided between two or more wards". Why has this consideration been totally disregarded in the case of West Byfleet?

In Woking BC's Core Strategy it is stated that "West Byfleet is the second largest centre in the Borough, and the only District Centre", designated as such "due to its size, range of uses and accessibility". A consequence of the proposed new wards means that this district centre would not form the focus of any ward, since it would be split in two. The Core Strategy also comments that "West Byfleet has a community feel". The proposed changes would put a large number of residents of West Byfleet into a different ward from the shops, businesses, churches, schools, library, health centre, railway station and recreation areas they use and which form the heart of their village, thus removing the community cohesion altogether.

The Boundary Commission's own advice document "How to propose a pattern of wards or divisions", clearly states that "a good pattern of wards should reflect community interests and identities". This would certainly not be the case if West Byfleet is divided between two wards, neither of which can reflect the community identity of this village.

A further piece of advice from the Boundary Commission is that a "good" ward "should be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries". This certainly does not apply to the present
proposal from Woking BC. The boundary dividing the village is totally unnatural and confusing, it splits roads in two and runs across people's back gardens.

In fact, the strongest, most easily identifiable boundary within these proposed wards is formed by the Wey Navigation Canal and the M25 motorway, both of which divide West Byfleet from Byfleet. This very substantial divisive boundary has been totally ignored within the present proposals.

The rationale given by Woking BC for including part of West Byfleet with Byfleet is simply "in order to ensure that Byfleet has an adequate number of electors". There is total disregard for the interests and community identity of West Byfleet in this statement. The proposed Pyrford ward would contain "the balance of West Byfleet not included in Byfleets". Once again, no consideration of West Byfleet's own needs.

In conclusion, I would ask that the Boundary Commission gives West Byfleet proper recognition in its own future draft proposals and keeps the whole village within one ward so that it can retain its thriving community spirit.

Yours faithfully
Carole March
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Maureen Mather

Organisation Name:

Comment text:

I would like to be represented by a councillor for West Byfleet as this is our postal address and where my children go to school, I shop and get the train. All bearing the name West Byfleet. I have nothing to do with Sheerwater or Woodham the proposed wards to which we have been attached. Some are suggesting Pyrford but this is less of a connection in my mind. West Byfleet ceases to exist in the current plans which I think is wrong.

Uploaded Documents:

None Uploaded
Re: Proposal to merge Byfleet Ward with West Byfleet

We understand from one of our neighbours on [redacted] that the number of councillors in Woking Borough is being reduced from 36 to 30 and the ward boundaries are being reassessed. As part of this there is a proposal being put forward to merge Byfleet Ward including Byfleet Village and surrounding area with West Byfleet.

We have lived in Byfleet Village for over 3 years now and we feel that it has a very distinct identity in its own right and this seems to be reinforced by the fact it is part of Byfleet Ward as opposed to West Byfleet. We have a thriving local community with the historic village at the centre and all the local amenities here. The people in Byfleet are very supportive of the village and generally take an active part in the local community.

Apart from the community aspect, Byfleet is clearly separated from West Byfleet geographically with the M25 and canal forming part of the natural boundary.

On this basis it is difficult to see how this proposal would work for both communities, and it would be a shame for Byfleet to lose its identity as a separate village by merging the wards just so Woking can make up voting numbers. We are not convinced that it would and we would be interested to hear your comments on this.

Kind regards,

Claire McMahon and Dean Wright
Dear Sir,

We would like to _strongly_ support the proposed boundaries for the new Pyrford ward. We would _much_ prefer to be in the new Pyrford ward as opposed to being in any new 'Byfleet', 'Byfleets', 'Byfleet and West Byfleet', or 'Sheerwater' ward.

Please note that we generally consider the proposals submitted to you by Woking Council to be entirely sensible, particularly as they make a real attempt to retain the natural cohesion of the ancient area of Pyrford.

Yours faithfully

Bernard McNeill
Mrs St Helen McNeill
I do not know what the final proposal from Woking Borough Council will be but I have concerns that it may involve the break-up of Pyrford into two different wards. If this turns out to be the case it will be against representations that my wife and I have made to the Council. I am of the firm opinion that the existing ward of Pyrford represents very well the strong community that has existed here for many years and should not be divided. The railway line to the North West which forms part of the boundary of Pyrford is a clear physical barrier with Pyrford entirely to the South East. It would be unacceptable to us to have parts of Pyrford in two different wards on either side of this railway line.
The Review Officer (Woking)

> Firstly I would like to say how astounded I am to hear of the proposal for change to the Ward boundaries for Byfleet Village. I would like to object most strongly to this change of Ward. The first written reference to Byfleet was back in year 727 it was formed as part of the lands owned by Chertsey Abbey, Byfleet is listed in the Doomsday Book. Byfleet Village has a long and rich historic past and this alone should stand for the community we are today a thriving modern village but with loads of history dating back and now we are to lose our identity if this proposal goes ahead. If this proposal goes ahead the name of Byfleets is ridiculous. I understand that part of West Byfleet is to be incorporated in the Ward of Byfleets. Many years ago the railway station in West Byfleet was indeed Byfleet and Woodham a mile from the medieval village of Byfleet until the Parish of West Byfleet was established in 1917 so why can’t the ward boundaries just revert back to Byfleet as it was before the year 1917 it would be as simple as that without changing the Ward name of Byfleet.

> Please reconsider very carefully this proposal and leave Byfleet as Byfleet our historic Village just change part of the West Byfleet Ward Boundary back to be part of Byfleet Ward Boundaries as it was before.

> Yours sincerely

> Patricia Moore

>
Dear Sir

I understand the reduced number of councillors from 36 to 30 in the Woking Borough will require ward boundaries to be reassessed.

The proposal to split up West Byfleet and include the eastern area into the Byfleet ward would be impractical because of the clear physical boundary consisting of the Wey Navigation Canal and the London Orbital Motorway (M25).

Any boundary change would be detrimental to both communities.

The historic village of Byfleet has been in existence and on record for more than 1000 years, the proposal to change the name of the ward to Byfleets just to satisfy Woking politics is unacceptable and grammatically incorrect.

Regards from Byfleet Residents

Christine and Brian Mullin.
WE AT WEST BYFLEET ARE STRONGLY AGAINST THE COUNCIL PLAN TO MOVE THE WEST BYFLEET BOUNDARY LINE.

WE ARE PART OF WEST BYFLEET VILLAGE AND WOULD LIKE IT TO STAY THAT WAY.

HOW CAN WE BELIEVE THE COUNCIL WHEN THEY SAY THIS WILL NOT AFFECT OUR COMMUNITY.

THE LONG-TERM AFFECT WILL MEAN US NOT HAVING A VOICE IN WEST BYFLEET COMMUNITY AFFAIRS. IF WE WANTED TO LIVE IN SHEERWATER WE WOULD HAVE BOUGHT A HOUSE THERE.

HOUSE PRICES AND COUNCIL TAX SHOULD BE LESS IF THIS GOES AHEAD AND SCHOOL CATCHMENT FOR OUR VILLAGE WILL ALTER. THE COUNCIL SHOULD RECONSIDER.
B E F O R E  E N F O R C I N G  T H E S E  
N E W  B O U N D A R Y  C H A N G E S.

R G & G S  P A Y.
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Anne Petrie

Organisation Name:

Map Features:

1: ROBIN HOOD ROAD ST. JOHNS

Comment text:

ROBIN HOOD ROAD ST. JOHNS - NOT SURE IF THE MAP HAS BEEN MARKED CORRECTLY. AS A LIFE LONG RESIDENT OF THIS VILLAGE OF ST. JOHNS WHICH FOR SOME REASON DOES NOT SEEM TO BE INCLUDED ON A LOT OF MAPS, ROBIN HOOD ROAD EAST OF AMSTELL WAY HAS NEVER BELONGED TO KNAPFILL, THE CREATION OF AMSTELL WAY WHICH JOINED LOCKFIELD DRIVE TO HERMITAGE ROAD, EFFECTIVELY CUT ROBINHOOD RD IN TWO MAKING THE ST JOHNS END A CUL DE SAC BUT FOR SOME REASON WE SUDDENLY FOUND OURSELVES HAVING TO VOTE AS PART OF KNAPFILL SOUTH WHICH AS RESIDENTS IS NOT SOMETHING WE IDENTIFY WITH, ALL OUR LIVES EVOLVE AROUND ST JOHNS VILLAGE. WHAT HAPPENS IN KNAPFILL IS NOTHING TO DO WITH US AND NEVER HAS BEEN, WE ARE ST. JOHNS RESIDENTS
-----Original Message-----
From: Joan Philbrick
Sent: 18 March 2014 22:40
To: Reviews@
Subject: Byfleet ward to lose its name

Dear sirs

It has been bought to my attention that Woking council wants to reassess the ward boundaries and for Byfleet ward to include part of West Byfleet and to be renamed Byfleets.

I do not believe the Byfleet ward boundary should be changed and find it really upsetting as a resident of over 35 years that Byfleet ward should lose its name.

Byfleet is a very old historic village, it is a thriving village and moving the ward boundaries would be detrimental to the village. The canal and M25 motorway make a very clear and physical boundary between Byfleet and West Byfleet.

Why should Byfleet ward be changed just because Woking need to make up its number in candidates for voting purposes. These proposals completely ignore the wishes of both Byfleet and West Byfleet communities and will also cause problems in Pyrford and other parts of Woking.

I would also like to know why we, the public were only given today and tomorrow to send in our objections, it has all been done very hurriedly.

Yours faithfully

Joan Philbrick
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Karen Pritchett

Organisation Name: n/a

Map Features:

Comment text:

I have only recently moved to my current address in Hurst Way, moving from another Pyrford/GU22 8 address in December 2013. I was careful to select a property within the Pyrford locale as this is where I feel "at home". I now understand that, under the proposals, the boundary would be redrawn and Hurst Way would be included in to the "Woodlands Ward" along with Woodham Road and the Sheerwater estate. I am of a strong opinion that the residents in Hurst Way have a very strong association with the Pyrford Ward – being members of the residents association, attending the Church of the Good Shepherd in Pyrford, the Pyrford Village Hall, being an active part of the Pyrford Flower Show and utilising the Pyrford Shops. do not believe the resident of Hurst Way would associate with the Ward of Sheerwater or have anything in common with the challenges of that area or the services provided. The socio economic makeup of Hurst Way is very much in line with Pyrford (highly educated, senior mgmt./professional or retired people, with a high percentage of retirees). Pyrford is very different in make up to the Sheerwater Estate where the socio economic mix is younger, less educated and less economically independent. You only need to look at the statistical data on the ONS (neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk) to see the very very clear cultural/social/economic/deprivation differences between GU22 8 and GU21 5. The boundary between Pyrford and West Byfleet has always been the boundary/line (I believe a line of trees in history) between Hurst Way and Rivery Close. It makes little/no sense to move the boundary in order to add less than 50 residents to a new ward (Hurst Way has less than 20 properties, inhabited generally by single/retired married couples).
From: Dunkeyson, Nicholas  
Sent: 04 March 2014 14:30  
To: Reviews@  
Subject: Proposed Boundary Changes

I have lived in my present home in Pyrford for 40 years and have a considerable understanding of what makes our village the pleasant desirable place to live – community is everything.  

Although I understand the need for reduction of the number of councillors and to ensure a comparable amount of electors in each ward, I do have an issue with dividing the well established community of Pyrford. We have shared values and goals and we also are pro-active in community led projects.  

The proposed ward boundaries make no sense to us; neither does the proposed name of “The Heath.” The creation of “The Heath” has caused much unnecessary angst, especially to those residents of Pyrford who now find themselves in the proposed “Woodlands” ward. There is no need to split a well established village.  

The proposed boundary doesn’t even meet the stated Boundary Commission’s recommendations re natural boundaries such as railways, major roads etc.  

I feel very strongly that all Pyrford residents should remain in the ward called Pyrford – the name “The Heath” means nothing to us - we have never been referred to as The Heath, as explained by Mr Ray Morgan at the Public meeting on 18th February. Historically we have been Pyrford Village for many centuries, although the spelling has changed over the years from the Saxon Pyrianforde which means "the ford by the pear tree.”  

The Maybury Estate residents do not share our history, aspirations, affinity etc and will have no regard for Pyrford residents. They have their own community, and different priorities when it comes to local issues.  

I am grateful for the opportunity for public consultation but I urge you to reconsider the proposals – reinstate the ward of Pyrford, and include all present Pyrford residents/electors in our village.  

Kind regards  

Barbara Provis
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: david reeve

Organisation Name: The Grove Area Ltd

Map Features:

Comment text:
Re Proposed single ward for Horsell, a good idea. Horsell east has no real interest tie up with Woodham
-----Original Message-----
From: carole.reyes
Sent: 19 March 2014 19:20
To: Reviews@
Subject: Byfleet

I object to Woking joining Byfleet to West Byfleet we are two very separate towns
Dearest Sir,

It has been brought to my attention that the boundary lines are being changed. I have lived in West Rayleigh for sixty years, and my family before me.

We have always been able to have a say in what happens in the village. It certainly do not want to become part of Sandpits.

My sons were educated at Fullbrook, and myself went to the Little school in Camp Hill Road, and from there to the Central school, as it was called then.

I certainly would not want my grand children walking to Shelley Dale School.

Another reason being, we would be part of the "Three Villages", which I have always been proud to be part of. For these reasons, and I am sure there are many more, I am very much against this happening.

I remain,

Yours Sincerely,

Mrs Glades M. Reynolds.
Dear Sirs
My wife and I greatly applaud WBC revised boundary recognising Pyrford's unique character and geography.
Michael and Valerie Roberts

Sent from my iPad
Dear Sirs

I was very pleased that common sense prevailed at the recent meeting and that the revised WBC Wards proposal was approved, whereby Pyrford would be a unitary element, to do otherwise would be totally illogical.

Yours faithfully
Patricia Rochester