Local Residents submissions to the Woking electoral review

This PDF document contains 18 submissions from Local Residents.

Some versions of Adobe allow the viewer to move quickly between bookmarks.

Click on the submission you would like to view. If you are not taken to that page, please scroll through the document.

Surnames A - C
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Gillian Ankers

Organisation Name:

Map Features:

Comment text:
I appreciate that in order to reduce Woking's 17 wards to 10 it will be necessary for some existing wards to be combined and possibly for others to be split up. However, I believe every effort should be made to do this with as little disruption to the existing situation as possible. In particular, I believe that the current Pyrford ward must be kept as an entity although it will clearly have to be combined with other areas as it does not have enough electors to stand alone. Pyrford is an ancient community which is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It is part of the parish of Wisley with Pyrford (Wisley is in Guildford Borough) and has a thriving 12th century church as well as a more modern church with meeting facilities which form the hub of community life. The village centre also has a primary school, a Cricket Club, a Village Hall (built as a First World War Memorial Hall), Scout and Guide premises and a well used parade of shops. There are a number of community groups within Pyrford including particularly the Flower Show Committee which puts on the annual Flower Show in July. This is a huge event including sideshows, stalls, entertainment and refreshments as well as horticultural, homemaking and handicraft competitions. It has been part of village life for almost 70 years. Pyrford is bounded to the north-west by the London Waterloo to Woking railway line and it would seem sensible to keep this boundary to the new ward.
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Peter Ankers

Organisation Name:

Map Features:

Comment text:

I live in Pyrford and I believe that the current Borough Council ward of Pyrford should be kept as a unified area within one of the new and larger Borough Council wards. The population of Pyrford is less than the target ward size and so this will not affect a requirement that all councillors should affect the same number of voters. The border in the north west should be the railway/golf course because residents on both sides of Old Woking Road consider themselves as part of Pyrford; in the south the border of Pyrford coincides with the edge of Woking Borough. Residents in, and to the west of, Coldharbour Road and Rivey Close consider themselves as being resident in Pyrford. Pyrford is mentioned in the Domesday Book. Today it is a very close knit community that is focussed on a school, church, local shops, cricket club and Village Hall. Separately from this central area there is the original 12th century Pyrford Church and a Borough Council playground. There are many social organisations based in Pyrford. If my proposal that the current ward of Pyrford is included in toto in a new ward then it will fulfil the second requirement ie that the interests and identity of a local community will be protected and can be effectively represented by a the councillors for the larger new ward that Pyrford will be part of.
Dear Sir

I understand that the latest proposal is that Byfleet Ward will include part of West Byfleet and the name will be changed to "Byfleets".

Byfleet is a thriving community and I believe that the proposed boundary changes would damage this - and will also seriously disrupt the growing community spirit in West Byfleet.

The motorway and canal also make a very clear physical boundary between Byfleet and West Byfleet - which is, I believe, one of the most important criteria used when deciding Ward boundaries.

I do not want the Byfleet Ward boundary to be changed, it is a proud and historic village and the Ward should not be renamed just so that voting numbers can be made up - especially when the proposed additional housing in Byfleet is taken into consideration.

I suggest that these proposals ignore the wishes of both communities and may also cause problems in Pyrford and other parts of Woking and should not therefore be implemented.

Yours sincerely

Brian Ashfield

Byfleet.
It would make sense if Horsell was treated as an entity. Combine the two wards. If this results in too great a number, Woodham, should go, maybe, to West Byfleet, which would be the centre that most people look to from that part, rather than Horsell. If the numbers don’t fit, then maybe add the town centre, which is, at present Goldsworth East, though it is well isolated from Goldsworth Park.
Dear Sirs

I objected strongly to the original proposals put forward by Woking Council which would have split Pyrford village in a nonsensical way, and would like to emphasise how pleased I am that the Council's latest proposal keeps Pyrford in one ward.

Yours sincerely

Lionel Barnes,
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Gordon Barr

Organisation Name:

Map Features:

Comment text:

I suggest you stop interfering and leave Pyrford in Woking the way it is Thank you
Sir

I write to advise you that I have lived in PYRFORD for nearly 34 years.

My children attended PYRFORD School, played on the PYRFORD Cricket Ground, played football for PYRFORD Colts and attended clubs in the CHURCH and the Arbor Facility.

My shopping is in PYRFORD.

PYRFORD MUST BE RETAINED as an IDENTIFIABLE UNIT within WOKING B.C.

Gordon J Barr
Dear Sirs

We were not able to comment directly to Woking BC due to only finding out about the process after their closure date.

We live in Silversmiths Way, and object very strongly to the change of boundary to put us into Canalside. Since moving here in 1990 we have always been treated as being part of Goldsworth Park. Indeed our house was the first of the show houses of Goldsworth Park. We are cut off from Goldsworth Park by virtue of Parley Drive, which has no pavements or safe crossing points. But we share a common builder and address.

We are in fact part of the main town of Woking and suffer from the same problems as other town residents with commuter parking etc necessitating police intervention in the past and with their help, installation of parking restrictions by double and single yellow lines. Our Community Police links are strong and the residents of Silversmiths Way are regular and frequent attendees at such meetings. We would expect such links to continue because the parking charge avoiders are making the road safety etc worse all the time in the area.

Residents of this area have absolutely no links to St Johns or Brookwood village other than by choosing to walk the canal path. After 24 years of residency we ask what on earth one would want to do in these places other than to drive through them. Any representation of people in Silversmiths Way, and the roads off it lies in the town centre, drawing a line to cut us off is just arbitrary and we at the eastern extremity will be isolated, as will Royal Oak residents.

With this proposal we would lose any meaningful representation as the majority of the rest of the area are unlikely to appreciate our concerns. Our votes would become meaningless or pointless.

Yours faithfully

Philip and Kathryn Bennett
Dear Sirs

I am writing to the Boundary Commission to express satisfaction at the revised WBC ward proposal, which recognises that the community of Pyrford should be included as a whole in the new revised Pyrford Ward.

Would you please take this comment into consideration when approving the WBC new boundary proposals.

Kind regards
Derek Berriman
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Ann ce Biggs

Organisation Name: 

Map Features:

Comment text: No, do not change knaphill s boundaries. Stop playing polit cs w th us. We are proud of knaphill and its green and pleasant spaces.
To Whom It May Concern

I wish to strongly disagree with the proposed new ward boundaries for Byfleet.

Byfleet village is an individual village in its own right and is a quite separate entity from neighbouring West Byfleet. The proposed name of ‘The Byfleets’ would further confuse the distinction between the two villages. For example, there is already confusion with the postal address for Byfleet (which still includes ‘West Byfleet’ as the now out-of-date postal town) and for visitors, confusing the stations (‘Byfleet and New Haw’ for Byfleet Village and the next stop ‘West Byfleet’).

The needs of the community of Byfleet are quite different from those of West Byfleet and therefore the distinction between the two villages needs to be upheld. The present boundary between Byfleet and West Byfleet coincides with the canal and the motorway, which both provide a natural boundary between the two villages.

Combining all or part of the two villages will undoubtedly reduce the attention to the diverse needs of both villages and thus make it more difficult for the councillors to support their constituents effectively.

I really do hope you will seriously consider retaining the Byfleet Ward as it has been known for hundreds of years.

Yours faithfully

Jane Bond
Byfleet Resident
From: Dunkeyson, Nicholas
Sent: 28 March 2014 17:31
To: Reviews@
Subject: Ward Boundaries

Dear Sir/Madam

Reducing the number of councillors in Woking Borough from 36 to 30 is a big change and is likely to have a substantial effect on the governance of Woking Borough. It would therefore seem important to minimise the resulting ward boundary changes and avoid any disconnection of existing communities - if at all possible.

While the extent of this change does mean that there must be some adjustment of the wards, it is possible to avoid creating new boundaries while still remaining within the official guidelines.

Woking Borough Council's officers have done a very efficient job in changing the boundaries so that voting numbers are well equalised, but their proposal seems primarily concerned with numbers (ie equalising the vote between wards) rather than avoiding disruption to existing communities. It creates new boundaries and has a particularly harmful effect on West Byfleet, which is officially designated as the only "District Centre" in Woking.

Effectively West Byfleet disappears and the centre would be controlled by councillors from the completely different and separate community in Byfleet. Local 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 even its own railway.

I'd therefore like you to consider a much simpler ward change solution which better preserves communities throughout Woking Borough and still adheres to your guidelines. A description is given below and a map is attached together with detailed figures based on the 2019 projected voting numbers.

This proposal merges adjacent existing Wards and then only needs three final adjustments:-
Woodham is moved to Maybury and Sheerwater, the Eastern area of Goldsworth East (ie "MA") is moved to Mount Herman West and Kingfield is moved to Old Woking - it only uses existing ward and area boundaries and no communities are split.

I hope you find this solution to be of interest.

Best Regards
Mr John E Bond
Ward Boundary Changes (variances in brackets):
1) Knaphill - no change (2.46%)
2) Combine Horsell East to Horsell West without Woodham (4.83%)
3) Combine West Byfleet and Pyrford (9.69%)
4) Combine Goldsworth West, South and Central (6.03%)
5) Combine Mount Herman East with Old Woking and add Kingfield (7.73%)
6) Combine Brookwood, Mayford, Sutton Green with Westfield and Barns bury (-4%)
7) Combine Hermitage, Knaphill South, St Johns and Hook Heath (-0.28%)
8) Add Woodham to Maybury and Sheerwater (10.23%)
9) Add Goldsworth East (East area) to Mount Herman West (-11.75%)
10) Byfleet - no change (-24.95%)

I understand that your guidelines are that at least 70% of the wards must have a variance of less than 10% and no ward should have a variance of more than 30% (see below).

The above proposal meets these criteria as only the last 3 wards have a variance of more than 10% and even Byfleet's variance is well clear of 30%. It should also be noted that the the adjacent but very well separated ward of "West Byfleet and Pyrford" has a positive variance which goes a long way towards balancing Byfleet's negative variance.

Please note that while a more precise allocation would be obtained by adding some of West Byfleet (eg Dartnell Park) to Byfleet this would disrupt both communities and would ignore the very clear physical boundary (motorway and canal) between these communities - it would not be welcomed by the residents of either area.

Ward Commissioners' Guidelines on ward sizing:

2.7 The Commission accepts that perfect electoral equality across a local authority is unlikely to be achieved. This is because, when drawing boundaries, we also consider community identities and interests, the need for strong, clear boundaries and parish boundaries as well as the need to secure effective and convenient local government. As a result, there will always be some variance of actual representation from the theoretical numerical average. Similarly, changes in population, from the moment we complete a review, mean that the electoral ratio and the electoral variance from ward to ward are likely to change immediately and over time.

2.8 When the electoral variances in representation across a local authority become notable, a further electoral review (FER) is required. Our criteria for initiating a FER in those circumstances is as follows:
More than 30% of a council's wards/divisions having an electoral imbalance of more than 10% from the average ratio for that authority; and/or
One or more wards/divisions with an electoral imbalance of more than 30%;
and the imbalance is unlikely to be corrected by foreseeable changes to the electorate within a reasonable period. We monitor the levels of electoral imbalance across all local authorities in England annually, and those that meet the above-mentioned criteria will, at some point, be included in our review programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Voters 2019</th>
<th>Ward Total</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byfleet</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>5,855</td>
<td>-24.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goldsworth East - Central+South</strong></td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsworth West</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookwood</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayford &amp; Sutton Green</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield &amp; Barnsbury</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingfield</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Herman East</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Woking</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Herman West</td>
<td>5,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goldsworth East - East</strong></td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>-11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage &amp; Knaphill South</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns &amp; Hook Heath</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>7,780</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knaphill</td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybury &amp; Sheerwater</td>
<td>7,447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodham</strong></td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horsell East - Park+East</strong></td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsell West</td>
<td>5,557</td>
<td>8,179</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Byfleet</td>
<td>4,503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrford</td>
<td>4,055</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woking Total</strong></td>
<td>78,018</td>
<td>78,018</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters for 30 wards</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters for 10 ward areas</td>
<td>7,802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Woking Wards

Proposed Woking Wards
Dear Sir

I am a resident of Pyrford and have been so for the last 7 years.

I have recently received information regarding the proposed boundary change.

I was disappointed to note the proposal for my road and immediate area to be included in the new "Woodlands" ward. I am a strong believer in the values of the community and the links that my young family and I have built up over the last 7 years. As context my wife teaches in the local Pyrford School where my son is a pupil, we are active members of the local church and other clubs and activities in the area.

These examples were the main reasons that we moved to the area, the identity is strong within Pyrford. I fail to see any links to Woodham and Sheerwater either geographically or as regards to our links within the local area. I firmly see myself as a Pyrford resident and see true value for this reaming. I am genuinely worried and concerned as regards to the ramifications of the proposal in regards of the future schooling of my children, my wife and I have already talked about us having to move house.

I am utterly opposed to the changes suggested and see little value in them, even after reading the information that has been made available. Quite simply I fail to see that the boundary change makes any "common sense".

I intend to fill out the online feedback, however have been unable to do so tonight due to a system error. I would however ask that you ensure my e-mail to you is given due consideration in the feedback process.

With Thanks

Jim Brockway
From: Dunkeyson, Nicholas
Sent: 30 March 2014 23:28
To: Reviews@
Subject: Fwd: Woking Borough Ward Boundaries

Sent: 30/03/2014 23:26:19 GMT Daylight Time
Subj: Woking Borough Ward Boundaries

To : The Boundary Commission

I write to inform you that I accept the new boundary plans passed by Woking Borough Council at their Meeting on 27th March 2014. I rejected the original draft plan put up by the Council.

I am resident of Elmstead Road, West Byfleet and thus currently in West Byfleet Ward. A move to an expanded Pyrford Ward in 2016 would be acceptable, although if possible I would suggest a slight movement of the western boundary to incorporate the Rough (in entirety) and Shey Copse in the new Pyrford Ward. This is a natural boundary and would mean consolidation of the open area which means so much to many of us.

Yours sincerely,

Rosemary Chrystie
I live in Old Avenue, West Byfleet and I would like to be part of the Pyrford Ward.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Cook

Sent from Windows Mail
Comment text:

I have already submitted comments, last year that I think it is wrong to reduce the number of elected members. Parties other than the Conservatives are poorly represented already and boundary changes run the risk of reducing this further. I don’t feel qualified to draw up changes to the boundaries and I think, in order to reduce the number of councillors and save costs, a professional should look at historic voting pattern and redraw the boundaries to retain the status quo in party numbers. Or, redraw the whole borough to achieve this result.
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: sarah cook
Organisation Name:

Comment text:
The proposal to split West Byfleet and put some with Byfleet and some with Woodlands makes absolutely no sense at all. West Byfleet is a separate and cohesive community which includes Old Avenue. We have a clearly defined village centre with a retail centre which can provide all that is needed for the community. There are also churches, schools and other community facilities which add to the unique character which is very different from that of Byfleet. West Byfleet has more in common with Pyrford than Byfleet. Sheerwater is a very different community which looks more towards Woking and Maybury than West Byfleet. The proposed boundaries feel as if the coherence of West Byfleet has been sacrificed for political expediency. There is no logic to it at all. I would propose that West Byfleet be kept as a whole ward and with parts of Woodham Lane to the Runnymede border be within the West Byfleet ward with Sheerwater and Maybury being a ward with a bit more of Woking town to make up electorate numbers. I feel very strongly that this proposal should be thoroughly reconsidered, bearing in mind the actual communities on the ground. In fact the published comments on the proposed boundaries imply an admission that the new ward of Woodlands is a disparate area with no community centre. I never go to Sheerwater unless there is a traffic diversion and in over three years of living in the area have never used any facilities in Sheerwater whereas we are in West Byfleet's centre several times a day. Please reconsider these changes carefully and listen to the community which you are meant to be serving.
Woking District

Personal Details:

Name: Keith Creswell

Organisation Name:

Map Features:

1: 

2: 

3: 

4: 

Comment text: With reference to the proposed new boundaries, the boundary between Woodlands and Byfleet Wards north of the railway constructs a large panhandle including areas such as Station Road and Woodlands Ave which regard themselves very much as West Byfleet. Further the boundary south of the railway excludes much of Madeira Road and old Woking Road which are even more part of West Byfleet. Any West Byfleet issues will be considered by 6 councillors all of whom may well have their main considerations elsewhere, e.g. Byfleet and Sheerwater. Therefore these proposals have failed in one of their prime objectives namely recognising and encouraging Community cohesion. Although extending the boundaries to include the traditional parts of West Byfleet may result in a slight democratic deficit, it would be more than compensated by having coherent representation and balance between Byfleet and West Byfleet villages instead of one whole village and half of the other.